AT GLENDON LAST WEEKEND 600 PEOPLE DISCUSSED
THE PROBLEMS OF QUEBEC: YEAR 8 AND CAME OUT ALIVE

All you need is love
OPEN LETTER TO RENE LEVESQUE

Dear Sir,

We are writing you, Mr. Levesque, in complete good faith. We are born and reared in Quebec, we have been educated in Quebec, we were nurtured in Quebec, and through the Glendon Forum in English, we have come to understand the need for a united Quebec. We hope you will consider what we have to say as a vital and sincere opinion.

We are convinced that the present situation of the world community can with French Canadians be restructured. Indeed, it must. Racial prejudice (the Seguro-White problem in South Africa), the English-Canadian French-Canadian question, the war between France and Germany (Viet-Nam) all seem to result from the simple fact that people just cannot treat each other as people. This is the problem.

We note that you have called for "sensible" talks. We believe that the talks must be "sensible," but that they must also be "fair." The "sensible" talk proposal is less than "fair." What makes a "fair" talk? It is to be found in the complete selfish wishes of a vital part of the whole.

How is the solution to be found in the endless demands of the present federal government? The solution we think can be found in the necessity to give more say to the people. We feel that the people have the power to change the world community. We feel that it would be a good idea to try the "fair" talk proposal. We do not think that this is*/null*

We feel that Canada can be a valuable experimental concept; insight to either logically destroy this argument or take the weight of our internationalism.

Yours with urgency and sincerity,

Your sincerely,

...
The first time Quebec happened

By KENNETH JOHNSTONE

We are the first to realize that separation is coming.

By BRIAN WARO

I approached Quebec: Year 8 as an opportunity to listen to and question a problem I did not appreciate. Michael Oliver’s discussion of the federalists made me aware of the choices that we were now facing. For the first time in English Canada, we were on no one road to an explosion of separation. Against confused resistance, the man who knows his own mind is irresistible, and Quebec had, more than most of the participants were asking: ‘What do you propose that I do, will you do it?’ That change didn’t take place all at once but you can see in the Phipps-Levesque relationship what was happening. You saw the cabinet minister wearing a suit with his name on the back chair blustering about his beliefs, while M. Levesque used him for fun. And then you saw the other side: M. Géroux, his hosts, at least when he wanted to withdraw in conviction, now cool, intense, now gentle, now passionate, while the federal minister lay back helpless. It wouldn’t be indicative to watch except that you felt that Papin had been coming to his conclusion something from you as he bided behind his façade, and Levesque was really engaged in something more important.

He even said so: Levesque said he had been in order to understand the nation know the score. But it wasn’t what he said so much as what he did. It was there, physically, brutally, physically there—at least English Canada had the feel of le Quebec.

On a whole, each person encountered a man of substance, Pierre had done only a small job. Further, Quebec students, particularly those from U of Montreal, were not as inescapable as the politicians. They materialize outside the Canadian Parliament, Ottawa, through the sense that the country they—a pears room with a coffee machine, typewriters, TV sets, big ash trays for cigarettes. Here was the real Quebec, the real public who don’t usually come to Ottawa. A flock of guests, Maas media from radio, TV, electronic news helps generate excitement.
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Je voyais ici, après question que vous ne pouvez pas. C'est à vous comprendre votre question vous voulez savoir à quel moment, l'indépendance, le syndicalisme est important. Dans beaucoup de pays, on ne peut pas faire aucun changement sans appuyer sur le pouvoir. C'est la doctrine de cette société. Et au Québec les ouvriers, syndiqués ou non, de 85% de la population sans aucun doute : un groupe qui ne fera jamais rien.

Pre Tém: Que pensez-vous de la situation?
Roy: Je n'ai pas croisé.
Pre Tém: Alors, que pensez-vous de Robert Cliche?
Roy: Dites que je suis en accord avec son programme social. Il est un socialiste.

Pre Tém: Je ne pensez-vous pas qu'il est possible que la question du bilinguisme peut être de nouveau sur le devant de la scène?
Roy: Toujours. Mais si vous voulez dire genre de négociations, non, absolument pas. Ils sont ici uniquement pour une chose, Québec sera toujours en Amérique Nord. Après l'indépendance l'indépendance et l'indépendance, le syndicalisme est important. Dans beaucoup de pays, on ne peut pas faire aucun changement sans appuyer sur le pouvoir. C'est la doctrine de cette société. Et au Québec les ouvriers, syndiqués ou non, de 85% de la population sans aucun doute : un groupe qui ne fera jamais rien.

