

Legal invasion of private mail

OTTAWA (CUP)—The government has introduced a bill which, if passed, will allow police to open a private citizen's mail for up to three years.

The bill regulation would permit any police force in Canada to open the mail if they "have reason to believe that it may contain illegal drugs or communications amounting to a threat to national security."

A judge of the superior court would have to authorize each interception, which according to the government, would only be done when all other procedures and attempts have failed.

Solicitor General Jean-Jacques Blais said that there had been fewer than 100 mail interceptions by the security service of the RCMP since 1970. He said this legislation, proposed under bill C-26, would be in effect for one year after the Royal Commission investigating RCMP illegalities submits its report to Parliament.

The government has been accused of undermining the work of the royal commission by introducing legislation before the first report of the commission is out, and opposition critics have said

that they will fight its passage.

Civil liberty groups have also criticized the bill, stating that it gives the government too much power and could be abused.

The legislation affects the Criminal Code, the Crown Liability Act and the Post Office Act and is seen by the government as a consolidation of previous legislation.

Each warrant issued would be valid for an initial 60 days but could be renewed. Interceptions lasting for the maximum three-year period would have to be signed by the Solicitor General.

tinued presence of his writings on the market ensure that, contempt law or not, hypocrisy and cant will get the roasting they deserve. Yet this is detracting from the main point: the implications of facing contempt procedures are as serious in February 1978 as in December 1968.

For somewhere in the deep recesses of Dalhousie University, there's another 21-year-old Tom Murphy . . .

Sincerely,
Bruce Wallace, Moncton, N.B.,
BA Hns (UNB)
Class of 1970

No class ?

To the Gazette:
Devoted and / or Prospective CKDU Listeners:

Since the 77-78 session began and things started rolling at CKDU, we became aware of a certain (shall we say "captive") audience which has gone to considerable effort to be recognized by us. No names are mentioned, but suffice it to say that they are a portion of the SUB staff.

Their response to our programming has been significantly consistent. Early in the year, they served us with a list of names demanding that CKDU BAN Classical music from the SUB. Since that time, they have called in almost daily criticizing the broadcasts of any and all forms of classical music from Bach to Gershwin.

At this time, we were broadcasting for 120 hours per week, with 5 hours and 20 minutes of scheduled classical music per week. This comprised a total of 4.4% of our broadcast content. Our promise of performance to the CRTC specifies that we are committed to 4.5%. So we were barely meeting standards at that time. Since then our content standards have improved, with the addition of some well-coordinated formats in which to present this music.

Enough statistics. Part of our policy at CKDU is that we provide a wide service to the members of the Dalhousie student community. We certainly have a debt to the music students, some of whom have and still do contribute to the running of CKDU.

In addition to this, we feel it imperative to recognize "classical" (i.e. classical, baroque, romantic) music as the important, necessary, and well established musical form that it is. It is absolutely absurd to think that this music has no present-day value. It is obviously the solid foundation of any significant present-day musical form.

I can understand the variance in taste which people have, and also that this particular group is a forced captive audience. However, I feel that their requests are very unreasonable. They have not asked for us to simply decrease our classical content. They want us to abolish it, and (in some cases) replace it with such musical forms as "Disco" and "Boogie". I do not wish to detract from whatever merits these forms may have, but I sincerely feel that they are available from plenty of other sources.

We have no intention of reverting to the musical mediocrity of a muzak system for the S.U.B., considering that we broadcast to the three residences, nor do we intend to become a top 40 AM station. We appreciate response and suggestions, and hope to build from them. However, these suggestions should be within the limits of reason.

Pat Gaul
Program Director

Letters continued from page 5

Reasonable request

To the Gazette:

Marc Allain in his article "Students Approached for Funds" (Feb. 9) has made at least one error in not verifying the information provided to him by Mr. Trent Thompson. He states: "According to the King's student union constitution, council can unilaterally increase student fees." That is not correct. I wrote King's constitution and I can assure you I am fully aware of its contents and the intentions of the student union when it was approved (after almost 6 months active debate). In the spring of 1976, the new document was approved by Special Resolution as defined by RSNS 287 (1976). Council has absolutely no power with respect to changes in union fees. The only proper means of changing the fee rate is by Special Resolution, i.e. approval of two-thirds of a general meeting of the whole union.

