

**Review of the
Regina Police Service
Canine Unit**

March, 1983

**Regina Board of Police Commissioners
Regina, Saskatchewan**

REVIEW OF THE
REGINA POLICE SERVICE
CANINE UNIT

BY

DR. DON FARIS

DR. WALTER CURRIE

MARCH, 1983

REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS
REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN

"The police, by the very nature of their function, are an anomaly in a free society. They are invested with a great deal of authority under a system of government in which authority is reluctantly granted and, when granted, sharply curtailed. The specific form of their authority - to arrest, to search, to detain, and to use force - is awesome in the degree to which it can be disruptive of freedom, invasive of privacy, and sudden and direct in its impact upon the individual. And this awesome authority, of necessity, is delegated to individuals at the lowest level of the bureaucracy, to be exercised, in most instances without prior review and control.

Yet a democracy is heavily dependent upon its police, despite their anomalous position, to maintain the degree of order that makes a free society possible. It looks to its police to prevent people from preying on one another; to provide a sense of security; to facilitate movement; to resolve conflicts; and to protect the very processes and rights - such as free elections, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly - on which continuation of a free society depends. The strength of a democracy and the quality of life enjoyed by its citizens are determined in large measure by the ability of the police to discharge their duties."

Herman Goldstein, Policing a Free Society

OUTLINE

	<u>Page</u>
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	i
INTRODUCTION	ii
<u>CHAPTER ONE</u>	
USE OF CANINE UNIT	1
- HUMAN USE OF DOGS	6
<u>CHAPTER TWO</u>	
SELECTION OF PERSONNEL FOR CANINE UNIT	9
<u>CHAPTER THREE</u>	
TRAINING	13
- MEANS OF DETECTION	15
- MEANS OF FORCE	15
<u>CHAPTER FOUR</u>	
SUPERVISION	27
- LOCAL POLICY	29
<u>CHAPTER FIVE</u>	
DEPLOYMENT OF POLICE SERVICE DOGS	34
- COMPARATIVE DATA	35
<u>CHAPTER SIX</u>	
CITIZEN COMPLAINT MECHANISM	40
<u>CHAPTER SEVEN</u>	
NATIVE PEOPLE AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM	47
<u>CHAPTER EIGHT</u>	
RECOMMENDATIONS	55
APPENDICES	60
"A" Brief Resume: Dr. Faris and Dr. Currie	61
"B" Criminal Code: Sec. 450-1, 25 and 26	62
"C" Job Descriptions - Sergeant and Handlers	64
"D" Metro Toronto Police <u>Injury or Force Report</u>	66
"E" Regina Police Service Dog Case Report	67

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

March, 1983

TO: The Chairman and Members of the
Regina Board of Police Commissioners

We are pleased to submit to you our Review of the Regina Police Service Canine Unit. As we indicated when we undertook this Review, we have attempted to take a problem solving approach - that is, we have attempted to go beyond merely dealing with symptoms. We have attempted to at least identify, and hopefully deal with, some of the underlying causes of the perceived problems.

We are appreciative of the co-operation we received from the Regina Police Service and from Police Departments across the country and in the United States. We also appreciate the interest and co-operation received from citizens and citizen groups in Regina and in other cities visited.

We sincerely hope that this Review will enhance the efforts of the Regina Board of Police Commissioners and the citizens of Regina to understand and respond effectively to these problems.

Yours respectfully,

Don Faris Walter Currie

Dr. Don Faris

Dr. Walter Currie

INTRODUCTION

The Regina City Police Commission held a Press Conference on Wednesday, November 10, 1982, at 8:30 a.m. in the Tenth Floor Boardroom of Regina City Hall. The purpose was to announce that they had asked Dr. Don Faris of Regina to conduct a Review of the Regina Police Service Canine Unit. At that time the Commission made available to the Press, and to other interested parties, a copy of suggested terms of reference, stating at the same time that other related matters would be dealt with by the Review. These suggested Terms of Reference were as follows:

TERMS OF REFERENCE - BUT NOT LIMITED TO - A REVIEW OF REGINA POLICE SERVICE CANINE UNIT

1. Use of Canine Unit
 - Is the use of Police Service Dogs a legitimate law enforcement tool?
2. Selection of Personnel for Canine Unit
 - Criterion for Selection
 - Psychological criterion
 - Police experience
 - Previous training
 - Selection process
3. Training
 - Examine training method and criterion
 - (i) Canine Handler
 - (ii) Police Dogs
 - (a) initial training
 - (b) ongoing training
4. Supervision
 - Training and experience of Canine N.C.O.
 - Reporting procedure re canine cases
 - Evaluations of handlers and dogs (ongoing)
 - Administrative monitoring
5. Deployment of Police Service Dogs
 - Are they used properly
 - Examination of:
 - free tracking
 - leash
 - building searches
 - Comparison - is deployment consistent with other agencies that deploy canine units?

At this Press Conference, and at subsequent meetings with interested groups, Dr. Faris summarized the Terms of Reference as follows:

"Under what circumstances is the use of Police Service Dogs a legitimate law enforcement tool? What policies governing selection, training, deployment and supervision of personnel and dogs are necessary and desirable? What mechanisms are desirable for receiving complaints?"

Dr. Faris announced, as well, at this same time, that Dr. Walter Currie of Saskatoon, had agreed to serve on the Review. Dr. Currie was a former member of the Regina City Police Commission and is a respected scholar in the areas of education and Native Studies.¹

A Public Hearing was announced for Monday, November 22, 1982 beginning at 8 A.M. in the Forum of the Regina City Hall. This Hearing was advertised in the Regina Leader Post of Saturday, November 13, Wednesday, November 17, and Saturday, November 20, 1982.

At the November 10 Press Conference, and at the Hearing, Dr. Faris stated that he and/or Dr. Currie would be willing to hear private submissions, written or oral. These private submissions were heard or received both before and after the Public Hearing of November 22, 1982.

Those persons making oral and/or written submissions to the Public Hearing on November 22, between 8 A.M. and 3 P.M. were:

- 1) Mr. Bill Rafoss, Chairman of the Board, Regina Community Legal Services Society.
- 2) Mr. Gerald Molloy, Staff member, Regina Community Legal Services Society.
- 3) Mr. Allen Borovoy, General Counsel, Canadian Civil Liberties Association.
- 4) Ms. Barbara Sanderson, individual submission.

1. Brief Resume: Dr. Faris and Dr. Currie are attached as Appendix "A".

- 5) Mr. Paul Havemann, and Dr. Jim Harding, submission on behalf of the Faculty of the School of Human Justice, University of Regina.
- 6) Mr. Keith Johnston, submission on behalf of the Law Union of Saskatchewan.
- 7) Mr. Gerald Clark, individual submission.
- 8) Mr. Kimball Cariou, submission on behalf of the Saskatchewan Committee, Communist Party of Canada.
- 9) Ms. Grace Stewart, individual submission.
- 10) Mr. Edward Pelletier, Director, Regina Friendship Centre.
- 11) Mr. Bill Fayant, Vice Chair, Regina Race Relations Committee.
- 12) Mr. Paul LaFontaine, Chair, Regina Race Relations Committee.
- 13) Mr. Matthew Shaw, individual submission.

It became clear at the November Public Hearings, and in subsequent meetings with concerned individuals and groups, that the issue of the use of police dogs in Regina was related to concerns about the fairness of the complaint mechanisms and underlying racial tensions in the City.

In order to do comparative studies in the use of police service dogs and the related issues of citizen complaint mechanisms and minority policing, Dr. Faris and Dr. Currie visited a number of Canadian and American cities. In December and January, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Winnipeg, Minneapolis, Detroit and Toronto were visited. Discussions were held with a variety of police departments, police commissions, dog handlers, citizens complaint personnel, Native groups, civil liberty associations and police experts.

CHAPTER ONE

USE OF THE CANINE UNIT

In the terms of reference for this review, the question is asked, "Is the use of Police Service Dogs a legitimate law enforcement tool?"

Police service dogs are used as law enforcement tools in two different ways. Firstly, they are used as a means of detection. They could be used to track a lost child, or to find drugs, or to sniff out explosives. They are trained to track suspects from point "A" to point "B". This ability to track suspects is accepted in court as corroborative evidence. (Regina v Haas - 1964, B.C. Supreme Court.) Secondly, police dogs are used as a means of force. The question then is,

"Is the use of a police dog considered a 'reasonable use of force'?"

Courts both in Saskatchewan and other provinces have decided that the police dog is a reasonable use of force either for protection or for effecting an arrest.

Generally, police dogs are used as a means of force in a situation where a person is suspected of committing an indictable criminal offence. Police officers would then be acting under Section 450(1) of the Criminal Code of Canada, which gives a Peace Officer the authority to arrest, without warrant, a person who has committed an indictable offence, who he/she believes has committed or is about to commit an indictable offence, who he/she finds committing an indictable offence, or for whom he/she has reasonable ground to believe a warrant is in force.¹

Furthermore, a Peace Officer has the right to use as much force as is necessary to protect himself or others in effecting an arrest. If a person takes flight, the officer has the right to use as much force as is necessary to prevent the escape (C.C. Sec. 25).

1. See Appendix "B" for Criminal Code Sec. 450-1 and 25 and 26.

In Canada, persons who commit indictable offences must accept the fact that if they attempt to escape arrest, police officers have the right to use as much force as is necessary to effect the arrest. In practice, this means that the police officer must choose the level of force necessary in the situation. Police officers may use unarmed physical force. They may tackle a person, pin their arms, or even apply choke holds. They may use a weapon, such as a nightstick or a flashlight. They may use a dog, or they may use a gun.

This authority to use force is an awesome responsibility. Herman Goldstein points out that.....

"The police, by the very nature of their function, are an anomaly in a free society. They are invested with a great deal of authority under a system of government in which authority is reluctantly granted and, when granted, sharply curtailed. The specific form of their authority - to arrest, to search, to detain, and to use force - is awesome in the degree to which it can be disruptive of freedom, invasive of privacy, and sudden and direct in its impact upon the individual. And this awesome authority, of necessity, is delegated to individuals at the lowest level of the bureaucracy to be exercised, in most instances, without prior review and control.

Yet a democracy is heavily dependent upon its police, despite their anomalous position, to maintain the degree of order that makes a free society possible. It looks to its police to prevent people from preying on one another; to provide a sense of security; to facilitate movement; to resolve conflicts; and to protect the very processes and rights - such as free elections, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly - on which continuation of a free society depends. The strength of a democracy and the quality of life enjoyed by its citizens are determined in large measure by the ability of the police to discharge their duties."¹

1. Herman Goldstein, Policing a Free Society, Ballinger; Cambridge, Mass. 1977, p. 1

Historically, in both England and the United States, the development of municipal police forces paralleled the growth of modern cities. In England, the large scale urban disorders associated with the economic hardship and food shortages of the 1820's led to an Act to establish a police force in 1829. Prior to this Act, the Armed Forces were used in an ad hoc manner to suppress riots. The intention of the 1829 Act was to reduce the level of force required to deal with civil disorder. To this day, the vast majority of police officers in Great Britain do not carry guns.

The United States experience was different. In a rough country composed of immigrants and frontiersmen, the use of force was easily justified. One American author put it this way,

"So, at the outset, actual fighting was the main job of American law enforcement. There had to be rudimentary order before there could be law. And we were a disorderly people. Promptly, then, the municipal policeman lost the constabulary attitude, became something more than the arrest-making agent of the courts, and formed the habit of inflicting direct and violent punishment himself. It was a drastic departure; its importance is clearly seen today."¹

Canada inherited the British tradition of policing with a deep concern to reduce the level of force necessary to maintain civil order. But, as in so many other ways, Canada is under continuous pressure to use American policing methods where the use of force is easily justified.²

1. Ernest J. Hopkins, Our Lawless Police: A Study of the Unlawful Enforcement of the Law, Da Capo, New York, 1972, pp. 324-25.
2. The violence in American society is seen in a very high homicide rate, frequently involving handguns. For example, Detroit with a population of one million has a murder rate of 500 a year. Toronto with a population of two million has a murder rate of 50 per year. In a recent year the Detroit police fired 800 shots at suspects and had 1400 shots fired in return. Detroit police killed 25 suspects. Both the exchange of gunfire and fatal shootings of suspects is rare in Toronto. American police are making efforts to reduce gunfire in their cities. cf. "Cooling It", Wall Street Journal, Dec. 28, 1982, p. 1.

