

the gateway

Edmonton, Alberta vol. 63 no. 25

RISKIN SLAPS BACK

The students of the University of Alberta have clearly voiced their opposition to the Students' Union request contained in the November 28th, 1972 referendum.

This to me is a clear indication of disapproval of the current financial philosophy that The Students' Union has adopted.

The executive of The Students' Union, unanimously approved the preliminary budget which, as you know, is the guideline to which we must adhere. The executive of The Students' Union unanimously approved the final budget at the end of last month, a budget which received approval from almost every member of Students' Council.

But now, as we face this crisis, my executive would set itself apart from the decisions of this organization. My executive, some of whom will seek re-election, wishes you to believe that I, single-handedly, decide how Students' Union money would be allocated and finally spent. I have no such authority.

I believe the fee referendum's failure is due mainly to the incompetence of the Vice-President, Finance and Administration. Garry West, a pharmacy student at the time of his election, has failed to provide leadership to the Administration Board which recommends on all money matters to council.

West was responsible for the advertising in the last referendum. As those who opposed the referendum diligently marched from class to class, making their view known, West put an ad in The Gateway saying vote "YETH" in the referendum. How were students to take the referendum seriously if our Vice-President, Finance and Administration did not?

The executive with which I must serve is a combination of those who ran on slates with my opposition and those who are administratively incompetent.

They point to eye-catching expenditures of \$40 or \$50 for stationery for the year, and a \$3 postal charge for a letter to 20 residents in North Garneau.

At the same time they omit to discuss the Vice-President, Academic's "plaything", the Research Assistant no. 1, who resigned because there wasn't enough for her to do. This position would cost The Students' Union approximately \$7,000 per annum. The Vice-President, Academic did not on any occasion solicit any work whatsoever from her.

Also, absent from information thus far

brought to your attention, is Delaney's \$2,000 tenure study which I so emphatically opposed. The study was not only of the poorest quality, but also was not referred to once by Mr. Delaney in the G.F.C. debate on Tenure. A complete waste of \$2,000.

The referendum indicates a dissatisfaction with our financial philosophy, the philosophy of all those who supported it in council.

In response to those who have attempted to step aside and avoid the current barrage of criticism I say this:

I will not resign. I will continue to serve those who elected me until they decide otherwise.

As for the expenses which have been criticized in Council budgets, I am instructing the General Manager as follows:

That no expenses shall be permitted on behalf of any member of the executive, for travel, food and entertainment, or otherwise, without the express approval of Students' Council through a motion of Students' Council.

That no advances will be made to any member or members of the executive for any purpose without the express approval of Students' Council through a motion of Students' Council.

That the second phone in Delaney's office and the executive conference phone are to be removed immediately from The Students' Union Building.

The financial responsibility of The Students' Union rests with Students' Council, on the advice of the Vice-President, Finance and Administration of The Students' Union.

If we have been wrong, then we shall do better.

However, whether they have announced their intentions or not, at least some, and perhaps all of my critics are seeking re-election.

I find it most despicable that they would now try to set themselves aside from the decisions that they themselves have made. . . To stand before you and openly cast off the responsibilities for their actions.

Priorities of The Students' Union are not set by me, but by the Council of which I am a member.

You have now had an opportunity to see why I had lost faith in my executive, a long time ago.

Gerald A. Riskin



Riskin not resigned

The defeat of last week's fee referendum was "an indication of dissatisfaction" but not a vote of non-confidence, SU president Gerry Riskin said Friday at a press conference which Riskin called to answer the call of the rest of the SU executive for his resignation.

He announced that he did not intend to resign and would have to be removed from office either by three consecutive votes of non-confidence by the Students' Council or a student petition with the signatures of 51% of the student body.

During questioning after his formal statement, Riskin said that he saw the negative vote in the referendum as a reluctance on the part of students to take money out of the SUB expansion fund.

He attributed the difficulties on this year's executive to the political ambitions of the vice-presidents, and to the fact that several of them had run on informal "slates" which were headed by different presidential candidates.

When asked how he accounted for the defection of Rob Spragins who had campaigned with him as his executive VP, Riskin said he thought it was dissatisfaction with the position rather than with Riskin's leadership. He said he had a letter from Spragins which pledged support in any votes of non-confidence.

Asked if he favoured a return to the formal slate system of electing the executive, he said that it is "the only workable system for this organization." He compared the present arrangement to a situation in which Stanfield would serve in Trudeau's cabinet.

He noted that the million and a half budget had been passed unanimously by the executive. "You can look for a scapegoat here if you want to," he said.

He answered a question about his gold-embossed presidential stationery by revealing that VP academic Patrick Delaney purchased an attache case at SU expense.

After the press conference, three of the four members of the executive who had asked for Riskin's resignation met with the press to answer the charges Riskin had made in his statement.

Delaney, Garry West and Beth Kunhke agreed that Riskin "had sidestepped the majority of issues brought to him." "How do you answer smears?" Delaney asked.

The VP academic was also insistent that while the research assistant Riskin had termed Delaney's "plaything" had been paid out of the academic affairs budget, (for which Delaney is responsible), Council had made the position directly responsible to the president, and that in her letter of resignation, the research assistant had been critical of Riskin. He said an attache case had been available to last year's executive, but that it had been stolen. The one he purchased was meant to replace the one stolen and was inventoried as SU property.

A special meeting of council was called for Monday night at which time the dissident vice presidents plan to present their motion of non-confidence to Council.

tj

L.I.P. service no F.U.N.

Free University North (F.U.N.), an organization providing free classes in subjects of community interest, has been denied an expected renewal of their Local Initiatives Program (L.I.P.) grant.

The denial comes as a shock as well as a surprise to those connected with F.U.N., because an extension of summer L.I.P. grants to cover October and November, the period between summer and winter funding, seemed to promise that the government had every intention of renewing the grant for the winter. The extension was made in response to pre-election criticism which attacked the government for terminating summer projects for two months while applications were re-submitted for winter grants. At that time, the minister in charge, Bryce Mackassy received much election-time publicity for the Canada-wide extensions to the grants.

F.U.N. representatives now see these extensions as a mere electioneering gimmick, a move by the government to gain the sympathies of L.I.P. supporters, and an attempt to hold down the winter unemployment figures to salvage some votes.

The only justification that the L.I.P.

has given for the denial of a winter grant is unacceptable to F.U.N. The cut was brought about by enforcing strictly a stipulation that projects must not be continuous or on-going. In the case of F.U.N. this clause means that they could only receive a grant if they could demonstrate that at the end of the December to May winter grant, that they would be self-supporting or be receiving funds from other sources. But representatives of F.U.N. say that this criterion was not in any way made clear to them.

They complain that from year to year, the criteria for the awarding of grants shifts and is never made available to applicants. They think that they received a summer grant because they were creating jobs and they think that this criterion of creating employment is more valid than one of developing self-sufficiency.

F.U.N. organizers feel that the decisions on L.I.P. grants are made for reasons of political patronage rather than on the basis of an assessment of the quality of the project. They think that if an assessment of F.U.N. was made that its record of community involvement in teaching everything from creative writing

to automotives should insure an L.I.P. grant.

F.U.N. will continue to operate on a voluntary work basis but the loss of the grant is crippling. Their 12-month budget for last year of 45,000 dollars went largely into salaries for an administrative staff of ten. Other costs are avoided since teaching is done on a volunteer basis, space for classes is scrounged from churches, community centers, and peoples' homes, and their administrative headquarters in Terra House are donated by the city. But in March their free lease in Terra House expires. Also, the lack of funds for publications and publicity will mean that they can only maintain their present state of involvement in the community and they will be unable to expand beyond their present circle.

They receive no income from tuition or registration fees because to charge any form of tuition is a violation of F.U.N.'s principle that learning should be free. To put any price on instruction would, they feel, carry them down the road that established universities have gone, leading to the situation where one is learning by compulsion and for a price, rather than in free pursuit of one's interests.