Glendon ends occupation, York hangs in

by MARILYN SMITH

DOWNSVIEW — At York university, one occupation is over while another is about to begin. The struggles began at Glendon College Tuesday and spread to the main campus over the weekend. Student anti-grant fees without first deducting tuition fees. This action blocked a potential 3,000 students out of 13,000 from taking part in the provincially organized fee strike against the government.

But today, in a complete reversal of its original stand, York administrators announced that all student awarded cheques will be released without first deducting tuition fees. York president David Slater also said that he will not commit the administration to endorse the provincial fee strike against the government.

On Tuesday, President John Theo Baldwin, President of Student Affairs, York University, said that he had been advised by the minister of colleges and universities that the universities could release non-academic penalties for non- academic offences. He said that this position differs greatly from directives we had as late as yesterday afternoon.

Slater refused: “I strongly support improving the lot of students who have paid. I will not commit myself and the administration to the pay their fees in order to get their grants will have the full sum of their cheques returned to them.

Delegates from Glendon said that this satisfied their demands and Glendon students voted to end the occupation. But students at the main campus also asked the administration to endorse the provincial fee strike against the government in its cutbacks campaign.

Slater refused: “I strongly support improving the lot of students who have paid. I will not commit myself and the administration to the pay their fees in order to get their
gains will have the full sum of their cheques returned to them.

Glendon students

by RICHARD HUNT

The occupation of the Glendon College registrar's office by 40 students ended at 6:15 pm last night following President Slater's announce ment that the student demands had been met. Slater stated that OSAP grant cheques will now be distributed without students having to pay their second installment on the spot, and all late penalties have been swept aside. In addition, the administration will re-consider demands deducted from OSAP cheques released prior to the occupation.

Upon hearing this news the occupiers decided to clean up the office and remain there until their last press conference at 6:00 pm. Immediately following this, students vacated the offices as promised on Tuesday.
300 STUDENTS BACK OCCUPATION

Over 300 students attended the general meeting called Wednesday following Tuesday's occupation of the Glenndin Registrar's office. After listening to remarks of a number of speakers, including Student Union President David Moulton and Glenndin Principal Albert Tucker, they voted unanimously that the occupation of the administrative offices should continue, and fully endorsed the student council's actions to force the York administration to distribute OSAP grant cheques without demanding that students first pay the second installment of their tuition fees. However, the decision to force students to pay outstanding tuition fees before giving them their OSAP cheques was made on December 29 during the Christmas break. Slater and Vice-President of Student Affairs John Becker reportedly consulted no other administrators or other members of the university in making the decision.

Moulton denounced what he described as an illegal and arbitrary decision by York President David Slater, demanding tuition payment, an act he said was made without consultation with the university community as a whole. At the same time a much more liberal policy has been followed at the University of Toronto, where the registration office is giving out the government cheques without demanding that tuition be paid.

Moulton noted that "While we've been talking of a university with open decision making, here he is consulting no one. He has shown his true colours during a time when the university is in financial trouble. How are we to react — why should students pay for such incompetence?"

Principal Albert Tucker placed most of the blame for the current crisis on the provincial government, he said, who has adopted a conscious university policy based on the assumption that the student enrollment must be lowered through higher fees. He advocated the government for making such arbitrary decisions without consulting either students or university administrators.

Tucker stated that York's policy was based on a memorandum from the Department of Colleges and Universities, and April of 1969, in which there are two significant clauses: students are not to be issued their cheques unless the financial arrangement regarding tuition payment has become satisfactory to the university; and in case a student refuses to pay his tuition, the cheque is to be returned to the provincial Department of University Affairs with an explanation for the non-payment.

As Mr. Tucker put it, the University of Toronto interpreted the clauses to mean that students can be issued cheques on the understanding that they will eventually pay their tuition — immediate payment of tuition is not demanded with the giving OSAP cheque. York on the other hand was following the stringency of the second clause stating that OSAP payments must be withheld when tuition is not forthcoming.

