The meeting was called to order by President Jystad. The purpose of the meeting was explained by Jystad to be the deciding of the validity of the recent elections held for the purpose of electing a chairman of the judicial council, and for the voting on the proposed constitutional amendments. Crawford said that the results of the primary are not in question. He presented the events concerning the ballots of the SAE fraternity, in which the votes arrived late. He also said that some students were questioning the validity of the voting process, since no closed booths were provided for the voting. It was also possible that some cards were not punched as the students voted. Lambros moved that the elections be held again as recommended, Bayley seconded. Lost 0-10.

In the discussion following the proposing of the motion, Walker presented a list of proposals by a group of students in regard to the election process. This list is as follows:

1. A defined system of voting procedures be included as an article in the Constitution of ASMSU
2. Primary and general elections for Judicial Council Chairman be held over.
3. Prior to this election, the functions and responsibilities of the Judicial Council as well as the qualifications and views of the candidates be adequately presented to the student body.

The reasons for the proposals were listed as:

1. The published rules for the election stated, "that the voter must have his activity card punched and must sign his name on a typed sheet. Violations of this rule occurred in the Grill where students were not required to sign a list while voting.
2. Published rules of election procedure provided that, "ballots must be turned in to the election headquarters in the Lodge by 4:15 p.m. Thursday." In violation of this rule the ballots from one living group were turned in at approximately 5:15 after counting of other ballots had begun.
3. Other failures of the election system include:
   a. The Grill was not open during the published polling hours, specifically from 11:34 to 12:00
   b. Proper facilities for secret balloting were not provided in all precincts.
   c. Names were double listed and thus people could possibly have voted in two places. Cards were not punched in some living groups.
   d. After counting, votes were placed in groups without reference to precincts.

The group further states: "We believe that because of the importance of the Judicial Council it is imperative that it be founded on a just and efficient election. We believe that without this, the Council will be unable to command the respect of the student body."

Bayley explained that the 4:15 deadline for the turning in of
votes was set merely as a convenience. Crawford said that the late votes were counted in order that an honest poll of student opinion would be obtained. Jystad said that he felt that as long as there is a question of the validity of the ballot, and a group of students feel that the vote was not fair, that another general election should be held. Erickson asked the group if they felt the fault were in the new system of voting, and if they would rather go back to the old system. Walker said that the number of personalities involved in the precinct vote was bad. Lambros asked if there were proof of cheating in the voting. Crawford said that no cheating had been reported. Leuthold said that in comparison with other methods of voting which have been used on the campus, there was cheating in all methods tried. He further stated that the Judicial Council is new, and has not actually been incorporated into the ASMSU structure. Since Central Board was handling the elections, the rules were made to facilitate rather than rules which were hard and fast and inflexible. There are already provisions made for elections in the constitution, but since this group (Judicial Council) is not yet an actual part of the ASMSU structure, the rules in the constitution do not necessarily have to apply in this case. Nelson questioned the "double standard" of having some students sign their names as they vote, and others not signing. Nelson further suggested that persons be paid to be in charge of the polling places. Bayley suggested that the group is not contesting the validity of the election, but the rules under which the election was run. Petite said that the infractions of the rules are a sign that the election wasn't fair. Torres suggested that if the Council is to start of a good basis, that the election be run over again. Wellinstein said that the procedures which were followed were very vague. Unless cheating is proved, he said, no basis for contention is present. Bayley said that as long as the polls are closed at the correct time, it does not matter at which time the votes are counted. Fowler feels that the whole election should be re-run. Leuthold said that the cause of trouble is that too many people are involved in the election process. If the votes were thrown out from one precinct because of one error, no room for human error would be left. He said that some leeway has to be made for this human error.

Crippen moved that a new primary and general election for Judicial Council Chairman be held at such time that is designate by Central Board or its election committee. Fowler seconded. Lost 4-6. Fowler said that Central Board has an obligation to right any wrongs which may have been done, and so suggests that the entire process be redone. Crippen felt that a new election should be conducted if there is proof of cheating in the election, otherwise the vote should stand as taken. Riddle suggested that in any second election which might be held in this connection, that an emotional factor which is not now present would cause voters to vote not for the person, but rather for some group instead.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Crocker, Secretary ASMSU
