



Alberta Human Rights Act is no basis for court actions against Boston Pizza

The Gateway, in keeping with its policy of covering off-campus stories, has performed a valuable service in exposing corporate oppression at its rampant, insidious zenith. The reference is, of course, to the famous *Boston Pizza vs. Long-Haired Males* case, to which your January 13 issue devoted in excess of 15 per cent of its news coverage.

If the Boston Pizza policy with regard to service of long-haired male persons is as you have stated, then we are opposed to that policy. Such an attitude on the part of a business, in relation to modern social mores, can only be termed reactionary and ridiculous. We would further agree that the best measure to combat this type of policy is to make it economically unfeasible for Boston to continue their course of conduct; that is, to boycott their restaurant.

However, we must take strong exception to The Gateway's over-indulgence in a sort of self-righteous martyrdom, which is epitomized in the Page four cartoon depicting a Christ-figure being refused service at the offending pizzeria. While understanding cartoonists' necessary techniques of stating issues in their extreme, we must nevertheless view this particular attempt at visual humour as pure self-flattery on the part of your staffers. The pretension that long-haired individuals by their appearance alone incorporate the same goodness and shoulder the same responsibilities associated with a Christ-figure is one that has already been over-exploited by numerous commercial interests; its appearance in The Gateway does not add to

its believability. Oh, that martyrdom were so easy!

Now a comment about the discriminated and evicted Mr. Stein (Page one of the January 13 Gateway). You have quoted him as stating that he plans to prosecute the Boston Pizza chain for "a clear case of discrimination" under the *Alberta Human Rights Act*. Might we suggest that he see his legislator before his lawyer. The operative section on discrimination is quoted below:

No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with another, by himself or by the interposition of another, shall

- (a) deny to any person or class of persons the accommodation, services or facilities available in any place to which the public is customarily admitted, or
- (b) discriminate against any

person or class of persons with respect to the accommodation, services or facilities available in any place to which the public is customarily admitted,

because of the race, religious beliefs, colour, ancestry or place of origin of that person or class of persons or of any other person or class of persons.

It seems to be very apparent from the above that there is no provision for an action of the type Mr. Stein contemplates under the present *Human Rights Act* of Alberta. Nor is any right of action in such a case envisioned by the *Canadian Bill of Rights*.

Better luck next time.

Lloyd Malin
law 3
Paul Sharek
law 3

Discrimination justified---the image is the message

To Mr. Wayne Burns,

This is in regard to the comment under your by-line on page four of the January 13 edition of The Gateway.

Given the accepted definition of discrimination, I agree with you, discrimination was practiced in the incident described. But, stop and think, it was not you nor your long hair that was discriminated against. The discrimination was against the image that you, and other males who wear long hair, project.

I personally have nothing against long hair, but I think that if you wish to follow the fashion or fads, you should be willing to accept the consequences. Roll neck dress shirts have been in vogue for a number of years, but in some establishments, this particular style of shirt is still not accepted evening wear.

Yes, this is analogous to your hair problem. It is something that you have made of yourself, something which is an option to you. Show up at the Steak Loft some evening in jeans and a sweat shirt and see whether you are discriminated against or not. You will not be allowed in because the image which you project is contrary to the image which the management wishes to project. This is discrimination but socially, and rightly I feel, accepted. Management should have the right to discriminate against those who do not groom and/or attire themselves in line with the reputation that the management wishes to establish.

Finally, it is not as if all services are being denied you, to your detriment.

W. A. Bell
Comm 2

Parity is not the answer

by Winston Gereluk

There is, of course, no question about it. The least that university administrators can do is grant students parity on all important decision-making bodies. The only good reason that they can have for continuing in their dictatorial fashion is the only reason that there is: the force of civil society that is behind the status quo.

However, even parity is not the answer to student problems.

From infancy, I was indoctrinated into a belief that we on the North American continent hold near and dear, (and are willing to shoot yellow-skinned people over); the democratic principle.

The best that I could decipher from all the babble about democracy is that all members of a community should be free to govern themselves; or, where the numbers are too great, to participate by electing responsible representatives.

In this university, the groups that should participate in government should include: (1) the students, the main reason for the university being here in the first place; (2) the profes-

sors, the veterans that guide the students and do much valuable (?) research, (3) the non-academic staff, who have much to say about the physical plant, and (4) the administrators, insofar as they justify their presence at this university. Representation on university government bodies should be based on population.

But there is even a deeper objection to parity than saying that it doesn't fulfill the democratic principle. Do students want parity on committees, the function and aim of which they don't agree with at all? Or—should the Czechs seek representation on the Communist Party?

How about the aim of The Disciplinary (DIE) Board? or the Long Range Planning Committee? or the structure of Faculty Councils? In many cases, students' interests might better be served by just ignoring these committees, or better yet, by joining them with the sole purpose of destroying them.

To be represented on many of the governing committees would be to merely have the right to participate in the wrongdoing—and if all we accomplish is becoming one of them, then what's the use?

Non-academic staff left high and dry---university pool is "out of bounds"

I wish to commend the U of A students for "Boycott Boston". The fight against discrimination and prejudice is one that should never be retreated from.

A form of discrimination is happening right here on campus, but it seems that there are no willing fighters to pick up arms and go to war. I am talking about Academic Staff vs. Non-Academic Staff.

My duties as a bookkeeper in Zoology label me as non-academic staff. The professors in this department rely and trust in me to keep their accounts in order; but it seems I am not worthy of sharing the U of A swimming pool with them or their "kind". If I attempted to enter the pool area would I not be asked to leave? If I were to question this, would I not be told "you are not academic staff"? Is this not the same as saying "you are Jewish, or you have long hair, or Indians are not allowed, or, or, . . ." And would I be free to enter the Faculty Club with the intention of wining and dancing?

I fully understand that the U of A pool is only so big, but why shouldn't the non-academic staff have one or two days a week

pool time — and no academic staff allowed (lack of space). It is true that the academic staff have to pay for these privileges; why isn't my "group" given that choice?

Does a degree or the desire to seek one, determine what class level one is on, or what race one belongs to? I am reminded of something said to me when I approached an academic staff

member with this question. His reply was: "Frankly, I do not feel that I should have to swim alongside the fellow who comes in and empties my trash can."

I certainly hope that the disease of the subject academic staff member is not contagious.

(Mrs.) Johanne Kelley
Department of Zoology

P.S. I would be very surprised to see this letter printed!

