

# Salient

An Organ of Student Opinion at Victoria College, Wellington, N.Z.

LAST NIGHT AT 8 O'CLOCK 100 students of the College assembled in the upper gym. After some 20 persons had spoken. An amending motion of censure was lost - the motion of no confidence in the Executive. The meeting concluded at 9.30 pm.

Mr. Downick rose to speak and was greeted by unbroken voices. He stated that the Executive had met on Sunday and had, after due consideration, rescinded the motion under dispute. In his opinion the members who called the meeting were genuine in their wish to consider the motion in the light of subsequent developments - this was met with howls and jeers.

Mr. Downick reiterated that he was giving factual data only.

Mr. O'Connor introduced the following motion without comment: "That this Association has no confidence in the present Executive of the Association; and that it neither endorses the sentiments contained in, nor condones the sending of, a letter from the Executive to the Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia."

Mr. Downick objected to the way in which the motion had been passed - there was neither prior notice or discussion. One member of the Executive "didn't know about it" and another "thought it a joke". The rescission of the motion was an attempt to escape the consequences.

Mr. Tallboys said the Exec. abused the power for which they were elected. Apathy was the greatest enemy of democracy.

Miss Marshall: "If you are against the Exec. it shows that you didn't elect them on a party political basis. Poor taste is indicated by introducing matters to Exec. affairs."

Mr. Hume said that the Exec. had subordinated the interests of the University to their own views. "This is a chance to repudiate Communist domination of the University" (cheers, howls etc.)

Mr. Alice Molloy told me that his circular "was not circulated to appeal to the intelligent students but to stampede the ignorant". (Cries of "we don't care") In reply Mr. Molloy admitted the statement but said that it was "a matter mentioned in a semi-facetious and slaphappy manner."

Mr. Cohen said that Mr. Molloy had said precisely the same thing in front of other students. Mr. Molloy agreed that this was so. Mr. O'Brien, jumping to Mr. Molloy's defence, claimed that as this had been a private conversation it was a matter of privilege not to be discussed.

"It is an affront to the members of the Debating Club," said Mr. J. Milburn. This had been the only opportunity to discuss the Czech affair.

Mr. Bryant: "After lecturing to the polemos of yellows and table-thumpers I have decided that we could elect worse people onto the Executive - followers of 'Zealandia' and 'Truth'. (Interjection: 'Not Zealandia')"

Mr. P. Gardner: The Exec. were not elected on a political basis, then why should they express their political views in a whole (int: "What a hole"). A good Exec. would not meddle in political affairs. He suggested an amendment to stop this from happening.

point of order was raised, and the motion was ruled in order. Mr. Evison dis-

agreed with the Chairman's ruling but the ruling was upheld. Discussion then took place allegedly on the amendment but there was no perceptible difference in tone or substance.

"I am not a Communist, I have not been a Communist and I never intend to be one", said Mr. Taylor, ex President of the Association. "As the movers of the motion claim to be supporters of democracy" he hoped for a fair hearing. This he did not get, due to the noisy jeers of groups. The Exec. was wrong - all Execs. are sometimes wrong even the most reactionary. "Anybody who has run the affairs of the Association is, by March slowly disintegrating into madness". He mentioned the responsibilities of Tournament N.Z.U.S.A. renits, and Extrav. - all these would have to be organised by the "caretaker exec."

Mr. McIvor said that the Exec. was trying to crawl out. They had abused their privilege. (this to the accompaniment of cheers, hear hears etc.) There was clarification of a point here and it was admitted, coyly, by McIvor that he was talking about Mr. Skinner.

Mr. K. Pound: pointed out, despite strong and vocal opposition, that the Debating Club was after all only one activity of students in the College.

Mr. C. McLeod: said that we had lost the confidence of the Auckland Students, the Otago Students (int. "Two well-known progressive bodies") and the City Fathers. He moved that the amendment be put. It was and was lost. Then the motion was put and passed. Mr. Ian McDowell took the Chair on the motion of the house.

Mr. O'Connor then moved as a motion a full list of names of nominees for the "caretaker exec". It was pointed out by Mr. Warner that this would give no opportunity for democratic nominations and votes. Mr. O'Brien pointed out that this would cause trouble and mean preferential voting. Amidst roars of approval it was decided to vote on the motion.

Miss Michael said that "in view of the feeling at this meeting" she would withdraw from nomination. Miss Casey who was then nominated declined nomination and Miss Webley was appointed to the vacant position. The following is the list (plus Miss Webley) proposed by Mr. O'Connor and voted in "in toto":

Pres:	G. McRiley
Vice-Pres:	*J. Battersby    *Miss McKenzie
Sec.:	*K. O'Brien
Comm:	*D. Brown                *Miss C Langford
	B. Lovell                " L Leicester
	C. Macleod               " L Webley
	S. McLellan              " J Robbins

\*Members of the retired Exec.

Mr. O'Brien suggested that these people would be most acceptable as they comprised many who had never been on anything in the College.

The meeting then closed.

-----  
 "Salient" does not apologise for the front page being upside down.  
 Apparently even the Gestetner has been affected.  
 -----

"Salient" is being brought out by a small number of the staff so that you may have a report before Easter. It is now the small hours of the morning.

Salient Editors are usually interested in the effects of journalism and pamphleteering. Last night's meeting was a psychologist's paradise, for among the 1,000 students who "deliberated" on the question of the right of our democratically elected representatives to our confidence, there was a large body who reflected the current highly-emotional atmosphere created by our daily press. There is a witch-hunt against Communism and anything which can be labelled Red.

How many of the howling mob who voted against censure and for no-confidence are interested in the affairs of the Executive and those of the Association? Their sole objective was to scalp a "Communist controlled" Executive, not on the basis of their Executive ability, but on political issues.

There are many who believed that they judged the case on its own merits but where were the speakers who could contrast the handling of our affairs by our late representatives with that of previous Executives? Where were the speakers who could put the relative importance of the rescinded motion alongside the very positive contributions of that body to student affairs? Only one speaker had the chance to attempt it and he had a rough time of it. The gag motion of closure was put before the meeting long before the real case at issue had been discussed.

If this is the way student opinion is to be gauged then the University is no longer a bastion of reason.

W.J.C.

-----

INGENUOUS QUESTIONS:

Dear Mr. Editor: Will you please tell me how an Executive which has two R.Catholics,

1.                      four S.C.Mers, a couple of Socialists, etc. be Communist controlled?
2. How is it that a member of the Executive who did not vote for the rescinding of the obnoxious Exec. motion was obviously chief cheer leader of those passing the vote of no confidence.
3. The Executive was exhorted on all sides to take notice of what the Students want and yet when they did take due note of popular opinion and rescinded the motion they were not thanked but accused of all sorts of low motives. How can this be?
4. How was it that people with such high democratic ideals that they wanted their opinion stated as that of the College found themselves unable to stand the idea of a different opinion being stated at the meeting?
5. WHY?

PUZZLED.

-----

Once upon a time there was a girl called Little Red Riding Hood. One day when she was taking a basket of goodies to her Grandmother through the wood she met a nasty wolf, who asked her where she was going. She told him. The wolf went ahead and ate up Grandmother. When Red Riding Hood got there she looked at her Granma in surprise. (Of course we know that it really wasn't her grandmother at all - don't we?) Said R.R.H. "What big eyes you have Granma?" (and as R.R.H.'s vocabulary was rather restricted she repeated this about the ears, feet etc. until finally she said "Granma What big teeth you have" "All the better to eat you with" said the Wolf and jumped out of bed and ate her up.

-----