It is also suggested that the request for a student contribution to King's 200 by Dr. Godfrey is somehow unfair to the generally impoverished King's student. I am sure Dr. Godfrey will agree that it is regrettable that he would have to make such a request, but the reality of fund-raising in these austere times seems to be lost on Mr. Thompson. It is perfectly reasonable for any corporate sponsor being approached for a sizable donation, to ask: "How much have the people to whom this institution

allegedly means so much contributed?" The difference between a donation and a handout is that a donation helps out with a program already in progress; a going concern, if you will. If King's students don't believe in King's Tomorrow, how can they reasonably expect any one else to?

Mr. Thompson should cease his pitiful bellyaching and make a concrete contribution to that which he holds so 'dear'.

Dale Robertson
Chairman
Constitutional Committee
King's College, 1975-77

Contempt is a serious charge

To the Gazette:

Your article by Denise Roberge in the January 26th Gazette "Cameron speaks," concerning writer Silver Don Cameron's Law Hour address, "Journalism and the Contempt Law," was most perceptive.

Writer Cameron was illustrating his point with reference to an incident which occurred on the campus of the University of New Brunswick nine and a half years ago, near the height of the anti-war movement's impact. Cameron had just joined the faculty of U.N.B. that fall, and the sequence of events which led to the Tom Murphy article occurred with dizzying swiftness.

Cameron was one of the few professors who spoke clearly and unambiguously for fair treatment of Dr. Norman Strax, an American physics professor who was barred from campus by a court injunction, for a disruptive incident involving closure of the university library—barely five days from registration and the beginning of classes.

Whatever purpose may have been served by the incident, it was

clear that the lines of communication were abominable.

Monopoly control of the local press, owned by industrialist K.C. Irving—who was then a member of the university board of governors, and whose papers were in full editorial support of American involvement in Viet Nam—ensured that, whatever the sequence of events, neither Dr. Strax nor anyone supporting him could obtain a fair hearing. However, C.B.C. radio and the Toronto Globe & Mail provided objective reporting. Public opinion was in the main almost totally moulded (and manipulated) by the Irving-controlled media.

It was in this situation that Tom Murphy wrote his column, Spades Down. The "long-haired, bearded student activist" was one of the few serious and thoughtful students with a completely humanistic perspective on the campus at that time. However, I hope to do him no discourtesy in saying that when he was writing the article referring to the courts as "instruments of the corporate elite" that he was expecting the student paper to be so widely read as it was; it was not then the practice to distribute the Brunswick in downtown Fredericton, with the exception of perhaps a token thirty copies.

The New Brunswick courts landed on him with both feet.

The situation has hardly changed. The New Brunswick media serve the interests of the powerful, partly out of fear of the contempt law and partly through the sheer relish of serving the vested interests. The recent "Friday afternoon massacre" at the Fredericton Daily Gleaner and the cognate case at the Halifax Herald, over the prospect of reporters forming a union, shows the editorial regard for the desire to play on the right side of the contempt law.

Silver Don Cameron may claim to be "disenchanted" but the con-

WARNING:

This Month's Issue of the

NATIONAL LAMPOON

Contains Printed Material That May Be Found Hilarious by Canadians.

On Sale Now



Cottman
TRANSMISSION

189 Herring Cove Road, Halifax
Call (902)-477-8001

CAR TROUBLE?

WE'RE GIVING
A 15% DISCOUNT

TO DALHOUSIE STUDENTS & FACULTY
CALL 477-8001

- Please show your membership card when paying the bill.
- We offer 24 hr. FREE TOWING SERVICE within 15 miles of downtown Hfx. 455-1566