

INSIDE
 This Issue

News

- New Grad Class Project chosen - p.3
- SU withdraws support from CASA conference - p.4
- Bus fares increased - p.4
- The *New* SU Budget - p.7

Ed/Spect

- Flak over Pillar and budget - p.8
- Money, money, money - p.8

Entertainment

- Rankin Family traditions - p.11
- Third Annual Year-End Genrecide review - p.12,13
- All You Get is k.d. lang and some ads - p.15

Sports

- Basketball at the Golden Ball Classic - p.19
- Hockey Reds take two from national champions - p.21

Classifieds

- p.22

Bruns Bits

Five things the Student Union could do with its "surplus:"

1. Red pens - they'll need them soon.
2. One-way tickets out of here.
3. A bi-election to replace all those appointed executives.
4. Don't spend it for a change.
5. If all else fails, raise staff salaries.

BUDGET SLASHED

by Joe FitzPatrick
 Co-News Editor

The Student Union has "fixed" its budget problems in an unprecedented move which saw a cut of 10% levied at the last meeting of Council before the Holidays, December 5, 1995.

Duncan Fulton, Acting Chair of the Finance Committee, confirmed earlier fears that the Student Union faced a large budget deficit, and added to the evidence that the 1995-96 budget is full of errors.

"There was a \$62,000 deficit projected with the budget we had. This immediately went down to \$40,000 when we checked the additions. When we checked the numbers in line items, it went down to \$32,000," Fulton told Council.

"There are tens of thousands unbudgetted."

In one of the four-hour meeting's few moments of levity, he joked. "In one day, we cut the deficit by \$30,000."

While the budget now calls for \$24,000 surplus, Fulton warned Council not to take comfort in this.

Fulton told the Council "there are tens of thousands unbudgetted." For example, the Cellar pub, according to the General Ledger, was advanced \$22,000. However, no record of authorization for this transaction could be found in Council minutes of this year.

In addition, there are several large sponsorships which are not accounted for in the budget.

Following a question from Councilor Shona Bertrand, earlier in the term, the terms of the sponsorships were disclosed only during closed sessions of Council.

The Student Union has received sponsorships from NB-Tel, Labatt's, the Bank of Montreal, Morneau & Associates [SU Health Plan broker], Frank Morrison & Son [the Union's insurance broker], Coca-Cola Bottling, and several smaller sponsorships.

The budget cuts were made without

consultation, according to Fulton. But the committee went over each budgeted item and evaluated them individually.

While the cuts were deep overall, they were not evenly applied. In fact, it was apparent that cuts were being made to cover overages incurred, yet, instead of avoiding additional overages, they appeared to be setting money aside to cover overages later in the year.

Campus entertainment, is an example of this. This item was spared any cuts, yet it has a budget of \$18,000 for four events in second term.

Fulton told Council "we usually loose money on the shows" and recommended not reducing the budget for this item.

Meanwhile, Clubs and Societies were cut by 13% in total (see page 7 for detailed list of Clubs and Societies cuts.) Yet, the Student Union Operating Budget was increased by 11% to cover overages in insurance, office expenses, student relations, accounting and auditing fees, staff salaries, and summer wages.

The budget proposal was not accepted readily, however, and debate, at times, was heated.

A total of fourteen motions were debated concerning the budgetary amounts. Debate centered around those areas which had an advocate on the Council.

For example, Trish Davidson, VP Student Services, attempted to exempt three areas of her portfolio: the Activity Awards, the Leadership Banquet, and the Terry Fox Run. The Terry Fox Run amount was altered from a 55% cut to a 10% one, the other motions failed.

Joie Hellmeister attempted to lessen the cut on AIESEC. Hellmeister is a member of the AIESEC executive. The motion was defeated.

The Engineering representatives attempted to argue that their societies should be cut less, disputing the numbers brought to the Council. While Fulton claimed that little had been spent, Councilors Micheal Blanchard and Bethany Bourque argued that they had spent 90% of their budget within the previous week.



Quicker and less painful cuts.

Photo by Mark Bray

Why the cut?

	overage	% over
Orientation	\$25,962.00	500%
SU Operating Costs	\$20,796.25	11%

Where the cuts were made:

	cut	% cut
Miscellaneous	\$21,769.00	48%
Clubs and Societies	\$11,710.55	13%
Student Media	\$9,475.50	8%
Campus Activities(w/o Orientation)	\$7,594.00	15%
Capital Fund	\$7,040.00	56%
Council Activities	\$6,023.90	6%
Student Services	\$5,366.00	12%
Student Publications	\$1,493.00	3%

Pillar editor removed

by Cynthia Kirkby
 Co-News Editor

Following the printing of a sexist article in *The Pillar*, then Editor-In-Chief Mike Blanchard was unanimously voted out of office by the rest of *The Pillar*'s editorial board.

The article, entitled "Woman - A Chemical Analysis" was coincidentally published on December 6, the sixth anniversary of the Montreal Massacre. The article, with the header "thsi [sic] is not an editorial" was printed on page 2, where the editorial normally appears.

Andrew Gorlick, formerly the

Publications Editor, is now serving as interim Editor-In-Chief. He commented that the article was "inappropriate, and doubly so because it ran on December 6." He added that the general response was that "people were offended."

"A retraction was printed immediately after the issue was released, and the reaction to that was favourable," he continued, "They were glad that we acted quickly and apologized for our mistake."

"Since then we've taken steps to implement changes to the paper to ensure that it'll never happen again."

One of these changes was

Blanchard's impeachment, which Gorlick attributed to the article and to unspecified "internal matters."

Blanchard, who is also an Engineering representative on the Student Union Council, called the impeachment process "unfair," adding that he did not have an opportunity to defend himself.

"Dan [Clowater, Managing Editor] and Andrew asked me to resign. I said I was prepared to, but not until I received a letter from the four editors... wanting me to resign. I decided over the next week that I did not want to resign. I called a meeting [for December 20] because I wanted

it over with before January. Two editors were leaving that day, and Dan and Andrew both had exams at seven."

The meeting did not go well, in his opinion. "I never had a chance to say anything," said Blanchard. "One editor would make a point, I'd try to address it and another guy would jump on me. Then they said 'Well, we have an exam, are we going to vote or what?'"

Blanchard added that he was puzzled by the lack of feedback he received over the article.

Continued on Page 3