

THE GATEWAY

Member of Canadian University Press

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF - - - - - John Taylor
MANAGING EDITOR - - - - - Dave E. Jenkins ASSOCIATE EDITOR - - - - - Roberta Sheps

NEWS—Jim Richardson, editor. Bev Woznow, Brian Watson, Kathy Showalter, Don Robertson, Heather McCoomb, Lyn Irwin, Sandra Stiles, John Francis, Reg Jordan, Branny Schepanovich, Dave Collier, Mike Angel, Louise Roose, Bill Samis, Iain MacDonald, Jim Rout, George Diado, Lindsay Maxwell, Barbara Anne Murray, Elaine Stringham, Bentley LeBaron.

FEATURES—Wolfe Kirchmeir, editor. Robert Leong, Bastiaan van Fraassen, Violet Vlcek, Carolyn Brodeur, Lillian Zahary, Peter Kirchmeir.

SPORTS—Gerry Marshall, editor. Owen Ricker, Al Zaseybida, Dieter Buse, Eleanor van Oene, John Burns, John Nelson.

PRODUCTION—John Whittaker, Dick Bide, Kae Powers, George Horner, Percy Smith, George Yakulic, Lorna Cammaert, Betty Cragg.

OFFICE STAFF—Judy Odynsky, Barry Mailloux, Eugene Brody, Richard Newson, Diane Peddleson, Mari McColl, Judith Betts, Judith Brown, Don Fisher.

EDITORIAL—Adolph Buse, Donna-Jean Wilkie, Robert Boyle, Chris Evans, Don Giffen, Joe Clark, Richard Kupsch, Sheldon Chumir, Doug Chalmers. Cartoons, Kyril Holden, George Samuels, David Winfield. Photos by Photo Directorate.

Advertising Manager - - - - - Jack Derbyshire Business Manager - - - - - Walter Dinwoodie

FINAL COPY DEADLINE

For Friday Edition—8 p.m. Tuesday For Tuesday Edition—8 p.m. Sunday

Opinions expressed by columnists in this paper are not necessarily those of The Gateway or members of its staff. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein.

Office Telephone—GE 3-1155

We'll Tell The World

Debating on this campus is in the midst of a welcome renaissance.

Two Hugill intramural debates, held during the lunch hour the past two Fridays, attracted 250 and 200 spectators respectively.

In recent years, Hugill debates have been quiet, unpublicized affairs, held in some obscure classroom in the Arts and Science Building. Fledgling debaters have been handicapped in learning to speak before audiences, as crowds numbered anywhere from five to 15 persons.

Perhaps choice of such topics as "Resolved: the Stan Kenton disaster was the result of student apathy," and "Resolved: that The Gateway is garbage" have drawn out the large, spirited audiences. Perhaps better organization and advertising are the answer. The response may simply be due to the new policy of having a Hugill debate once a week at the same time in the same place: Friday at 12:30 p.m. in the West Lounge of SUB.

Whatever the reason, only good can come of an increase in interest in debating. Students on this campus are far too enchanted with the social whirl and have tended to leave such constructive and beneficial activities as debating to the more serious element of the student body.

It is trite to say that a man or woman who can stand up and speak in public is better-equipped to make his or her way in this world. And if a person can think while standing up and speaking, so much the better.

Judging by the enjoyment evidenced by the

Three Big Parties

Four federal by-elections were held in eastern Canada Oct. 31. Former Conservative seats of Labelle and Peterborough were won by the Liberals and the New Party respectively. Conservatives and Liberals each held one riding they had represented before.

The significance of these elections does not lie in the Conservative losses and the Liberal gain. The significance instead is in the victory of the New Party in the safely old-line Ontario riding of Peterborough.

From the day that a political amalgamation between the CCF party and organized labor was first mooted, observers and opponents across the land doomed it to death. Consulting history, and their personal lists of differences between farmers and union men, the pundits announced that no party could stand which tried to draw together the farmer and the laborer.

Monday they saw it stand.

There appear to be many reasons why the New Party won Peterborough. Their candidate was young, and popular. His constituency suffers from unemployment as do perhaps few other areas in the country. His party offered hope to voters who could see none in the Conservative and Liberal platforms.

Hugill audiences, debating can be entertaining as well.

The McGoun Cup aspect must also be considered. The McGoun Cup annually goes to the western Canadian University which can muster the best four-man debating team. Alberta has won the cup for the past few years, with the exception of last term. However, these victories have usually been attained through the application of skilled teaching to a handful of promising speakers. What has been lacking at the University of Alberta is a large body of competent and active debaters, constantly meeting and polishing their art.

