

How the students council gets its money

By MICHAEL MOURITSEN
President of CYSF

In my discussion last week of the Student Federation's budget, I attempted to explain the administrative costs of the Council. One frequently-expressed view claims that 50% of the budget is spent to administer the other half. In fact, as I pointed out, about one-third of the \$95,000 is devoted to what could be classified as "administrative", cut that this classification is not as clearcut as it first appears.

By outlining the responsibilities of the Council's full-time employees (president, business administrator and secretary), I indicated that salaries are not paid merely to manage the affairs of the Council. The secretary and the business administrator, in addition to their work on the Council's administration (e.g., typing and accounting), make it possible for the Federation to offer its many services (such as duplicating, charter flights, car pool, and employment service). The cost of operating these services is included in these two salaries.

The president is paid not only for his work as chief

executive officer of the Council, but as a representative on numerous university councils and committees. The office of president is a full-time position for the same reason that the editor-in-chief of Excalibur is full-time: in the opinion of the Council and the editorial staff respectively, the responsibilities of each position are sufficient to warrant it.

This week, I would like to explain how the Federation obtains its money. Of \$95,000 available this year, \$15,000 was carried over from last year, and most of the remainder (\$78,000) is the anticipated operating grant from the University. Many students are under the erroneous impression that they pay "student fees" to their student councils. A university policy on financial support of student government was issued earlier this year, and I will quote some excerpts from it:

"Student governments receive operating grants from the University which are drawn from general University revenues. A student is not paying a compulsory membership fee to the University which is passed on to a society legally separate from the University. He is paying a tuition fee to the University, which, in turn, supports a

wide range of departments, agencies and activities furthering the University's educational goals."

The policy goes on to state the reasons for university financial support of student councils:

"The university supports student government as one of its educational functions believing that significant educational benefits are available to both the active participants of Councils and to those who enjoy the programme options offered by student governments. Because it is educationally important that these options be available to student members of the university, financial support of student governments is guaranteed by the university."

The annual grant to the York Student Federation has been calculated at \$10 per undergraduate member, and \$5.50 per graduate member. Each college council receives a grant of \$17 per member-student, and the Graduate and Environmental Students' Associations receive \$9.50 per student.

I will conclude this discussion of our budget next week, with a discussion of the Council's external policy.

Opinion piece

War in the Middle-East

Israel's insistence on secure and defensible borders has been validated by the unproved attack on the Jewish State by two Arab nations, Egypt and Syria. Were the present borders of Israel as vulnerable as those of pre-1967, the Arabs' first strike would have gravely endangered the State's existence.

The attack, long in planning, was deliberately scheduled for Yom Kippur, the holiest day of the year for the Jewish people, a day traditionally spent in solemn prayer and reflection. In Israel itself, essential services such as transportation and communications had been suspended in deference to the deep convictions of its Orthodox citizens.

The vileness of this choice of time for the attack was compounded by the Arabs' claim that Israel had started the war. This line was maintained even in the face of reports from United Nations observers that both the Egyptian and Syrian armies crossed the cease-fire lines while the Israelis had not. However, on Sunday afternoon, the official Egyptian news agency, Sawt El Arab, declared: "The battles which took place so far proved that the decision to attack which was taken by the responsible Arab leadership was not a mere adventure but a planned campaign which did not avoid the needed sacrifices that the leadership sees as the price of victory and the return of Arab land and honor."

The lax attitude of many countries, and the United Nations organization, toward terrorist activities against Jews and Israelis has served to encourage the Arabs in the belief that they could spill Jewish blood

with impunity. Austria's surrender to Arab terrorists on Rosh Hashana is the most recent example. One after another, nations of Western Europe have refused to take significant measures to curb Arab terrorism within their own borders; many have actually released convicted Arab murderers from prison. The Munich killers, for example, have all been freed.

This indifference to Jewish lives — the complete subordination of moral, to strictly political considerations — is also reflected at the U.N. In 1967, Israel could barely, in Abba Eban's words, get "its plight inscribed on the agenda." Since then, the U.N. has refused to consider the most obvious acts of Arab terrorism and the brutal treatment of Jews in Arab nations. The present situation demands a reconsideration of the vocabulary of the middle East conflict. Before, Arab leaders like Sadat had been described by the press as "moderate." This "moderate," Sadat, had declared in 1972: "In the coming campaign, liberation of our land will not be enough. There is no way out but the complete liquidation of Israel's arrogance," the latest euphemism for genocide. In the same speech, Sadat declared his willingness to sacrifice a million soldiers in another war. Sadat's words were translated this week into action, disputing the thesis of those who had interpreted his statements as mere rhetoric.

Menachem Maierovitz
Co-Ordinator
Jewish Student Fed.

Anthony Gizzie

Re-evaluate CYSF

With the current rumblings towards CYSF from Stong and Vanier Colleges, I feel it is about time we re-evaluate the entire situation to see where the problem lies. In my view CYSF is doing a mediocre job due to the lack of centralized control over many activities and facilities which can only be managed effectively by one strong co-ordinating body.

The college system in many ways is good, but it is not working to the advantage of the majority of students. The campus is too large, and most students who live off campus are not served at all by this system. Colleges are just glorified residences and this is a fact that cannot be disputed.

