

rules needed

The autonomy of individual researchers and the public right to information are the two combatants in a new policy wrangle scheduled for G.F.C.

According to U of A environmentalist and professor of pharmacology, E.E. Daniel, current university policies on the publication of contract research do not adequately protect the public interest, especially in cases where public hearings are to be held.

Daniel has requested that the G.F.C. consider two improvements of the present situation: one to prevent researchers from delaying the publication of their research until after it has been received by the agency which commissioned it, and the other to ensure that no findings of a researcher can be suppressed even if they were not specifically requested by the contractor.

At present the university policy forbids researchers to take in projects "the publication of which might be restricted," according to Research Grants Officer, R.A. Holmes.

But Daniel observes that researchers are able to delay the publication of their research until after the contracting agency has received it. "I don't know how common this practice is," Daniel said in an interview last Friday. "But with more and more requests for contract research, the university policy should be made clear."

He cited two examples of contracts which might attract public criticism.

The more controversial, and the apparent motivation of Daniel's motions, is the study done by the Boreal Institute for Canadian Gas Arctic Studies Ltd. Acting Director of the Institute, R.S. Jamieson has refused to make the study public until after the National Energy Board hearings of the application to build the pipeline. No contract was ever signed, but Jamieson argues that it is a matter of courtesy to the Consortium to allow it to use the findings of the research it paid for

before they are made available to anyone else.

In an earlier Gateway interview, Jamieson admitted that the study, to gauge sociological effects of the pipeline and to devise a training program, "was done on the assumption that the pipeline would be built," a realistic course, he said, due to the governments commitment to building the pipeline.

However, another report, based on research done as part of the same project, has been made public by the researcher who did the work, Larry Stuhki, an anthropologist now at the University of Nebraska who opposes the idea of a pipeline.

According to Jamieson, Stuhki's findings were not included in the Institute's report because they were "outside of the terms of reference of the study."

Daniel's second example is an investigation of a proposed Kaliska Lake, N.W.T., hydro-electric project being done by William Fuller, chairman of the zoology department.

Fuller argued in an interview last Monday that "if you contract with the government, you have a commitment to the people who put up the money to allow them to have the first look."

But it is equally important that the report be made public long enough in advance to allow the public to respond, he insisted. The distribution of a report to the public is the responsibility of the government, Fuller said.

"I don't know that the university should dictate how and when one must publish. The kind of regulations Dr. Daniel is talking about would bind the researcher," Fuller objected. "The university already has safeguards. It's only a matter of timing."

Last Wednesday, the G.F.C. executive referred Daniel's requests to the G.F.C. research committee for its comments.

tax muddle cheats grads

by Bart Hall-Beyer

The changed deduction pattern on the paycheque stubs of various subspecies of graduate students have brought into focus a tax hassle of potentially immense proportions. After 24 hours of telephoning and pavement pounding, such as can only be engendered by attempting to deal simultaneously with the university and the federal civil service, one thing has become clear: there is one hell of a muddle about, and from it, grad students will likely be able to take home an additional fifteen dollars a month.

First is the change in the amount of your income that the university consider taxable. Everyone is given an automatic exemption of \$1500 on the taxable portion their assistantship. However, under the new tax law, up to \$500 of a bursary is exemptable (Bulletin IT-75(1)). Since the remission of fees is self exempting (if you report it as income, you are eligible to deduct it in April - if you don't report it you can't deduct it) and is also considered to be a bursary, it is not included in the \$500 exemption. Thus you may request an additional \$500 exemption on the portion from which tax is withheld. To do this you must file a new form TD-1 and write in the bursary exemption yourself.

Additionally, the university are not required to deduct taxes from the bursary (06-code) portion of the monthly paycheque, since bursaries are not included as a required at-source-deduction in Section 153 of the Act. At present, however, Payroll are deducting tax at the full rate from both 01-code and 06-code income. Unemployment Insurance and Canada Pension are deducted only from 01-code income (salary). Thus with a (\$1500 exemption) monthly cheque of \$333.34, and (a \$1500 exemption) \$44.50 in tax is deducted. With a \$2000 exemption, \$38.00 is deducted at present. If the university nabobs can be convinced (and

eighteen hundred grad students knocking on doors can be pretty convincing) not to deduct income tax from the 06-code income, then these monthly deductions are reduced to \$32.05 and \$25.75, respectively.

