

A Lesson In Social Responsibility

A recent incident which occurred in our province prompts me to write the following article regarding the policeman and the execution of his duty. More specifically I'm going to deal with the implications of the use of force by the policeman, meaning reaction of the public, the newspaper, "The Evening Patriot" and the Attorney Generals department. Finally I will state my own assessment of expressed attitudes and my own opinion as to what extent we the public are responsible for the actions of policemen.

Finally, the incident itself. Reports indicate that the Summerside town police, suspecting the driver of a vehicle to be impaired, indicated to the driver that he was to stop. Not only did he fail to stop but he ran at high speed. The events which followed are history.

Now lets look at this situation intelligently. Impaired driving is a criminal offense. Yes, that's right. It ranks right up there with the biggies, murder, robbery etc. The fact the more

people drive while impaired than murder or rob doesn't lessen the seriousness of the crime. However, if I interpret the reaction of the Attorney Generals department and the "Evening Patriot" correctly, criminal offenses vary in degrees of seriousness. The attitude expressed seems to be, shame on the big bad policeman for shooting at such an insignificant criminal as the impaired driver. What we seem to say is that it's okay for a person who is in all probability incapable of walking a straight line, to get into his car and drive, thereby, endangering life and limb. Yet, let the policeman try to enforce the law and he is denied by his ultimate boss, the Attorney General's department. It reminds me of the tape recorded voice of Mission Impossible which says should you or any of your men be caught the Secretary, in this case, the Attorney Generals department, will disallow all knowledge of your actions. Of course Mr. Bennett did not voice an out and out denial, but his

departments action in setting up an enquiry because the police used force empowered to them by the law, serves as a denial. So, if the policeman's actions fall under scrutiny why should the policeman stick his neck out to enforce the laws of a boss who won't sanction his actions. Furthermore, why should the general public have any regard for the authority of a policeman who, it would seem, can't be trusted by his own boss not to abuse his authority. The implications of any instance of the use of force by policemen are no simple matter to understand. I feel the above incident clearly demonstrates the refusal of we, the people, to accept responsibility, I think it's time that we got our values straight. If we did this with regard to this situation we would realize that we the people, are ultimately the guardians of the law. Since it isn't practical for everyone to be a policeman we appoint people to do the job. Yet, because these are our laws, made for our protection, which we all would enforce, were it practical to do so, we must share all responsibility for his actions with the policeman. But what do we do. What we have done right here in our own situation, or perhaps it would be better to say what we the public have allowed the newspaper and Attorney Generals Dept. to do is make a scapegoat of the policeman by denying that in acting as he did, that he was acting on our behalf or with our consent.

What kind of people are we when we express the opinion, or allow the opinion to be expressed for us that a policeman rightfully executing his duties is a greater threat to public well-being than is the criminal who by his very action or actions tramples on our laws and endangers our safety. Yes if one is to read the editorial page of the Evening Patriot of March 26, 1973, this is exactly the opinion implied. It ranks as a dark day indeed when the supposedly responsible newspaper will take it upon himself to resort to sensationalism and will display the twisted type of reasoning which I have describes above.

Example: "The whole purpose of keeping impaired drivers off the road is to reduce the dangers of driving, it does not seem sensible that the police resort to shooting to nab such impaired drivers."

The defense rests.

-Herb Morrison

Student Union Meeting's Minutes

A synopsis of Student Council Meeting Minutes

Article XI, Section C, Pg.4 of UPEI-SU Constitution should read "The Speaker is not a member of Council.

The Centennial Commission has approximately six to eight hundred dollars available for Centennial Projects. The President invites Council members and the general student body to submit proposals which could take advantage of this opportunity to combine Student Employment and Community Service.

Motion: The Student Union purchase used headliner for Cadre, if in good condition, for a sum of \$400.

Motion carried

Two members of the UPEI-SU Mary MacKenzie and Tom Kusack, have been chosen by Crossroads Canada to participate in a work visit to Africa.

Motion: UPEI-SU give the sum of \$25. each to Mary MacKenzie and Tom Kusack, UPEI students chosen to represent Crossroads Canada

Motion carried

Motion: Activities involving the SU, in the form of Pig & Whistles be utilized

in order to donate the amount of \$800. to the Progress Fund.

Motion carried

Motion: Give International Students Association funds of \$50. to finance party at the end of this academic year.

Motion carried

Motion: The President of UPEI-SU be paid \$75. a week for 16 weeks, beginning May 10th and ending August 30th 1973 and the UPEI-SU pay for two full summer courses the President plans to take.

Motion carried

The Council accepted the appointment of the following Committee Heads and members proposed by the Personnel Board:

Cadre Stan Dalton Editor in Chief effective Mar. 28/73.

Student Judicial Committee

Bill Simmons-Chairman
Bill Sugget-Vice Chairman
Scott MacDonald-Member
Charlie Mills- "
Paul Roderick- "
Ken McNeill- "

vacant three positions

Winter Carnival Committee
Mitch Cattiny Co-Chairman
Charles Thompson Co-Chairman
Guy Desaulniers Member
Bill MacIntyre "
Bill Simmons "