While wholeheartedly stating his support for the students, Tucker tempered his endorsement with a plea for students to choose the correct enemy. He stated that withholding tuition fees could seriously affect the financial position of the university, which he described as highly pressurized, and asked "Why must the university face the financial burden if it is really the government's fault?"

Moulton ridiculed Dr. Slater's arguments, which he described as vague and deceptive in what he described as an off support by Slater toward the student fight against the cutbacks in post-secondary education financing.

L'union fait la force

Finally, Glenndin notre college qui est national vient d'avoir un peu de publicité. Notre college a jamais eu l'attention qu'il vient d'avoir ces derniers jours. Même radio muniel au Québec a fait des rapports sur la situation qui regne ici.

Comme je l'ai dit mercredi, les Francophones qui travaillent pour le département Ministre ne sont pas directement impliqués dans l'occupation au bureau du Registrar. Mais je ne voyais pas cela juste que les Francophones s'en mêlent pas avec nos confrères Anglophones. Nous sommes tous du même collège, et nous devions ainsi être solidaires. Personne ne peut nous leur donner un coup de main dans leur confrontation avec l'administration de York.

A l'assemblée générale d'une heure hier, nous avons vu les Francophones present et voter en faveur de la poursuite de l'occupation. C'était bien!

J'ai parlé avec quelques Anglophones après l'assemblée et ils étaient très fiers de l'appui qui leur a été donné. En continuant à leur aider moralement et activement nous aurons un college plus uni.

Attention

C'est finit ! L'occupation vient de se terminer. Les dépendances qui ont été partiellement occupées par les étudiants ont été acceptées par David Moulton il y aura plus de nouvelles à s'asseoir vendredi, le 13 janvier, à un heure.

SHAW puts it all together!

Now you have academic qualifications...but still lack practical business skills. You realize it's more than degree and nerve to get past that job interview. Hence, you pick up the phone and seriously about the other half of your education... with a Shaw Career Course. Become a Legal Secretary, a Medical Secretary or an Executive Secretary. The ABC Course (Accelerated Business Course) is a fast secretarial course designed specifically for the University graduate or student. Just 6 months... by the time it would normally take. Don't forget the Taylor Fash Course for that career in the Fashions of Tomorrow.

A Shaw Career Course could make the BIG difference.
Accessibility battle still to be fought

Although there is obvious satisfaction about the success of the recent occupation, one must remember that our larger dispute with the Ontario government is still far from a resolution.

Students occupied the registrar’s office and took over the student awards office at the main campus to protest a decision by the York administration not to give students the second installment of their student loans until they paid their tuition fees. The administration backed down.

In rescinding the earlier policy, President David Slater has now made it possible for students receiving financial assistance to participate in the fee strike in protest against the Ontario government’s decision to raise tuition fees and reduce the amount of money available through the Ontario Student Awards Program.

Glendon principal Albert Tucker has repeatedly stated he believes jurisdiction set up to reduce the enrollment at Ontario universities. If that’s the government’s aim it seems to be succeeding. Delays as a result of enrollment shortfalls may force some universities to cut back on academic and support staff, as well as the number of programs offered.

In calling for a province-wide fee strike last fall, the member institutions of the Ontario Federation of Students asked students to endorse and back up two major demands:

1) That the fee increases be rescinded until there has been full public debate on the Wright Report due to be held Tuesday - thus a debate on the future of post-secondary education in Ontario;
2) That the loan ceiling of CRAP grants be lowered from $800 to its original level of $600.

The OFS position is quite clear. Stated simply, it is that the government should not impose further financial hardships on students — and thereby further discourage students from lower and middle class families from attending post-secondary institutions — until the intent and possible ramifications of its policy has been fully explained.

The government has always purported to support universal accessibility as a goal in education. Yet it is clear that its policies, designed to reduce post-secondary enrollment, belie any real commitment to this objective. The Ontario Federation of Students, along with university administrations and faculties, want to know why.

York student dependent on financial assistance from the government can now participate in the fee strike OFS has called. But all students concerned that our universities should become progressive institutions — or at the very least wanting the government to publicly justify its policy — should now withhold the second installment of their tuition fees.

