

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

---

Tuesday June 24, 2003 – 6:00PM  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

## A G E N D A (SC 2003-06)

2003-06/1	<u>CALL TO ORDER</u>
2003-06/2	<u>NATIONAL ANTHEM "O Canada:"</u>
2003-06/3	<u>University of Alberta CHEER SONG "Ring Out a Cheer"</u>
2003-06/4	<u>STUDENTS' UNION CREDO</u>
2003-06/5	<u>SPEAKER'S BUSINESS</u>
2003-06/6	<u>ROLL CALL</u>
2003-06/7	<u>APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA</u>
2003-06/8	<u>PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION</u>
2003-06/9	<u>APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES</u>
2003-06/10	<u>QUESTION PERIOD</u>
2003-06/11	<u>APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (MINUTES)</u>
2003-06/11a	Please see document SC 03-06.01
2003-06/12	<u>APPROVAL OF STUDENTS' UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEES REPORTS</u>
2003-06/13	<u>OLD BUSINESS</u>
2003-06/14	<u>LEGISLATION</u>
2003-06/15	<u>NEW BUSINESS</u>

**2003-06/15a**

SMITH/WELKE MOVED the adoption of the following resolution:

WHEREAS the Executive Committee and the President are empowered to call meetings of Students' Council to allow the latter to deal with pressing legislative matters in a timely manner;

WHEREAS the calling of meetings for other purposes than to deal with unforeseen pressing legislative matters in a timely manner ought to be the province of Students' Council, and not the Executive Committee;

WHEREAS the proposed August 16th meeting of Students' Council is not to include any unforeseen pressing legislative matters;

WHEREAS the single item of legislative business anticipated to be on this meeting's agenda could be dealt with as effectively on a regularly scheduled Tuesday meeting; and

WHEREAS this meeting therefore represents a flagrant abuse of the President's power to call meetings of Students' Council,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Students' Council cancel the meeting currently scheduled for August 16, 2003.

**2003-06/16**

**REPORTS**

**2003-06/16a**

Student Activities Coordinator Report

Please see document SC 03-06.02

**2003-06/17**

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

**2003-06/18**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**2003-06/18a**

**Next Council Meeting**

**UPCOMING  
COUNCIL  
MEETINGS**

- July 8, 2003 – 6:00PM
- July 22, 2003 – 6:00PM

**2003-06/18b**

**UPCOMING FACULTY  
ASSOCIATION REPORTS**

- Pharmacy
- Physical Education

**2003-06/19**

**ADJOURNMENT**

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Tuesday June 24, 2003, 6:00pm  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

## MINUTES (SC 2003-06)

Faculty/Position	Name	Present/ Absent	Vote #1
President	Mat Brechtel		
VP Academic	Janet Lo		
VP External	Chris Samuel		X
VP Finance	Tyler Botten		X
VP Student Life	Jadene Mah		
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Roman Kotovych		
University of Alberta Athletics Board Exec Officer	Kevin Petterson		
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Paul Reikie	X	
Arts	Alex Abboud		
Arts	Chris Bolivar (Kyle Kwanami)		
Arts	Adam Kaasa	X	
Arts	Erin Kelly	X	
Arts	James Knull (Chris Jonstone)		X
Arts	Chris Laver		X

Arts	Terra Melnyk		X
Arts	Heather Wallace		X
Arts	Paul Welke		X
Business	Adam Cook		
Business	Steve Smith		X
Education	Charles Beamish	X	
Education	Allison Ekdahl		X
Education	Mandeep Gill	X	
Education	Christine Wudarck		X
Education			
Engineering	Josh Bazin		X
Engineering	Paige Smith		
Engineering	David Wepler (Margaret Laffin)		Abstain
Engineering	Matthew Wildcat (Angela Thomas)		X
Law	Dean Hutchison		
Residence Halls Association	Samantha Kelch (Kyla Rice)		
Medicine/Dentistry	Jesse Pewarchuk (Stephen Congly)		
Medicine/Dentistry	Rosalind Ting	X	
Native Studies (School of	Valerie Kanaga	X	
Nursing			
Nursing			
Open Studies			

