

# SENATE MEETING

Thursday  
March 8, 1956  
3:30 P.M.

## MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM

Faculty members entitled to vote for Senate members may be present at Senate meetings but shall not be entitled to vote or make motions. Such faculty may, at their request and with the approval of the Senate, be given the privilege to speak on matters under consideration in which they have an interest.

Members of standing committees who are not members of the Senate, including student members, may be present at a meeting of the Senate during such time as a report of their committee is under discussion and may participate in such discussion, but shall not have the privilege of making motions or of voting.

A special section will be provided for the seating of such faculty and such members of standing committees.

### UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

#### SENATE DOCKET March 8, 1956

Your Committee on Business and Rules respectfully presents the following matters for your consideration at the meeting of the University Senate on March 8, 1956 in Murphy Hall Auditorium at 3:30 p.m.

#### I. MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 2, 1956

Reported for Action

#### II. NONSENATE COMMITTEES AND BOARDS FOR 1955-56

Reported for Information

The President reports the following replacement:

*Student Behavior, Committee on:* N. L. Gault, Jr. to replace W. F. Maloney.

#### III. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

1. *Report to the Legislative Interim Commission on Building Needs.* The Committee met on February 8, 1956, in Room 307-309, Coffman Memorial Union building, to consider a report to the Legislative Interim Commission to Study Building Needs. Present by special invitation were members of the Faculty Consultative Committee and chairmen of the group committees on the University Self-Survey.

President Morrill commented on the responsibilities assigned to the Commission and on the need for a comprehensive study and report by the University. He mentioned the earlier Dorweiler Report on University building needs. The purpose of this meeting, he said, was to inform the several groups represented on the preparation of University material for the current study and to enlist the assistance and co-operation of all.

Vice President Middlebrook indicated the sources of material and introduced a number of staff members, each of whom presented tentative report sections in turn. Supervising Engineer Roy V. Lund exhibited an extensive inventory of present building space on all campuses and commented on the classifications and summaries available. Dean Summers presented statistics of future University attendance and he and Mr. V. L. Ausen, Supervisor of Room Assignments and Scheduling, introduced a method for relating space requirements to college enrollments. Mr. E. C. Jackson, Assistant Comptroller, gave figures on research work at the University and offered a projection of that work, along with written comments from Comptroller Lunden. Advisory Architect Winston A. Close tentatively outlined land needs.

There was brief discussion in which the point was made that the state policy on all public institutions of higher education is obviously important. The President invited later comments on the pattern that the University's report should take and on the way in which our problems should be placed before the Legislative Interim Commission.

2. *Recommendation of Honors Committee.* The Committee on University Honors presented certain nominations on February 1, 1956. In the discussion which ensued, questions were raised concerning the methods of screening and selection employed and about the possibility of other types of awards. It was said that the Committee is already studying such other awards. Names were proposed for two existing University buildings. All nominations and proposals were approved, on motions duly made and seconded, and the President was authorized to take the report to the Regents.

3. *Procedure on Copyrights in the Name of the University.* When the University is to hold copyright to material, it has been the practice to turn over all negotiations to the University Library. This has applied to the Press and to the faculty alike. There was a suggestion that the Press might take over this function, inasmuch as it provides virtually all of the material with which the University is thus concerned. It was moved, seconded, and voted to recommend that the Press be designated as the agency to handle copyright negotiations whenever a copyright in the name of the University is desired. Regents' approval will probably be requested.

4. *Autobiographical Writing of Retiring Staff Members.* At its meeting of October 5, 1955, the Administrative Committee appointed a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Librarian Stanford to explore the values and possibilities of selecting retiring staff members to record significant observations and recollections concerning their connection with the University for archives. This committee made a brief written report on February 1, 1956, recommending a limited trial of such a procedure. The President's office would work through the deans of the colleges in encouraging, guiding, and assisting persons who might make a special contribution to the record or develop material of over-all value to the University. The report did not contemplate a program which would in any way set aside the usual procedures for gathering historical material about the University. It was moved, seconded, and voted to adopt the report. Vice President Willey and Dr. Stanford will collaborate with the deans who see the opportunity to promote such writing.

5. *China Institute Inquiry on Faculty Placement.* President Morrill had received a communication from the China Institute regarding available teachers, perhaps Chinese Nationals, for appointments in American colleges and universities. His office has information for departments that may wish to obtain lists of prospects.

