

The Gateway

Member of the Canadian University Press
Winner N. A. M. MacKenzie Trophy 1963-64
Winner Ottawa Journal Trophy 1963-64
Editor-in-Chief - - - Bill Winship

PAGE FOUR

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1964

Share The Wealth

Early Tuesday morning Students' Council approved a budget totalling \$237,690.

The approval, at 1:40 a.m., climaxed seven hours of debate.

Students' Council could have spent seven more hours. Many Councilors didn't do their homework, and were obviously not prepared to do their job properly.

The Finance Commission, which spent well over twenty hours preparing the budget, did an excellent job considering that Council's summer spending spree put the union in difficult financial straits. Its recommendations, however, should not have been accepted as gospel.

Insufficient time was spent debating the merits of their budget criteria. Yet these criteria were constantly used to justify cuts in budgets. In some cases the criteria were not applicable.

To deal briefly with their criteria: no one will dispute the necessity of a balanced budget, or the practicality of an operating reserve to cover any unforeseen contingencies. Certainly the question of who benefits from the money spent, and how many students, is of primary importance. And naturally Students' Union clubs should be placed at the top of the priorities.

Individual budgets were scrutinized on a four point basis: is the budget honest? are there any variances between budget request and previous years' actual expenses? can we afford any large increases requested? does the organization have any other sources of funds, e.g., outside bank accounts?

Hearings were held with every organization requesting over \$400 or requesting increases over last year's expenditures.

PENNY WISE

The criteria which sparked the most debate was one placing a maximum allowance of \$150 on parties sponsored by the Students' Union, and which further eliminated any other "reimbursement" such as coffee expense. Without a doubt, if funds were not so scarce, this item would not have appeared in the form of a rigid budget recommendation. No doubt some reduction was called for, but as yet there have been no concrete reasons given to justify the cuts.

The Gateway, for instance, will continue to have coffee at the expense of its party fund because it is considered an essential part of a press night, and a justifiable expense.

Another criteria which could potentially save the union considerably more money than slashing of coffee expenses, that wherever possible advertising by clubs should be done using Gateway and Signboard Directorate media, was given, and no doubt will continue to be given lip service.

The budget specifically allocates over \$2,200 to advertising and poster costs. Yet the two media specifically mentioned, Gateway and Signboard, will probably receive less than

one third of this based on expenditures of past years.

No real effort was made to insure that these monies be returned to the union in the form of revenue wherever possible. No real effort was made to justify these expenditures on other media where the aforementioned would do as well or better.

POUND FOOLISH

If one could describe the spending habits of the Council in one sentence it would assuredly be, "penny wise and pound foolish." Blame for the budgetary problems encountered rests entirely with Council and not the Finance Commission.

Over the summer Council saw fit to spend the following amounts without realizing its effect on the total budget picture: \$6,000 more on printing costs of the Evergreen and Gold, \$3,500 more on a literary supplement for the Gateway, \$734 for additional delegates to the National Congress, \$174 for additional observers at the National CUS Seminar, \$2,000 for a university band, a very substantial amount for a salary for a General Manager, \$4,000 in effect by suggesting The Gateway increase its frequency of publication with the view to eventually evolving into a daily, \$525 for a leadership seminar at Pigeon Lake, \$200 for a conference sponsored by the Anglican Club, and finally, \$2,700 by reducing Freshman Introduction Week registration fees by two-thirds. There were other expenses which in total committed the Union to expenditures of over \$30,000—none of which were included in last year's budget.

Questions and suggestions arising out of the budget:

(1) Can a deficit of \$4,380 be justified for Freshman Introduction Week? It seems obvious that the whole question of FIW is due for re-consideration. Specifically, it seems apparent freshman fees must be raised to cover costs.