Open Studies			
Pharmacy			
Physical Education	Holly Higgins		
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth		
Faculté Saint-Jean	Zita Dube		X
Science	Anne Aspler		X
Science	Tereza Elyas		
Science	Aisha Khatib		
Science	James Meeker		X
Science	Shawna Pandya (Matthew Eaton)		X
Science	Elaine Poon (Talwar Sundeep)		X
Science	Steven Schendel		X
Science	Duncan Taylor (Justin Kehoe)		
Science	LeeAnn Lim		
President Athletics			
General Manager	Bill Smith	X	
Speaker	Gregory Harlow		
Recording Secretary	Shirley Ngo		

Guests of Council: Teodora Alampi, Chad Moore, Chris Jones

2003-06/1

**CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting is called to order at 6:00pm

2003-06/2

**NATIONAL ANTHEM "O Canada:"**

DUBE led singing of the national anthem, "O Canada".

2003-06/3

**University of Alberta CHEER SONG "Ring Out a Cheer"**

KAWANAMI led the singing of the U of A Cheer song, "Ring Out a Cheer".

2003-06/4

**STUDENTS' UNION CREDO**

2003-06/5

SMITH led the reading of the Students' Union Credo

**SPEAKER'S BUSINESS**

Resignation from Valerie Kanaga – Due to time constraints and the requirement to be out of town during the summer, she will not be able to attend many of the meetings so she has decided to resign from council.

There are also attendance issues that need to be dealt with tonight. The 3 members - Reike, Kaasa and Ting have not been attending the meetings. According to our bylaws, they are now removed from Students' Council. Bylaw 100 is very explicit and leaves me no room for exceptions. Their seats are now vacant. If council does not like this, I recommend they take this up with CRAP.

2003-06/7

There will be a CRAP meeting today after this meeting.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

LO/SAMUEL MOVED THAT the agenda be approved

KAWANAMI/SMITH MOVED THAT items 14a and 14b and 15b be special orders.

BOTTEN/SMITH MOVED THAT item 15c be added to the agenda, upon the recommendation of the Nominating Committee, ratify the selection of Jamie Matheos as a student at large member of the Golden Bear & Panda Legacy Fund Committee.

KAWANAMI – The reason why items 14a, b and 15b should be attended is because, well, I have always considered democracy to be pressing and urgent. The point is that these things were attended by the previous council, if we leave them too long, it may be forgotten. It is important to settle these questions early so we know how much money is being dealt with. Also, the budget is coming forward next meeting so we need to know this.

BRECHTEL – The resolution passed sometime ago, it is important. A lot of this has to be done over the summer. The first step in the process that hopefully won't take up too much time over the summer.

BOTTEN/LO – The Gold Bear Legacy Fund Committee will be meeting this Thursday to discuss the funds that will be given to the teams so it will be nice to show up with a full committee.

**Motion is carried.**

SAMUEL – Roll Call!

**Speaker** – To go through a roll call for every one of them will add an enormous amount of time to our schedule. So when the chair feels that the roll call is important then it will occur. SAMUEL - I would like to challenge the chair. I think the roll call vote will serve a purpose to see who is here at the meeting and it doesn't appear to me that we have reached our high point for democratic credibility.

**Speaker** – I am going to hold that this is out of order. (15 with chair/13 opposed of withholding the chair.)

**Approval of the agenda is carried.**

2003-06/9

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**KOTOYVCH/SAMUEL MOVED THAT** the minutes be approved. **DUBE/WELKE MOVED TO STRIKE** the section from the 2003-05 minutes under the Question Period, page 2, the dialogue between Dube and Kotovych. **MELNYK** – My name is spelled incorrectly at the bottom of the page 3, 2003/05 minutes.

**SMITH** – Why is the attendance missing from the minutes?

**Recording Secretary** – I have no idea.

**SMITH/BAZIN MOVED THAT** the approval of the minutes be postponed until July 8, 2003.

**Carried.**

2003-03/10

**QUESTION PERIOD**

**WALLACE** – I was wondering about the progress of the U pass. NAIT has decided that they aren't interested? Is there a backup plan about this and what is the progress on it? **SAMUEL** – Meeting with the people at ETS was a good meeting to have. She provided us with some insight to what may happen. As far as what we are doing in the future, we are looking for alternate sources of funding and we will be looking at why ETS gave us the price they did. As far as the whole NAIT pulling out thing, this year's current executive doesn't even want to pool the students. The NAIT president has made it quite clear he is inflexible on the issue. In particular, UBC and U of C are 2 institutions that we are looking towards. However their transit department is unwilling to release their numbers. (U of C pays 58 dollars a term). I've got a meeting with councilor Langley in the near future. I know that Grant McEwan executive is excited about this.