STAR and GLOBE ignore issues

The unfortunate distance in community between the university community, the public and the press, was well demonstrated in yesterday’s condescending editorials in THE STAR and the GLOBE and MAIL. While support on this campus seemed unanimous in sentiment regarding the sit-ins, it was a dissenting cry beyond the front gates. Each paper dealt with the issue in their own distinctively caustic way.

The general tenor of THE GLOBE’s coverage and editorial picture the protestors as childish brats bent upon usurping the administrative facilities away from the administrators and into the hands of kids whose sole interest appeared to be playing bridge and scrabble. It is surprising that THE GLOBE, which has said the propensity for coin ing snazzy new phrases, did not club the students’ legitimate demands as “the scrabble manifesto”.

The whole phony image of a party in the Glendon registrar’s office denied the protestors the right to be here with one considers their incomes and their lifestyle were in jeopardy. Rather than try to debate the issue and the accusations of illegality intelligently, THE GLOBE squawked angrily that its gray offices on King Street and like some distorted private school master (the editorial’s heading simply read “Enough”), it rapped their collective knuckles with its final solution, a firm and militant” remained nonetheless “eloquent verbose sentences, full of additio ns. Administrative support, in Glendon at least, in the form of an active endorsement by Principal Albert Tucker, received no mention.

The questionable legality of York President Slater’s actions, the most significant point of contention with the students, received no mention or reply, while both papers called the sit-in, itself illegal. The word “trespass” that THE STAR used, was plainly factuous at Glendon at least, where the administration supported the students’ action through public statements.

Finally, both papers displayed utter ignorance toward the plight of the majority of young people in this province who are discouraged about university because of high tuition and social-cultural norms. The last words of THE STAR’s editorial, “students might as well get used to it; they’ll have to face the real world some day,” are particularly galling when one considers that the real world involves a provincial government attempting to perpetuate an upper middle class elite in the university through the raising of tuition.

by PAUL WEINBERG

The STAR and the GLOBE ignored this week’s events through ridiculous verbose sentences, full of sarcasm and bombastic in its use of the atmosphere and the students, received no mention of the students’ legitimate demands as “the scrabble manifesto”.

Then send them home to their mothers and fathers...” Globe and Mail editorial, Thursday, Jan. 2
The gateway to opportunity will become a tollgate

by Wayne Roberts

In the course of the summer a number of graduate students were planning to donate blood to the Red Cross as they registered for the year. They thought a bleed-in was the most dramatic way of expressing their feelings of being bled dry by their $100 share of the $392 fee hike for graduate students. Undergraduates, whose fees are also going up more than $100, might have considered similar actions. For present trends continue, there won't be much left but solid stone in the years to come.

It is crucial to recognize that this year's fee increase is only the first of a series designed to turn students into hemophiliacs in a continual bloodletting ritual planned by the federal and provincial governments. The intention of government to force more and more of the burden of post-secondary costs onto students is made abundantly clear in two government-sponsored reports of major significance—the provincial Wright and the federal Peltchins Reports.

The Wright Report, commissioned by the provincial government in April, 1969 to investigate the future of post-secondary education in Ontario, created widespread panic when its draft report was released last spring. The report is peppered throughout with a pastiche of cliches, sentimentalism, and expressions of high ideals. We read for instance: "the paramount value which the commission has brought to its evaluation of post-secondary education is its commitment to the individual. The commission wants to emphasize the importance of the individual in education: the individual must be central... We must preserve and cherish the fragile, exquisite, special animal of this earth we call man."

Similar phraseology tells us of their commitment to an educational process that lasts through a whole lifetime, to "universal accessibility to post-secondary education at all ages as our first principle, and to an educational process free from the scourge of bureaucracy."

But as Star columnist and former NDP education critic Walter Pinson noted, they must have had a different person writing the actual recommendations. Verily, what they gave with the left hand in their posturing on principle, they took away with the right hand in actual policy formulation. Their dedication to lifelong education becomes concretized in a recommendation that employers permit their workers a six-month leave of absence from work every five years, paid out of a fund based on 10 per cent deferment of each worker's salary.

