

DISCRIMINATORY LEGAL SYSTEM KILLED

by Rick Grant

The University of Alberta has taken a step away from its traditional conservative position in the area of administrative regulations. The move to a more liberal approach in campus regulations of conduct came yesterday when General

Faculties Council accepted the recommendations of a committee designed to study law and order on campus.

The main points of the motion based on a report by the ad hoc committee on Discipline, Law and Order, said that the

"law of the land" would hold on the university. Acts of civil disobedience would be judged by the courts without prejudice or threat of retribution from the university.

The motion protects members of the university community

from threat of double jeopardy that existed for several years at the U of A whenever someone committed an infraction of a Canadian statute. The university community is defined as administrators, non-academic staff, teaching staff, the student body.

Double jeopardy occurs whenever someone is convicted of the same crime by two separate judicial bodies. Previously, a student who had been convicted of a crime in a Canadian court could expect to be expelled for "conduct not in keeping with the best interests of the university."

But, there are still a few gray areas when it comes to interpretation. For example, a student can be censured for plagiarising by the university and still be charged with violating copyright in court. A student however, who commits an offense that can be considered as two separate offenses can still be charged in a court of law and by the university. A hypothetical case would be the case of a student who broke into a professor's home and stole copies of an examination paper and obtained good marks as a result. The student in such a case would be charged in a court of law for theft and have his marks invalidated for cheating.

The committee report stated also that when regulations exist

through jurisdiction of the land outside of the university, these regulations would be binding on the university community. Enforcement would lie with those agencies and agents who hold the legal authority to enforce them.

The report went on to say that since the university engages in activities which relate to its purpose and tradition and has provided jurisdictions to protect these areas not covered by any governmental legislation, the university members would be subject to them.

The ad hoc committee was initiated in April of 1969 to review discipline, law and order on the campus. Its purpose was to review the regulations governing student conduct and discipline and to draft a revised set of regulations which in some cases violated civil rights.

At the time of the committee's formation, the north american universities were going through a period of unrest, characterised by student riots and protests. At stake was the traditional role of the administration of a campus as the chief legislative body and as the final say in matters of discipline and academic matters. Although the U of A escaped any major disruption, several other major campuses such as Berkley, Carmel, Columbia and

Cont. page 12

The Gateway

VOL. LXII, NO. 23,

TUES. Nov. 30, 1971; TWELVE PAGES



Photo by Don Bruce

A revolutionary new transit system was unveiled today. The sleek functional unit is noiseless and emits no noxious fumes. The one horsepower engine is guaranteed to start in all weather conditions and has an astoundingly low gasoline consumption. The developing corporation feels that the vehicle may begin sales in 1985.

Student Health bleeds university

by Cathy Rayment

Student Health (University Health Services) is costing the University too much money says President Max Wyman.

A General Faculties Council Committee has as a result been formed to study the role of Student Health. The committee consists of three members of the University Planning Committee, three members of General Faculties Council, and one member of the Student Health Service Committee. There are three students on the committee.

The major problem with Student Health is its cramped quarters. Since it was first built part of the building has been lost to nearby construction. The building is located under the towering Medical Sciences building so there is no room to expand—even upward. In the past ten years there have been 15 proposals for new sites for Student Health but none as yet have been accepted.

Although Medicare has somewhat reduced the cost of health facilities to the University they still cost the University \$380,000 a year. The doctors employed at Student Help sent in bills for student services to Medicare. The federal government in turn reimburses the University but not for the total amount, hence the huge

deficit. Another drain on the budget is the pharmaceutical department subsidy. A student pays a maximum of one dollar per prescription despite its cost to the clinic. Since the cost of drugs is not covered under Medicare this special service to the students costs the university \$60,000 per year.

The Management of the in-patient service at Student Health accounts for another one-third of the Student Health budget. The service necessitates full time staff and all the equipment necessary for the maintenance of such a centre. The in-patient treatment centre is a valuable one in that it allows students to remain in close contact with the University and their studies while in hospital.

To attempt to remedy the problem of financing this in-patient centre, representatives from the University Hospital and University Health Services have been meeting to discuss the possibility of moving the bed patients out of the jurisdiction of Student Health and into the University Hospital. The move would allow student their close ties to their studies but would cut the operational costs of the health service. The government could then support Student Health under hospital rather than education costs. This

continued page 12