6. *Application of the "No Smoking" Ruling in Classrooms.* There have been complaints about smoking in classrooms and a general laxity in observance of the "no smoking" signs posted by the Physical Plant Department in accord with practices of the State Fire Marshall. Discussion showed apparent agreement that during the conduct of major classes, smoking by instructors and students should not be condoned. Deans and directors were asked to extend explicit reminders to all faculty on suitable control of smoking and to attempt to maintain responsibility to their own college on the part of teachers and students who use classrooms in buildings occupied primarily by other colleges.

7. *Report of University Schedule Committee on a Study Day.* There was a recommendation to the Administrative Committee, February 1, 1956, from the University Schedule Committee to provide, on an experimental basis, a study day (study break) in fall and winter quarters by starting examinations for those quarters one day later than usual and having commencement for fall and winter quarters on Saturday evenings, with no study day provided for the spring quarter. Student leaders who had been invited to attend this portion of the meeting also participated in the discussion of the proposal. Arguments for and against the proposal were heard; many of these were documented by a special subcommittee of the Schedule Committee. It was voted that this matter be tabled to provide time for more extensive discussion of the concrete proposal in the several different faculties.

R. E. SUMMERS, Secretary

(over)

#### IV. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

##### Reported for Information

Your Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics respectfully reports the following schedules for baseball, golf, tennis, and track for 1956.

##### BASEBALL 1956

March 19-20, Texas at Austin  
March 21-22, Rice at Houston  
March 23-24, Houston at Houston  
March 26-27, Oklahoma at Norman  
April 6, Winona Teachers at Winona  
April 7, Luther at Decorah, Iowa  
April 13-14, Iowa State at Ames  
April 20-21, Iowa State Teachers  
April 27, Wisconsin  
April 28, Northwestern  
May 1, St. Thomas at Lexington Park  
May 4, Illinois at Urbana  
May 5, Purdue at Lafayette  
May 11-12, Iowa  
May 15, Augsburg at Parade Grounds  
May 18, Michigan State  
May 19, Michigan  
May 22, St. John's at St. Cloud  
May 25, Ohio State at Columbus  
May 26, Indiana at Bloomington

##### GOLF 1956

April 30, Iowa and Wisconsin at Madison  
May 3, Carleton and St. Olaf  
May 4, St. Thomas  
May 5, Gustavus at LeSueur or New Ulm  
May 7, Iowa State at Ames  
May 10, Carleton and St. Olaf at Northfield  
May 11, Gustavus and St. Thomas  
May 19, Iowa and Wisconsin  
May 25-26, Conference at Northwestern  
June 24-30, NCAA at Ohio State

##### TENNIS 1956

May 5, Northwestern  
May 14, Iowa at Iowa City  
May 15, Iowa State at Ames  
May 23, Indiana (9 a.m.), Wisconsin (2 p.m.)  
May 24-25-26, Conference at Minnesota  
May 29-30-31, Washington at St. Louis

##### TRACK 1956

Indoor  
Feb. 4, Northwestern  
Feb. 11, Iowa State  
Feb. 18, Wisconsin at Madison  
Feb. 24-25, Northwest Open  
March 2-3, Conference at Michigan State  
Outdoor  
April 20-21, Kansas Relays at Lawrence  
April 27-28, Drake Relays at Des Moines  
May 4, Purdue at Lafayette  
May 5, Northwestern at Evanston  
May 12, Iowa at Iowa City  
May 19, Wisconsin  
May 25-26, Conference at Minnesota  
June 1-2, Central Intercollegiate at Milwaukee  
June 15-16, NCAA at Berkeley

J. WARREN STEHMAN, Chairman

#### V. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STUDENT AFFAIRS

##### 1. Reported for Action

*Policy on speakers brought to the campus by student organizations.* The Senate Committee on Student Affairs maintains that an essential part of the education of each student is the availability of diverse viewpoints expressed by speakers engaged by student organizations. To limit opportunities to hear various viewpoints would be inconsistent with the educational responsibility of the University. A necessary complement to the classroom is the opportunity to review and discuss opinions of speakers representing varying attitudes concerning human affairs.

The committee believes that all departments of the University, including the Senate Committee on Student Affairs, should seek to encourage and assist student organizations in furthering opportunities to hear the widest range of viewpoints held and advocated regarding issues that divide our society.