Moreover, costs can be pared considerably. Calling for tenders on frosh caps, buttons; a reduction in advertising costs (where did the \$800 allocated go?); a drastic cut in costs of the Gold Key reception (from \$630 to \$150 perhaps); eliminating the cost of a football game (\$1,000)—these are just a few of the more obvious areas where cost can be reduced.

(2) Has not the time arrived for a complete re-evaluation of the position of the Evergreen and Gold? Can we continue to justify a \$36,000 debit? Perhaps it's time the yearbook was put on a voluntary basis. Perhaps its time thought was given to producing two books, both on a voluntary basis, serving different purposes. Perhaps it's time the students were consulted as to what they want in the way of a yearbook. The ramifications of these suggestions involve a revamping of the entire Students' Union fee structure.

(3) Can we afford \$2,600 for a band?

There are a good deal more questions but we'll leave them for another time.



"WOULD YOU LET THIS MAN CUT YOUR HAIR?"

A Viewpoint From 209B

UAB Needs More Student Voices

The time has arrived for some positive reorganization of the University Athletic Board.

During the past few years there has been less and less student direction in policy matters.

The University Athletic Board reversed an earlier decision Tuesday by voting down a proposal to place two more student councillors on the Board. The arguments put forth to justify the reversal failed to grasp the essential problem.

There would be no need for additional student membership on UAB if the present members were doing their job properly. They are not, and the grandstand issue is only one example of the degree to which non-student initiated action is governing UAB's decision.

Council's concern with UAB is well-founded. At present the Presidents of Men's and Women's Athletics do not provide sufficient interaction for two reasons: one, they are seldom at Council meetings; two, even when present they rarely participate in the discussion and so far have not volunteered to present verbal reports on UAB policies.

For this reason we need more voice in UAB. And having the Students' Union President sitting there or a member of the executive is not enough, for they speak for only one segment of the Council, and being very busy, may not be able to devote

enough time to UAB business.

The suggestion that practical experience in athletics is a prerequisite for UAB is nonsense. The only prerequisite needed is a sincere interest in and knowledge of student athletic needs and activities. There is nothing inherent in the ability to play good football to qualify one to speak on matters of athletic policy.

In fact it is probably a deterrent, for it makes that person too sympathetic to the demands of our professional administrators. And what our athletic administrators want, and what the students at large want, can be, and often is, different.

The students who presently make up the UAB are in colloquial terms, "jocks". They are thoroughly convinced of the inherent good of athletics. Seldom do they question the value of intercollegiate competition. Can they truthfully say they have considered whether intercollegiate activity is necessary? Most seem sublimely convinced that whatever Dr. Van Vliet and Mr. Zemrau propose is in the students' best interests. I suggest it is not.

It may not be in the best interests of UAB to increase student membership. It is in the best interests of the students to increase student participation. Whether this involves a complete reorganization of UAB or additional student membership is debatable. Something must be done, and soon.

The Papermakers

Associate Editor Barry Rust
News Editor Don Sellar
Sports Editor Alex Hardy
Features Editor Janis Kostash
City Editor Doug Walker

Editorial Assistant Adriana Albi
Fine Arts Marion Raycheba
Photo Editor Hiroto Saka
Makeup Editor Bill Miller
Cartoonist Bill Salter

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Gary Klerman, Assistant Sports Editor, Larry Krywanluk, Beverly Bayer, Barrie Brenand, Les McLeod, Sherry Learmonth, Sue Hill, Lawrence Samuel, Janet Orzech, Brenda Walls, Ginger Bradley, John Loewen, Richard Lof, Regina (of the Journal), Bruce Ferrier, Allan Shute, Linda Strand, Al Bromley, Barry Keith, Barbara Reklmowich, Malcolm Fast, Ann Matheson.
The Gateway is published twice weekly by the Students' Union of the University of Alberta. Opinions expressed by columnists are not necessarily those of the editors. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final Copy Deadline: for Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Thursday: for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Monday. Advertising Manager, Bev Bayer. Circulation 7,500. Office phone—493-1155.