

At least one senior faculty member does not wish to see budget cuts imposed only on the lowest paid University employees. At a meeting of the President with Department Chairmen on February 24th, the Chairman of the Physiology Department, Dr. M. Schachter, suggested to the President that University employees be subjected to a general salary ceiling of \$25,000. This ceiling to be maintained for the next three years, after which it would be reviewed by the President in light of the prevailing financial climate. It has been estimated that up to \$250,000 might be saved by such a measure.

According to Dr. Schachter several other Department Chairmen supported his suggestion at the meeting, although there were some opposed to it. The President would not allow the proposal to be made as a formal motion at the meeting as he was asking Deans and Department Chairmen to bring back suggestions to him from their Departments in ten days time.

See the story on Departmental responses.

## You can't cut half a secretary

Prof. A. A. Ryan, Provost, commented Thursday that the 17.8 per cent cut listed for Student Services was "misleading" and that "the actual budget cut for the various services is approximately the same as for other administration services." This is because \$84,000 of the proposed \$150,000 cut (i.e., 56 per cent) is expected to come from a transfer of the cost of infirmity service from Student Health to the University Hospital. (See Gateway story, Feb. 3).

He also confirmed that Student Health would be expected to absorb an additional amount of the budget cuts allocated to the five areas of Student Services (Alumni Secretary, Student Awards Office, Student Counselling, Student Affairs, Student Health). "We were all told to work towards the same cuts," he said.

When asked whether budget cuts would result in people being fired, he replied, "Well, not permanent staff," and gave the Dean of Women and the Dean of Men as examples. Later he explained that it was easier for large departments and offices to absorb cuts than it was for small ones. "You can't cut half a secretary if you've only got one."

Prof. Ryan supplied a copy of a brief submitted to General Faculties Council in answer to questions about the services provided by people in his Department. The brief states that "The Provost interests himself in the general welfare of the students and endeavors to further their interests." Among the six duties listed are "1. participating in the formulation, promotion, and implementation of University policy as it affects the students," "4. being available to students with problems of any kind," and "5. keeping abreast of students trends elsewhere."

The brief states that "The Dean of Women is particularly concerned with the welfare of the women students. Approximately 35 per cent of her time is spent keeping in touch with and interpreting the campus scene to help promote a constructive milieu for women students...50 per cent is largely devoted to personal interviews and follow-up action related to individual problems (medical, psychiatric, courts, family) and other personal concerns."

The brief lists some of the duties of the Dean of Men as "liaison with city and provincial agencies, service clubs, the City Police and R.C.M.P., the Liquor Control Board, student faculty organizations, student clubs, the fraternities, and individual students," and states that he "deputized for the Provost in his absence."

The Assistant Deans of Men and Women for Residence "assist the self-governing Residence Student Association as requested. They are not disciplinarians, but have had delegated to them the landlords' power of refusing admission to or requiring withdrawal from residence. They are also available to individual students with problems," according to the brief.

# WHO GETS MORE?

*A Theory to Explain the Uneven Distribution of Good Things At This University*

*Functional Theory of Social Stratification:*

*Those who propose this type of theory want people to believe that the reason why rewards are unevenly distributed in society (eg. why some people get paid more for working than others) is because:*

- 1) they are doing a job that requires harder work.
- 2) they are doing a job that is more important in "keeping things running".
- 3) they have performed some great service in the past.
- 4) they have the brains, training, special knowledge or skills that others don't (or can't possibly) have.

*An Example -- In reading the budget, you may notice that a janitor earns considerably less money than those who are in charge of financial planning. According to this theory, the reason is that janitors either don't work as hard, aren't doing as important a job, aren't the sort of people who could do the job of administration as well, etc.*

*Finally, people who hold the above social theory usually believe, and want others to believe, that ours is an open social system, that the top jobs are equally available to everyone; the secret is that the people who have them have just tried a little harder (applied themselves more).*

**"The responsibility for implementing the cuts in various faculties does rest with each Dean - subject to review by the President and the Board of Governors."**

D.G. Tyndall

*This table shows where the main increases in the University budget are located. It is important to note that we have compared the actual expenses for 1970-71 with the budgeted amounts for 1971-72.*

*1. It shows which areas have been allocated greater increases by the Administration and the Board of Governors. (Note the Deans Offices and the Administration itself).*

*2. It shows that in some areas, cuts may only appear substantial because they are based on the inflated amounts proposed rather than the actual running expenses for 70-71.*

