

The Daily Tar Heel

Vol. 81, No. 33

Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Monday, October 9, 1972

Founded February 23, 1893

Surplus 'freeze' denied

Campaign bill voted

by William March
Staff Writer

The Student Legislature (SL) meeting in special session Thursday night after the regularly scheduled meeting time ran out, amended and passed the Campaign Spending Limit Bill proposed by Representatives Dave Gephart, Chuck Felts and Bill Hill.

During the regular session, the legislature rejected a reworded version of a bill authored by Representative Dick Baker, vetoed in its original form last week by Student Body President Richard

Epps, which would have set a limit on extra allocations from the Student Government General Surplus.

The campaign spending bill prescribes limits of under \$200 for all campaigns for campuswide offices, lower limits for lesser offices and a \$200 limit on spending in support of a referendum.

However, according to an amendment proposed by Representative David Boone and added to the bill by the legislature, "this Act shall ipso facto be deemed null and void and without any effect whatsoever" if the DTH or any other

publications supported by SG funds gives editorial endorsements to a candidate or a proposal before a referendum, or fails to provide equal space in news stories to each candidate, "it being provided that such space be used as each candidate wishes."

The bill was further amended on the floor, under a proposal by Representative John Morehead, to provide for the disqualification of any offending candidate and a new election to be held in case of an offense. As it came from the Rules Committee, the bill had required only that offending candidates pay to the Student Government a fine equal to 50 percent of the excess money they spent.

Epps, a major proponent of campaign spending limits in the past, said, "I am pleased that some legislation about this is now on the books. I had hoped for a stronger bill, but perhaps this one can be modified as we see the effect of its implementation."

The bill was passed by a two-thirds majority, which means that it will go into effect immediately, rather than in 30 days. Thus the bill will cover the November 7 referendum on student government reorganization as well as campus elections on October 17.

Boone's amendment was originally rejected in the Rules committee, as was a proposal to raise the limits in the bill to a level of \$500 for a presidential campaign.

The bill proposed by Baker would have prohibited all extra spending by the SL not authorized by the 1972-73 budget, without affecting budgeted daily operations, until "the Student Legislature shall determine what portion of the General Surplus is to be made available for further appropriations."

The bill would have required the Finance committee and the SL to make such a determination and to hear all requests for extra funds by November 9. It is a rewording of a proposal by Baker which was passed and vetoed last week.

"The purpose of this bill, said Baker, "is to find out what groups want money so we can ascertain how to spend the surplus." Baker said he would try again to pass a bill enforcing "fiscal responsibility in allocating extra funds out of the surplus."

The bill was attacked by Wayne Thomas, student body treasurer, Representative Marilyn Brock and Finance Committee Chairman Gary Rendsburg. Several legislators who supported the bill announced that because of its failure, they would vote "no" on every non-budget spending bill to come before the legislature. Later in the evening, the legislature approved a bill authorizing an extra \$300 for the Rugby Club, but it turned down a \$3,700 request from the Fine Arts Festival committee.

The legislature also passed by consent a resolution authored by Representative Ed Polk which "strongly urges" the campus police to be more lenient in handing out parking tickets, and authorizing a committee of three representatives to express student dissatisfaction about parking tickets to the Campus Police Chief.

Student Body Vice-President Fred Davenport appointed Reps. David Pope, Sam Boone and Richard Robertson to the committee.

\$117,000 a surplus or working capital?

by William March
Staff Writer

The financial situation of Student Government with reference to the General Surplus funds and their responsible use is a much discussed and little understood situation.

Controversy concerning the surplus began when Student Body Vice-President Fred Davenport announced and criticized the fact that Student Government has a surplus of \$117,000, criticized the University administration for its handling of student fees and suggested that Student Legislature should allocate some of the surplus for projects by campus organizations.

Several campus groups responded and brought requests for funds before the Finance Committee. The committee then presented the requests to the Legislature in the form of bills.

These requests were for extra allocations not figured into the Student Government's budget for the year. If passed, they would have an effect on the amount of surplus, which is carried over into next year's surplus account.

Opposition arose in the Legislature from granting such requests on the grounds that it would be fiscally irresponsible to award the money on a first come first served basis, when the Legislature was unaware of how much of the surplus could responsibly be spent.

