

Heated Debate Follows

Model Parliament Dissolved First Night

The dissolution of this year's Model Parliament after two and one half hours of session gave rise to heated political comment.

Lorne Yacuk, Political Science Club president, felt that all the activities of the evening had been in order, since "The Coordinator of Model Parliament waited until Sunday evening for any group to approach him to make up the government. Since no party saw fit to join another in coalition, the Coordinator, upon my orders, asked the party with the greatest number of votes to make up the government. All parties were informed. There was no objection."

FAILURE NO TRAGEDY

He felt the dissolution was no tragedy, and that the executive of the club could not be held responsible for the failure of the session, which he, speaking only in an unofficial position, felt to be due to the "immaturity" of Pitfield, Young, and Hunter, and the actions of Shugarman's party.

He said of Shugarman "One of the principles he started his party on was that Model Parliament was a farce. His party would help to alleviate this situation. In fact, his presence caused even greater harm."

He went on to say, "I find it interesting that for the first time in the history of the House, the government fell on the first night while in the opposition sat a new party supposedly dedicated to the preservation of dignity in the House."

Individual political statements, by party leaders, follow.

Liberals (Government)

The government's decision to dissolve Model Parliament was not without justification.

The Liberals were a re-elected minority government. If another party or parties had wished to form the government they should have signified their intention to do so the night of the Model Parliament elections. This was not done and the Liberals proceeded to draft legislation and compile the order papers for Model Parliament at the Governor-General's request.

Monday night the opposition introduced a motion of "no confidence" in keeping with their traditional right. It is interesting to note that certain items of legislation they opposed had constituted parts of the opposition parties' campaign platforms.

THRONE SPEECH

At 9:15 p.m., Monday, a motion that the House proceed with a vote on the Throne Speech was before the House. The government received a written and signed guarantee from the leader of the NDP stating their eleven members would support the government on all questions up to and including the vote of "no confidence." In return for their support the NDP would acquire the right to introduce a money bill from the opposition.

On the division pertaining to the "previous question" the NDP disregarded their own guarantee and voted against the government. "The party of principle" showed it had none.

At 9:20 p.m. the government moved, in accord with the order papers which had not been altered by motion, that Debate in Reply to the Throne Speech be adjourned to Wednesday night. Support for this motion would have saved the parliament. The opposition chose to defy the rules of the House and voted against the motion. They made no attempt to change the order paper subsequently.

The fact that the NDP had recanted on its position, and the fact that the opposition did not move to suspend the order paper, rather to defy it, left the government with one impression. It was that the opposition chose to disregard parliamentary principles and procedure. The government did not wish to be part of such a parliament and chose to dissolve the House in the interest of Model Parliament itself.

Ian Pitfield
Liberal Leader

Conservatives (Opposition)

After the elections on Friday, the Liberal government, rather than consolidating their position decided to go it alone in model parliament. As opposition leader I certainly did not think that our party would be approached, however the Liberal party had two other parties, the NDP party and the Constitutionalist party, with which to gain confidence of the house. They approached neither party, preferring to enter the house on the strength of their legislation.

The parties in opposition did not consider the Liberal bills strong enough to justify such a stand. Therefore a government, with 22 seats, entered Parliament with 35 members definitely against them.

The Liberal leader knew he did not have the confidence of the house; in fact he obtained a writ of dissolution from the Governor-General before ever entering the house. This writ was to be held over the house. The thought behind the move being: defeat our government and you don't get to sit for three nights.

As a result we sat for one night because we would not be intimidated.

There was no reason why the Liberal government should not have stepped down and let the opposition party form the government. Time and time again it was demonstrated to the government where the confidence and strength lay in the house.

Yet they considered it lay on the opposition's shoulders to capitulate, not on theirs. As opposition leader, I introduced a motion of non-confidence, a move I make no apology for.

Every year such a motion is introduced but usually the government does not fall until the last night. This year was the exception.

I would take this opportunity to congratulate the Liberal party for their fine opposition to my motion of non-confidence. They fought valiantly and in effect won the battle. I realize full well the Liberal government was toppled unconstitutionally, but can only state here and now that I regret it.

For those not familiar with parliamentary procedure I will explain.

There is a move to change the schedule. No such move was made either on the part of the Government or the opposition. If the opposition had not overthrown the government by 9:15

p.m. the government was comparatively safe until Wednesday. The Liberals, due to fine parliamentary procedure, reached this time dead-line. However, their motion to leave the motion of non-confidence and proceed with the orders of the day was defeated. It never should have been.

As the official opposition we voted against the bill, however we had only 13 members to have passed the motion. This was a breach of parliamentary procedure and on this, and only this point, can I sympathize with the Liberal government.

Gordon Young
Conservative Leader

New Democrats (Opposition)

The unfortunate conclusion of Model Parliament could have been prevented. It came about because the Prime Minister realized his government did not have the support of the house, and dissolved the house before a vote could be taken. This was contrary to the spirit of Model Parliament.

The Liberal government did not have the confidence of the house because it introduced no significant legislation. The major campaign issue of the election two weeks ago was residence fees. Yet not one word of this issue was brought in.

The New Democrats secured from the proposed Constitutionalist-Conservative coalition permission to introduce a money bill from the opposition side of the house to reduce residence fees, in return for our support. In our view, because this meant the coalition had the majority of the house's votes, they should form the government.

However, the Liberals formed the government and dissolved the house without giving anyone else a chance to form a government.

Robin Hunter
New Democrats

Social Credit (Opposition)

As a responsible political movement on this campus, we believe that Model Parliament should be conducted on a serious constructive basis. It has been demonstrated this (Monday) evening that this view is not shared by the other political parties on this campus.