Pre Tém: Pourquoi?
Roy: Pour moi, CUS est un organe très de conservateurs que nous, ses membres ne sont pas socialiste.

Pre Tém: Je ne pensez-vous pas que la lettre de réponse de Pierre Bourgault au sujet de la conférence?
Roy: Bon, disons que ce n'est pas que Pierre Bourgault a fait cette réponse il y a deux ans parce qu'un type comme lui n'est pas très bien traité tout d'abord, on l'aime gens. On l'aime gens.
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Williams, Schultz clash over civil disobedience motion

By CAMILLA MARSDEN

'We are so concerned with imposition from above, have you tried reform from the bottom? You're so concerned with the god-damned structure.'

''How many departments have you tried reform from the bottom? You're so concerned with your concept, what about the power of ideas?''

This Rick Schultz demanded of Communications Officer Glen Williams in a tense Monday evening council debate on reform of the York Act. The motion, tabled by Student Council President Alan Whiteley, called for a student-faculty commission to be formed to rewrite the York Act, or, if this be immediately acted upon, a concentrated programme of civil disobedience to be sponsored by council.

It was in essence an attempt on Whiteley's part to speed up the work of the Board-Senate Liaison Committee of which Schultz is a member.

Rick Schultz felt another commission would merely dilute the work of the Board-Senate Committee. 'Your Senate, your Board, the senate committees; you should accept recommendations from another committee,' he stated.

Williams proceeded to question the legitimacy of the Board-Senate Committee. They meet once a month; why not once a week, once a day if their work is so important? They meet in secret with only four students, why not with all students?

'I am not content to just submit quasi-suggestions to an undemocratic body. We (the Student Council) are sitting on the biggest body of potential power in this university,' said Williams, defending the motion.

'This worries me. Exercises in politics of confrontation are always dangerous,' said Professor Robert Snow. 'The group to contact is the faculty association. They potentially exert more power than any other group on campus.'

At this point, Rick Schultz, provoked into an outburst of exasperation, summed up his position.

'I am not concerned with the Board of Governors making a lousy decision nor the Senate. I am concerned with students taking coherent responsibility. Students don't have to be unpopular where they reside or in the class. This is a centralization, a centralization on the lowest levels; then they can do the level work. By changing the structure do you change the students? No! You can't light the flame.'

Council, apparently in agreement with Schultz, debated the motion. President Alan Whiteley took this as an indication of non-confidence and submitted his resignation.

After a five minute recess a return to council, apologized for taking up the time, and said he would stay. Student Council decided to set up a permanent sub-committee of second, third, and fourth year reps to be responsible for all of Principal Reid's advisory committees.

Professor Robert Snow made a plea to the library committee in particular to try and do something about the 'bureaucratic hang-ups' at the other campus. A starting example of this is the renewal of books borrowed from Strachan Science Library: the books must be brought back to Frost Library, at this campus, sent up to Steacie, checked out, and finally returned to Frost. The process takes three days.

Grey Saucer to be decided this week

By TOM ELLISON

As you sit reading this article the football season may or may not be over. As of Friday afternoon, the original eight team league had been reduced to two. Four, Second Year, A House, D House, and First Year all secured playoff positions in that order.

It was the closest race since the league's inception; only four points separated the top four teams and everyone was expecting two very close and hotly contested semi-finals.

In the D House game they got their wish. Second Year held onto a slim 9-7 lead throughout most of the game but fell apart in the final stages and lost 13-9 and therefore all hope of winning both the league championship and the Grey Saucer.

The second encounter was not quite as close but every bit as exciting. A House jumped into a quick 18-0 lead and was never threatened. It ended up 26-13. It was unfortunate that the field was like a barnyard, but then all four teams played like animals and the results most likely would have remained the same.

After fifty-eight games had been played, the entire gridiron picture had boiled down to a best two out of three playoff between D House and the Axemen. The games were scheduled for Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday (if necessary). The first one went to A House in a squeaker, 16-15.

Things were so tense that A House was forced to run out the clock with one minute remaining in the game. Scoring for D House were Paul Sullivan (touchdown and convert), Jim Coronneo (touchdown) and Brian Newlands with three punt singles.

Ian Wightman was the big gun for the winners, matching Sullivan's output of eight.

Tom Ellison got the other major award. The Shields kicked three singles.