

by Gary Draper

Does the Report of the GFC Law and Order Committee propose an unnecessary, legalistic, reactionary system? Or, does it protect the student from summary, arbitrary procedures being instituted by the university administration? That is the problem with which G.F.C. will be wrestling at a special meeting on Monday.

In 1969 (when the university was trembling before the assaults of vast armies of rabid radicals), the General Faculties Council set up a committee to review the question of law and order on campus.

The recently presented report has been greeted with a mixed reaction. The Grad Students' Executive has applauded it for its fairness and justice. Students' Council has condemned the greater part of it as legalistic and unnecessary.

The provisions of the Report apply only to students. The committee noted the desirability of establishing general procedures covering everyone, but apparently the university has the power to discipline only students in this manner.

Basically, the report advocates the creation of a tribunal called a General University Disciplinary Hearing to consider charges against students presently heard by Deans' Council. An Appeals Board to hear appeals from decisions of the tribunal and other disciplinary bodies such as the Students' Union DIE Board would also be established.

The controversy is over the procedures of the Disciplinary Hearing. Pat Delaney, SU Academic Vice-President, feels that the number of cases (2 or 3 per year) doesn't indicate a necessity for such an elaborate structure. He states, "I have a fear of things like this getting out of hand. The end does not justify the means."

He feels that problems like plagiarism and cheating can be dealt with by the department concerned and disciplinary matters by the SU DIE Board. Delaney believes that the Ombudsman, GFC Appeals Committee and other present structures can effectively protect the student.

Provost Ryan, a member of the Law and Order committee, appeared to think the quasi-judicial nature of the procedure was necessary to show the courts that the university had dealt fairly with its students.

George Mantor, SU President-elect, is fearful that, "If they set up this elaborate mechanism, they're going to want to deal with more than one or two cases per year."

He is also concerned that, "anyone with an axe to grind can put someone up before the board", since there is no provision for dealing with frivolous charges.

He would like to see the Students' Union take over the responsibility or come up with an alternate system.

Charlie Richmond, grad student and member of the committee a former S.D. U.er who fellow committee members give credit for much of the report, answers the charge of overly legalistic and elaborate procedures with the argument that, "we need good justice no matter how few people need to be protected, and due process gives the student a fair deal."

Monday GFC debates:

LAW &

ORDER



He prefers due process to the present system of relying upon the magnanimity of Deans' Council. Richmond says studies have shown that students have gotten a good deal from academic courts and that civil courts are reluctant to intervene.

He feels that the proposed system would protect any students taking part in civil disobedience activities.

Delaney is concerned that double jurisdiction between the university courts and the civil courts might lead to double jeopardy. He states, "If the student has offended against the law of the land, I don't think the university has any right to try him for it."

Richmond and Ryan both stated that the university can only try a student if he or she is hindering the university in pursuing its traditional purposes. Richmond said that the student could petition for a cessation of the university hearing if a civil court case was under way.

Mantor is anxious about the fact that transcripts can be refused to a student charged with an offense and is not satisfied with the procedures for serving the charges. Both he and Delaney feel that transcripts should be automatic.

There is some concern as to who will be sitting on the tribunal. The committee only specifies that the chairman have some legal training, and makes a vague recommendation for peer representation.

The committee apparently unofficially considered sufficient peer representation to be that at least two

out of the three board members be students, but no concrete recommendation appears in their report.

The one part of the report that just about everyone likes is the proposal to create a Campus Law Review Committee to examine present rules and regulations of the university and propose desirable changes. The Law and Order Committee members as well as critics of other portions of the report consider this proposal long overdue.

A few regulations that you may not be aware of, but which you have agreed to obey by signing your admission form, are:

- In the case of dishonesty or any serious indiscipline in the classroom, the instructor has the authority of suspension from the classroom. Further action is to be taken by a committee consisting of the Provost and the Department and Dean concerned.

- University clubs which wish to invite the general public to on-campus events or to sponsor off-campus speakers, are responsible for informing the President or his designee, and for making appropriate arrangements, including arrangements to ensure the protection of persons at or about the meeting on University property.

- Off-campus trips by individuals, groups or teams representing student organizations of the University, are subject to the prior approval of the Dean of Physical Education, in the case of athletic matters, and the Dean's Council or its designee in all other

cases. Requests for such off-campus trips should be made in writing indicating the names, dates, arrangement for travel, accommodation, and if required, the name of the official University representative. Applications should be made more than twenty-four (24) hours before the proposed off-campus trip.