**ABBOUD** – The focus on our lobbying on bill 43 are on smaller issues. A number of my constituents feel that they are in the dark on this. So how are you going to let people become more aware of this?

**SAMUEL** - One of the pitfalls of lobbying is that it occurs behind closed doors. We've had a meeting and the goal is to build support from a very broad base. As far as what we are doing for the internal community, it's a difficult time because there is a small number of people on campus. If the councilor has any suggestions on how we can more effectively do that, I would encourage the councilors to talk to their constituents about it.

**SMITH** – Pleased to hear that the legal review of the Internal Review Board is very time sensitive. I am wondering if the President will apologize to IRB for negligence, also, in the future how long will the IRB allow its chair to fulfill basic functions like sending emails

**BRECHTEL** – The first 2 questions, my report to council goes over some of it. No, I'm not going to go through it all. The date the IRB set for having the letters returned was July 1, there will be at least a month for the people that got the letter to respond, so I gave it lower priority. Will I apologize for negligence or contempt? I will apologize for negligence because I should have more time in my day. How long in the future? Hopefully this will spark discussion to see how long it will have things done in the future. Some of the emails were sent off today.

**DUBE** – Do we have any bands yet? **MAH** – We are in negotiations right now, we will have a better idea towards end of July. Last year we didn't actually have a band on paper until late August. You can submit a proposal or offer for a band on a given date and the agent will sit on that and try to solicit other venues and will try to get the higher bid. Us being a school, it leaves us in a bit of a disadvantage. We are competing with NAIT for bands.

**CONGLY** – Can you describe the APC differential that will be judged

**BRECHTEL** - If any new proposals are coming, here are the things that you have to meet. The 2 things that were most notable to me, is that they have to go to the students and discuss it with them. Afterwards, they have to discuss it with the students again. If we do run a website, we have to put that in the proposal. In the proposal they have to detail what kind of student support they have to back up the differential proposals.

**WELKE** – In our efforts to increase people being able to bike. Are we going to take into account any safety measures?

**MAH** –Yes. The year of the bike – it is a campaign of safety and transportation. We are looking at setting up some tables and tents with campus security and maybe United Cycle to give bike safety info. We are also looking at setting up programs for people to learn about bike safety.

**MELNYK** – How far does your report go into discussing Bill 43 and why it is such a big deal?

**SAMUEL** – I will be posting links to actual links themselves. There will be contact information there so if you have further questions, you can contact myself.

**LAVER** – What efforts has there been made for urban rep at WOW?

**MAH** – Please clarify urban rep for me?

**LAVER** – Modern progressive music, hip hop....etc.

**MAH** - We have to make sure we are offering something for everyone. We have been debating if we want to bring in a live event or bringing a DJ. A DJ will cost more, with the setup of the lights.

**KOTOVYCH** – As you know, the City of Edmonton is moving to a smoke free environment in restaurants. Will the SU be following suit?

**BOTTEN** – I haven't given this thought yet. I will have something to report to council in 2 weeks to see where our operations may go.

**KAWANAMI** – What progress has been made on all those scholarships we were told about (print-on-demand)?

**LO** – Our President is the primary on that and I am the Secondary. It is pushed onto our July list of things to do.



**KAWANAMI** – Regarding the U pass, have you explored the option of some sort of park and ride option, due to congested traffic?

**SAMUEL** – Yes.

2003-06/11  
2003-06/11a

**APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

**KAWANAMI** – Wondering if the space will be used for constructive purposes?

**KOTOVYCH** – This has been in the works since March. Use of the office is mandated by bylaw. Yes, I plan to use the office. I am trying to set it up. The office will be put to good use. If council feels it is not necessary to have an office, they are more than welcome to alter the legislation.

**ABBOUD** – Regarding item 2c. Is there any recourse for anybody not following it?

**BRECHTEL** – The recourse to bring the individual to the DIE board.

**CONGLY** – Why were the changes made in 2c?

**BRECHTEL** – There are safety concerns with having dark washrooms. The lights are turned on and off in common spaces like the photocopy room so it will take more energy than to leave it on. People aren't always aware when they are going to be out of the office.

2003-06/12

**APPROVAL OF STUDENT'S UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEES REORTS**

**LO** – AEB is the best board I have ever sat on.

**BRECHTEL** – We wanted to bring some base principles to council and will drive us as we go through it. There are 5 things here, and they are a little vague. Please feel free to ask me any questions. As simple as these 5 principles seem, they will driving the bylaws for the next 8 months.

2003/06/15b

The first one – Right now the constitution takes 3 readings, the leg takes 2. The constitution is what constitutes the groups. Instead of having some rule we see as having 2 or 3 levels, we will treat them all the same.

2. – Nobody likes reading long legislation. The 2<sup>nd</sup> part is that we seem to have redundant definition sections and it will be nice to have a definition section and define how are going to define definitions if they are not written down.

3- This is such things as, if possible, putting all the dedicated fees in one place. Only put at the end of it the differences.

4- There are legal systems that the government runs, we don't really find ourselves going through distinct interpretation all the time. Simple wherever possible

5 – We have a lot of redundancy in our bylaws and constitution. So simple is better.

**Speaker** – If you do not like these principles, this is the time to bring it up. This is all part of making council effective. Whether you agree, disagree, now is the time to say your peace.

**DUBE** – I think it is fantastic that we try to reduce redundancy. It should be passed over to council.

**KAWANAMI** – Regards to consolidation, depending on which committee they are on, it will require a long time. With regards to a constitution aspect, it may lead to a certain amount of confusion. It may be a bit harder, it will increase the learning curve and people looking at bylaws will have to dig deeper. I encourage council to think hard about these recommendations. If there is any sort of doubt, it should be brought up now.

**COOK** – I would like more argumentation to number 1. Concerned that it may lead to more confusion rather. What are our fees, who are our VPs, the things that entrenched in constitution and what the principles are to run this.

**SMITH** – What a constitution should do is, should set out what the organization is and why it exists, should set out some guide regulations, should prescribe how constitution can be amended. It is all set out in the University's Act. Essentially, to have this separate layer, only exists so we can have a constitution. Appears radical to say that we abolish the constitution. As far as confusion goes, there will be more confusion in one layer of constitution. All that will be affected is what the constitution will look like, and it will look a lot shorter than it does now.

**JONES** – Response to Councilor Cook for more information on number 1. There are 2 different approaches. First there is the content. The proposal from IRB is not to change the content, but the structure. For example, you can have 1 bylaw that covers everything or 20 little bylaws.

**DUBE** – I think it is inappropriate to compare this to the Canadian Constitution. Though it is not explicitly written that we have a Prime Minister, it is customer.

**KAWANAMI** – An important aspect we have to look at, is what is the symbolic value of having an internal ...I think it is somewhat beneficial for SU to define its own terms.

**SMITH** – Wondering if Councilor KAWANAMI if a 3<sup>rd</sup> reading actually makes council think higher and please provide an example of what is higher.

**HUTCHISON** – The constitution is generally the fundamental document. I caution council before removing this. Bylaws are easily repealed and created so they can become very burdensome.

**MELNYK** – Under the impression that they will be included in bylaw, so regardless if it goes through 2 or 3 readings, it will be significant.

**CONGLY/COOK MOVED TO** strike section 1 from the report.

**SAMUEL** – There are 2 differences between the constitution and the bylaw. The inherent value in a piece of constitution holds, is not in the content. If we move the constitution to a bylaw, the value is still there. The main thing is moving from 3 readings to 2 readings. The 3 reading serves zero purposes. By the time it gets to the 3<sup>rd</sup> reading, it is a done deal.

**ASPLER** – What exactly would the differences be aside from changing the names and number of readings? Have other universities tried this?

**BRECHTEL** – Symbolic difference. There are a number of different places looking at this. Haven't examined other school's constitutions

**BOTTEN** - I have discovered one school - the U of Western Ontario has 2 bylaws. Bylaw 1 is 127 pages in length. That would be my example of a similar setup.

**SMITH** – A constitution lays bedrock that is not easy to repeal or amend. But our constitution that is easy to repeal or amend, so it should be in bylaw.

**ABBOUD** – Can you make the argument that our constitution is too easy to amend and repeal

**SMITH** - I would say that is not the case. What is in the constitution are not bedrock principles. There are several things in our constitution that are copied verbatim from the Universities Act. We don't need this pretend constitution to make us feel better. Some other Universities do this, student association legal structures aren't very good. We can use other student association examples, but they are not very credible.

**ABBOUD** – This is change just for the sake of change. The 3<sup>rd</sup> reading will serve as a rubber stamp. Expediency is not a valid point from changing a point.

**COOK** – I am in favor of this motion. I think it will stick out more in students mind. I think it is a distinct name given to those principles. Having 6 readings to get to that point, when students vote in something through referendum, they want that to stick, they don't want council to take 2 readings and take it away from them.

**MEEKER** – Reading the exact principle in front of us, if we are concerned about the number of readings. This is simply looking at the structure of that. We should be looking for that type of thing, not the structure of our bylaw. Things like our student fees, you can put into bylaw so it is difficult and we can't just take it out. We can take our constitutions and do certain things to it. All those issues will come forth in the bylaws as well.

**Speaker** – What I would interpret the U A Act is saying, we are going to call them bylaws for convenience. If you went to court of law, the justice would uphold that interpretation. What we have created is semantics, so this is why this report has come up in IRB in this fashion. I'm going to rule this out of order.

If you vote with the chair, you will be continuing debate on this. Voting against the chair, is ending the debate and to say that the constitution is unconstitutional and is a violated of the Universities' Act.

Welke and Bazin opposed. Everyone else agrees.

**HUTCHISON** – I believe the Speaker is totally correct. The constitution needs to be elevated, other than having a bunch of bylaws created. That is the solution to this, more so than just creating bylaws.

**DUBE** – I think we are going around in circles. Lets look at what a constitution is. You can have a constitution strictly run by custom. All we are doing is clearing a definition. Lets not fight over the word, "constitution".

**RICE** – Keep that in mind your student groups will be affected.

**LO** - I believe constitutions are symbolic. It was mentioned that accessibility was a problem. A constitution allows it to be assessable to students. I looked at the constitutions and it is organized by themes. Things such as those to allow Students' Union look over things that aren't thousands of pages long.

**KOTOVYCH/HUTCHISON MOVED** the previous question on the amendment only.

**Carried (22/11/0).**

**CONGLY/COOK MOVED TO** strike item 1.

**Carried (16/15/0).**

**DEFEATED (17/18/0).**

**WELKE/SCHENDEL MOVED THE** previous question on the main motion

**Carried.**

(Abboud/Hutchison/Kawanami/Lo/Cook/Congly/Rice oppose the approval of the committee report).

**LEGISLATION**

**KOTOVYCH/ABBOUD MOVED THAT** Students' Council approve the changes to Bylaw 2100. (FIRST Reading).

**KOTOYVCH** - This was discussed in March. There were a lot of arguments that were not raised. As to the reasoning, first thing is that posters do matter in an election. If you reduce the posters, they provide an advantage to people whom have run before as their name is familiar so you need to have that for new candidates that are running. Print limitations – poster reduction from 20 to 10. I probably could have ordered 300 posters instead of 200 and that would have saved me about 20 dollars. You can't expect a major drop in dollars if you limit the number of posters. With the CRO recommendations – the winning candidates spend more on their posters.

2003-06/14  
2003/06/14a

If you drop this down to 350, you will have a level playing field for everyone. However, the winning candidates spent more on their posters. It is important to have the availability there. People don't go to hit the limit on purpose. There is an argument that you don't need flashy posters to win. I was at the UBC Campus, they have a centralized poster place where all the posters are the same, based on the same motif, but voter turnout was much lower. Another thing about the unfair advantage given for slate.

Only a slate can go over the base, so only members of slates can afford to have glamorous campaigns. Elections are a very important part of SU. Cutting is not the way to improve the SU profile. This is still a reduction in money that we are spending from last year.

**CONGLY** – The main amendment to bylaw 2100 is in section 61, 62, 63 inclusive.

**SCHENDEL** – I am in favor of these proposals. If I remember correctly, the councilor who suggested the change to 350 just shrugged their shoulders and said, "what about 350". I suggest we pass this.

**KAWANAMI** – Would you not agree that there is plenty of free advertisement in the handbook when your picture is in the handbook?

**SAMUEL** - I think that if an executive member did an exceptional job, they will have the positive name recognition. However, if that member has not had an exceptional year, that name recognition will hurt them. The \$500 will allow more breathing space for fines.

I think this body is doing far too much credence to glossy posters. Is the glossy poster that much more of a benefit than a non-glossy poster? Example, the Pepsi campaign, my campaign was about \$590. I would like to think that I won on my own merits. This buys into the whole concept of relative success. I think in terms of the budget impact, I would think that this would be a good year so we wouldn't have a debate which is centered on theory and a concrete example on what future campaigns would be.

**LO** – I'm opposed to this motion. I believe an election is to mark yourself appropriately. Posters are one venue to do some, but not the only venue. Cutting to \$350, forces candidates to try other methods. For example, using forums, going to classrooms, actually talking to the students...etc. When Grant McEwan does their elections, they have 4 campuses, their limit is \$150 and can spend out of their own pockets.

**SCHENDEL** – What is their voter turn out?

**LO** – I don't know

**ABBOUD** – What is the student population of Grant McEwan compared to ours?

**LO** – Fair enough. I speak opposed to this motion.

**BOTTEN** – We do have a VP Academic elected without having her face on the poster for sometime. Expenses are like gas. Campaign budgets will fill the same thing. Comparing us to other schools in favor are not valid. I speak against this item. There are more important items to discuss than the campaign budgets.

**ABBOUD** – Regarding glossy posters, I looked over the minutes of March 11 where we discussed the \$350. Samuel made the point that diverting the funds from the budget, it will force candidates to use forums...etc. I don't see that argument. If we divert funds from glossy posters, they have no effect on voter turnout. Which is one of the main things we should work on. Banners cost a fair bit. This is how you get people to vote and get them aware of it. The amount of coverage that Gateway has been giving us is lower. It assumes there is a core base of 400 people. Aside from posters and banners, there is Gateway and CJSR. If we didn't have limits, someone with rich parents can probably win because they have nice posters. It is not a matter of just glossy posters. How many of you pay attention to something that is black and white compared to one that is on nice glossy paper.

**BOTTEN** – Would students notice the glossy posters if they were clumped with other glossy posters on a wall

**ABBOUD** – Students will still notice them. There were posters everywhere in the Atrium, even though they are clumped together, but we had the biggest turnout. This assumes that students vote based on posters, the most posters do is draw attention to attention. A larger budget allows for more creativity, you can spend it on Lego if you like.

**WUDARCK** – I don't think \$350 is enough. Elections are very important because it ends up being who is in this room. We should not have the "try and see" method when it comes to elections. I don't think this is something we should risk and have an even lower voter turnout.

**PETTERSON** – I think posters are overdone. If you take the extra money from people's money and run the campaign letting people know why they should be voting. Faces everywhere is ridiculous. It may even drive you not to vote. I think the whole thing is ridiculous. So if you put more effort in explaining to people what you want to do and promote what the SU does, that would be more effect.

**RICE** – I've never had anyone come to my classroom to talk during the last 3 years of my degree. If you guys are concerned the money, look at the Joke candidate budgets. There have been years where I have seen 4 and that is a bit excessive.

**BRECHTEL** – It is about communication. As candidate last year, I went to many classes during every class break and I still didn't manage to hit every class. I would love to talk to people more, but you fall back on other things, which is printed material, bag tags, whatever they might be. The things that we use are the same thing that candidates spend on everywhere. Those things at the end of the day are the most effective way. The reason why candidates spend the expenditures on the same thing is that it works.

**COOK** – You can win a campaign without glossy posters. However, the reason why I'm voting for this is because slates have an advantage and it increases voter turnout. The reason why you know there is an election is because there are posters all over the walls. If the Gateway is not covering them, how can we get the word out that we are having an election.

