

## Student Health Service investigated

### Community health service concept at stake

Rumours, like mirages, are not to be discounted too quickly; both can only exist by virtue of something more substantial.

When rumour reached the Gateway office that Student Health Services was in trouble, that for a variety of reasons it was either going to be cut back or shut down completely, it was decided that an investigation was in order. The first person asked to discount or verify these claims, was Dr. Ball, Director of University Health Services (UHS), who stated simply, "I can't reassure students on this campus of the continued operation of this centre".

During the interview he explained the basis of the trouble; that only \$200,000 of U.H.S.'s \$581,000 expenses were paid by the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission, thereby leaving the centre with a deficit of \$381,000 which had to be supplied from University revenue.

Many of the fears for UHS's survival stemmed from the fact that on September 27, 1971, General Faculties Council had set up a Committee "to review the role and future development of the Students' Health Services with the composition to be recommended by the Executive Committee".

At that meeting, Dr. Wyman had described the need for such a committee; "since the Students' Health Service had been established, conditions concerning public health care in the province had changed

considerably, and it was felt that the time had come to review the operation of the Student Health Service and the policy of its future development". The motion, moved by Dr. Tyndall and seconded by Dr. Corman, had originated in an Executive Council meeting in which Dr. Wyman had further indicated that "in the light of the present financial situation", and "with the establishment of Medicare", a study was needed to see if Student Health Service was really necessary.

The proposed composition of the Committee also shed some light on the generally negative attitude of the University Administration towards UHS. The original proposal, put by Dr. Allen, specified three GFC members, three University Planning members, and only one member from the UHS Committee. However, the composition was later changed by the Nominating Committee of GFC to include more members from the UHS Committee, because the Nominating Committee thought that "this would provide a fairer representation".

Dr. Cookson, a member of the GFC Committee to review UHS, expressed his concern about the continued existence of UHS in an interview with Gateway.

His main concern centered around the fact that, out of the many services which the University offers, they should have chosen UHS as the only one to examine. He had waited for six months, he explained, to



see what other services would be subject to a similar probe, only to learn in the last GFC meeting that, in fact, UHS was the only one under study by a special committee.

Workers at the University Health Service were no more sure of their positions: all those interviewed said that they were troubled by rumours which had reached them, but had received no definite indication that even a cutback was being considered, and that they would be surprised if one were. Speaking on behalf of her colleagues, one worker commented, "We don't know...we're just waiting to see what happens....We hope that if anything happens, they let us know at least five or six months in advance...We don't know, you know how slowly things happen around a large bureaucracy".

At a meeting of the GFC Committee Wednesday morning, Dr. M. Horowitz, GFC member, asked if anyone was aware of the nature of the proposed 1972-73 budget which Dr. Ball and his staff were to have drawn up. He was told simply that it was not available, but was not told that the reason for its delay was that Dr. Ball had been sent a letter by the Administration advising him not to submit a budget for two more weeks.

At this same meeting, Dr. Tyndall revealed that the inquiry of which the Committee was in charge, had actually originated with the University Planning Committee because there was a problem of space for UHS. Furthermore, he said, there were "questions raised by certain members of the Board of

Could the services offered in the shoddy little structure in the foreground be of any importance at all, compared to the big important things that must happen in the brand new BASIC MEDICAL SCIENCES BUILDING that stretches from horizon to horizon behind it? Evidently, some people think they are, and prove it by crowding the temporary structure day after day. Some people, however, don't have to use public health centres.

### Correction

## Democracy not nixed by Dean

The article entitled "Democracy overruled...nixed by dean" in Thursday's edition of the Gateway has several errors in it.

1. Dean Coutts did not say that the Committee to Investigate Teaching had no right to interfere in the Faculty of Education.

2. Dean Coutts involvement was limited to a statement to Faculty of Education Council that he did not think it would be wise to institute the pass-fail system this year.

3. The story states the final verdict was a "NO" from Dr. Coutts. The "NO" in fact was a conditional one from Dr. Myer Horowitz, head of the Department of Elementary

Education. The condition was that only if the whole class requested pass-fail would the request be considered. Likewise the statement "Dean Coutts would not allow Ed. C.I. 301 to experiment with the pass-fail system" should read "Dr. Horowitz would not consider Ed. C.I. 301 experimenting with pass-fail unless the entire class agreed to use it."

4. Dr. Tucker did not make the statement "I am going to have to let it go. I have no time to get involved in all this bureaucratic bull shit." He intends to continue working for the pass-fail system.

We apologize to Dean Coutts and Dr. Tucker for the inconveniences caused them as a result of these errors.

## Gateway editor candidates to be interviewed today

Four persons have declared their intention of seeking the position of Gateway editor-in-chief for the next academic year.

The four, Jim Carter, Ross Harvey, Terri Jackson, and Ron Yakimchuk, will be interviewed by the Gateway staff and Student's Union Personnel Board today in the Gateway office.

The Gateway staff will elect one of the candidates who will be their choice for editor. Personnel Board will also make a recommendation to Students' Council who must then make the final decision before Feb. 15.

Jim Carter is presently editor

of the Engineering Society's paper, *The Bridge*. Last year he worked with the Gateway and was the person in charge of the editorial pages.

Ross Harvey has been "your friendly arts editor" on the Gateway for the past two years.

Terri Jackson is a graduate student in English and is active in the Edmonton Birth Control and Abortion Referral Service.

Ron Yakimchuk has served with the Gateway, in various positions, since 1965. He presently shares the duties of Layout editor with Jim Selby.

The interviews with the candidates will be held this afternoon at 3:30 in the Gateway office. The public is welcome.