Young Canadians are tremendously impressed by T.V. police dramas such as "Starsky and Hutch" or "Hill Street Blues". Both young offenders and young police officers may think these television programs are the real world of police work, and thereby increase violent behavior as a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The British tradition which attempts to reduce the level of force and the American tradition which easily justifies the use of force, are in conflict in many parts of police work. In our opinion, this is true of the attitude toward the use of police dogs as a means of force. The use of "this awesome authority" by an officer, through the release of his dog, depends upon the decision of the officer who must weigh the seriousness of the crime and the degree of force needed to prevent the escape of the fleeing suspects. The RCMP in the British tradition, view releasing the dog as the same as pointing a gun and pulling a trigger. They do it very seldom but when they do, they mean business, because the seriousness of the crime necessitates strong measures to apprehend the suspect.

The American attitude is generally that their law allows the use of "deadly force" on a fleeing felon, so you are doing the person a favour in using a dog rather than a gun. By far the highest ratio of injuries to dog arrests occurred in an American city that we visited, where they even send their dogs in to do building searches in "an aggressive manner". It is significant that another American city that we visited, had a very low injury ratio, undoubtedly due to the city limiting the instances when a dog may be used as force against a fleeing felon - armed robbery, arson, rape, bank robbery, or break and enter with violence. The dogs are used primarily as a means of detection.¹

In submissions we received at the public hearings and in personal interviews, we heard a wide variety of opinions about the use of police dogs.

At one end of the spectrum of opinion were those who argued that police dogs were completely unacceptable. They felt that there was no way in which the use of an animal against a human being could be justified in a civilized society. For some of these people, even the use of dogs for tracking purposes was offensive and they used expressions such as "Gestapo" and "Nazi Germany" to express their feelings of disdain.

1. See Pages 36-37.

At the other end of the spectrum were those who were completely satisfied with the use of police dogs and could see virtually no situation in which they could not be used. These people see the dogs as a deterrent to crime and consider injuries to be completely acceptable as they occur to people who are in the act of committing criminal offences.

We also heard from a great many people whose opinions fall somewhere in between these two extremes. Their opinion was that police dogs could be acceptable - depending on the purposes for which they were used - and how they were used.

It is our view that the question of whether police dog usage is acceptable in Regina is a public policy decision which should be made by the Regina Board of Police Commissioners. Both the Board members and the public of Regina should be clear that it is the Board of Police Commissioners who are responsible for such policy decisions and not the Police Department.

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS DECIDE, AS A MATTER OF PUBLIC POLICY, WHETHER OR NOT POLICE DOGS WILL BE USED IN REGINA.

If the Board of Police Commissioners decide that they do not want to use police dogs in Regina, then the review of the particular matters referred to us becomes irrelevant. If the Board decides that the use of police dogs is acceptable to them, then:

WE RECOMMEND THAT IF THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS CONFIRM THE USE OF POLICE DOGS IN THE CITY, THAT THEY MAKE POLICY REGARDING THEIR USE AS a) A MEANS OF DETECTION, OR b) A MEANS OF FORCE, OR BOTH, AND

WE RECOMMEND THAT IF THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS CONFIRMS THE USE OF POLICE DOGS AS A MEANS OF FORCE, THAT THIS USE BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICY OF THE LEAST POSSIBLE USE OF FORCE.

We shall now turn to a section on the history of the human use of dogs, to place the use of dogs in police work in an historical context.

HUMAN USE OF DOGS¹

The exact origin of the dog is not certain. Some authorities suggest the dog descended from the fox, the jackal or the wolf or some unknown common ancestor. Other authorities believe the dog may well have a separate distinct origin. In any case, the dog may be traced back to the earliest periods of recorded history where he is found in drawings, carvings, paintings and sculpture.

Human use of the intelligence and loyalty of dogs goes back equally far. It seems likely that early humans used dogs to help hunt their food and guard their dwellings. They were used to guard flocks or to carry burdens or to pull sleds or wagons.

The use of dogs in war goes back at least to the Peloponnesian War (431 - 404 B.C.) when fifty guard dogs saved Corinth from attack by the Greeks. The Romans and later the French under Napoleon both used military dogs. During the Boer War (1899 - 1902) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904 - 1905) dogs were used to search battlefields for the wounded and missing.

The Great War of 1914 - 1918 saw the Germans begin the conflict with some six thousand dogs, trained as messengers, guards and sentries. The British responded by opening their own War Dog School. In World War II, all major powers used trained dogs. Again, the Germans led the way entering the war with fifty thousand trained dogs. Both sides used dogs as sentries, messengers, pack dogs, for spotting machine gun nests and to locate the wounded. More recently, the United States used thousands of dogs in Korea and Vietnam.

The non-military use of the tracking ability of dogs can be traced back to the use of tracking hounds in Britain in the 1620's to trail "highwaymen" hiding in remote areas. In the United States, Uncle Tom's Cabin records the use of bloodhounds to track runaway slaves.

1. The material for this section is largely from Sam Chapman's Police Dogs in America, University of Oklahoma, 1979. Professor Chapman is presently working on a survey of the use of police dogs in Canada.

The ability of a dog to link a criminal to his crime was observed as early as the reign of Pyrrhus (300 - 272 B.C.) King of Epirus:

"... A certain slave for some unknown reason had been done to death by two men, when they met him on a lonely road. His dog, who was with him and sole witness, remained by the body. The King passed that way on a royal progress, and, observing the animal by the side of the corpse, bade his charioteers halt. 'Bury the body', he commanded, 'and bring the dog to me'.

Some time elapsed: The dog remained with his new master, and accompanied him when he went to a review of his troops. As two of the soldiers marched smartly past, the animal flew at them with such a fury that he all but tore them to pieces. No further evidence was needed, for, in order to escape from the dog, the criminals confessed their guilt."

The formal training of dogs for law enforcement is usually traced to experiments in France in 1895, in Germany in 1896 and in Ghent, Belgium in 1899. The Ghent program was considered both effective and efficient and was the model for programs in France, Hungary, Austria, Italy and Germany. Indeed, by 1910, over six hundred towns in Germany used police dogs. The earliest formal law enforcement use of dogs in Britain apparently dates to 1910 in the Liverpool and Hull areas. The first American programs dates to 1907 in New York City. The first officially recognized canine program in Canada was that of the R.C.M.P. in 1935. Vancouver city began its program in 1958, followed by other large Canadian centres.

By 1980 there were 1,850 police dogs attached to forces in England and Wales. In 1978 there were about 1,400 handler/dog teams in the U.S.A. Presently there are police service dogs in some thirty-four Canadian municipalities. Thirteen municipalities which had dog units no longer have them because of financial cost, misuse or ineffectiveness of the dogs.

Police dogs are used extensively in the six Canadian cities we visited - Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Prince Albert and Winnipeg which use some 50 police dogs. Although the Metropolitan Toronto Police Service does not have a canine unit, they occasionally call upon the services of their "dog club" composed of five members of the Police Force.

In addition, the R.C.M.P. have seventy-five dog handler teams across Canada. We also visited their training facility at Innisfail, Alberta.

CHAPTER TWO

SELECTION OF PERSONNEL FOR CANINE UNIT

Vacancies in the Regina canine unit are filled by those who voluntarily apply to serve in the unit.¹ Applications are accepted from all constables who have a minimum of two year's police experience. The eligible applicants are interviewed by a panel of three persons: the N.C.O. in charge of Canine, the officer in charge of Operations and the officer in charge of Canine, or his delegate.

As this is a specialized service, selection is not on the basis of seniority alone. Dog handlers often work alone and, therefore, must demonstrate an interest in the work and personal initiative as police officers. Successful applicants normally have had from three to five years' service and normally can expect to stay in the canine unit for a minimum of five years. As there are no corporal positions in the unit, those nearing the time for promotion are normally moved out.

Experience with dogs is an asset, but not a requirement. Those who are accepted as candidates are used as "quarries" to further assess their attitudes toward police dogs and the type of work dog handlers must do. Obviously, a person who is afraid of dogs would not make a good dog handler. The dog handler and his family must like dogs. In fact, the dog lives at home with the family. The "socialization" of the dog with the handler's family is very important. The handler's family becomes the "pack", for dogs have a strong "pack" instinct. The dog must learn that it is the lowest member of the "pack" because if it feels that it can be dominant, it will try to demonstrate that dominance by biting members of the family. It is claimed by some that with a properly trained dog this question of the dog challenging its position does not arise.

A person could be a very fine police officer, demonstrate initiative, have an excellent record and be highly motivated, and yet fail as a dog handler. Some handlers cannot handle a particular dog. Informants told us of cases where the "personality" of one handler did not match the "personality" of the dog he was assigned. When the handler

1. Job descriptions for the Sergeant and Dog Handler positions are included as Appendix "C"

was given another dog, they worked well together. And when this first dog was trained by another handler, they worked well together. We also heard, in another city, of a case where a very good officer tried to train three dogs, and failed every time!

It is our perception that in nearly every city, Regina included, the canine unit is seen as an elite group. Like the Emergency Response Unit, this group has special training, uses special equipment and often wears different uniforms. These special units do not have the routine boredom of other types of police work. In fact, the dog unit is often first on the scene of the crime and has very responsible decision-making powers.

Excellent physical conditioning is necessary. The dog handler must be young, agile and have a high level of endurance. The dog handler must also have a high degree of psychological health. Many informants told us that "the dog takes on the characteristics of the master". If the master is overly aggressive, the dog will be overly aggressive. If there is a streak of meanness or irresponsibility in the master, this will be reflected in the dog.

The psychological criteria for serving as a dog handler are so important that we feel this must be given special emphasis. Potential dog handlers are generally drawn from the experienced officers of the Regina Police Service. The psychological testing of new officers as they join the Regina Police Service has been strengthened over the years. At present, every new officer is tested by the use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Test, (M.M.P.I.) and the results are interpreted by a highly respected Regina Psychologist, Dr. Colin Peyson. In addition, every officer is re-tested before being added to the Emergency Response Unit.

WE RECOMMEND THAT EVERY CANDIDATE FOR THE CANINE UNIT BE RE-TESTED PSYCHOLOGICALLY.

These officers have normally had three to five years service and could be affected by the stress of police work. In addition to that, the Canine Unit probably has a higher stress load day to day than any other unit, including the Emergency Response Unit, which is very seldom called out. As the present members of the canine unit have not had this additional psychological testing before being added to the unit,

WE FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT THE ENTIRE UNIT BE RE-TESTED.

The Regina Police Service should be commended for their concern about the effects of stress on their officers and their families. People outside police work may not realize these pressures.

"Police officers are particularly vulnerable to stress. They must make split-second, life-and-death decisions; their assignments are often dangerous; and they work under the realization that even routine assignments can unexpectedly become life threatening. The boredom of some assignments causes stress, as does the need to repress emotions so that the officer can appear calm on the job. Also contributing to stress are the irregular hours, rotating shift work, the quasi-military structure and discipline, inadequate opportunities for transfer and advancement, and the perceived need to live up to the "supercop" image portrayed by television programs and films."¹

Proper training in how to handle stressful situations is essential for all police officers, and especially so for dog handlers who meet these situations far more frequently than the average officer.

"It is in the nature of police work that some people will resist arrest. Likewise, it is to be anticipated that officers will often be in situations in which they are taunted, provoked, and defied in various ways. How an officer handles such a situation will depend in large measure upon how he perceives it. If he sees the opposition and hostility, however expressed, as an attack upon him as an individual, he will probably react in kind. If instead he develops some understanding of the factors that produce such attacks on the police, he will be more capable of responding in a cool and dispassionate manner. Of course when the police must deal with persons who have no respect for the law or the police - and this is frequently the case - the most strenuous effort to be tactful and persuasive will not work. In these situations the training an officer receives in using minimal force becomes extremely important.

1. Guarding the Guardians, p. 32

Meeting stress with calm is counter to nature inclinations; it is certainly in conflict with the stereotype of how the police are expected to function. The young person going into police work most likely believes that one should stand up to a challenge, and this attitude is often reinforced by seasoned police officers. As an officer, he must be convinced that the height of maturity and prowess is to deal with challenges to his authority in a calm, unemotional, and somewhat detached manner. He must rise above the emotions of those with whom he is dealing, even at the risk of appearing cowardly. Restrained dispassionate conduct on the part of police in hostile confrontations has won a great deal of respect for them and has, at the same time, provided some clear and dramatic lessons for the community on the true nature of the police role in our society. My own impression is that officers who develop a reputation for being unflappable receive less resistance to their actions and to their authority."¹

What is the quality of training our officers receive ... "in using minimal force...?" How well trained are our officers in ... "being unflappable...", in "meeting stress with calm...", in dealing with challenges to their authority?

One final comment on the selection of personnel for the canine unit is that the present practice quite properly seeks experienced police officers. However, this means that the dog handlers are all white males as that reflects the general composition of the Regina Police Force. In other parts of Canada, we met several canine units that had, or now have, female dog handlers. We also know that the R.C.M.P. has had a considerable number of officers of Native ancestry as dog handlers.

