

## The public eye finally blinks

AS REPORTED ON THE FRONT PAGE OF THE *National Post* yesterday, media mogul Rupert Murdoch has banned paparazzi photos of Kate Middleton, Prince William's girlfriend, from his papers. This is, at first blush, a surprising move. Tabloids—of which Murdoch owns many—make a business of taking intrusive photos.

Clearly, then, something is amiss, so let's review this case. Murdoch is responsible for the publication of the British tabloids *The Sun* and the *News of the World*. In August 2006, *News of the World's* royal correspondent and two associates were found guilty of plotting to record phone conversations of members of the royal family and other public figures. Now, Murdoch has banned the publication of intrusive photos of someone close to said family.

This could be seen simply as a gesture of good will. It goes above and beyond the Press Complaints Commission's guidelines, which state that "it is unacceptable to photograph individuals in private places without their consent" and that "private places are public or private property where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy." *News International's* staff photographers are obliged to "operate within the PCC code, which says everyone is entitled to respect for family life and [that] it is unacceptable to photograph individuals in private places without their consent." But if this is the reason for banning its photographers from intruding into Ms Middleton's life, why then has it not banned the publication of intrusive photos, period?

Apparently, a little bad press awhile back, a little good press now and that's all it takes to get into the good books again. And apparently, getting some good press is easy as finding a big story (like rumours about a certain soon-to-be-engaged prince), making a selfless gesture, saying you won't intrude and topping it off with some vague policy language to cover your bases.

Perhaps we should ask what exactly constitutes a paparazzi photograph. The term is fairly vague after all. Is it any interference in the private lives of public figures? If so, can photographers really limit themselves to just capturing their public appearances? We can hardly overlook the fact that this is a big business, and that capturing that one perfect shot can mean a cover story, inciting publication—and scandal—around the globe.

Still, we can't restrict the actions of the paparazzi completely. What would happen if, out of the goodness of their hearts, and in the interest of not intruding into peoples' personal lives, a large majority of tabloids, press agencies and the like agree not to have their photographers stalk their subjects and print intrusive photos? The few rogue photographers who still took pictures would suddenly have a rare commodity that they could sell at a premium to those who are still printing them, essentially giving them a monopoly over that particular market.

Maybe I shouldn't be too critical. Maybe one organization taking a step back will encourage others to do the same. But I can hardly believe that in this cutthroat business, a media mogul like Murdoch would all of the sudden decide to show his softer side with out some sort of sinister ulterior motive.

KRYSTINA SULATYCKI  
Photo Editor

## iPhone-phone-phone-phone-phone

IT'S ALWAYS THE LITTLE GUY WHO TRIES STICK it to the man and rain down on the big parade—in this case, Apple. Communications company Cisco Systems is slapping them with a last-minute lawsuit, claiming ownership over the term "iPhone," despite both parties thinking the naming rights had already been settled. Good for Apple for opting not to splatter their copyright on every new "iSomething" gadget in the first place, but they had to see this kind of fallout coming. At least they could have been little more original, and went with something like the iHoy-Hoy. Alexander Graham Bell would be proud.

MIKE KENDRICK  
Design & Production Editor



ADAM GAUMONT

## LETTERS

### Praise be to Amanda

I wish to express my appreciation for your 9 January editorial, "There's salat to like about new sitcom."

Amanda Ash writes that she hopes *Little Mosque on the Prairie* will show the world "just how ridiculous and naive they can be about other cultures." As a Muslim, and as a Muslim Canadian, my personal hope is that the show will also help some of my fellow Canadians realize that many of us Muslims are not averse to laughing at ourselves.

When you think of "Islam" or "Muslim," a sense of humour may not necessarily be the first thing that comes to mind. I would like my fellow Canadians to realize that many Muslim Canadians share some of the same sense of laughter that others do. Humour can be an invaluable tool for overcoming communication gaps caused by misunderstanding, fear and ignorance. My hope is that this show will help us all to laugh at the absurdities inherent in day-to-day life, and along with it [make] us pause to reflect on some of our inner biases. Thank you for publishing this editorial.

NADIA HUSSAIN  
Via e-mail

### New ruling puts 'pha,' final 't' in pharmacist

(Re: "Pharmacists get power to prescribe," 30 November). Pharmacist prescribing is a revolutionary step in Canada's health-care system. Consuming 37 per cent of the Alberta government's budget in 2002/2003, our health-care system is one of the most overburdened and expensive institutions in Canada. Despite a \$41.3 billion infusion from the federal government in 2004, the health-care system continues to suffer from a chronic shortage of money, with wait lists remaining long for important quality-of-life-improving interventions such as cataract surgery and hip and knee replacements.

