

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Tuesday, January 30, 2001 at 6:00 pm

SUB, Third Floor, Southside

MINUTES (SC 2000-18)

Faculty/Position	Name	Present/absent
President	Leslie Church	Present
VP Academic	Christopher Samuel	Present
VP External	Naomi Agard	Present
VP Finance	Gregory Harlow	Present
VP Student Life	Jennifer Wanke	Present
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Mark Cormier	Present
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Patricia Kozack	Present
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Andre Poulin	Absent
Arts	Jamie Speer	Present (6:15 pm)
Arts	Brendan Darling	Present
Arts	Kirsten Odynski	Present
Arts	Kory Zwack	Present
Arts	Richard Kwok	Present
Business	Erika Hoffman	Present
Business	Paul Chaput	Present (6:20 pm)
Business	Dean Jorgensen	Present
Education	Morine Bolding	Present
Education	Janna Roesch	Present
Education	Dan Coles	Present
Education	Robert Hartery	Present
Education	Justin Klaassen	Present
Engineering	Joe Brindle	Present
Engineering	Wayne Poon	Present
Engineering	David Weppler	Present
Engineering	Tim Poon	Present
Engineering	Kevin Partridge	Present

Law	Chris Veale	Present
Residence Halls Association	Shannon Moore	Present
Medicine/Dentistry	Andrew Schell	Present
Medicine/Dentistry	Karen Cheng	Present
Native Studies (School of		
Nursing	Jennifer Read	Present
Pharmacy	Chelsey Cabaj	Absent
Rehabilitation Medicine	Leah Ganes	Present
Faculté Saint-Jean	Wendy Gall	Present (6:50 pm)
Science	Tim Van Aerde	Present
Science	Mat Brechtel	Present
Science	Zaki Taher	Present
Science	Helen McGraw	Present
Science	Chamila Adhietty	Jason Zhon (p)
President Athletics	Tashie Macapagal	Absent
Gateway / Editor in Chief	Dan Lazin	Present
Recreation Action Committee		
General Manager	Bill Smith	Absent
Speaker	Stella Varvis	Present
Recording Secretary	Thea Varvis	Present

Observers

Jason Curran, Elections Office

Martin Levenson, FACRA (CJSR)

Jimmy Jeong, Gateway

Greg Semenchuk, Red Deer College

Jon Dunbar, Gateway

S. McEwen, GSA

Gregory Kitt, WUSC

Anita Kuper, Students' Union

Alfred Orono, WUSC

Etienne Bireseya, WUSC

Christine Rogerson, Orientation Program Coordinator

2000-18/1**CALL TO ORDER**

Council was called to order at 6:07 PM.

2000-18/2**NATIONAL ANTHEM "O Canada"**

Church led Council in the singing of the National Anthem.

2000-18/3**University of Alberta CHEER SONG**

Cormier led Council in the singing of the University of Alberta Cheer Song.

2000-18/4

APPROVAL OF AGENDA**Brindle / Kwok** moved that the agenda of the SC 2000-18 meeting be approved.Late Additions:**Church:**

2000-18/5b – Constitutional Amendment Presentation

2000-18/9j – Political Policy relating to Gateway Autonomy Petition

Consensus

2000-18/5

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION**2000-18/5a
OFF-CAMPUS
SU FEES
REFERENDUM**

Tim Poon, Engineering Student Councilor made a 15 minute presentation regarding a referendum on Students' Union fees for off-campus students

A list of non-instructional fees was included in the agenda package. An off-campus student is one who takes all their courses in a specific term in off-campus facilities. In 1998 there were 18 different categories of fees, and the SU wanted to simplify the fee schedule in the 1998/99 year. They gave one class each for full-time, part-time and summer terms students. These 3 categories were given to students in a referendum question and it was easily passed. Off-campus students started to complain because their fees were raised from \$0 to over \$40. The Executive published a report that demonstrated the problems with the fee structure and Council approved the report. Referendum asks to reduce SU membership fees, not dedicated fees and not on-campus fees. Proposed referendum question was included in the agenda package. There are strong opinions on both sides, but we should take the consideration to ask students for their feedback. **Poon** recognized the length of the meeting and asked Council to stay to debate the issue

McGraw: How many off-campus students are there?**Poon:** About 1600 term equivalents.**Church:** It's about 850 students.**Hartery:** Do the numbers include collaborative programs?**Poon:** It does, but those students are considered off-campus and this will apply to them.**Church:** The referendum was structured in a way to have no net financial impact to the SU, but your proposal is an over \$100,000 cut to the SU budget. That would be \$2.42 more per student - how do you think this should be handled?**Poon:** The SU has incredible resources. You could raise Power Plant prices or allow the student population to grow by 1.1%.**McGraw:** Where do most off-campus students study?**Poon:** A large number study out of the city, but a significant number remain inside the city.

Harlow: Since students will now pay \$0 in SU fees, will they still be allowed to be a member of the SU?

Poon: Every University student is a member of the Students' Union **member** no matter how much they pay.

Zwack: How did you pick \$0? Why not a minimal fee?

Poon: This is the easiest number to implement in the Registrar's computer system. I don't want to get into a fee negotiation, I just wanted to ask students what they felt about a reduced fee. I wanted a debate on the concept. Quality representation is priceless, you can't put a price on it.

Odynski: What would the impact of the referendum be?

Poon: It's a binding referendum, it's results would have to be implemented

Odynski: Why then zero and not another number?

Poon: It would be able to be implemented with the most ease. It allows students to focus on yes or no, not \$5 or \$6.

Partridge: If Council votes no, does that mean Council won't ask students this larger question?

Poon: This is getting into debate but you could vote yes and get feedback from students or you could vote no and not ask students about this question.

Kwok: It'll cost \$2000 for this referendum – why?

Poon: Each side of the referendum question is allowed to spend \$1000 to run their campaigns and are reimbursed by the SU.

Semenchuk (sp. by **Harlow**): I'm here on behalf of collaborative nursing and education students who are very concerned. What about dual representation? If they're on another campus that offers benefits, are they allowed "dual citizenship"?

Poon: It's possible, the Faculté Saint-Jean has that now. I'm going for a specific fee for a specific group of students, but if you wanted to open that up, you could.

Semenchuk: Would this affect fee sharing?

Poon: This is hypothetical, there's nothing in place right now so I can't answer that.

Church: The only fees collected would be for a dedicated referendum, so we could not enter into a fee-sharing program because as no fees would be collected there would be none to share.

McEwan (sp. by **Church**): GSA fees aren't charged at \$0 for most grad students. Our off-campus students pay half (approx. \$30), the same as part-time students. I don't think it's as simple as you make it out to be.

2000-18/5b Constitutional Amendment Presentation

Gregory Harlow made a 15 minute presentation relating to Constitutional Amendments

I wished to come back with more options as Council had requested, but only one will be brought as the motion to be discussed later. All students pay two types of fees: SU membership and dedicated referendum fees. Council determines how dedicated fees are spent. The proposals are included in the agenda package. Option A is that Council could withhold money if they felt fees weren't being spent properly or they could grant a partial amount – those mechanisms already exist. Each fee

would have to come to FAB to be approved. I wouldn't need any extra help for this option but I need Council to back me up. Option B is the same as the one I tabled last meeting where fees would be discussed on a set schedule. Option C would add a mandatory expiry date to all fees. Option D is endorsed by the Executive. Referenda will remain untouchable for up to 6 years at which point Council is entitled to amend those fee amounts – this is limited to an increase of 15% and there is no limit for a decrease. After 6 years, those who voted for these fees would have left, so it's still democratic. Option F is that Council may amend or rescind referenda.

Coles: In regards to Option D, why was six years chosen?

Harlow: The executive felt this was a reasonable time-constraint as most students would have graduated.

McGraw: For any of these options where Council changes the fees, would that come to us or FAB first?

Harlow: Council ultimately has to approve any changes, it would not be part of the annual budget process.

Lazin: How does Option B differ from the option tabled last meeting?

Harlow: It doesn't, it's the exact same but I thought it should still be included.

Levenson (sp. by **Brindle**): We have no problems with accountability but why the need for this change? Is there a perceived or actual lack of accountability, or is it tinkering for the sake of tinkering?

Harlow: Council isn't here to maintain status quo, it's here to improve. There are accountability issues at stake, which I could bring up here. This is an essential part of Council asserting its responsibility to maintain funds.

Brindle: I'd like your list of accountability issues so I could gage the scale of this situation

Harlow: With regard to CRFC, the committee has lost its focus. The Legacy Fund spending was a violation of this Council's decision. With Student Legal Services, I don't think they are doing anything wrong, but three half-hour sessions per year are not enough for me to ensure procedure is correctly followed. There are also issues with FACRA. I am not doing this light-heartedly.

Odynski: Can you go over the difference between D and F?

Harlow: D passes with referendum and cannot be touched for 6 years while in F there is no waiting period.

Coles: How do other SU organizations handle situations like this?

Harlow: Western Ontario holds full authority over every cent but other universities are very lax, the whole spectrum exists.

Lazin: I see no reference of taking this to FAB, am I misunderstanding?

Harlow: I don't need Council's approval to take things to FAB, it doesn't require a constitution amendment or bylaw amendment.

Kitt (sp. by **Partridge**): WUSC supports accountability. We have concerns with mandatory referenda because it would be very onerous for our organization. We

couldn't run an election every four years.

Levenson (sp. by **Brindle**): Our feeling is that accountability is desirable. We don't feel automatic referenda are in order. We would support periodic reviews. But CJSR is a partnership between the SU and the community, FACRA must remain autonomous. We haven't had an accumulated deficit since we started getting referendum fees. I'd like to dispute Mr. Harlow's term that we "play radio", we are licensed by the CRTC.

Harlow: I didn't mean play that way.

Coles: I speak in favor of Option D: we represent students that have voted for these referenda.

McGraw: I endorse Option F. As long as we recognize Council has a right to amend fees we shouldn't tie our hands to a 6 year waiting time.

Lazin: I encourage Council not to support any amendments to Article 5, to adjust the fees. They have been approved by students, they should be able to control it directly at all times. No option here is entirely suitable. I would suggest an amalgamation of some options.

Orono (sp. by **Wanke**): I agree that there is no good option here. This Council does not have the power to amend fees that students have decided on.

Veale: I agree with Mr. **Lazin**. The option closest to my approval is B. The problem with D and F is that you're giving Council too much power.

At this point a straw poll was taken:

Option A: general agreement

Option B: general disagreement

Option C: disagreement

Option D: agreement

Option F: disagreement

Option D seems to be the one Council goes for.

Some Councilors noted that their objections were based on the fact that there were no suitable options.

2000-18/6

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Speer / Kwok moved that the minutes of the Tuesday, January 23, 2001 SC meeting (SC 00-17) be approved.

Wanke: p. 3: "Specifics of GATEWAY autonomy" [and SU position]; p. 3: [actual cost of a completely autonomous Gateway comes to \$7/student/year]; p. 4: length of the paper is determined by advertising, [it's a business decision]; p. 5: they [should have printed] 12 pages; p. 5: "No small group...student money" should read [Council is not the most accurate representation of students].

Lazin: p. 4: Any profit made [after retained earnings] would go to student scholarships; p. 4: [cause] for my termination

Jeong: p. 5: when the papers were confiscated [DIE board didn't agree but James Brown did]; p. 5: students lost out more without [access to information]

Consensus

2000-18/7

REPORTS

a. Leslie Church, President

Tabled until the next council meeting

- b. Christopher Samuel, Vice-President Academic
Tabled until the next council meeting
- c. Naomi Agard, Vice-President External
Tabled until the next council meeting
- d. Gregory Harlow, Vice-President Operations & Finance
Tabled until the next council meeting
- e. Jennifer Wanke, Vice-President Student Life
Tabled until the next council meeting
- f. Mark Cormier, Undergrad BoG Representative
Tabled until the next council meeting
- g. Law Faculty Report
- An oral report was provided by **Veale**
We've had our law show, we will probably donate \$8,000-\$12,000 to Kids Cottage.
- h. Residence Halls Association Report
- An oral report was provided by **Moore**
We've been looking at our constitution. We're looking to get more inter-residence activity. We're looking into the new residence to be built, likely in front of Lister Hall. There will be more residences built in the future. Newton construction is almost done. We will hold a no-frills conference for the international organization of which we're a member. It will be 90 students from here and the U.S. We've recently won some international awards.
- i. Executive Committee, Minutes (Information Item Only)
See Document SC 00-18.01
- j. The Minutes of the various SU Boards and Committees are available on the SU WebPage: www.su.ualberta.ca

2000-18/8

QUESTION PERIOD

Van Aerde: I had a student concern about photocopying costs being quite exorbitant. What should I tell them?

Samuel: Onecard costs 10 cents, Print Centre costs 5 cents, copies in the Education building costs 6 cents. Any particular concern can be brought to me in my office.

Jorgensen: Referring to the Executive Meeting Minutes: what are the results of Harlow's investigation?

Harlow: That was regarding revamping off-campus student fees. At the time the Registrar could only accommodate four so I wanted to see if it could accommodate more, which it actually can.

Lazin: I have included the budget for the Gateway, any concerns should be addressed to me.

Roesch: I asked for a constitution.

Lazin: I forgot, I will table that next time.

2000-18/9

LEGISLATION

Harlow / Samuel moved to add Item 9b on the agenda to deal with proposed changes to Article 5

Unanimous Consent

**2000-18/9a
ARTICLE VIII -
POWERS
REGARDING
FINANCE**

HARLOW / SAMUEL MOVED THAT (FIRST READING) Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the proposed changes to Article VIII - Powers Regarding Finance

Harlow introduced the motion.

The second part of s. 10 is from the days when we had a mortgage. Since we no longer have a mortgage this section is unnecessary.

Harlow / Brindle moved to amend s. 11a to replace “increase” with “change”
Carried

Lazin: The changes that we’re making are dealing with council changing referendum fees but council can’t change these fees.

Speaker: According to Article V parts of the constitution that have been amended by referenda must state that they have been amended by referenda and only those particular sections can be further amended by referenda. Because s. 11 was never affected by a referendum question Council is able to amend that section without referenda.

Debate: none

Vote on the motion
32/2/2 **Carried**

**2000-18/9b
ARTICLE V –
POWER TO
AMEND THE
CONSTITUTION**

HARLOW / SAMUEL MOVED THAT (FIRST READING) Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the proposed changed to Article V – Powers to Amend the Constitution

Harlow introduced the motion.

We have to amend Article V in order to remove the restrictions from ss. 2 and 3 of Article V and place the 6-year restriction on items that were passed in referenda.

Coles: What ramifications does this have for previous referenda?

Harlow: All referenda passed prior to 6 years ago will immediately be subject to this article. If council wanted to increase or decrease by a maximum of 15% the money given to those sections they could.

Levenson (sp. by **Brindle**): I’d like to suggest a friendly amendment. I’d like to see a provision for a periodic review of these services and that the review should not be limited to finances but also review the objectives of the organization and how effectively they use the resources of volunteers, etc. This would allow Council to make an informed decision, and then if they should so wish they could take it to referendum.

Harlow: I'd be happy to accommodate that but I don't feel that belongs in the context of a constitution but in the context of bylaws.

Lazin: I don't think this is in the interest of democracy. Giving council the power to alter referendum fees even by 15% is not a good idea. I'd suggest to council to see those bylaws before they pass this.

Church: The purpose behind limiting it to 15% was because we saw many referenda that could be improved but aren't because no one wants to take the time to run more referendum questions. We need a little bit of leeway to improve the operations of organizations without forcing students to go to referendum on little issues.

Brindle: Five words: necessary cost of living adjustment. It's possible that some of these fees have to go up to improve or maintain services. I support this.

Lazin: Still, 15% is quite a substantial amount. This could still have a drastic effect on services, and these decisions should go to students through referenda.

McGraw: Having student-elected representatives decide for students is hardly out of order.

Samuel / Kwok moved the previous question
30/4/1 **Carried**

Vote on the main motion
32/4/1 **Carried**

**2000-18/9c
BYLAW 2050 -
NOMINATING
COMMITTEE**

HARLOW / AGARD MOVED THAT (FIRST READING) Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the proposed changes to Bylaw 2050 Respecting the Nominating Committee of the Students' Union

Harlow introduced the motion.

