

cont'd from page 6

the same way heterosexuality is a sexual orientation. Lifestyle implies acting in a certain manner. Homosexuality cannot be defined simply as acting in a certain manner, just as heterosexuality cannot be limited to actions.

Is homosexuality "adored [sic] by society in general"? This may well be true, but does that make it an unacceptable orientation? Perhaps "society in general" does not understand homosexuality and is therefore homophobic? In any case, the public mood cannot be used to justify any form of oppression.

Chatterton goes a step further in suggesting that homosexuals should accept resistance because they oppose "the most basic grain of human existence." I would agree that our sexuality is a basic element of our humanness, but the normality of heterosexuality is a myth. To common defences for a "more normal way"—St. Paul's letters and Genesis—are both culturally bound and archaic. Homosexuality, as with all human sexuality, is a God-given gift to be enjoyed and cherished.

Perhaps this Chatterton person should collect his or her pennies and send them to the National Citizens Coalition's recent "dump Grossman" campaign. It seems these hard-line conservatives are disappointed in Ontario's PC leader; he and three of his colleagues voted in favour of Bill 7.

—Michael J. Kooiman

[Sic] habit is in poor taste

Editor:

Grow up, *Excalibur*! I adore [sic] the way student newspapers constantly print letter replete with original spelling errors or typos, and then point them out to readers with a snickering [sic] that says: "see, not only is this guy a jerk but he can't spell either."

While B.J. Chatterton's diatribe against homosexuals (Letters, Jan. 22) hardly deserves courtesy, I wonder if people with whom you agree get the same shabby treatment. It does reflect badly on an otherwise fine publication.

By the way, you missed "privileges" in the same letter. Let he who is without sin, etc. . . .

—Ted Wakefield
Communications Dept.

Bill 7 protects suspected gays

Editor:

This letter is in response to the letter of B.J. Chatterton in your Jan. 22 issue. Bill 7 to amend the Ontario Human Rights Code does not give special rights to homosexuals, it speaks for the human rights of all.

One does not have to be gay or bisexual to be protected by the amended Code, it protects people who are suspected of being homosexual. It means, for example, that the large number of York men (students, staff and faculty) who have earrings cannot be denied a job or an apartment because the owner/manager does not like "faggots." Also, because the wording is "sexual orientation," it protects heterosexuals in gay-owned businesses and apartments. None of these are "special" rights.

Secondly, sexual orientation is not a choice. Even early studies were enough to convince psychiatric and psychological associations that homo-/bisexuality is not an illness, and further research has proved that sexual orientation is determined by the age of five. I would ask Mr/Ms Chatterton when he or she first realized that they were interested in people of the opposite sex.

Gay and bisexual women and men choose their lifestyles in exactly the same way the heterosexual people like B.J. Chatterton do.

As Mr/Ms Chatterton does point

out, (conservative) estimates state that homosexuals make up 10 percent of the population at large. I suggest that members of the Coalition for Family Values, who say they stand for the love and closeness of the family unit are alienating and ostracizing members of their very own families.

The Ontario Government is not the first governing body to pass such legislation, and certainly not the last. It is a crime that anyone is outcast in the tolerant society we pretend to be. Ask anyone in the women's movement, the black community, etc., however, and they will tell you that being mentioned in the Human Rights Code does not mean the struggle for basic rights is over.

—S.M. Zepp

Fault found in housing site

Editor:

Re: "York moves to cash in on housing market."

I am writing this letter in response to *Excalibur's* article of last week. The article discusses the university's decision to lease certain acreage to developers. First of all I would like to say that I am pleased that the university has found a solution to some of York's financial problems. However I do find fault with the site chosen for this development, "a parcel of land, 20-25 acres in the southwest corner of the campus (adjacent to University City)." I feel that development in the southeast area of campus near Keele would be a better site. My reasons are as follows:

1) The necessary landscaping and construction would destroy or endanger an area of land filled with beautiful woods, not to mention a stand of pine trees well over 100 years old which are a part of York's heritage. Considering the amount of money York spends on landscaping the campus to make it less barren looking and to provide necessary windbreaks it seems ludicrous to ruin what natural beauty the campus has.

2) This area is used by York and University City residents for walks, gardens, and the area provides what Jane Jacobs would describe as a psychologically necessary greenspace (not to mention the fact that it helps to provide a natural barrier against the rougher elements of the Jane-Finch corridor).

3) On a more 'practical' side, the southeast area of the campus has acreage which does not have to be graded or have trees removed. This would mean less expense to the developer.

