

**Oral History Interview with Dr. Guy Chauvin**  
**Conducted by Angela Baker, May 31, 1993**  
Transcription by Anne MacLean, August 6, 1999

AB: All right. Let's start off with a little bit of background information. Could you state your full name?

GC: Guy Chauvin.

AB: And your date and place of birth?

GC: Oh, gosh! Fourth of October, 1936. Montreal.

AB: Okay. Could you describe your educational background?

GC: I went to school! Educated in French, took first year engin., well high school in Mont Sainte Louis and then first year Engineering at L'École Polytechnique, and switched to McGill University and the Commerce program. Got a B.Comm. degree and then I went to the Navy and got a number of Naval courses and training, and all this kind of stuff, and various places; in Montreal, Portsmouth in England and various other bits of training. Then I came to Halifax. So I was in Halifax and I started an M.A. program at Dal University, and then in Political Science. My commerce degree was honours Economics and Political Science. Public Administration is the political science thing, but I did most of the History of Political Thought courses. And, so, Dalhousie. Then I left the Navy, got a job teaching here without having finished my Master's degree yet. In those days, that was the 1960s, the middle to late 1960s, the University was expanding. Universities all across the country were expanding tremendously, and you could get a job, provided you, more or less, provided you said I'm really interested in scholarship, or something. And as I said, I'd started, done quite a bit of the course work towards the M.A., and then I finished my M.A. I taught here for a number of years, and I took leave, three years leave, and went into the Ph.D., or did the residency requirement for a Ph.D. degree, and completed that at Trinity College, Dublin, in Ireland.

AB: Okay. So how many years have you been associated with Saint Mary's?

GC: Twenty-five.

AB: Twenty-five? And what capacity were you first? Were you a lecturer?

GC: I was a lecturer.

AB: SO how has your role at Saint Mary's changed over time?

GC: Well, it hasn't changed much. I still teach. The role hasn't changed much. I've become involved in faculty affairs to a greater extent than I was when I first came here. I showed no interest. I'd come from military, the hierarchy and so on, of the military. I

wasn't likely to be a disruptive influence. I followed orders, and that kind of thing, and this was a very paternalistic organization at that time; it was run by the Jesuits, sort of thing. But gradually I got involved in politics as various things happened to friends of mine, and so on. And I got drawn into faculty politics, and now I'm president of the Faculty Union. So in that, and.., I've president of the Faculty Union, off and on, for many years, so I suppose, in that sense, my role has changed; I've gotten more involved in faculty affairs.

AB: You were quite involved in the institution of the union, weren't you?

GC: Yeah. Well, the institution of the union, I was on the C.U.P.E side, and there was a fight about how this place would unionize. I was in favour of unionizing through C.U.P.E., rather than C.A.U.T.E., who had no experience in unions. We were the first, oh no, we weren't the first, there was a union before ours, certified in British Columbia in the days when you could have unions in British Columbia. Nelson, British Columbia, which was a small university, which has, after it unionized, was closed by the government. It was the skiers' university, and Nancy Green and various other famous Canadian skiers, trained or did their studies at Nelson, British Columbia in those days, because it was up in the mountains. It was a great place for skiing, up in the Rockies, they would study and ski. But it a very small university, and that was the first English-speaking Canada..., there were [santicles] in Quebec but there were no unions, English-speaking unions before Nelson, and we were the next. We haven't been closed yet, so.

AB: That's good! So, what affect; what changes took place after the union came?

GC: Well, the chan..., many of the changes had taken place before the union came in, I mentioned earlier that this was a rather paternalistic organization - it was run by Jesuit priests, who are, you know, the soldiers of Christ; running things in a very militaristic line, and there was the president, the very reverend, father president, or reverend father, doctor president. And there were the, there were lots of priests teaching here at the time. As that control slipped, there was a bit of a vacuum created, as the university became laicized. And there were problems, some of the, face it - some of the Jesuits had some problems towards the end. There was a shortage, I guess, of young priests coming in, and some of the priests were doing some fairly strange things, there were, for a variety of reasons. There was a great deal of.. the church was going through some problems, I think, the Catholic church, a lot of people, a lot of priests leaving, becoming laicized. And there was a bit of a vacuum.

We had a faculty manual. I remember working on the faculty manual for long hours, drafting the faculty manual, which was sort of a, the rules by which we would live, sort of thing, and how the administration would treat faculty, and how faculty would respond, and so on. And we worked long periods of, long evenings. I can remember working long evenings with the then Chair of the Psychology Department, and the Dean, Dean of Engineering. We had a Dean of Engineering in those days. And we worked on a mutually agreeable faculty manual which would govern the faculty association, which we then

had, and its relationships with the administration. And then we got our first lay president, who came here, and more or less told us this faculty manual wasn't worth the paper it was printed on. As far as he was concerned, it wasn't a legal document, and he didn't intend to be bound by it. Now the Jesuit priest, the last Jesuit President, Father Labelle, more or less agreed, and that was why we had the Dean of Engineering more or less representing administration. This team we were negotiating with. And we were more or less told it wasn't going to count for anything, and that's really began the process of thinking about a union.