Representative Dick Baker, president of the Graduate and Professional Student Federation (GPSF), proposed an amendment to one such spending bill which would have required the Finance Committee to determine how much of the surplus could be spent before any such bill was passed. The bill specified that the surplus funds should be "frozen" until a determination of how much surplus could be spent was made, and it required the committee to hold budget hearings and invite campus groups to submit requests for projects.

According to Student Body Treasurer Wayne Thomas, the SG General Surplus is not a fund of unused money which has simply piled up. Because of the arrangement and handling of student fees by the administration, the surplus is actually the working capital for the

News Analysis

Student Government appropriations.

Student fees are kept in trust funds to accrue interest while the surplus is a checking account. Requisitions are made from this account, and the account is later brought up to its original balance by disbursements from the administration's trust funds.

Therefore, a possible interpretation of Baker's bill would have been that no requisitions could be made on the surplus, and that, in effect, no Student Government money could be spent. The Finance Committee chairman, Marilyn Brock, Thomas and others in the SG administration further felt budget sessions were unnecessary for determining the merits of the various requests for funds.

Nevertheless, the bill was passed. Student Body President Richard Epps then vetoed the bill.

Thomas said the surplus account is normally large at the beginning of each year and shrinks when he writes requisitions from it. The reimbursement process is gradual so that the surplus builds up gradually through the year, after large early withdrawals. At the end of the year, it is reimbursed to its original balance, and any unused funds are added to it.

Baker's second bill would halt extra appropriations "unless authorized by the 1972-73 Student Government budget," until the Student Legislature has determined "what portion of the General Surplus is to be made available for further appropriations."

This bill would not place any limit on how low the checking account which holds the surplus could go.

The bill would require the Finance Committee to determine how much of that constant figure should be retained until next year and how much should be spent of extra allocations to the campus groups making requests.

"We can't make reasonable calculations on this basis," said Thomas, "because we are uncertain of what the final figure on the General Surplus will be at the end of the year."



Silhouette

September's sunflowers can't stand up to October's frost, as the condition of these flowers testifies. But they loom large against an autumn sunset, providing one last look at summer.

(Staff Photo by Johnny Lindahl)

DTH poll gives Nixon slight lead

by David Eskridge
Staff Writer

Richard Nixon would carry the campus student vote by eight percentage points more than George McGovern, according to a recent DTH poll, if the November general election was held today.

Telephone responses were received last Thursday from 322 UNC students, whose names were picked at random from a computer list of all UNC students. Of those who responded, Nixon received 135 votes (48.9 per cent) and McGovern received 113 votes (40.9 per cent). Twenty-seven students (9.7 per cent) said they were undecided. Only students who were registered were included in the tabulation.

Most Nixon supporters said they did not like the way McGovern kept changing his mind on his policies. Others said they were voting for Nixon because he had the most experience.

One Nixon supporter said, "Nixon has done the best he can and I don't think we need a change now, especially with the alternatives."

Nixon received criticism from McGovern supporters for his Vietnam policy. One student said, "The guy (Nixon) had great potential in stopping the war in '68, but he didn't."

Another McGovern supporter, who

summed up the feelings of most of his colleagues, said, "I don't like the way the present administration has been handled." Another more blunt McGovernite said, "I'm voting for McGovern because I can't stand Nixon."

In other results from the poll, Democrats were far ahead in state and local elections with students.

In the U.S. Senate race, Nick Galifianakis received 60.4 per cent of the students' endorsements while 17.8 per cent said they would vote for Jesse Helms if the election were held today. 21.8 per cent were undecided.

In the race for governor, 52.3 per cent of the students said they would vote for Hargrove "Skipper" Bowles. Jim Holshouser received 25.4 per cent of the vote while 23.3 per cent of the students said they were undecided.

Jim Hunt, Democratic candidate for lieutenant governor, held a commanding lead in the poll. Hunt received 51 per cent of the vote to Johnny Walker's 7 per cent. Forty-two per cent of the students said they were undecided or not voting.

In the race for the second Congressional District House seat, as with the local elections for State Senate and House and Orange County Board of Commissioners, the majority of the students said they had not yet made up their minds and no candidate was greatly preferred.

Tar Heel defense fund set

by Mike Fogler
Staff Writer

Daily Tar Heel editor Evans Witt has announced the initiation of the DTH Legal Defense Fund to pay the legal costs in representing the newspaper in the suit of which it is the subject matter.

The suit, filed by four UNC students in Greensboro, challenges the use of mandatory student fees to fund a campus newspaper which expresses opinions not in agreement with those held by all students.

