

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

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

MINUTES (SC 2000-19)

| 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 | Absent |
| BoG Undergrad Rep. | Mark Cormier | Present |
| Agric/Forest/HomeEc | Patricia Kozack | Present |
| Agric/Forest/HomeEc | Andre Poulin | Absent |
| Arts | Jamie Speer | Present |
| Arts | Brendan Darling | Present |
| Arts | Kirsten Odynski | Present |
| Arts | Kory Zwack | Amy Salyzyn (p) |
| Arts | Richard Kwok | Present |
| Business | Erika Hoffman | Present |
| Business | Paul Chaput | Present |
| Business | Dean Jorgensen | Present |
| Education | Morine Bolding | Present |
| Education | Janna Roesch | Present |
| Education | Dan Coles | Present |
| Education | Robert Hartery | Absent |
| 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 | Tanya Spencer (p) |
| Medicine/Dentistry | Andrew Schell | Present |
| Medicine/Dentistry | Karen Cheng | Nicole Iverson-Martin (p) |
| Native Studies (School of Nursing | Jennifer Read | Susan Sloane (p) 7:00pm |
| Pharmacy | Chelsey Cabaj | Absent |
| Rehabilitation Medicine | Leah Ganes | Absent |
| Faculté Saint-Jean | Wendy Gall | Present |
| Science | Tim Van Aerde | Present |
| Science | Mat Brechtel | Absent |
| Science | Zaki Taher | Present |
| Science | Helen McGraw | Present |
| Science | Chamila Adhietty | Present |
| President Athletics | Tashie Macapagal | Chris Nelson (p) |
| 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

Lisa Clyburn

Martin Levenson, FACRA (CJSR)

Shaun Flannigan, The Gateway

Roman Kotovych

Gregory Kitt, WUSC

Sheamus Murphy

Justin Lee

Raymond Biesinger, The Gateway

2000-19/1

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:14 pm

2000-19/2

NATIONAL ANTHEM "O Canada"

Church led Council in the singing of the National Anthem.

2000-19/3

University of Alberta CHEER SONG

Van Aerde led Council in the singing of the University of Alberta Cheer Song.

2000-19/4

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Taher / Van Aerde moved that the agenda of the SC 2000-19 meeting be approved.

Late Additions:**Church:**

2000-19/5a – Presentation: The Senate Community Service Recognition Program
 2000-19/10b – APIRG Referendum
 2000-19/10c – Off-Campus Fees Referendum
 2000-19/10d – Gateway Referendum
 2000-19/10e – Power Plant Projector
 2000-19/10f – BSA Line of Credit

Consensus

2000-19/5

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

2000-19/5a

Christian Idicula, Senator, made a fifteen minute presentation regarding the Senate Community Service Recognition Program.

The University likes to highlight community service, yet does not really recognize it. This program is for the Senate to receive submissions and compile a book to distribute throughout the community, which states who is doing what. It would recognize the benefit and contributions of students. We'd like you and people you know to fill out the form attached to the handout. On May 7, we will have a celebration media event where people included in the book will be able to attend and celebrate. We'd like to advertise the event and contributions in The Journal. **Idicula** asked Council to distribute the information. Recognized contributions must have taken place in the 2000 calendar year.

2000-19/6

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Samuel / Church moved that the minutes of the Tuesday, January 30, 2001 SC meeting (SC 00-18) be approved.

Samuel: p. 17 3rd paragraph : omit "original", replace with "main"

Church: p. 14: the "C" in Church has been left out.

Agard: note her abstention on 2000-18/10c

Poon: p. 14: clarify that he's talking about Bylaw 350, Section 8a

Consensus

2000-19/7

REPORTS

a. Leslie Church, President

- An oral report was provided at the meeting.
- Attended the Loughheed Scholarship luncheon.
- We wrapped up our strategic planning, document will come to Council in March.
- I have been occupied by DIE board, IRB and election issues.

b. Christopher Samuel, Vice-President Academic

- A written report was provided at the meeting.
- Bookstore Director and I were not able to meet yet.

c. Naomi Agard, Vice-President External

- A written report was provided at meeting.
- Been busy with MP Lobby tour.
- Provincial election coming up, the writ will probably be dropped Monday. There will be a polling station at Lister Hall. Please watch your emails and pass on any information I give to you, to the students.

- d. Gregory Harlow, Vice-President Operations & Finance
 - An oral report was provided at meeting.
 - Occupied with DIE Board
 - Most of time spent preparing legislation.
 - No new legislation will come to Council today in terms of bylaws.
- e. Jennifer Wanke, Vice-President Student Life
 - **Wanke** sent regrets for her absence from this meeting.
- f. Mark Cormier, Undergrad BoG Representative
 - An oral report was provided at the meeting.
 - University of Alberta Board of Governor's Report to the Students' Union (January 12, 2001) was tabled.
 - Board of Governor meeting on March 2nd, working on BoG subcommittees and boards to prepare for the March 2nd meeting.
- g. Medicine/Dentistry Faculty Report
 - An oral report was provided by **Schell** on behalf of Medicine.
 - Working on Faculty formal, which will be mid-March.
 - Med Show is coming up in March.
 - An oral report was provided by **Martin-Iverson** on behalf of Dentistry.
 - We had our annual skit night last weekend.
 - We went on a weekend trip to Montreal for a conference.
- h. Nursing Faculty Report
 - An oral report was provided by **Read**.
 - Running a blood donor clinic starting on February 15 – to raise money for the graduating class.
 - CBL SOS – information on how students are feeling about the tutorial clinical is going well, and will go to the Dean at the end of March.
 - Looking forward to Preview Days.
- i. Executive Committee, Minutes (Information Item Only)
See Document SC 00-19.01
- j. The Minutes of the various SU Boards and Committees are available on the SU WebPage: www.su.ualberta.ca

2000-19/8

QUESTION PERIOD**Spencer:** What replaced the division of Neuroscience?**Cormier:** I can find out for you.**Speer:** What progress have you made in getting exams deferred when there's more than 3 in 48 hours?**Samuel:** I met with the Registrar, I will be making this a presentation item on boards and I will see it through the process.

Hoffman: What will be happening to the Gold Key Committee meeting if we have a Council meeting next Tuesday?

Samuel: If Council approves Tuesday's meeting, the Gold Key meeting will probably be rescheduled.

Gall: What's going on with the midterm professor evaluation?

Samuel: Response has been good. I will take the question to the Staff Association and then it will be put through the decision-making process.

Gall: How long?

Samuel: Hopefully by the end of March, or May.

Partridge: What ever happened to Campus Advantage?

Samuel: We haven't done anything with it, ask Christian.

Speer: Which one of the six MPs weren't supportive of student initiatives?

Agard: Peter Goldring was only supportive of lowering interest rates on student loans. He didn't really like any of my initiatives.

Salyzyn: Can you elaborate on the revamped confirmation system?

Samuel: Students will be notified several times during the summer and students will be given information that they can go to Student Services to waive the fee. We won't be changing the fee amount.

2000-19/9

LEGISLATION

2000-19/9a ARTICLE VIII - POWERS REGARDING FINANCE

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

Harlow introduced the motion.

S. 11 allows for a limitation to be put on Council's power. It limits increases or decreases to 15%.

Levenson (sp. by **Veale**): I handed out a summary of CJSR's position.

Veale: S. 11 in combination with changes to Article 5 allows this body to go against the will of the students. Every fourth meeting of Council during the year, Council could be debating these issues. I urge you to vote against this.

Poon, W.: Isn't this before DIE board now?

Samuel: No.

Harlow: Council could either implement this accountability role or continue to abstain from taking that responsibility. I think this is a normal step for Council to take. A 15% increase of decrease is not destructive.

Kitt (sp. by **Samuel**): On behalf of WUSC, our perspective is that this is a workable solution to accountability. Our organization is confident that we can work with Council to make things work.

Veale: Accountability is important, but this isn't the only method of accountability. Harlow brought five solutions, but none were acceptable. No Council should have this kind of power available to them.

Odynski: We're an organization responsible for student voices. By giving us this power it makes us be even more accountable and it will make us take our jobs more seriously. 15% is reasonable; we're not going to cripple any organizations. We could also give organizations 15% more, as well.

Spencer: I'd like to point out the irony that 15% wouldn't break organizations, but off-campus fees being reduced would apparently break the SU.

Kwok / Poon, T. moved to call the question.

25/8/1

Carried

Vote on main motion

23/7/3

Carried

**2000-19/9b
ARTICLE V -
POWER TO
AMEND
CONSTITUTION**

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

Harlow introduced the motion.

Without this, the amendment to Article VIII has no meaning. This removes the restriction on S. 11. It balances the democratic voice of students with the turnover rate of University.

Veale: We are elected representatives, but then why do we have to take things to referenda in the first place? Other forms of government still consider their referenda valid, even though there is turnover there, as well.

Vote on motion

24/7/3

Carried

**2000-19/9c
BYLAW 2050 -
NOMINATING
COMMITTEE**

HARLOW / AGARD MOVED THAT (SECOND 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.

This is housekeeping in nature, no substantive change is being proposed.

Vote on motion

34/0/0

Carried

**2000-19/9d
BYLAW 10430 -
OFFICERS OF
STUDENTS'
COUNCIL**

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

Harlow introduced the motion.

This bylaw is the combination of two bylaws. The aim is to make our legislation a little clearer and less cumbersome.

Vote on motion
34/0/0
Carried

2000-19/9e
BYLAWS -
200 - SPEAKER OF
SU
210 - RECORDING
SECRETARY OF
SU

HARLOW / CHURCH MOVED THAT (SECOND 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 replaces these bylaws, so they must be removed.

Vote on motion
33/0/1
Carried

2000-19/9f
BYLAW 390 -
CREFC

HARLOW / CHURCH MOVED THAT (SECOND 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.

The purpose of this bylaw is to allow for the creation of an open category that this fund will be able to use to increase the number of people who would be able to benefit from it.

Vote on motion
34/0/0
Carried

2000-19/9g
PP
UNIVERSITY
RELATIONSHIP
TO THE BUSINESS
COMMUNITY

AGARD / CHURCH MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the External Affairs Board, approve the changes to the Political Policy regarding University Relationship to the Business Community

Agard introduced the motion.

The policy is included in the agenda package. We clarified the policy to ensure that funding was unrestricted and not targeted.

Taher: Will unrestricted funding turn off prospective donors?

Agard: We felt that University students need unrestricted funds rather than targeted funding.

Taher: People would want their names attached to concrete things.

Agard: The policy stresses the importance, but does not preclude targeted funding.

Kwok: Why did they strike out “students contribute directly to the success of the business community”?

Agard: We didn't, we subsumed that in the third whereas.

Vote on motion

29/3/2

Carried

2000-19/9h

STANDING ORDERS

VEALE/CHAPUT MOVED THAT Students' Council amend the Standing Orders of the Students' Council as follows:

- A) Adding to s. 4: "Any member speaking to an item for a first time, excluding the mover of the item, is limited to one (1) minute; any member speaking for a second or subsequent time is limited to thirty (30) seconds. The mover of an item may speak for up to five (5) minutes to introduce that item only. Any member answering a question is limited to one (1) minute."
- B) Adding s. 16: "Presentation and discussion items shall last for a maximum of one-half (1/2) hour total, with the presentation portion taking no longer than fifteen (15) minutes. Discussion items may be extended by up to fifteen (15) minutes with the consent of a simple majority of voting members of the Students' Council for the first extension. One (1) further extension of up to fifteen (15) minutes may be granted but shall require a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote."
- C) Amending s. 9 to read: "Extensions shall be limited to a maximum of one (1) hour per extension and no more than two (2) extensions per meeting shall be granted."

Veale introduced the motion.

This isn't directed to anyone in particular, but to all of us. This is pretty self-evident. This is designed to streamline the whole process in order to retain interest. If we restrict speaking time and meeting time we won't have people rush the voting at the end of the meeting just for the sake of getting out of here.

Speer: I like Parts B and C, but not A. We should have due time to speak our mind on certain issues.

Kwok: I'd like to remind Council that I timed Veale, and it took more than 30 seconds. I think we should extend the time.

Kwok / McGraw moved to amend Part A of the motion by changing "1 minute" to "2 minutes" when a member is speaking to an item for the first time and "30 seconds" to "1 minute" when a member speaks for a second or subsequent time.

McGraw: I think this retains the intent, without stripping us of our speaking time.

Partridge / Kwok moved to amend the amendment by changing "1 minute" to "2 minutes" for members answering questions.

Kwok: This is my oversight, the reply should logically have the same time as the question was allowed.

Vote on the sub-amendment

Carried

Vote on amendment as amended

Carried

Harlow: I think B and C are quite innocuous, I think Part A strikes at the heart of what a deliberative body should be. We should not be limited to two minutes and one minute sound bites.

Harlow / Brindle moved to divide the question so as to consider separately Part A from Parts B and C
Carried

Debate on Part A only:

McGraw: I don't think 2 minutes and 1 minute is a sound bite. If you can't say what you want in 2 minutes, you should be moving an amendment.

Spencer: I wonder what the Speaker would think of this added responsibility?

Speaker: Whatever Council asks me to do I do. I'm it's humble servant

Gall: I'd like to speak against this. If someone wants to say something for longer than 2 minutes, they should. Time limits could limit the information we have.

Kwok: Would the time limit be stopped by the Speaker or would a Councilor have to call another member on a point of order?

Speaker: Both means would be available.

Kwok: What if someone needed a little extra amount of time?

Speaker: I don't like dealing in hypotheticals. The Speaker must ensure Standing Orders that Council has set for itself are followed.

Harlow: I think this is a reaction to a unique situation that has arisen over the last little while. Today, we have whipped off many items in a remarkably short amount of time. I urge Council to vote this down.

Veale: We have whipped off several things, but they've also been Second Readings. This isn't a knee-jerk reaction. We have extended meetings on several instances, but a lot of the extra time was not spent on debating the motions.

Gall: If this is in place and it's up to a Councilor to stop debate, they could stop debate if they didn't like what the other person was saying.

Brindle: There's not much danger here. It doesn't cap the Speaker's list, you can speak again. I think we can trust Council to handle Part A.

Spencer: I was a Councilor last year, and I can't remember such long meetings. I think this is a reaction to the present.

Roesch: I do remember meetings that went this long, usually around election time, too.

Harlow: Point of order – do standing orders need 2/3 majority to pass?

Speaker: According to Roberts', only a simple majority is required.

Harlow: Robert's Rules gives 10 minutes, so is this not an amendment to Robert's Rules?

Speaker: An organization can change or modify Robert's Rules to suit its practices and organizational personality.

Poon, W. / Brindle moved to call the question
19/10/5

Carried

Vote on Part A as amended

Carried

Debate on Parts B and C:

Church / Samuel moved to strike the last two sentences of Part B and add the following: "Discussion items may be extended by up to fifteen (15) minutes with the consent of five (5) voting members of Students' Council for the first two (2) extension. Further extensions require a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote."

Veale: The reason I set it out as a simple majority and limited it to two extensions was so that a small group of students, say five, could not be able to extend discussion to one hour.

Samuel: I'd like to speak in favor of this amendment. Dr. Carmichael made a presentation that lasted more than an hour and I would have hated if this interesting and constructive discussion had been limited.

Gall: I'd like to point out that sometimes we have more than one presentation. If we have three presentations would we limit them to ten minutes each?

Jorgensen: It's half an hour total, per item isn't it?

Veale: That's what I had intended.

Friendly amendment to add the words "per item" following "Presentation and discussion items shall last for a maximum of one-half (1/2) hour."

Unanimous consent

Church: Point of information, can Council get around this with unanimous consent?

Speaker: Council can change its operating procedures whenever it wants when there is unanimous consent.

Jorgensen: Is this necessary?

Church: I am in full support of this, my only concern is that fifteen minutes is not a long period of time. It seems to me to be an undue application of rules. I feel that five Councilors are not going to overrun debate.