And The Band Played On

When electric power failed Tuesday evening, the touring folk singer Odetta and a Convocation Hall audience were left in darkness.

The show went on, in a manner that is not only in the tradition of showmanship, but is also a tribute to a compelling performer and to the medium of folk singing. Without spotlights, without a microphone, without any of the electrical gadgets considered essential to much modern entertainment, Odetta sang to an attentive crowd she could not see.

This was folk singing as folks should sing it. Shorn of light and stage effects, Odetta sang as though each member of her audience was sitting where those men sat who first strung their fears, their hopes, their troubles to music.

Ring-a-Ling

The trouble at the University, it seems, unlike the City of Edmonton, is not getting a telephone, just getting a book.

the
GLASS
HOUSE

by Joe Clark

Thirteen issues of the 1960-61 Gateway have been published, and bouncing in their wake are familiar criticisms of the student press.

As an alumnus of that small and misunderstood company of Canadian student editors, I want to set down a defence of college journalism, and perhaps indicate to our critics the hopes and the aims that make us operate as we do.

We are first of all a responsible press. Responsible not so much to the Students' Council and the University administration, as to ourselves and to the profession in which we apprentice. That, after all, is the most honest responsibility.

The guide to our conduct is quite often our opinion of what is right and what is wrong; seldom, but not seldom enough, are we guided by Students' Union by-laws and by the edict of those who provide our budget and distribute our diplomas.

This is substantial independence. It is often objected to by those who take the narrow view that a newspaper financed by student funds should be a publicist of student endeavours and a medium of "campus spirit".

People who take that view do not want, or do not understand, a good newspaper. A good newspaper is an independent forum of opinion and news. It is not the publicist, nor the servant in any other form, of its owner or of any special interest.

There will be found about the offices of most students editors a high degree of idealism and of discontent.

The discontent was once our trademark, and earned us a reputation as exuberant and irresponsible radicals. I think it fair to say that today idealism is the dominant atmosphere in college newspaper offices, with discontent a strong ally. For good or bad, college editors have begun to

take charge seriously.

We realize there is much wrong in the world. And we believe we see in journalism a power to at least help arrest that wrong, perhaps correct it. A desire to achieve good has led sincere young people into politics or religion or medicine or science, so is that desire leading some students into journalism.

Building great newspapers requires more than high resolve especially since the modern record of Canadian journalism has not been a record of greatness. There are men of high ideals and purpose in the editorial offices of many Canadian dailies; and more of them in the country's weekly shops. But their effect has not been widely felt.

Rather than being followed, the example of modern Canadian journalism will, to a large extent, have to be overcome. The daily press of today is disappointing, especially to student journalists who realize what these newspapers could and should be. The weekly papers, small enough to keep their ideals upright, are so small they can affect only individuals. Unfortunately, many weekly editors also regard their papers as a business, not a calling.

This column is written without any special provocation. I hope that it will make more clear to the campus the difficulties and the dreams of college editors.

REFLECTIONS

Marriage is one of the common goals of our society. From youth, the idea that we should marry is inculcated into us by parents, church, schools and others who claim to have our interests at heart.

Behind the propaganda is the idea that in marriage we will find happiness and fulfillment. It is the idea that two people together can find fulfillment more easily than one person can find it alone.

This is a concept completely at variance with the emphasis put upon the individual by our western way of life.

The individual is the cornerstone of the philosophies of free enterprise and democracy. We are told — often by the same institutions which condone marriage — that only through the development of individual capacities will we make true progress.

And marriage, for all its claims to fulfillment, restricts the individual's development of his peculiar capacities.

Marriage forces upon a woman or a man consideration of her husband, his wife. It calls for a compromise of interests, often stunting or completely killing interests which the marriage partner does not share. It detracts the man from development of his peculiar capacities so that he can earn a family's living; the woman from hers so that she can make a home.

In short, marriage replaces vital self-interest with a communistic "care for others." It modifies dynamic selfishness with go-nowhere

tolerance.

To borrow a term from world affairs, the motive of marriage is "peaceful co-existence." Marriage partners are supposed to live together, compensating for one or the other's weaknesses, capitalizing on one or the other's strengths; to work together, securing material comfort and mutual pleasure; to sleep together, producing new candidates for co-existence, perpetuating the dull, plodding race.

Peaceful co-existence in world affairs aims at staying near the status quo. It is a static concept, seeking survival without change.

Surely mere survival is not a worthy goal for mankind. We are each of us endowed with capacities which, if developed, would satisfy and fulfill us much more than matrimony. These capacities, it might be noted, are God-given; marriage is an institution created on earth.

—by adam