Consistent with the 1946 Basic Policy Concerning Student Organizations and Their Activities, the following policy is recommended:

1. Recognizing that the responsibility for administering policies, regulations, and for general supervision over student activities has been assigned by the central administration to the Office of the Dean of Students, student organizations, in planning an event involving an off-campus speaker, shall consult with and inform the Student Activities Bureau of the name and qualifications of the speaker, the subject of his remarks, and the time, date, place, and nature of the meeting. In each case a request for approval should be made a minimum of three working days prior to the event.

2. In the event of a decision adverse to the request of the organization for approval of the program planned, submitted in accord with No. 1 above, the Dean of Students shall promptly inform the Senate Committee on Student Affairs which will meet as quickly as possible in a public hearing to uphold or reverse the decision.

3. Further, when such a decision is upheld or reversed by the Senate Committee on Student Affairs, its decision may be appealed in accordance with the established appeal procedure.

4. The Office of the Dean of Students will report annually to the Senate Committee on Student Affairs concerning the implementation of this policy, including a summary of off-campus speaker activity with a description of the procedures used and the problems encountered in administering this policy. Upon request the Senate Committee on Student Affairs may serve as a consultative body for the Office of the Dean of Students on any problems involved in the application of the policy at any time during the year.

5. The principles embodied in the preamble shall serve as a guide in the application of this policy. These principles imply that approval should be withheld from a speaker only if it can be clearly judged his presentation would serve no educational purpose.

6. The Senate Committee on Student Affairs recommends that the President authorize the Dean of Students to adopt the procedures outlined in Nos. 2, 4 and 5 above.

##### 2. Reported for Information

*Minority Report.* The Committee instructed that the following minority report be included in the Committee's report to the Senate:

"We of the minority wish to express our support of the speaker policy outlined in the majority report and urge its adoption by the University Senate. We believe that the proposed policy is an improvement over the present policy regarding the sponsorship of speakers by student organizations.

"We cannot, however, express support of the proposed policy without making clear that the policy is not our concept of the best speaker policy which the University could have. We believe that the goal towards which the University should move is the removal of the requirement for prior approval of speakers sponsored by student organizations. We believe that the principles embodied in the preamble to the proposed policy, regarding the need for the availability of diverse viewpoints and the undesirability of limiting the opportunities to hear various viewpoints, indicate that student organizations ought not be required to secure prior approval of speakers whom they wish to hear. We believe that recognized student organizations ought to be allowed to invite whomsoever they wish to appear before them, provided only that space is available and that what is ordinarily thought to be good order is maintained."

The minority report is signed by Yvonne Wilson, Dave Cadwell, Jack Estes, and Rod Nelson.

KENNETH E. CLARK, Chairman

#### VI. NEW BUSINESS

#### VII. NECROLOGY

##### ALVIN HALVOR LARSON

1886-1955

Alvin Larson, agricultural botanist and assistant professor (emeritus) in the Department of Plant Pathology and Botany, passed away November 22, 1955, in St. Paul. He was born on May 7, 1886, near Henderson, Minnesota, and his boyhood was spent on a farm, where he developed a keen interest in plants, an interest that remained a strong motivating force throughout his life. After graduation from the Henderson High School, he taught for several years in the rural schools of Sibley County, Minnesota. He graduated from the College of Agriculture, University of Minnesota, in 1915, after which he taught agriculture in the Little Falls High School for two years. In 1917 he accepted a position in the Department of Plant Pathology and Botany, University of Minnesota, where he remained until his retirement on June 30, 1954, having been a member of the staff for 37 years.

In addition to his teaching duties, Professor Larson served as director of the State Seed Laboratory from 1921 to 1926, and later became consulting botanist and taxonomist for the Minnesota Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Plant Industry. He was long active in the Association of Official Seed Analysts and contributed both in principles and in deeds to the development of the pure seed stocks on which our modern agriculture depends. He was one of the principal planners and forces behind the organization of the North Central Weed Control Conference, and was awarded an honorary life membership in this organization in recognition of his contributions to the fields of weed control and the ecology and taxonomy of weeds. He was a member of Alpha Zeta and of the Acacia fraternity.

Professor Larson knew the flora of the state exceptionally well, and his ability to identify plants from fragmentary specimens never ceased to amaze his colleagues. Each plant was a distinct "personality" to him, an individual with many related facets, all of which he was able to bring out with a combination of knowledge and enthusiasm that never failed to catch and hold the interest and ignite the enthusiasm of the students. He was unsparing in his devotion of time and energy to students, colleagues, farmers, and others who made demands upon him. A multitude of people within and outside the University have been led to an enjoyment of the study of plants through the work of this outstanding naturalist, teacher, and friend.