**WALLACE** – When I ran to sit in this seat, I thought it was the CRO's job to get people up.

**COOK** – It is their job but not solely their job. Students hear about the SU when an election is on and that is a concern.

**EATON** – I've happened to run a campaign. The thing that struck me when we were done the campaign, for every poster you put on the wall, there was one that didn't. For every hand out that was given out, there were 40 that were sitting at home.

**DUBE** – People are talking about poor turnout, we had a greater turnout than the SU election we were involved and talking to people. We are walking into new election procedures this year. Lets be realistic, you don't want your message out, you want your name out. Posters are still going to be there, if they are not glossy, whatever. Make your priorities. We are all in the same boat.

**KAWANAMI** – Rather distressed that as we are talking about our campaign budgets, we spent all this time talking about posters. The number \$350 was pulled out of the air. I tried to run a campaign based on information. We printed out cheap posters and a 13-page policy manual and we lost badly. Council should trust the recommendation and trust the system, which is \$500, which is a reduction from last years' budget. I vote in favor of this.

**JONES** – As a twice-failed election candidate, if there is one thing I learned in political science, is that it takes 3 things to get elected – money, time and buzz. You can substitute them. If you have more money, you can buy time and publicity. You can buy time, newspaper space. If you have more money, you can get people to hand out fliers for you. Money is a critical factor in the way we run elections. Currently our electoral system is skewed to candidates that are members of the SU. They are asked not to do their job for 2 weeks, which means they have time.

These people also have advantages in publicity. There are some faculties that are heavier in workloads and time commitments than others. During election campaigns, I was forced to choose whether to choose talking to people in classrooms or passing. I choose to talk to people and my GPA took a severe hit because I did not have time to replace it. People who are in programs where time is secrete, there is no chance of success that can contest election. When was the last time you saw someone in a heavy faculty win?

**Roll Call was conducted by the Recording Secretary.**

**JONES** – When was the last time someone in medicine ran for office? Our elections are to some degree slanted, in favor of executives or directors of student groups. They are slanted away from the average student. \$350 is not enough. This creates a serious incentive to be part of a slate.

JONSTONE /EKDAHL MOVED THE previous question.

Carried.

Main Motion is carried (29/6/4)

(BOTTEN/LO/MAH/SAMUEL abstained)

2003-06/14b

KOTOVYCH/BAZIN MOVED THAT Students' council approve the changes to Bylaw 2200. (FIRST Reading)

KOTOVYCH – The new system skews it even more. What it does is an attempt to go back to the changes before in March.

Motion is carried. Unanimous consent.

2003-06/15

NEW BUSINESS

2003-06/15a

SMITH/WELKE MOVED the adoption of the following resolution:

WHEREAS the Executive Committee and the President are empowered to call meetings of Students' Council to allow the latter to deal with pressing legislative matters in a timely manner;

WHEREAS the calling of meetings for other purposes than to deal with unforeseen pressing legislative matters in a timely manner ought to be the province of Students' Council, and not the Executive committee;

WHEREAS the proposed August 16 meeting of Students' Council is not to include any unforeseen pressing legislative matters:

WHEREAS the single item of legislative business anticipated to be on this meeting's agenda could be dealt with as effectively on a regularly scheduled Tuesday meeting; and

WHEREAS this meeting therefore represents a flagrant abuse of the President's power to call meetings of Students' council,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Students' Council cancel the meeting currently scheduled for August 16, 2003.

BRECHTEL – Intent of meeting is the Tuition policy. Intent was that in that debate, there would be a discussion where tuition should stand. I believe it is the first issue students look to the SU to decide. We hope to have something concrete at the end of the day.

WELKE – How would this deal with a pressing legislative matter, especially when we have been given 2 months time?

BRECHTEL – Does council always vote at the end of the meetings? There are unforeseen issues that need to be discussed at certain times. My intent was that last meeting we have a short discussion on it. I think this is a good idea and this meeting should happen.



**DUBE** – I am supporting this decision and I think this is an emergency and has been for 10 years. In the eye of most students it is the number one priority. It is necessary. I am almost embarrassed by allusions that people are making that executives are dictatorships. I think they are asking us to do our jobs.

