

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

---

Tuesday October 21, 2003 – 6:00 pm  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

## A G E N D A (SC 2003-14)

- 2003-14/1                    CALL TO ORDER
- 2003-14/2                    University of Alberta CHEER SONG "*Ring Out a Cheer*"
- 2003-14/3                    SPEAKER'S BUSINESS
- 2003-14/3a                    Approval of the Minutes.
- 2003-14/4                    APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
- 2003-14/5                    PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION
- 2003-14/5a                    Presentation on Charity Cancer Project by David Wepler
- 2003-14/6                    QUESTION PERIOD
- 2003-14/7                    APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (MINUTES)  
  
Please see document SC 03-14.01
- 2003-14/8                    APPROVAL OF STUDENTS' UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEES  
REPORTS
- 2003-14/9                    OLD BUSINESS
- 2003-14/9a                    Motions up for Automatic repeal April 30, 2004 (submitted  
to Students' Council as per Bylaw 400)  
  
Please see document SC 03-14.02
- 2003-14/10                    LEGISLATION
- 2003-14/10a                    **BOTTEN MOVED THAT**, upon recommendation of the Internal Affairs  
Board, Students' Council repeal Article X of the Students' Union  
Constitution.  
  
Please see document SC 03-14.03
- 2003-14/11                    NEW BUSINESS

2003-14/11a

**BAZIN/SAMUEL MOVE THAT** the following changes be made to Standing Orders:

CURRENT

27. Length of Speeches

Members having obtained the floor while a debatable motion can speak no longer than four minutes unless they obtain the consent of the assembly.

PROPOSED

27. Length of Speeches

Members having obtained the floor while a debatable motion can speak no longer than ~~four~~ eight minutes unless they obtain the consent of the assembly.

2003-14/11b

**WALLACE/PANDYA MOVED THAT** Students' Council hold a referendum asking students if they are willing to pay an amount not to exceed \$60 dollars per semester to implement a universal bus pass. The following conditions will apply:

-Collection of this fee will not be implemented until such time as Edmonton Transit Service (E.T.S.) and the Students' Union are able to create a universal bus pass agreement.

-No opt out clause will be provided subject to availability of E.T.S. service.

-The Universal Bus pass shall be valid and unrestricted (all days of the week) for the months between September and April inclusive.

2003-14/11c

**WALLACE/PANDYA MOVED THAT**

**Whereas** the potential of the Bill 43 campaign has yet to be developed to the point of having any significant impact on the passage of legislation of critical importance to the Students' Union,

**And whereas** this is not a failure on the part of the Executive but of a system upon which the Executive must rely to formulate and implement its political advocacy efforts,

**And whereas** it is unacceptable for the Students' Union, whose primary function is to provide political representation for the undergraduate students' body to the University, provincial and federal governments and general public, to allocate less than one-eighth of the Students' Union membership fee towards political advocacy:

**Be it resolved that** no less than one-third of the monies collected from the Students' Union membership fees be directed exclusively towards political advocacy in the 2004/5 budget.

**Be it further resolved that:**

- 1.) The External Affairs Board (E.A.B.) prepare a report to define political advocacy, and to establish guidelines for the resources needed to effectively implement its political advocacy efforts.
- 2.) The Executive Committee provide recommendations, based on the report from E.A.B., outlining the structural staff and administration changes necessary to build up infrastructure for effective political advocacy.
- 3.) The Financial Affairs Board take the recommendations from the Executive Committee and determine the financial impact.
- 4.) The product of these actions should be the submission of a proposal to Council no later than November 18<sup>th</sup>, detailing the areas that are currently lacking in resources, and would stand to benefit from additional funding. This proposal should also detail areas that will be implemented, and an approximation of the resources needed for these new areas. Most notably, FAB should provide an approximate breakdown of resources, and an estimation of feasibility.

2003-14/12

**REPORTS**

2003-14/13

**INFORMATION ITEMS**

2003-14/14

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

2003-14/15  
2003-14/15a

**ROLL CALL**  
**Next Council Meeting**

UPCOMING  
COUNCIL  
MEETINGS

November 4, 2003  
November 18, 2003

2003-14/16

**ADJOURNMENT**

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

---

**October 7, 2003**  
**Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall**

**ATTENDANCE (SC 2003-13)**

<b>Faculty/Position</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Present/ Absent @ 9pm</b>	<b>Vote 1</b>
President	Mat Brechtel		X
VP Academic	Janet Lo		X
VP External	Chris Samuel		
VP Finance	Tyler Botten		X
VP Student Life	Jadene Mah		X
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Roman Kotovych		
University of Alberta Athletics Board Exec Officer	Tawana Wardlaw		X
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Paul Reikie		
Arts	Alex Abboud		
Arts	Chris Bolivar		Absent
Arts	Vivek Sharma		
Arts	Erin Kelly (Mimi Simon)		X

Arts	James Knull		
Arts	Chris Laver		X
Arts	Terra Melnyk		X
Arts	Heather Wallace		X
Arts	Paul Welke		
Business	Adam Cook		X
Business	Steve Smith		
Education			
Education	Allison Ekdahl		X
Education			
Education	Christine Wudarck		X
Education			
Engineering	Josh Bazin		
Engineering	Paige Smith (Cole Nychka)		
Engineering	James Crossman		
Engineering	David Wepler		X
Law	Dean Hutchison		Absent
Residence Halls Association	Kyla Rice		X
Medicine/Dentistry	Jesse Pewarchuk		X
Medicine/Dentistry	Tony Kwong (Eric Lai)		X
Native Studies (School of	Matthew Wildcat	X	X

Nursing	Jean Abbott		Abstain
Nursing			
Open Studies			
Open Studies			
Pharmacy	Erica Skopac		X
Physical Education	Holly Higgins		X
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth		X
Faculté Saint-Jean	Zita Dube		X
Science	Matthew Eaton		
Science	Tereza Elyas		X
Science	Aisha Khatib (Baber Khatib)		X
Science			
Science	Shawna Pandya		
Science	Elaine Poon		X
Science	Steven Schendel	X	Absent
Science	Duncan Taylor		X
Science	LeeAnn Lim (Stephan Duval)		X
President Athletics			
General Manager	Bill Smith	X	
Speaker	Gregory Harlow		
Recording Secretary	Shirley Ngo		

**Guests of Council:** Sara Katz, Wade Brown, Chelli Kelly, Adrienne de Montarnal, Kyle Kawanami, Nicholas Tam, Stephen Kirkham, Ari

**MINUTES (SC 2003-13)**

2003-13/01

**CALL TO ORDER**

Speaker calls meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2003-13/02

**UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA CHEER SONG “Ring Out a Cheer”**

LO leads Students’ Council in the singing of the cheer song.

