

Senator proposes commission Campus police alternatives

by Bruce M. Lantz

Peter Harvison is the Chairman of the Senate Inquiry on Campus Police at Dalhousie. While the GAZETTE does not necessarily agree with the stand presented in this article, we do feel that students must take an active role in consideration of the type of force we want here. Hopefully this article will stimulate people into giving this matter the thought it deserves.

In order to establish what role the student should perform with regard to security at this university the position of the student to the rest of the community must be determined, says Peter Harvison, Chairman of the Senate

Committee investigating the campus police.

"It was apparent from the first public meeting of the Senate Committee that the students present were not interested in seeing a professional security force on campus," he noted.

At this point it is not very clear whether the advantages of using students to secure the buildings will outweigh the disadvantages. "The possibility of student unrest and the use of confrontation tactics to secure political objectives is a definite consideration; the CP's could face a situation of conflict with fellow students."

"While several CP's have stated that they refuse to get involved in 'politics', it is at best, difficult to separate political from non-political situations," stated Harvison.

"Students can be used as security

personnel solely for campus functions, leaving the remainder up to the administration. Or a variety of student/university security relationships can be established," said Harvison.

If the student is to be responsible solely for the security of student functions, it would be practical to put the student police under the authority of Council (with an administrative voice on the committee). This is the case at most universities employing student police.

It has been suggested that a Police Commission be set up with a majority of student representation to co-ordinate the force and make policy decisions. A professional administrator could be hired to oversee the operation, with a chief and perhaps deputies under him. The university would then hire its security personnel through this independent body.

The need for a professional administrator is apparent; the workload of the present chief reflects the impossibility of student self-management.

"There are dangers to this. The administrator may quickly become institutionalized and a workable student-professional work relationship might be difficult to attain. The question still to be answered is: who makes the decisions in the event of a political disturbance."

"In addition, the concept of a Police Commission reflects traditional concepts with its bureaucratic framework," he said.

An open Senate Inquiry, meeting on the CP's, will be held on Wed., Feb. 23 at 12:30 in the SUB lobby.

Campus police will benefit

by Don Retson

If and when changes are made in the structure and role of the Campus Police, those who stand to benefit most are the Campus Police themselves.

This seemed to be the feeling among most of those present at the first hearing of the Senate Committee on Campus Police last week.

According to SC President Brian Smith, the committee was set up to examine the student Senator's role, responsibility, and control of the CPs on campus.

This committee was established back in early October and includes six members — two members appointed from each of the administration, Senate and Students Council.

While the committee was primarily intended to accept briefs from interested students, much of the time was devoted to questions about the present structure of the force. One of the most interesting aspects of the meeting was the apparent disillusionment of several campus police with the structure of the force — the hierarchy in particular. The policy for selecting the chief of police came under heavy fire from several students — inside and outside the force.

The present policy, whereby a senior administrative head of the Physical Education department handpicks the chief should be relaxed by a committee made up of members of the Student Union as well as Campus Police. This committee would take applications from interested students, giving preference to those with previous experience. The duties of the chief of police, which includes all hiring, firing and promotions of police personnel, also came under attack. If the Campus Police are to have any semblance of democracy it was felt necessary that a committee of Campus Police decide who is to work on the force and in what capacity.

While Campus Police are often criticized for their handling of internal affairs as well as the arrogant behaviour of certain police while on duty, much of the blame lies outside the force. One campus policeman complained that because of the absence of any discipline committee or discipline code, "most of us don't know what we are doing or where we are going."

The same can be said for those who have been hassled by Campus Police. To correct this situation it was suggested, a public relations department should be established — possibly to look into student's complaints.

One of the decisions yet to be made is a redefinition of the role of Campus Police. In the past year, the force expanded rapidly to cope with the added responsibility of policing new buildings on campus.

Unfortunately, training has not kept pace with their increased size and responsibility — in fact it is non-existent.

If the Campus Police are to become more involved in the security of the university and are to be an adequate substitute for professional security it is imperative that they receive some sort of training. The main reason the university is reluctant to provide any training is that it would mean increased salaries. Since its establishment, Dalhousie Campus Police have received \$1.50 an hour. This is 50¢ an hour less than the salary of Saint Mary's CP's.

To cover such a salary increase it was suggested that perhaps the police should be cut back and a greater emphasis should be placed on the quality of the force.

While many important questions were raised, the inquiry suffered from a lack of student participation and awareness of basic issues.

The final committee report should be ready by late March or April.



Union President Brian Smith with Parliamentarian Chris Smith. Note the absence of V.P. Hearn. (Dal photo)

Hearne neglects report as Smith demands results

by Bruce M. Lantz
and
Frank Cassidy

Student Union Vice-President Jim Hearn, hired last summer to suggest amendments to the union constitution has not made any recommendations yet and SC President Brian Smith isn't taking the situation too lightly.

Hearn was hired, along with three others, during the month the present Council took office, at a salary of \$200 a month, and as yet no report has been submitted.

This situation is not unique with Council committees. They are faced with the same situation in other areas. Although the final reports from all committees were due to be handed in to Council one month ago only three have been received: from Liz Ness, Mike Bowser and Peter Wedlake. Smith has had about enough.

"I'm just about to blow my cool" over the response Smith said last Friday (February 11).

To remedy this situation, he intends to call for a committee to examine the possible alternatives to the present system of government.

He also said Hearn's committee should have brought the constitution up to date. However Hearn doesn't seem too anxious to submit his report before the end of the year, or for that matter, at all.

"I tried to get the thing going, but I couldn't," Hearn said last Sunday (February 13). "I think we should leave it for incoming people."

So, at the present time it looks as if Hearn will have made a lot of free money unless Union President Smith can come up with a solution which will force Hearn to submit his proposals before his term of office expires.