- "Activity Zones" have been designated in various parts of the University campus to provide locations from which University groups may advance a cause and sell literature or other material in connection with that cause. Such activities are restricted to "Activity Zones". Applications for the use of the Zones should be made to the Vice-President (Finance and Administration) or his designee.

For the first time the 16 present regulations have been gathered together.

It is reliably reported that when the committee asked an administrator for a list of regulations in force, he said he wasn't sure, but that he thought it was in the archives. Seeing all of these regulations in one place has alarmed some people as to their potential as instruments of repression.

The committee has also proposed three new regulations and 10 new rules to govern the implementation of regulations. One of these states that, "lying and intentionally misleading fellow students and staff" is an offense. The other rules, more enforceable, prohibit cheating, plagiarism, disrupting classes, destroying property and so on.

The four people interviewed in connection with the report see the proposed system as having different effects. Delaney and Mantor appear to believe that since there has been no great history of student activity, the plan is unnecessary unless it is going to be used as an instrument of repression, which they strongly oppose.

Prof. Ryan gave the impression that he felt it was necessary to have some form of disciplinary tribunal and that this one was preferable to Deans' Council.

Charlie Richmond seemed to feel that the new system is necessary to protect the student from arbitrary, summary procedures imposed by the university, by assuring the student of due process and of a fair hearing by his peers.

The situation is not an easy one, since some form of disciplinary system is necessary, but at the same time basic freedom and individual rights must be protected.

The report is seen by some people as needless and reactionary, and by others as essential and progressive. Most people agree that the matter should be taken out of the hands of Deans' Council, but the consensus ends there. I suppose it all depends on how you look at it.

There are some very good things in the report and some questionable areas as well. One safe prediction is that the report will emerge from G.F.C. (if at all) in a substantially altered form.

CONFERENCE continued from page 3

vehicle for Quebec national liberation. However this is entirely incorrect, he insisted.

The treacherous role of the PQ was shown in the April-May strikes when they would not support the strikers. Young said that what is necessary is the founding by the trade unions of a mass independentist labor party. Such a party could represent the interests of the working class and not the capitalists.

Feminism and socialism

Another speaker at the conference was Joan Newbigging, organizer of the Vancouver League for Socialist Action, and an activist in the NDP and women's liberation movement. In speaking on "Feminism and Socialism", Newbigging noted the "revolutionary dynamic" of the women's liberation movement.

She explained that as women struggle for their basic rights, such as the right to abortion, to equal pay, to child care, they are going to come to realize the nature of the nuclear family, the state, and the system that oppresses them.

She said that complete women's liberation can only be accomplished in a socialist society, and that women struggling as women for their rights now is an essential part of the struggle for that socialist society.

The student revolt

Richard Thompson, former editor of *Young Socialist* and long time activist in the student movement, spoke to the conference on "Where is the Student Revolt Headed?" Thompson noted that the roots of the radicalization of students are to be found not in the university itself but

in the international crisis or capitalism.

However, he said that the thing that is touching off a resurgence of the militancy of the student movement is the education spending cutbacks and tuition fee increases that are happening right across the country. Thompson said that the fee hikes in Ontario and Saskatchewan, and the recommendations for a doubling of tuition fees as contained in the Alberta government Worth Report, indicate it is only a matter of time until students in Alberta are hit.

Thompson cited examples of how the students' union leadership in Ontario had betrayed the struggle against the cutbacks. He said that what is needed is a mass action strategy for the fight against the cutbacks, and only the YS has such a strategy.

Bureaucrats sell out Vietnamese

Mark Priegert spoke on "The

Meaning of the Vietnam Settlement". Priegert said that first of all the cease-fire is not the victory for the Vietnamese liberation forces that many people are trumpeting it as.

What exists in South Vietnam is an unstable dual power situation with the Thieu regime holding many of the high cards. Priegert said that a key factor in forcing the Vietnamese to negotiate with US imperialism and stop at much less than a victory, was the pressure applied by Moscow and Peking.

The bureaucrats in these two workers states are willing to sell out the Vietnamese in order to achieve a *detente* with the US. Priegert noted that the Vietnamese have every right to make concessions in their fight against the US, in the face of terror-bombing and the pressure of Moscow and Peking.