Witt said the DTH Legal Defense Fund is asking for contributions first from students, "because they have the greatest stake in the case."

Contributions are also welcomed from faculty, staff and any other concerned people in the University because "continued existence of a strong student newspaper is essential to the growth of this University."

Assuming the editor of The Daily Tar Heel is approved as a defendant in the case, he will reply to the complaint of the plaintiffs, saying the suit attacks the students' right to have their money spent as they see fit by their elected representatives.

In other words, all students in good standing at UNC, including the plaintiffs, have the right to vote in all elections, to run for the editorship of the DTH, and to run for and hold offices in the Student Legislature, the body which has the power to allocate funds from the student fees.

The editor of The Daily Tar Heel is elected each spring in the same election as the president of the student body and other officers.

Contributions can be brought by the DTH office in the Student Union or mailed to the DTH Legal Defense Fund, Box 49, Carolina-Union Building.

Concerning the contributions, Witt said, "we are hoping to raise several thousand dollars."

The amount of money needed to represent the DTH in the suit will depend on how much time the case takes. The suit could last far beyond the current academic year, according to Witt.

It is almost a certainty the suit will not be terminated in the near future.

The original defendants are UNC Chancellor N. Ferebee Taylor, University President William C. Friday, UNC Vice Chancellor of Business and Finance Joseph Eagles, the UNC Board of Governors and the UNC trustees.

Upon approval of Witt's motion to intervene in the suit, the editor of The Daily Tar Heel will be added to that list.

Plaintiffs in the suit are UNC students Robert L. Arrington, David A. Boone, Robert Grady and Murray G. Miller.

Weather

TODAY: Clear and cool; high in the upper 60's; low in the upper 30's; probability of precipitation near zero through tonight.



What does he see?

Little boys, always searching, often see things that older people would not even begin to notice - like devil's faces in mudpuddles and God's image in a letter. That older generation does miss a lot.

(Staff Photo by Johnny Lindahl)

Perspective

Reforms facing 'maze'

by Mary Ellis Gibson
Staff Writer

The Schutz Committee report on academic reform could conceivably get lost in an administrative maze, but at least some of the committee's 39 recommendations on education at UNC will probably be implemented.

The recommendations of the Schutz Committee (the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Undergraduate Degree Requirements) for a four course load, a variety of degree programs and an Educational Resource Center (ERC) are now in the first stage of consideration.

Chancellor N. Ferebee Taylor has asked Provost J.C. Morrow to consult with various administrators and administrative committees for their recommendations on the Schutz report. The initiation of a normal load of four courses or the equivalent measured in credit units is being studied by the registrar with the assistance of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and others, according to William Little, acting chairman of the Schutz Committee.

The recommendations of these groups will then be referred to the Provost and to the Chancellor, who will probably make the final decision on the change.

Little said. Some of the committee's recommendations will eventually come before the Faculty Council for consideration, Little explained.

Faculty Council, a group of elected representatives of the faculty from all departments and schools, must approve all major changes in the A.B. degree program.

Faculty Council will eventually consider the recommendations on prescribed studies and elected studies after a report from the administrative board of the College of Arts and Sciences.

The board will probably request the language departments to develop a program in language and culture and ask the social science departments to devise a divisional major, he explained. The departmental and divisional proposals would then be presented to Faculty Council for approval.

Most of the changes in the University proposed by the Schutz Committee call primarily for administrative action. Various administrators must consider the proposals for granting faculty leaves, for allowing students to leave school for a semester and for raising standards of the Dean's List.

The administration will also consider

establishing teacher evaluation processes and an Educational Resource Center and changing advising procedures.

The faculty must consider changes in the degree program and a proposed raise in the quality point average necessary for a student to stay in school.

The Schutz Committee has also recommended that a professor not be required to give a final examination. Faculty Council must pass legislation to change the exam policy. This recommendation is implemented.

Because the Schutz report has been distributed to faculty and is available to students, it cannot easily be ignored. Consideration of the committee's suggestions is inevitable, but rapid action - whether positive or negative - is not.

At this point few students, faculty or administrators seem very excited about academic reform. This lack of interest may allow action on the Schutz proposals to end with consideration by various study groups.

On the other hand, the Schutz Committee study may eventually provoke members of the academic community to look at the University critically for constructive change whether or not the resultant change follows the committee's recommendations.