

# gateway

Thursday, March 17, 1983

When someone says,  
it's not the money but  
the principle of the  
thing...

...it's the money.  
Abe Martin

## U rips off SU

by Sandy Vickerson

The Students' Union is being subjected to questionable costs created by the University Administration.

Since Sept. 1981 the University has charged the SU \$10,000 for the collection of their Student Union membership fees. The University has failed to justify this charge in terms of cost. Tom Wright, Students' Union Business Manager, feels that this charge is "totally unjustified for the simple reason that they have to collect their fees anyway and all they have to do is calculate what portion belongs to the SU."

However, this is the only campus in Canada where this type of fee is applied.

Bert Knowles, the comptroller, claims "the \$10,000 fee was derived by calculating what percentage of the total fees belonged to the SU and then charging the SU that percentage of the collection costs."

It does not cost the University any extra to collect SU fees.

The University has also made it known that as of next year they

would like to charge revenue-producing organizations in SUB for utilities.

Roger Merkosky, SU Vice President Finance and Administration says, "This is silly, because not all these revenue-producing organizations make a profit, an example of this is Student Orientation Services. The organizations that do make a profit could run into losses by next year."

Lorne Leitch explains, "This issue is not clear and the Administration will probably not charge non-profit organizations for utilities."

If this proposal is passed it is estimated that utilities will cost the SU \$90,000 next year.

The University was responsible for the cleaning of SUB until 1982 when they gave the responsibility to the SU. This was accompanied by a cleaning grant, which started out at 279,000 and was phased down to 225,000 and frozen in 1979, but the administration claims it is negotiable. Tom Wright says, "That doesn't sound negotiable to me, the yearly cost of cleaning SUB is now \$500,000."

But not health

## Feds cut education

OTTAWA (CUP) — Two federal ministers confirmed March 8 that the government will limit transfers to the provinces for post-secondary education to the 6 and 5 formula, but will spare transfers for health care.

The announcement was widely expected, although the manner and timing came as a surprise. Finance minister Marc Lalonde broke the news during question period in the House of Commons March 8.

Secretary of state Serge Joyal would ordinarily have made the announcement. Reporters surrounded him in a scrum outside the Commons after question period, and Joyal confirmed Lalonde's statement.

Bruce Tate, a Canadian Federation of Students researcher, said Joyal does not get along with Lalonde and was apparently angry at him for pre-empting Joyal's announcement. Tate said officials in Joyal's department are unsure how the government will cut education transfers because Lalonde's statement apparently surprised them.

Lalonde told the House that transfers for health care will not be reduced below increases planned according to the formula for Established Programs Financing. But EPF transfers are a lump sum used for both health care and education, and the Federal

government cannot currently tell provinces how to allocate that money.

Joyal said it is up to the provinces to determine whether cuts will be borne by universities or hospitals. "They can do whatever they want," he told reporters.

Tate said it is unclear how the government will resolve this apparent contradiction. He said they may split EPF into health care and education components, or simply ask the provincial education ministers that the cuts will be to education and "he didn't seem to meet with a lot of opposition."

"The provincial governments have clearly expressed that their impression of public opinion is that health care is a lot more dangerous to cut," Tate said.

As with most federal-provincial dealings, all the interested parties have different sets of figures on how big the cut will be. The federal government claims it will mean a \$102 million cut in 1983-84 to the nearly \$4 billion transferred to post-secondary education; the opposition says it will be much higher.

The six and five formula in this case will actually mean seven and six, because the government will allow for a one per cent increase in Canada's population each year.

But the cuts come as no surprise to CFS.

## Juniors & seniors join hands

by Richard Watts

Undergrads and Grad students may be entering an alliance to influence the University's financial plans.

At Tuesday's Students' Council meeting, the president of the Grad Students' Association, Robert Aschah, was made a special member of Council to ask for Students' Union support for the Grad Students' policy on University Budget priorities.

The policy basically states that until such time as the U of A is adequately funded the University should cease to expand. This would mean a halt to the hiring of any new administrative or non-academic staff and a moratorium on the building of any new structures.

"If the Students' Union approve this document tonight it would mean we could go into the various financial committees with a solid bargaining position," said Aschah.

Council rep for Arts, Dwayne Chomyn opened the discussion by stating "I don't see where opposition to this could come from since it seems to make common sense to me."

Common sense or not, there was some opposition arising perhaps from basic Undergraduate mistrust of Grad students.

Council reps asked for clarification and requested Aschah supply information stating how many new administrative positions had been created during a period when academic positions were being cut back.

"I'm not comfortable answering that question in a public forum but I could say that the number is surprising," said Aschah.

Fiona Bland, Council rep from Commerce asked "This bit about a moratorium on any new buildings; are you referring to the new Commerce Building?"

Aschah sidestepped by saying that the government probably had more to say about the construction of a new Commerce Building than he did.

John Koch, Council rep for Engineering also had objections; "I don't think I could support a motion that advocated a building moratorium when I hear that there is a new Electrical Engineering Building being planned."

Aschah referred to the larger picture of the world's economy; "In the real world out there we've got falling oil prices, high inflation and high unemployment we can't be greedy now, that's what happened in the last depression."

"We want to ensure that the existing structure of the University is maintained before we start anything new," he said.

Council also had objections to the idea of a freeze on any new programs and cited the possibility of a Native Studies Program which councillors seemed to agree was a necessary improvement to the University.

There was agreement with the Grad students policy Randy Headley, Council rep for Dentistry said "The policy is kind of hard line but in these sort of economic times we have to be hard line and if we can't fund what we've got right now I don't think it's smart to begin anything new."

In the end of the debate Councillors agreed to support the motion.

John Koch said "If it is a question of solidarity when dealing with the University, I'd agree to support this motion."

photo Martin Beales

## CONTENTS

In the News . . .

In the Letters . . .

In the Arts . . .

In the Sports . . .

In the Features . . .

...Council bickers

...killing galore

...groovy reviews

...swim records

...El Salvador