**ABBOUD** – I commend the executives for being on the ball. If the intent is to get the dialog going, we live an electronic age, can the same goal not be set up on a web board?

**DUBE** - Can you conceive a threat on the web board often digresses to something that has nothing to do with the topic

**ABBOUD** – We can have a moderator to monitor the comments. It just seems like we are forcing everyone to come in on that day. As much as the whole executive's heart is in the right place, this is not the right place to go into it.

**KOTOVYCH** – Can we have something more along the lines of CRAP?

**DUBE** – Would you conceive that this is a very formal discussion?

**KOTOVYCH** – Yes.

**COOK** – I am going to support this motion. I think it can get accomplished in the meetings that we have now. It should not be a mandated meeting on the 16<sup>th</sup>. It should be an informal meeting but without a Speaker and Recording Secretary.

**BRECHTEL** – The intent was not to have a formal meeting.

**ALAMPI** - I would be there that morning. But what about having it on an evening during the week? Maybe on a Wednesday night and then follow up on a Thursday.

**PETTERSON** – We just had 35-minute debate on when we are going to have another debate. I don't think this is going to be the most effective use of time.

**SMITH** – My intent was not to call the execs dictatorships. It is not the role of the executives to direct council when council should do its job. I am against a meeting on that date. This meeting is not necessary to do that. My main defense is that the meeting is not necessary and can be done as effectively on a Tuesday

**HUTCHISON/CONGLY** Moved the question.  
Defeated (17/10/0).

**KAWANAMI** – This does not really sound like a council meeting. I think that it is a case of...it can be accomplished without being a formal meeting. If people aren't there, that is their problem. If they aren't there, it reflects badly on the organizations. People usually block things off on Tuesday nights, they may have stuff to do on other nights.

**EATON** – You should be there. The meeting needs to happen, I don't agree that it would happen in a 15 minutes debate.

**CONGLY** – I’ve sat here listening here to whether there will be a meeting at the end. This whole debate has been extended than it way should have been. Please call the question.

**ABBOUD** – I don’t agree with councilor Congly. If it is defeated now, I don’t think they will hold it again next week. Using CRAP as an example, debating tuition is the same as debating whether we should have roll call at 6 at 9 or both. I am sure everybody would be interested in tuition.

**BRECHTEL** – If we combined all the meetings we had regarding tuition the year before, they would equal one full council meeting. I don’t think it is okay to pass this issue to a subordinate group. This is the process that is followed in the pass for urgent matters. It has always been done like this.

**RICE/WALLCE** Moved the previous question.

**Carried.**

**Main Motion is defeated.** (HUTCHISON Opposed.)

2003-06/15c

**BOTTEN/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Nominating Committee, ratify the selection of Jamie Matheos as a student at large member of the Golden Bear & Panda Legacy Fund Committee.

2003-06/19

**ADJOURNMENT**

**DUBE/BAZIN MOVED TO** adjourn at 10:07pm

**Carried.**

**Executive Committee Report to Students' Council June 24, 2003**

**1. The following motion were passed at the June 9, 2003 Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. MAH/LO MOVED THAT the Executive Committee recommend to Students' Council that the agreement between the Students' Union and Tess Elsworthy relating to the Women's Centre be signed.  
VOTE ON MOTION 5/0/0 CARRIED
  
- b. SAMUEL/BOTTEN moved that the Students' Union provide office space (302J) in SUB to the Board of Governors representative for the 2003/04 year.  
VOTE ON MOTION 5/0/0 CARRIED

**2. The following motions were passed at the June 16, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. BOTTEN/LO MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve the proposal brought forward by the Student Groups Director for the creation of the Event Assistant and Administrative Assistant positions.  
VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED
  
- b. LO/MAH MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve an expense of not to exceed \$2,000 from the SUB Expansion budget to install a security system in 2-900 SUB  
VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED
  
- c. LO/MAH MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve the proposed amendments to Operating Policy 3.05 relating to Computers and Lights. (background attached)  
VOTE ON MOTION 3/0/1(BOTTEN) CARRIED

**3. The following motions were passed at the June 19, 2003, 2003 Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. BRECHTEL/LO MOVED THAT all Students' Union operations with the exception of the building, be closed on June 30, 2003.  
VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED