

## Dialogue Possible

To The Editor:

Friday evening Dr. Marcel Chaput, Quebec Separatist leader, speaking to a local audience, denied that there can be any meaningful dialogue between those who do not use the same terms of reference, and do not stand on an equal footing. By way of illustration, he cited the English-French disproportion in Parliament, in federal-provincial conferences, in population, in population, in economic control even in Quebec.

Much that he said about the cause of French-Canadian frustration is unhappily true. The majority in Canada has been guilty of over-riding the French-Canadian minority—not, be it said, primarily because that majority is or was Anglo-Saxon, but because it is human and sinful.

On the other hand, on whatever basis Dr. Chaput reached his conclusion that dialogue is impossible he is now in principle committed to that position. It is for him not simply a statement of fact, it is practical politics, it is a goal to be reached as soon as possible. The sooner we both come to believe that we really cannot communicate with one another, the sooner the party which Dr. Chaput leads will attain power.

Hence his address is deliberately couched in provocative language, which arouses the expected anger and hostility of English-speaking extremists, who proceed to demonstrate admirably that there has been in fact no dialogue, no communication. What was scarcely heard at all on Friday night was the voice of moderation on both sides, still convinced that hard as it is we can talk with one another, make the effort of comprehension, and find the common ground that yet exists.

One such voice is that of Mr. Claude Ryan, editor of *Le Devoir*, who recently clarified the stand of that sturdy champion of French-Canadian rights. Rather than simply identifying French Canada with Quebec, he sees the French-Canadian question in terms of the country as a whole, and opts for what he calls "the Canadian hypothesis." He does so mainly for economic and political reasons. "Quebec," he says, "from a short-range point of view, will need close ties with the rest of the country. If not, it will become even more of a satellite of the United States or else the plaything of other powers attracted by its resources. Our economy . . . needs outside markets for the sale of its products. It needs foreign capital for the development of its resources. Why should we say no to Canada today if we are forced to say yes to other tomorrow? One doesn't deny one's past for the simple pleasure of theoretically changing partners.

"But our most important reasons for choosing Canada are political. On condition that Quebec can enjoy all the autonomy it needs for the development of its own life and institutions, we believe that the maintenance of the Canadian tie offers very valuable advantages. The first of these is surely the possibility of maintaining and developing French life in the rest of the country . . . We must continue to support our compatriots in other provinces . . . The second advantage is the chance we are offered in Canada to build a new type of society—in which the political organization is suited to the development of different cultures, without being rigidly or exclusively influenced by any one . . . (But) if this

Canadian hypothesis is to be realized, it will require substantial changes in the constitution of our country and the operation of its political institutions . . ."

Dialogue with such views as these is both possible and urgently necessary, if we are not to prove Dr. Chaput right after all.

Yours sincerely,  
Charles F. Johnston  
St. Stephen's College

## Give Blood!

To The Editor:

In response to the Letter to the Editor, Nov. 24 issue of *The Gateway*, titled "Anti-Blood Drive." First of all let me say that there is no Phys Ed 5, also that if the person using the pseudonym B. H. Ealthy, is a student registered in the faculty of physical education, he would know that all the research that has involved the giving of blood, does not reach the conclusion that the giving of blood is detrimental to any physical activity.

As for the performing of open heart surgery without the use of blood transfusions, I personally have not heard of any. This does not say that there have not been such operations performed. Blood of the patient's type would, no doubt, be on hand in case of an unforeseen emergency.

If B. H. Ealthy becomes dizzy, weak, and lacks physical vigor after having given blood, I suggest that he is in poor physical shape or has convinced himself before hand that this is the way he should feel after having given blood and therefore does. But this has not happened to him because he states that he has not given blood.

Finally, I would like him to meet and talk to the thousands of people who are alive today because not everyone felt like himself, and gave blood. He could not convince these people that giving blood should be taboo.

Neil Russell, B.P.E.  
ed 4

## And More Blood

To The Editor:

I find some confusion in the letter submitted as a protest against the coming Blood Drive. What is B. H. Ealthy protesting against—the university sponsoring a drive or the giving of blood in general?