It took some time, it took five years I suppose, somewhere around five, four or five years, to go from that, to actually taking action to unionize the place because, again, because there was no experience. Nowadays, at universities, as soon as the shoe drops, they go in and unionize. But in those days - how do you do it in a university? You know, there was Nelson, British Columbia, not an encouraging example, having been shut down by the B.C. government. But having been told the faculty manual had no legal standing, and the president didn't intend to be bound by it, we were looking, what could we have that would bind the, the administration. What, what would create an ordered universe within which we could operate, instead of arbitrariness from the top?

The Jesuits were very paternalistic, but they were very kind as well. I mean, they were professionally charitable people! We weren't that sure about the lay president. We suspected that he didn't exercise in kin..., let's face it, the Jesuits, a few people had to be let go for a variety of reasons, and the faculty was somewhat unhappy; some of them were perhaps justified, people not being renewed, and so on. But there was no process, no procedure; they didn't know how these things were done, how decisions were arrived at. These people simply didn't get their contracts renewed, or were told to leave, or were bought out. And we weren't sure how this was happening, we just knew that some of these people disappeared, and some of them weren't happy to disappear; there was something a little bit strange happening there.

There were two cases about that time, of people who had to leave the university, or left; we're not sure what negotiations took place. This was part of the problem, all this was done behind closed doors, and so on. But one of them was someone I shared this office with, a professor of sociology, and he had to go, and you know might have been quite justified, but we just didn't know. No one was justified in the evidence, we were just told, we were simply told the president told him, more or less, to go. And he did go. He got a job somewhere else; it hasn't a matter of tremendous hardship for him. But it was disquieting to see these kinds of decisions coming down.

Now those came down with the, the, the last of the Jesuit fathers, and we were even more suspicious of the lay president. We just didn't know where we would; where there was an appeal if these kinds of decisions were made. And he did come in here and, like gang busters, the first president, the first lay president, announcing that he was going to fire all sorts of people, and so on. So that had, had panicked the faculty. And it's quite remarkable, when I say that this is the first university in English-speaking Canada, or the

oldest union, other than Nelson, British Columbia, the oldest union in English-speaking Canada, that this was a faculty that had, you know, grown up as a, in a paternalistic environment, run from the top by the very reverend, doctor president, running the show. That it was a faculty that was older than the average in university faculties. It had more religious than the average; more people were still Jesuits, and so on. It was a Catholic, fairly conservative faculty, and so on, and yet we unionized first, which is, just indicates how much of a radicalizing experience this was. This tossing away of the, the faculty manual, and the rather cavalier attitude towards firing, I mean, announcing that fourteen people are going to be fired, and so on. So, eventually, the faculty, got itself organized, formed a union, had a vote of non-confidence in the president; the president was told by Senate, that Senate didn't want him as Chair, anymore. And all this worked its way through. He finished his term, but without academic responsibilities in the last year of the term; he just served out his term. And that was it, I mean, we, we then had, we, by then we had a union; we were organized.

Then, then the union movement starting gaining speed at other universities. Nova Scotia now; St. Francis Xavier is not unionized, but I think it would unionize, it knows the way to do it; it would be done at the drop of a hat, if happened to be necessary. It may never become necessary, because, administrations may say well we'll treat the faculty, we, they wind up negotiating salaries, and so on. Here, salaries were, again, sort of manna from Heaven, I mean, we found out, we got a little letter every year that told us what our salaries was going to be for the next year, and we said thank you, very much. Now we negotiate those things, but even at X, which is not unionized, the one non-unionized university in the province, negotiate salaries; they have committees that meet with committees of the board, and so on. So they act almost like a certified, unionized university, but they are not. But every, both sides know if the relationship sours, they'll unionize like that! (as he snaps his fingers)

AB: So, relations changed after the...

GC: Well. . .

AB: Explain what .....

GC: Well, yeah. Relations changed from what they'd been just before unionization. I think, to some extent, they restored some faculty control over academic areas. It defined the relationship better, it became less arbitrary; the problem was arbitrariness. There was a Senate, and there continued to be a Senate after unionization, and the Senate decided academic issues; it had decided academic issues before. But it was just, now it was no longer arbitrary, or not everything was arbitrary. There were, there were steps to be taken, and established steps; recognized steps. And that, that made for a more formal relationship, and, as I say, it's even affected those universities that are not certified as trade unions; even those universities behave more as unionized universities. There's, out West, they can't unionize in Alberta, British Columbia. In British Columbia, I think there's a move to change that with the new government, but Alberta, they can't form trade

unions. But, boy, they sure work like trade unions! The, the universities tend to have professional officers for their associations, and so on, and they negotiate, it's just not on a certified basis. So, the whole climate of these things are determined - how salaries are arrived at, and how the relationships between the employer, or the administration, and the faculty - are, have changed across the country, whether the universities are unionized or not.

