

External affairs on U.S.-Canada relations

by E. Nijenhuis

Last Friday, Dalhousie's Center for Foreign Policy Studies hosted high level officials from the Department of External Affairs and invited participants, in a Foreign Policy Seminar. These seminars represent a relatively recent attempt by the Department of External Affairs to maintain closer contacts with their informed constituency. The purpose of the seminar was to exchange information, as well as to inform the participants of recent developments in Canada's Foreign Policy.

The two morning sessions were entitled "Canadian Policy towards the Middle East situation" and "International Cooperation to protect the Fisheries". In keeping with a traditional policy, these sessions were closed both to the public and to reporting. According to Dr. G.R. Winham of Dalhousie's Center for Foreign Policy Studies, the sessions were both informative and useful.

The Hon. Allan MacEachen, Secretary of State for External Affairs was the guest speaker at a luncheon that followed at Shirreff Hall.

The afternoon session, which was open to the public, was about Canada - U.S. relations. The meeting was chaired by Dr. D. Stairs of the Center for Foreign Policy Studies, with an introduction given by Mr. Whittleton Deputy of Director of the US division of the Department of External Affairs and a commentary by Dr. Munton a specialist in Canada-US relations at Dalhousie.

No new policy was revealed by Mr. Whittleton in his background talk. According to Mr. Whittleton, a turning point in Canada-US relations was the application by the US

of so called "Nixon economics". As part of this policy, Canadian goods were included in a general restriction of trade. This led Canada to seek new ties and markets to act as a counter-weight to American influence. Currently, negotiations are under way for a contractual link with the EEC. The recent trip by Prime Minister Trudeau to Mexico, Cuba and Venezuela was also part of this "Third Option" policy.

According to Mr. Whittleton, the main reason for tensions in relations between the two countries at this time is a mutual lack of understanding of each others atti-

tudes and policy goals and the impact these policies have on the other's interests. The only way this problem can be resolved is through frequent high level consultation and negotiations.

An example given of the positive effects of frequent consultation, was Canada's Energy Policy. Initially, it was faced with a good deal of hostility, but the U.S. is now able to accept the oil export restrictions as representing an issue vital to Canadian interests.

Problems still exist in areas where vital interests are not so readily apparent. Examples of this

are the Time and Readers Digest rulings, the recent CRTC rulings concerning American advertising on Canadian television as well as the workings of the Foreign Policy Review Board. These are seen by some as a manifestation of anti-Americanism. Canada views these policies merely as straightening out irregularities in the tax laws or necessary if Canada is to maintain its national identity. The solution of the problem can only be found in keeping interested segments of the American population informed on the reasons for Canadian policy.



Snow storm did not cancel classes and made walking difficult for awhile. Dal Photo / Walsh

Possible senate reform

by Patricia Aikens

The crucial question of Senate reform is currently under debate by Senate members. Several proposals as to the method of reform have been put forth in the monthly meetings, and it seems that substantial changes are needed concerning the size and the representation of the Senate.

As it stands, the Dalhousie Senate is comprised of 264 members - all full time professors (136), 17 Ex-Officio members (President, Vice-Presidents, Dean, Registrar) 20 members from the affiliated institutions of Kings, Mt. St. Vincent and the Nova Scotia Technical College, 57 chairpersons (Heads of Departments, Directors of Schools or Institutes), 28 other academics and 6 students.

Senate members who propose reform want membership reduced from the ridiculously high number of 264, to a more sensible number of perhaps 70 members, and want representatives to be elected. Presently members are accorded their seats by the position they hold in the university). According to Helen Spinelli, a member of the Committee on Senate Reform, only a small number of the 264 members handle the Senate business anyway. As for representation, Ms. Spinelli feels that the automatic membership of full time professors should be abolished and student membership increased because the Senate needs more representative members in order to function as a body.

The Senate Council was previously established as a body organization to take care of the routine

matters of Senate, however, it has since taken all meaningful debate away from the Senate, says Ms. Spinelli. For example, the Senate Council may discuss an issue and the Senate, like a rubber stamp perhaps, "gives tacit approval or disapproval".

Professor K.A. Heard, who is the chairman of Committee on Senate Reform, does not entirely agree with Ms. Spinelli. Although he admits that many issues in Senate do not receive proper debate, he feels strongly that the Senate is much more than a rubber stamp.

Those opposed to Senate reform are opposed to the changes on three

groups. To begin with, they feel the membership is not too large because only a certain number of members (about 40) show up regularly anyway. Secondly, they feel that with a membership of full time professors, Ex-Officio members, and administrators, a certain wisdom and experience is added to the Senate which the students do

not possess. Finally, the system works, so why try to change it?

It does not seem probable that the debate surrounding Senate reform will be resolved in the near future. And as Professor Heard says, "It's always difficult to persuade the enfranchised to disenfranchise themselves"!

Manitoba acts on housing

WINNIPEG (CUP) ---- Because of "the total lack of reasonable housing now available for students", the student unions at the University of Manitoba and Red River Community College have decided to become involved in supplying housing for students.

The U of M student union council January 29 decided to form a joint Housing Management Board with the Red River Students Association.

The board will be responsible for investigating different forms of housing and different ways of housing, administering, and allocating the housing.

The council also recognized the "need for the government and the university to supply reasonable housing for students in post-secondary institutions" and agreed to continue lobbying for increased housing funds.

According to U of M student union director Brent Mooney, the board has several options in the kinds of housing it will recommend. These include used houses, new apartment blocks, used apartment blocks or new houses.

Mooney said he would prefer

used houses, because they are cheap and easy to renovate and could be bought in small units. His second choice was new apartment blocks, because they could be located near the university, financed by CMHC mortgage and adapted to the needs of students.

Once the board has decided what kind of housing to recommend, it will bring its choice to the U of M and Red River student councils. The councils will then allocate funds to purchase and renovate the housing.

The board will then become a joint corporation owned by the two student unions. It will be in charge of setting policy for purchasing housing, making investments, and hiring management to oversee the daily operation of the housing.

The corporation would be legally separate from the student unions, so they would not be liable if it folded.

The money for setting up the corporation and buying housing, said Mooney, would come from a surplus built up by the Red River student association and a sinking fund established by the U of M student union.



Student senator Peter Clarke Photo / Grandy