Does he believe that the university should ignore the possibility of obtaining blood for the Red Cross solely because a minority of students—and I believe a glance at statistics of those who do give blood prove it is a minority—believe it is "against the will of God" to mingle blood?

I am sure B. H. Ealthy is aware that he is under no compulsion to offer his pint. In sponsoring the Drive, the university is not suggesting that all its students "believe" in giving blood. It just provides the opportunity—and a convenient one—to give blood if one feels it is God's will.

B. H. Ealthy does admit that many people have been saved by "mingling their blood." His description of one operation which involves the use of only one's own blood certainly does not eliminate the necessity of blood needed to save lives.

Regarding the second complaint that the body is weakened—this certainly may occur, but not for a lengthy period. One may feel dizzy for a few hours after giving one pint but there may come a time when one is terribly dizzy, perhaps near death, for need of

# Viewpoint Writers Defend The Engineer's Wall, Deplore The Delay In Student Loans, Challenge Dr. Chaput's Statements, Encourage Donation Of Blood.

two or three pints.

During the weeks of December B. H. Ealthy and others of the same belief can offer a quiet protest by staying away from Blood Drive. Others can offer their protest to him by attending.

Yours truly,  
Linda Hutchinson  
arts 4

## Parallelism?

To The Editor:

It is much to my surprise and distress that the intellectuals among *The Gateway* staff and in the intellectually superior faculties have not recognized the true purpose of the Wall. This letter is to enlighten the inane among us of its design. Why did the engineers on campus hold up their already tarnished reputations for the cause of WUS?

The Wall was actually and simply a protest against parking meters. It was expected that the idea would be immediately recognized, seized upon and acclaimed as common ground between the engineers and the rest of the campus.

The reasoning behind it, once explained, is so childishly simple that any engineer fails to see why at least a few of the more intelligent artsmen did not immediately see it. L. A. Malmberg ag 4 certainly did not see it when he wrote in his letter "I objected . . . to being denied the right to walk where I please when I please."

The connection? He thought he had the right to walk where he pleased. We certainly do not have the right to park where we please when we please, and the engineers have done their job of pointing this out by the parallel situation of walking. The "K" parking lot behind Lister Hall is there, yet we cannot park there "where I please when I please." Our SUB parking lot requires a "cullecshun" (in the words of Tom Landsman ed 4), or we don't park there.

And certainly the (pecuniary) humiliation of a parking tag is greater than the verbal and unimportant humiliation of a "fink hole." Your final results cannot be withheld for objection to the Wall, while they can for objection to (and rejection of) a parking ticket.

Students of our campus, we have the real explanation of the Wall. It is in terms that even engineers can understand. If the Wall is an infringement of our rights, so is the parking meter. If the Wall should have been torn down, laud and glorify the parking meter painters. If parking meters are a Good Thing, then so was the Wall.

Need any more be said?

Geoff Michaels  
eng 1

## Engineers Defended

To The Editor:

I believe I have read everything (and I mean everything). I am referring to the letters to the editor in the Nov. 24th issue of *The Gateway*. Two letters in particular caught my attention.

The first was a "chapter" of trash written by an education student, Tom Landsman. Mr. Landsman seems to think he is "it." (He probably looks like one too.) I am sure that upon arriving at the wall he was met by a milk bottle with an obscene word written on it. If Mr. Landsman had opened his eyes he would have seen that the obscene word read S-H-A-R-E. I am equally sure that he was met by one who said "Ya gotta heva pass to git true da wall." Maybe Mr. Landsman forgot that engineers also had to take English in high school and believe it or not some even

did well in the subject.

Mr. Landsman seems to think an engineer is an ignorant slob who comes to varsity to drink beer and chase women because he is too ignorant to do anything else. I can prove different by using a few examples. So far I have not met a first year engineer whose average was below seventy per cent. (Maybe I stick around with the wrong crowd.) I also know a few first year engineers who won the Governor General's medal. Seeing as I am from a different part of the country I can only say that this medal is awarded to one who has had the highest average in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Landsman please reconsider and then maybe you might even switch to engineering (if your grade twelve average was high enough).