Their distaste for bureaucracy is transformed into a morass of need-test formulas for the individual and a government supervising body that would reduce autonomy in the university network to matters of administrative discretion. As a Treasury Board document leaked last January indicates, the techniques of this body will be blunt. Phyllis Gusskurt resigned from the Advisory Committee on University Affairs in protest against this Treasury Board document which was drawn up without consultation with CUA and was simply handed down. She wrote a letter requesting advice on "constraint (re cutback) alternatives."

A citation illustrates how they plan to infringe on the essence of university autonomy while respecting its forms: A freeze on the Basic Income Unit value would constitute an important cost-saving technique since autonomy (the quotes are in the text) makes it difficult for the Government to pinpoint areas where possible savings should be made. Holding down of grants would force (sic) the institutions to economize and improve their productivity. It is clear, then, that their concerns in regard to costs will not stop even with increased fees for students. On the contrary, the fee hikes are part of a coherent attack on the norms and values currently attached to education in this province.

In familiar fashion, their devotion to that fragile animal is more sensitive than facile in the scramble for more scholar for the dollar. Educational investments are cynically placed in the marketplace where you pay to consume education just like you pay for stocks in a land company and where the social value of education is ultimately judged relative to manpower needs. Meanwhile, the dedication to universal accessibility is translated to encompass correspondence courses not part-time study. The older "high-floor" policy whereby a student was supported to his level of competence is replaced by a more callous equation of competence with ability to pay and a more conscious direction toward profitable occupational training. Both the Treasury Report and the Wright Report are quite explicit on this point. On the latter point, the Treasury Board makes clear its intent to "shift their (the universities) emphasis".

De-emphasizing undergraduate, non-professional courses by reducing weighting would force universities either to reduce enrolment in these courses or selectively raise fees, thus putting pressure on for reducing enrolment.

For the courses that are available, the Wright Report states: "there is a shifting of public subsidies for costs from the institution to the individual. All students would be assigned a cost of operating costs. (It is difficult to understand exactly how the $50 figure was arrived at—it was simply subtracted from the number $20 on a ketchup bottle). Then, a sliding scale of grants and loans would be made available to each student according to his parents income. Apart from a child dependent on parental income these recommendations have the feature of providing free educative "quarantine" of the population which rental incomes generally remove from the educational system at university.

Wayne Roberts is a graduate student at the University of Toronto. This article is reprinted from THE VARSITY.
It is a cheap gesture indeed! Furthermore, while the proportion of grants to institutions are specific and eagerly anticipated, the increase of grants to needy individuals are yet to be witnessed.

Unless we become too anxious in anticipation, the Wright Report adds a necessary caveat: "There does not seem to be any way to achieve social mobility — except through the combination of public help and individual effort."

When it gets down to specifics, the Treasury Board once again saves us from undue speculation on the course charted by the Wright Report:

"Limiting enrollment will mainly affect those students entering the system who are the least employable of the 18-24 age group. In terms of the 1972-73 projection, this will reduce the freshman intake by 16,000, and may result in a shift to part-time education."

Increasing the loan portion will discourage poorly motivated students on the one hand but it will also affect students from lower income groups unless a contingent repayment feature is introduced.

Their reverence to universal accessibility can be fairly easily measured; by their fees you shall know them. Their words give little indication of what they are up to.

The more recently available Pelchins Report, commissioned by the federal government for the 1971 Federal-Provincial Conference is, if anything, more ominous than the Wright Report. It recommends everything from the ending of all grant portions of loans after second year to the breaking up of "conglomerate" post-secondary institutions into their constituent parts to save administrative and teaching costs. It concludes with the ringing declaration of recommendation 31:

"The general subsidization of post-secondary education is terminated forthwith. To the extent that it is socially desirable to subsidize certain programmes or some students, the subsidies should be made specific and should be related to the attainment of the social goals. When pursued as a consumer good, post-secondary education falls into the category of a luxury good. In this context, it is grossly inequitable to subsidize the consumption of luxuries when large segments of the population lack necessities."