WE RECOMMEND THAT IN FUTURE ASSIGNMENTS TO THE CANINE UNIT, PEOPLE OF NATIVE ANCESTRY AND WOMEN BE GIVEN HIGH PRIORITY.

As well, in order to retain expertise and experience within the unit, and to assist with the on-going training needs,

WE RECOMMEND THAT A POSITION OF CORPORAL BE CREATED WITHIN THE CANINE UNIT.

1. Goldstein, Policing a Free Society. p. 172.

CHAPTER THREE

TRAINING

Regina actually had police dogs in service as early as 1958. From that time until 1964, there were one or two police dogs on call. The program was closed down in 1964 for several reasons. Neither the dogs nor the handlers had a high level of expertise and subsequently they were not very effective. A second reason was that the rest of the force did not understand how the dogs should be used and therefore did not call upon their services.

In 1972, the Police Department raised the idea of having a professionally trained canine unit with the Regina Police Commission. The idea was brought forward as a budget item in 1973 and approved. Probably the moving force behind this idea was Deputy Chief George Moore, who had come from Vancouver where he had seen the Vancouver dog squad gain a favourable reputation.

The R.C.M.P. Training Unit had no immediate vacancy to train a dog handler, so a Regina constable was sent to train with the Vancouver Police Department from September 23 to December 15, 1973. This constable returned to Regina and trained four other officers.

The basic training methods contained in the Regina Police Service Canine Training Manual are, in fact, very close to the 1973 Vancouver Training Manual. The potential dog handler is given a young German Shepherd dog, before either start their formal training. The dog begins to live at home with the family and becomes "socialized" to the family, to people in general, and to other dogs. Basic obedience and retrieving begins during this socialization period. This allows for evaluation of both the handler and the dog before formal training begins.

Formal training with an inexperienced dog and an inexperienced handler usually takes ten to twelve weeks. An inexperienced handler with an experienced police dog can complete the training in eight weeks.

The training consists of studies on the theory of dog training, human-canine communication, science of smell, climatic olfactory conditions and the care and management of dogs.

The practical, training consists of many hours of work on basic control, tracking, area searches, attack, harass, building searches, location of evidence, scent discrimination, crowd control and public relations.

In order that all police officers may understand the role of Police Service Dogs, all recruits at the Saskatchewan Police College receive three hours of lectures on the use of dogs in Police Work. These lectures are given by Sgt. Forbes of the Regina Police Canine Unit.

Following the period of initial training, the dogs and handlers undergo continuous in-service training and evaluation. Each month two training days are scheduled. The handler/dog teams are assessed and evaluation reports are completed. In addition, each spring and fall, there are three day training sessions under the direction of the trainer. The daily evaluation report is the same used by the R.C.M.P.

The kind of training that Regina police dogs undergo should be of interest to the public. Some people have the impression that a police dog is trained to be a savage, snarling brute ready to tear a person apart. In fact, when police dogs are chosen, "aggressiveness" or "aggression" is far down the list of desirable qualities. A survey of police agencies in the United States and Canada in 1981 indicated that "aggression" came sixth out of ten propensities looked for in a police dog. The results were as follows:

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Propensities</u>	<u>Average Score (out of 7)</u>
1	Olfaction	6.8
2	Loyalty	6.7
3	Emotional Stability	6.7
4	Willingness to Learn	6.5
5	Stamina	6.4
6	Aggression	6.2
7	Agility	5.9
8	Adaptability to Climate	5.8
9	Appearance	5.7
10	Retrieval	5.2

1. Canadian Police Canine Association, The Quarterly, August, 1982.

The police dog provides the police with a versatile tool. The dog is a tool which has two primary functions. He can be used as a means of detection. He can be used as a means of force.

MEANS OF DETECTION

The dog can be used as a means of detection because his senses of smell, hearing and sight are so much more acute than those of humans. The dog's olfactory ability (sense of smell) is up to 40,000 times as great as a human's for many smells and up to 2 million times as acute for certain tracking scents. It is no wonder that it is the dog's olfactory ability that police forces rate so highly. In addition to his acute sense of smell, the dog has an ability to hear which is perhaps seven times as great as the normal human. Add to this eyesight, which can detect motion when humans overlook it, and better night vision. It is no wonder the police value dogs as a means of detection.

In Regina, police dogs have been used successfully to search for a lost child, to find a senile adult, and to discover the location of a young woman who had wandered away under the influence of a drug overdose, which would have been fatal. They have also helped recover lost articles.

Their use in crime work has included searches for drugs, explosives and corpses. They have recovered evidence for criminal prosecution, such as guns, knives, shell casings and clothing. Using articles of clothing, they can be used to indicate people in police line-ups. They can indicate the location of criminals concealed in buildings or in back alleys at night. They have tracked suspects from the scene of a crime to locations several miles away. They have been used to track suspects or prisoners attempting to escape custody.

MEANS OF FORCE

The dog is also useful as a means of force. The dog's speed is at least two and one-half times that of a human. His jaw power has been rated anywhere from 750 to 1,000 pounds per square inch. Even when the dog is not actually used, his barking or snarling is a psychological weapon. Many persons who are willing to attack or fight a police officer, will surrender in the presence of a dog.

Police dogs are generally trained to protect themselves if they are attacked. One Regina police dog has been shot in the head, stabbed in the jaws and beaten with crowbars and two-by-fours and is still on duty.

Most police dogs are also trained to protect the police vehicle. If anyone attempts to steal a canine unit police car, they are in for a rude surprise!

The police dog will protect the handler if the handler is attacked. There are many dog handlers who feel they owe their lives to their dogs.

The Regina police dogs are also trained to disarm a suspect upon command. On two occasions in 1981, suspects waving rifles and threatening officers were disarmed by police dogs. Not only the lives of officers but also the lives of suspects were possibly saved by these actions. In most cases, suspects are bitten when attempting to escape arrest. Dog handlers are required to issue a warning to stop or the dog will be released. If the suspect continues to flee, the dog will bring him/her down.

The use of police dogs as a means of detection is seldom a matter of controversy. The use of the police dogs as a means of force has been more frequently criticized. The citizens of Regina have a right to know how police dogs are used as a means of force, including how they are trained. Are they trained by methods that emphasize aggression? Are these animals the proverbial wild beast? The answer is that the Regina training philosophy is not based on emphasizing aggression. The training program for attack uses as its primary motivating factor, the desire to please the master. These dogs are trained to be under the control of their master and, if they attack, it is because they have been trained to do so in that particular situation, or have been directly ordered to do so. The following is an outline of the attack training given Regina Police dogs. Books on the subject of attack training are available from the Public Library. The following information will not assist criminals, but it will inform the public about the training that is given Regina Police dogs. It is a direct quotation of material recently produced by the Regina Police Service Canine Unit.

A. Methods of Attack Training Employed by Regina Police Service

(1) Aggression

Two motivating factors used in Police Service Dog training are: (a) aggression, and (b) the Dog's desire to please or serve the master. Aggression is a secondary motivation factor, while the prime motivator is the desire to please and serve the master. Where aggression becomes the prime motivation factor, the Dog's reaction will be over-aggressive toward any person encountered. This is the main difference between guard dogs, motivated by aggression, and Police Service Dogs, motivated by the desire to serve.

Aggression training consists of several progressive steps during formal training. In the first seven weeks of training, temperament and aggressiveness is closely monitored at each level. During the final four weeks of training, the progressive steps are used simultaneously in attack training.

B. Attack Training - Six Progressive Steps

Initial training is always in direct control of Handler (in harness).

(1) Tracking or area search training functions

The Police Dog plays with quarry on locating him, while in harness. The dog is taught to locate the subject and enjoy the encounter. At this stage, there is no aggression whatsoever.

(2) Promote Police Dog to Grab Clothing (Tug-of-War)

The Police Dog is encouraged to grab and pull pieces of cloth, held by the Handler. In effect, this is a tug-of-war and is an enjoyable experience. Confidence is reinforced as Dog is allowed to win. As well, the use of the front part of the Dog's mouth is promoted, for the purpose of holding the article.

(3) Introduction of Aggression

The Police Dog, on locating suspect, either by tracking or by area search, is encouraged to give tongue (bark) only. No physical contact is allowed.

(4) Forced Retrieving - Initial Stages

The dog is encouraged to hold any object in his mouth. The command to release is introduced. Most of the objects used in this exercise are awkward for a dog to hold and, therefore, the use of the back part of his mouth is required.

DURING THE SEVEN WEEKS, ALL THE ABOVE STEPS ARE REPEATED AND REPEATED, PROMOTING THE DOG'S CONFIDENCE AND ENJOYMENT IN THESE ACTIVITIES. HIS AUTOMATIC VERBAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF QUARRY IS, THEREFORE, ATTAINED.

(5) Initial Master or Quarry Response

A gunny sack is attached to an armguard in such a manner that a minimum of eighteen inches of material hangs down. Progressively, the gunny sack is shortened. First applied by Handler using armguard and playing and/or placing the armguard and material on the quarry. The dog is promoted to pursue quarry and grab the clothing which, up to now, has always been loose and hanging. Progressively, the material is shortened until it is firmly around the armguard. This promotes the dog to grab the sleeve and hold onto the material, rather than grabbing the arm with the front part of the mouth. Once this is accomplished, other forms of material are placed over the armguard, usually jackets.

(6) Watch Without Attack and Attack on Command

When efficient in attacking the material on the armguard and being efficient in barking and watching quarry, the dog is allowed to contact the quarry during watch command. Correction is applied to indicate to the dog that no physical contact is to occur on watch command.

Four methods are utilized in detaching the dog from physical contact:

- (a) Switch response - severe correction applied to hind quarters.
- (b) Reverse force applied through leash and choker chain.
- (c) Command word to stop.
- (d) Command word to release, associated through force fetching.

Master protection training is introduced. The quarry fights with Handler and the dog is encouraged to grab the armguard. The dog's instincts of protection of its Master are further developed beyond his natural reactions.

C. Weapons Other Than Guns

(1) Small Weapon

The Police Dog is encouraged to respond to the arm in which a weapon (knife, small club) is held by quarry.

(2) Large Weapon - Long stick, shovel, rake

The Police Dog is encouraged to harass and delay the quarry holding large weapon. The dog circles and dodges, barking at quarry until an opportunity arises allowing the dog to attack the arm the weapon is held in. The quarry hits the Police Dog, inflicting pain. The dog will, through his training, assume the watch position; harassing, delaying by circling and barking. He will attack the weapon with or without command.

D. Situation Training

(1) General

Attacks are performed in situations the dog will encounter in his service:

- (a) Building searches, quarry runs
- (b) Fleeing autos, driver runs

(c) Tracking situations

(d) On-view situations

In each of these situations, hot pursuit may be required.

(2) Building Searches

To this time in the training program, the Police Dog has located persons by scent, but has never actually had to detain or apprehend the quarry. In these exercises, the quarry flees upon being located by the dog and the dog must prevent escape by physically apprehending. Police Dog is given armguard by fleeing quarry.

(3) Fleeing Auto - On view from auto

The quarry or, on occasion quarries, flee from a vehicle being pursued. Police Dog sent in pursuit of quarry fleeing from vehicle.

(4) Tracking Situations

In tracking situations, located quarry flees. The Police Dog is let go in hot pursuit to apprehend.

IN ALL OF THESE SITUATIONS, THE DOG RESPONDS TO THE SLEEVE (ARMGUARD WORN BY QJARRY). THIS IS REFERRED TO AS "SLEEVE RESPONSE ATTACK TRAINING".

(5) Distraction Training

The Police Dog is put in a position where outside factors such as persons, vehicles, other animals, noise, etc., will not effect his ability to complete the exercise as commanded.

An example of this would be in on view situations, other officers are placed between the fleeing quarry and the Police Dog. All of these persons are running in the same direction., The Dog must bypass the other officers, concentrate on and apprehend the quarry.

(6) Environment Training

The Police Dog is placed in situations where there are many environmental distractions. This includes yards with fences, hedges, parking lots, urban streets, both residential and business districts. In all of these situations, the Police Dog must apprehend the fleeing quarry.

(7) Attack on Recall

When the dog is sent in pursuit of the quarry, at any stage of the attack, he must recall to the Handler without physical contact with the quarry.

Training procedure for this exercise may be any or all of the following:

- (a) Attach a 30 to 60 foot line to the choker chain. Other end is held by the Handler. The dog is sent in pursuit on command and at some point recalled. If the dog continues to pursue, he quickly is halted by the line and is commanded to come to Handler.
- (b) Command word to stop followed by recall.
- (c) As described in previous watch command training.

(8) Attack on Motionless Person

Person can be either sitting, standing or lying down. Police dog is sent in pursuit of a motionless person. Dog must not use aggression against this person.