But we were part of the movement, and very early part of the movement; shortly after us, in a matter of months, there were universities in Ontario that began to do this, and so on, and it spread fairly rapidly across the country. I suppose the expansion had a lot to do with it; the expansion of the universities I mentioned. I came in here, and you just had to say, "oh yeah, I'd like to teach", "look at me, here I am", and you'd be hired, type of thing, it wasn't as it is today, you didn't have much, to have much by way of qualifications, or anything like that. So, the rapid expansion changed the nature of universities, they became much larger enterprises than they had been, and I think that complicated the administration of universities. Religious universities, there aren't very many that are still, you know, clearly, religiously affiliated. Even X, which is the last one here to change, but they have a lay president and X, and the Mount has a lay president, we have a lay president here. There are not that many that have retained a religious character; Sir Thomas More, in Saskatchewan, but it's part of the University of Saskatchewan, basically. There are some religiously affiliated colleges - Anglican, Lutheran and so - but the character of universities has changed; it's become more of a business, and governments want more accountability, and more accountability has meant more, growing administration, more financial officers, and so on. The university is watched more carefully, but that means they have more, faculty become concerned as to how money's spent; how much is going to faculty development, teaching resources, and this kind of stuff, and how much is going to the control function of the university.

And the control function has mushroomed, it has tremendously, and it is not entirely the fault of the administration; I mean, as union president I sort of take the view it's all due to administration, but the reality is much of it is due to the government demand being greater for accountability for the money it provides. I mean, government pays the lion's share of university education, you know, it's not the students that pay the lion's share; students here pay a fairly high proportion at Saint Mary's, of the cost of their education, but the government still pays most of it, and the governments are, well, you know the climate today. You know we had all this talk of rationalization, and the like, and I don't, and while we've changed governments, and I think that will change the climate a little bit, there's still going to be insistence that the government will want to know it's not wasting its money by pouring it into universities. Ironically, that doesn't always mean that there's more money being put into the teaching function, because, you know, you demand more accountability, you have more people who are counting for, for the money. So, the business offices mushroom and all sorts of those ancillary, in a sense, ancillary operations mushroom faster than the growth in faculty, in very many cases. We've seen that as a bit of a problem.

AB: Okay. Let's move on to academic changes that you've noticed over the years. Course offerings, and changes in academic programs, and this kind of thing.

GC: Oh, there've been changes in academic programs. Some, some things have changed, some things have changed for a number of reasons. Certainly, there's been a big development in the Faculty of Commerce, in this university; Accounting has, has grown, but Faculty of Commerce has always been a major area of the, of the, of Saint Mary's. But when I came to Saint Mary's twenty-five years ago, there were, were, there was an additional faculty, I guess, there was a Faculty of Engineering; had a Dean of Engineering. And then it became a division, and was folded in the Faculty of Science. But then there was, you know, when I first came here it was Arts and Science; that was one Faculty. It was Commerce, Engineering, Arts and Science, and Education; and Arts and Science was, of course, by far the biggest faculty, bringing in both the Arts and Science, and there was one Dean of Arts and Science, who was, ironically, an engineer, although he wasn't Dean of Engineering. So, there had been a few changes like that; Engineering has disappeared as a faculty, and Arts and Science have become split into, into two.

The faculty are far better trained today, there are far higher proportion of people with Ph.D.'s, for instance, than there were in those days. In fact, we have a very good record in terms of faculty qualifications here at Saint Mary's; most of our people have Ph.Ds. That has been a development, as well, in the Faculty of Commerce, for instance, a few years ago, one was absolutely amazed to see somebody with a Ph.D. in Accounting, for instance. Nowadays, high proportion of the Commerce, of the Department of Accounting, I mean, I'm not actually sure about numbers, but a high, a fairly high proportion have Ph.Ds. in Accounting; and so, there has been that change, the faculty has become more professional, or far more highly trained over the years. Certain areas have emerged, new areas - International Development Studies, Women's Studies, Atlantic Canada Studies - there have been some areas of studies that have developed. Others have disappeared; we once had a Western European Studies Program - that, that has vanished. So, these things come and go, I guess, with momentary enthusiasms of the vulgar multitude, or something like that. So, a few things have disappeared, many things get... One of the, it's not that easy, it's not the university that decides, "we're going to offer this", you have to get the sanction of the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission; there are lots of hoops to go through. Again, the question of accounting of money; the government wants to know what its money is going to be spent on. So, if you want to start a new program, you have to propose it to the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission, get approval, and so on; certainly there are, you know, trendy areas that develop in departments, and departments go in for something for a while, maybe then they become less trendy and get dropped, sort of thing. We have taught, of course, in Soviet Politics for a few years, in this department. Well, there isn't the Soviet union anymore; we have the courses on the books, but who's going to teach it? Well, partly it's the resources of the department, we don't have somebody who's an expert; but

at the moment, we don't look very hard for somebody who could come in and teach Soviet Politics because it's gone, it's not there anymore.

But sometimes, your teaching is governed by the interest of, the interest and competence of the people you have in the department. And you can't mount courses and, you know, even in say, literature, a particular era of literature, unless you've got somebody who's studied that era of literature, you know; if you'd had no one who'd ever read Chaucer, in the English Department, they couldn't teach a course on Chaucer. So, at one stage, we had somebody here who's quite familiar with the Middle East, and we had, regularly, had courses on Middle Eastern politics; we're interested in that area because that's certainly not an area that has faded. You have the conferences going on now between the Palestinians and the Israelis; tri-party talks, sponsored by the Americans, some of them, trying to resolve the problems of the Palestinians in Israel, and so on. That's still a very interesting area, and we, but we don't have anyone at the moment, on staff, who knows very much about the Middle East; maybe as part of a foreign policy course, you touch on it, or something like that; or International Relations. But we don't have anybody that's a specialist in Middle Eastern politics, or has that as one of the, a series of specialties; maybe we will.