4) Traffic access can be easily obtained from Keele Street which would not interfere with traffic coming from Sentinel Road and onto Niagara Blvd. As we all know traffic on Niagara Blvd. is impossible during the morning and evening rush hours, and during the times when students enter and leave the campus for night classes. If the junction at Niagara and Murray Ross Parkway also had to contend with traffic from housing or industry (and who wants industry near York?) the traffic situation would be impossible (no matter what a developer might assure us). Traffic would not be a problem in the southeast corner as Keele Street can handle the added load and Murray Ross Pkwy. is never busy.

5) Finally, at the risk of sounding snobby, there would be decreased possibility of having non-students wandering onto the main pedestrian thoroughfares of the campus if the housing and industry site was at the southeast corner of campus. This site is more removed from the campus. Since the safety and security of students and University property is already a problem the site that is farthest away from the main campus is the best choice. The graduate residences would be most exposed to

this problem (as would be the car owners of those residences).

The CYSF did put out a questionnaire through *Excalibur* concerning York student opinions concerning the land use issue. Maybe I missed publication of those results, but I would like to know what the results indicated. I'd like to know if student opinion means anything to the York University Development Corporation and if Greg Spearn will remember to include affordable student housing in the projects he discusses.

—Judith Fraser

WLU's paper done injustice

Editor:

I would like to address Zena McBride's *Kampus Kronikle* (Jan. 15, 1987) "And they wonder why we won't join CUP" because I believe she has done *The Cord* an injustice.

McBride's "Kronikle" pooled facts from a news story and a news comment appearing in the Jan. 8 issue of *The Cord*. In so doing McBride has distorted the intent of both pieces.

The comment piece dealt with the "controversial" resignation of Canadian University Press president Diane Dyson. At the CUP national conference in North Bay, members of the national office went to the hiring commission with grievances against Dyson. The commission then spoke to Dyson, and after talking to her, recommended that she resign. Dyson offered her resignation and the hiring commission accepted it. Rumours circulated about Dyson's "forced resignation." It was rumoured that should she not resign, the rest of the executive would attempt an impeachment.

The hiring commission overstepped its constitutional boundaries by accepting the resignation, which it could only accept on behalf of the membership. The membership would then have to vote on it. The hiring commission accepted all information in confidence and therefore, were legally bound to refrain from revealing anything. However, they asked the membership to vote in favour of their recommendation without a reason why.

This was serious. The hiring commission couldn't talk and we, the membership, couldn't vote informatively. We voted not to accept Dyson's recommendation for lack of information. What resulted was that the members with grievances against Dyson were "convinced" to make public what they had given in confidence. Dyson defended herself and then stated her own case. It was messy but necessary; we had no other process to follow. The original *Cord* comment piece was intended to clarify that situation.

Excalibur used information from our paper out of context. You also reprinted material without our permission, a privilege reserved for CUP papers. *The Cord* would appreciate it if in the future *Excalibur* followed proper copyright law and asked permission beforehand. We're flattered that you want to use *Cord* material, but we would prefer you didn't bastardize our stuff.

—Mike Wert, *Cord Weekly Staff*

(Editor's Note: *Excalibur* did not pool the two articles but reprinted in full the news article on the CUP conference. *Excalibur*, however, apologizes for not requesting permission to run the article.)

Our writer responds:

Mike Wert:

I acknowledge the fact that *Excalibur* displayed (for whatever lame excuse of ignorance that we can muster up) severe lack of judgement in reprinting the said article (in full) without first obtaining permission; however, I feel that *The Cord Weekly*

cont'd on page 11

Be Your Own Boss

Young people can get an interest free loan to start up their own summer or year round business.

Ask us how.

CALL FREE

1-800-387-0777

or visit your placement office.

IT COULD PUT YOU IN BUSINESS.

START UP is sponsored by the Ontario Ministry of Skills Development in co-operation with The Ontario Chamber of Commerce and The Royal Bank of Canada.

Ontario
Ministry of Skills Development



Put Your B.A. To Good Use At

Sheridan College
Oakville Campus

University graduates and students with one (or more) successful year(s)* toward any degree may apply for...

A Unique One-Year Diploma Program In

APPLIED RESEARCH

(Applied Social Research)

- Direct Entry gives you credit for your university work - complete a two-year program in only 1 year.
- A practical program equips you for a career in the research field in areas such as: marketing, psychology, sociology, health, education, or media.

*You may also apply for our two-year diploma program and receive "advanced standing" for selected courses.

Next term begins Sept. 1987.

For further information, complete and return to:
Gernot Kohler, Ph.D., Co-ordinator,
Applied Research Program
Sheridan College, Trafalgar Rd.
Oakville, Ontario L6H 2L1 or call
(416) 845-9430, ext. 324

Name: _____

Address: _____

Interested in:
One-year program _____

Two-year program _____