Our lack of a centralized system for social and student affairs is so glaringly evident that our reputation as a good "student" university suffers greatly throughout Ontario.

The problem is basic — the solution simple. Let the colleges run their own college affairs, but let CYSF handle the university-wide jobs like orientation, winter carnival, all bookings for dances and concerts and all student clubs and organizations.

This will naturally mean a stronger CYSF and more money to their treasury. But think about it. If any other university student outside York knew that all he received for his seventeen dollars paid to the colleges was a newspaper, games room, and maybe a dinner trip, all of which mainly served the residences, it would be only a matter of time before heads began to roll.

So to you at Vanier, Stong, and all the rest, read section eight, article three of the CYSF constitution, get out of the federation if you want to and let CYSF build a form of student government that will work for every York student. I'd rather there be bloodshed on this issue than the current case of anemia.

Letters to the Editor

All letters should be addressed to the Editor, c/o Excalibur, room 111 central Square. They must be double-spaced, typed and limited to 250 words. Excalibur reserves the right to edit for length and grammar. Name and address must be included for legal purposes but the name will be withheld upon request.

Is United Way the only way?

Once again the vast organization of the United Way has been cranked up to collect money. Public figures and business executives discover the plight of the poor and many a spirited volunteer will work his heart out for the good cause.

Just as one does not knock motherhood, it is sort of frowned upon to criticize the United Way. The number of people speaking out openly against this sacred institution has nevertheless been on the increase and I intend to add my voice.

United Way champions the principle of voluntarism in the raising of funds for social services. It is the laissez-faire approach to dealing with social problems and it has been defeated many times. The predominance of the ability-to-pay method of raising funds in our society indicates the direction in which the social consensus has moved. Yet the United Way wants to sustain this anachronism at any price.

When the government needs money for defense expenditures or to pay subsidies to producers, to name two examples, no one in his right mind would suggest to leave the fate of these programmes up to voluntary contributions. However, when it comes to helping the poor, the sick and the handicapped, the

revenue end is considered largely a matter of charity and the United Way.

The dismal failure of the approach may explain why, in their desperation, the campaigners have resorted to all kinds of gimmicks to further their lost cause. The phoney survey of 10,545 unidentified donors supposedly representative of actual giving patterns is a case in point.

After I pointed out in the Globe and Mail during the summer of 1972 that this survey was a fraud, this survey was not referred to again in the 1972 campaign. However, since it appears again this year as the source of the "Fair Measure Guide" I feel a duty to speak out and to repeat what I said earlier in the Globe and Mail.

With a coverage of 10,545 persons sampling errors are small and the statistical raw data themselves are most valuable for other research. For this reason, the research department of the Metro United Appeal was asked to share out some statistical details. Not surprisingly, after four months of correspondence, the reply finally came that the relevant records had been destroyed.

Unfortunately, the survey was so ill-conceived that not even the loss of the records could conceal its futility. Some crude arithmetic will illustrate the point. If these actual givings are representative for Torontonians, then by relating them to the 1967 gross annual earnings for Toronto, one can derive some rough estimate of the actual donations by individuals.

Despite large error margins, this figure must have some resemblance to what was actually collected from these individuals in that year. However, by interpreting the survey results in this way, the 1967 United Appeal campaign would have been a phenomenal success. The fact it was not leaves little else but to infer that the surveyors must have been generously excluding those donors contributing little, or nothing at all. But what meaning is left for these survey figures which are supposed to guide by what others give? Does the potential donor not also want some indication of the number of people giving little, or nothing at all? Why run a large scale survey at all to generate these types of figures that can be had much more simply? It took a long time to produce the results during which the productive time of many spirited helpers was used up. In addition, the operation probably absorbed a sizable sum of donated dollars intended for a good cause. Did the United Appeal officials take sufficient care in reviewing the project before committing these resources? Was this sacrifice justified to add some fictitious authenticity to the Fair Measure Guide? Or was the whole thing just a fundraising technique after all, that was hoped to go unscrutinized on account of the noble purpose it served?

In fairness to the campaign director with whom I had the correspondence, I should mention he replied in the same paper that the consulting firm did the survey free of charge, that no group of donors was deliberately excluded, and that another survey was contemplated. I

leave it up to the reader to decide whether this answers my charge.

Paul G. Reinhardt
Assistant Professor
Atkinson College

C'est la voix de la-haut

La voix de la-haut

I'm tired of being bullied.

Yes, I must confess, I'm one of those guilty of sitting alone in the cafeteria, not greeting every black student I meet with a big white smiling "let's be friends." Although I don't have a "Che Guevara suit" in my closet along with all the skeletons you seem to be searching for, I can be accused of having been a grumbling "inactive activist" from time to time.

O Father Lawrence — I have sinned! Guide me to the righteous path. I try as hard as hell to be a proper unctuous undergrad.

And while you're at it, why not try to save all my cohorts in crime — those misguided, mis-directed souls whose political views, unlike yours, aren't validly substantiated, you assume.

If you can't save us all, Heaven knows, you've still done your duty. Continue to write your cathartic columns. I'll follow them religiously.

J. Nefsky