We are confident that the people who supported us in the recent election would wish us to dissociate ourselves from the farce our Model Parliament has become. It is therefore with deep regret that the Social Credit members of this house tender their resignations as of now.

Preston Manning
Social Credit Leader

Constitutionalists (Opposition)

The reason for this statement at all is because the Liberals, with a writ of Dissolution, from the acting Governor-General, dissolved Model Parliament; and in so doing caused the end of formal sitting and consequently the ruin of Model Parliament '64.

You will probably read elsewhere in this paper that once the Opening Ceremonies were dispensed with debate centered around whether or not the House should vote on a non-confidence motion.

The Conservatives and Constitutionalist (with 24 votes between them as opposed to the Liberals with 22) were prepared to form a coalition government if it could be demonstrated that the Liberals lacked the confidence of the House. The NDP leader had agreed to support the coalition;

and overthrow the Liberal government.

In the ensuing debates there were challenges to the Speaker (to indicate that the House was capable of overthrowing the Liberals and would), questions of procedure and debate. In every division that was called the Liberals were defeated! (The Socreds absented themselves from the floor almost immediately in what I believe was an unconstructive and irresponsible gesture; they later issued a rather pompous statement deploring the action of all parties—a very curious move since they had taken no stand at all during the entire debate. However, even with their 8 votes pledged to the government they could not have altered the outcome unless one of the other Opposition parties would have reversed their posi-

tion.)

The Liberals proceeded to stall, and put off their defeat. They used every Parliamentary tactic—which is to their credit, when they came to the conclusion that they would indeed be defeated, Mr. Pitfield dissolved the House. What he did was perfectly legal, perfectly constitutional. This is what is done in Ottawa. I contend this should not have been done in MODEL Parliament. Another election, and a new session, were impossible. The Liberals knew this; but because they refused to sit as the Opposition they killed Model Parliament. ("If you won't play the way we want then we won't play and the game is over"). It was an extremely selfish, irresponsible act... the height of obstinacy, obstruction and poor taste.

David Shugarman
Constitutionalist Leader

Varsity Voice

Yearbook

To The Editor:

We, the undersigned, as undergraduates at this university would like to declare ourselves strongly against the policy that Students' Council has taken regarding the yearbook pictures.

We feel that the purpose of a university yearbook is to recall memories of the year. We contend that university memories are made up mainly of people, and a collection of candid shots and posed executive portraits does not create memories for very many students. If undergraduate pictures are deleted, we cannot see any reason for having a yearbook at all.

Bob Langridge, Sci II
W. Macdonald, Comm I
Jack Simpson, Ed III
Philip Cove, Arts I
W. Duthie, Sci I
Denny Burns, Sci I
Harry Kane, Sci IV
Christopher Panter, Arts IV
Pete Tyler, Phys Ed I
Harvey Konelsky, Eng I
David A. Mappin, Arts I
T. Craig Montgomerie, Eng I

Cragg Retaliates

(Continued from Page 4)

Mr. Gillespie suggests that the Administration buy half our building. Perhaps Mr. Gillespie has some inside information. I suggest he make a point of speaking to people like Provost Ryan, Dr. Johns, one or two members of the Board, and he might even try Mr. Hinman, the provincial treasurer. I suspect the skepticism which he has applied with a liberal brush to other parts of the project would come home to roost on his own plans.

Mr. Gillespie states that he wishes to see a new students' centre built. He questions the financial arrangements. Perhaps he should join the firm of Clark-son, Gordon as a senior partner. Or then again, he might become chief assistant to the Bursar. Rumor has it that Premier Manning is looking for a new provincial treasurer. This should give Mr. Gillespie a good opportunity to flex his financial muscles.

Finally, Mr. Gillespie suggests a referendum. Your Students' Council has considered this question at length. They have rejected the idea of a referendum with an overwhelming majority. A referendum would force the Students' Union to freeze their plans at a point where they should not be frozen. If any changes were

To The Editor:

I've just finished reading the Hawrelak affair in the Toronto Star Weekly, and am disgusted.

I though odd things happen in Quebec, but I think Edmonton beats it.

I'd like to congratulate Mr. Mathews and Co. on their stand against that awful man (Hawrelak). They must be encouraged by the fact that the honest man is always the one amongst the many—from Diogenes and his search down to the present day.

We have ban-the-bomb groups etc. fighting for posterity. My concern for my small son is not annihilation—death comes sometimes anyway—but his growing up in an atmosphere where dishonesty is not only tolerated, but condoned.

So good luck to everyone of you at U of A who is opposing dishonesty and your sympathizers.

(Mrs.) Margaret MacDougal
Kenogawi, Quebec

P.S. My husband, Scots-Canadian, says only crackpots write letters to strangers!!

I'm from Cork, Ireland, now housewife, Catholic (Roman), have one small son.

All above in case it interests you to know background of writer. I've been 10 years in Canada.

made after the referendum a further referendum by implication would have to be held. In fact, a referendum would do more to prevent the detailed study which is required than any other possible approach.

Let me assure all members of the Students' Union that further study will occur. Let me also assure the student body that the Administration and the Cabinet are most anxious to see the most economical and functional building possible. However, neither the Board of Governors nor the Cabinet of the provincial government are looking for ways to get rid of money, as Mr. Gillespie implies. If the project is going to be thoroughly studied, the student body must allow their student government the freedom of action which will permit detailed study and negotiation with all those concerned.

And so I say to Mr. Gillespie, because the matter is in substance not closed, and because no one concerned feels the proposal has yet reached the highest possible level, a referendum would be most undesirable and would prove nothing at all.

I trust these, as well as the answers given at the general meeting last Wednesday, shed some light on the present controversy regarding the new Students' Union Building.

Wesley Cragg