2003-13/03

**SPEAKER’S BUSINESS**

**Speaker** - Congratulations to Vivek Sharma, James Crossman and Nicholas Tam. Mr. Crossman and Tam, which one of you will be holding the seat? Mr. Crossman will be. Any appointments to council tonight?

**TAYLOR/BOTTEN MOVED THAT** Matthew Eaton be named as the next science councilor for the remainder of the 2003-2004 Students’ Council year.

**Speaker** – Mr. Eaton, please leave the room so we can deliberate.

**Motion is carried with unanimous consent.**

**Speaker** – Mr. Eaton, welcome to Student Council. If there are no objections, let’s move directly to the presentations. Tonight we have Dr. Amrhein and Ms. Clark to give a presentation on the budget process.

2003-13-5a

**PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION**

**Dr. Amrhein** – A budget process that is built around a notion of a multi-framework. Shortly after I came into this job, I tried to imagine a scenario of what we got out of, which consumes a great deal of time. We took this very seriously and is in the process of testing out various ideas. GSA council voted last night to allow their president to enter such discussion. I gather you will not vote on it tonight, but we will stay as long as you want to answer questions.

Slide 1 – This is the continual curve. Takes us back to 1981 where the provincial government donated \$15000 per full time student. In 2002-2003, that number is shy of \$9000. In other words, per student, the government has threw dramatic cuts, or through the costs of inflation, has managed to withdraw \$6000 from the university per student.

Slide 2 – If we look at the ratio of government operating grants to tuition fee, the government provided 2.32 cents in operating grant. If we look at it another way, if we compare the proportion of the operating grant provided by the government in 1991, tuition starts at 13% and is currently at 26 %. If you add the numbers together, you get 90%. All the way back to 91 and 92, the sum of tuition was not sufficient to cover the operating budget. If you have more expenses than revenue, it is called debt.

About 4-5% of that is the budget deficit and that is an enduring problem for the university. Our goal is to pay off the deficit. Why do you want to continue to pay all this tuition? You get psychic income from all the learning, but it doesn't help you pay your bills. So that is the underlying position of the university.

**Ms. Clark** – In general, Dr. Amrhein has talked about tuition and government grant. On the other side of expenses are salaries and benefits. By benefits I mean total compensation. The benefits that we have to pay for in the future. That is by far our largest loss, it is 80% of our operating budget. Also, our energy expenses are huge. We do not have enough to cover this, leading to a 7.5% deficit that we have this year.

**Dr. Amrhein** – If you go to any of the GFC committees, you will have the opportunity to hear the long version. What we hope to convince you of, we are trying to do a 2 year arrangement. This year and next year, permitted under the current framework, we take the maximum tuition under the existing framework. For 7.6% percent for this year. So we are asking you to agreeing to a 2-year tuition deal. We hope to come to an agreement, that if there is additional funding - we wouldn't assume that it is coming. We will go to the provincial government to push the case. The government knows this, we have brought peace to the house on this. The students have agreed to put as much as their own funding into the pot as they can. We will make a very aggressive push to the government. There is ample evidence that the government is content to stand on the sidelines when a major institution can't agree what the framework is. The presidents will come to the ECT and will be a part of the process where we try to whittle down to what we can afford. So that your presidents will be at the table where the priorities will be set. So it is a comprehensive package, it is a 2-year package. There would be no secrets, no complete total transparency, will see the documents where I work from. So, that is the proposal that we hope that you give your president lead to negotiate with us, whenever you get to the vote. That is the pitch, we would like to answer any questions.

**SMITH** – That is nice to have to have students at EPC. But, my question is, is it contingent on a 2 year deal? So if we don't accept the 2-year deal, you won't be pushing the government for funding?



**Dr. Amrhein** – No. It is business as usual. It is the end result of the whiddling down process. If we don't have a framework agreement, it will be business as usual.

**SMITH** – So is it possible that we will have that on-campus fight and still pose that maximum tuition there? Is it necessary to support that to need that unified push?

**Dr. Amrhein** - Not necessary push, but if you want us to have the time, what we are proposal is a framework agreement that we have the time and ability to convince the board members that we do have the time to go to the provincial government. As long as we are debating on campus tuition, the point is to get agreement on campus as fast as possible for a 2-year period. So we can mount this. If this all fails, we will still do the best we can.

**WALLACE** – You alluded to the fact that this year there will be more money from the provincial government. If we go into that...if we go to a certain amount, we will still fight tuition costs? And it won't matter how large that amount is?

**Dr. Amrhein** – The agreement is, budget framework assumes 2%. Anything above that, we will agree before how much goes to investments in this and that, and the bottom line. That is what we are suggesting.

**REIKIE** – I really like that fact that you are coming here and looking for cooperation here. I think it is extremely wasteful to spend all this energy fighting when our hands are somewhat tied. I feel that it is clear that the issue is lack of funding from the provincial government, it is a drop in provincial government. I do feel, that it would undermine the argument that tuition being too high if students would go into an agreement with a maximum tuition agreement. It seems to me that we will say that “we can do it”, but we would like to “not do it”. I do think it is most important that we approach the province together.

**Dr. Amrhein** - Many will agree with you. But I suggest that we look back over time. We have not always taken the maximum tuition, but we have often done that. No matter what we have done, back to 91, the government has not only not provided additional support, they haven't even maintained their current support. We can do it again, we can not have the tuition dance and go into the legislature. So my view is, maybe we should try something different. Maybe if we go to the provincial government, if we put 2 years all the money that we can afford, agree on the campus...now government - what is your excuse for not putting any money back into the system? What is your excuse for breaking faith with the students? All I can do is look back 23 years, the curves look identical. Nothing has worked for the last 23 years. This is hope.

**Ms. Clark** – I think it is difficult to adhere to a principle where you are agreeing to a higher tuition. I think what we can agree on is the quality of education. The simple math is, if we don't get the government money that we are talking back, and the other source is to take cuts in institution. That hurts everybody. But more fundamentally, cuts in the institution means cutting quality. 20 years from now, if you look back and you are proud of getting a U of A degree.