Methods used are as above in Attack on Recall.

(9) Socializing with Quarry after Attack

When the Police Dog is efficient at all previous attack training situations, he is encouraged to socialize or, in effect, play with the quarry once the exercise has been completed. This enables the dog to be aggressive only on command.

The dog receives continuous training in socializing with people in different situations. This is a key training function as the dog's temperament and aggressiveness becomes controlled. This allows the dogs to perform in large groups during public relations demonstrations and in all other circumstances except when under command of attack.

E. Attach Response

(1) Act of Attack

All training exercises discussed have been directed toward the first response area, the sleeve or arm. Through repetition and consistency, this is the area of first response action in all situations.

Not in all situations can a dog react to the first response area. Therefore, a second response area is introduced in the training program.

Examples why this is necessary:

- (a) A person fleeing, running very fast, has a tendency to hold the arms tight against his body where the dog has difficulty seeing or being able to take the sleeve. Factors are height of arms swinging in front and light conditions.
- (b) Person jumping over physical barriers, i.e. fences, hedges. In these instances, the arms are not available, only the lower portion of the legs are extended.
- (c) Person fleeing on a bicycle.
- (d) Dog reacting to a person kicking at him.

(2) Secondary Response Area Training

The method followed is similar to initial attack response, however, the lower legs of quarry are wrapped in cloth. In these circumstances, the quarry keep their arms high and out of reach, promoting the dog to take the lower leg region. The dog is to take the extended cloth, rather than the leg itself.

It should be pointed out the primary response remains the arm.

(3) Soft/Hard Hold Technique

A normal German Shepherd dog has the capability of applying in excess of 800 pounds per square inch of pressure with his jaws. Substantially more pressure can be applied by the back portion of the mouth than is available with the front portion. The term "soft hold" refers to the dog holding with the front portion of the mouth and "hard hold" refers to the dog holding with the back part of the mouth.

Using cloth in training promotes the dog to use the front portion of his mouth in attack response. The amount of pressure applied by the dog holding an object depends upon the resistance force the dog is confronted with. In actual practice, when a dog takes hold of a subject who immediately stops and offers no resistance, the dog releases and watches. Where a subject resists and tries to pull away, the dog applies further pressure. Where the dog attacks the extended portion of the body, arm or leg, and force is applied against the mouth, the hold will become a "hard hold" and extreme pressure will be applied. It should be noted there is sufficient power in a "soft hold" to puncture skin.

Through training, the Police Dog will apply pressure only when confronted with resistance.

(4) Quarries

Quarries are persons used to be pursued by Police Dogs in their training functions.

In the past, four civilian persons have been used in this function; however, due to the possibility of injury, only employees of the police department are used. Prospective Dog Handlers are required to perform as quarries, so a preliminary assessment can be made. (It might be noted that over 95% of quarries are white male police officers.)

To better observe the reaction of Police Dogs toward people, quarries who are not afraid of dogs and quarries who do, in fact, fear dogs are used.

(5) Summary

Upon completion of training, the Police Dog will indicate a suspect by barking and circling, without contact. He will physically contact a suspect only if the subject continues to flee, if force is used against the dog, or if force is used against the Handler.

The trained Police Dog will cease contact and revert to the watch position upon command. He will cease the attack prior to or during actual contact upon command.

In attack, the Police Dog will go for an arm, unless for some reason it is not readily available.

One major question arises from the above description of the Regina Police dog training methods. The very first point is that "aggression" is a less important factor than "pleasing the master" in motivating the dog. Yet this "pleasing the master" motivation is less clearly developed in the description of the training methods than are the "aggression" factors. Another point to be remembered is that at the same time the dog is being trained, the handler is being trained. Throughout any training procedures, emphasis must be made on the minimal use of force.

If the above uses of the Police Dog are what are intended when the dog is "...under the control of their master...", then we must also record that our study of Regina Police Service Dog Case Reports revealed instances where their use was clearly inappropriate. We know of three cases in 1981 where the dogs ran after and seized three juveniles (one 11 year old, one 12 year old and one 14 year old). None of these juveniles were charged with any crime. One suffered a serious puncture, one suffered a scrape and the other a welt to the leg. In one case the juvenile had broken a pop bottle on the street, which is an annoying but hardly a serious offence. In the other two cases the juvenile just happened to be in the vicinity of an offence. In none of these cases was the dog in harness when used.

In other instances, where an offence against the Criminal Code was committed during 1981, one must question the degree of force used in the apprehension of the suspect(s). In one instance, the released dog located the suspect hiding between four tires under a van - "...dog bites to the left leg". In a building search, the dog was let into the building through the broken window and "By the time I (the handler) got inside via broken window, I could hear a struggle taking place in the back". A third example: "the suspect was presently in the yard--stealing vegetables from the garden. I ... saw the suspect carrying a head of cabbage ... I shouted at him to stop ... the police dog was sent in pursuit. The fleeting suspect ... sustained several scrapes to his right forearm and bruises on his right thigh". Another incident involved a dangerous driver who stopped his vehicle near a field with two police cars immediately behind. "When (the driver) pulled over, and when his door opened and he started running, police dog X apprehended him." The driver " ... received several small scrapes to his left leg ... "

In the first example, if the dog had been on leash, would the bites have occurred? Should the dog have been out of eye/voice contact so that the struggle ensued in the building search? Did the theft of a cabbage warrant the force used? And in the fourth incident - are dogs being used in place of officers because it is easier, and quicker, and no one questions the use of force embodied in a K-9? The Criminal Code states in Section 25 that:

"Everyone ... as a peace officer ... is, if he acts on reasonable and probable grounds, justified ... in using as much force as is necessary ... "

And Section 26 states,

"Everyone who is authorized by law to use force is criminally responsible for any excess thereof according to the nature and quality of the act that constitutes the excess."

To ensure better that the authority to use force is wisely used and not abused,¹

1. See Appendix "D" for a sample copy of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Injury or Force Report

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA POLICE COMMISSION ESTABLISH REGULATIONS WHEREBY ANY MEMBER OF THE DEPARTMENT WHO DURING THE PERFORMANCE OF DUTY USES FORCE RESULTING IN AN INJURY BEING SUSTAINED TO A PERSON, OR WHERE A COMPLAINT IS MADE THEN, OR MAY LATER BE MADE, RESPECTING THE USE OF FORCE, SHALL NOTIFY HIS DUTY OFFICER AND FILE A REPORT OF ALL THE PERTINENT CIRCUMSTANCES WITH ONE COPY GOING TO THE CHIEF OF POLICE WHO WILL REPORT THE INCIDENT TO THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS.

As we pointed out earlier, the current Regina Police Service Canine Training Manual is based on the 1973 Vancouver Training Manual. It is not up-to-date in a number of areas.

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE WRITING OF AN UP-TO-DATE REGINA POLICE SERVICE CANINE TRAINING MANUAL BE GIVEN HIGH PRIORITY, and, WE FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT THIS NEW MANUAL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS TO BE CERTAIN THAT IT IS IN LINE WITH THEIR POLICY OBJECTIVES.

Yet another step which should be taken to strengthen the training of both the dog handlers and the dogs would be to have an external expert on the breeding, raising, training and use of police dogs come to Regina to give an annual assessment of each handler/dog team. Such experts might come from the R.C.M.P. training unit at Innisfail, Alberta or from civilian trainers or consultants with other police departments.

The results of these assessments should be given to the police command. In addition, the police command should spend time with these visiting experts so that they become acquainted with the range of potential administrative policies available to meaningfully monitor and control the use of police handler/dog teams. Therefore,

WE RECOMMEND THAT THERE BE AN ANNUAL EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT OF THE HANDLERS AND DOGS.

CHAPTER FOUR

SUPERVISION

The dog handlers are under the direct supervision of a sergeant. The sergeant had four and one-half years of general police experience before becoming a dog handler in 1974. After two years as a handler, he became the trainer in 1976. He had headed the canine unit since that time and has trained seven handler/dog teams. The sergeant has attended training seminars in Calgary, Edmonton and Brandon on several occasions. He has given expert evidence in both Queen's Bench and Magistrates Court and lectures on the use of Police Dogs (three hours) each year at the Saskatchewan Police College. Sergeant Forbes has been a Director of the Canadian Police Canine Association for three years and in 1982 was a Judge at the Calgary Police Canine Trials.

Each time a police dog is used, a Police Service Dog Case Report must be completed by the handler (see Appendix "E"). One copy of this dog case report goes to the general files, attached to a General Occurrence Report. The other copy is retained by the dog handler.

WE RECOMMEND THAT AS WITH OTHER REPORTS IN THE REGINA POLICE SERVICE, THERE BE FOUR COLOUR CODED COPIES OF DOG CASE REPORTS AND THAT THE COPY THAT IS RETAINED BY THE CANINE UNIT BE FILED BY THE SERGEANT IN A CENTRAL FILE.

The Sergeant reviews these dog case reports, as well as conducting the monthly and semi-annual training sessions. Occasionally, he rides along with the dog handlers to see them operate under "street" conditions.

Each year the Sergeant is responsible for doing an Annual Assessment of each member of his unit. This performance evaluation is done on a standard form (RPS 308) according to policy laid down in the Administrative Manual, Part V, sec. 055.1. All officers are rated on nine scales. These deal with the knowledge, quality and quantity of work, use of working time, dependability, judgment, initiative, co-operation and general appearance.

Within the Canine Unit, monthly summaries are kept of arrests by the handlers and a separate summary of arrests by the dogs. This dog-arrest summary has a column to indicate injuries to prisoners. Injuries are also noted on the Police Service Dog Case Report and this notation includes a description of the injury, where it was treated (which hospital) and by whom (doctor's name). It is a policy of the Regina Police Service that every person suffering from a dog bite injury must be taken to a hospital to receive treatment. The injured prisoners are treated in the out-patient facility and we know of no case where a person was hospitalized. Because these are out-patient cases, there is no way to recover them from hospital records, apart from a costly search of out-patient records (60,000 in one hospital alone). Injuries are also reported to the Duty Inspector each time an injured prisoner is brought in. The report of the injury goes to the officer responsible for the canine unit the next day. While dog bit injuries are treated as a serious matter by the Regina Police Service, there are further steps which should be taken to record the extent of the injury.

WE RECOMMEND THAT EVERY SUSPECT WHO HAS BEEN CONTACTED BY A POLICE DOG SHOULD HAVE A PHOTOGRAPH TAKEN OF ALL INJURIES AT THE TIME THAT THEY ARE BOOKED, AND THAT THIS PHOTOGRAPH BE ADDED TO THE GENERAL FILE, and

WE RECOMMEND THAT EACH DOG BITE BE REPORTED TO THE REGINA CITY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, and

WE FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT AT THE END OF EACH MONTH THE MONTHLY POLICE SERVICE DOG CASES REPORT GO TO THE CHIEF OF POLICE AND FROM HIM TO THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS, and

WE FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS URGE THE SASKATCHEWAN POLICE COMMISSION TO DRAW UP A PROVINCE-WIDE POLICY ON THE USE OF POLICE SERVICE DOGS AND REQUIRE OF BOARDS OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS AN ANNUAL REPORT ON THE NUMBER OF PERSONS CONTACTED BY POLICE DOGS, AND THE NUMBER OF PERSONS INJURED BY POLICE DOGS.

Local Policy

The implication of these last two recommendations is that while accountability for the use of dogs seems reasonably clear within the Police Department, overall public accountability must be made clear. It must be made clear that the responsibility for the policy of dog use lies with the Saskatchewan Police Commission and the Regina Board of Police Commissioners. There is at present a local policy statement which is as follows:

L-94.7 Canine

(1) General

(a) Unless assigned a specific duty, members of Canine Section will act in support of other units on calls which indicate their dog will be of assistance.

(b) When available, policy dogs will be the first to cover the ground on searches in such incidents as silent alarms, alarms ringing, suspects on premises and prowlers or persons hiding in open areas. Members first arriving at the scene shall request the services of the police dog, unless one has been dispatched. They are then to surround the area or building and await the arrival of the dogmaster. Except in emergencies, no member is to precede the dogmaster and dog into any building or area or situation to which the dogmaster has been detailed.

(2) Operational

(a) The final decision to apply a police dog to a specific police operation shall remain with the dogmaster concerned, keeping in mind the dog's capabilities and the probable or possible results in the use of the dog.

(b) Before releasing a dog for the purpose of locating a suspect in a building, the dogmaster is to call a warning to the effect that a police dog will be released. If the person does not make himself visible and come forward, the dogmaster is then to wait a reasonable time before releasing the dog.

