

Boycott CBC

Many students reading this paper probably feel that we are wasting our time proposing a boycott of CBC Radio advertising, further they probably feel that discrimination against gay people is not a serious problem.

Arriving at the above opinions misses the whole point. If we are to assume that discrimination against gays is a trite issue because there are so few gays in Halifax (not necessarily a correct assumption) then we are missing the more serious problem of discrimination against any person and society's condoning that discrimination. If we are to allow individuals to decide that they will not rent to, serve at a restaurant, sit on a bus seat, etc. with someone who is female, black, gay, foreign, ugly, we have allowed them to decide that the value of that person in our society is determined solely by their appearance. Should we next determine university entrance by appearance?

To condone discrimination as someone else's problem is to undercut the very fabric of our society, when we are discriminated against we know it hurts. When was the last time you were discriminated against because you were female, black, gay, foreign, didn't you just burn wishing there was something you could do. If you can not remember having been discriminated against then when did someone say to you "Sorry we don't rent to STUDENTS". Why? Was there something wrong with all students because they may have had a bad experience with one or two? Or did they even have a bad experience with students, maybe they don't know any, and it is the fear of the unknown that causes them to have a prejudice. Is that fair? We all know it's not.

Now, why are we as a population not doing something about discrimination against gays; probably the main reason is that we are afraid of being thought of as gay. Well, it is that fear of being called gay that proves how strong the discrimination still is, it also proves how our friends feel that to complain about discrimination proves we must be part of that minority.

People can see discrimination when it happens to someone else, they can overhear someone say "Sorry, we don't allow _____s here", as someone else gets refused service. But why does saying "Hey, now wait a minute you can't do that," immediately make us one of "them"? It doesn't.

It seems simple enough so far. Discrimination against any individual is morally wrong. Now why CBC?

CBC is a publically owned broadcasting corporation, and as such it has certain responsibilities to the country. (CBC President A.W. Johnson has outlined some of them for us in next week's *Gazette*). It is the failure of CBC to live up to its moral responsibility, its mandate, and further CRTC regulations, and the outcome of those failures which is its pointed and active discrimination against the Gay Alliance for Equality (GAE) that has generated outrage on the part of the *Dalhousie Gazette*.

CBC Radio advertises extensively in the student market, because they wish to have the academic community as part of their audience. We are concerned with CBC Radio because it is the



Public Service Announcements policy of CBH that is being used to discriminate. As with all boycotts, be they Kraft, Molson's, or CBC, it is the public pressure and possibility of public pressure that forces these large corporations to fulfill their moral responsibilities. The worst thing is that it takes threat of condemnation for these corporations to shape up, it certainly does not seem to be their own internal sense of right and wrong. Have they no morals?

Discrimination like cancer, has to be rooted out. If weak minorities can be discriminated against where will it stop? And who will be left to stop it?

Drop CBC a note, let them know how you feel.

John McEwen
 Director of CBC Radio for the Maritimes
 5600 Sackville
 Halifax

The Dalhousie GAZETTE is the weekly publication of the Dalhousie Student Union. The views expressed in the paper are not necessarily those of the Student Union or the editor. We reserve the right to edit copy for space or legal reasons. The deadline for letters to the GAZETTE is the Monday preceding publication. No unsigned material will be accepted, but anonymity, if necessary, will be granted. The Dalhousie GAZETTE, Canada's Oldest College Newspaper, is a founding member of the Canadian University Press. The Dalhousie GAZETTE office is Room 334 of the Student Union Building, telephone 424-2507. The subscription price is \$5.00 per year (27 issues).

Editor
 Advertising Director

Advertising Representatives:

Circulation Manager

The staff and contributors for this issue included:

Dal Photo
 Dal International
 Helen DeMarsh
 John D'Orsay
 Wayne Ingarfield
 Harvey MacKinnon

Valerie Mansour
 donalee Moulton
 Judith Pratt
 Mike Walsh
 Eric Wood
 Greg Zed

Martin Douma
 Pat Gardner

Donna Treen
 Anthony Wallace

Allan Zdunich
 Richard Coughlan
 Dave Purcell
 Debbie Bugden
 Joe Wilson

LEGAL WIRE-TAPPING

This is one of the extracts of "The Highlights of the Peace and Security Program" the Federal Liberal Government under former civil libertarian, Justice Minister, and "Just Society" founder Pierre Trudeau proposes to make as law. With the War Measures Act in mind, it is of particular import to note that extent to which the government has plans to condone police invasions of personal privacy governed entirely by their own discretion.

It is not perhaps coincidental that at the time the original Electronic Surveillance legislation was introduced the Federal Liberals were in a minority position dependant upon the support of a strongly civil libertarian NDP.

Where does that leave us when illegally obtained evidence is admissible in court? In future issues the Gazette will publish other parts of the program. Editor's note

Criminal operations, especially those of organized crime, depend on effective communication. They are often planned on the telephone and discussed in private meetings. These oral communications are an important source of evidence and their interception is a key aspect of police work in fighting crime.

After almost two years of experience with the Protection of Privacy Act, some aspects of that law are seriously impairing the effectiveness of police, particularly in combatting organized crime.

The legislation introduces several changes designed to increase the effectiveness of police use of electronic surveillance, while at the same time maintaining the fundamental protection of the individual's rights to privacy adopted by Parliament in 1974, including the criminal and civil sanctions for the violation of these rights.

There are six principal amendments proposed:

- the courts will be empowered to grant authorization to intercept communications in relation to all indictable offences instead of the limited list of crimes now specified. In addition, any offence, indictable or otherwise, may justify an authorization where it appears to form part of a pattern of criminal activity of an organized nature;

- evidence derived directly or indirectly from an unlawful interception may be admitted by the court. This restores the common law rule in part but the unauthorized intercepted communication itself remains inadmissible and the act of interception punishable as a criminal offence;

Cont'd on page 5

For National Advertising, this paper is a member of

youthstream.
 The Campus Network
 307 Davenport Road, Toronto, Ontario M5R 1K5
 (416) 925-6359