

# VIEWPOINT

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 27, 1964

PAGE FIVE

## Through A Smog Darkly

To The Editor:

The Gateway has been working for such cases as making Edge more readily available and meals more delicious at Lister Inn, how about a campaign on the elimination of smog from lecture rooms and student laboratories? Do you have to smoke whether you want to or not, particularly, a second hand one? Why should you have to brush cigarette butts aside before you can put down your books on the desk? This is the fourth university I am at in the U.S. and Canada (one was a summer session) but it is the first time I was expected to see the blackboard or projection screen through a blue-black haze of tobacco smoke. Possibly the Hon. Judy La Marsh may have some suggestions.

Yours truly,  
John Laws

## Poppy Day '64

To The Editor:

The Royal Canadian Legion is very thankful to the students and the staff of the university who each year contribute so generously to the poppy fund by the purchase of poppies. Every year for many years the members of Delta Upsilon Fraternity have undertaken this poppy sale.

This year more than \$600 was

donated by people on the campus and this is a very real help to veterans in need and their families who seek assistance from the poppy fund.

Sincerely yours,  
Alan F. MacDonald,  
Montgomery Branch,  
Royal Canadian Legion

## Wall Again

To The Editor:

Are you one of the many who were manhandled by the gargantuan guard who guarded the sacred wall? I agree that the wall was a great gimmick and that WUS performs a useful service. However at the sight of others being manhandled I objected to being forced to "contribute" and to being denied the right to walk where I please, when I please. I drew myself up to my full 5'9" and looked the monster square in the belt buckle and asked him why I could not pass and who in hell he thought he was. He and all those around him jumped up and down with evident glee and announced that this wall was approved by almost everyone of power and consequence. Would someone, anyone, tell me if manhandling, derision, and the forcing of girls in skirts to crawl through the hole in the wall (if they objected to being forced to contribute to the

**Viewpoint writers dislike looking through a smog darkly, are still mad about the "wall", and, of course, find fault with the Gateway.**

"cause") was approved? If so, perhaps we will find ourselves being issued with swastika arm bands in the near future.

However I have some faith in the administration, enough to believe that the things to which I object were not approved by the wise ones above. More likely it was a case of bad judgment on the part of the campaign organizers or on the part of the guard alone. I hope so. If not, perhaps the guard would like to play king of the castle next week. He should find that smashing good fun.

L. A. Malmberg  
ag 4

## Words, Words

To The Editor:

Must everyone write such long letters to you?

Sincerely  
I. N.

## Retraction Demanded

To The Editor:

As vice-president of the Engineering Students' Society, I must voice a strong complaint. Your enthusiasm and desire to be on top of the news has led you into the very shaky field of predicting future events, before you have gained an effective mastery of the art of reporting past happenings.

And you fell flat on your face. Don't worry about it, it doesn't really hurt much.

But really, trying to tell the world that ten unidentified stu-

dents destroyed a wall that the engineers dismantled 12 hours earlier. And that they encountered feeble opposition from engineers. This had to be out in left field.

No error is impossible to correct, and a front page retraction of your noble effort of a flash, accompanied by a positive coverage of the WUS Wall achievements, will effectively right the wrong you have done the engineers.

Yours in good faith,  
Ed Chessor

*Editor's Note—Retract what? The wall was torn down by approximately ten unidentified students. And indeed, they encountered feeble opposition from engineers.*

## Criticism Criticized

To The Editor:

I feel I must comment on the trend in The Gateway's editorial policy; specifically, the consistent opposition on practically any grounds to Premier Manning and to The Journal. Not being a Social Creditor or a Journal fan, I myself often disagree with their views, but I at least give myself credit for having to some extent an open mind. To what then can we attribute The Gateway's policy? Fiery Idealism, however misdirected? Or how about Youth in Search of a Cause?

The latest egg laid by The Gateway in this regard is the editorial appearing in the Nov. 17 issue, in which Mr. Manning and The Journal are attacked for their criticism of Dr. Lupul's stand on

religious junior colleges. Mr. Manning's statement, "sheer nonsense," describing Dr. Lupul's views is branded as not giving evidence of having considered the criticism on its merits. If The Gateway had bothered to read the entire Journal editorial it would have discovered that Mr. Manning said more than two words on the topic, and did indeed show evidence of some thought behind his statement. Also, I quote: "Quality is being sacrificed to save a buck" and, "It is refreshing and reassuring to know that some professors feel and act upon their responsibility to criticize, and to speak out for quality."

Where may I asked is the evidence to support the implication that the teaching staffs of these religious colleges are harmfully biased and/or intellectually inferior to the professors here in Edmonton? I had the privilege of attending the Camrose Lutheran Junior College for my first year and after being initially apprehensive, (I am not Lutheran) was delighted to find that the professors were, and are, top-notch; implied here is that their "stifling" religious views were not foisted on us.

This type of removed, armchair criticism reflects nothing but disrepute on The Gateway, and I challenge you in future to look into the facts a bit more before sounding off on something you obviously know nothing about.

Alan Fielding  
arts 3

P.S.—Don't get me wrong—I LIKE The Gateway.

## How To Make Canada Work

# Cooperative Federalism: Mutual Goodwill, Joint Economic Planning

The following talk was given by Forestry Minister Maurice Sauvé at the 7th annual seminar of the Canadian Union of Students at Laval University (Aug. 30-Sept. 5). It is regarded by many observers as one of the most incisive statements of the moderated French-Canadian position delivered by a French-Canadian. Mr. Sauvé is both an intellectual and a politician. He holds degrees in arts, economics and law. As a student he was elected president of the National Federation of Canadian University Students.