(c) In using a police dog in the apprehension of a fleeing suspect or in using a dog as an actual means of force, the dogmaster concerned must give proper consideration to a peace officer's responsibilities in the use of force as defined in the Criminal Code of Canada.

(3) Control

(a) Free tracking should only be used in an indictable offence or where there is reasonable and probable grounds that one has been committed or is about to be committed.

(b) Summary conviction offences - dogs shall be harnessed and in the control of the dogmaster.

(c) Police dogs shall be kept under control in areas to which the public have access.

(d) Police dogs shall not be left unattended when they have contact with the public.

(4) Juveniles and Missing Persons

(a) Dogmasters will not knowingly send their dogs after juveniles unless under direct control of a harness and the dogmaster.

(b) Dogs shall not be used in the searching for missing persons, children, mental patients, unless under the direct control of the dogmaster.

(5) Disturbances and Crowd Control

(a) Dogs shall not be used in crowd control that involves children.

(b) Dogs may be used in crowd control in extreme conditions, but only at the order of the Duty Officer, unless in an emergency situation where the dogmaster feels his life or a fellow officer's life is in danger and a decision must be made at that moment.

(c) Dogs shall not be used in minor disturbances such as fights, strikes, etc.

(6) Domestic or Wild Animals

(a) Police dogs shall not be used for the purpose of searching for domesticated or wild animals.

(b) Stray dogs shall not be kept in Canine kennels or transported in Canine's vehicle.

(7) Apprehension by Police Dog

(a) When a police dog is used in the apprehension of a culprit the doghandler will immediately advise the dispatcher whose responsibility it will be to notify the Duty Inspector.

(b) The Duty Inspector will, as soon as feasible, interview the person apprehended as well as the dog handler to establish:

- The tactics employed in the apprehension,
- the degree of force used, and
- the extent of injury, clothing damaged, etc., if any.

(c) A written report by the Inspector outlining the above findings will be submitted prior to the end of his shift, to the Deputy Chief of Operations.

We question whether many of the Regina Board of Police Commissioners were even aware that such a policy existed, let alone that they should be publicly accountable for this policy. Let us examine the question:

Who is responsible for the use of dogs?

The Police Officer? Ultimately the use of a dog as a means of force lies with the dog handler. He makes his decision within the framework of policies laid down by the Regina Police Service. Dog handlers act as they are trained to act, and officers that take their place will be trained in much the same way. It is this officer to whom "...this awesome authority..." to use force is delegated at the lowest level of decision making in the bureaucracy.

The Chief of Police? Management and administrative policy decisions within the Regina Police Service are the responsibility of the Chief of Police. This includes administrative policies respecting the use of dogs. But these policies, and his management, must be approved by the Board of Police Commissioners. If his policies or management are not satisfactory to the Board of Police Commissioners, he may be replaced.

The Board of Police Commissioners? They are responsible and accountable for the operation of the Regina Police Service. They can change policies, or replace the Police Chief. But, they are bound in some regards by the regulations of the Saskatchewan Police Commission. They are only part-time with no permanent administrative staff. And, they are appointed by City Council.

The City Council? The City Council appoints the Board of Police Commissioners. If City Council is dissatisfied with the Board of Police Commissioners, they can replace the Aldermen and any others who serve on the Police Commission.

The Citizens of Regina? The quality of police service in Regina is ultimately decided by the people of Regina. What accountability do they expect from the Regina Police Commission? What overall responsibility do they place on the Regina City Council? What level of use of force will they support? Do they support the use of police dogs? For what purpose? In what manner? If the people of Regina are dissatisfied with the use of police dogs they must say so, or be held ultimately responsible.

At what point in this chain of responsibility can changes be made to increase public accountability? It is our opinion that one very vital, and at this point weak, link in the chain is the Regina Board of Police Commissioners.

A very important step is to increase the public accessibility of the Regina Board of Police Commissioners. If a citizen wanted to raise a policy issued with the Board, which is legally responsible for policing in the City of Regina, how would that citizen go about it? That Board is not listed in the phone book. That Board has no office or address where they can be reached.

The Board of Police Commissioners which has been strengthened by the addition of two members of the public, has recently taken steps to deal with serious issues such as race relations, high speed chases, and booking procedures. But they are in the position of being publicly accountable for the expenditure of some twenty million dollars, without having an office, with no staff of their own, with no significant budget of their own to deal with their responsibilities.

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS ESTABLISH A PERMANENT OFFICE IN THE REGINA CITY HALL. THE BOARD SHOULD HIRE A PERMANENT HALF-TIME EXECUTIVE SECRETARY. THE OFFICE SHOULD BE STAFFED BY A SECRETARY/RECEPTIONIST ON A FULL-TIME BASIS. THE BOARD SHOULD HAVE SUFFICIENT BUDGET TO INITIATE ITS OWN RESEARCH PROJECTS.

The Saskatchewan Police Commission is filling a gap in a limited way by providing a one-day seminar to provide orientation to new police commissioners. In future, they should hold more advanced level seminars to assist those who have been Commissioners for a year or more.

And in order to increase public accessability to the Board,

WE RECOMMEND THAT IN ADDITION TO HAVING A REGULAR PART OF THEIR MONTHLY MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS HOLD SOME OF ITS REGULAR MEETINGS IN WELL PUBLICIZED LOCATIONS IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE CITY TO HEAR FROM PEOPLE IN THOSE COMMUNITIES.

And to further increase public input into policing policy in the city,

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS SET UP CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEES COMPOSED OF REPRESENTATIVES OF A WIDE VARIETY OF ETHNIC, RELIGIOUS, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC GROUPS IN REGINA TO GIVE THE BOARD ADVICE ON PRESENT AND/OR FUTURE POLICING POLICIES.

CHAPTER FIVE

DEPLOYMENT OF POLICE SERVICE DOGS

In the various cities we visited, we attempted to gather some statistical data to assist us in making recommendations concerning the use of police dogs. We wanted to know if different techniques were used, and if so, how they affected the efficiency of the dogs and the number of injuries suffered by suspects.

We found it very difficult to gather comparable data. Statistics are kept in a different form in different cities. For example, the number of dog arrests as compared to handler arrests would vary widely. Some cities do not even keep these figures separately, as they credit the handler/dog "team" with the arrest. Some cities have their handlers do considerable police work that does not involve the use of the dog (e.g. arresting people on warrants) and yet credit this to the "handler".

Even the data on "total times dog used" could vary as one city might credit the influence of the dog barking inside the vehicle at the scene of a disturbance as a "dog use" while others might not credit this as a "use" unless the dog left the vehicle.

Probably the most difficult area to deal with is that of "injuries". We found many police departments very reluctant to give us data on injuries. The Regina Police Service was very open in giving us its injury data. In 1981 they recorded 64 injuries. They divided these into 48 "minor" injuries and 16 "major" injuries. They defined a "minor" injury as ... "a superficial wound requiring tetanus shot only. These scrapes and scratches can be caused either by the dog's mouth or paw and can also occur as the subject falls to the ground. Not all require treatment". The "major injury was defined as ... "a puncture of the skin caused by the police dog in apprehension. Some cases require stitches, however no person has ever been admitted to hospital because of dog inflicted injuries".

COMPARATIVE DATA

REGINA SASKATOON WINNIPEG CALGARY EDMONTON VANCOUVER TORONTO DETROIT MINNEAPOLIS
(1982)

Total Calls for Service 64,624 68,973 203,430 230,212 203,430 146,000 1,088,185 622,669 215,126

Calls Attended by Canine 4,091 1,596 N/A 6,000 5,487 12,671 14 N/A N/A

Total Times Dog Used N/A 508 2,453 3,110 3,708 3,237 14 1,023 829

Total Successful Dog Uses 198 N/A N/A N/A N/A 406 1 N/A N/A

Dog Arrests 250 N/A 157 278 280 332 0 282 40

Handler Arrests 373 275 261 254 221 N/A N/A N/A N/A

Injuries 64 Few 13 20-30 8 68 in 8 Months (1982) 0 7 40

of Dog Handlers 4 3 6 12 8 15 Club 19 13

Many other cities gave us some sort of round figure estimate. In some cases we received different estimates from different sources in the same Police Force. In every Police Department there was great sensitivity to the fact that the press could, and in many instances had, created very difficult situations for canine units by publicizing dog bites. Over two-thirds of the City Police Canine Units had had such experiences and in at least one instance had been very close to being abolished. Nearly every police department emphasized the importance of maintaining good public relations and many canine units have a very busy schedule of public demonstrations.

Some of the injury figures seem very low. Toronto's figure of zero is accurate. Although the Toronto Police Department has no canine unit, they still feel the need for dogs occasionally. Four police officers, at their own expense, have trained German Shepherds. However, the use of these dogs is very sporadic, they are often called in many hours after a crime has occurred. Their one successful use happened when a canine club member, almost fortuatoously was on the scene very quickly. Evidence was found that led to three arrests. A recent Hinkling-Johnson management report has recommended the creation of a canine unit on a pilot basis.

Another very low injury figure which is highly credible is that of 7 injuries in Detroit. Detroit population is approximately 60% black people who often hate and fear police dogs. They recall the use of dogs by slave owners in the American South. The use of police dogs can be a volatile issue in American cities with black populations. Despite that fact, many large cities, such as Detroit, and Washington, D.C., have large canine units. These dogs are never used for crowd control, and they are largely used for tracking and very seldom as a means of force.

Another interesting feature of the use of dogs in Detroit was that the dogs were used in two-person squad cars. The dog was used as a special detection tool by the two officers. Having a human partner means that a dog handler does not rely on the dog as his "partner". The one-person dog units used in the Western U.S. and Canada, almost force the dog-handler to view the dog as his "partner". Indeed, some

dog-handlers and some literature refer to the dog as a "partner". Spending night after night, hour after hour with the dog, the handler and the dog do become very close. This could lead to a very dangerous reliance on the dog. Although they are highly trained, police dogs only have the intelligence of a one or two year old child. They cannot really "think" what they do. They cannot phone in for assistance. They cannot even open a door to go to their handler's assistance. If an undue reliance on the dog as "partner" can endanger the officer, it might also endanger suspects, as one officer alone with the dog may feel forced to use the dog as a means of force more frequently than he/she would if he/she were also accompanied by another officer.

Certainly one argument against using two-person cars with a dog is that it would be more expensive. On the other hand, it would have the advantage of giving first-hand experience of the use of police dogs to patrol officers, other than handlers, as well as the advantages discussed above. And finally, the poorest argument for the use of police dogs is that they are "cheap". Their justification lies in their value as an additional tool.

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA POLICE SERVICE CANINE UNIT
EXPERIMENT WITH THE USE OF TWO-PERSON CAR UNITS AND MONITOR THE
RESULTS.

Even if the use of one-person squad cars is continued, we must stress the importance of the dog handler having back-up from other officers, even if only for his own safety. Usually, for example in the case of a break and enter, other police officers will have surrounded the building. The dog then serves a useful purpose to detect the suspect on the premises. But why must the dog make the arrest? If the handler is close enough to "read" the dog and control it, he should be able to prevent any contact taking place. And if he is backed up by other officers, any suspect who attempts to flee from a building which is surrounded should be arrested by those officers. Indeed, once detection has taken place, the dog and handler should be able to back off, leaving the arrest to other officers.

There must be no pressure for the canine unit to make "arrests". They should be noted for the quality of their work, not the quantity. They should pride themselves on the number of arrests without injuries to the suspect.

There are on-going discussions between dog trainers about the relative merits of having dogs track "free" or "on-line". Both sides will argue their system is more effective. While it may be argued that "free" tracking is totally necessary in some situations, as a general policy we feel that it is important to assert that "on-line" tracking should be the norm.

The problem with "free" tracking is that the dog can get too far away from his handler. We read case reports where the dog did get a block or two away from the handler. Obviously, in this situation, the dog is outside the handler's control. This presents a number of dangers. It is dangerous for the dog. He might very well be hit by a car, become involved in a dog fight or be beaten by an escaping suspect. It is dangerous for the handler. If he is not there to back up his dog, his dog similarly is not there to back him up. It is dangerous for the suspect. If the dog catches him outside the range of control of the handler, the dog may do more damage than is necessary. And finally, it is dangerous for the public. If the dog is outside the control of his master, loses the trail of the suspect, and sees someone running in the area, he may very well attack that person.

WE RECOMMEND THAT "ON-LINE" TRACKING BE THE NORM IN THE CITY OF REGINA.

In building or area searches, the dog is normally "free". In this situation, we must emphasize the necessity for the dog handler to stay very close to his dog. He/She must stay close to "read" the dog and he/she must stay close to control him. We are concerned about the number of suspects bitten in building or area searches. Possibly one factor is the high percentage of suspects who are under the influence of alcohol and/or other drugs. These people will kick out at, or attempt to fight the dog. The handler must be close to the dog to prevent this contact occurring, if possible, and to minimize damage if it cannot be prevented from occurring.