T. E. PETTENGILL, Clerk of the Senate

MBM  
D65

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

DOCKET SUPPLEMENT - MARCH 8, 1956

I. SENATE COMMITTEES FOR 1955-56

Reported for Action

The President reports the following changes:

Student Affairs: N. L. Gault, Jr. to serve during William F. Maloney's absence; Noreen Herreid to replace Newell C. Griffith, student.

II. SPECIAL MEETING - APRIL 12, 1956

Reported for Information

A special meeting of the University Senate will be held on Thursday, April 12, 1956 at 3:30 p.m. in Murphy Hall Auditorium to consider a Report of the Senate Committee on Education on the Physics Department transfer matter.

The special meeting was requested by the Senate Committee on Education and endorsed by ten Senate members as required by the Constitution.

Dear AAUP members,

Inadvertantly, the motion on which you were asked to vote in the questionnaire submitted by the Committee on Academic Freedom was not included in the materials sent you. Here it is for your reference: (If you have already sent in your questionnaire without voting for or against this motion, we hope you will send us your opinion after studying it.)

The Minnesota Chapter of the AAUP endorses the spirit of that section of the Association of American Universities statement on the rights and responsibilities of universities and their faculties, jointly authored by President Morrill, in which it is said that:

A university must ... be hospitable to an infinite variety of skills and viewpoints, relying upon open competition among them as the surest safeguard of truth. Its whole spirit requires investigation, criticism, and the presentation of ideas in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual confidence. This is the real meaning of "academic" freedom. It is essential to the achievement of its ends that the faculty of a university be guaranteed this freedom by its governing board, and that the reasons for the guarantee be understood by the public.

As scholars and the teachers of scholars, we feel that this position would be inconsistent with any practices which have the effect, whether intentional or unintentional, of inhibiting the invitation to this campus of speakers judged to be of interest by the group responsible for the invitation. We accept the obligation to assist in any process of public education that might be involved in connection with the adoption of a freer procedure, and we feel that the principles quoted above, and the principles of democracy itself, commit the University to implementing a policy towards invited speakers identical to that already adopted towards books recommended for the library; one which does not require the administration to pass judgment on the beliefs or attitudes of the speakers invited to this campus by the scholars on this campus -- whether faculty or students.

## INTRODUCTION

The AAUP Chapter Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure feels that the most important issue now concerning it is the current revision of the regulations regarding the approval of visiting speakers, due to be considered at the next meeting of the Senate. Since the Chapter meeting at which this was discussed and a rather general motion adopted as the sense of the meeting, a good deal has taken place. In order to get a fair sample of the Chapter's views, in accordance with the desires of the Senate, we are circulating a summary of the views on both sides and a list of seven brief suggestions for Yes/No approval, as well as a copy of the general motion which was supported by the Committee. Please return the questionnaire immediately to Professor Ruby Pernell, 459 Ford Hall.

Frederick Ellis (Chairman)  
Lawrence Steefel  
Mulford Sibley  
Edward Bade  
Michael Scriven

AAUP Committee Report on  
'Visiting Speaker' Policy

(February, 1956)

The AAUP committee on academic freedom and tenure would like to submit this brief summary of the opposing arguments over the speaker policy to assist members in their consideration of the enclosed motions which should be voted on immediately, using the enclosed ballot. (It should be noted that THE COMMITTEE DOES NOT ENDORSE ALL POINTS QUOTED AS BEING VALID, IT MERELY REPORTS THEM; they are based on several meetings including one with the President and Dean Williamson.)

The committee's synthesis of the most persuasive arguments it has heard for retaining the present policy is as follows:

"The most important fact relevant to the issue is not disputed: there has been only one instance in which a veto has been employed in the past 12 years. It is apparent, therefore, that there is no great yoke of oppression to be cast off. In fact, we are in very favorable circumstances compared, say, to the University of Illinois which, ~~even~~ after the recent relaxation of its policy, still permits only two political speakers a year - and that during election years. Is it then wise to stir up an issue which might well precipitate a special ruling by the regents under pressure from some of the citizens' groups, resulting in a net loss of freedom (as at Columbia and Ohio State?) There seems to be no recent evidence of restrictions on freedom, and no grounds for believing that if we force a change, it would necessarily be for the better, quite apart from the unfortunate effect there may well be in the minds of the legislators who will be preparing the University's budget in a few months. Keeping things in proportion, it does appear unwise to risk serious damage to the whole educational enterprise of the University for the sake of altering a policy which works well enough in practice.

