

Time For A Change

For the third consecutive year, Model Parliament sits constricted. To the immediate right of Mr. Speaker is a minority government lacking the numbers, and thus the power, to introduce the legislation it wants to introduce. Situated around the House are representatives of five other parties, each of whom is concerned not with the business of Model Parliament, but rather with strengthening and forwarding the position of his particular party.

To the three-day MP's of Alberta's Model Parliament, this is no exercise in Parliamentary procedure. Nor is it even erstwhile debate of important issues. The proceedings in this House are merely lessons in defending one party against five others, and in flying one particular political flag highest in a field of six.

The original intent of Model Parliament was to provide practice in Parliamentary procedure, and instruction in the government side of politics. During the last three years at Alberta we have had rather too much practice in the peculiar procedure of Parliament under a minority government, and too much instruction in the purely political side of government.

To use a hackneyed political phrase — It is time for a change.

* * *

There seem to be two ills affecting Model Parliament. One stems from an overdose of competing parties; the other from an underdose of general interest in the issues of government.

Under the present Model Parliamentary system, the minority-government-breeding situation of six parties campaigning seems unavoidable, and likely to worsen. If six parties can contest Model Parliament in 1960, what, but special restriction, is to stop twelve from

campaigning the next year?

Organizers of Model Parliament try to give their campaign a high tone by eliminating kick lines and brass bands. For their efforts, they receive minimal student interest in issues, and campaign rallies characterized by blind partisan bleating, and the drum-beating of a junior mob, as capable of reasoned thinking as thugs in a fight.

If we are to maintain similarity between campaign procedure on campus and on the actual political hustings, we cannot limit the number of competing parties. And if we are to allow party allegiance to become the factor which determines one's vote, we cannot expect to generate wide interest in government issues.

* * *

There has been a suggestion that Model Parliament be purged of all brands of established politics, and that the emphasis be restored to the learning of Parliamentary procedure, and the debate of government issues.

This would be done by specifying that only two, or at the most three, groups be allowed to contest Model Parliament, and that none of these groups have any affiliation with political organizations active in the province or nation. Each group would form anew each year to form policies, would campaign on these policies alone, and debate them in the House.

There are definite drawbacks to such a scheme. For one thing, taking the politics out of Model Parliament would discriminate against the campus political clubs. For another, the removal of off-campus affiliation would raise again the problem of financing a campaign. And, if another is needed, the scheme is not guaranteed to end minorities, or interest the campus in government.

But it is a scheme for something new. And something new is what Model Parliament needs, if it is to accomplish anything more than the more turbulent re-casting of political lances already cast.

Freedom Of The Press

Everybody wants a flag to wave. That is one of the reasons why the Canadian University Press passed and unanimously adopted the high-sounding and defensive Charter of the Student Press, printed in these columns Friday.

But that is only one of the reasons.

The more important, and in CUP editors' minds the decisive, reason for this Charter was that some Universities and some Students' Unions apparently do not realize that the Charter's rights should exist. They apparently do not realize that a democratic press — be it on a weekly, or a daily, or a student level — cannot exist without wide freedom, and the opportunity to exercise responsibility.

Especially in the province of Quebec is this Charter necessary. In this province, editors have been fired, student columnists expelled, and papers seized and burned as they have rolled off the presses.

But in every province is the Charter applicable. And on most campi — including at the University of Alberta — the Charter is in some way necessary.

The University of Alberta has at times lost sight of the importance of a free student press. Student and administrative officials here have occasionally allowed their immediate considerations to overshadow the long-range necessity of letting a student paper make up its own mind.

They have told editors through the years "you must print this," or "you musn't print that;" and at least once a Students' Council has threatened to fire an editor who stubbornly refused to print a meeting's minutes.

The press Charter affixes heavy responsibilities upon the editors of student papers. It reminds editors that their freedoms are earned only so long as they accept the responsibilities of reasonable judgment and honesty.

Thus is this high-noted Charter of the Student Press more than just a flag for whipper-snapper editors to wave in administrative eyes. It is a reminder, a necessary reminder, both to those who determine the freedom, and those who determine the responsibility.

Give 'em Hell

Saturday night, in tumble-down Varsity Rink, U of A's Golden Bears socked Edmonton's "all-star" junior hockey team 6-3. Almost certainly, this dumping of the cocky Oil Kings will be the highlight of a University hockey season which has barely started.

One of the outstanding features of Saturday's game was the rabid support given the Bear players by other University students. The volume and size of that support was sufficient to draw a disparaging remark about "pseudo-intellectuals" from an Oil King executive who knows more about gate receipts than brains.

We should take him up on his crack, and follow the Golden Bears into the Gardens for their return Wednesday night. Playing their first game in a month, the Bears defeated a team long ranked above the University squad. In their follow-up game, on enemy ice, they should not be fan-less.

Let's go to the Gardens, and give 'em Hell.

THE GATEWAY

Member of Canadian University Press

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF Joe Clark
 MANAGING EDITOR John Taylor
 ASSOCIATE EDITOR Sylvia Raycheba
 MORALS AND CONDUCT EDITOR Colin Campbell

Advertising Manager Dave Jenkins
 News Editor Ellen Nagloren
 CUP Editor Roma Standefer
 Sports Editor Gerry Marshall
 Features Editor Roberta Sheps
 Copy Editors Adolph Buse, Donn Downey
 Literary Editor Roberto Ruberto
 Business Manager Walter Dinwoodie

News Staff: Gloria Lehner, John Vandermeulen, D. J. Wilkie, Cyril Sapiro, Dick Bide, Marian Paxton, John Whittaker, Bill Holmes, Richard Kupsch, Bill Roddie, Sheila Warhaft, Mike Angel, Reg Jordan, Rondo Wood, Judy Odynsky, Naida Maher, Alice Payne, Mary Price, Neil Fransden, Al Smith, John Francis, Tony Chernushenko, Lois Griffiths, Jean Craig, Adriana Slaniceanu, Meredith Johnston, Jim Richardson, Wolfe Kirchmeir, Sonja Kulka, Sports: Ed Wigmore, Ernie Marshall, Don Giffen, Owen Ricker, Alex Potapoff. Cartoonists: George Samuels, Gerry Dixon. Photos by Photo Directorate.

FINAL DEADLINE COPY

For Friday Edition 8 pm. Tuesday
 For Tuesday Edition 8 pm. 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

Letters To The Editor

Poor Plodding Plowboys Or Suave City-Slickers?

To the Editor:

Your long-awaited editorial of Friday last has come to hand. It is to be deplored for its superficiality of understanding politics in Western Canada.

The essential fact of Western Canadian politics is that the people, when they have the choice of sharp-dealing, power-hungry urban middle class or naive, plodding, God-fearing farming men, follow their natural impulses of self-preservation and refrain from putting a sharp knife into the hands of those they feel capable of throat-cutting. The report of The Gateway awhile ago on the Young Liberals' meeting was edifying in this respect. Of those whose names I know that were elected to office, all were young legal minds. Now the law doesn't teach morality; it is not ethics or philosophy. It teaches when you may be punished for what society decrees (through lawyers—MP's in Ottawa?) is unacceptable. In this sense the law is amoral. If you were to give carte-blanche to someone, would you choose a humble, semi-literate man of God or an openly amoral power-seeker? One remembers the Russian Marxists early in this century trying to maintain contact with the people.

Western Liberals and Conservatives, in provincial politics seem to be a little bit stupid about this—they wait for the people to come to them in their Windsor Park homes). Mr. Diefenbaker's success has been attributed countless times to his being a man of the people, the grass roots themselves. Why not learn from this.

Youth, "fulfilling its function and duty in politics", if it does so without reference to the preservation of human values in our society, can do nothing but discredit its party in the eyes of the voter, for surely, if youth has anything to contribute, it is the maintenance of such values. To keep the cynical self-seekers who have lost all their illusions and many of their values, from debasing both party and state.

Surely the fourth estate, traditional self-labelled crusaders for human rights and the dignity of man, should have some higher concept of what politics is about than the party wheel-horses. More especially so a campus newspaper. If you can perceive no higher place in politics for youth than that of getting its share of the pie, perhaps you had best stop writing about politics.

Kenneth C. Murray