So there are changes like that, which are not deliberate matters of choice, you know, it's not the department going, and saying "we want to teach a course in this"; we'll hire in that area, you do that occasionally when it's considered very important, but some of the other, we could not conceivably, in the Political Science Department, have found that we had on one, no one to teach Canadian Politics; we'd certainly be, you know, and a vacancy, we'd certainly hire in that area and insist that area be covered. But some of the areas the departments cover are sometimes a matter of accident, than design. Now, the changes that have occurred. Engineering has changed largely because it changed across the province; I mean, part of the change in, you know, from it being a department into a division, is that initially three years of Engineering was done at the satellite campuses, in a sense, and then you went and did two years at T.U.N.S.; what was then the technical; what was the Nova Scotia Tech I guess. What was it called? Gosh, it's amazing! You forget. What became T.U.N.S. anyways, and now T.U.N.S. does three years, and the subsidiary satellite campuses do two years. So, that's part of the reason for downgrading it from a Faculty, because it was doing a program of equal length to the, the other areas. So, that kind of thing has changed, and there have been changes in emphasis, for instance, in the Faculty of Education. I would think they've done a lot more with graduate students, graduate degrees in Education, than they used to because the teacher market is fairly well-supplied at the moment, except for, I guess, Physics and French, I suppose; the two "F" subjects. But the, so they, they train fewer, proportionally fewer undergraduate teachers, but more for upgrading of teachers who are already in the system, and coming to get Masters of Education, Masters of Arts in Education. Again, the degree has changed; there used to be just a M.A. in Education, now there's a Master of Education, which is without thesis, and so on. We probably give more masters degrees than we used to. We have developed the Department of Astronomy, which didn't exist....

well, it was Physics and Astronomy. When I first came here, I think they had one astronomer, and the rest were physicists. Now it's be, it's again Astronomy and Physics now, but, I think, it's Astronomy and Physics instead of Physics and Astronomy; you get that kind of change that doesn't a fairly new program. Certainly the M.B.A. is, you know, something that has developed; certain masters degrees have emerged in that way.

So, the offerings of the university are a little bit larger, a little bit wider; International Development Studies I mentioned, that was a new area that came in and certainly developed, the Masters in Psychology is a, you know, there has been some growth in graduate programs, though we have continued to concentrate on undergraduate education; and people worry about that. People are worried about, some people are, I don't imagine all of them are, some people are worried about the proposal, for instance, for a Ph.D. in Accounting which has been put forward; this will detract from teaching undergraduates. So Nova Scotia universities have done reasonably well in attracting students form outside, and largely because, I think, they're small; people like coming here for undergraduate degrees. I mean, it's not just Saint Mary's, I mean, that's true at Acadia, X, so on. We do, the province of Nova Scotia imports more student than any other province in the country, proportionally; a higher proportion of our students are from outside Nova Scotia than anywhere else, which leads to financial problems, funding and so forth. But that is because we're smaller universities that offer a, perhaps more intimate atmosphere for undergraduates; they do meet the professor who's teaching the course, rather than a graduate teaching assistant who's finishing his Ph.D. thesis and really would like to get back to chapter two, rather than talk to a student, and so on.

AB: So what differences have you noticed in the student population over the years?

GC: Oh, well, they, they, there are, there are obviously moods that, that sweep through. I mean, I came here in the sixties, and I was here in the late sixties, which was the period of student rebellion. Demonstrations, food demonstrations, people picking up their lunches and dumping them all in giant garbage bags out in the pa..., what was then the parking lot, now the library. You know there was this kind of thing going on, student rebellion, and so on; that died down and we haven't seen much of that student radicalism since. Students, well I supp..., we always complain that students can't write, that they're worse than they ever were, and so on. I'm not sure about that. You talk to high school teachers, there has been a change in terms of their reading and writing, I think, which has obviously affected university; that's mainly on the academic side of students, but the television culture, and the visual culture, has affected the, retarded a bit, the ability to read and write. I think that's had an impact on that. So we do tend to, I think, exaggerate the ignorance of students when they arrive, and their awful writing styles and so on. But the, students now, partially because of the economy, or probably mainly because of the economy are more concerned about what they're going to do when they come out; is there going to be a job there? and so on. Whereas, students in the late sixties were not that concerned, they knew there was a job out there. When I was an undergraduate, and that's

going even considerably further back, but when I was an undergraduate taking a commerce degree, we had a course on Saturday mornings that I can remember, which was Commercial Law. Commercial Law was on Saturday mornings on your final year. It was from nine to twelve and that's the only time you got it, so people did show up. But when you came out at twelve, there were people waiting outside, from brokerage firms, and trust companies, because we were commerce students. "We buy you lunch?" They want to talk to you about hiring you for a job. And that would start at the beginning of the year, they would be enticing you to go and work for them, and so on; pretty different, or very different today.