Finally, the examination of the canine units' dog case reports reveal that one dog inflicted a very high proportion of the injuries. Is this because of handler error? Is it because this particular dog is not appropriately trained? Is it because this is a young, strong dog? Is it because he has not mastered a "soft-hold" bite? We can only ask these questions, but ultimately the question is, "Why did the police command not take action?"

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS
REQUIRE THE REGINA POLICE SERVICE COMMAND TO REPORT ON THE
WIDELY DIFFERING INJURY RATES AND TAKE ACTION TO CORRECT THIS
SITUATION.

CHAPTER SIX

CITIZEN COMPLAINT MECHANISM

When a citizen has a complaint concerning the use of a police service dog, where do they go? Are they satisfied that their complaint will be dealt with fairly and efficiently? These questions arose out of public concern expressed at the Public Hearing and in personal interviews. Some citizens expressed the view that if they had received an explanation of the use of police dogs and an apology for what they felt was a misapplication, they would have been satisfied. Other citizens complained about the delay in handling what they felt was a straight-forward complaint. Others expressed the opinion that many people do not come forward with complaints against the police because they fear police harassment. The view was often expressed that you could not expect the police to fairly investigate the police. How could you expect one team to umpire their own ballgame?

We found that complaints about the use of police dogs arose from time to time in most cities which did not strictly limit the use of police dogs as a means of force. Nowhere did we hear complaints about the use of police dogs as a means of detection. The total number of complaints against police officers and against dog handlers in Regina from 1979-1982 are as below:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Against Dog Handlers</u>	<u>Total Complaints</u>
1979	3	56
1980	2	71
1981	8	60
1982	5	58

It would be fair to say that there was concern about the mechanism for handling citizen complaints against the police in every province that we visited. In every city, complaints about the use of police dogs were handled by the same mechanisms as any other complaint. The concern about the mechanism, therefore, naturally applied to the way in which complaints were handled about the use of police dogs.

One major problem we identified, in Saskatchewan, was that many citizens were not aware of the options that were available to them if they had a complaint against the police. Indeed, in the vast majority of cities we visited, there were not even posters or pamphlets on public display in the main lobby of the central police station advising citizens of the procedures to be followed to lay a complaint against the police. This is the situation in Regina. It is unfortunate because it often means that a citizen who feels that he or she has been wronged by a person in a blue uniform must approach another person in a blue uniform asking how to lay a complaint. The psychological barrier is obvious and may explain in part, the general perception that many people, and particularly persons of disadvantaged or minority groups, are reluctant to lay complaints.

In Saskatchewan a person with a complaint against the police has at least six alternatives before him.¹

- 1) They might request a Special Inquiry by the Attorney General under Section 53 of the Police Act. Although this is rarely used, it might be requested under extremely unusual and serious circumstances.
- 2) A person might undertake civil action in the Courts. This has happened even though it is costly in terms of time and money.
- 3) Criminal action can be taken in the courts. Charges of excessive use of force by police officers could end up in criminal court as "use of force" is dealt with in the Criminal Code of Canada.

The three aforementioned mechanisms are, in fact, very seldom used. It is the following three which are more commonly used and are dealt with in Part IV of the Regulations under the Police Act.

1. In addition to these six alternatives, it should be mentioned that the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission can receive complaints against the police from people who believe they have been treated in a discriminating manner by police because of their race. For example, Sections 7, 12 and 16 of the Saskatchewan Human Rights Code might all apply to cases against police officers or the Police Service.

4) Complaints may be taken directly to the Saskatchewan Police Commission. This three person provincial commission has as its chairman and vice-chairman, two male lawyers, and a third member is a woman school teacher from rural Saskatchewan. All three members are part-time and therefore do not secure their livelihood from law enforcement. The Commission has full-time staff, including a full-time investigator with a law enforcement background. The Regulations read:

4.01 Complaints are to be in writing and shall be acknowledged by the Commission.

4.02 Complaints may be referred by the Commission to the Board of Police Commissioners, or, in the absence of such board, to the council, for investigation and report.

4.03 In the event the Commission is satisfied with the report and investigation, a letter outlining the decision reached is to be forwarded to the complainant, with a copy to the board or council.

4.04 In the event the Commission is not satisfied with the investigation and report, it may cause further enquiries to be made, either by referral back to the board or council, or by instituting its own inquiry.

4.05 When a complaint concerns a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police employed in the province, the matter shall be handled in accordance with section 12 of the Act.

5) Complaints may be taken directly to the Police. Citizen complaints are received, investigated and action recommended by police officers assigned by the Chief of Police. It is then up to the Chief to decide what action is to be taken. Discipline Procedures are outlined in the Municipal Police Discipline Regulations under the Saskatchewan Police Act. Disciplinary action may range all the way from a verbal or written reprimand to dismissal and/or action under the Criminal Code of Canada. The Regulations read:

4.06 To the extent it is reasonably possible, complaints are to be in writing, and signed by the complainant.

4.07 A member who receives a complaint shall forthwith record details of the date, time, place and nature of the complaint and identities of the persons involved.

4.08 Upon receipt of a complaint, a written acknowledgement is to be made forthwith to the complainant and notification to the member involved.

4.09 The chief of police shall assign a member who is of equal or higher rank than the member involved to investigate the complaint provided, however, that such member must not have been involved in any way in the subject matter of the complaint.

4.10 The investigating member shall, where possible, take statements from all witnesses or persons having knowledge of the subject of complaint.

4.11 The investigating member shall promptly submit a report outlining the results of the investigation to the chief of police, indicating therein any recommendations or observations he may wish to put forward.

4.11 The investigating member shall promptly submit a report outlining the results of the investigation

4.12 Upon receipt of the investigating member's report, the chief of police will consider appropriate action, which may include a decision to

- (a) take disciplinary action, or
- (b) advise the member as to future conduct, or
- (c) take no action against the member

4.13 (1) When a complaint is received from the Commission, board or council, the chief of police shall, after taking whatever action he deems necessary, provide the Commission, board or council, whichever the case may be, with the full investigational report, together with an outline of what action, if any, was taken against the member.

(2) When a complaint is made directly to a member of the police force, the chief of police shall advise the complainant, in writing, as to the outcome of the investigation and what action, if any, was taken against the member involved.

(3) At the conclusion of each investigation, the chief of police shall advise the member involved, in writing, of his findings and decision.

4.14 The chief of police shall supply the Commission at the end of each calendar year with a report on Form "G" in respect of complaints against members and the disposition thereof.

6) The sixth alternative is for complaints to be taken to the local Board of Police Commissioners. The Regulations state:

4.15 Complaints are to be in writing, and receipt thereof shall be acknowledged in writing.

4.16 Any complaint received by the board or municipal council shall be forwarded to the chief of police for investigation and report, unless the chief of police is the subject of the complaint, in which case it shall be investigated by the board, or where there is no board, by the council.

4.17 Upon receipt of the investigational report, and notification of action taken, the board or council will

(1) when the complaint is received direct from the public, notify the complainant as to the results in writing, or

(2) when the complaint is received from the Commission, supply the Commission with full investigational material along with details of any disciplinary action taken against the member involved.

Assuming that we continue to work within the framework of the present Police Act, a great many of the concerns about citizen complaint mechanisms could be quickly and easily solved.

The concern about public accessibility of the complaint system could be solved by the preparation of pamphlets¹ and posters explaining the complaint mechanism. These should give the address and phone numbers of the Regina Police Service, the Regina Board of Police Commissioners and the Saskatchewan Police Commission. These posters and pamphlets should be visibly displayed at the main entrance to the Regina Police Station, the Booking Area of the Police Station, City Hall, Public Library, Courthouse, Regina Friendship Centre, Regina Legal Aid, and other suitable locations.

1. The Saskatchewan Police Commission has published a good pamphlet entitled "How to Resolve a Complaint against Police". Unfortunately it is dated and gives the wrong address (an old address) for the Commission. Even more unfortunately, this pamphlet is very hard to find. Except for the Saskatchewan Police Commission office (new address) we only found it displayed in the waiting room of Regina Legal Aid.

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS PREPARE, PRINT AND DISTRIBUTE PAMPHLETS AND POSTERS OUTLINING THE CITIZEN'S COMPLAINT MECHANISMS, and

WE FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS PLACE AN ADVERTISEMENT IN THE REGINA TELEPHONE DIRECTORY HEADED "COMPLAINTS AGAINST THE POLICE" AND LIST ALL THREE AGENCIES NAMES, ADDRESSES AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS.

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS OFFICE BE ONE LOCATION TO RECEIVE CITIZEN COMPLAINTS.

Our discussions with citizens who complained about dog bites leads us to believe that many recognized that although they may not have a case in law, they did want an explanation and an apology.

WE RECOMMEND THAT AN INITIAL INFORMAL RESOLUTION STAGE TO CITIZEN COMPLAINT PROCEDURES BE MORE CLEARLY IDENTIFIED, AND THAT ALL AGENCIES INVOLVED EXPERIMENT WITH VARIOUS METHODS OF MEDIATION.

We heard citizens describe what they felt were very long delays in having their complaints resolved. This is also a matter of concern to officers who are complained against.

WE RECOMMEND THAT BOTH THE COMPLAINANT AND THE OFFICER COMPLAINED AGAINST BE GIVEN A REPORT AFTER FOUR WEEKS AS TO THE OUTCOME OF THE INVESTIGATION AND WHAT ACTION, IF ANY, WAS TAKEN AGAINST THE MEMBER INVOLVED. IF THE MATTER IS NOT RESOLVED BY THIS TIME WE RECOMMEND THAT BOTH PARTIES BE GIVEN REPORTS ON THE PROGRESS OF THE MATTER EVERY FOUR WEEKS UNTIL IT IS RESOLVED.

Some citizens reported instances where they had observed police behaviour which they felt was excessive use of force.

WE RECOMMEND THAT IT BE MADE CLEAR THAT WRITTEN, SIGNED COMPLAINTS WILL BE ACCEPTED FROM THIRD PARTIES.

And as citizens are uncertain as to where they may lay complaints:

WE RECOMMEND THAT CITIZENS BE INFORMED THAT THEY MAY LAY COMPLAINTS WITH ANY POLICE OFFICER OR ANY SASKATCHEWAN MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OR MEMBER OF REGINA CITY COUNCIL, WHO WILL FORWARD THE COMPLAINT TO THE REGINA POLICE SERVICE, THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS OR THE SASKATCHEWAN POLICE COMMISSION.

And because of the gravity of the charges and in order that they may be dealt with quickly,

WE RECOMMEND THAT IT BE THE POLICY OF THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS AND THE REGINA POLICE SERVICE TO DIRECT ALL COMPLAINTS ABOUT EXCESSIVE USE OF FORCE DIRECTLY AND IMMEDIATELY TO THE SASKATCHEWAN POLICE COMMISSION FOR INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION.

NATIVE PEOPLE AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Accusations were made at the public hearing and in private interviews that the police dogs were used in some special way against Native Peoples in Regina. More often, however, these charges were made in the context of accusations of general police brutality toward Native Peoples. When that issue was pressed, the deeper concern that was expressed was the feeling that there were very bad race relations in Regina. Native Peoples expressed the view that they encountered a great deal of racial prejudice in this city, and not the least from police officers.

While dog case reports do not contain an ethnic or racial description of those people who are arrested, an attempt was made to determine by "ethnic appearance" the race of some 85 persons injured by dog bites in 1981 and early 1982.¹ This rather imperfect survey was done by handler/dog teams to see if there were any wide differences by handler/dog teams. The overall percentage of persons bitten who appeared to be of Native ancestry was 59%. There was only a 2% difference between handler/dog teams. This 59% figure is shockingly high but not out of line with the general incarceration rates for Native Peoples in Saskatchewan.²

One dog case report was particularly interesting, since some people suggested that the dogs would select a Native person to bite if given a choice. This case involved a young white man and a young Native person leaving the scene of a crime. The dog pursued the two men. The Native person stood still while the white man continued to move. The dog bit the white man.

It must be remembered that most dog cases occur early in the morning hours. It is dark outside and even darker in buildings. We find it hard to believe that the dog handlers calculate the person's race before they send the dog in pursuit. The most reasonable explanation for the high rate of injury to Native persons is their present situation in our society.

1. Some dog case reports do describe some fleeing suspects and some arrested suspects as "Native", but these are infrequent.
2. See pp. 48, 49.