Even the principle said to be involved seems rather doubtful. It

is not at all obvious that the University should relinquish all control over speakers on campus. There is the danger, amply illustrated in the thirties, that political organizations might use some group of students as a front and thus obtain the campus as a free platform. This can hardly be defended as educational. And the University cannot risk a suit such as might follow from allowing someone to advocate sedition or some illegal act on campus; nor can the appearance of even legal agitators be defended on educational grounds. Again, student groups undoubtedly can benefit from the advice of experienced consultants who can call to their attention the consequences of certain choices of speaker - and in the unlikely emergencies discharge the regents' obligation to regulate the operation of the buildings for which it is responsible to the people of this state."

The arguments for altering the present policy might be synthesized as follows:

"Granted that no sensational cases are at present being debated, is it not precisely at such times that one should consider the arguments for a reform in the relevant legislation? The Senate has only recently acquired the responsibility for ~~so~~ doing (its constitution makes it clear that it does have this responsibility) and the Student Activities Bureau has only recently indicated that it wanted guidance in this matter. There is a need; and it is surely best to discuss the problem of providing a policy in the absence of emotional or public commitments over some bitterly debated issue. At the moment, there is no formulated policy for student organizations to study or for the program consultants to apply. One way or another, it is an obligation of the Senate's to clarify the policy; and since the Senate has expressed considerable interest in ascertaining the AAUP's position, it is appropriate for the AAUP to express its own view or views, the more so since it is directly affected by the decision since the faculty themselves wish to hear many

visiting speakers. It is sometimes argued that there really is a policy, namely, that formulated in the 1936, June 10, 1946, and 1955 Senate minutes. These contain the vaguest generalities and basically give only a procedure, not a policy, viz., get the Dean of Students' Office to decide. This hardly provides a basis on which a student organization can make decisions about inviting speakers. Next, it is said that no exact policy could possibly be formulated: this is even said to be an advantage. But the Constitution and Bill of Rights exist in the face of far worse difficulties precisely because in a democracy we prefer to have a loosely formulated law than to rely entirely on the benevolence of even an elected leader. A great deal could be conveyed by the use of examples in formulating a policy, e.g., we would allow someone with such-and-such qualifications to speak on "China Today" but not such-and-such other qualifications. It looks only too clear from Dean Williamson's reservations in the case of Mrs. Helen Sobell that there would be marked disagreements about specific examples; but it should be emphasized that a communist has now been granted permission to speak on campus (even though it took six days for the approval to come through.) Has there been a change in policy? What principles are now supported? Students and faculty have a right to ask, and we can only lose by refusing to discuss them until a crisis occurs.

Now the fundamental objection to the present arrangements whereby campus groups obtain approval of non-faculty speakers is not that a direct veto is or will be frequently employed by the SAB. It is, indeed, employed so infrequently that one might well ask why it is needed at all. But under what conditions can a veto arise? Only when the secretary of the student organization is prepared to openly defy the concerted efforts of the SAB at the compulsory consultation or consultations that the present policy requires before approval is issued. Every student leader on campus knows that the SAB keeps a record of all memberships in all



organizations on campus, and that this file is available to employers and the government. He has to be very idealistic, stupid, or wealthy to push matters to the point where an organization to which he belongs acquires a bad name with the SAB for stubbornness. Better by far to change the program a little, or indeed to abandon it: after all, no invitation has as yet been issued. It is, as a matter of fact, very surprising that there have ever been cases where the matter has reached the Senate Committee on Student Affairs. If we are looking for reasons why students are apathetic about political matters, social issues, and moral or religious questions, we should not overlook the point of view of the student secretary or committee considering a controversial speaker and the necessity for convincing a program consultant acting according to unknown principles, backed up by a dossier system for recording errors and a veto whose operation is connected with the views of the University's Public Relations Department. (President Morrill has denied that this connection exists; but it was not clear whether he had in mind the whole range of University-approved functions for students and staff or only those originated by student groups. The usual belief is based on supposed action in the first group (e.g., "New China" film) which is thought to have an inevitable effect on the second.) This is not a situation calculated to encourage experimentation. But surely experimentation is valuable and free speech to be encouraged on campus: or at least off it, for under the present rules evening meetings in private homes must also be approved. Would it not be better to drop the requirement of compulsory consultation (although compulsory registration could be retained, which would always enable the administration to exercise the veto they will constitutionally always have) and remove the veto from the avowedly unwilling shoulders of the SAB? The extent of censorship cannot be measured by the number of acts of censorship, since each act prevents a hundred applications.