**REIKIE** – I agree with those comments. It is also my concern that a number of students that aren't representative because they can't come to this university. You said that this will be opening a new page of the book, has it ever been such a large student population and come together with the administration and lobby collectively and strategize to put pressure on the government?

**Dr. Amrhein**- Not in my experience. If you look at the total cost of education for a year, room and board is much greater than tuition. We do the profile of students and we don't see it over time. The university is very effective in redistributing wealth. If someone is so discouraged that they don't even apply, then we have no way of tracking that info. The U of A will not be short of students. In fact, we are turning away more highly qualified students. So the double jeopardy that we are fighting is that the very low grant per student and the insufficient places.

**SAMUEL** – Under this proposed framework, are you referring to automatic tuition rollbacks on conditional base funding?

**Dr. Amrhein** – Haven't sorted into the details. For us to be able to rollback, the money will have to be in place and recurring. A grant doesn't help us rollback tuition if it is recurring. So this is core base recurring operating funding. I think that at some point, the executives will line up behind the president.

**SAMUEL** – For the past x number of years, the administration of the university has been asking the province for more money, so I'm not under the new framework what the new framework will look like? So will it be the administrators joining us on the steps in chicken suits? What is the practical real change we will see in terms of efforts?

**Dr. Amrhein** – I don't have specifics. It might be a full-page ad in the Journal signed by the 3 presidents, or maybe 5 presidents, all saying the same thing. The government doesn't like public shows of aggression. We have a sense that the government is interested in post secondary matter. We haven't tried having 3 presidents walk into the same room and say the same thing. I'm sure that the media will be interested in it. If one president is saying one thing and another president is saying another thing, the government can ignore us.

**DUBE** – Thank you for coming to speak to us. My comment is that I understand that the administration has responsibility to make this place run efficiently. The SU has a responsibility too, and students want us to advocate tuition.

**Dr. Amrhein** – 30% cap is no. It is not our issue. We don't plan to go into that zone. We have a list of things that we are concerned about. We are absolutely lobbying on Bill 43. We aren't going to take something important to make room for an item that isn't a U of A item. Other people see the 30% cap as their issue, we aren't saying that it isn't important, but it is not our priority. On your first comment, I say that students often focus on tuition, but do they think about the value of their education. The quality of that degree is threatened. I think that it is important for the students to not worry endlessly about how much they pay, but also the value of what you pay in your degree. So I'm not worried that you have little to worry about, but the trend lines are all against me to say that 5 years from now.

**DUBE** – I am wondering where the quality of our students come in. I want my children to be able to attend university as well. It seems like you are more concern about the quality of the University to take the best students.

**Dr. Amrhein** – The quality of students that we taking are among the best in Canada. We know that, we have the comparative test results. I don't know how you can conclude on the success on the students.

**ABBOUD** – You said that one of the reasons students should indorse this is because of 5 interest groups that don't have the same goals in mind. I would say that is not true, the fact that each group has a different priority, seeing how we are going to be under this proposal if we decide how the money is going to be allocated. Something else, it doesn't seem that we are changing the tactics we are using for the last 23 years. One of the advantages you said is that you will be freeing up the time of board members to participate in this campaign, but have they agreed to do this? Another thing, one thing that works is public pressure. So, has there been any thought that instead the number of backroom negotiating with the government, to take this to public so that people will recognize that post secondary is important and valuable?

**Dr. Amrhein** – I didn't say that they were 5 different voices. I said that there were 5 fragmented voices. We have had many voices in many years and each voice is arguing what is the best and brightest future for the university, but this hasn't worked. I have an idea, based on conversations with student groups that there can be a single voice. It is our time to lobby, board members many of them have time to lobby, some have no spare time. The point with board members is that they are very influential. It is not backroom negotiating. This is through the front door. We can get these influential people to help us. Yes, I have asked them and their view is that a fragmented view is not worth their time. They challenged us to come up with a single voice. If we fail in a single voice, my effort is not wasted. We'll see. The proposal is –the single voice.

**HUTCHISON** – You talk about the single voice, you mentioned that 2 issues of the university are not the students. So how do you see as coming together as 1 single voice?

**Dr. Amrhein** – My belief is that we all have the same priorities. Different ways to attain that goal and that goal is to provide the best education, under the framework, accessible to students, based on their academic merit. My only flawed strategy trying to get the single voice is to try to convince you to allow your president to give it a shot. As evidence it is the worse kind of case. I have no evidence that it will work. The budget tells us we need to go to the maximum tuition, with or without blah. Giving we are going to do that, otherwise the university's budget sinks. Or we take massive cuts, and I can't get the professors that will give you the key ingredients and what this university is known for.

**EATON** – If we this agreement, we take max tuition, under the current system if Bill 43 passes. After that, is there any assuming that the tuition cap is increased, do you think you will be more receptive to keeping those increases as small as possible?

**Dr. Amrhein** – Our goal, both of us is to keep tuition as low as we can. We have put a proposal on the table for 2 years, if you give me your President's lead, there might be a counter proposal. If there is an absent in agreement, we can only talk this year or next year. Can't really talk about the future. But, yes, we are open to this conversation.

**KELLY** – You mentioned that if we don't do this, we won't have enough staff to provide us with our degrees. The problem is that we don't have parents that are voicing their opinions. There are many students that come from all over, different countries that don't have a voice and can't vote, so that takes a large chunk of your argument that we aren't doing as much as could.

**Dr. Amrhein** - I agree. In my years, I had huge US dollar student loans. Fewer than 20% students on this campus is not from Alberta. It is an important group, but my message is to the 80%.

**BRECHTEL** – Thank you for coming. Also thank you for being open to explore a new process. What I want to say is, we are having one again this Thursday at 8am and as the committee is struck, you are all invited to come. That is the issue we will be talking about. We need to figure out how to get into that point. The details on what the SU feels is going to worked out there. Debate will continue over the next 2 weeks.

**Dr. Amrhein** - No mater what you decide, we will still be working with your President. I think this proposal represents the best shot that we have. If you want us to come back, we will come back.

**SMITH** – Does anyone have anymore questions?

**Speaker** – People that are in favor of continuing discussion. Raise your hands. We will continue discussion then.

**PEWARCHUK** – I think it is great that it seems like people are figuring out that the old approach is not working. Basically, I know that a lot of my classmates, we had a differential debate. We believe in quality before everything else. My only concern is, over the period of the next 2 years, looking at a 7% increase, will you be also increasing opportunities for scholarships?

