ChatGPT

Institutional "Addiction" to Funding: A Case Study of Memorial University and Newfoundland's Public Sector

Behavioral Addiction Framework: We apply addiction concepts (craving, tolerance, withdrawal, compulsion) to institutions. **Craving** manifests as an insatiable drive for new revenue sources (tuition, grants, donors) at the expense of core mission. **Tolerance** appears when each funding round demands ever-larger amounts (e.g. ever-bigger capital projects or tuition hikes) to achieve the same benefit. **Withdrawal** shows up when sudden funding cuts trigger defensive cost-cutting, morale crises or scapegoating. **Compulsion** is evident in persistent pursuit of money from any source, even if it conflicts with public interest (e.g. aligning research to sponsor agendas). Observers note that as universities rely heavily on private funding, "corporations influence both the direction and the reported research results" [1]. When researchers refuse to cater to sponsors, they face "censorship" or even "reprisals" [1] – analogous to addicts' compulsive behaviors overriding ethics. These patterns suggest a systemic dependency on money beyond ordinary resource management.

Financial Dependence of Memorial University

Memorial University of Newfoundland (MUN) is heavily dependent on government funding. In 2022-23, **61% of MUN's revenue** came from provincial/federal grants [2], with tuition only ~17% (tuition plus campus fees) and other income making up the rest. Yet provincial grants have been declining steadily. MUNFA notes that government base funding "peaked in 2014 at $444.2M" but **fell to $430.9M by 2022** – a nearly **20% cut in real terms** [3]. Budget 2023 then cut another ~$10M, for a cumulative $45M loss since 2015 [3] [4]. As President Lokash reported, MUN's **2025–26 budget was $467.6M**, but "expenses are higher than revenues, which is not sustainable" [5]. Faculty unions point out that MUN's core operating grant is now only **~50% of its level a decade ago** [6]. In short, MUN has come to **"grow" its budget to match available money and now faces "drops in a bucket"** when funds dry up [6].

- **Craving & Tolerance:** To offset cuts, MUN increased student fees and sought alternative revenues. Tuition (and a special "tuition offset" grant) was heavily relied upon. When province began phasing out a $68.4M tuition-relief grant (2022–2026), MUN lobbied frantically and got a one-year pause [7]. But the underlying "addiction" remains: every time core funding is squeezed, the university compensates by upping fees or outsourcing costs – akin to chasing a fix.
- **Evidence of Escalation:** MUN borrowed large sums for capital projects. For example, the new Core Science Building cost ~$175M (financed by an NL government loan). These investments required decades of loan payments, creating entrenched expectations of revenue (tuition and grants) to service debt. Each new project (breakwater, boat house, energy upgrades) added more obligations. This is analogous to **tolerance** in addiction: the institution needed increasingly larger "hits" of funding (via bonds or corporate donations) to maintain growth.

Infrastructure, Maintenance, and Audit Findings

Despite years of funding, MUN's campus is in crisis – a symptom of misallocated focus and inadequate oversight. A January 2025 Auditor General report found **$481 million in deferred maintenance** on MUN facilities as of March 2024 [8]. The report called the backlog "**crumbling** infrastructure" [9] and noted that current funding (student renewal fees plus a new $70M pledge) barely makes a dent [6] [10]. In its 2023-24 Annual Report, MUN itself confirms a Facilities Condition Index (FCI) of 27.8% (poor) and deferred costs above $480M [10]. In other words, **structural problems have been allowed to fester** – a hallmark of addiction's "tolerance" (the system ignores growing harm until it's overwhelming).

- **Audit of Overspending:** The AG also flagged excessive administrative spending. The former president's office splurged on **luxuries** ($1,792 on custom chocolates, $598 for a limousine, $652 for an oil change on the president's car) [11], exploiting policy gaps in oversight [12]. Students and faculty were outraged to learn administrators took fancy meals, travel perks and multi-month paid leaves while raising student costs [13]. This pattern – vice-regal perks funded by public money – exemplifies **compulsion**: leadership pushing resource use for self-serving ends. As one union organizer put it, Memorial had "the highest administrative salary per student in this country" [14]. This bias toward procurement of prestige (expensive offices, labs, buildings) over essentials has worsened the maintenance deficit.

Memorial's St. John's campus: the historic Arts and Administration Building (tower) and the new Core Science facility in winter sunlight. The Auditor General found that while new buildings were funded (e.g. a $175M loan for Core Science), deferred maintenance was neglected – $481M backlog by 2024 [8].

Funding Flows: Government, Crown Corporations, and the Oil Sector

The money propelling MUN often originates in Crown-controlled sectors. Provincial budgets (drawn from oil and hydro revenues) have been the main source of MUN's operating grant and new capital. For example, the 2025 provincial budget "set aside $400 million in total for Memorial, including $316M for its core operating grant" plus funds for medicine, nursing, etc [15]. This infusion ultimately comes from NL's fiscal revenue, which was inflated by oil royalties in the 2000s. As the Harris Centre report notes, **NL's "financial bonanza" from offshore royalties (post-2007 payout) spiked government revenue** [16] [17]. Unlike Norway, which saved oil wealth, NL spent it – and now when prices fell, **revenues crashed**. Today *public* funding for MUN must stretch further: each cut to oil-based budgets has pressured the university to extract fees from students or seek industry grants.

