Thresher staff, and the fact that no other campus office specifically constitutes a special case; however, this would involve the Student Council in the event that the assistant editor went on scholastic probation. It was further stated by the administration that the possibility that the organization of the Thresher is four weeks.

The next week the Student Council, in accord with the rule that no one may hold an elected office while on probation of any kind, took action. The action it took was reported in last week's Thresher and is summarized below.

The Thresher is not protesting the action taken by the Council because the person involved happens to be a member of the Thresher staff. Had it been a person holding any other office, our feelings would have been the same. The question is not whether the Student Council can protest against a student being placed on disciplinary probation. It cannot, because it is not the Council's responsibility to judge whether or not a student should be put on probation. But the Council can, in view of the unusually short period of probation, the organization of the Thresher staff, and the fact that no other campus office specifically requires a year of apprenticeship, legally arrange for Claire to finish her term next year as editor, which, as far as we can see, would be better for all concerned.

The formidable parliamentary machinery of Robert's Rules of Order, however, seems to have run away with the Council, with the result that the body proposed a special election, almost rescinded it this week, and was forced by a petition calling for a referendum on the subject to halt all proceedings until the student body has a chance to vote in the matter. The question is whether or not the Council is justified in carrying out the rules of probation to the letter, or whether it should look into particular cases.

On April 10, 1959, Claire Plunguian, then holding the position of assistant editor, or assistant editor, of the Rice Thresher, was put on probation from that date until the end of the term. The actual length of this probation is six and a half weeks. Since the Thresher is not printed during Dead Week, the length of this probation affecting her title on the Thresher is four weeks.

On April 15, 1959, at their next meeting, the Student Council took up the question of the vacancy in the office of assistant editor of the Thresher. It was moved that the Council suspend the "vacancies" by-law and appoint Claire permanent editor as of next fall, when she would be off profession. This motion was withdrawn when the Council decided that there was no sufficient reason for suspending this by-law.

The point in question is simply whether or not the present probation ruling is an exceptional case. The Student Council has discussed the matter very thoroughly during the majority of two meetings and at length outside of the meetings. Three different times the Council has made the decision that this is not a special case:

1. The administration stated that it is not unusual in any way to place someone on disciplinary probation for a part of one semester. It was further stated by the administration that the possibility that the person concerned would be restricted from being editor was thoroughly looked into particular cases.

2. The same decision would have been reached by the Student Council in the event that the assistant editor went on scholastic probation. Almost everyone would agree that this would be the right decision. Some would say but that is different for it would last for a whole semester.

3. The incident in question might be considered trivial and thus constitute a special case; however, this would involve the Student Council making the decision whether or not the probation was justified. Up to this point no one has ever questioned the justice of probation until this paper. However, if this were to be questioned, the only evidence the Student Council would have is the reason for the probation, i.e. "... de-fying the authority of an Institute official." This reason does not constitute a special case as it is not an uncommon reason for probation.
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