The updates are for the purposes of consolidating bylaws and basic housekeeping.

Debate: none

Vote on the motion
35/0/2 **Carried**

**2000-18/9d
BYLAW 10430 -
OFFICERS OF SC**

HARLOW / AGARD MOVED THAT (FIRST READING) Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the Bylaw 10430 Respecting the Officers of the Students' Council

Harlow introduced the motion.

This is the amalgamation of two bylaws, namely the ones regarding the Speaker and Recording Secretary, into one. Nothing substantive has changed and it has gone through IRB.

Debate: none

Vote on the motion
35/0/1 **Carried**

2000-18/9e
BYLAWS -
200 - SPEAKER OF
SC
210 - RECORDING
SECRETARY OF
SU

HARLOW / WANKE MOVED THAT (FIRST READING) Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, repeal Bylaws
- 200 Respecting the Speaker of the Students' Union
- 210 Respecting the Recording Secretary of the Students' Union

Harlow introduced the motion:

The bylaw we just passed makes these two bylaws redundant.

Debate: none

Vote on the motion
35/0/1 **Carried**

2000-18/9f
BYLAW 390 -
CREFC

HARLOW / CHURCH MOVED THAT (FIRST READING) Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the changes to Bylaw 390 – Respecting the Campus Recreation Enhancement Fund of the Students' Union

Harlow introduced the motion.

This bylaw governs the granting of the Campus Recreation Enhancement Fund. This will increase the number of people who will be assisted by these funds.

Odynski: Who are included in non-campus recreation?

Harlow: The Frisbee Club (or Ultimate Club) receives funds from this organization. The open category is that – open - you just have to enhance campus recreation.

Vote on the motion
34/1/0 **Carried**

2000-18/9g
PP
GOODS &
SERVICES TAX
(GST)

AGARD / SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the External Affairs Board, approve the changes to the Political Policy regarding Goods & Services Tax (GST)

Agard introduced the motion.

These next three policies have been recommended for renewal by the external affairs board.

Debate: none

Vote on the motion
36/0/0 **Carried**

2000-18/9h
PP
DIFFERENTIAL
TUITION

AGARD / SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the External Affairs Board, approve the changes to the Political Policy regarding Differential Tuition

Agard introduced the motion.

We went through this debate last year. We wanted to make this more generic so it could apply year after year with regard to differential tuition.

Vote on the motion

32/1/3 **Carried**

2000-18/9i
PP
QUALITY OF
EDUCATION

AGARD / SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the External Affairs Board, approve the changes to the Political Policy regarding Quality of Education

Agard introduced the motion.

We're renewing this policy. The only change is editorial. It outlines what we feel defines quality of education.

Debate: none

Vote on the motion

38/0/0 **Carried**

2000-18/9j

HARLOW / AGARD MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee support the tabled Political Policy relating to Gateway Autonomy Petition

Church introduced the motion.

We put together a motion we felt encapsulated the sentiment of Council from our debate last meeting.

Levenson (sp. by **Brindle**): If you pass this and the students in referendum vote for Gateway autonomy, your authority will be called into question.

Harlow: If students vote in favor for autonomy, we will abide by that. But until then, we have a duty to guide.

Agard: If we don't have a firm position we won't be providing any form of leadership.

Lazin: What disadvantage is being referred to?

Church: Students are losing access to that space at a rent that is more reasonable. Our perception of the issue is that students are not getting the best deal.

Lazin: The alternative is for the Gateway to pay the SU and charge a levy to the students, is that advantageous?

Church: If the Gateway was autonomous it wouldn't charge students at all.

Vote on the motion

25/3/9 **Carried**

2000-18/10

NEW BUSINESS

2000-18/10a
BUDGET
TRANSFER

HARLOW / CHURCH MOVED THAT Students' Council reallocate \$1200 (One Thousand Two Hundred) within the OmbudService budget to purchase a new computer

Harlow introduced the motion.

This is simply a transfer of money within the service. All questions can be directed to the director of OmbudService who is present.

Motion **Carried**

**2000-18/10b
TRANSFER**

HARLOW / CHURCH MOVED THAT Students' Council transfer \$1,013,664 (One Million Thirteen Thousand Six Hundred and Sixty Four) in Excess Reserves to the Building Reserve

Harlow introduced the motion.