(Lest these reports seem to be outside of a national re-orientation, it is worth noting that the B.C. Sacred government was preparing a similar one. The Worth Report in Alberta takes its stand in calling for an end to university expansion and an 11 per cent increase in costs assigned to students. Its charm is captured in such comments as "Students need to escape the shelter of irresponsibility that basic education presently provides" and "The proposed changes in education should allow a more rapid and precise adaptability to the shifting demands of the labor market."

Together, these reports constitute a sharp reversal in the received wisdom of the past decade on the value of education. In the sixties the popularity of Galbraith's Affluent Society and the first report of the Economic Council of Canada made the concept of education as a public investment virtual household coinage. From the Massey Commission to the Bladen Report, funding recommendations were based on the central premise that post-secondary education as a stimulator of Canadian cultural and economic growth. Now, with the Wright Report, the federal government, having finally concluded that post-secondary education is a social escalator and, for a time, an indispensable tool in the race with the Russians that justified the unprecedented infusion of resources into post-secondary education both in the United States and in Canada.

Claude Bissel, who presided over the University of Toronto to witness the results of this process, jubilantly noted the transparent importance of this new attitude at the beginning of the 1970's with a note of financial optimism in university circles that had previously only known despair. "There is an economic approach to an overhead cost always implies the question: 'Isn't it too much?,' Bissel rejoiced, "the economic approach to a capital investment always asks: 'Is it enough?'"

In fact, it was Bissel, voicing the concerns of the traditional meritocracy, that sounded one of the few notes of caution: "There must always be concern." He said pliably, "least accessibility turn into a super-highway that leads to an intellectual wasteland."

--open-doors replaced by a competence police
--occupational Report and the opil on both the Treasury tent to "shift axes":
--inderegrade, by reducing velocities either cases or thus putting

Too bad for those who are crushed in the braking process.

Now, suddenly, education has reverted not only to an "overhead cost" but a "luxury good". Both the Wright and Pelchins Reports deny any meaningful relationship between education and society's manpower needs. Both — but particularly the Pelchins Report use this definition of education to conjure up an image of students as a parasitic elite drawing off the wealth of society. There is no other social, cultural or economic activity in which the haves are subsidized to a greater extent than in universities, and there is no other activity in which more public funds are spent on young people over the age of 18 years than in higher education. Considering that many of the participants in the process are able to pay the full cost of their education and considering further that the majority who participate would probably have participated even then had they been able to, public subsidization of their participation contributes to a serious distortion in the social and income structure.

It is suggested that it would be more rational to establish institutions and programs which will provide opportunities to the academically weak to develop their nonacademic talent. To retard a general subsidization of the academically gifted at the expense of the academically weak, who are dispatched to the world of work at an early age to produce some of the subsidy, is exploitative, discriminatory and perpetuates a social bias in favor of the academic process. In an attempt to have the demand and technical works technical degrees fees rise faster than the general university rate the concept of high was never a government official university economic. A privilege with a suitable privilege — restriction to be a privilege within the point of view of the B.C. Socred government was definitely, as early as 1969, an attempt to stress from with exclamation pr opens his study on that enrollment had student points that doubled 1969-70.

One suspects panic creation rather startling new evidences. These figures were quite canny accuracy as the difference in those were trying to pro rational, long-term are simply manuevoir that will outrage as passive rejection of social goals. All of this documentation, you think the number attempt to disappear between education needs. It is not to refute the rationalization and social better attempt to reduce a genuine economy's capacity to develop at universities. For them the needs of the economic joltling to a halt. Too crushed in the brilliancy.

One social group that the — the —

Nowhere do the — the other social jolt versus the others? asks Peitchinis one potential alternative is the students.