## By Hon. Maurice Sauvé

There is in Quebec a new surge of nationalism. Nationalism tempered with reason and moderation can be the most constructive and dynamic force in the world, as we have seen in Quebec since 1960. In this sense, I am a Quebec nationalist and a Canadian nationalist. But, it is essential to realize that the new French-Canadian nationalism has two distinct aspects—an economic aspect and a cultural aspect, which is much more emotional. Quebec nationalists seek not only economic reforms, and not only cultural reforms, but both together. Misunderstanding of this point in English Canada has led to a great deal of confusion about what Quebec "really wants."

First of all, Quebec's problem is primarily economic. Part of the solution to Quebec's economic problem is undoubtedly the economic growth of Canada as a whole, which will be shared in large measure by Quebec; and with this growth will come the

creation of much of the additional revenue required.

Secondly, the cultural aspect of French-Canadian nationalism stems from the passionate feeling of French-speaking Canadians for their language and their culture. We sense very deeply that cultural assimilation into the great North American mass must be fought at all costs.

## GUT ISSUE

This is a gut issue—we have an instinctive, visceral conviction that our very survival as individuals, our very personal identity depends on this. Therefore, it is more difficult for us to discuss challenges to our language and culture calmly and rationally. But, I believe most strongly that our French culture, "le fait français en Amérique," is far more likely to sustain itself in North America as part of an economically flourishing Canada, than behind the artificial walls of extreme nationalism.

At the individual level, one effect of both these aspects of the new nationalism can be seen in the growing desire of French-speaking Canadians to participate more fully in the management of business in the province and in the country, and in the growing feeling that French Canadians should be better represented in the federal civil service, especially in the upper ranks.

We do not claim this as a right to which we are automatically entitled, regardless of our ability. But we do feel that as more and more French Canadians are becoming fully able and qualified to manage large industrial complexes and to administer even the most important departments in the public sector, we should not

find these positions closed to us simply because we are not members of the "Establishment."

The same is true of the upper echelons of the world of big business and finance, even in large companies which do a great deal of business in Quebec, or even have their head offices there. We are happy to compete for these positions on the basis of merit and ability alone, if English Canadians will make an effort to avoid discrimination on any other basis.

## QUIET REVOLUTION

In fact, English Canada should welcome and encourage the whole of Quebec's quiet revolution. For the stronger and more dynamic the French-Canadian becomes, the more it has to offer to Canada as a whole.

Some English Canadians have even said that Canada's ability to resist American cultural, economic and eventually political domination depends in large measure on the strength we can draw from French Canada. This may be true, for it is largely our unique bicultural, binational character that makes us different, and can be our greatest strength.

First of all, we must find ways of making more money available for carrying out provincial responsibilities such as education, social welfare, municipal needs, roads, etc. Quebec is not alone in lacking sufficient revenue for these purposes.

The only trouble is that the constitution, as presently interpreted in the context of current federal-provincial tax-sharing arrangements, does not tell the provinces where they are to get the money.

I am a pragmatist in these matters. At this stage, I believe we should not approach this problem from the point of view of who has the constitutional right to collect what, but with a view to finding a solution to the problem in whatever way we can, taking into consideration both federal needs and provincial needs, rather than rights.

Should this be impossible for reasonable men to do? Why then do we not meet together, as responsible Canadians, with a common interest in the welfare of our great nation, and work out a fiscal system which will answer regional needs while at the same time it safeguards the essential Canadian interests?

While we may not all be able to agree on what rights we should have as English or as French, as provinces or as the Federal Government, surely we as Canadians can agree on what we want our government to do. And such solutions as the contracting-out provision in joint federal-provincial programs prove that we can work out ways for them to do it.

## HARD THINKING

But, contracting-out is an ad hoc spur-of-the-moment kind of solution. At coming federal-provincial conferences, the eleven governments must sit down and do some hard thinking about how to reach more permanent and general solutions.

An extremely important step in this regard was taken at the last federal-provincial conference in Quebec City last April, when the Prime Minister announced the establishment of a joint federal-provincial Tax Structure Committee. This committee will examine Canada's whole tax

structure, federal and provincial, and make recommendations to a future federal-provincial conference. This should prove to be an extremely important body, provided that all 11 governments take the matter seriously and are willing to make the committee an effective tool.

## CHANGE CONSTITUTION?

Will this mean changing the constitution? Perhaps; but that is a bridge we should not cross until we come to it. For myself, I would like to see a careful re-examination, when the time comes, of sections 91 and 92 of the BNA Act, to see whether the division of powers and responsibilities therein made still is the best and most effective way to meet the needs to today's vastly changed conditions and national priorities.

The second step, equally important, which we must take in order to make this country work better is joint economic planning, both regionally and on a country-wide basis. Economic planning, which I am convinced is the answer to most of Canada's economic problems, necessarily implies the participation of both federal and provincial governments in the planning process. Here also, we must sit down together and work out generally agreed economic priorities. We must agree that there exists an identifiable general interest for all Canadians that is greater than the mere sum of all our particular, local or regional interests.

Mutual goodwill, open minds, continuous consultation and joint economic planning—that is my definition of co-operative Canadian federalism, and that is how I would like to see us make this country great.