

of conditions of disadvantaged individuals or groups including those that are disadvantaged because of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.”

In short, the effect of subsection (2) is to render subsection (1) inoperative. The logic behind this is outlined at the very beginning of the Charter in Section 1 which states:

“The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society.” Thus, equality under the law guaranteed to female and male persons as set out in Section 15(1) is offset not only by Section 15(2) but also by Section 1 of the Charter. Section 1 recognizes that certain freedoms will be subjected to “reasonable limits” if such limits are prescribed by law (which they are in Section 15(2)) and can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society. As to this criteria, there is no reason to play a numbers game. The statistics on the number of men versus women employed in various occupations are quite clear. Women are severely under represented in numerous fields. I must qualify such a statement, however, as there is always the exception to the rule but this does not mitigate or remove from reality the fact that the majority of occupations (perhaps except those traditionally occupied by females ie. nursing, secretarial work., etc) are male dominated. If Hanus and Murphy wish to become members of the “Politically Correct” versus being labelled as the “Politically Incorrect,” all they need do is refer to Section 28 of the Charter which states:

“Notwithstanding anything in this Charter, the rights and freedoms referred to in it are guaranteed equally to male and female persons.”

This means that the “reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society” do not apply to Section 28. Therefore, males who feel they have suffered discrimination at the hands of affirmative action programs designed to give preferential consideration to females have a clearly stated (although relatively untested) legal alternative. So please stop crying in your beer!!! Oh, and by the way concerning the issue of impartiality, if you are not “feminist bashing” why have you not addressed other affirmative action programs designed to offset the disadvantages of other minorities which you mention collectively but

do not deal with individually, including such persons of a particular race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age or mental or physical disability? Myself, I will only believe you are impartial if you address at least one of these with the same “vigour” and “intensity” as you have with the sex issue. I hope you realize that a logical conclusion any reader may draw from your articles is that you are not only against affirmative action programs designed to ameliorate disadvantages experienced by females, but that you also oppose similar programs aimed at helping the other groups I have specified. Overall what I find most disturbing about your column is the unprofessional light in which you present it. A prime example? Does “intelligence of a walnut” ring a bell? If you are trying to get people to sympathize with your cause, I suggest you need a change of tactics. I thought unprofessionalism is what you were trying to critique especially in regards to the manner in which a particular course at this university is taught (so you say), but yet you are behaving in exactly the same fashion. Critiquing an issue without speaking directly to the sources involved or taking part in or sitting in on their classes or meetings indicates a blatant disregard for objective presentation of an issue.

Respectfully,

Lisa Reiten

