

Excalibur

Everything secret degenerates; nothing is safe that does not show it can bear discussion and publicity
—Lord Acton

Excalibur, founded in 1966, is the York University weekly and is independent politically. Opinions expressed are the writer's and those unsigned are the responsibility of the editor. Excalibur is a member of Canadian University Press and attempts to be an agent of social change. Printed at Newsweb, Excalibur is published by Excalibur Publications.

News 667-3201

Advertising 667-3800

Food price increase will pit college against college day student against resident

The other day, the food services committee, as expected, announced a rise in food prices on campus.

The blame for rising food-costs has been placed on the college system and the problem of keeping so many serveries opened.

No one can deny that the college serveries system is inefficient, wasteful and costly. After all, services are being duplicated. Moreover, the only beneficiaries of the system — resident students — form a small minority on a campus traditionally dominated by day students.

Thus, the decision of the persons in charge, people like Norman Crandles for instance, to blame rising costs on the colleges is a clever one. The position is easily defensible; few students will bother looking for the underlying reasons for the whole food mess. They will accept their lot without complaint — except maybe a misplaced demand to shut down some serveries.

This is not to suggest that some serveries shouldn't be closed. If they can be replaced by other facilities without affecting the welfare of students, then such a measure is certainly acceptable.

What we find distasteful is the clear attempt to pit college against college — with each one trying to prove its serveries is more vital than the next — and day students against resident students.

Resident students, stuck with scrip money, aren't going to be as directly affected in hard cash terms. They already have the scrip. Moreover, many go home on weekends, so they have lots left over. A 10 per cent price increase won't mean a thing to most of them, and they readily admit it.

The whole effect of the administration's excuses will be to block discussion of more important matters like Where our food money goes and why. Why Versa Food has a lock on the contract. Why the quality is so deplorable. Who makes the decisions, etc.

Dividing students along partisan lines is an old trick, and we're getting tired of it.

A recommendation: boycott the cafeterias. One or two days of no sales in Central Square, the busiest eatery on campus, would let the food services committee know their arbitrary action had not gone unnoticed. And think of the health benefits.

Michael Lawrence



Staff Meetings

Thurs.: 2 p.m.
and
Mon.: 5 p.m.

Editor-in-chief

Brian Milner

Ass't editor

Michael Forman

News Editors

S. Jennifer Hunter
Michael Hollett

Editorial ass't

Bonnie Sandison

Entertainment editor

Warren Clements

Photo editor and graphics

Peter M. Hsu

CUP editor

Rosemary McCracken

Sports editor

Rick Spence

Staff at large — Peter Matilainen, Agnes Kruchio, Sol Candell, Stan Henry, Alan Risen, Vince Dorval, Chris Gates, Judith Nefsky, Robin Endre, Ron Rosenthal, Shelley Rabinovitch, Dynamite C. Strange, J. W. Beltrame, Norma Yeomanson, C.T. Squassero, Julie Buck, Sue Cooper, Dale Ritch, Mike Distaulo, Mira Friedlander, Ed Pivowarczyk, Steve Hain, Colan Inglis, Honey Fisher, J. B. M. Falconer, Michael Barris, Godfrey Jordan, Kevin Richer, Richard Gould.

The facts for Michael Mouritsen

"The single most important issue facing York students is the quality of education, an area which the student federation has refused to involve itself. I would like to redirect the entire focus of CYSF from an almost exclusive concern with its budget to a direct involvement in the planning of the university's academic policies and priorities."

Almost a year ago, Michael Mouritsen wrote the above. Last February, Mouritsen's platform was one based on educational priorities, the need for students to have some control over the courses they would experience while at York. Why Mouritsen chose to ignore a mandate supporting this platform is a mystery and a tragic disappointment.

"Since next year's enrolment will likely remain static or decline, it is virtually certain that teaching staff will be laid off... This is an immediate problem that will confront the new CYSF president. Students have an obvious interest in the retention of good teachers. A vigorous student federation con-

cerned with these issues can do much to rectify this."

Mouritsen as candidate recognized the need and opportunity for student governments to drop an obsession with budget allocation and instead act as a voice for important student issues. Mouritsen can complain that he and council are unjustly berated but the fact remains that the president has failed to move on the important issues he vocalized last year.

"Council has ignored genuine problem areas at York, such as the procedures for evaluating courses and teachers, first year registration, the inadequate undergraduate advising system, complaints that Atkinson students are unable to pre-register, and that graduate seminars are often scheduled twice a month rather than weekly."

Granted things have changed, some for better, others for worse, but one thing remains the same. Mouritsen continues to ignore "genuine problems".

There is some lesson to be learned here, a

lesson that comes as no surprise in an era lacking political integrity. The candidate will make promises but don't expect any action after his election. The voter must allow for some negligence on the part of his candidate.

Maybe it's not too late for Mouritsen or the other political amateurs on council. It certainly must have occurred to them by now that even a large budget can't buy respect, that students are tired of the president's weekly defence of his insipid council and his part in making it so.

Those "genuine problems" spoken of so nobly still remain. If the president was sincere in his concern, the opportunity remains for him to demonstrate it.

"York will require a student president who can articulate these arguments to the administrators, and who has credibility with both students and faculty."

Unfortunately, York still requires such a president. Credibility has been substituted with the incredible—a council and president who refuse to be responsible.

Letters To The Editor

YUSA's passiveness must end now

As a member of YUSA, I would like to say why I disagree with our executive's latest proposal for an agreement between YUSA and the administration according to the Arbitration Act. After talking to two lawyers, including Ernest Rovet, several disadvantages became clear to me.

First, the Arbitration Act, in contrast to the Labour Relations Act, would not give us the right to strike or slowdown. The teachers and hospital workers have been trying to gain this right for over ten years—are we going to throw it away? No one likes a strike but it's the only real bargaining power employees have. With inflation and projected staff cutbacks, we have to demand this right, even if we choose not to use it.

Secondly, the act would not protect us from organizing attempts by an outside union. Thirdly, a legal case under the Arbitration Act is a

federal affair and generally means a very expensive and lengthy court case. YUSA could not afford this—the administration could. So who will the act really protect?

And fourth, if we include all administrative and supervisory staff we can never be recognized under the Ontario Labour Relations Act. We will be considered a "sweetheart" union—puppets of the administration.

It seems that our executive is primarily concerned that administrative staff be part of the association. This is at the expense of the majority of YUSA members earning \$4,000 - \$5,000 a year. And to be frank, I know a lot of women in grades 2 - 4 who don't want their supervisors in the same bargaining unit. Is the man or woman who can independently decide to hire, fire, demote, promote or lay us off in the same boat as we are? But this is not to say that ad-

ministrative assistants will not get the benefits of a contract nor that all 200 will be excluded. At the University of British Columbia, their association has divided administrative assistants into 2 levels, so that only the top supervisors who have INDEPENDENT decision-making power are excluded.

Our passive dependency on the mood of the administration must end. In a period of financial crisis we need more than crumbs—we certainly put in more than crumbs. So I say we stick to our decision made Oct. 25 to apply for voluntary recognition under the Labour Relations Act. If our present executive disagrees then they should step down.

LET'S HAVE GOOD SENSE NOT GOOD FAITH!

TERRY DANCE