Vote on amendment

20/10/2

Carried

Jorgensen / Brindle moved to divide the questions so as to consider separate Part B from Part C

Carried

Debate on Part B only:

Partridge proposed a motion to amend Part B so as to limit extensions to 3 total.

Speaker ruled the amendment out of order because in the last amendment to this section, Council voted not to limit the extensions to 3.

Brindle / Taher moved to appeal the decision of the chair

Brindle: I think this is different enough from the original motion and is still a good idea. The chair has erred ever so slightly and we should overturn it.

Speaker: My reasoning was clear, I won't repeat it.

Vote to uphold Chair's ruling

16/11/3

Carried

The Speaker's ruling is upheld.

Klaassen: If two-thirds of the people in the room want to hear what's being said, the people have spoken. Why place a restriction?

Veale: The purpose of this motion is to prevent this situation from happening. We need limits.

Vote on Part B only

Carried

Debate on Part C only:

No debate.

Vote on Part C

Carried

2000-19/10

NEW BUSINESS

**2000-19/10a
CREFC**

HARLOW / CHURCH MOVED THAT Students' Council ratify Amanda Kuspla and Tyler Boake to sit on the Campus Recreation and Enhancement Fund Committee as the students-at-large

Harlow introduced the motion.

I need Council to ratify these two people so we can have two student-at-large members on the Campus Recreation and Enhancement Fund Committee

Vote on motion

Carried

2000-19/10b

**APIRG
REFERENDUM**

ZWACK/VEALE MOVED THAT Students' Council upon the 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 research, education 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.”

Church introduced the motion

APIRG collected more than enough signatures on their petition and then referred it to IRB to develop this question. IRB worded a clear and fair question for the binding referendum.

Brindle: What happens to the money that is collected at the end of the year?

Church: That's an issue that will be resolved in the drafting of the bylaw.

Vote on motion

Carried

2000-19/10c

**OFF-CAMPUS FEES
REFERENDUM**

HARLOW/SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the following as a referendum question for the 2001 SU General Elections:

“Are you in favor of the proposed amendments to the Students' Union (SU) fee structure (Article VIII s.3 of the Constitution), which would:

- i. Create a special fee category for Off-Campus Students, (students whose on-campus credits are equal to zero);
- ii. Require that Off-Campus Students be assessed an SU Membership Fee equivalent to the fee assessed to Part-Time Students (currently \$11.69 per Fall or Winter Term);
- iii. Require that for the purposes of Article VIII, Off-Campus Students be assessed SU Referendum Fees as Part-Time Students;
- iv. Require an increase in SU Membership Fees of \$0.82 per Full-Time Student (currently \$23.39) and \$0.41 per Part-Time Student (currently \$11.69) in the Fall and Winter Terms, and \$0.55 per student in the Spring and Summer Term.

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

Church introduced the motion.

There were two petitions that were circulated: the off-campus fees issue and Gateway autonomy. There is some concern over this issue. The Executive proposes to bring the off-campus fees issue to referendum. We tie off-campus students to part-time student status to make it easy for the Registrar. Part-time status would also apply to the dedicated fees. We recognize that this is a system of tradeoffs. In this format, we would be comfortable to bring this issue to students.

Poon, T. / Partridge moved to amend the motion by striking s. 4 from the question

Poon, T.: Last week I brought a proposal to Council about off-campus fees that would ensure on-campus fees would remain the same. It was amended to increase the on-campus fees, which I thought was a poison pill, but 36 hours later a petition of this sort was circulated. I can't support this referendum question as it proposes to increase on-campus student fees.

Samuel: It was I who introduced the poison pill and I think it's essential that it's included in the question. We tried to balance the needs of off-campus students with the fiscal needs of this organization to serve all students. The only other option we have is to cut services. We have to shoot down this amendment.

Partridge: I disagree with Mr. Samuel. Off-campus students have only been paying fees as of recently. If student population increased by 1% the loss would be made up.

Bolding: Didn't we vote on this last time?

Kwok: If on-campus students thought this was an issue, they would vote in favor of this, even with the poison pill, in this form.

