

EDITORIALS

How many pieces of silver, Mr. Trudeau?

Five York students have proved that Canadian immigration laws are now being grossly misused.

Last weekend, posing as American Air Force deserters, they found that Canadian immigration officials were turning potential American immigrants over to the American authorities for incarceration.

Canadian immigration law does not discriminate between a deserter and any other applicant for landed immigrant status. The

government has gone on record as saying that "an individual's status with regard to compulsory military service has no bearing upon his admissibility to Canada."

But this same government sanctions this destruction of the law by turning back deserters to American authorities for punishment.

By letting this situation occur once, the Minister of Immigration is guilty of negligence. But this has been a common practice for over four months.

The only plausible reason for such actions by Canada is that the United States have asked Canada to disregard our law for the sake of expedience.

And thus the government of Mr. Trudeau has compromised the integrity of an entire nation.

Since the Prime Minister is ultimately responsible for the laws of the country, we can only assume that Mr. Trudeau has been bought off; that expedience, and not legality, is his key to office.

Levesque, go home

I would like to comment on Rene Levesque's recent visit to York. I admit that Quebec does have grievances and issues which Quebecers should feel are important. I also admit that it is quite possible, in fact, maybe even probable, that Levesque is sincere in his feelings about Quebec and separatism. In fact, he is quite within his rights to present his case for separatism.

But that does not mean that I have to agree with him, and I didn't. I think that it would be very bad for Quebec as well as for the rest of Canada.

However, what is even worse is that a man like Levesque can come to York and receive, outwardly, at least, the positive support that he did from his audience.

Disregarding the fact that he is a French Canadian he is an example of the type of politicians of either English or French background that we don't need. I found his little narration almost overwhelmingly critical and cynical that it was a little repulsive.

He started off calmly telling a few little jokes, getting everybody on his side and then proceeded to launch an emotional and biting swath through everything ranging from the federal government to his own schooling in Quebec.

We all know that there are many things wrong but we don't need power hungry politicians and public figures like Levesque giving emotion-packed and audience-swaying speeches bemoaning the ails of our society.

What we do need and should support are individuals with ideas offering a few positive, constructive, viable and encompassing alternatives, not just biting criticisms.
David Anderson (WIII)

letterslotsoflettersletshavelotsofletters

All letters to the editor will be run, space permitting. If you have a definite opinion, send it in. Letters longer than 250 words may be edited, and letters should be signed, or use of pseudonym explained to the editor. Please type to a 64 character margin.

Levesque's rhetoric

We jammed ourselves into Winter's Common Room to hear the words of Rene Levesque. The fact that he said almost nothing, but presented a highly emotional appeal for Quebec sovereignty was not the issue. What appeared as the issue from the response of the students was that: this man is actively advocating a program of disunity for Canada, and "isn't that just too groovy?"

Alright, now to the content of Mr. Levesque's appeal. He proposed a numerous amount of "ifs". They were strung out, somewhat in this fashion: if my party gains a 25% minority in the next Quebec Provincial election, and statistics say they will; if in the following election my party wins a majority; and, if the Federal Government continues to blunder in their attempts to reconcile Quebec with the rest of Canada; then, (ha! finally a 'then') then Quebec will stand sovereign.

If sovereignty is realized, then neighbours (for that is what Rene says we'll be, two different countries living in the same neighbourhood) let's not spend valuable time bickering about what has happened, but let's work together, harmoniously.

Also Rene mentioned many times during his hour and a half appeal

that Quebec is getting a "snow-job" from the rest of Canada. The Bi and Bi Report has come too late, says Rene. The flag is bullshit says Rene. We could have been duped in by it twenty years ago, but now we feel a strong sense of identity (God bless those that feel a strong sense of identity!) and prefer the fleur de lis, besides it looks more aesthetic, says Rene.

In a long and drawn out illustration of how petty bureaucrats screwed up necessary economic aid to Quebec, Rene drew applause and laughter from the students.

Well that's not surprising: I haven't met a student yet who liked a petty bureaucrat.

After Rene finished his ninety minute tirade, a group of students were seen trying to form a committee. The purpose: to plan a farewell party for Quebec.

What I would have liked to ask Rene, had he not let his emotions speak so long so that only a few questions could be raised: Who is giving who a "snow-job"? All you have done, Rene, is to spout a long series of conditional "ifs". Then you assumed that the conditions would, magically, fall into place. With the "ifs" as truisms, Quebec has left. Now you tell us, Rene, not to waste valuable time, to work together as neighbours. That to me, Rene, is one helluva snow-job!

Rene's "ifs" continue to echo in my ears. I can only respond to them by what Shaw once wrote: "If 'ifs' and 'buts' were pots and pans, there'd be no need for tinkers."

You have told me nothing Rene, but set numerous conditions. God help you if they are not all met; but

more important, God help Canada if they are.

Brian Pape (WII) is a philosophy student.

Alice in Wonderland revisited

The Interim Report of the Special Commission on Parking of the President's Advisory Committee on Parking makes some of the most delightful reading since "Alice in Wonderland".

... because of (the present parking system's) detrimental effects on academic pursuits and the public image of the University." Detrimental effect on academic pursuits? On the public image of the University? The mind boggles.

"Motivated by the general dissatisfaction. . . General? Or the dissatisfaction of a few starry-eyed students and deadbeat faculty members who don't want to pay for reserved parking and so don't think that anyone else should be permitted to do so?"

