Still waiting for an explanation

Budgeteer willard roper's article in the next column, is due to the "false impression of the Institute Committee's action with regard to non-payment of dues, largely evoked by the position of the Institute in the last issue of The Tech, leaves us a little sad.

Firstly sorry that Mr. Roper evidently missed the whole point of the editorial. The Tech did not question the worthiness of the嫌怨. The use of the fine is whether there was sufficient activity in a given organization either to reorganize the books, pay dues of $1.00 would show to the Institute Committee the necessity for requiring activities to submit reports, and will present it, will not be required to pay more than the $1.00. I fail to see where the action is either arbitrary or unnecessary. Since action has been initiated against non-paying activities there have been many questions raised as to the reasons for requiring activities to submit reports and pay $1.00 a year. The University has always been required to do both, and we consider their position as unjust, because all other activities are included with certain special ones, thus spreading the responsibility and making for a lack of discrimination, there is a claim of unfairness.

Willy, shouldn't the Institute Committee have some measures of control over the undergraduate activities? First, the Institute Committee must be protected because it is the best organization to handle the financial reports and pay $1.00 a year. In the first place, it has been done for all activities in the Class A and B groups. Such organizations as Technique and The Tech of Class A, and the Aeronautical Engineering Society, and the Society of Mechanical Engineers and many more of Class B have always been required to do both, and none of the committees could have been handled, however properly. We are sorry, too, that Mr. Roper, whose intentions in the main matter are undoubtedly very just, must swallow humble pie sufficiently to state that all of the activities which "can present a satisfactory excuse" will not now be required to pay the fine. We know of one instance in which this was not true, when an activity, the Menorah Society, was fined because they were unable to get an opinion for which it had a good reason. To be sure, there was a vague promise given that the fine would be returned, if no fines were made.

In general, we agree with the sentiments expressed by Mr. Roper. Except, of course, that we know that informative letters in at least one case were called to reach the proper persons. And, too, we feel that the whole matter could have been handled more efficiently if the new rules had gone into effect not in the middle of the school year when these activities are already in progress, but early next year, after they had made provisions for the new conditions.

Prom Committee Scores A Hit

Activities of the Junior Prom Committee are deserving of praise of the student body, we believe. In the past, we have considered themselves either the chosen angels of the people and uncontrollable as far as suggestion was concerned, or business agents out to make their class rich. This year, we have come to the conclusion of being stopped the sale of options when they had sold their quota, although the corridor was sometimes in such an anxious state to get an option on a ticket. We have already commented on the usury and the whole scheme of the class the kind of a dance they specified. The ticket sales should be very gratifying to those in charge and the is national recession, depression, or what have you.

Prom should be a great victory for cooperation, since both class and committee agree they like the plans, and efforts appear to be directed more toward a dance than toward making money.