**Dr. Amrhein** - We are getting ready to mount another campaign, a long list of opportunities to fund student scholarships and bursaries. Administration is finding everyway to increase this. Yes, that is completely consistent with our comprehensive.

**SMITH** – I think you made the case well that we need a single voice that the presidents to say the same things to the government. We already have a consistent message, why is it that is not a single sufficient message -like taking a full page ad in the Journal, what isn't that enough?

**Dr. Amrhein** – We can take the ad. I will even pay for the ad. The issue is, what is the impact of an ad, when the message is not consistent? The government knows this, they read the student newspapers. They are so infused in the life of this campus that I can't even issue a memo that doesn't end up at the legislature within 24 hours. Where management is saying "max", where students are saying, "zero". And then we have just wasted the Ad. If we are debating tuition, then until that is finished, I don't see that we have the winning conditions necessary to convince the government that we have a unified voice with a single mission.

**REIKIE** – I don't feel we just have 1 shot at this.

**Ms. Clark** – Our fiscal year ends at the end of March. I think the question is, in terms of looking forward, planning for the 04-05 year. In terms of going to the government, we recognize there is, we are willing to put our money there, we are asking that you put your money with our money, it makes it more powerful. So is there rush to do this, we are really starting on the train. We make the budget decision in March.

**SAMUEL** – What steps are you going to use to ensure our voice is heard on government year. I think that we can do a good job of fighting the tuition fight on campus. However, I don't think that it is necessary that I think the important part is that our message is heard to the people of Alberta. So, why can't we do all these things and still have the on campus tuition fight when our target audience isn't necessary the government, but the people of Alberta.

**Dr. Amrhein** – You may be right. I think it is an inferior strategy, based on 17 years of watching the government stand on the sidelines. In terms of election time, it is a good time to do this. If we don't do it this vote, we will do it some way. We will do it the best way. I may be wrong.

**KELLY** – Is our students' petition for lower tuitions and demonstrations and is your pull for tuition really that fragmented of a voice? Doesn't it show that we are desperate for funds, isn't that a very clear singular voice that we want funds?

**Dr. Amrhein** – Yes, so let's sing it as a single choir and go where things happen and that is over at the legislature.

**KELLY** – Why is that we are the ones that have to give?

**Dr. Amrhein** – We have 2 sources, the government and tuition. We are in charge of tuition, we have a budget framework, a deficit target, and the only source of revenue is tuition. That is the point. Yes, we do it everywhere when we go to the government, but look at our success record.

**KOTOVYCH** – If this does not get approved by Student Council, is the administrative still open to having student representation to EPC

**Dr. Amrhein** – The negotiating answer right now is, “no”.

**COOK** – I was at the dinner the other night and saw effort by President Fraser, putting forth a case where these people are in fact fighting for our interests. The only thing that I want to ensure happens - if we agree with you on multi year tuition, that you guys will still be open to have a representative on EPC, to make sure that what the university spends money on, is what students want. The biggest concern is that we are going to lose the fight that the university will spend money on what students want.

**Ms. Clark** – Frankly, there are lot of things that we wouldn't spend money on. For example, pension funds have soared, but we have to put the money in and we don't have a choice. I'm with you, I think that enhancing what students get from this place, we all want that, but sometimes we have zero choice about cleaning up chemical spills and clean ups. Sitting up at the EPC table doesn't mean that you get to make a decision as to where the money goes. It is not always fun.

**Dr. Amrhein** – We haven't ruled anything out. We have a proposal. However, I will pursue maximum tuition, this cycle and next cycle, I'm not hiding that.

**Speaker** – Many thanks on coming this evening. We have gone into our first 90-minutes, so we will take a break now and take a 10-minute recess.

**Speaker** – Okay, just finishing the last few things in Speaker's Business. We have a bunch of new councilors here. Pick up a blue binder, please come up and get one of these. Please fill out the list for your contact information. Also, if you are not on the email list, and need one, grab this and fill it out. 2, for the new councilors, unfortunate that almost 50% of your term is over, as speaker one of my jobs is to be here for your resource, I have an office in the SU building, my office is on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor, so if you need some help crafting a motion, or putting an item on the agenda, please feel free to come up. Quick note on vacancies, there are still 3 vacant positions in Education and on Open Studies, 1 seat in Nursing and 1 seat in Science, but Mr. Baber Khatib was going to be appointed tonight, but for some reason that is not happening tonight.

2003-13/3a

**BOTTEN/HUTCHISON MOVED TO approve the minutes.**

**TAYLOR** – Page 17, my comment at the bottom of the page should say, “...when science councilors were voted in, there were just 234 votes....if you were to take a solution (council) and remove some of the solvent (executive committee), but keep the solute, (power). So now it is the same amount of legislative power, but concentration is much greater. Also puts too much power to the executive committee, by removing the approval of executive reports. I think there are much better ways of doing this.

**BRECHTEL** - Page 5, strike the extra comment from the Speaker, “Speaker – Tonight, please write down all your amendments....”

**HUTCHISON** – Page 14, my comment should say, “As someone that lived in Lister”, not “lives”.

**BOTTEN** – Page 8 - change whole paragraph to: “In 2001/2002, \$127,146 was collected in APIRG fees, but no funds were disbursed to the group that year. Last year, \$54,050 was released according to the startup budget submitted to Students' Council. This is the budget proposal for the remaining \$73,096 including the investment plans for the money. \$20,000 of this will not be available to the Board for operating matters; the remainder will need to be approved by Students' Council in future years should the Board wish to use it in a given year.”

11e - (page 12) amendments to sentences: “A portion of this money will be put away” - add - " so that the Forest Society can finance this project themselves at the end of the 10 year period."

the last 3 sentences, change to: "This money resides in our chequing account, and taking \$20,000 out of the bank means that we will need to pay interest on our overdraft until we receive our fees from the University, after which time the \$20,000 hole in our account is not a big deal. I've discussed the matter of the interest with the Forest Society and they've agreed to cover it for us."

2nd comment should read:

"The loan is to be repaid in full by January. Aside from tree purchases or operating needs, I am not sure what the money is used for."

**Carried.**

**SMITH/WALLACE MOVED THAT** Students' Council move in camera.

**Carried.**



2003-13/3b

**TAYLOR/BAZIN MOVED TO** approve the in camera minutes  
**Carried.**

**SAMUEL/WALLACE MOVED THAT** Students' Council move ex camera.

**Carried.**

2003-13/4

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**SMITH/BAZIN MOVED TO** approve the agenda

**SMITH/BOTTEN MOVED TO** add the late additions package to the agenda.

**SMITH** - ACPC need to start work as soon as possible. Committee at large needs to get started. This needs to be done 2 meetings from now.