The Native peoples' situation in Saskatchewan is characterized as follows:¹

- * population growth of over twice the provincial non-Indian rate.
- * predominance of youth with about 45% of the Native population being under fifteen years of age. This results in an inordinately high dependency ratio.
- * high migration ratio to the cities. About 44% live in four of the largest urban centres.
- * very high incidence of single parent families.
- * educational attainment of grade nine or less with a high drop-out rate.
- * unemployment rates (in good times) of 42% for status Indians and 27% for Metis/non-status people.
- * marginal job skills with overwhelmingly large proportion of employment in the lowest levels.
- * high incidence of alcoholism.
- * high incidence of violent deaths.
- * sub-standard and overcrowded housing.
- * high crime and incarceration rates.

The 1976-1977 data shows that some 64% of male and 85% of female admissions to provincial correction centres were Native Peoples.

John Hylton's 1980 study, Admissions to Saskatchewan Provincial Correctional Centres: Projections to 1993,² reveals that the incarceration rates for the male population over 15 years of age are:

Status Indian	: 1 in 8
Metis and Non-Status	: 1 in 25
Non-Native	: 1 in 200

Incarceration rates for the female population over 15 years of age are:

Status Indian	: 1 in 50
Metis and Non-Status	: 1 in 200
Non-Native	: 1 in 5,000

1. Marv Hendrickson, Metis and Non-Status Indians, October, 1982.
2. Published in February, 1980

Assuming absence of change to the criminal justice system, about 70% of the status Indian men can expect to be imprisoned in a provincial correctional centre by the age of twenty-five. For Metis and non-status, the figure is 34% and for non-Native men, the figure is 8%. In the case of women, 14% of all status women can expect to be jailed by the age of twenty-five. Equivalent figures for Metis and non-status and non-Native are 2.5% and 0.3% respectively.

John Hylton's explanation of these high incarceration rates is simple,¹

" ... it is no surprise that the sub-standard living conditions experienced by Natives and their lack of opportunities have been accompanied by greater involvement in the criminal justice system. One of the earliest "symptoms" of the "native problem" was the disproportionate number of persons of Indian ancestry who were incarcerated in federal and provincial correctional institutions."

This high involvement in the criminal justice system is typical of many other groups whose disadvantages include culture differences, race and poverty. For example, it was true of those minority groups who have taken turns occupying the slums of New York City. Poverty alone accounts for a great many of the problems and, as more and more Canadians of the lower and middle classes suffer from unemployment, more and more non-Native Canadians will find themselves suffering from the constellation of problems suffered by Native Peoples, including involvement in the criminal justice system.

Because of the frequent interaction of the police and the Regina Native population, it is quite natural that both groups should gain a negative impression of the other. No one likes being arrested or having their family or friends arrested. Since some 90% of the "criminal activity" and arrest situations involve alcohol and other drugs, it is no wonder that there are many unpleasant experiences. The police do not like to have to handle drunks, they also quite properly fear explosive domestic situations, and they are regularly called upon to handle both.

1. Ibid, p. 1.

The Native Peoples suffer disproportionately from poor education, unemployment, alcoholism, family disruption and poverty. They can be viewed as "victims" in our society. But the police may also be viewed as "victims". They are called upon to do the frequently unpleasant, sometimes dangerous, and often thankless job of enforcing society's laws. Because the rest of us, all of us, have not been able to solve the underlying problems, they must deal with the symptoms.

On the basis of their daily experience, it is not surprising that police attitudes toward Native Peoples are not what might be desired.¹ These negative views are only a somewhat intensified version of the general public's views.² If the police hold negative views of Native people, it is also not surprising that Native Peoples hold equally negative views of the police.³ In a general survey of race relations in Regina, negative experiences with the police are frequently mentioned.⁴

Similar results were reported in other Canadian cities.⁵ Recent studies in North Dakota and South Dakota report very serious concerns. The North Dakota report states quite clearly that "... even though there has been progress in the quality of justice for all persons in the State, Indian people face problems which place them at a severe disadvantage in the criminal justice system."⁶

1. John Hylton, Job Satisfaction in the Regina Police Department, Regina Police Department, Regina, 1979, p. 49 ff.
2. John Hylton, Public Attitudes about Crime and the Police in Regina, Regina Police Department, Regina, 1979, p. 79 ff.
3. Cowley/Merasty, Native Recruitment Study, June 1982, p. 3 ff.
4. Ken Collier, Survey on Race Relations in Regina, March 1982.
5. Douglas Skoog, L. Roberts and E. Boldt, "Native Attitudes Towards the Police", Canadian Journal of Criminology, 1980, pp 354-359. This Manitoba Study showed Native attitudes toward the police were very ambivalent and much less favourable than white attitudes - although not absolutely negative.
6. Report of the North Dakota Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, August, 1978.

The South Dakota report summarizes their findings as follows:

"The study found evidence of widespread abuse of police power throughout the State. Improprieties cited included selected law enforcement, search and arrest without cause, harassment and brutal treatment, arrest of intoxicated persons on disorderly conduct charges and simple discourtesies ... Native American seldom serve on juries in South Dakota. As a result of this, together with prejudicial attitudes of potential jurors, it is very difficult to obtain an impartial jury for Indians in South Dakota. State imposed trial delays, a high number of guilty pleas and possible abuse of the plea bargaining system was found to work to the disadvantage of Native Americans, and affirmative action program efforts by most agencies are inadequate to change a justice system in which personnel are almost entirely white and male."¹

In looking at a number of steps to improve the situations in these States, it is significant that both reports recommend that one first step is to increase the number of Native people employed by law enforcement agencies. "It is axiomatic that Indian officers, male and female, could contribute significantly to improved communication between police and Native Americans and thus help to ensure that all persons receive equal protection under the law."²

It is very clear that the American experience with "minority policing" has proven the value of having racial minorities fairly represented on police forces. Perhaps the leading example is the City of Detroit. Detroit is a notoriously difficult city to police with a very high rate of violent crime and murder. Even though half the population of the City of Detroit is black, in 1966 only 2.5% of the police officers were black. The very difficult policing situation finally became impossible with the famous 1967 Riot. Following that riot, the whole area of Police-Community relations was seriously examined. Police, political and business leaders committed themselves to support having a fair proportion of black members on the Force, and to change policing practices which were offensive to the minority community.

1. South Dakota Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Liberty and Justice for All, October 1977, p. ii.
2. Op. Cit. p. 21. Not all Native People support this view. Some argue that they could not enforce laws used against their People which are not made by their People.

These serious efforts raised the proportion of black officers from 2.5% in 1966 to over 40% in 1978. According to Detroit authorities, the results have been a more professional and effective police force. Community relations have improved tremendously. But perhaps most dramatically, the level of violence between the public and police has been reduced. Prior to integration of the Detroit Police Department, there was an average of one policeman killed per month. In the eight years prior to 1982, there was only one fatality.

The Regina Police Commission is to be commended for instituting a Native Recruitment Study. There is no need to duplicate the work of that study.

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE COWLEY/MERASTY "NATIVE RECRUITMENT STUDY" BE MADE PUBLIC AND THAT ITS MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS BE FOLLOWED.

The people of Regina should be concerned that with at least 10% of the population of the city of Native ancestry, we have only one (1) police officer of Native ancestry. In the past, there have been well-intentioned but misguided efforts to change this situation. The Cowley/Merasty Report suggests strategies which will bring about change if they are seriously undertaken. Recent public opinion surveys show strong public support for such action.¹

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS TAKE ALL THE STEPS NECESSARY TO HAVE THE REGINA POLICE SERVICE DECLARED AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER SO THAT THE NUMBER OF NATIVE POLICE OFFICERS MAY MORE NEARLY REFLECT THAT PROPORTION OF THE CITY'S POPULATION WHO ARE OF NATIVE ANCESTRY.

And, WE FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THAT THE CITY OF REGINA LIKEWISE UNDERTAKE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS TO DEMONSTRATE THEIR GOODWILL TOWARD PEOPLE OF NATIVE ANCESTRY IN OUR CITY.

1. Hylton, Public Attitudes about Crime and the Police, 1979, p. 79 ff. This study showed 81.2% agreement that "Natives should have more responsibility for providing police services to Natives", and 81.8% agreement that "We should have more Natives on the police force".

And, WE FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS GIVE THEIR FULL SUPPORT TO THE RACE RELATIONS ACTIVITIES OF GROUPS SUCH AS THE REGINA FRIENDSHIP CENTRE AND REGINA NATIVE WOMEN AND COMMEND THEM FOR THEIR LEADERSHIP IN THIS IMPORTANT AREA OF OUR CITY'S LIFE.

In most of the cities visited, we were introduced to units within the police forces whose main tasks were, for example,

- (a) 'to inform police members about the multicultural aspects of the society', (Edmonton, Race Relations Program);
- (b) 'to improve the overall relationship between the Native Peoples residing in the urban area and the department', (Vancouver, Police Liaison Program); and
- (c) 'to create a better understanding which is meaningful and long lasting between the growing ethnic community and the police', (Metropolitan Toronto Police, Ethnic Relations Unit).

In Edmonton and Vancouver, the members of the programs were civilians headed by an officer located in the station. The Edmonton unit reports directly to the Chief and is funded from the Police budget. Each member of the above units is representative of a specific ethnic group; is fluent in that language; and was selected through community involvement (Edmonton and Vancouver). The Toronto unit, reflecting the appearance of new nationalities in the city has grown from nine to twenty-two officers, in 1981.

WE RECOMMEND THAT A RACE RELATIONS UNIT BE ESTABLISHED IN THE REGINA POLICE DEPARTMENT, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. THAT THIS UNIT BE HEADED BY A SENIOR NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER REPORTING DIRECTLY TO THE CHIEF OF POLICE. THAT THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE UNIT BE TWO CIVILIANS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATIVE PEOPLES, ONE FEMALE AND ONE MALE. THAT THE UNIT BE FUNDED OUT OF THE REGULAR ANNUAL BUDGET. THAT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE UNIT AND THE SELECTION OF THE CIVILIAN MEMBERS INVOLVE THE NATIVE COMMUNITY THROUGH ITS URBAN ORGANIZATIONS IN THE CITY AND THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS.

The 1981 Census shows that those urban centres with the greatest population growth are here in Western Canada. Within the Province's stable population total of some 960,000, the Native population is growing at double the rate of the general population. The 1979 report of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians on off-reserve Indians, shows that more than 50% of reserve peoples of Southern Saskatchewan live in urban communities. Coupling these facts with the data mentioned in the Hendrickson and Hylton studies (among others) indicates a growing urban problem which demands prompt attention to prevent serious public disorders - disorders which cannot be "handled" by more police or by more prisons.

WE RECOMMEND THAT THE REGINA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS URGE
THE REGINA CITY COUNCIL TO REQUEST THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA TO
ESTABLISH A TASK FORCE TO TAKE ACTION TO REMEDY THE
SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROBLEMS FACING THE NATIVE PEOPLES OF THE
PROVINCE AND OF THIS CITY.

CHAPTER EIGHT

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners decide, as a matter of public policy, whether or not police dogs will be used in Regina (p. 5).
2. We recommend that if the Regina Board of Police commissioners confirms the use of police dogs in the City, that they make policy regarding their use as a) a means of detection, or as b) a means of force, or both (p. 5).
3. We recommend that if the Regina Board of Police Commissioners confirms the use of police dogs as a means of force, that this use be in accordance with the policy of the least possible use of force (p. 5).
4. We recommend that every candidate for the Canine Unit be retested psychologically, and we further recommend that the entire unit be retested psychologically (p. 10).
5. We recommend that in future assignments to the Canine Unit, women and people of Native ancestry and women be given high priority (p. 12).
6. We recommend that a corporal's position be created within the canine unit (p. 12).
7. We recommend that the Regina Police Commission establish regulations whereby any member of the Department who during the performance of duty uses force resulting in an injury being sustained to a person, or where a complaint is made then, or may later be made, respecting the use of force, shall notify his Duty Officer and file a report of all the pertinent circumstances with one copy going to the Chief of Police who will report the incident to the Regina Board of Police Commissioners (p. 26).
8. We recommend that the writing of an up-to-date Regina Police Service Canine Training Manual be given high priority (p. 26).

9. We further recommend that this new manual be reviewed and approved by the Regina Board of Police Commissioners to be certain that it is in line with their policy objectives (p. 26).
10. We recommend that there be an annual external assessment of the handlers and dogs (p. 26).
11. We recommend that as with other reports in the Regina Police Service, there be four colour coded copies of dog case reports and that the copy that is retained by the Canine Unit be filed by the Sergeant in a central file (p. 27).
12. We recommend that every suspect who has been contacted by a police dog should have a photograph taken of all injuries at the time they are booked, and that this photograph be added to the general file (p. 28).
13. We recommend that each dog bite be reported to the Regina City Department of Health (p. 28).
14. We further recommend that at the end of each month the monthly policy service dog cases report go to the Chief of Police and from him to The Regina Board of Police Commissioners (p. 28).
15. We further recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners urge the Saskatchewan Police Commission to draw up a province wide policy on the use of police service dogs and require of Boards of Police Commissioners an annual report on the number of persons contacted by police dogs, and the number of persons injured by police dogs (p. 28).
16. We recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners establish a permanent office in Regina City Hall. The Board should hire a permanent half-time Executive Secretary. The office should be staffed by a secretary/receptionist on a full-time basis. The Board should have sufficient resources to initiate its own research projects (p. 32).

