

The Gateway

Member of the Canadian University Press

Editor-in-Chief - - - - Don Sellar

Managing Editor Bill Miller

News Editor Al Bromling

Asst. News Editor, Helene Chomiak

Sports Editor Bryan Campbell

Associate Editor Doug Walker

Page Five Linda Strand

Fine Arts Editor John Thompson

Photo Editor Neil Driscoll

EDITORIAL: CUP Dateline Editor: Ginger Bradley. Desk: Jim Rennie. Cartoonists: Dale Drever, Peter Bassek. Production Manager: Joe Will. Office Manager: Peter Enns. Editorial Board: Don Sellar, Doug Walker, Bill Miller, Linda Strand. Editorial Assistant: Carole Kaye. Librarian: Lois Berry.

STAFF THIS ISSUE—SUB cof wasn't open Sunday night as announced earlier, so loyal staffers had an opportunity to use the pop machine in Dinwoodie. Plugging the machine with dimes were Lorraine Minich, Richard Vivone, Sheila Ballard, Andy Rodger, Marion Conybeare, Jim MacLaren, Lawrie Hignell, Lorraine Allison, Don Moren, Ralph Melnychuk, Ekkehard Kottke, Penny Hynam, Marg Penn, Rose Mah Toy and yours truly, Harvey Thomgirt.

The Gateway is published semi-weekly by the students' union of the University of Alberta. The Editor-in-Chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final copy deadline (including short items): for Wednesday edition—7 p.m. Sunday: advertising—4:30 p.m. Thursday; for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Monday. Advertising Manager: Alex Hardy. Office phone—433-1155. Circulation—8,300. Authorized as second-class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash. Postage paid at Edmonton.

PAGE TWO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1966



shot down

responsibility roosts

The National Existentialist Student Party, most recent in a long line of student protest parties, tonight will form the official government in this year's Model Parliament.

It is a party founded, manned and supported by students from the Faculty of Engineering. It was founded "on the premise that Canadian government is becoming bogged down with unchanging and ubiquitous bipartisan forces," whatever that means. It is in office primarily because a large bloc of engineering students voted for it. This shows, according to its leader, William Eckford, engineering 3, that "the engineers are the least apathetic and most closely knit group on campus." It shows at least, that no other faculty has its own political party.

The NESP does not represent, as all other campus parties do, an official parent political party. Its leaders lack experience in political procedure, especially in the procedure of forming the government. This, in itself, would not have been a bad thing, if the party had injected some life into the campaign, and had been remotely prepared to form the government. Its policies, how-

ever, as presented during last week's campaign, represent the very things it is ostensibly fighting against; that is, a tired rehashing of already old ideas, plus an appeal to the common man by asking him to submit his ideas to their committee rooms.

It is unfortunate that a demonstration of the solidarity of engineering students had to jeopardize the present model parliament, not to mention future ones. In spite of an increase in the percentage of votes cast, student politics on this campus is in danger of extinction through a lack of serious student participation.

We do not wish to question the sincerity or the ability of the members of NESP, or to condemn the inter-party committee for allowing it to run, especially before the session. This will hopefully be a lesson to the regular parties to revitalize themselves. The responsibilities of all concerned must, however, be pointed out. The parliament is bound by its own rules to sit for three days of sessions. With sincere diligent work, and with no small amount of co-operation on the part of all members, this exercise in politics can be a valuable experience for everyone concerned.

the great debate comes to campus

by jim laxer
for canadian university press

The storm that has been brewing in recent weeks about Washington guidelines for U.S. subsidiary corporations in this country is the latest sign that this may be the year to re-examine Canadian nationalism.

Both on the campuses and in the mass media, the issue of Canadian independence is returning to the fore.

In many parts of the country debates, teach-ins and articles are drawing the line between the nationalists and the continentalists. The nationalists believe that Canadian society is distinct and valid—they favor Canadian independence. The continentalists seek closer ties with the United States and tend to view this country's sovereignty as a nuisance that stands in the way of a great, all-inclusive North American society.

This gulf between Canadians, expressed in rather simplified terminology, has existed since Confederation, of course. But for many years after the Second World War, the issue seemed to sink from view. The rise and partial eclipse of Diefenbaker nationalism in English Canada and the quiet revolution in Quebec then brought the issue back to stage-centre once more.

But oddly enough, the Diefenbaker phenomenon was brushed off by many as yokel-nationalism and, especially in academic circles, seemed to strengthen the tendency toward continentalism.