We even have their liberalism on u. Reasoning that since students are eliminating process far before they are reversing social accessibility by getting in the early years. Vagan Provost for them. incentives, by reducing velocities either cases courses or thus putting pressure on for reducing enrollment. For the courses that are still available, the Wright Report suggests shifting of public subsidies for operating costs from the institution to the individual. All students would be assigned 50 per cent of operating costs. (It is difficult to understand exactly how the 50 per cent figure was arrived at — one scholar suggested they subtracted the magic number 7 from the number on any Heinz ketchup bottle). Then, a sliding scale of grants and loans would be made available to each student according to both his parents income. Apart from enforcing child dependence on parental income, these recommendations have the added feature of providing free education to that "quar-tile" of the population whose parental incomes generally remove them from the educational system far before university.
It is a cheap gesture indeed!

Furthermore, while the reduction of grants to the already eagerly anticipated, the increase of grants to needy individuals are yet to be witnessed.

Unless we become too anxious in anticipation, the Wright Report adds a necessary caveat: "They do not seem to be any way to achieve social mobility — except through the combination of public help and private philanthropy."

When it gets down to specifics, the Treasury Board once again saves us from undue speculation on the course charted by the Wright Report:

Limiting enrolment will mainly affect those students entering the system who are the least employable of the 18-24 age group. In terms of the 1972-73 projection, this will reduce the freshman intake by 16,000, and may result in a shift in part-time education...

Decreasing the loan portion will discourage poorly motivated students on the one hand but it will also affect students from lower income groups unless a con
tingent repayment feature is introduced...

Their reverence to universal accessibility can be fairly easily maintained: by their fees ye shall know them. Their words give little indication of what they are up to.

The more recently available Pelchinis Report, commissioned by the federal government for the 1971 Federal-Provincial Conference is, if anything, more ominous than the Wright Report. It recommends everything from the ending of all current portions of loans after second year to the breaking up of "conglomerate" post-secondary institutions into their constituent parts to save administrative and teaching costs. It concludes with the ringing declaration of recommendation 31:

The general subsidization of post-secondary education should be terminated forthwith. To the extent that it is socially desirable to subsidize certain programs or some students, the subsidies should be made specific and should be related to the attainment of the social goals. When pursued as a consumer good, post-secondary education falls into the category of a luxury good. In this context, it is grossly inequitable to subsidize the consumption of luxuries when large segments of the population lack necessities.

(Lest these reports seem to be outside of a national re-orientation, it is worth noting that the B.C. Socred government was preparing a similar one. The Worth Report in Alberta takes its stand in calling for an end to university expansion and an 11 per cent increase in costs assigned to students. Its charm is captured in such comments as "Students need to escape the shelter of irresponsibility that basic education presently provides" and "The proposed changes in education should allow a more rapid and precise adaption of schooling to the shifting needs of the economy.") Together, these reports constitute a sharp reversal in the received wisdom of the last two decades. In the sixties the popularity of Galbraith's Affluent Society and the first report of the Massey Commission of Canada made the concept of education as a public investment virtual household coinage. From the latter commission issued the famous report, funding recommendations were based on the central importance of post-secondary education to the productivity of the Canadian cultural and economic growth. The Cold War helped, too. The Wright Report sums up the limiting enrolment as definitely the use of post-secondary education as a social escalator and, for a time, an indispensable tool in the race with the Russians that justified the unprecedented infusion of resources into post-secondary education both in the United States and in Canada.

Claude Bissel, who presided over the University of Toronto to witness the results of this process, jubilantly noted the transparent importance of this new attitude at the turn of the decade. It injected a note of financial optimism in university circles that had previously only known despair. "Whereas the economic approach to an overhead cost always implies the question: 'Isn't it too much?,'" Bissel rejoiced, "the economic approach to a capital investment always asks: 'Is it enough?'

In fact, it was Bissel, voicing the concerns of the traditional meritocracy, that sounded one of the few notes of caution: "There must always be concern," he said, "lest accessibility turn into a super-highway that leads to an intellectual wasteland."

"Too bad for those who are crushed in the braking process."