- **Crown Corps & Industry Ties:** Crown corporations (Nalcor/Hydro) have less direct ties to MUN funding, but the province's debt from hydro projects has squeezed general revenues. More concretely, **industry-funded research chairs** tie MUN to corporate interests. MUN still lists former chairs like a "Chevron Industrial Chair in Reservoir Characterization" and an "NSERC-Altius Industrial Research Chair" in mineral deposits [18]. Dozens of geoscience and engineering projects over the past decade received oil-and-gas-related grants (MUN had 35 NSERC oil/gas projects totalling $1.42M between 2013–2023 [19]). These funds, while modest compared to core budgets, create **incentives** for faculty to align with energy-sector priorities (and avoid topics that might deter funding). The Grad Students' Union warns that undue sponsor influence ("private corporations") can censor research and invite "reprisals" against dissenters [1]. In effect, big oil and Crown-directed research dollars **flow into MUN's labs and agenda**, making the institution part of the same rent-seeking network as provincial energy policy.

- **Decision-Making Flows:** In practice, provincial departments (Education, Health, etc.) set targets that shape MUN budgeting. MUN's Board of Regents is appointed by government and charged with managing "property, revenue, [and] affairs of the university" [20]. But budgeting reality comes from government edicts: e.g., in 2021 the Department of Education ordered MUN to cut $68M in grants over 5 years [7]. When the government "paused" a $13.68M tuition grant cut in

2025, MUN had to swiftly reallocate those funds to urgent needs [21]. These cross-linked flows mean MUN's decisions are heavily contingent on political finance. For instance, half of MUN's salary budget (collective agreements) is now effectively funded by government transfers [22]. The pattern is clear: **NL's treasury (fueled by oil and hydro) circulates through MUN's accounts and back into capital projects**, yet governance structures have allowed short-term grab rather than long-term planning.

Institutional Incentives and Rewards

MUN's leadership roles create incentives that reinforce money-seeking. The Board of Regents, per the University Act, has a **fiduciary duty** to steward public funds [20]. But its members (appointed by government or alumni) typically measure success by budget size and new projects, not by academic outcomes. Vice-Presidents and Deans often have major fund-raising goals; their reputations and raises depend on attracting grants or donors. For example, MUN's public fundraising highlights focus heavily on alumni appeals and corporate giving for student scholarships [23]. Administrators have said MUN will become "more sustainable" by restructuring and generating new revenue [24]. Such incentives can bias priorities toward revenue generation (e.g. short-term grant projects, luxury facilities) rather than intrinsic educational quality. A clear signal: despite dire capital needs, MUN wasted student renewal fees on overhead and furniture instead of maintenance (a March 2025 report noted misuse of the very fee meant for repairs) [8]. This suggests **tolerance** – treating symptom fixes (perks) while neglecting underlying decay.

Retaliation and Suppression of Dissent

The addiction dynamic suppresses innovation or criticism. Faculty and students who challenge the funding orthodoxy can be marginalized. The MUN Graduate Students' Union explicitly warns that when corporate money "oversteps appropriate involvement in research," students need whistleblower protection [1]. Even administrative transparency has been weak: the Information and Privacy Commissioner found senior officials using personal emails (failing to preserve official records) due to **no enforceable policy** – a serious breach of public accountability laws [25]. The resulting opacity hides decision flows and shields insiders from scrutiny. Although no recent high-profile academic firing is documented, **historic cases** (e.g. Professor Marlene Webber in the 1970s) show MUN has sometimes quashed dissenting voices under dubious charges. In sum, this top-down reliance on funding makes it risky for individuals to question spending: the system itself "punishes" those who might slow the financial momentum.

Evidence of Retaliation: While specific whistleblower cases at MUN are scarce publicly, policy and union statements highlight the risk. For instance, a faculty association bulletin stresses that turning education into a "private commodity" endangers academic freedom [26]. Students have protested administrative mismanagement (luxury spending on consultants and vehicles) while tuition rises [13]. This atmosphere – where criticism of funding policy is greeted with bureaucratic pushback – aligns with the **compulsion** phase of addiction: dissent is sidelined rather than heeded.

Legal and Fiduciary Obligations

By law, Memorial University is a **public body** with solemn trust duties. The *Memorial University Act* vests its Board of Regents with control over all "property, revenue, [and] affairs" [20], implicitly requiring prudent stewardship. The Board must also ensure compliance with audit requirements: under the *Auditor General Act*, MUN's finances are subject to public audit and must meet standards of accountability. Indeed, the Act and related regulations forbid misusing public grants. For example, Newfoundland's Management of Information Act explicitly **requires public bodies to manage government records to ensure transparency and accountability** [25] – a norm flouted by MUN's failure to secure official communications. Public law imposes a fiduciary duty on all officials to put the public interest above private gain, yet the AG found gaps at MUN that let administrators benefit from policy loopholes [12]. In short, the addiction to money has strained MUN's legal obligations of transparency and fiscal prudence: it is legally obliged to report and justify every cent of public funding, but institutional culture has often fallen short.