... a relocation of surface parking as depicted in the appended diagram is under study." It's not the relocation of surface parking that's under study; it's the appended diagram that's under study. . . by everyone who's received it. No one has managed to figure it out yet.

"If the Commission's proposal is adopted by the Administration, 350 parking meters will be installed during the summer of this year." If the Commission's proposal should be adopted by this or any other administration, every thinking adult on the campus will promptly leap from the top of McLaughlin in despair.

Psyched out again

I question the validity of J. Lecander's complaint regarding the Psych 201A course ('Psyched Out', Excalibur, Feb. 6). Granted, his disgust with the cheating that apparently went on during the Feb. 4 exam is warranted; however, I feel his complaints expressed in the rest of the article are entirely unfounded.

"Of course there were a few brilliant students who somehow anticipated and spotted the questions correctly but a high percentage were totally confused," states Lecander. However, Dr. Stager, course director, says that the questions plus the answers were strongly hinted at in tutorials and lectures prior to the exam. Dr. Stager, who when I spoke to him was reluctant to give any more publicity to this misrepresentation of the course, says Lecander's "psyched-out business is probably the result of not attending lectures".

Also it's significant that not one of the Psych 201A students bothered to attend the Feb. 6 general meeting of the psychology department to convey their dissatisfaction to their reps in the Society of Psychology Students and to Dr. Stager himself. (A reminder of this 4 o'clock meeting was given at the lecture that very day.)

Criticism is easy but it should be based on accurate facts. Criticism can be constructive but only if followed up by meaningful action.

Anne Wright (FIII)

Excalibur

February 13, 1969

editor in chief	ross howard
managing editor	rolly stroeter
staff-at-large	george b. orr
news	grant carter
coordinating editor	don mckay
assistant news	dave cooper
features	frank liebeck
assistant features	anne wright
entertainment	david mccaughna
sports	stu smith
photo	scott mcmaster, alan lamb
layout	bob elgie, richard levine
copy desk	gale campbell, olga shpak,
	anita levine
advertising	rolly stroeter

excalibur was founded in 1966. it is produced by the students of york university and published by the york student council. opinions expressed do not necessarily represent those of the student councils or the administration. excalibur is a member of the canadian university press, printed at web offset publications, and has a circulation of 7000.

office: 030a steacie science library, york university, downsvew ontario. phone 635-3800 or 635-3880.

deadlines: advertising on monday at 1 pm. copy on tuesday at 5 pm.

coops gets top billing tonite 'cause this week he copped out for real. . . richie, notre philosophe likes Rolly Strudel & claire la belle (clarabelle?). . . someone isn't talking to olga so she's making ME miserable. . . don't print that, says tonyoo but what did he say? bob's hair is getting long, does that make him a longhair? (did I say that??) . . . georgie b. all set for hop to sir george for burning bldg. pix but why don't we do it here? . . . grant is back on the bourgeois press. . . anne re-typed like a sweet kid while harried editor studied for exam. . . a valentine kiss to uncle pat from o. & schmendel. . .

The annual revenue from the 350 meters installed within the ring road "will be \$78,750 at 100 utilisation." Utilisation by whom? By students? Not on your life, with free parking available outside. By faculty and staff? Running out to insert a nickel every half-hour? With a three-hour maximum? Poppycock! Utilised by a handful of visitors to the campus dim-witted enough to pay a five-cent fee they're not obligated in any way to pay.

"The possibility of a bank loan to finance this investment (sic!) is being investigated." It's a delight to picture the bank manager's face when he is asked to entertain this preposterous nonsense. And from university professors, at that!

"(Underground parking) mini-mises operating costs." Oh?

"Since it is certainly not economical to construct under-ground parking facilities beneath the already existing buildings. . ." While this stunning revelation will not exactly revolutionize engineering thought, it has the dubious distinction of being the first and only sensible statement in the entire report.
Bemused Parker

MBA student dissents

It was most disappointing to read Dean Gillies' letter concerning the possibility of allowing students without undergraduate degrees into the MBA program at York University. The Dean in this letter suggests that "persons 30 years of age or over, through self-education or other qualifying background may be eligible for admission". This concept is not new as "mature" persons are admitted into undergraduate courses at several universities now. Few graduate schools of business do allow what Dean Gillies is suggesting York do in his letter, but because others do is no basis for a similar arrangement at York. Why don't universities allow knowledgeable and expertise persons into PHD programs should they lack academic requirements? In actual fact and if carried to a logical extreme, Dean Gillies is proposing that no formal academic degrees are needed to proceed to graduate degrees. Do I detect a trend to the abolition of "age-old" degrees? Should this radical suggestion be implemented, one should question the stability of the existing faculty of administrative studies in order to determine the success of the proposed one. Assuming the former as a stable operation, could such a course of action detract from the already established standards at York.

As opposed to a degree for these "mature" individuals, consider diploma courses, seminars and the Division of Executive Development at York. Surely these people would qualify for such programs.

Finally, it would have been considerate of the Dean to have consulted the present graduate student body for an opinion on the matter. Rather, he states that it is mandatory for those involved to appear for a 2½ - 3½ hour testing program to help establish further standards for such candidates. Little wonder undergraduate York students revolt, if the lack of communication and autocratic role is prevalent as it has been for the graduate MBA students. At one time my sympathy had been with the establishment. I is no longer.
D. Enns (MBA II, part-time)