So, I think students have become very concerned, and they don't want to rock the boat; to a greater extent than they used to. So, you don't get the student radicalism that there was in the sixties. I don't think it was particularly bad here at Saint Mary's, but we did have student radicals; I can remember a few names, which I won't put on record, of students who were leaders of some kind of student rebellion on campus. And it upset some members of faculty, it upset many members of faculty. It didn't upset me particularly; at one stage, I think I was the only faculty member who would talk to these people. But they used to come and see me and spend time in my office, and sometimes I told them what they were doing was stupid, but they just said "we'll, we have to do it, you know". It was sort of the story of the French Revolution, when one of the French revolutionary leaders was saying, "the mob is marching, and I am their leader. I must go and take the front". The whole type of thing. So, it was that kind of thing, at the time; that has quieted down, we haven't seen it again. I imagine one of these days that kind of thing will come again; it just hasn't dropped up.

Other changes, of course, specifically at Saint Mary's is that Saint Mary's was initially an all-male institution, when I first came here there were very few female students, there were part-timers. The only females were part-time students; most of us had one or two in my, a class. Today, half your students, well I suppose slightly larger, well it's almost a representation of the population at large with fifty-two percent of women; though for different reasons, the population at large is because they live longer, more old ladies than you have old men, old gents. But that has changed considerably; in the sea of faces before you in class, you see many more female students, And I tend to see, I don't want to describe them as more serious students because a lot of the student rebellion had a serious purpose; they had a lot of fun doing, I expect, but it was a, it was a bit of rebellion that went the society and so on. And the society accommodated them, to some extent.

There was a regulation here, you had to wear a jacket and, and tie to go to class; now, that was in the day of the all-male class. Well, some people would come without shirts; that was the way you rebelled, but you still came with a jacket and a tie, no shirt, no trousers or something. But the, that has changed, I mean, no dress code. Nowadays, when you see somebody coming up with a, coming to class with a tie and jacket, or a female student coming in with a dress, and so on, you know they're headed for an interview; they're, they're going for a job interview that day. So, it's not standard anymore, but that was part

of it; breaking down those, those rules, which I'm not sure what relevance they, they really had, except to say that once you get out into the business world, you may have to wear a three-piece suit, type of thing. But why? You don't have to practice for years to learn how to wear a three-piece suit. That seemed to be the thinking; oh yes, you're going to be a university graduate, you're going to get a job, with an insurance company, or something, and you'll have to wear a suit so, you gotta start practicing; years of practice of doing up buttons! So, there wasn't much rational behind those kinds of rules, and some of them have, have been kicked aside. The important rules are the academic regulations, and even those are sometimes a little bit strange; it tends to be those that are important, more so than the, the rules about dress codes. So, the rebellions of the sixties did break down that insistence on shortened haircuts, and that kind of, it was like being in the military; the rules were not enforced as stringently, but that, that has changed as a result, I think, of the rebellion of the 1960s.

But they certainly, they wanted to change the world, but it didn't work very well; and someday, someone will come along and want to change the world again. I think every time there's one of these movements it gets disappointed, it never accomplishes what it sets out to do; but it makes a few changes, then retreats, becomes discouraged and joins the conforming multitude. I mean, strange to think of some of those people, some of those people who were student rebels, who are now deputy ministers and politicians; very conventional, and so on. I know one of them who became the deputy minister, but they've changed a lot in those years. But there's always a need for somebody. I think we lack that today, I think, because of the economic circumstances; because students are worried about whether they're going to get a job, and let's not have any black marks against our name, and let's make sure we get top-notch letters of reference - saying we are polite - and all this kind of stuff. You do miss the challenge, that there should be to all sorts of things; you should be challenged out there. In society, the homelessness, and single parents, and lack of funding for all sorts of things, and the misery that exists in our society. I mean, recent reports saying that we're not treating children well, in Canada; we're not looking after the welfare of children. Well, well that should upset students. This is a stage where people should where people should become upset with that. One of the problems is that students work too much today; they don't sit around and get indignant, work on each other, and work themselves up because they have to go and sling hash at something like McDonald's, or something. Oh, did we stop?

AB: Just checking.

GC: They have to go sling hash at McDonald's, or work as a bartender or waitress, or something like that; the students are losing part of their education because of that. And that's most unfortunate, but we, you know, contribute to that by raising fees all the time; fees are becoming higher and higher and that makes life very difficult, and I'm quite convinced that students do lose a significant element in their education by having to do that. When I was an undergraduate, w..., very few, we might work one night a week, or something like that, or we'd be in the military and get paid as a reservist for one or two

night and a weekend every four, something like that; but we didn't that much money, we were probably more affluent than many of the students that come to university today. But also the fees, proportionally, were considerably lower. And we used to, after class, I can remember going to the McGill tea room, that was what one at McGill. I remember going to the McGill tea room and we'd sit there, sure, we'd joke and so on, but we'd also discuss Joseph Schumpeter's "Socialism, Communism and Democracy" which happened to be one of the textbooks in one of our Economics courses, which was a very stimulating textbook, and so. And we'd talk about the arguments, so we learned more, I think, doing that, rehearsing the arguments we'd heard, rehearsing our profs commentary all on the idea of Schumpeter, and so on, then we did in class. But we needed the class to provide the commentary that we would then discuss and hash over. If you have to go down to McDonald's twenty minutes after you finish the end of class and you sling hamburgers for three hours, or something like that, and then you come, you've forgotten what you got at that lecture.