An hour's conversation with M. A. Rousell, Comptroller, convinced me that the university are genuinely interested in the students' well-being in this matter. The 06-code question is something they simply had not run into during the nightmare that is National Revenue. The status of GTA's, GSA's, and particularly GRA's is in some doubt, and the tax office thoughtfully neglected to send the university a copy of the Interpretation Bulletin 75 (pertaining to scholarships, etc.) until the Comptroller's office heard rumour of its existence and had the audacity to request a copy.

games: pro and con

Last Thursday's debate held in Room 104 SUB concerning Edmonton's sponsorship of the 1978 Commonwealth Games brought City Alderman Dave Word and Ed. Leger together in a confrontation over an issue which may greatly affect Edmonton's future.

Leger, strongly opposed to Edmonton's participation in the Games, pointed out that the \$40 million which will be needed to construct a stadium and other facilities to house the Games could be used far more wisely and that the Games were being used as an excuse to build a complex structure which was rejected by the Edmonton tax payers.

Leger predicted that a small minority of the public would be likely to turn out to watch amateur wrestling and lawn bowling. He also claimed that due to Britain's entry into the European Common Market, the importance of the Commonwealth is rapidly declining and claimed that



March first is the deadline for applications for O.F.Y. grants, the program which according to the pamphlet which accompanies the application forms, "is designed to give youth their opportunity to make things better."

"We believe," the blurb continues, "that the enthusiasm, energy and idealism of youth has made, and will continue to make, a significant impact on improving social, cultural and environmental conditions of local communities."

Application forms for those interested in a share of the \$39,970,000 available for projects next summer are available from Canada Manpower Centres. Maximum earnings are \$90 per week for post-secondary students and \$70 a week for high school students. There should be

enough money for 33,834 people.

The criteria for assessing projects include community benefit, the number of participants, feasibility, innovation and the financial needs of participants. An attempt will be made to encourage more involvement of low-income youth and those in the North.

In addition, the final selection will take into account regional unemployment figures, provincial government priorities, and male-female ratios. Last year, 3,200 groups had to be chosen from over 20,000 applicants.

The fifteen page long application booklet calls for detailed information about expenditures, community benefit and project feasibility.

channels sought

Reporters outnumbered students at last Thursday's special student budget meeting with university president Max Wyman.

Three students attended the meeting which was covered by three reporters and a photographer. Student (non-attendance) was blamed in part on poor Gateway coverage before the event.

In a presentation similar to that given a week earlier to the Board of Governors, Wyman explained the budget forecast on which his meeting with university groups have been based.

Besides providing a channel for groups to make known their priorities for

this year's budget, Wyman said he hoped the meetings would suggest permanent procedures for making budgetary decisions in future years.

Wyman plans to meet in mid-February with department chairmen, deans, directors and student representatives to discuss what kinds of mechanisms might be most acceptable to the university community.

Students who were present questioned Wyman on the effects of various methods of distributing the estimated 3% cuts required by next year's budget.

The proposal to distribute funds on the basis of workloads or student hours in each faculty, as suggested by one student, Wyman called unrealistic because it failed to take into account the fact that instruction costs per student hour are more costly in some.

A proposal to redistribute funds on the basis of increasing or decreasing faculty enrolment, also poses problems, Wyman said. Faculties have continuing commitments which cannot easily be broken, and some faculties with declining enrolments, still provide numerous "service courses" for other faculties, which their faculty enrolments do not reflect, an example being the large number of students registered in education who take courses in arts.

"If you're lucky," Wyman explained, "there will be retirements or resignations of staff in education or arts (faculties with declining enrolments), but to fire somebody is legally not possible" without one year's notice.

One of the students present argued that such restrictions make it "hard on faculties which are still growing". Wyman agreed but noted that cuts to faculties with declining enrolments would have the same effect on departments within those faculties which were still growing.