One area that is severely under-

utilized is the skills of other health-care professionals beyond those of physicians. The *Globe and Mail* reported on 2 November 2006 that Canadian doctors are lacking in several areas such as the use of "multi-discipline teams to treat chronic illness." Alberta is attempting to circumvent this deficiency by pursuing alternative means to meet patient care, such as utilizing other health-care professionals such as pharmacists.

A key point expressed in the Health Policy Framework released by the Alberta government in February 2006 expressed that in order to improve patient care, other health-care professions such as pharmacists and nurse practitioners should "assume a greater role in the delivery of primary, preventative and chronic care." This recommendation is based on studies focused on pharmacist interventions, such as the SCRIP study conducted by Dr Ross Tsuyuki, of the University of Alberta, in 2002.

In order for pharmacists to make these interventions, they need to hold a greater level of responsibility than is currently available.

Prescribing rights promises this, by enhancing our ability to make interventions, change medications when necessary, follow up more closely with our patients and ultimately alleviate some of the costs to our health-care system by enhancing patient outcomes. Pharmacists are the most accessible health-care professionals, and can therefore take patients out of wait rooms by providing non-acute care services, such as refilling prescriptions for a diagnosis already obtained.

Pharmacist prescribing is an exciting new innovation for our health-care system in an attempt to promote its sustainability. Pharmacists in essence have been prescribing for years, assisting patients with colds, allergies, headaches and other conditions that can be treated with over-the-counter medications. The Alberta government has opted to extend the responsibilities of pharmacists so that they can provide optimal care to their regular patients, with appropriate due diligence. Diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and arthritis are chronic conditions that are becoming increasingly

prevalent in our aging population. In order to reduce the burden on the already overworked medical doctors, allowing pharmacists to take on even a greater role will shorten wait times and ensure that patients are experiencing the best care possible. Pharmacist prescribing is introducing us to a new era of a sustainable health-care system.

ROSE GLEESON  
Alberta Pharmacists Students' Association

Letters to the editor should be dropped off at room 3-04 of the Students' Union Building, or e-mailed to [letters@gateway.ualberta.ca](mailto:letters@gateway.ualberta.ca).

The Gateway reserves the right to edit letters for length and clarity, and to refuse publication of any letter it deems racist, sexist, libellous or otherwise hateful in nature. The Gateway also reserves the right to publish letters online.

Letters to the editor should be no longer than 350 words, and should include the author's name, program, year of study and student identification number to be considered for publication.

## LETTERS FROM THE ARCHIVES

### Proposed 'SUB' a poor use of students' money

I for one am opposed to the Students' Council's plans for a new Students' Union Building. What is the justification for such a building at this time or even in the near future?

There certainly are plenty of occasions when the present building is not used at all, and taking into account the availability of classroom space in the University of Alberta as a whole, we may safely say that this utilization is less than 30 per cent.

It seems hardly justifiable to spend the amount of money contemplated when the crying need is not for more buildings but better

education. How many students on this campus could use a proportion of \$4 million to improve their intrinsic educational needs? Quite a few, I'll wager.

The prognostication of the number of students who will be attending this campus of the University of Alberta is likely to be highly inaccurate. Judging from the size of large universities in concentrated metropolitan areas of the United States, it appears that there is a limit to the number of students that can be accommodated on anyone campus. I suggest that this limit is being approached at the Edmonton campus.

Even if, however, the limit should be 20 000 students and 20 000 students should attend this campus, is it right to force these students to pay for facilities on which they had no part in deciding? Will students be willing to pay perhaps \$75 and more per year in Students' Union fees? Has the Students' Council

ever asked even the present students' body about their plans?

These are questions to which I, and others, would like to hear answers. Perhaps part of the answer lies in the answer to the question: Are the majority of students getting their money's worth now, at the present scale of Students' Union fees?

I think that as long as membership in the Students' Union is compulsory, it is reasonable to expect some economy in its operation. To construct buildings for no economic necessity other than that of contractors shows a callous disregard of the rights of ordinary students.

D HOHN  
6 December 1963

From the Archives is a semi-regular feature where the Gateway runs historical letters that we feel are of particular importance—or are just really hilarious.