We collect monies through dedicated referendum fees but the Legacy Fund and the Access Fund don't use their money every year and this is saved in an Endowment Fund. This suggests that the money that has accumulated over the years, slightly over a million dollars, be transferred to the Building Reserve. It would be irresponsible of us to sit on this much student money instead of putting the money to beneficial use. The Executive feels this better serves students needs.

Zwack: Why would services be forced to save the money and then not spend it?

Harlow: The purpose of Endowment Funds was to make the Access Fund self-sustaining but that won't happen until it accumulates \$50 million dollars.

Ganes: Could you explain why Access Fund excess would better serve students by being invested in this building rather than distributing more bursaries to students?

Harlow: We have tried to give as much money out to students as we can, but the access fund is a last resort bursary so it narrows down the people who are eligible. The access fund will waive the restriction for certain situations. There are other possibilities for distribution, but it is hard to assess need.

Church: The access fund has increased with the amount tuition has increased. About \$900,000 of the \$1.1 million is coming from the Access Fund and SFAIC. We'd like to create a one-stop student finance station between the stadium car park walkway and west entrance of SUB. If we can do that, I think that we will serve students in a way that we aren't now in student finance.

Poon (W): I find taking this much money away from the Access Fund ridiculous. Most students don't know they're giving some money to the Access Fund so they don't consider opting-out. I don't think students will appreciate this transfer. I am opposed to this legislation.

Hoffman: I asked some students and I feel this money would best serve students by loosening the eligibility requirement for the Access Fund. Also, students will not be able to opt-out of this building fund.

Roesch: Why is there \$20,000 from WUSC?

Kitt (sp. by Church): Sometimes refugees get their sponsorship in their 3rd or 4th year, so that's why some money accumulates. We've also had 2 students who haven't finished their program here. In 1999 we didn't sponsor a student at all because we couldn't find a student that met the university's TOFEL requirement. That surplus has accumulated over 12 years.

Roesch: How do you feel the money should be spent?

Orono (sp. by **Wanke**): About 3 years ago we were in a deficit. This year we're expecting 2 students. One is a single mother and another might be blind.

Kitt (sp. by **Church**): We're never certain if the refugee will have a disability or have a child, this surplus offers security to WUSC if situations such as that would arise.

Samuel: With regards to the Access Fund we have to recognize that it is a last-resort fund, and not many students are eligible. As soon as all students step into the SU building, they are accessing a SU service. This money would expand food and study spaces.

Odynski: With the Access Fund, how do the endowment funds work? Are they locked away for a certain time? When can they be accessed?

Harlow: It depends. With WUSC it transfers until the next year. With Access Fund it remains until the Access Fund becomes self-sufficient.

Jorgensen / Zwack moved to extend Council 45 minutes until 9:52 pm
Carried by two-thirds majority

Odynski: If we move this into the Reserve Fund are we going to run into this problem again?

Harlow: The legislation we passed earlier this council will be able to deal effectively with this. We can amend the bylaws of various organizations to allow them to roll over their surpluses into next year's operating revenue.

Kwok: Does this legislation deal with the entire reserve, including WUSC?

Harlow: We're proposing this is left in the Endowment Fund as outlined.

Kwok: In the case of WUSC, I'm guessing there is something in their legislation about surpluses.

Wanke: WUSC is supposed to contain enough money to bring in one student per year. They are not allowed to go into that fund and give present students more money. In theory, they could bring in another student but they can't decide where they can allocate this money.

McEwan (sp. by **Church**): \$23,000 is a very small amount to bring in a student. We should keep this fund as a socially minded university.

Zwack: I think the Executive has a good objective but I feel this money should go back into the organizations or back to students.

Poon (W): I think the Executive should find a better way to spend this money in the area this money is coming from. I'd like to ask **Church** and **Harlow** why something can't be done to keep the money in those specific areas instead of being placed in the building reserve?

Harlow: It could be done. I could expand the definition of the Access Fund beyond "last-resort" but it would be hard to expand those definitions. If you increase the money for the people currently in this last-resort position - I don't know if this is the best way to serve students. We have a one-time opportunity to apply this money to something long-term. Our discretionary income basically vaporizes this year. If we ever want to expand this building this is the option we have to look to. I'd urge council to look at the long-term ramifications of this proposal.

Speer / Roesch moved to call the question
Carried by two-thirds majority.

Vote on the main motion
15/17/3 **Failed**

2000-18/10c
CASA
LOBBY
CONFERENCE

AGARD / HARLOW MOVED THAT Students' Council approve the previously budgeted expenditure of \$2352.46 (Two Thousand Three Hundred Fifty Two Dollars and Forty Six Cents) to send Naomi Agard, VP External and Leslie Church, President to CASA's Lobby Conference from March 12-17, 2001

Agard introduced the motion.

This is one of the most important things I do this year, along with the President. This is our CASA lobby conference in Ottawa. This was supposed to be held in October, but there was a federal election this year. We would lobby on campus infrastructure, relieving student debt, extending millennium scholarship, restoring federal funding to post-secondary education as it's at an all-time low.

Debate: none

Vote on the motion

Carried

Church's and **Agard's** abstention was noted.

2000-18/10d
REFERENDUM

POON, T./ PARTRIDGE MOVED THAT a referendum be held during the Students' Union General Elections of March 2001 regarding off-campus student Students' Union membership fees

Poon, T. introduced the motion.

Students' Council can modify SU fees only through binding referenda. We should ask students the question. We should look at how this affects students. I wanted to get a sense from Council whether this question should be asked or not. I question whether the numbers in the Executive submitted reported in the agenda package are accurate. We have to look at what's relevant and of benefit to students.

Kwok: Point of information: if we don't debate this will it die due to time restraint?

Poon: Bylaw 350, Section 8a says that the Gateway must run referendum questions. I don't want to force this question to referendum. I just want to bring this issue to Council to see if it's worthy to put to students in a referendum question.

Church: The executive has carefully prepared the included information we submitted. Student make-up has diversified across the country. We don't only represent students on this campus. They are registered and enrolled in this institution, and so we represent them. You must consider the long-term effects of

this on the SU. We are the only people on this campus authorized to represent students. We cannot take this lightly. The consequences are far more reaching than Mr. **Poon** has outlined. Co-op students were extremely vocal when this issue came up to Council before. Co-op students were always legally supposed to have paid fees but didn't in the 1990's because the University couldn't identify them. This University has tried to be more accommodating to off-campus students. Council should not support this referendum. Students' already voiced their opinion two years ago.

Gall: I think it's important to recognize that students voted for this two years ago. We should listen to them and not keep trying until we get the desired result.

Speer: The question here is whether to ask the referendum or not, not whether it is positive or negative. **Church** and **Poon** shouldn't grandstand.

Bolding: Education students don't do 4-month and 9-month practica but 4-week and 9-week practica and only 10% leave the Edmonton area.

Agard: To address Mr. **Speer's** comment, I agree with you. Putting a question to referendum says that we can't decide on this issue because it's complex. Yet, I feel there is a clear-cut answer here to why we shouldn't put this question to answer. 75% of students have already given us their answer. I would say no if this question went to referendum. We represent students on and off campus.

Harlow: This question has serious financial ramifications to this institution. I can't support a motion that would leave us \$100,000 out to where we are today. Ultimately this body is the body that has to make the books balance and this motion would make that very difficult. The political representation of this Council alone is worth the SU fees.

Roesch: Aren't students at Red Deer College and Grand Prairie not getting posters of elections or ballot boxes? How can you say you represent them when you won't give them a chance to vote or know who's running in the election?

Hartery: There are no posters, there is on-line voting but none of them know about it. There is basically just a lack of communication which is why those students don't feel represented.

Jorgensen: I represent many co-op students and I have to question Mr. **Poon** on why they shouldn't pay any fees at all when they are still privy to SU services via the website.

Poon: You may change the fee with an amendment.

Jorgensen / Zwack moved to amend s. 2d of the proposed referendum question to replace \$0.00 with \$11.69.

Debate on amendment only:

Poon (T.): I agree with this.

Gall: Students already voted on this and already decided on it. Why do we have to keep hitting this over the head?

