

Realtor Objects To Costs

By Lawrence Samuel

An Edmonton realtor whose associates have planned a "model university" says the present administration is pricing itself out of the undergraduate market.

The University of Alberta campus at Edmonton has been visualized as a post-graduate university, realtor Tom O'Dwyer said.

He objects strongly to the inflated costs of higher education.

SEPARATE COLLEGE

He forsees a smaller college which will pay for itself in a matter of a few years.

This college is seen as giving courses in arts, education and other courses not needing too much expensive equipment. It would, instead, have the finest possible instructors.

The cost for covering 50 per cent of the areas covered by the present university would be about one fifth the price of the buildings and equipment on this campus. Mr. O'Dwyer says that he could start tomorrow to finance and build this college for \$8,000 per student compared with an estimated \$27,000 for the U of A.

ECONOMICAL YEAR

The per pupil, per year, cost would be \$800 with fees of about \$250. This is compared with a total cost of \$1,700 including \$300-450 fees at present.

"The location would be up to the students and their parents to decide," said Mr. O'Dwyer, "for they are the ones who will have to use and pay for the facilities. This is in direct contrast to the present situation where the users of the faculties have no say in how they are developed," he noted.

This factor of students having a say in what they will receive is what brought Mr. O'Dwyer into the limelight.

GOOD BUT CHEAP

He says: "Students do not want Cadillac costs and Chevrolet results. They want a good education which they will be able to pay for in their lifetime. Educational costs should not be saddled on future generations who will have debts of their own."

Mr. O'Dwyer reiterated his charges that the university is an outsized, out-priced, stateism slanted degree factory. He threatened to get results in his fight to change the situation at all costs.


"A taxpayer is entitled to prod," he said. "You either have to quit or you have to get rough." He is even prepared to go to jail to protect future generations.

Quaecum Someone Goofed?

Watch out for an epidemic of bad Latin on campus.

The U of A motto, "Quaecumque Vera," has been misspelled on much of the dishware being used in Athabasca and in SUB.

Beware of all plates marked "Quaecumque Vera." They are counterfeit.



LOOK MA, NO WINGS—Thunderbird flies during the Saturday last game. Note stupefaction on face of bashful Bears. The Golden Bears went on to win 29-2 to take the western football championship undefeated in this season.

Photo by Wm. C. Stenton

Bears Top BC, Golden Gaels May Follow

By Barry Rust
Gateway Sports Editor

The proposed "Golden Bowl" is rapidly becoming a reality.

In an emergency session with members of Promotions Committee, University Athletic Board under its director Dr. Maury Van Vliet, unanimously supported and passed a motion allowing Golden Bears to participate in the inter-conference contest.

The lone obstacle, other than promotional and administrative problems of staging such an event, is a financial one.

The "Bowl" would pit University of Alberta's Western Champion Golden Bears against Senior Inter-

collegiate title holders Queen's Golden Gaels in Clarke Stadium Nov. 16. In a rapidly placed phone call to Queen's following Alberta's 29-2 trouncing of UBC Thunderbirds, Golden Gaels officials assured Promotions head Bob Lampard that they were definitely interested in making the trip. Queen's had just finished demolishing Western Redmen 51-9.

Queen's Athletic Board dealt with the matter Monday afternoon and agreed in principle to send the powerful Gaels west, provided they receive proper financial assurances. At present all manner of financial possibilities are being surveyed. A decision is not expected until tomorrow afternoon at which time Queen's will be notified.

UAB BACKS VENTURE

University Athletic Board indicated Sunday that they are prepared to back the venture in part. Promotions Committee plans to requisition Students' Council to sponsor the game as a student activity but failing that will approach private concerns.

In response to UAB queries regarding adequate campus spirit to merit sponsoring such an event, Lampard replied, "I think campus spirit is higher now than ever before and it was evident last Saturday. Every one is talking East-West final."

Assistant coach Frank Morris, appearing on behalf of the team stated that in his opinion "the prospect of meeting the Eastern champions had spurred the Bears on towards the end of the season."

PROMOTE BOWL

Bob Gilesie, in moving the vital motion, asserted that with proper backing every effort should be expended to promote the bowl. Lampard pointed out that there was more at stake than a football game in that it will serve as rallying point for alumni of both representatives along with the students. At this point Dr. Van Vliet called for the vote.

Dr. Van Vliet summed up by pledging both his personal support and that of UAB.

On the eve of announcing what he hopes will be the big events confirmation, Lampard enthused, "this is a one in a hundred year, a one in a hundred team and a one in a hundred opportunity. We have the facilities and backing, all we need is the students and their spirit and we'll make this the biggest success ever."

If it materializes Clarke Stadium will see the biggest sporting event in U of A history.

Demonstration Planned

Another demonstration is planned for City Hall—this one for November 12.

A group, similar to the one which voiced a moral objection against Edmonton Mayor Hawrelak on October 28, will base this demonstration solely on the question of civil rights—the fact that the right to protest peacefully was denied.

A spokesman said the group feels that Hawrelak's failure to condemn mob violence has forced this second non-violent protest.

Physicist Says

Research Board Plays Politics

By Patricia Hughes

The Defence Research Board is playing politics.

This was the charge made by Dr. D. B. Scott of the physics department, head of a group of eight U of A physicists, who, for the past several months, have been vigorously opposing the adoption of the Bomarc B missile as a defence against nuclear attack.

"It appeared to me," he said, "that the vice-chairman and chief scientists of the Defence Research Board had made no attempt to satisfy themselves about the validity of claims made for the Bomarc B missile. Indeed it appeared that they were prepared to play along in a political game, and give the stamp of scientific approval to it, without a scientific study."

DIVERGENT VIEWS

On March 26, 1963, these physicists signed a statement summarizing their views. The Special Committee on Defence, noticing that these views were divergent from those of the department advisers, invited Dr.

Scott, Dr. J. T. Sample, and Dr. L. E. Trainor, to appear as witnesses at a committee hearing in August.

In doing so the professors came into conflict with the Defence Research Board, which stated that they were "naive, lacked classified information, and were very primitive in their comprehension of nuclear physics." Later, Dr. Scott and his colleagues were asked by the committee to submit a report in reply to the criticisms of the DRB.

It has since been learned that this reply, released in Ottawa on Oct. 17, was recorded as Appendix A in the Special Committee on Defence report.

OPINIONS IGNORED

No further action has been taken by Ottawa, and it appears that the government chooses to ignore the suggestions of the U of A delegation.

Have the efforts of Dr. Scott and his colleagues been successful? Perhaps not as far as the men in Ottawa are concerned. However Dr. Scott has been asked to address the United Nations Association on Nov. 26. His topic will be "Nuclear Weapons and

Canada's Defence Policy." Beyond that no future action has been planned.

This does not mean, however, that the professors have given up.

PROFS REMAIN ADAMANT

To quote from the August report their position has been, and still is as follows:

"We have noted that the attempt to justify, to the Canadian public, nuclear-equipped Bomarc and Voodoo interceptors has been heavily dependent on the claim that the resulting nuclear defence would 'cook' the nuclear bombs in attacking aircraft.

"We have attempted, as physicists, to read meaning into the cooking claim and we have concluded that it is very dubious. It is possible to design bombs that would respond to the 'cooking' process but, in our opinion, it is so easy to design against it, that it would require a very co-operative enemy to allow it to happen. We have conceived it our duty to make known our views in this respect."