

The Gateway

Member of the Canadian University Press

Winner N. A. M. MacKenzie Trophy 1963-64

Winner Ottawa Journal Trophy 1963-64

Editor-in-Chief - - - Bill Winship

Associate Editor Barry Rust
News Editor Don Sellar
Sports Editor Alex Hardy
Ass't Sports Editor Gary Kiernan
Features Editor Janis Kostash
City Editor Doug Walker

Editorial Assistant Adriana Albi
Fine Arts Marion Raycheba
Makeup Editor Bill Miller
CUP Editor Pat Mooney
Cartoonist Bill Salter
Columnist Bruce Ferrier

STAFF THIS ISSUE—Fast away the old year passes. Helping to pass it Sunday were: Al Bromling (overset contribution); Brenda Walls (dug up story); Bryan Campbell (another line story); Hans Smit (big story coming); Sue Hill (short-short editor); Bryan Edmiston (made the front page); Kevan Dalen (killed himself for by-line); Helene Chomiak (slept in, but made her flight); Lawrence Samuel (hates literature?); Don Risdon (a good sport); Gerry Ohlsen (some debater); Big Jim (had cabinet appointment Sunday night); and me (Regina).

The Gateway is published twice weekly by the Students' Union of the University of Alberta. Opinions expressed by columnists are not necessarily those of the editors. The editor-in-chief is responsible for all material published herein. Final Copy Deadline: for Tuesday edition—2 p.m. Sunday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Thursday; for Friday edition—7 p.m. Tuesday, advertising—4:30 p.m. Monday. Advertising Manager, Bev Bayer. Circulation 7,500. Office phone—433-1155.

PAGE TWO

DECEMBER 15, 1964

Clarification Needed

The open letter sent by faculty members of this university to the people of Alberta is not something to be taken lightly.

The letter protests "a growing atmosphere of restricted freedom in Alberta" and lays the blame for such conditions at the feet of the government in this province. The mere fact the 149 deans, department heads and professors saw fit to circulate and publish the letter indicates they, as top level public educators, lack confidence in the government's educational policies and implies the actions of some government members are irresponsible and detrimental to the best interests of Albertans. These are serious charges.

The signed statement proclaims:

Freedoms of speech, of the press, of religion, and of association, must be defended at all times so that they are not lost.

The recent exercise of such freedoms in Alberta has resulted in strong condemnation by some members of the provincial cabinet and other influential figures. These government statements can only intensify an atmosphere of excessive caution in the use of our treasured freedoms of thought and expression, an atmosphere which, if it is permitted, can lead to the atrophy and loss of these freedoms.

Indeed certain cabinet ministers have been publicly denouncing certain aspects of education in this province. But were their comments induced by exercise of democratic and constitutional freedom? If so, what

were the specific instances and by whom? Government officials haven't told the people of Alberta and neither does the letter.

Have university professors, or others, been prevented from or penalized for, engaging in public speech, expressing religious belief or associating with people of their choice? Has the press been suppressed, or its freedom been abused? If these things have happened, what are the circumstances? What are the points of contention? Many allegations have been made on both sides of the fence but to date no one has been willing to provide evidence in support of their stand.

We have called upon cabinet ministers A. J. Hooke and Randolph McKinnon to quit making generalized accusations of the educational system. We asked them in a Dec. 8 editorial to "put up or shut up."

What is good for the gander is good for the goose. The petitioners have gone to great length to endorse the ideals of a free society and a good educational system. (And to deplore "lip service to democratic freedoms.") No one is about to question the ideals. They are admirable objectives, but meaningless in this case without reference to specifics.

Let's have the open letter senders tell us what prompted their actions. Let's have government members explain their position. Let's have some cards on the table, or else have done with the whole thing.

The Waiting Game

Have you ever had to wait for your date in the new women's residence?

If you have, you have probably noticed there is not much to do if you have to wait an extended period of time.

You will probably have noticed there are two things to read: a rather torn, tattered and mutilated copy of *U.S. News and World Report*, a wonderful magazine to skim through once, but if you have to wait often, the "average" university male finds it a bore; the alternative is to read *The Gateway*, but if you're a conscientious Gateway reader, you've read it before going out.

We suggest to the women's house committee that they consider installing pinball machines in their lobby so on-time males, who are waiting for their tardy dates (as is often the case), will have something to do to while away the time.

Or they might install some old-

fashioned nickleodeons with those . . . er . . . uh . . . well, you know what type of pictures.

Or maybe they could subscribe to magazines which would have more appeal to the "average" university male. *U.S. News and World Report* is not the type of magazine we had in mind.

Or, perhaps the house committee could insist the women post their planned time of departure, and then make sure *les demoiselles* indeed do leave at the appointed hour, upon pain of some suitable punishment. Besides being a remarkable achievement on part of the women concerned, this procedure would virtually eliminate the frustration of the many males who now wait patiently downstairs with nothing to do.