**Amendment of the agenda is carried.**

**Main motion is carried.**

**Speaker** – I have one change, to make item 10a, a special order. It is gunning up our legislative process so it needs to be dealt with.

**SMITH** - So item 10 subsection 10a has been passed?

**Speaker** - What we are debating are b, c and d. We are picking up from last meeting. So, alternating back and forth again, we will start with someone in favor of the motion.

**WELKE/KOTOVYCH MOVE THAT** Students' Council move in camera.

**WELKE** – Basically, I'm hoping to have a discussion on having executive accountability.

**Defeated.**

**ABBOUD** – I'll be voting in favor of this motion. I was one of the first people to speak in favor of this before it got to council. We are debating the motion on the table. Basically, it comes down to this. As councilors, what is the best way to accomplish these things? Or is it not necessary separating, the terms separation of powers. It seems like overly possible, according to our constitution, it alludes to a certain separation of powers. What it comes down to is, there are no clear guidelines, as Smith has said. Councilors seem unfit to act in ad hoc situation. For students to know what their rep should be doing, for potential candidates to know what they will be doing, for that I am voting yes. There are a lot of things that need to be worked out from this proposal. This is important enough that we should go ahead and explore. I encourage council to do the same.

**PANDYA** – Part of the reason I moved the amendment to help people that were sitting on the side. So I motion to add 10c as an amendment.

**PANDYA/SMITH MOVED TO** add 10c as an amendment.

**BRECHTEL** – I don't know, but is it sufficiently principle to include this on a second reading?

**Speaker** – Yes.

**PANDYA** – This is the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting spent on this. So basically, this amendment will help make up your mind on this. If this resolution does pass, we are not left in a mess, we have a system in place that we will currently striving to improve the system. I propose that each branch to come together at different intervals, at the end of each year, this will go on for 3 years, they will forward their suggestions to council. That way we will have a system in place that we striving to improve the structure of our government.

**BOTTEN** – I don't know the book on rules is on this, but I think this issue needs to be discussed separately. This is part of the logistics. Should item 10a be carried? I think for the time being, it clouds the water of discussions at heart. While I respect the idea behind it, I think council should vote against the amendment. If 10a is carried, I would like to see this come back at that time.

**The amendment to add 10c is defeated.**

**Speaker** – Now back to the main motion.

**BRECHTEL** – I tried to track why this is happening. As I talked more with people who are in favor of it, my discussion with the solution agreed to me that the base assumption that he believes that council should spend more time debating more time focusing on bylaw, but not on detailed issues. In every way, it has fall out of that. I think that governmental systems are meant to deal with. If you had a group of 5 people, you wouldn't make bylaws to get them done. When you get to the government candidate level, you need rules. So now we find ourselves between the 2. In strict separation of powers, it is more towards the larger governmental systems. Now I believe that council needs to work through bylaws. However, they have the capability to deal with issues that are sufficiently macro that end up on the executive committee report. The students do care about the details and the constituents do want you to debate these things. I think we do have the time to do it. I think it is something that we should be doing it. So that is where the debate lies for me - whether or not we have the capability to do it and I think we do have the capability to do it. I do think our constituents care and we have the time for it.

**HUTCHISON** – Do the executives still have the right to sit among student council.

**SHARMA** – Couple questions.

**Speaker** – I rule that out of order.

**WELKE** – I am challenging the chair on that.

**Speaker** – This is a judgment call. We have had 8 speakers on this item. 5 from last meeting and 4 from today. There are 8 new councilors that don't know about this, given the time and effort on this, I don't think we have sufficiently debated this. That being said, if you vote for the chair, you allow debate

**Will of the chair is upheld.**

**BAZIN** – I'm in favor of this motion. We talk about this a lot in IRB. I believe that it is better than what we have. The executives will still sit on council, but they won't have a vote. They will talk to councilors.

**WELKE** – So the executives will be able to ask questions.

**BAZIN** – Yes.

**BRECHTEL** – Is any of this fact?

**BAZIN** – This is the way I envision it. It could change. It is a complex issue. At the beginning, I wasn't sure where I stood on it. As time went by, I really feel that when we start mucking around with the executive committee reports, we make wrong decisions as to what to strike. I think that we need to set out what is an executive character in law. That way we will be able to act appropriately every year and not just year by year.

**DUBE** – I've called other universities, other university executives and researched this issue as best as I can. I do not know if what we are proposing is better than the status quo. I don't know if why we can't solve each issue one at a time, I don't think we need to completely need to scrap the system we have now without knowing if the new system will be efficient. It comes down to where we want to be 3-4 years from now and I don't know if this is. As for the executive reports, on the lack of information problem, before a decision is made, the info has to be there, so I don't see that problem being solved with separation of powers. 2<sup>nd</sup> point, difference of point. Instead of looking and focusing on the technicalities, we need to look at what our vision as a students union. I think we can define the roles of the executives without having to cut them out of the picture.

**ABBOUD** – How are we cutting them entirely out of the picture?

**DUBE** – Right now the students have a vision of what they believe the executives do. Without the input of our students on how they feel how the executives will do their job, I believe if we cut out executive votes, it can be construed that we are cutting out the executives.

**KOTOVYCH** – Been on both sides of this debate. Our legislative process has changed with this new 3 reading system put in place. The reason first reading was to give councilors time to find out stuff over the 2 weeks. There are a lot of questions as to what this will entail. This will go to IRB and come back to us. Second thing is that I see a leadership rule from the executives. In the system that we have now, it is not really a separation of power, legislative branch debates this. What we will still be able to do as councilors, if we direct the execs to do something, we can still attach conditions. Council can still decide how much information they need to have. Essentially, the problem with our current system, executives should deal with everything and council should know about it. So, I thought about this a lot. I will be voting in favor because I want to see what IRB will come up with.

