



—Theo Bruseker photo

THE SMILE THAT WON THE BEST—This is Susan Olynyk, house ec 1, and it can be generally agreed that she is one of the best cooks in the school and if she keeps smiling like that, all men will agree unanimously that she is the best cook in the country. But with such a smile, who needs to cook. Anyway, she's Gateway's Copy girl of the month.

SU loses \$1,500 on variety group

The Back Porch Majority came and went before anyone realized they were here.

They were to have given two performances in connection with Homecoming Weekend but ended up with about 250 people for one performance, while the other was cancelled.

Lack of proper advance

publicity has been blamed for the financial loss.

Co-ordinator of student activities, Don McKenzie in explaining the loss said, "The Back Porch Majority is not well-known in this part of Canada. Glenn Sinclair was in charge of advertising but he had to be out of town."

At \$2.50 a ticket, the stu-

dents' union did not make up the \$3,000 necessary to pay for the cost of the group said Glenn Sinclair, master of ceremonies.

"I was only co-chairman of Homecoming Weekend committee," said Sinclair.

The first performance scheduled for Saturday was cancelled after poor advance ticket sales.

The one performance with only 250 people (Sinclair's estimate) left the 744-seat theatre quite empty.

Sinclair figured on a loss of roughly \$2,400 at \$2.50 a ticket.

McKenzie stated, "I would estimate that we lost \$1,500 but this has not yet been confirmed."

A reply to telegram

Hon. A. J. Maceachen, minister of immigration, has replied to the students' council telegram asking that 12 Czechoslovakian refugees be admitted to Canada to attend the University of Alberta.

The telegram from the Liberal member read,

"Thank you for your telegram

Sept. 25 regarding Czechoslovakian refugee students. Dr. Wyman, your vice-president academic, has referred the same matter. My department is acting urgently to expedite arrival any such students who may be ready to enter universities in Canada immediately."

The message was received Monday.

GSA rejects SU fee structure

Yearbook luxury scorned

By JUDY SAMOIL

Wednesday night's Graduate Students' Association meeting proved that it really does exist. In a mind-blowing marathon lasting to the wee hours of the morning, the GSA forged through about 12 items of business.

Foremost on the agenda was consideration of graduate students' union fees. This year they have been forced to pay \$15 and be accepted as fulltime members, unlike last year when associate memberships for \$5 were offered.

According to an agreement made last spring, graduate students were to have the option of a full membership of \$15 or non-membership. The forms in part five of registration had made no provision for this.

The increase of \$10 was to have been allotted to the SUB building fund, but common feeling among GSA council members is that this is not so. With this year's increase comes the added convenience of the yearbook, a luxury many grads have no desire for.

After much pointless and out of order discussion on the merits of a students' union membership, a motion, calling for grad students being given a choice of paying either \$20 for a full membership or \$8 for an associate one, was agreed upon.

Following that, the council agreed to ask grad students to withhold \$15 from their fees payment until such a time that an agreement could be reached. This was backed by the popular feeling that a full membership is not suited to the needs of a grad student.

In a verbal agreement with GSA president Richard Watson, D. G. Tyndall, vice-president for finance and administration, has agreed not to take action on students withholding this \$15. Many of the members, however, expressed a desire for written confirmation.

A well-meaning councillor pointed out that faculty members also use the SUB facilities, only they don't pay. This came in the course of a discussion on the benefits, both tangible and intangible, of SUB to the grad students.

After a relatively brief (for the GSA) discussion on an experimental program for welcoming new foreign grad students to the U of A, item five came up.

This concerned the Tory building grad students' lounge on the fourteenth floor. The major point of discussion was the intention to open it up at night with coffee available on an honor system of \$5 for 50 cups.

At that time the rumor printed in Friday's Gateway was mentioned. The GSA denies allegations that undergrads have been forbidden access to the lounge. It is encouraged as a grad lounge, but not specifically to the exclusion of undergrads.

"That place downstairs is an abomination," said Peter Boothroyd, about the basement coffee room. He feels more coffee rooms are needed on campus.

One outspoken council member who later regretted his choice of wording, suggested letting the undergrads in and using them to ensure the sale of coffee in the lounge.

GSA also wants the grad lounge to be open to all grad students

on campus, not merely those in Tory.

The council then wasted time by discussing in detail the appointment of temporary representatives to various committees on which they have just gained representation. The general consensus was to appoint anyone to size up the situation and then later to worry about electing a representative.

There was a comment from some executive that this meant the death of the SDU since GSA was being asked to fill those representations that the grads couldn't.

After the seemingly endless discussion on committee appointments had finished, the GSA discussed student responses regarding campus disturbances. In general, it was felt that GSA shouldn't take any stand, since this action was personal to the individual. There ensued a rather pointless discussion on war games and tactics.

University president Dr. Walter H. Johns' memorandum on student conduct was illustrated as another example of his semantics causing trouble interpreting his commiqués. One member thought the wrong impression resulted from it. He claimed Dr. Johns didn't want police on campus, nor did he want to call them in. Other council members didn't agree and heckled his statement. Another pointed out that, in a city by-law, three people meeting in a public place can constitute a disturbance.

It was agreed that Dr. Johns was out of touch with the students. This, coupled with an attempt by SDU to create a bad impression, would result in student unrest.

The university
and its role
in social reform
see page five