Now, suddenly, education has reverted not only to an "overhead cost" but a "luxury good." Both the Wright and Pelchinis Reports deny any meaningful relationship between education and society's material needs. Both — particularly the Pelchinis Report use this definition of education to conjure up an image of students as a parasitic elite drawing off the wealth of society. There is no other social, cultural or economic activity in which the haves are subsidized to a greater extent than in universities, and there is no other activity in which more public funds are spent on young people over the age 18 years than in higher education. Considering that many of the participants in the process are able to pay the full cost of their education and considering further that the majority who participate would probably have participated even if they had to pay the full cost, public subsidization of their participation contributes to a serious distortion in the social and income structure.

It is suggested that it would be more rational to establish institutions and programs which will provide opportunities to the academically weak to develop their nonacademic talents. The general subsidization of the academically gifted at the expense of the academically weak, who are dispatched to the world of work at an early age to produce the subsistence of the subsidy, is exploitative, discriminatory and perpetuates a social bias in favor of the academic process. This is the more disturbing when account is taken of the fact that the demand for and supply of both technical and technical workers the products of the technical colleges has been rising at a faster rate than the demand for those with general university education.

The concept of higher education as a right for all has been accepted by his government officials even in the heyday of university expansion. Now, it will become a privilege with all the attendant suitable privilege — its luxury cost will restrict its users to the wealthy. And, it will be a privilege with all the terrible legacy of the point of view of government demagogues. For, they will be able to entertain themselves with self-images as fee-hiking Robin Hoods, redressing social balances by removing students in lower-middle incomes from their wanton educational pursuits.

Although some of the revisions in official government thinking began as early as 1969, an atmosphere of crisis and panic exudes from their documents now. With exclamation points galore, Pelchinis opens his study with statistics showing that enrollment had tripled and costs per student had doubled from 1960-61 to 1969-70!

One suspects that the motive here is panic — creation rather than presentation of starting new evidence. The fact is that these figures were anticipated with uncanny accuracy as far back as 1962.

The difference is that in 1962 people were trying to promote some kind of rational, long-term planning. Now, they are simply manoeuvring with statistics that will outrage and shock us into a passive rejection of previously valued social goals.

All of this is done with little documentation. You can count on your thumbs the number of references which attempt to dispute the relationship between education and future manpower needs. There is not even an attempt to refute the relationships between education and social benefit. There is no attempt at a critique of the Canadian economy's inability to fully utilize the skills developed at universities. There is not even projections on long-term manpower needs of the economy. We are merely jolting to a halt, Too bad for those who are crushed in the braking process.

One social group will have to pick up the tab — the students. Where is the alternative source for funding the universities? asks Pelchinis. "There is only one potential alternative source and that is the students."

We even have to bear the brunt of their liberalism on universal accessibility. Reasoning that since most lower income students are eliminated from the school process far before the university stage, they are reversing strategies to promote accessibility by getting at school children in the early years. While their utterances on this level are confined to innocuous gestures, they raise the most visible barrier to accessibility: fees.

They would consider tuition for high school academic programmes which are also too late to enhance minds already destroyed by poverty. They are capable of doing anything to avoid fighting for accessibility on the frontrunner where the easy pickings are being waged. For them universal accessibility becomes a cruel rhetorical gesture — a weapon in the fight for higher tuition.

Nowhere do they consider the potential for alternate sources of funding and alternative government priorities which could permit a coherent attack on a class-
It's up to us to fight back
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Blased educational system. The percentage of federal government revenues derived from corporations has decreased 6.4 per cent in the last three years. The net provincial revenues from taxable income in Ontario zoomed from $151,844,000 to $948,000,000 between 1962-63 and 1970-71. Meanwhile, corporations took a gentle slope from $185,718,000 to $457,000,000. A 70-million dollar grant to ITT highlights last year's federal government subsidies to wealthy corporations. Last year's defence budget was $1,946,000,000 or 600-million more than all government funds on education.

Conservative minister George Kerr defended the raise in fees, speaking in the Ontario Legislature.

It is simply one of the ways for this government to raise more revenue. You know, you can only increase taxes on gasoline and park fees and licence fees and booze and tobacco so much without generally increasing taxes in certain other areas such as corporations, because of the unemployment we have at the present time. It was felt that there could be some increase in tuition fees without discouraging or making it too difficult for those students who wished to go to university, regardless of their family income.