17. We recommend that in addition to having a regular part of their monthly meeting open to the public, the Regina Board of Police Commissioners hold some of their regular meetings in well publicized locations in different parts of the City to hear from people in those communities (p. 33).
18. We recommend that the Board of Police Commissioners set up citizen advisory committees composed of representatives of a wide variety of ethnic, religious, social and economic groups in Regina to give the Board advice on present and/or future policing policies(p. 33).
19. We recommend that the Regina Police Service Canine Unit experiment with the use of two-person car units and monitor the results (p. 37).
20. We recommend that "on-line" tracking be the norm in the City of Regina (p. 38).
21. We recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners require the Regina Police Service Command to report on the widely differing injury rates and take action to correct this situation (p. 39).
22. We recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners prepare, print and distribute pamphlets and posters outlining the citizens' complaint mechanisms, (p. 45)
23. We further recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners place an advertisement in the Telephone Directory headed, "Complaints against the Police" and list all three agencies names, addresses and telephone numbers (p. 45).
24. We recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners office be one location to receive citizen complaints (p. 45).
25. We recommend that an initial informal resolution stage to citizen complain procedures be more clearly identified, and that all agencies involved experiment with various means of mediation (p. 45).

26. We recommend that both the complainant and the officer complained against be given a report after four weeks as to the outcome of the investigation and what action, if any, was taken against the member involved. If the matter is not resolved by this time, we recommend that both parties be given reports on the progress of the matter every four weeks until it is resolved (p. 45).
27. We recommend that it be made clear that written signed complaints will be accepted by third parties (p. 45).
28. We recommend that citizens be informed that they may lay complaints with any police officer or any Saskatchewan Members of Parliament, Member of the Legislative Assembly, or Member of Regina City Council who will forward the complaint to the Regina Police Service, the Regina Board of Police Commissioners or the Saskatchewan Police Commission (p. 46).
29. We recommend that it be the policy of the Regina Board of Police Commissioners and the Regina Police Service to direct all complaints about excessive use of force directly and immediately to the Saskatchewan Police Commission for independent investigation (p. 46).
30. We recommend that the Cowley/Merasty "Native Recruitment Study" be made public and that its major recommendations be followed (p. 52).
31. We recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners take all steps necessary to have the Regina Police Service declared an affirmative action employer so that the number of Native police officers may more nearly reflect that proportion of the city's population who are of Native ancestry (p. 52).
32. We further recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners recommend to City Council that the City of Regina likewise undertake affirmative action programs to demonstrate their goodwill toward people of Native ancestry in our city (p. 52).

33. We further recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners give their full support to the race relations activities of groups such as the Regina Friendship Centre and Regina Native Women and commend them for their leadership in this important area of our city's life (p. 53).

34. We recommend that a Race Relations Unit be established in the Regina Police Department, as soon as possible. That this Unit be headed by a senior non-commissioned officer reporting directly to the Chief of Police. That other members of the Unit be two civilians representative of the Native Peoples, one female and one male. That the Unit be funded out of the regular annual budget. That the establishment of the terms of reference of the Unit and the selection of the civilian members involves the Native community through its urban organizations in the City and the Regina Board of Police Commissioners (p. 53).

35. We recommend that the Regina Board of Police Commissioners urge the Regina City Council to request the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada to establish a Task Force to take action to remedy the socio-economic problems facing the Native peoples of the Province of this City (p. 54).

0137E

APPENDICES

DON FARIS

Don is the Minister of Christian Development at Wesley United Church in Regina and part-time United Church Chaplain at the University of Regina. He served in the Saskatchewan Legislature from 1971 to 1978, the last two years as Minister of Continuing Education and Minister of Education. Prior to that he studied in Canada, the United States and Scotland and served the Church in British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Zambia, Central Africa. His wife, Margaret, and he have two children at home in Regina.

WALTER CURRIE, OJIBWAY - POTAWATTOMI

From 1978 to 1980, he taught Indian Studies at the Saskatchewan Indian Federated College, University of Regina. For the next two years he served as the Assistant Director of the newly created Gabriel Dumont Institute of Native Studies and Applied Research in Regina. At present, he is a professor in the first year of the Native Studies Program at the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon. While in Regina, he served as one of the first two "civilians" appointed to the Regina Board of Police Commissioners in 1981-82. Walter is "from the east", Ontario that is, where he taught elementary school; was a professor and founding chairman of the Department of Native Studies at Trent University; served his People as Chairman of the Toronto Friendship Centre, as President of the Indian Eskimo Association of Canada, and as a Board Member of the Kawartha Local of the Ontario Metis and Non-Status Indian Association. June, his wife, and he have three children living in various parts of the country.

CRIMINAL CODE: SEC. 450-1, 25 and 26

Arrest without warrant by peace officer - Limitation - Consequences of arrest without warrant.

450. (1) A peace officer may arrest without warrant

(a) a person who has committed an indictable offence or who, on reasonable and probable grounds, he believes has committed or is about to commit an indictable offence,

(b) a person whom he finds committing a criminal offence, or

(c) a person for whose arrest he has reasonable and probable grounds to believe that a warrant is in force within the territorial jurisdiction in which the person is found.

Protection of Persons Administering and
Enforcing the Law

Protection of persons acting under authority - Idem - When not protected - when protected.

25. (1) Every one who is required or authorized by law to do anything in the administration or enforcement of the law

(a) as a private person

(b) as a peace officer or public officer

(c) in aid of a peace officer or public officer, or

(d) by virtue of his office,

is, if he acts on reasonable and probable grounds, justified in doing what he is required or authorized to do and in using as much force as is necessary for that purpose.

(2) Where a person is required or authorized by law to execute a process or to carry out a sentence, he or any person who assists him is, if he acts in good faith, justified in executing the process or in carrying out the sentence notwithstanding that the process or sentence is defective or that it was issued or imposed without jurisdiction or in excess of jurisdiction.

(3) Subject to subsection (4), a person is not justified for the purposes of subsection (1) in using force that is intended or is likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm unless he believes on reasonable and probable grounds that it is necessary for the purpose of preserving himself or any one under his protection from death or grievous bodily harm.

(4) A peace officer who is proceeding lawfully to arrest, with or without warrant, any person for an offence for which that person may be arrested without warrant, and every one lawfully assisting the peace officer, is justified, if the person to be arrested takes flight to avoid arrest, in using as much force as is necessary to prevent the escape by flight, unless the escape can be prevented by reasonable means in a less violent manner.
1953-54, c. 51, s. 25.

Excessive Force

26. Every one who is authorized by law to use force is criminally responsible for any excess thereof according to the nature and quality of the act that constitutes the excess.
1953-54, c. 51, s. 26.

CANINE N.C.O. QUALIFICATIONS & JOB DESCRIPTION

- 1) Rank:
Sergeant

- 2) Core Function:
Supervision and training of Dog Handlers and the supervision of Police Service Dog training.

- 3) Position Requirements:
 - (a) Necessary:
 - Knowledge of federal, provincial and municipal statutes
 - Knowledge of policies and procedures of the force
 - Knowledge and interest in dog training methods and dog handling
 - (b) Desirable:
 - Above average physical condition
 - Ability to prepare and present training lectures
 - Knowledge of philosophies and methods of man-management
 - Ability to address public gatherings and organizations
 - (c) Duties:
 - Advise in selection of Dog Handlers and Police Service Dogs
 - Train and develop Dog Handlers
 - Monitor and assess performance of Dog Handlers and their dogs
 - Develop training methods and co-ordinate Police Dog training
 - Prepare budget annually
 - Maintain equipment and order supplies as required
 - Prepare and present training lectures
 - Address groups and organizations to promote interest and discussion in police work
 - Be available to support patrolling units where a Police Dog may be of assistance
 - Perform other duties as assigned by superior

- 4) Accountability:
Officer in Charge, Special Services Section

DOG HANDLER: QUALIFICATIONS & JOB DESCRIPTION

1) Rank:

Constable

2) Core Function:

To protect life and property, preserve the peace, prevent crime, enforce the laws of the land, and to be available to act in support of patrolling members where the services of a Police Dog may be of assistance.

3) Position Requirements:

(a) Necessary:

- Knowledge of federal, provincial and municipal statutes
- Knowledge of policies and procedures of the force
- Knowledge and interest in the handling of dogs

(b) Desirable:

- Good physical condition
- Ability to write accurate and concise reports
- Ability to address groups or organizations
- Two to three years police experience

(c) Duties:

- Patrol as directed by supervisor
- Attend calls for service
- Enforce all federal, provincial and municipal statutes
- Assist patrolling members where Police Service Dog may be of assistance
- Provide care and training for Police Dog
- Attend public gatherings to promote interest and discussion in the Police Service
- Perform other duties assigned by superior

4) Accountability:

N.C.A. in Charge, Canine.

See instructions on reverse



INJURY or FORCE REPORT

REPORT OF INJURY

REPORT OF FORCE

(COMPLETE IN ACCORDANCE WITH REGULATION 4.8.5)

(COMPLETE IN ACCORDANCE WITH REGULATION 4.8.4)

Date _____ Time _____ Unit _____

Person involved _____
SURNAME GIVEN AGE

_____ ADDRESS TELEPHONE

Marital Status _____ Type of Employment _____

Condition of Person _____

Nature of Injuries (if any) _____

Treatment _____

Examining Physician _____
SURNAME GIVEN TELEPHONE

Hospital _____ TELEPHONE

Charge(s) Laid _____

Describe details in first person, including how injury sustained (if any):

USE BLANK FOOLSCAP PAPER FOR MORE SPACE, IF REQUIRED.

OFFICER IN CHARGE

OFFICER'S SIGNATURE

RANK

NUMBER

DISTRIBUTION (FOR INJURY REPORT)

- White -- Attach to Unit Copy (No. 4 - buff) of the Record of Arrest (MTP 202)
- Pink -- Forward to (Staff) Superintendent
- Yellow -- Forward to Unit Commander

DISTRIBUTION (FOR FORCE REPORT)

- White -- Forward to Chief of Police
- Pink -- Forward to (Staff) Superintendent
- Yellow -- Forward to Unit Commander

PD-118 10M Feb. 74

REGINA CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT
POLICE SERVICE DOG
CASE REPORT

FILE No. 80-17162

PROPERTY EXH. No.

1. DATE AND TIME
OF THIS REPORT

July 10, 1980, 0050 hrs.

2. CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENCE		Break, Enter & Theft 306(1)(b)		3. ORIGINALLY REPORTED AS:		SAME	
4. VICTIM OR FIRM		5. ADDRESS		6. DATE OF ORIGINAL REPORT		SAME	
		Albert St.					
7. P.S. DOG (NAME & NUMBER)				8. P.S. DOG SERVICES REQUESTED BY:			
				Cst. Bihun			
9. DOG USED FOR:				10. AGE OF TRAIL:			
Building Search							
11. TIME DOGMASTER NOTIFIED:		12. TIME ARRIVED AT SCENE:		13. TIME COMPLETED:			
0052 hrs.		0054 hrs.		0057 hrs.			
14. TYPE OF TRAIL				15. TYPE OF TERRAIN:			
DEFINITE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> BLIND <input type="checkbox"/>				Building			
16. WEATHER CONDITIONS (WIND, TEMP., ETC.):							
17. MANNER OF DOG'S PERFORMANCE:							
Good.							
18. DETAILS OF ACTION TAKEN: (PERSONS LOCATED, EXHIBITS FOUND, ARRESTS, ETC.)							

1. At approximately 0052 hrs. this date, I was dispatched to Albert St. for a Break & Enter in progress.
2. On arrival I was advised by Cst.'s Bihun and Watson that they observed an individual inside the building.
3. I then took Police dog to the rear of the building and found a broken window. I then advised whom ever may be inside, to come out, and after no reply, sent Police dog inside.
4. Inside the building on the south wall, Police dog located an individual. This individual was dob;
5. was then turned over to Cst.'s Watson and Bihun.
6. For further particulars please read General Occurrence report 80-17162.
7. There were no injuries.

1 2 3 4 5

19. DOGMASTER: Cst.

20. ACCOMPANIED BY:

APPROVED BY:

