

The Gateway

member of the canadian university press

editor-in-chief - - - Rich Vivone

managing editor Ronald Yakimchuk
news editor Miriam McClellan
assistant news editor Glenn Cheriton

casserole editor Elaine Verbicky
sports editor Bill Kankewitt
photo editor Chuck Lyall

STAFF THIS ISSUE—'Twas the night of the press night and all through ol' SUB, not a creature was stirring except the mottley Gateway crew of Ellen Nygaard, Laurie Kostek (whom I forgive 'cause she's a sexy wench), Ina van Nieuwkerk, Joe Czajkowski (I hope he's a good sport if I spell his name wrong), Judy Griffiths, who's still working on her story, Lorna Cheriton, plumber Mike Murphy, Sadie Brushmop, from caretaking services, Sam Agronin of Canada Goose fame and (natch) yours truly purple party poopingly, Harvey G. Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published tri-weekly by the students' union of The University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is solely responsible for all material published herein. Editorial opinions are those of the editor and not of the students' union or of the university.

Final copy deadline for the Tuesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday, advertising—noon Thursday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Friday. For Thursday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—noon Monday prior, Short Shorts 5 p.m. Tuesday. For Friday edition—7 p.m. Wednesday, advertising—noon Tuesday prior, Short Shorts—5 p.m. Wednesday. Casserole advertising—noon Thursday previous week. Advertising manager: Greg Berry, 432-4329. Office phones—432-4321, 432-4322. Circulation—10,000.

Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton. Telex 037-2412.

Printed by The University of Alberta Printing Services.

PAGE FOUR

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1968

The CUS referendum

Students' council decision Monday to hold the Canadian Union of Students re-entry referendum on the same day as the students' union elections would indicate that our councillors are unable to gain from past errors.

We are referring to the last CUS referendum, held during the students' union elections in the spring of 1967, when virtually all coherent debate on CUS was stifled because of the election campaign.

As now, there were very few people on campus knowledgeable on the CUS question. And most of these were either running for office, or were outgoing executive and council members.

The latter group was forbidden from speaking on the CUS question because this would influence the outcome of the election as well as the referendum. The students' union by-laws forbid any outgoing executive member to do anything during an election which would affect the election of the new executive.

The candidates for election, meanwhile, found they would have to stand or fall with the CUS referendum, and in fact no one who stood for CUS won a position. The CUS issue forced candidates to ignore local issues which were of great

concern to this campus, but in turn, they could give only superficial attention to CUS in the time at their disposal.

There are several good reasons, therefore, why the referendum should be held up to two weeks before the election:

- it would permit all informed persons to devote all of their spare time to the referendum.
- it would create less congestion of issues during election week.
- it would permit candidates to run on the basis of the outcome of the referendum, rather than having to try and influence the outcome.

This would prevent the very likely situation of a pro-CUS and an anti-CUS candidate both being elected (probably on different issues) and both feeling they had a mandate to act on their platforms.

As for council's speculation that holding the referendum before the election would mean a very light turnout for the referendum, such an occurrence could only come about if council failed to stimulate a thorough debate on the matter. It is council's duty to see that persons informed on CUS be given opportunity to speak, even if this means bringing speakers from other campuses.

Bye, bye model parliament

It appears model parliament has done what many of us wish it had done long ago. It has laid down and quietly died.

The NDY withdrawal last year started the death throes. This year it appears the NDY club is dead since two meetings in one night netted three members—total.

The Liberal club is still alive, but it has acquired a new independence (was it the recent federal election?) and seems inclined to go to Calgary for a conference with provincial Liberals instead of playing the model parliament game.

Glenn Sinclair's Conservative club seems willing to play, but doesn't want anybody to play with.

Exactly what the Socreds are doing is anybody's guess. Either they're dead or they are looking for a new leader, like the provincials are.

Meanwhile the political science club, which organizes model parliament, appears to be out of the scene too. The most likely reason for this is they have lost all their leadership and have not yet reorganized.

We are distressed if this means that organization's normally excellent selection of speakers is not present this year, but if they eliminate model parliament, we will be relieved.

The discussion by the great uninformed of Canada's role in NATO and the Turkish invasion of Cyprus is not our piece of pie.



DO YOUR SHARE FOR BLITZ

Peter Warrion and his religion

Allan Garr is vice-president of Canadian University Press. In 1967-68, he attended Simon Fraser University. Here are his observations of Peter Warrion, president of the Canadian Union of Students.

By GARR

"Peter Warrion only looks like he has a football for a head but . . ."

I've been sitting in Ottawa now for the past month reading this kind of trivia about the young lad who, as president of Canadian Union of Students, has made his mark in the world not because he yells revolution, not because he rapes and pillages, and not because he wears hush puppies.

Peter Warrion has become as common a household word as Auschwitz not for what he said but for what Canada thought he said.

That boy Warrion, who has had more invitations to get out of Canada than Charles de Gaulle, gets heat rash, and suffers nervous spasms every time he drives by the Eddy Match company. And if confronted with a burning building he would, no doubt, give birth or drop dead.

How anyone could change his image from a slightly over-weight ex-seminary student to a fire-breathing reincarnation of Che Guevara, sans facial foliage, was at first beyond me.

But it happened. The reason of course was that the media, because of social pressure, were forced to overlook the essence of Warrion's speech.

I can honestly say the message I heard in Guelph as it spilled from fair Peter's parched lips was the most scintillating rejection of Catholic doctrine ever delivered in this country, if not in this century.

Warrion's "State of the Union" address, if approached with the correct analysis, has both profound religious and sexual overtones.

Warrion's sexual and religious repression stems from his long years as a seminary student. Apparently he rejected that world for the less tedious hang-ups of a layman but that hasn't panned out.

I put it to you that Peter, out of frustration, has turned his perverse oratory talents to the task of making the Canadian Union of Students a vanguard movement to break the death grip of the Catholic church on Canadian govern-

ment and drive the church out of Canada and back to Quebec where it belongs.

His plea to the fatcats of student government began: "brothers and sisters"—a remnant of his days with the church.

Once they get a hold of your mind they're hard to shake off and I can only sympathize with Peter.

He continues: ". . . this is your thing, let it all hang out." Time to pause for a bit of close reading.

It would appear that Peter Warrion, the Sancho Panza of the Canadian student movement, has asked his followers to reject their life of dedication to a spiritual cause, as he once did, and revel in carnal delights.

Warrion's reference in his speech to burning, so often mis-quoted, is a further rejection of Catholic dogma. The analogy of building as body and body as temple of God is common to Christian metaphysics.

He is not asking us to destroy something made of bricks and tax dollars. He is challenging a basic doctrine of the Church founded on the statement of Saint Augustine: "It is better to marry than to burn."

It is this statement that led the Wife of Bath to a life of questionable restraint and the Catholic church to its present stand on birth control.

Peter Warrion is not to be ridiculed for his stand. He is a product of this society, a society dominated by religious bigotry.

But it is to be seen whether he can erase the footsteps of the last great Peter, founder of the Catholic church.

That man can be remembered for exacting funds from his followers, despite the instructions of Christ, and putting those who would not pay to death.

Our Peter has based his movement on more solid ground than a fistful of platitudes and a rock. You can't knock sex.

And so we see Peter in a new light, not as a thrill-seeking jock, but as a man who has come to the realization that marriage and burning are both hell if you can't mess around a bit on the side.