**BOTTEN** – Up until now, I haven't been convinced that the quote from Councilor Smith, "If, however, we move to a separated system... we can gain so much more". We are talking about political ideologies. I don't mean to demean it or compare it to other things. This government is here for students. I don't think we should take this away. We are not debating specifics here and sure, let's send this to IRB. My concern sending this to IRB, what came back was this, and I want to point that out. But, I would argue that there are many problems with our government that I can't disagree with, but this not the solution. We haven't done that outside of this. Item 10a point c – "that Students' Council have no ability to affect the implementation of Students' Union legislation excepting those portions of Students' Union legislation dealing specifically with Students' Council, its officers, or its subcommittees" sounds like, the students on this faculty vote and will sit there and not be making decisions effectively. These changes sound terrific, sounds like change for the sake of change and should not be what this body should be doing.

**WALLACE** – I would like to give the inexperienced side of this. I had no idea, didn't really understand what my role was and it took 5 months of training and I would stand as someone that has benefited by having the executives here. I would like to talk about communication. My big thing is that, communication may or may not break down, you will have an executive committee that will do what they want to do and councilors will want to maintain that. I don't think we can ignore the past but we have proven this year that we are a really strong body if we can work together. They should not be separate entity, like they are the enemy and we are the ones to keep them in check. We need to be able to have some input. Do I think that separation of powers will emulate the system that we have? No. We can do all these things well within the means that we have now. As a rookie councilor, I can't tell you how many times I went and talked to students and they can't comprehend this. More experienced councilors that bring something this so out of the majority of the councilors that sit here. I want to be able to communicate to my constituents. I can't imagine what kind of process would happen in dealing with the budget. If we are solely responsible for a 90 million budget, I don't know if we can do that without the executives. I think the system that we have now really works to enhance student input. Therefore I will vote against this.

**WELKE** – The delineation of responsibility is not served to create an "us" and "them" environment. We are still on the same team. We will just have different responsibilities.

**WALLACE** – The reason why this is so hard for me to understand is because this is all in theory. I don't think we should waste IRB's time to go to a 3<sup>rd</sup> reading.

**WELKE** – I think this will have the exact opposite effect where communication will be more necessary. They will need to communicate back and forth to ensure that are working for students.

**CROSSMAN** – Assuming this does go through and the situation where council is separated from the executives – the concerns about communication and cooperation –if you noticed that if we started off and this is what we are going to be. If we start off thinking that the executives and councils are going to be enemies, that is how it is going to be. This idea that separation of powers will lead to a lack of communication is something that I take issue with, because we ultimately decide how the communication will be.

**BOTTEN** – When you say “we” ultimately decide, do you mean this council, next council?

**CROSSMAN** – I mean this council. Whoever happens to be the councilors and executives will set it to tone whenever this is implemented. I think that when that initial tone is set that we believe in communication and cooperation, that is what will be set.

**HUTCHISON/TAYLOR MOVED** the previous question.

**Defeated.**

**PANDYA** – It has been mentioned that we are changing for the sake of change but I don't think that is the case. This is the change for the sake of efficiencies. I think that somewhere along the way, the separation of powers got blown out of proportion - simply of the term, “separation”. Maybe a better term will be “categorization of tasks”. We are clearly not going to be breaking up communication. As councilors we have the power to find what we need to see. The executives are still going to be around. Passing separation of powers does not mean that you are not going to be talking to the executives. It just means that your tasks are clearly defined. I guess my main question is why this categorization of tasks is equivalent to a breakdown of communication. How on earth do we move beyond the theoretical and how are we going to implement change if we keep saying that it is too theoretical? This isn't advocating separation of communication, only advocating a categorization of tasks.

**EKDAHL/REIKIE MOVED THE** previous question

**Defeated.**

**SAMUEL** – This issue has been muddled up with so many other issues. It has been confused with the new legislation changes. It is a perfectly valid motion. There have been complaints and concerns the way the debate has proceeded. I would argue that anytime a major change you will spend a lot of time on it. Somewhere in this whole issue, the issue has gotten muddled. What we always had are our students. Some people are concerned that student council will be cut out of the executive decision, but will never be cut out of the process. We need student support, student input. Your role that changes is your role that will affect this suggestion. Notion of a power struggle, I think it is far easier to engage to fight over the same blah. If it is on the same issue, yes there will be fighting. I think that when you put the executive decisions in the hands of the executives, you raise the profile of this body and the importance of it. It will also allow the executives function, does not mean they will shut out students.

**SMITH** – This idea has potential. Excellent questions have been brought out. Wallace asked how we will deal with the budget. We as a volunteer body meet every 2 weeks. What if the budget approved by council was more general and value based? That is what we can do under the separation of powers. The details will be worked out by the VP of Operations/Finance. Council can decide the amount of money that goes to for example, Orientation and can debate over that. Right now we deal with a lack of information on the executive report by asking them questions. That will not change. I want to address the point of the president that you have to include the council to have a slurpy machine. Council gave it feedback, the executives can get feedback when they like. Council did not make the decision. How do we make progress if we aren't willing to experiment it? Ultimately, unless we are willing to experimenting, you can only hypothesize. So let's vote in favor of this.

**BRECHTEL** – It is not something I want to experiment with, without figuring out the implications. My first comment was to say that the basis of this is that we should deal with bylaws instead of dealing with instances. I think if we are going to try to fix something, we should identify a problem, we should find a solution that problem. If we see council inviting themselves too much in executive reports, then we should solve that problem. Executives will still show up here because we care about our jobs, we'll still be here, we won't be voting, executives will still have the expertise on things. It is decided year to year what council wants, so it is very subjective. What I said earlier, given the information, councilors can have the information to make the decision. I come here, give my report, move motions, sit on committees - that is my functional job here.

**HUTCHISON** – It is 9 pm, please take the attendance.

**The Recording Secretary conducts roll call at 9:00 pm**

**ABBOUD** – I feel that the President’s arguments are appropriate for a third reading. Item c has been somewhat contentious, if you taking contention with 1 of the 3 points, would it be better to strike the points, instead of defeating the whole motion? We talked a lot of talking about the theoretical. Nothing proposed in theory has been adopted in its pure form. That is why you have the theoretical versus the practical. Yes, there are other ways, if you define one branch of government, it makes sense to me to outline the other 2 branches of government. If we are going to do one of them, we should do all of them. Last point, the executive versus council agenda - if our executives don’t get the day to day, face to face interaction with students, the executives can still have sounding boards to deal with students. They should leave it to council who are full time students and can talk to students. The voting thing isn’t contentious. We should strive for a one-member one-vote system.