I mean, you're not... that's an important part of education, and I think people are missing out on that today and are less, people, this be an economics course and we can go after and have a cup of tea, or coffee, or something like that after an economics course, but there'd be engineers, all sorts of people taking Economics as an elective. There'd be also those of us who were Economics majors, or honors, so on, discussing it from their perspective, so on. You know, this could be a very stimulating discussion. So okay, we'd take an hour doing that, and we'd spend half an hour discussing the lecture or forty minutes discussing the lecture and twenty minutes flirting with the female students and so on. They with us and all that. But we would do some of that kind of exercise, do some of that intellectual processing of the ideas we were being exposed to. And that's missing today, for many students, if not most students, that kind of thing is no longer possible.

So, that's a change, and that's not a change for the better. On the other hand, universities offer courses that are topical perhaps, the programs are less rigid than they used to be, you can tailor your program to what interests you, more than you could in the past. You know, many of the former undergraduate programs you only had a couple of electives that were allowed, I mean, you had to take this, this, this, or something. Your course was mapped out a lot more carefully and a lot more strictly than it is now. Some of that's good, some of that's not so good, because you don't necessarily get the progression of courses that you want to have. You wind up sometimes with a salad of sometimes incompatible elements, sort of thing. But, so there's something to be gained, and something to be lost. It was probably too rigid, maybe now we're not rigid enough. You know if you t., you've taken a B.A. I imagine, or take a B.A. lately, the only thing you have to take is that list, those five courses in your first year, one humanities, one, two social sciences and this and that, and English 200 - it's not 200 anymore, it's 201 and 202 or something like that, and either a language, other than English, Philosophy 200 or a natural science. Is that about it? Yeah, I guess that covers it.

AB: That's it?

GC: So, that's the only rigidity, except by departments. Then if you elect a major, you'll be required to take one or two courses in the department. That's it. After that, you shop. You can wind up with a rather disparate, on the other hand, if you work at it carefully and plan your program well, you can wind up with a splendid success, you know, of course. But this leaves it more to the student than it used to be. It's what you make of it.

AB: Have you noticed any changes in the ethnicity and age of your students, over the years?

GC: Not all that much. We used to have, well, you could say there are fewer, I would say there are fewer black students today than there were before, but that's largely because the fees that have been imposed on foreign students have discouraged some of the Jamaican and West Indies students from coming up. We are not getting much of the Native, Black or Mi'kmaq population, and that's a shame. I think we have to work harder at getting those people in. But raising fees and eliminating bursaries isn't going to do it. The government, the previous government - it's gone now, one shouldn't say evil things about a deceased government, I guess...

AB: Yeah. No.

GC: But I think what they did with eliminating bursaries was hard on those people. A large number of studies have indicated that people who are poor are more reluctant to go into debt than the middle-classes. There's an uneasiness about debt, and let's face it, you know, the people who, the black indigenous population of Nova Scotia, as a result of massive discrimination, and so on, of racism and so on, tends to be poor. The Preston area is not the South end of Halifax, I mean they tend to be poor out there, and they're going to be even more reluctant to come to university when there's no bursary, or when the bursary is subject to taking a large loan. And to face being in debt when you come out of university, that tends to upset people. So, I don't think that's been constructive, in terms of attracting those people, the middle-class, yeah. Put more money into loans, because loans you get, or you hope to get the money back. And maybe it's cheaper for the government to provide loans than it is to provide bursaries, obviously. But I think for some of those people, it, this doesn't work. So, there has been a change in that sense. Of course, women, you asked about, well this is not ethnicity but certainly it's a change. I think, we've seen a few more Native/Micmac students, in recent years, but there were some in those days as well, and they're certainly not here in large numbers. What was the other one you said?

AB: Age.

GC: Age. Well, there were always part-time students who were upgrading. What you see now are more mature students doing full, full degrees. People take a year off, or two years off, you know. People who've done some university and are coming back to finish a degree. I think you see more of those today. So the age, you tend to have mature students who are doing full, but at each individual courses, because you have part-timers who were coming in and taking one course, or something like that. The change hasn't been

remarkable. I haven't found it remarkable, you, you, I suppose possibly, slightly older, average age because you do get students who are somewhat older. Well in the past year, I've a number of older students in various classes, I suppose. Some of them are senior citizens coming back, you know, retired and never had a chance to get a university education, or they got an education in something else, and they'd like to get a degree in some other subject, or something like that. Some of those people come back, but they weren't absent..., they weren't non-existent twenty-five years ago. I suppose there were fewer of those twenty-five years ago, but you did get part-timers in a course, so that's slightly older, yeah. Slight rise in age.

AB: In the changes in the size of the university, have you noticed your relationship with you students change any over the years?

GC: Yeah, it's less intimate today, I think, than it was then. Though that's always with some students, but there were more, I think, of them who were on a very close relationship with, with faculty members, in the past than today. Today you tend to concentrate on the very good student who are going to do honours, and you know you have a close relationship with honours students. They're in your office all the time. Less with the, the run of the mill student, you don't look for them, and they don't look for you, or less than they used to, I think. That, that has changed a little bit, and this is not improving. The student- faculty ratio at this university is very bad in that sense; there's a very large student-faculty ratio. See you're getting more and more students per faculty member at the university and limits the opportunity for contact and the like. So, that creates a bit of a distance, I suppose, though it's still much closer than what my experience was when I was an undergraduate in a university with large graduate schools and lots of graduate students. As an Honours student, I was entitled by right, twenty minutes every fortnight with a faculty advisor. I'd go in and he had a big pocket watch on his desk, when the twenty minutes came around didn't matter if I was in the middle of a sentence, or whatever, I would be told "Sorry, I have another student waiting", sort of thing. And you'd have to go and be replaced by another honours student, and those were honours students! The ordinary undergraduate didn't get a hell of a lot of time from faculty members, and many of the courses were taught by Ph.D. candidates, and the like. The fact that we are an undergraduate institution has saved us from that fate, or saved the undergraduates here from that fate. But it's becoming more and more difficult to deal with the large number of students, per faculty member, and also they've got to go to McDonald's and sling hash. They're not around as much as they used to be.

AB: Okay. That's about all I wanted to cover. Is there anything else you can think of that you'd like to add? Changes you've seen over time?

GC: Oh, well. Changes over time. The university has expanded. I'd like to see some more changes, obviously. Like to see a better library, though we've certainly improved. A smaller proportion of the Library's space is taken up with the lives of the saints today, than used to be the case twenty-five years ago. I think many of the problems are financial, you know, there aren't the resources to hire more faculty. I mean, the way to

improve the faculty to student ratio is to hire more faculty. But there's not enough money to hire more faculty. The way to improve the Library is to buy more books and to subscribe to more journals, but nowadays if you want to subscribe to a new journal, and there are new journals coming out, then you have to get rid of an old one. And the fact that it's been published for ten years doesn't mean, there's nothing left in that area.

AB: Yeah

GC: It's very difficult to make these choices, and to decide on what you're going to cancel. And what you end up doing is canceling something that you aren't using that year, and two years down the road you hire somebody whose area of specialization is in that journal's area. And, of course, you've got to get back to that journal. And not only back to that journal, but buy the back issues of the journal. And that's all easy to do, we've done that. I belong to the Irish studies committee, and I teach an Irish politics course that we have, and some years ago we used to get, through the History Department, we used to get the Irish, Irish Historical Study. A very fine journal on Irish history, but before we set up the Chair in Irish Studies, somebody assessed that it was an expensive journal and we weren't teaching Irish History, so we cancelled it. Well now we've got a Chair of Irish Studies, we're emphasizing Irish Studies and the Canadian government is coming in with money for Irish Studies, and we don't have that major journal. That's the major journal in History. There's an Irish political studies, but that's more limited to politics. But for a study of Irish society, and I believe the major journal, is the Irish Historical Studies. Much broader than, Ireland's a much smaller country, but it does have a lot of articles on the history, politics. It really is, a much more comprehensive coverage of various areas of Irish Studies than one would expect than simply as an Irish historical journal. So we did order all the back issues we had missed. Well, that was a fairly expensive project. Now, fortunately, because the Chair of Irish Studies was available from the charitable Irish Society and so on, eventually, Cyril Byrne, who got the Order of Canada for his fundraising, for the Chair of Irish Studies, managed to squeeze money out of various turnips around the country.

AB: Yeah

GC: And did get enough money for us to get back issues of that journal. But you see what happens; this is the tragedy in the sense. We've cancelled some journals, we've cancelled the Journal of Political Theory because it's the most expensive journal in the social sciences. Well, I subscribe to it, I have a personal subscription, so that, when, it's not because I want to teach political theory, so that it's not completely lost here. But I've had to step in and buy my own subscription because we've cancelled the library's subscription. I don't mind, that means I get to keep them, but..

AB: Yeah.

GC: But, that we shouldn't have to do things like that. But that's a question of funding, inadequate funding. Saint Mary's been very badly funded. Also, is a problem in

attracting faculty to, to this university. We... the Maritimes are paid less on the whole, fifteen percent less than the rest of the country. Well, if you're, at the moment if you're offering jobs to political scientists that's not a major problem, but if you're offering jobs to Accountants, Ph.Ds. in accounting, that is a problem. So you end up paying a market differential to people; paying more money to get them here, so the salary is more comparable to what they'd get somewhere else. That leads to people who are already here and aren't getting the differential saying, "Hey, how come he or she is getting more money than I am?" It leads to tensions, to problems which at some stage are going to blow over a little bit, or likely to. But it makes it difficult to attract the best, to pay, 'cause even though I say it's not a problem if you're offering a job in Political Science, you don't get the best candidates, necessarily, willing to come here for less money, than they could get in Ontario, or Saskatchewan, or whatever. The rest of the country may catch up with us, I mean, British Columbia has had a few cutbacks of money, and now it looks like Ontario wants people to cut back, so eventually, the rest of the country may catch up to us, but that's not, that's not a healthy thing either. This, it leads to bad morale, you get dispirited people who don't know they, weakens the commitment to the institution. If you don't feel fairly treated, very often people, you know, say, "Gee, I'm worth more than this". It's the Clairol commercial, you know, "I'm worth it!" People tend to feel they're worth more than they're being paid when they look at other groups progressing more rapidly than they do, in society. People say, "Well, why is it that I'm not getting that."