There were several factors involved in this. Intellectuals had long believed that they were part of a cosmopolitan society that knew no frontiers. Nationalism was somehow passé. With their usual ability to confuse sophistication with convention, the universities managed to yawn away the first two post-war decades.

Equally important, the intellectual community was the first to take up the English-French debate of the early 1960's. The two solitudes became so busy with each other that they scarcely noticed the economic, cultural and political invasion that was descending on them from another quarter.

The English-French debate had a rather ironic conclusion. It began with French Canadians demanding recognition for the view that they belonged to a "nation"; it ended with English Canadians in doubt about their own nationhood.

Gradually during the glamorous Kennedy years a general unease began to overtake this country. It was increasingly obvious that American subsidiary corporations were sharing an ever larger portion of the strategic sector of our economy. We began to wonder whether sovereign Canada would be permitted to trade with Cuba and China.

Then came angry words between the U.S. State Department and Canada's Conservative Prime Minister regarding nuclear warheads for our Bomarc missiles. In 1963 John Diefenbaker's government went down before the onslaught of a continental establishment.

The period from the fall of the Conservative government to the present has seen the genesis of the new nationalism in English Canada.

Professor Gad Horowitz of McGill University says: "English Canada will have to decide what it is. . . . The result should be a new Nation, bearing the clear imprint of a British past without offence to those of a non-British ancestry or to those of British ancestry who are now in conflict with their past."

But ironically the dean of the new nationalism is a man who believes that Canada's day is almost over. George Grant, 47, head of the department of religion at McMaster University has depicted the issues in terms both classical and new in his *Lament for a Nation*.

Grant believes that Canadian economic integration into the United

States has been proceeding apace since 1940. He sees the Liberal party and especially C.D. Howe as the instruments of continental intrusion.

He states: "The Liberal policy under Howe was integration. . . . The society produced by such policies may reap enormous benefits, but it will not be a nation. Its culture will become the empire's to which it belongs."

Classical Canadian nationalism once found its focus in a protective tariff that sheltered an east-west export-based economy to provide an internal market for the central Canadian industrial complex. But Grant argues that Canadian corporate elite has become so intertwined with the American that it has lost all its nationalism.

In choosing the term "continentalism" as an epithet for the enemies of Canada, Grant brings to mind the hard battles that raged on this issue over half a century ago. In 1891 John A. Macdonald fought the "Continental Union" scheme of the Liberals; he said he would oppose "this veiled treason with my utmost breath." During election of 1911, Borden declared that the central issue of the campaign was whether a "spirit of Canadianism or continentalism shall prevail on the northern half of this continent." (He won.)

Grant considers that Canada has become increasingly a "branch-plant" society.

This process has progressed to the point that the small towns and rural areas of the country have become the reservoir of national feeling, in Grant's view. Harold Arthur writing in *Saturday Night* says Toronto, from a "well-groomed, puberty-conscious daughter" has "grown up to be a North American bitch. Her chosen role is the Canadian receptionist for the New York office."

But there is evidence that, in the cities too, the new nationalism is beginning to make itself felt. Those close to Canada's past and those who are groping toward a new society are becoming clear that the issue of independence must be faced.

The extent to which the question is pervading the public consciousness is reflected in a statement by an executive of a large U.S. subsidiary that if Washington continues to pursue its guidelines policy "we couldn't call our soul our own."

This year, around the focus of Lament for a Nation, the battle between the continentalists and the nationalists has come to the campus. At Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, in a debate on the subject, Hugh Innis, head of the social science department, told his listeners:

"No Canadian would spend one Hershey Bar a week to save Canada."

The Liberal Prime Minister of McMaster University's debating parliament made a recent statement that North America as a whole would be a more viable economic unit than Canada alone.

"You are being taxed for patriotism. Our industries have too many different products, and too few units of each product to be economic. Tariffs cost as much as the Canada Pension Plan and are only an incentive to inefficiency," he said.

A McMaster Tory replied: "Don't throw Canada into the melting pot and blend it with the so-called 'Great Society'."

Students at the University of Alberta are organizing a teach-in on the subject Canada: Satellite or Sovereign to be held Saturday with Grant as a guest speaker.

Whatever the outcome, the universities will be called upon to play a crucial role as a catalyst for the new alignment, and students from coast to coast will likely flock to the lists on behalf of the one side or the other.