**COOK** – When I was elected to student council. I was elected to represent business concerns. I was not elected just to make bylaws. I don’t think students are best served when they want their councilor to do something with the Students’ Union, I need to make a bylaw to implement a change. There are a lot of issues that are undefined. Things come up every year that we can’t foresee, so why can’t we leave it? Because it will ultimately reduce the efficiency. To get anything passed it takes a great deal of time and effort to do it. In terms of the vote on council, I vote that executives should have a vote. I think when students elected the VP of Op/Fin they wanted them to have a say. In terms of theory and experimenting, yes, it is experimenting. I am opposed to the principle of the motion. I don’t like taking executives off council.

**KNULL/LAVER MOVED** the previous question

**Motion is carried.**

**Main motion is defeated (14/25/1)**

2003-13/6

**QUESTION PERIOD**

**WALLACE** – This question is for the President. I would like to know where Bill 43 is. I would like to know where the banners are in cab, if there is a classroom speaking list, where the schedule is and where we stand on our Bill 43 campaign.



**BRECHTEL** –The tables have been set, what we are lacking are volunteers. We still have a lack of volunteers, banners are not up, but we have received them. The classroom speaking list, as far as I know, it does not exist. It is difficult how much my time will be spent classroom speaking as each of us have a number of things to do. About the volunteers at Lister – we sent out an email, and received negative response to it.

**BAZIN** – Question for the VP Operation and Finance. Wondering about the bottom line, breaking even, stuff like that.

**BOTTEN** – We do not have profit loss statements, I'll have them by the 15<sup>th</sup>, by next council meeting if not earlier.

**TAYLOR** – Question for the BoG, how did the BoG meeting go?

**KOTOVYCH** – The Wellness report was approved at the meeting. I spoke against the smoking ban. I'll use Augustana as an example. When I was first asked about Augustana at the first council meeting on how I would vote on that today and I said at that time given the information I had. And after speaking with councilors and attending 5 more meetings, all my issues were addressed and I was in favor of voting in favor of the issue. About the smoking ban, I was opposed to it, I wanted to amend the report, but I was unable to amend the report. The approval of the document was the approval of the smoking ban. At the board meeting where you have the opportunity to talk to the administrative, Mat and I spoke against the smoking ban and we asked if “is the approval of the wellness report an approval of the smoking ban?”. The answer we got was “no”. We were told that everything in the wellness report may not be implemented and it will be reporting back to the board back in January and will looking at mitigating a smoking ban. So it came down to, are you in favor of the wellness report as a whole taking account that a vote for the report is not a vote for the smoking ban and given that, we were able to essentially get that guarantee. Basically I felt approving the rest of the document.

**ABBOUD** – Question for the VP Student Life. About the handbooks, when advertising wasn't going well. SU mitigated their financial losses. At SU info booths, volunteers were told that not to hand out books to engineering students.

**MAH** – Engineering students could obtain a handbook from the Engineering Student Society, which would be best suited for the students and the information in that book would be better to the engineering student than the generic student union handbook. As similar with the ESS handbook, the SU produced a limited number of handbooks, we couldn't afford to print a book for every book for students on campus. If an engineering student did not receive a handbook, it is simply because we ran out of handbooks. Councilor Ekdahl helped run the booths and Janet Lo was running the other tent distributing handbooks. Hopefully we will have the opportunity to work with the Engineering Students' Society in the future.

**NYCHKA**- So you are saying you “prefer” not to give the handbook, students might take that as not giving them one.

**MAH** – Engineering students were given a SU handbook if they wanted one. We felt that the information in the Engineering Students' Society handbook contained information that would be more relevant for them instead of our generic handbook. I don't know how in terms of the Q/A format, but I would invite a discussion on this at a later date.

2003-13/7

**APPROVAL OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

**PANDYA** – Can you give us a bit of background of item 1a?

**BRECHTEL** – The NODA conference is both the North American and International conference in which we send our orientation leader every year. They learn about experiences from other places. There is no other profile orientation, so it is a good place to send her (Norma), who runs our orientation program.

2003-13/8

**APPROVAL OF STUDENTS' UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEE REPORT**

2003-13/8a

**BOTTEN** – An administrative detail was left out.

**BOTTEN/SAMUEL MOVED THAT** the Financial Affairs Board report be approved.

**Motion is carried with unanimous consent.**

2003-13/8b

**BRETCHEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement Board Selection Committee Report be approved.

**BRECHTEL** – One of the better DIE boards in history. We have some people that are familiar with the Students' Union and some that aren't. This is the most qualified DIE board I've seen.

**Carried with unanimous consent.**

**2003-13/8c**

**MAH/TAYLOR MOVED THAT** the Student Life Board report be approved.

**LO** – There are also reports from AAB. With regards with GFC, it is not a voting body, just an information body. This is just for information

**Carried.**

**2003-13/9**

**OLD BUSINESS**

**2003-13/9a**

**Speaker** – Certain types of motions that don't find their ways into bylaws are automatically repealed after they have been approved. Basically these motions are automatically repealed unless council moves to remove them.

**ABBOUD/BAZIN MOVED THAT** reaffirm august 1<sup>st</sup> 2000,

**SMITH/MAH MOVED TO** postpone this whole item to the next Student Council meeting.

**KOTOVYCH** – Wondering what the rationale to postpone is?

**SMITH** – The trial had not gone underway. The suit has been filed. There are some people that do have opinions on this.

**The motion to postpone is carried.**

**2003-13/10**

**LEGISLATION**

**2003-13/10b**

**BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve amendments to Students' Union legislation based on the following principle (Second Reading):

(a) that general meetings be abolished.

**BRECHTEL** – I introduced this last time. Hopefully you had time to think about this. For those of you that follow the general executive forums, the rationale of IRB is that it really isn't appropriate to have a general meeting. So we didn't think it was necessary.

**Carried.**

2003-13/10c

**PANDYA MOVES THAT** there be:

- a) A probationary three-year review process that critique and make suggestions for improvement of the new system
- b) That the committee(s) assigned to this task update Council frequently at to-be determined intervals on the progress, pitfalls and pros of the new system
- c) That the committee(s) include an annual detailed review that be submitted to Council, which must then vote on renewing the system at that time.

**Speaker** – Council Pandya, can I assume this motion is withdrawn? It has no seconder at this point.

**PANDYA** – Yes, withdraw it.

2003-13/11

**NEW BUSINESS**

2003-13/11a

**BOTTEN/SAMUEL MOVED THAT** Students' Council approve a budgeted expenditure of not to exceed \$1,280 for the Vice President (Operations & Finance) to attend the Campus Advantage Mid-Year meeting from November 24<sup>th</sup> to November 27<sup>th</sup> in Windsor, Ontario.