SECTOR	ACTUAL ESTIMATED		INCR EASE
	COST (1970-71)	COST (1971-72)	
Office of the President	\$ 114,773	\$ 156,310	36%
Vice President (Academic)	80,336	155,390	93%
Vice President (Finance & Admin.)	101,181	126,550	25%
Vice President (Planning & Devel.)	74,178	106,830	44%
Comptroller's Office	671,093	1,002,020	49%
Personnel Office	119,542	157,530	32%
Purchasing	344,529	377,188	10%
Registrar	487,724	708,585	45%
Campus Development	245,566	300,860	23%
Institutional Research and Planning	197,039	270,480	37%
Secretariat	50,619	67,900	34%
Senate	4,710	15,000	219%
Libraries	4,686,092	5,034,120	7%
(spent on books)	1,616,480	1,399,280	-13%
Campus Security	289,989	335,795	16%
Alumni Secretary	43,627	63,635	46%
<b>FACULTIES</b>			
Agriculture	\$ 2,497,841	2,802,005	12%
Dean of Agriculture)	81,258	97,990	21%
Arts	7,678,197	8,495,100	11%
(Dean of Arts)	256,970	324,045	26%
Business Administration	1,011,614	1,130,505	12%
Dentistry	1,307,272	1,406,855	8%
(Dean of Dentistry)	66,388	71,110	7%
Dental Hygiene	130,585	162,345	24%
Education	4,490,745	4,917,700	10%
(Dean of Education)	264,232	308,805	17%
Engineering	2,951,437	3,308,735	12%
(Dean of Engineering)	129,307	172,720	34%
Graduate Studies and Research	2,293,920	2,470,450	8%
Household Economics	519,947	591,730	14%
Law	444,833	520,475	17%
(Dean of Law)	85,629	96,395	13%
Library Science	174,483	199,910	15%
Medicine	4,217,291	5,063,315	20%
(Dean of Medicine)	168,672	\$202,845	20%
Nursing	320,859	365,850	14%
Pharmacy	501,725	566,655	13%
Physical Education	975,622	1,052,130	8%
(Dean of Phys. Ed.)	452,225	321,145	-29%
Rehabilitation Medicine	290,992	348,845	20%
College St. Jean	211,053	405,000	92%
Science	11,651,713	11,246,370	-4%
(Dean of Science)	\$ 224,717	331,930	48%

*It appears that the 71-72 budget is inflated in terms of:*

*1. the actual expenses for past years (and reasonable increases);*

*2. Recent deficits in operation expenses of the past few years. For example, in 69-70: provincial grant - \$43,533,000; fees - \$8,432,000; deficit - \$92,000. In 70-71: provincial grant - \$50,136,000; fees - \$8,981,000; deficit - \$866,000. In 71-72: provincial grant - \$55,550,000; fees - \$9,480,000; deficit - \$1,872,000.*

*Another Theory to Explain the Uneven Distribution of Good Things at This University.*

*Conflict or Political Power Theory:*

*People who hold to this type of theory would want to say that the reason that some people enjoy privileges (eg. higher pay, expense accounts, vehicle allowances) is because they have the power to make the important decisions (eg. who gets the higher salaries, etc.) (See Dr. Tyndall's story) According to conflict theorists, it's a myth that the people at the top are more clever, work harder, etc. -- usually the opposite is true. One reason why it's extremely hard to see through this myth, is that it is the powerful ones themselves who decide which jobs are going to be called 'important', 'hard', requiring hard work or talent', etc.*

*Furthermore, according to people who hold this view, the only way that somebody gets into a powerful position is to have influential friends, to show a willingness to obey the 'masters', to be of the right ethnic origin, and/or to be rich. Once in a while somebody else makes it -- that only keeps the open-system myth' alive.*

*These at the top do not necessarily have to be competent in order to obtain or hold their jobs.*

## Head of chemistry wants more

While surrounded by talk of budget cuts, some people are attempting to get even more money out of the University.

At the February 28th meeting of GFC a report was presented from an ad hoc committee looking into the financing of reprint costs and page charges. The report and its proposals were presented by Dr. H. E. Gunning, Chairman of the Chemistry department.

It is well known that publication in the scholarly journals requires great intellectual ability but perhaps not so widely appreciated that a good deal of hard cash is also involved. The reprints which a professor is morally obliged to send out to his colleagues who request them are supplied by the publisher at a cost which may be several hundred

dollars.

In addition an increasing number of journals use the page charge system to make their operation more profitable. Page charges may be as high as \$70 per page, with the most prestigious journals going for the highest charges because of supply and demand.

Thus a professor publishing a 20-30 page article in a good journal with reasonable circulation may well find himself faced with a bill for over \$1000 from the journal.

The bulk of these publication costs are borne by the granting agencies such as MRC, NRC, Canada Council, etc., but the University supplies some funds for this purpose. One of the key proposals of the Gunning committee was that "the

division of funds among departments will be made roughly on the basis of the amounts each department expended in the preceding year on such items from any source." Thus a department having a large amount of external grant money being spent on publication costs would get a larger proportion of university funds for this purpose than another less fortunate department.

This point was not missed by other GFC members. Dr. J.W. Macki of the Mathematics department noted "We in the physical sciences are going to clobber the daylights out of people in the humanities who do not have Canada Council grants." Dr. Macki then successfully proposed an amendment to the proposals, deleting the offending sentence. Better luck next time!