Samuel: This creates a differential SU fee that makes 2 sets of classes of students.

Zwack: \$11.69 is just a number. I think a lot of people would be happier with this.

Partridge: As far as co-op students are concerned, they're still on campus for 8 or more terms and paying full SU fees. The five terms they spend off-campus they don't get anything. When this came to question two years ago, 600 off-campus students were unable to vote

Poon T. / Chaput moved to extend Council by 20 minutes until 10:12 pm
Carried by two-thirds majority.

Speer: Off-campus students still get political representation and have access to services on-line. They don't get all services, though. They don't have access to this building, what the Executive calls the key service. I support partial funding.

Brindle: There is already a differential fee between full-time and part-time students. Mr. **Samuel** are you saying that you don't represent a part-time student the same as a full-time student? If we're not represented the same we shouldn't be taxed the same.

Church: Every off-campus student last year and this year was told about the elections: how to vote and where to vote. I want to remind Council that this isn't only about co-op students. Other off-campus students can still be full-time students with access to this campus. Two-thirds of off-campus students reside in Edmonton. There are still considerations that come up for off-campus students. If we start reducing fees for services on the assumption that they're not using our services than we're placing a price tag on SU services, and it's difficult to determine that fee. A part-time fee is still not true to the tenants of our system.

Ganes: There are some problems with the Registrar's statistics with Rehabilitation Medicine. I'm in favor of the amendment because they're still served by the SU but there is a difference in representation

Harlow: This still leaves us financially under.

Kwok / Darling moved the previous question
24/2/5 **Carried**

Vote on the amendment
Carried

Debate on main motion resumed.

Zwack / Speer moved to call the question
16/15/0 **Failed**

Wanke: This is an issue of magnitude, that's why it was brought to referendum before. We have now put legislation into place that allows us to tweak referenda. We're debating on whether or not we should put this to referendum again. We don't. We have already put this to students. Please defeat this.

Samuel / Kwok moved to amend the proposed referendum question by changing \$23.39 to \$24.65 in s. 2a, \$11.69 to \$12.37 in s. 2b, \$11.69 to \$12.37 in s. 2d

Samuel: The SU is cash strapped, this revised proposal still robs us of \$50, 000. As such, I ask Council to support this amendment to ensure the main motion is overall financially neutral.

Poon: If the student population increases by 2% the finances will be made up. This is a poison pill to kill the entire motion. If this is passed I will withdraw the motion.

Kwok: I think students need to make an informed decision.

Harlow: This amendment is essential to the financial soundness of this motion.

Brindle: \$100, 000 is 1.1% of the annual operating budget. There are many surpluses. \$100,000 is peanuts.

Speer: All of a sudden this revenue is essential but we got along well without it for the ten years they weren't paying.

Lazin: What happened to the \$4,000 SU surplus?

Kuper (sp. by **Harlow**): \$299, 000 is the SU's operating budget. The mortgage is on top of that but that's a different issue. Council approved a budget, if you decrease fees they are taken away from that. You can take money out of the mortgage, but you will never get it back and you're taking away an important long-term option.

Harlow / Wanke moved that Council be extended 20 minutes until 10:30 pm
Carried by two-thirds majority.

Church: The reason the organization is dependent on these fees is because when these fees got approved the average student saw a decrease in fees. There has been no monetary gain.

Jorgensen: Is the \$11.69 just for the term they're off-campus?

Church: Yes.

Vote on the amendment
15/11/3 **Carried**

Poon / Partridge moved to withdraw the main motion as amended.
Unanimous Consent

2000-18/11

INFORMATION ITEM

2000-18/11a

2000-18/12

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Upcoming Faculty Reports

- Medicine/Dentistry
- Nursing

Samuel: February 1st is the deadline for award applications.

Church: Application packages for the general elections will be available tomorrow morning.

Rogerson: Backpack-to-Briefcase seminars are being offered in February.

•Next Council Meeting

- Tuesday, February 6, 2001 at 6:00 pm in SUB, Third Floor

•Future Council Meeting

- March 20, 2001
- April 3, 2001
- April 11, 2001

2000-18/13

ADJOURNMENT

Brindle / Poon moved to adjourn at 10:15 pm.