R. J. M. G. B.

## Cleansing

To The Editor:

In Salem, Mass, in 1692, a wave of emotional hysteria was provoked by the writings and sermons of Cotton Mather and other ministers of the Christian faith. They believed that evil forces must have been responsible for recent political and military disasters suffered by the Massachusetts Bay Colony. To protect themselves from these evil forces and to rectify the situation, the Christians went out and hung nineteen persons and pressed one to death on a rack with weights.

In Ardrossan, Alberta, 1964, the Christians, now aided by their very devout Social Credit followers, are once again embarking on a similar cleansing operation to keep their faith pure and unadulterated. Will this mean that nineteen more persons will have to meet untimely ends this time?

John R. Leicht  
ed 3

## Intellects And Wall

To The Editor:

I was surprised to read and hear the comments so hastily put forth by some of our self-named intellectuals of the art and education faculties with regard to the engineers' "Wall."

It is indeed a shame that some university students are so intellectually advanced and at such a stage of maturity that they cannot see the obvious good intentions and humorous nature of the engineers' construction, not to mention the time and energy involved in carrying out this endeavour.

As for some of the slanderous remarks made (some in print) about the engineers themselves—they are born of the same ignorance which leads a man to stand on a pile of rubbish in his own yard to look over the fence at his neighbor's uncut lawn.

Sincerely  
M. T. Smith  
eng 1

## Ask And You Shall Receive?

To The Editor:

Mr. Harry Hays has suggested the slogan "Eat more Beef." "Dief the Chief" does not agree. As a result his title has been changed to "Dief the Beef." All in all, "Beefing" has become somewhat of a national pastime lately, and in order to keep up with the times I have decided to indulge a little myself, hence the following "Beefed up" opinion regarding the Student's Award Office.

Students in Alberta are extremely fortunate in that the financial assistance available to them is considerable. Perhaps the

best in Canada. Unfortunately, the administration of these monies has not kept pace. How else can one explain the following suspense thriller?

A certain student, in need of financial assistance calls a the Students' Award Office immediately after registration (Sept. 25). Upon completion of the application form he is told that it will probably be processed within ten days (Oct. 5). Then days later he is told to call back in about one month (Nov. 5). A month later he is advised that the money should be forthcoming in a week (Nov. 12). On Nov. 12 he is assured that another week will do it (Nov. 19). Sure enough, on Nov. 23 a letter arrives stating that the student has qualified for two loans, one from the province and one under the new federal loan plan. The provincial loan will be forwarded in three weeks (Dec. 14). The certificate of eligibility for the Federal loan is negotiable any time after January 4, 1965.

From Sept. 25 to Dec. 14 adds up to something like eighty days. That's a long way from the original ten day estimate. Is this necessary? Perhaps it is impossible for the Awards Office to move more quickly. But why, then, do they not tell the student to expect to wait between two and three months? If told in advance, the student would be in a position to budget accordingly and make alternate arrangements if necessary. Keeping students in suspense by issuing false information not only is of no value to the student, but can quite easily place him in a serious dilemma. After all, someone who expects to receive his loan in ten days will spend his money on hand accordingly.

I say, one Hitchcock is sufficient.

"Beefeater"

## Washed Out

To The Editor:

I thought I would be the last person to be writing to Ann Landers, or *The Gateway*, but since I have got my laundry back from Lister, I am now writing to both!

The pay-off came in the latest edition of "The Tower," the residence paper, where it is stated that the laundry service is under the direction of Mrs. E. Dodd—a seven year "veteran" of laundry service. Now I know why my clothes looked like they had been through the war! For instance, in one batch of laundry, I lost a blouse, had the buttons torn off my pyjamas, and lost the garters off my "unmentionable."

Although this letter must remain anonymous, you might recognize me by my "passionate pink" sneakers, which now match my red university sweat shirt.

Washed Up

Editor's Note—And perhaps we'll also recognize you by the nylon stockings bunched limply around your ankles.

## Lunching Illegal

To The Editor:

I notice a recent addition to the Cameron Library staff. Now, in addition to an inspector at the entrance and an extractor of fines, the graduate library of this university employs a policeman to seek out errant lunch eaters.

May I take this opportunity to thank the university administration and the officials of the library for continuing to stock books and for maintaining a skeleton staff to process them.

Humbly,  
Anne Wilson  
arts 4