This alternative is perhaps the best, because it would involve no added expense to the house committee, and would make for better relations between residence women and their suitors.

VIEWPOINT

French Canadian Author 'Fed Up'

Mme. Solange Chaput-Rolland is a prominent French-Canadian journalist, editor and literary critic. She will speak at the U of A during the Canadian Union of Students sponsored French-Canada Week, Jan. 25-30. The following are excerpts from the book *DEAR ENEMIES*, of which she is co-author.

Quotes from *DEAR ENEMIES* by permission of Madame Solange Chaput-Rolland and Mrs. Gwethalyn Graham, and the Macmillan Company of Canada Limited.

"I feel a need to free myself by saying everything that is not habitually said about Canada. I am fed up with your unilingualism, your open contempt for French Canadians, your intolerable custom of having your children taught our language by teachers who can't speak a word of French and of ignoring the whole French 'fact'. Yes, I am fed up with the never-ending economic superiority of your businessman, with your pretensions that you are more 'competent' in no matter what field, with the skilfully camouflaged desire of certain English Canadians to have done once and for all with this French survival and its obstinate presence in an Anglo-Saxon context. I feel like indulging in one fine furious outburst to clear the air of this *mesentente cordiale* which has done nothing since 1763 but place Quebec in opposition to the rest of this so called British Country.

"Scarcely three years ago, some English newspapers in Quebec, the *STAR* and the *GAZETTE*, for example, were still systematically ignoring the reality of French Canada. Reading them, one could have sworn that Quebec was an English province! Today they are making a real effort to pay some attention to us, but we haven't the slightest illusion about this sudden interest in our problems. What makes us suddenly attractive to your compatriots is our nationalization of electricity, our almost miraculous industrial development, and our astonishing possibility of becoming in less than ten years one of the most prosperous provinces in Canada. We are no longer the poor relations of Confederation; we are no longer employees to be exploited or poverty-stricken citizens to be tolerated; we have become a force to be reckoned with.

"I am neither a separatist nor a nationalist fanatic, but I am passionately attached to my French identity and relentlessly determined to defend it against anyone who would try to make me *live* English.

"Few people are as spiritless and as gloomy as ours. We have our eyes fixed somewhere else; some on London and the 'mother country', others on Paris and 'la Douce France', and collectively we are making little effort to cure our own country which is suffering from such a lack of love. We are led to imitate the worst that comes to us from Europe or New York, by-passing our own real potentialities. When a Frenchman or an Englishman sings his national anthem it is an act of faith in his country. When a Canadian mumbles *O Canada*, he continues putting on his coat and tying his scarf.

"Because I live in a democracy, I want above all a freedom of being. But if, in order to live in freedom in a Canada entirely dominated by English thinking and an English way of life, I must constantly do battles to keep my language and its spirit intact, then both what I have to say and my happiness in being alive will always be clouded. I shall shut myself up again in my French solitude, and my bitterness will snuff out the dynamism that is indispensable to creative work and to economic or social success.

"True bilingualism, the kind I believe in, wouldn't oblige every Canadian from the Atlantic to the Pacific to speak two languages, but it would bring about a greater understanding between our two realities, our two mentalities, our two histories. To abstract a part of a historical situation without providing it with any intellectual substance. To speak French and at the same time show contempt for the Quebec identity is equally to impoverish the richness of one's being.

"I am grateful to Marcel Chaput (no relation of mine) for having stimulated our sense of national pride, our due measure of self-confidence, and a taste for expressing our exasperation in broad daylight. In French Canada we have been long on words and short on self-confidence.

"I believe in the future of Quebec—if our people can go on being patient and if they resist the skilful persuasion of separatists who are holding up before them a shining independence as decisive as it is economically impossible to realize. If we have a redrafting of the Act of Confederation, we shall march side by side with you and with our heads up. From now until then, we shall be patient in the face of reality, but impatient to dominate it."

Somewhat Muddled

To the Editor:

Mr. Salter's cartoon of Dec. 8 left me somewhat muddled.

His symbolism is certainly well-varied. It is probably not inappropriate to place a Latin motto on the sun-chariot of Helios, since it is drawn of Roman military design anyway. The motto, based on early views of the Mother Church on kingship, is nicely contrasted with the simple but expressive Anglo-Saxon labels under the Puritan figures pulling the chariot. The barbed-wire fence adds a quaint Western-North-American touch.

But the figure in the chariot—who can he be? My first guess was Phaethon. However, the halo seemed to discount this thesis. I consulted my pocket change: it did not seem to be Prince Phillip. The quotation at the bottom could mean that the figure is either York's son or Richard III; both are unlikely possibilities.

This leaves me still confused. If it is not too much trouble, I wonder if perhaps Mr. Salter could explain his work to those of us still floundering in the wash of his imagery.

Bruce Ferrier
arts 2