

## Student Health Cont.from page 1

suggestion has been welcomed by the hospital and now waits a decision by the university.

The value of Student Health is seen in its admission figures. Between May 1970 and April 1971, doctors provided 31,906 services to students. Approximately the same number of cases was seen by dentists, dental hygienists, public health nurses, psychologists and psychiatrists. The numbers are already higher this term than they were at the beginning of last year.

The health facilities face every type of ailment. Most commonly treated are infections of the upper respiratory tract, viruses, and injuries. A psychologist looks after psychiatric problems -- which are mainly severe anxiety and depression. Influenza, venereal diseases, gynecological problems, and mononucleosis are also treated.

The health education program is still another facet of the

services offered. Students can receive information on dental hygiene, weight watching, and contraceptives. All of these programs are an essential part of comprehensive health care. If hospitalization is necessary, the student can be admitted immediately.

A University Health Service is a necessity. It is a part of nearly every North American and European university. Medicare and other such services do not provide adequate attention to the specialized needs of students, they merely pay the doctor's bill. In an area such as the university, with a high population density of students, there is a great need for quick, efficient medical service. Students cannot wait weeks to see a doctor. They need a place where they can be looked after immediately, without appointments. University Health is such a place.



At a recent meeting of General Faculties Council, several important issues were debated by both faculty members and student representatives. This little publicized council is of extreme importance to university students by virtue of the powers for both good and evil inherent in its organisation.

## Law and Order cont. from page 1

Sir George Williams underwent considerable strife.

Because of his unrest, the U of A decided to reform its policies on law and order. The committee considered such drastic approaches to the problem of student disobedience as the near fascist restrictions that the University of Toronto implemented in 1969 and the University of Saskatchewan recommended in 1970. As well,

the committee invited submissions from students.

The committee made several recommendations in January of 1970 that raised the ire of students. The committee had proposed measures that would have, in the words of a student that attended an open meeting of the committee in February of 1970, "denied the equality for students in the eyes of the law and would convict students on the basis of a preponderance of

evidence rather than reasonable doubt."

The idea of the standard on enforcement on the campus caused Alderman Dave Ward to make a notice of motion to City Council to "take whatever steps necessary to ensure adequate and non-discriminatory police protection for all citizens."

Alderman Ward went on to say that there was a different approach to enforcement and

protection on the campus than existed elsewhere in the city.

"Basically it boils down to the fact that law-breakers in 1/20 of Edmonton's population and the people they may affect are handled by a group of security guards who are not trained in police work, and an administrative head who has had little if any police experience."

Following Alderman Ward's charges, the role of the campus

police force has been redefined and their powers of arrest have been reduced to those of an ordinary citizen.

GFC, by passing the motion, recommended by the committee has raised some doubts about the need and legality of a private police force. The motion however does serve to protect the university community from the dangers inherent in a double judicial system.

# "My powerfull brain is blowed itself up!"

—Albert the Alligator, 1956

The Gateway offers the following as a comment on the Law and Order report passed by the U of A General Faculties Council yesterday.

It is the report of the equivalent committee at Trent University in Ontario.

The U of A committee was formed two and a half years ago, held numerous hearings and meetings, submitted a lengthy interim report, and has just now submitted its final report.

The Trent committee was formed by that university's Senate (roughly equivalent to our GFC) two years ago, held meetings for a couple of months, renamed itself the "Committee on Rape and Pillage", and immediately submitted the following report.

## Rape and Pillage

We deplore it.

1. It seems an untidy and exhausting way to make a name for the place, to say nothing of what that name might be.
2. There are better ways of achieving warm personal relationships than rape, and better ways of promoting site development than pillage.
3. It is usually too cold.
4. It upsets the bus schedule, and might upset the bus.

1. Disruption arising from Dissent.

By this, we refer to action arising from causes outside the direct responsibility of the University: imperialism, DDT, or the use of government aircraft for political purposes.

The university indeed hopes that all its members, even professors, will be concerned with the quality of life. It is not out of the question that such a concern could arise from the habit of reflection, and could lead to intelligent action, even by professors. Action may disrupt the normal functioning of the University, although we would not insist on this point, lest we imply that the normal state is inaction. Where such disruption seems possible, we trust there will be prior consultation between the parties concerned. We

see no way to guarantee this.

2. Disruption arising from Festering Grievances

When one considers Trent's history of nipping even the tiniest germ of a grievance in the bud, one might speculate that we would be cunning to let a few seeds sprout into crunchy issues. Still, it is conceivable that a few matters could evade our elaborate system of everyone reconnoitering everyone else, and become Festering Grievances.

Few students or faculty are wise in our byzantine ways, and some feel cut off, despite our fetish of Open Doors and Minds. To remedy this Alienation (the only five dollar word in this report), we might ask the Vice-President to publicize his function of being a troubleshooter. If he fears that trouble might shoot back he could have a small advisory committee--nothing fancy, we hope, lest the cure contribute to the disease.

In sum, we need an institutional arbitrator who is visible and nimble, a specialist in opening channels.

3. Disruption arising from the Hell of it.

This is not really an urgent problem. It has been part of university since the Feast of St. Scholastica in 1355, when Oxford students fought the town and lost. In Canada, it has traditionally been vested in the Faculty of Engineering or the Athletic Department, and has been a hallowed part of university life, right up there with swallowed goldfish. What makes the recent disruptions different has not been their gratuitous nature, but their intense altruism.

This university, along with most others, has been able to cope with aimless louts in the past, and will no doubt continue to do so. We may have trouble with the true believers, but the very act of predicting what precise sort of trouble would modify the course of events.

## Recommendations

1. We suggest the Iron Law of Perversity.

"Those who do not accept the premise of order in a University are unlikely to accept the legitimacy of any explicit procedures or institutions meant to safe guard order."

2. From this Iron Law, certain corollaries follow:  
i. Any official list of sanctions becomes something to be got around by those who are so inclined. If no one wishes to get around sanctions, they were probably unnecessary in the first place.

iii. A Disciplinary Code or Court is only as effective as the degree of acceptance it first obtains. If either obtain a wide degree of acceptance, they are logically superfluous, and serve at best as anodynes.

iv. It is *not* far-sighted for a calm and cohesive institution to lay down elaborate plans for meeting disruption, because such plans will tend to provoke the very evil they are supposed to remedy. Such preparations might be the academic equivalent of late-medieval armour or the ABM system; we might not survive our own defenses.

3. OK, smart committee people, how do we survive?

Our only modest admission is that it is not our place to point out the obvious to our academic leaders. Whatever we might recommend would have to be obvious, or we would not have thought of it.

If members of our community are unhinged by the prospect of the Invasion of the Vandals then perhaps they will join us in the simple observation that the job of the President is to preside. Presiding means sorting out conflicts. This is very disheartening and leads to a low view of human nature. But because Truth is partial (see the Trent motto) yet seems now and then to be personal property, good men will conflict, and other good men will have to sort things out.

Recognizing this human reality might lead to a new social contract; we wave copyright.

In sum, the limits of legitimate dissent are either obvious or *ad hoc*. If obvious, we will all man the fire-brigade; if *ad hoc*, we trust the President to take such measures and counsel as seems wise.