A number of highlights emerge from a consideration of government policy on post-secondary education. First, apart from the conscious attempt to reduce enrolment and costs by raising fees, the whole system is chaotic and unplanned. Apart from the lack of long-term planning, short-term planning is a crude juggling act. Liberal critic Bullock asked George Kerr why the government was spending 21-million dollars on a student employment program and then exacting 23-million dollars in tuition. Government is running very fast to go backward.

Secondly, the scorched earth policy toward universities is likely to be an enduring one. Successive Canadian governments have shown a continuing inability to solve problems traditionally allocated to the public sector — particularly housing and education. Now, they have given up trying and are beginning a frontal attack on those who hold them responsible for high levels of social well-being.

Petchinis rises to eloquence on this point:

"The interpretation given by many to the concept of the 'affluent society' has been misleading and illusory; it has resulted in an increase in economic and social expectations far beyond the capacity of the economy to meet. It would be instructive to all in society, therefore, if from time to time we were to face the reality of constraints of scarcity. This will cause us to realize that inasmuch as there may be a general affluence, it is not possible to satisfy all social and economic needs at the same time. Even if the economy were to operate close to its potential capacity, it would still be necessary to make choices amongst alternative social needs.

Since governments are unwilling to solve the problems of financing the public sector by taxing corporations, they will follow the same policy as in welfare matters — tax the lower middle class level incomes of stably-employed workers and poorly paid professionals. Students fall perfectly into this category. Therefore, they will be assigned the brunt of their own costs plus the costs of government genuflections to those less fortunate than themselves.

"The gateway to opportunity will become a tollgate. Students face the prospects of increased reliance on parents — an umbilical cord welded in gold is a useful social sanction in the government's war against student experimentation with different social ideals and practices, as well as a degradation for students of our age group.

"Women will be the first to suffer. It should not be forgotten that it is women who have accounted for much of the percentage increase in university attendance. Any attack on increased enrollment must of necessity strike them first as the most vulnerable sector. And any of us who are responsible for our own fees will partake in the Wright Report's dedication to the work-study concept of education — working as waitresses, clerks, or laborers throughout the year (rather than just the summer months) to pay for our initiation fee into privileged domain.

"Finally, although the governments' steps backward are marked by chaos, they are decisive. The Wright Report argues firmly against the concept of free tuition as a completion of a historical trend toward equalizing opportunity through taxation. "The commission cannot accept the belief that we are helpless victims of linear projections of history. Surely, if we think a social trend undesirable we should be able to change it or, at least, to modify it.

"Governments are moving to take their stand against history. It is now up to students, who occupy a decisive sector of this society's economy and future, who are situated in the vortex of a government's all-out attack on the whole educational system, to begin to fight back.

Numbers and action are of the essence. The commitment of the government to cut back on education and launch an attack on students will only be changed in the face of mass pressure. For those who delight in the apathy of the U of T campus, it is worth recognizing that apathy is an interesting and creative form of protest against student bureaucratic politics. But, it will not pay tuition fees.

"Since last spring, students have engaged in a number of protest activities ranging from a graduate students strike, to demonstrations of 1000 in Ottawa and a demonstration of 1500 in Queen's Park. We are engaged in a long-term battle with the federal and provincial governments on the rights of students and all that these might imply for a society geared to maximizing outlets for creative expression. The struggle ahead promises to be a long one. It will even have its dull and routine moments. But as the Wright Report noted, "our Commission was established in difficult and turbulent times for education." It is up to us, the students, to determine its future.
THE OCCUPATION'S IN PICTURES

Student liaison officer John Becker

Marilyn Burnett, Steve Irwin, and Paul Dowling speak with David Slater and John Becker

Approximately 200 people at York heard John Becker explain the university's about face

President David Slater's philosophy of life: If anything can go wrong it will.

The York occupation force discuss strategy.
If the people at the bottom of the pile stopped grinning and let go, what would happen?