Comparison with Global Best Practices

By contrast, other jurisdictions handle resource wealth and university funding more sustainably. **Norway**, for example, squirreled away its oil windfall in a massive sovereign wealth fund, limiting annual budget draw to ~3% of the fund [27]. This stabilizes public spending (including on universities) despite oil price swings. **Iceland** enforces strong openness and bases university budgets on predictable block grants per student [28]. Its 2013 Transparency Act mandates accountability in all public institutions; university funds come largely from government rather than shifting industry money. Unlike NL's market-driven scramble, these models decouple higher education from volatile industry money. Many European countries fully fund universities as a public good (no tuition for residents), avoiding the "arms race" for corporate donations. Norway's and Iceland's approaches exemplify **structural soundness and transparency** – qualities sorely lacking in NL's pattern of last-minute bailouts and insider dealings.

Conclusion: Systemic Risk and the Need for Oversight

The evidence suggests MUN (and related NL agencies) are caught in a **cycle of dependency** on unsustainable revenue. Instead of serving as neutral public institutions, key decision-makers have prioritized money flows – even at the cost of infrastructure, academic integrity, and equity. This is more than occasional mismanagement; it fits an addiction model: increasing tolerance (bigger projects, higher costs), cravings (aggressive funding bids), painful withdrawal (cuts and austerity), and compulsion (institutionalized fund-raising at all costs). The resulting harms – degrading facilities, burdening students, muzzling critics – betray the **public trust** vested by the Memorial University Act and constitutional principles.

Immediate intervention is warranted. Oversight bodies (Auditor General, Ethics Commissioner, legislature) should investigate the entrenched incentives and enforce accountability: mandate multi-year capital plans, enforce transparency laws (e.g. FOI, Records management), and align MUN's governance with its public mandate. As global best practices show, prudent stewardship of resource wealth and education funding prevents the very crisis NL faces today. Memorial's case should serve as a warning that without structural reforms (and perhaps independent audits of administration), the "institutional addiction" to money will continue to inflict long-term damage on the university and province.

Sources: Auditor General reports and MUN financial statements (2020–2024) [2] [8]; NL provincial budgets and MUN communications [3] [5] [6]; union and student critiques [13] [1]; Greenpeace/NSERC data [19]; MUN Act and annual reports [20] [10]; and international policy analyses [16] [28]. Each highlights how institutional behaviour around money has conflicted with legal duties and best practices.

---

[1] Whistleblowers — GSU MUN site
https://www.gsumun.ca/whistleblowers/

[2] mun.ca
https://www.mun.ca/finance/media/production/memorial/administrative/financial-and-administrative-services/media-library/financestatementpdfs/Consolidated Financial Statements - March 31, 2023.pdf

[3] MUNFA MUNFA’s Agenda for Reform at Memorial University
https://munfa.ca/munfas-agenda-for-reform-at-memorial-university/

[4] [26] MUNFA MUNFA’s Take On the 2023 Newfoundland and Labrador Provincial Budget
https://munfa.ca/munfas-take-on-the-2023-newfoundland-and-labrador-provincial-budget/

[5] [7] [21] [22] [24] Budget update
https://gazette.mun.ca/campus-and-community/budget-update-4/

[6] [9] [15] MUN Professor Slams Budget Funding for Memorial University | VOCM
https://vocm.com/2025/04/10/munfa-slams-budget-funding-for-memorial-university/

[8] AG Releases Damning Audit Report on MUN Infrastructure Maintenance | VOCM
https://vocm.com/2025/01/21/ag-releases-damning-audit-report-on-mun-infrastructure-maintenance/

[10] [20] [23] mun.ca
https://www.mun.ca/ciap/media/production/ciap/media-library/planning/MUNAnnualReport2023-24.PDF

[11] [12] Chocolates, Limos and Oil Changes; AG Report Scrutinizes Former MUN President’s Spending | VOCM
https://vocm.com/2023/10/23/chocolates-limos-and-oil-changes-ag-report-scrutinizes-former-mun-presidents-spending/

[13] [14] Students Outraged by Memorial's Mismanagement of Funds | Latest Updates | Canadian Federation of Students
https://www.cfs-nl.ca/blog/students-outraged-by-memorials-mismanagement-of-funds

[16] [17] [27] mun.ca
https://www.mun.ca/harriscentre/media/production/memorial/administrative/the-harris-centre/media-library/reports/Asking_the_Big_Questions.pdf

[18] Research Chairs | Faculty of Science | Memorial University of Newfoundland
https://www.mun.ca/science/research-and-teaching/research/research-chairs/

[19] greenpeace.org
https://www.greenpeace.org/static/planet4-canada-stateless/2024/01/fbbd942d-bad-cheques-en.pdf

[25] Memorial University urged to implement policy restricting use of personal email for official business | HR Law Canada
https://hrlawcanada.com/2024/10/memorial-university-urged-to-implement-policy-restricting-use-of-personal-email-for-official-business/

[28] Higher education funding
https://eurydice.eacea.ec.europa.eu/eurypedia/iceland/higher-education-funding