On the other hand, there was a time when the university profession, university teaching profession, was known for frayed shirt-cuffs and collars. A lot of us do it because we like it, it's, it's a nice, it's a nice job dealing with young people; you seem less stuffy than you would get, if you weren't. I sometimes look at my contemporaries who came out of the commerce program, who have become stock-brokers, and so on, and I think how unbelievably stuffy they have become. And I hope I haven't become that stuffy. I don't know, maybe I, well, probably strike some people as stuffy and so on because I dress with a tie most of the time. Not many of us do that. I think I'm a lot less stuffy than my contemporaries at McGill, for the most part. So, a lot of people do university teaching because they love it, I mean, and they would do it even if they couldn't, were offered jobs at a lot more money doing something else, sort of thing. This is what they love doing, and they're going to continue doing it, but it's not good to pay less than people do, can get doing the same job, somewhere else, sort of thing. And that means you have some difficulty attracting the very best. The student ratio is a problem. And one of the problems, which is an advantage in one way, and a problem in another, is this business of not having graduate studies at most of our universities. It's stimulating to have graduate students, people who are doing research in the same area you're in, and so on. And you become interested in their research, and so on. We don't get that in the undergraduate institutions, to anywhere near the same extent as you do in the... On the other hand, I think that's good for the undergraduates, but again, it may make it difficult to attract the really research oriented faculty member. If you can get a job at a university which h..., or she can get a job at a university which has a Ph.D. program in the area, you

know, you're going to have eight graduate students doing Ph.Ds., you know, and the alternative is a job here where you're going to have sixty-five undergraduate students, who aren't really all that interested in what you're teaching, and so on. You may choose, it depends how much teaching is important to you, versus the research side. I mean, both of them, both are important to faculty members, but to some, teaching is more important, not more important than research, but more important to them personally, I mean, what they get their jollies out of is teaching. Imparting their knowledge, and so on. And others aren't interested in it; I suppose an anal-retentive personality. But they're interested in doing their little bit of research, and so on, and which they will communicate through papers, and so on, but tend to be not as interested in dealing with people; with students. Those people are not going to come here if there's an alternative. Whether that's good or bad, I don't know, but it happens to be a pattern that develops. What else?

Certainly, we've gone to certification; we've become unionized. I don't think that's had, some people say that's had a bad effect on university governance, it makes it more antagonistic, and so on, than it needs to be otherwise. But on the whole, I find, I've been president of this union for many years, not in succession - at various times, and the relationship with administration has been relatively good on academic matters, and so on. The Senate makes academic decisions. When we get to money, yeah there is some adversity, but I don't think that would be less, certainly not less than the University of Toronto which is not unionized and where they're having battle royals at the moment, battles royals I guess, at the moment over closing the School of Forestry and other various academic decisions that are being made under a great of pressure from the administration. They're having their fights there too. And it's because of money; because of the need to cut back and save money. I don't think things would be that different, I think it's not unionization that's made the difference, or certification that's made the difference, it's the lack of money, the shortage of money from the government.

And the shortage of money has been due to improving economic conditions for faculty members, let's face it, that's been part of it, but it's also been various other factors. The cost of journals. Look at subscriptions to the Library. Occasionally, you get these ads for journals; personal subscriptions sixty-five dollars a year, institutional subscriptions two hundred fifty dollars, or something like that. So, if a library buys it, they have to pay two hundred fifty dollars. That's the only way that journal can survive; if they don't do it the journal will die; if they try to even it out and have the same price, no, you'd see no personal subscriptions. So, but, you know, that creates problems for universities in terms of resources, very, very difficult. So, I don't think the, the changes that have occurred, and the, the tensions that have occurred between administrations and faculty are due to unionization. I think unionization emerged largely because those tensions were coming because of various difficulties. Ours were not so much financial, because we came earlier. But unionization toady tends to place because of tensions, you know, this is one way of resolving tensions. There are mechanisms in the labour- relation process that lead to arbitration, to conciliation, all sorts of things that fall into place if

you're certified, which may not be there if you're not. Arbitration of grievances, for instance, if you're dismissed, even dismissed for cause, well the cause has to be proved, in arbitration; basically a court of law, you know, if you're going to dismiss people. Tenure's not absolute, you can be fired, even if you have tenure, but only for cause because you can't be fired because the president says "Oh, ah, out! We have one too many professors of History", or whatever one as, one, you go, "Oh, I don't like you. You go", type of thing, or "I don't like your views" which is even more of a touchy subject, academic freedom and all this kind of thing. But tenure's not an absolute protection against misbehavior, and so on. You have to prove it in a court of law, and the labour-relations framework gives you a way of solving that dispute, it makes clear what steps you go through. So, it's simplified some of these relationships, as they became constrained by lack of money, and so on. I'm not sure there are occasional questions raised about the effect of certification on university relations, relations between the university and the faculty. Course, the faculty has always looked upon itself as the university; the alumni looks upon itself as part...; the students look upon themselves; but when I write to the President or something like that, I never refer to the employer as being the university. They've often come back to me saying, "Would you j...", when there's a waiver required, "Would you join the university in waiving, or would the Union join the...", I always reply "The Union is prepared to join the Employer", Because they're not the university.... That I'm sure of, I'm not sure who it is, but it's not them. So, I don't know what else L..

AB: Is that all?

GC: Is that enough? I don't know I'll probably think of more things. If you think of something..

**Tape ends**