

## Charity

In an editorial (Sign of the Times, National Post, 27 November 2008), the National Post chastised students of Carleton University for deciding to redirect the proceeds of their annual charity drive to a group of sufferers whom the students perceive will represent a greater variety of the population. I wonder what the fuss is about. Surely the students can raise money for whomever they want to, and they can change their minds about whom they donate to, can't they? Since when have sufferers of cystic fibrosis—or any other group—become entitled to the students' efforts and the proceeds?

The crux of the Post's furor is, "because (as [the students] mistakenly believed) the disease almost exclusively afflicts white males—and so isn't 'inclusive' enough." The Post gives no evidence that the belief is mistaken.

What difference does it make that the students would rather support a cause that isn't exclusively (mistaken or not) white males? I see as important the fact that they are donating their time and efforts to a worthy cause, whichever one they chose to support. Surely the Post editors have important issues to confront instead of playing politically correct Big Brother to Carleton students.

Ted Scott, November 2008