

Preventative Medicine

—BY L. PETZOLD—

A LETTER to the Editor was printed in a 1982 issue of the "Quarterly" regarding alternatives to discipline. In that letter, a concerned member pointed out that the Association should be involved in the re-education of members and also should be looking into alternative ways for preventing discipline hearings.

Although each and every member of the Association, including the Council and administrative staff are concerned regarding those persons who must be taken to discipline, it is a fact that most of the situations which progress to the discipline level cannot be dealt with at any other level. These are matters which involve possible findings of professional misconduct, being incompetence as well as charges of professional misconduct which are of a nature that they cannot be dealt with at a lower level than discipline.

There has been an ongoing concern over the past years regarding those matters which could possibly be curtailed or those surveyors who could be re-educated to change their practices, improve their method of surveying, and become more aware of the requirements of surveying, in order that their situations do not progress to a point where discipline is the only answer. In order to aid members of the Association and to avert matters escalating to a discipline situation, "complaints sessions" are undertaken by the Complaints Committee. If you have read the Complaints Committee's reports for the past few years, you will notice that several complaints sessions are held. Just exactly what is a "complaint session?"

The terms of reference for a complaints session of the Association are as follows:

1. Complaints Sessions may be called by the Complaints Committee
 - a. in order to attempt an acceptable reconciliation between a surveyor and the Committee, a surveyor and another surveyor, or a surveyor and the public;
 - b. in order to clarify for the Committee and the parties involved, the matters which are being investigated.
2. Members shall comply with all reasonable requests of the Complaints Committee to attend a Complaints Session.

3. The Notice for the Complaints Sessions shall prescribe
 - a. the time and place of the Session
 - b. the parties who are being notified to attend
 - c. the general scope of the issue.
4. The Complaints Session shall be an informal meeting with the aim of reaching an acceptable solution to the problem.
5. The Chairman of the Complaints Committee or his appointee shall preside at a Complaints Session and is authorized to regulate the course of the Session and to take any reasonable action commensurate with the purpose of the Session.
6. The substance of a Complaints Session shall be recorded and placed in the appropriate file.
7. At the conclusion of the Complaints Session, the Chairman of the Complaints Session shall:
 - a. record any decisions of the Committee, and
 - b. provide the party/parties with copies of any undertakings and decisions.
8. Failure to honour agreements reached at a Complaints Session may result in an offending member being called before a Disciplinary Committee for Professional Misconduct.
9. After a Complaints Session and after considering the circumstances of the inquiry and having due regard for the requirements of all parties the Complaints Committee may recommend a Disciplinary Hearing.

As can be seen from the above, "complaints sessions" are for two very separate purposes. In 1a. above, the purpose of the "complaints session" is to attempt an acceptable reconciliation, and this is a totally educational session. In 1b. above, although the session may be educational, it is perhaps more educational for the Complaints Committee, rather than for the surveyor involved. We have found that 1b. is more likely to be an irreversible situation, whereas a complaints session under 1a. is a total educational experience.

At a complaints session, a member of the Association is asked to attend by the Complaints Committee to review and discuss certain surveys and prac-

tices of survey undertaken by him, or by his firm. Many persons who are asked to attend such sessions at first are reluctant or are apprehensive of the purpose of the session. It would appear that from the comments following the sessions, that most of the surveyors who have attended have found them to be of benefit. At these sessions the Complaints Committee attempts to review those matters which have been brought to the attention of the Complaints Committee which, if left unchecked, would result in the surveyor's quality of surveying deteriorating or perhaps the standard of his practice in general deteriorating, to a point where discipline would be inevitable.

What type of matters are dealt with at a "complaints session"? In the past, we have dealt with the matter of estimating and pricing of surveys, where a surveyor has consistently caused the Association problems in that his final bills were often brought to the attention of the Association, due to the fact that they were considerably in excess of either the estimate or the firm price. Several surveyors have attended regarding the basic understanding of the rules of evidence, when it appeared that in certain situations they were not clear as to how they should consider evidence. We do point out that surveying offers the surveyor the responsibility of giving a professional opinion, however at times it is apparent that the surveyor's education has not been of enough depth in certain areas, and these areas are dealt with by the Committee. We have also dealt with surveyors who have not instructed or checked their field crews' work and it has been found that in isolated incidents, either certain regulations were not followed completely, or regulations and standards were misinterpreted. Another major reason for a complaints session, is that two surveyors will disagree with each other's work, and will not, between themselves get together, discuss the matter, and come either to an equitable settlement regarding the property line in that both will agree on the same line, or in the alternative, will notify their clients as to their clients' course of action, because the surveyors cannot agree. This type of complaints session is common, and unfortunately should not be a matter that the Association has to become involved in, but rather should be a matter of communication between surveyors.

The complaints sessions are matters that have been brought to the attention of the Association through complaints that have been received. The complaints sessions are **not** alternatives to discipline, but rather may be preventatives so disci-

cont'd on page 50

The World's Worst Movies

LOVESICK

Warner Bros., written and directed by Marshall Brickman; with Dudley Moore and Elizabeth McGovern.

Note: In the past some connection has always been found between the reviewed movie and land surveying — alas, none can be found in *LOVESICK*.

We will be vigilant to find such apt screen offerings as *CHAINS, LINKS AND WHIPS* (the chilling story of a sado-masochist surveyor). Until then, we ask your indulgence.

FOR PERSONS with a macabre passion for Awful Movies, *LOVESICK* is something of a disappointment. It can't approach the inspired banality of *ON GOLDEN POND*, nor can it compare in moronic conception and execution with Hail Bartlett's masterpiece *COMEBACK*. Why then, when the lights dimmed at the Odeon Popquornerie, were we there with the other revellers? Well, we had memories of *ARTHUR*, also with Dudley Moore, and we naively hoped that *LOVESICK* would reach the depths plummeted to by that benchmark turkey.