**BOTTEN** – Every year the Campus Advantage Group holds 2 meetings. One is the general meeting, the length of the trip include in here, there is travel. I'm planning to take a train. It will be \$55, cheaper than spending the night. The flight round trip is \$300 dollars. If council allows it, I would like the flight out on the Oct 17, train hopping on my own time and that is also designed that I will not be flying on the weekends.

**Carried. (Botten abstained)**

2003-13/11b

**MAH/LO MOVED THAT** Students' Council ratify Rae-Anne Hilsenteger and Jennifer Willson as Athletics Campus Promotions Coordinator (2).

**MAH** - We finally hired 2 coordinators. So we no longer need Councilor Petterson and I to fulfill this duty. They are going to be a great help and has already been. It will be great if we can ratify them.

**Carried with unanimous consent.**

2003-13/11c

**BOTTEN/BAZIN MOVED THAT** Students' Council strike an ad hoc committee comprised of the Vice President (Academic), the Vice President (Operations & Finance) and the Community Relations Coordinator, for the purpose of selecting Student At Large members for the Awards Selection Committee, Eugene Brody Funding Committee and Financial Affairs Board, with the selected candidates to be presented for ratification by Students' Council no later than November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003.

**BOTTEN** – Best interest of everybody to have 3 people that are in the SU offices all the time. Within 2 meetings, we will have selection and a list for ratification if this goes through.

**Carried with unanimous consent**

2003-13/12

**REPORTS**

**COOK** – Oktoberfest will be held on October 10th in main quad. German sausages, German beer...etc.

**DUBE** – I invite you all from 11-1pm to the Fac.

**JONES** - Please to announce that we are inviting other faculties to participate in engineering week. We are prepared the option of putting together a team to compete and try to win an engineering award.

**TAYLOR** – Last week of October is science week. Come have fun and drink.

**BRECHTEL** – We are still working on the Bill 43 campaign. You can be legislators, you can also be volunteers. Email Chris or I, the more volunteers we have, the easier it will be to have people at tables.

**LO** – Still looking for volunteers to test Bear Tracks on Oct 20-21<sup>st</sup>. If you are interested, please let me know.

**SAMUEL** – We have pamphlets on Bill 43 if anyone is interested in finding out more information. We have MLA events, at 11 am. It says 11 pm in my report, ignore that.

**BOTTEN** – I still have half my prize, if you want the 2 tickets to Swollen, please let me know.

2003-13/16

**ADJOURNMENT**

**KOTOVYCH/WALLACE MOVED TO** adjourn at 10:00 pm.

**Carried.**

**Executive Committee Report to Students' Council October 21, 2003**

**1. The following motions were passed at the September 25, 2003, Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. BOTTEN/SAMUEL MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve the proposed changes to Operating Policy 7.17 (Conferences)

VOTE ON MOTION 5/0/0 CARRIED

- b. MAH/BOTTEN MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve the tabled letter to Chris Jones.

VOTE ON MOTION 5/0/0 CARRIED

**2. The following motion were passed at the September 29, 2003 Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. BOTTEN/BRECHTEL MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approves the proposed changes to Operating Policy 7.17 relating to Conferences.

VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED

**3. The following motion were passed at the October 15, 2003 Executive Committee Meeting**

- a. BOTTEN/SAMUEL MOVED THAT the Executive Committee approve the proposed agreement between the Students' Union, the University of Alberta and the UofA Dance Club regarding the use of Dinwoodie Lounge

VOTE ON MOTION 4/0/0 CARRIED

## **Motions subject to automatic repeal April 30, 2004**

May 3, 2000:

CHURCH/HARLOW MOVED THAT the next meeting of Students' Council be held at 6:00 pm, Tuesday, May 23, 2000 and that meetings of the Students' Council be held every second Tuesday according to the Meeting schedule for 2000/2001 school year.

July 18, 2000:

AGARD/CHURCH MOVED THAT Students' Council support the CASA Federal Election Strategy and National Action Plan 200/2001 as passed by Extraordinary Resolution at the CASA Annual General Meeting June 10, 2000 in Fredricton, New Brunswick.

August 1, 2000:

CHURCH/AGARD MOVED THAT Students' Council reaffirm support for the Travel Cuts lawsuit.

February 6, 2001

ZWACK/VEALE MOVED THAT Students' Council upon recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the following as a referendum question for the 2001 SU General Elections:

“Do you support the establishment of an Alberta Public Interest Research Group (APIRG) that will:

1. Allow students to work on public policy issues through student-directed education, research, and action initiatives;
2. Operate a fund of approximately \$125,000.00 per year, subject to the following conditions:
  - a) an increase in Students' Union Fees (Article VIII s.3 of the Constitution) of \$2.50 per Full-Time Student and \$1.25 per Part-Time Student for each of the Fall and Winter Terms.
  - b) Students who do not support APIRG shall be able to opt out and obtain a full refund of the dedicated fee.

*The result of this referendum question shall be binding on the Students' Union as per Article V s.2 of the Students' Union Constitution.”*

HARLOW/CHURCH MOVED THAT Students' Council hold an additional abbreviated Student's Council meeting on February 13, 2001.

April 10, 2001:

HARLOW/CHURCH MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the external Affairs Board, ratify Liam Arbuckle as the National Director of the Canadian Alliance of Student Association [sic] for the 2001/2002 academic year.



# Constitution

## ARTICLE X - GENERAL MEETING OF THE STUDENTS' UNION

1. A General Meeting of the Students' Union will be held each year prior to the Students' Union elections for the purpose of presenting the candidates for office.
2.
  - a. Upon receipt of a petition signed by at least five hundred (500) full members of the Students' Union, a Special General Students' Union Meeting will be called.
  - b. No matters may be raised at such a meeting except those that are the subject of the petition.
  - c. The quorum required for such a meeting will be one twentieth ( $1/20$ ) of the total membership of the Students' Union, or seven hundred and fifty (750), whichever is less, as defined by Article I, Section 2.
  - d. A Special General Meeting of the Students' Union duly called and constituted within the requirements of the section may, upon approval by a two-thirds ( $2/3$ ) majority of the Students' Union members present, rescind any motion of the Students' Council.
  - e. Such a meeting may, upon approval by a majority of the Students' Union members present, make recommendations to the Students' Council. Such recommendations will be binding on the Students' Council.