...and promise ...and promise

accurately program the grid square coordinates of various targets.

SM: The difference in our negotiation style will be to go in and try to change the perception that private industry and the government tend to have towards education. As Edep Schumacher said, education is potentially our greatest resourse, depending on how we use it. If we can suggest to the government and industry that we have something valuable to offer them, that the benefits they'll get by making investment now will be far greater in the future. Hopefully, we would be able to increase funding that way, so we would be able to decrease the amount we would have to pay on tuition. I'm aware that other people have tried to do this in the past and they've met with some difficulty . Hopefully, if you go in there with a positive negotiating attitude it's possible to increase the funding.

Also with the WCT, I believe it should be abolished specifically because it is an attack on the integrity of the students, the integrity of the English profs who are passing the individuals who fail the WCT and as such it is an attack on the integrity of the institution itself. However, a suggestion that I would offer them is that they (implement the test) upon admission to campus. If in fact you do fail it, then all you have to do is take the English remedial course and if you pass that then you don't have to write the WCT again.

CJSR requires a \$50,000 subsidy this year and the Gateway requires one of approximately \$20,000. What do you plan on doing with them and how do you see the relationship between campus media and student government?

M.F.: With regards to CJSR, due to the fact they are a broadcasting establishment, I think there will have to be a major relocation of their offices. We need their equipment for our future plans. As far as the Gateway goes, becoming a nuclear power also means tighter security measures. We can't afford to have premature disclosures of our negotiating positions. Certainly, as VP External, my experience in observing foreign leader has given me a great upper hand as far as bargaining power goes. We can't disclose too much to these foreign powers. Therefore, we'll have to let the situation dictate before we make any changes to the journalistic integrity of the Gateway.

SM: I've gone and talked to the station manager of CJSR because I was interested in seeing exactly what his concerns were and I've spoken to the VP Finance about CJSR because I wanted to see what he perceived to be the problems.

I feel certain things offer something that is beyond an economic standpoint. CJSR offers students an opportunity to do something that is spreading fairly much around other campuses and if they could do something to increase their listening audience then I would like to up their kilowattage through new towers.

As far as the Gateway goes, I don't mind taking care of their funding. In fact, I'd like to see something like the *Grind* appear again because I think it's good for us to have more than one voice on campus.

PS: CJSR is a new service and you can't expect a relatively new service to come out and start making a profit. That's why we collect fees: to supply help to those services that are not self-sufficient, as in the case with CJSR. In the past they have had problems with revenue but I think the SU can help them not by cutting them off but by offering them some of their expertise. I believe this deficit is a worthwhile expenditure which will decrease in future years.

With the Gateway, \$20,000 is nothing. It's coming out and informing the students every week of new developments within Students' Council. If a new paper arises on campus, I believe the Gateway with its 75 year tradition should maintain its position as the SU newspaper. A new newspaper may need some financial backing in the form of advertising but further than that, I believe we should remain devoted to the Gateway.

JW: CJSR is not a profit making operation. It was never intended to be and it probably never will be. Its CRTC (Canadian Radio and Television Commision) licence gives it a mandate to have an extremely wide range of music from different ethnic groups and as a result we don't see a lot of mainstream music. We don't consider them a profitmaking operation but that \$50,000 deficit is due to them overshooting their budget. What we'd like to see is them making a budget estimate and then sticking to it. The students cannot afford to be paying for the cost of unrealistic expenditures on the part of CJSR.

The Woodbridge Slate would like to see the Gateway become more financially independant. Right now it is making most of its operating costs off of its advertising, and I can easily see it becoming independent and absorbing that \$20,000 so that we don't have to pay it. Also the Woodbridge Slate would like to see the editor-in-chief become elected as this avoids the second floor SU party politics. That way, we can get an editor-in-chief in there that will be more autonomous from the SU and give the paper a chance to really get in there and do its job by attacking issues for the students.

DO: The Gateway and its \$20,000 subsidy is very reasonable.

It is excellent and provides a lot of services that we couldn't get form other papers. I don't think the Gateway has to worry about losing its autonomy. Council doesn't interfere with what goes into the paper but that may be due to apathy. Some problems do arise due to personality conflicts between the editorial staff and people in office.

CJSR is a real touchy issue. Some people like them and others are really pissed off. They are controlled by the First Alberta Campus Radio Association and not by the Students' Union and a lot of people aren't too pleased with that. So, maybe we should let the students themselves decide what should be done. Do they want a radio station that provides them a service that is controlled by an outside group and is funded by their money or do they want CJSR run by the Students' Union so that we can have more input into the programming? I think this is an issue which we must take to the students. It's their money and I think we do have to let them decide what is to be done with this.

What should the relationship be between the executive and the business, finance and area managers? Do you see a need for downsizing the bureaucracy or the replacement of any of the current managers?

SM: Conversations with people in office have indicated to me that the organization right now may require a little downsizing but feel it runs reasonably efficiently. They believe the managers they have working for them are reasonably competent.

PS: I believe the area managers are very competent. With the business manager and the financial manager, I think their salaries have to be taken into consideration. Last year, one of the individuals admitted making \$75,000 the past two years. I feel they've done a real good job. They took us out of a deficit situation and we have to take that into account. However, we should look at their salaries and see what they're doing for the amount they're receiving. Maybe it's time for some fresh blood in there.

JW: The executive is in there to give input from the students to the student services. The managers are there to manage. That is their job, that is their skill. We have good managers who are all doing a fine job.

What has to happen in the executive has to

let them know what we want, what the students' needs are, and let the managers use their skill to provide it. Otherwise, what we're doing is letting inexperienced people who just got elected trying to be experienced managers. That just does not happen. That ends up with very bad results. It's not responsible and it does not make us a credible institution.

We have a reasonable bureaucracy in most terms. However, there are certain positions which are being paid a good salary. One example is the researcher who is supposed to research various issues relevant to students. The president is supposed to direct this person. At the current time, we don't utilize that person as much as we could. We should either have people in there working hard full-time or not have them at all. Otherwise, we're just spending the students' money for nothing.

DO: The interaction between the present managers and the Students' Union is really interpersonal right now and not all that bureaucratic. The ultimate bosses are the SU executive but we do have a lot of people who know what they're doing in there and try and use that to their advantage. What we have to do is keep our eyes open and make sure the managers aren't doing too much for their gain.

I think our managers are really good and none of them need replacement. They're all doing their jobs very well.

M.F.: Mr. Impact, Mr. Launchpad and myself like the idea of expanding the bureaucracy we have now. As we see it, the bureaucracy we have is fine for an institution of this scale, but of course with our plans in mind we're going to need a much, much larger bureaucracy just to keep it running. We're going to need specialists in the new field in which we're entering. Also, we're going to need people to help us with things like protocol. I think all the jobs are going to have to be paying a lot more than they are now because we'll have the finances to do it and we'll also want to attract the best and the brightest.

Tuesday, March 11, 1986