But it was not to be. In *ARTHUR* a wondrous alchemy had turned all gold into lead. Dudley Moore, whose comic abilities compare with those of Peter Sellers, had been made into a tedious drunk, the vivacious Liza Minelli into a melodrama Bronx working goil, and John Gielgud into a Jeeves unworthy of *The River City Players*. *LOVESICK* isn't in that league, but there are similarities, chief of which is the total un-

PREVENTATIVE MEDICINE

cont'd from page 48

pline charges do not have to be laid because the matter does not become serious enough for discipline charges to be laid.

The Complaints Committee does not necessarily always call in a member for a complaints session prior to discipline charges being laid. If matters are, in the opinion of the Complaints Committee, clearly beyond the scope of the Committee, then a complaints session will in all likelihood not be held.

The Complaints Committee itself is made up of five members of the Association, two in private practice, two in government service, and the Secretary of the Association. An outline of the responsibilities of the Complaints Committee in a typical situation will be prepared for the next issue of the "Quarterly". ●

believability of the vagrant idea loosely referred to as a plot.

In *ARTHUR* we were asked to believe that Liza Hypotenuse, the sum of the female squares, could find happiness with Arthur, a person whose body had become a Johnny Walker sieve. The hurdle is just as high in *LOVESICK* - allow me to meander with you through the mediocrity.

Dudley plays New York psychiatrist Saul Benjamin, 5' 2" (1.57m), 49 years old, successful but bored. All day long he sits on a chair daydreaming and pretending to listen to a collection of well-heeled weirdos who take turns at stretching out on his couch and spilling all. Each is a stock nut, the kind you'd find in the works of Alfred A. Neumann. One blows off steam by telling her erotic dreams, torrid enough to make Erica Jong, or even Baton Corp. blush. Another, a chubby matron with enough money to choke Croesus, rambles on about a new career in ballet. An elderly man with a startling resemblance to a Moray eel just lies there, saying not a word. A vaudeville gay lisps about his boy friend. Saul drums his fingers, and checks the wall clock - the moment the hour is up he ends the session with all the finesse of a slammed door. During these hours of trial he is sometimes visited by the ghost of Sigmund Freud, whose urbane ectoplasm looks and sounds like Alec Guinness. While the patients babble, Sigmund, invisible to all except Saul and the camera, holds forth about matters psychiatric. An observant analyzee might consider himself saner than the doctor, who appears to be chatting to an empty chair.

Saul looks forward to a lucrative, if shatteringly boring life, assuming he can stay out of the padded cell himself. But Fate, and the incredible typewriter of Marshall Brickman, insert a monkey wrench into the plans, in the gorgeous shape of Chloe Allen (Elizabeth McGovern). Choe is a playwright whose latest effort packs such theatre horsepower that it is being directed by Joseph Papp, is in rehearsal at Lincoln Centre and has had its parts fought for by the biggest footlight names. This kind of adulation suggests that Chloe has a few years under her belt, but no, she seems to have written it during spare periods at Cornpone High. She has an 18 year old body, 5' 8" (1.73m) and a 13 year old face. She is pestered by producers who want to throw money at her, and by dreamboat leading men, all with etchings, so for solace she has been going to a psychiatrist buddy of Saul's, a freakish looking guy with two Afros, one on each side, with a billiard ball in the middle. He has fallen for her, and is on such a guilt trip that he (a) asks Saul to take her

over, and (b) he has a heart attack and dies.

The plot now petrifies. Chloe turns up in his office, Saul gazes at this ingenuous child and, going bananas with a passion as pure as that of Hugh Hefner for Miss Squidjigger, he abandons Mrs. Mondragon and the others and is off in hot pursuit. As any child can tell, Saul is experiencing a delayed adolescence. In fact a six year old sitting behind us piped "A clear case of regressive adolescence, complicated by obsessive compulsion, isn't it, Daddy?", to which the reply was "Ask your mother".

Even if frowned upon, Saul's lecherous intentions towards the rosy-cheeked Chloe are at least understandable to any male under 100. But the script now arranges that she will fall for him, a circumstance as unbelievable as if Orphan Annie eloped with Pappy Yokum. The movie takes off for fantasyland, leaving the audience wishing it had chosen "I Was a Golden Age Werewolf" at Cinema 3. But, true to *The Critic's Creed*, I stuck my eyelids open with gum, and will press on, sparing you nothing.

Chloe, being a sweet country girl, just a simple barefoot Broadway playwright, does more than speed up Saul's tired blood. Ennobled by contact with her, he does the honorable thing, abandoning his wife and his wealthy clientele to move to the slums. There he will open a street clinic, where he will shrive troubled muggers and help the . . . er . . . socially disadvantaged deal with *The Man and The Klan*. This brings the Discipline Committee down on him. It doesn't mind his entanglement with his patient - shrinks sometimes behave like minks, they chuckle - but they are aghast at his *FREE* street clinic. It's unethical. To be fair, I must say that Alan King, John Huston and Selma Diamond, as the Committee inquisitors, perform hilariously, in the only noteworthy scene in the movie.

Winding up this mishmash, Saul tells the Board where to go. As the curtain dips mercifully, he and Chloe, hand in hand, are heading for the Lower East Side, to promote Mental Health. *The End*. The audience interrupted its jaw-cracking yawning for long enough to stagger out.

In conclusion, I would like to suggest to Dudley Moore, who is really a brilliant and versatile performer, that he abandon his insistence on romantic roles. Any hunk can do that - witness Stallone and Sirdar. What the suffering movie audience really needs is a good laugh. That's Dudley's schtick. ●