See no art gallery, here no art

by Andrew Watts
Students returning to the
university campus will undoubtedly notice the lack of the
Students Union Art Gallery from
its once familiar position in SUB.
Last May 18th, student's
council voted to close the gallery
after voting against a motion to
maintain it for at least one more
year.

Last May 18th, students to council voted to close the gallery after voting against a motion to maintain it for at least one more year. In speaking for the entire executive, we were really pissed off, "ays Ray Conway, v.p. internal.

The motion in question The students as year, explains to convey."

The students as year would have gene to decide whether the levy should be afternated whether the levy should be added whether the levy should be actived whether the levy s

would have seen a \$3 levy assessed on top of regular Students' Union fees. This would have generated sufficient funds to enable the gallery to remain open. The issue would have gone to

pretty complicated thing." But he said he and other Board members pushed for an announcement.

the university administration, who will be converting it into offices to handle their overload problems.

According to SU Business According to SU Business Manager Tom Wright, the rental of the area will bring in \$67,000 to the SU coffers annually.

Arguments against the motion centered around the fact that at that time (May 18) the majority of the students would not be around and aware of the levy being assessed them.

At that same meeting a representative of the gallery equated the levy to 'less than two beers in RATT, a couple of packs of cigarettes or four rides on ETS.

However, vp. Internal Conway did leave the door open for future considerations into the reopening the gallery.

"It depends on our finances," he explains, "if we get five or six years of good executive we may reopen it."

open it.



The Students' Union Art Gallery fell victim to the cost of living

UBC numbers game

VANCOUVER (CUP)—The University of British Columbia's administration "deliberately mis-lead" the Board of Governors about the university's finances earlier this year, a former student Board representative now

Board representative now charges. After the administration predicted \$7.4 million deficit for 1982-83, the Board voted in January to increase tution fees by 32.8 per cent, lay off support staff, reduce physical plant spending and place hiring freezes on many departments.

and place hiring freezes on many departments.

In June, the administration revealed a \$6.4 million reserve.

I feel we were deliberately misted by the administration into place the second of the sec

Niwinski

The administration claimed the reserve resulted from "unusually high short-term interest rates" last fall, financial retrenchment by various faculties and "uncertainties associated with the medical school expansion budget."

BKUT University spokesperson Jim Banham denied that the Board was misled.

"I think the president (of UBC, Doug Kenny) has kept the Board informed," he said. "The Board at its meetings gets monthly financial reports about what is happening at the University.

"And it (the Board) has a finance committee which meets before every Board meeting and goes over the report. I don't think the administration can buy that argument that the Board is not being informed."

But Niwinski and Alma Mater Saigiety vp Cliff Stewart pointed out that the \$2.7 million generated from the short-term investments could have covered the amount raised by the fee increase. The administration claimed

the amount raised by the tee
increase.

And Niwinski and Stewart
with current student board
member Dave Dale, said that
because interest rates peaked in
October and November, the
administration had ample opportunity to inform the Board of its
boart term investment exercises.

unity to inform the Board of its short term investment earnings.

T think it (the information) would have shed a different light on such things as tuition fee increases, Dale said, adding that he learned of the extra money at the end of April.

Stewart said he thinks the administration's failure to report the high investment earnings demonstrates "either goss misrepresentation on the part of the administration, either of which is totally unacceptable."

Banham said the surplus

Banham said the surplus Banham said the surplus resulted from an attempt to soften the impact of the \$7.4 million retrenchment in the 1981/82 budget, made to deal with the projected shortfall.

Dale said that although he found out about the reserve at the end of April, he didn't want to make it public then because "it's a