This is not a matter which involves the regents: it is a matter for procedural decision by the president, and a comparatively minor decision at that, for it is not a matter of abandoning control over student organizations: before an organization is able to ask speakers at all, it must be passed on as a responsible group by the SAB, and its officers are thereafter responsible to the SAB for all its activities. No one is suggesting that this requirement be changed (though its detail should be clarified.) No one is suggesting that the restrictions on external financial support or solicitation should be changed. Hence, it is irrelevant to talk about campus "front groups" since the proposed change will not make them any more likely. Finally, no one imagines that removing the veto from the SAB in any sense prevents the president from taking exceptional action in those cases in which it can be justified; and one occasion in twelve very disturbing years hardly suggests a serious increase in his burden, especially since he would automatically be consulted by the SAB in such a case anyway. The minor chance suggested is in keeping with the principle of "free speech unless its refusal can be justified" (rather than "no speech unless permission can be justified") - the principle according to which we choose the books in the library and according to which the Harvard students have for years operated without excitement and with success. (President Morrill feels these comparisons are unsound. We permit profanity in books that we would not allow in speeches, he says. If this point is granted, it would still not apply to the main issue, viz., political-moral-religious points of view expressed in polite language at meetings where attendance is voluntary. Harvard has a long tradition: but it is attacked and vulnerable to attack by the Massachusetts legislature, as well as by its extremely powerful and conservative alumni--taxes are as important as endowments.) Students would have all the facilities of consultation if they so desired; the president's office would be informed well in advance

owing to the necessity for compulsory notification of the Room Scheduling Office; and the University would be in the advantageous position of defending its speakers on grounds of a policy of free speech within the law, rather than on the grounds of a policy of the specific merits of each individual speaker, a decision which is, in any event, hardly best made by those on whom the only pressures are the repressive ones of the vigilante groups."

Before asking you to vote on the general motion that was submitted at the last meeting, we should like to obtain an expression of opinion from you on the following specific suggestions. Please vote on all.

1. If a veto is retained in any form, a serious and immediate attempt should be made to formulate the principles according to which it will be applied (or at least to give some examples - real or imaginary - on both sides of the dividing line) so as to explain the approach of the SAB for the benefit of student leaders: such an account to be submitted to the Senate for discussion.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

2. (Suggested by the Senate Committee on Student Affairs) There should be a mandatory review by SCSA of any refusal by SAB of permission for a visiting speaker.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

3. (Suggested by the Senate Committee on Student Affairs) The only grounds for refusal should be the absence of any educational value.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

4. (Suggested by All-University Congress) The requirement of compulsory approval by SAB, if retained, should apply only to meetings involving the use of University property or personnel.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

5. The availability of SAB for voluntary consultation should be retained, and a requirement of compulsory registration (4-days' minimum notice) with Room Scheduling (these registrations to be available to SAB) be substituted for that of compulsory consultation prior to approval of the invitation. SAB would retain the duty of guarding the University's interests and submitting to SCSA any cases which it regards as requiring decision. SCSA would have veto power, subject to appeal to the Senate. (The latter provision would make it advisable for secretaries to give two weeks or more notice when possible in doubtful cases.)

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

6. (Suggested in essence by the minority report of SCSA) Apart from the requirements of obeying the law, maintaining good order, and compulsory registration (as in 4), there should be no preliminary veto power below the presidential level. In this case, the students would have full educational responsibility for their invitations and the results, and would naturally be individually or collectively subject to the now-existing types of disciplinary action by SAB which would also be able to warn the student group, and notify the president, if deemed necessary.

Both the faculty advisers and the SAB would be available for voluntary consultation.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

7. There should be no change at all.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

8. Other suggestions:

After reading the general motion enclosed, please vote on it.

---

9. I vote in favor of the general motion.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Abstain \_\_\_\_\_

Signed \_\_\_\_\_