Harlow: I have been forthright with the finances of this organization. This year we have a surplus from the mortgage, but the Power Plant is under-performing, we will be giving the Exam Registry \$15,000, etc. We have only \$100,000 to save or spend out of our \$9 million budget. This is the god's honest truth.

Taher: It was mentioned at the last meeting that until 2 years ago off-campus students didn't pay fees. Fees must be adjusted; it's financial reality.

Vote on amendment only

Failed

Debate on the main motion:

Poon: Last week I brought this issue to Council. Students don't want to increase on-campus fees; they only want to lower off-campus student fees.

Harlow: I wish I had a money tree in my backyard, but I don't. I hope everyone votes to bring this to students. At the end of the day, you have to balance the budget. We're asking students to be fair.

Kwok: Would this change in fees directly affect any groups that get funding from dedicated fees?

Harlow: I haven't looked closely. I believe the financial impact on other organizations will be minimal.

Kotovych (sp. by **McGraw**): I want clarification on what is meant by on-campus credit?

Church: This is how the Registrar's office determines tuition.

Martin-Iverson: Mr. **Poon**, you didn't have enough signatures to put forward your referendum. Maybe you should support this.

Gall: I think it's important that we increase on-campus fees. Either fees go up, or services go down. Either way students have to take a cut. This motion reflects reality and addresses the problem. I am in favor.

Hoffman: I am a part-time off-campus student taking a night class, so how will I be considered?

Church: In your situation you'd be considered a part-time student and not an off-campus student.

Odynski: You should clarify that off-campus students and part-time students are paying the same amount, and they'll both be increased.

Friendly amendment to strike the bracketed part in Part ii of the question.
Unanimous consent.

Weppeler: There has been a clear voice from students to put this question to referendum. I am in support of this because it's very important for students to decide this issue.

Chaput: I fear that this issue has lost support from the people who tried to bring it around in the first place. I urge you to vote no.

Veale / Brindle moved to have a ten minute recess.
Carried

[Recess]

Return from Recess

Poon, W. / Wepler moved to extend Council for a maximum of one hour, until 10:25 pm
Carried

Church / Samuel moved that Council approve the motion in principle and refer the question to the Internal Review Board for further refinement.

Klassen: This bastardized version has no support for it, so I don't think it's a viable referendum question.

Brindle: I think there's a large group of students out there who'd vote on the Yes side whether or not a yes campaign was run or not.

Partridge: I cannot support this by principle without seeing the actual question.

Odynski: I speak in favor of referring this to IRB. We need a clear intent, and that won't be made at 9pm. For the sake of our sanity, refer this to IRB.

Wepler: What would the timing be and would IRB be open to student participation?

Church: We have an IRB meeting at 6pm on Monday. Students can and are welcome to attend.

Vote on motion to refer the matter to IRB

Carried

2000-19/10d
GATEWAY
REFERENDUM

SAMUEL/HARLOW MOVED THAT Students' Council upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the following as a referendum question for the 2001 SU General Elections:

“Do you support *The Gateway* becoming an arms-length student institution that will operate a fund of approximately \$125,000 per year subject to 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?

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

Church introduced the motion.

Again, this didn't qualify as a valid petition. The Gateway and SU relations are strained. The Executive has several issues of accountability. The relationship we have now with the Gateway is unacceptable. We could try and exert more control or instead we could try and give the Gateway the chance to exert more ownership

over the production process. We thought there is potential to move us to a new relationship that could be aided with a dedicated fee. I think this could be a very bold step forward. It's my suggestion that Council moves this motion in principle and leaves the actual wording to IRB, but also that Council has the expectation that if this referendum is passed, a bylaw would be written to determine a new relationship that would exist.

Veale: Could you explain the dedicated fee aspect – would we be levying a dedicated fee just to run the Gateway? If so, what happens to the money the Gateway gets now?

Church: The answer is complicated. The Gateway right now is budgeted to break even. By not being a direct part of our operational budget we're not feeling a substantial gain or loss.

Roesch: I can't support this motion. If we put this to referendum we're asking for money on no basis of a working relationship. Where does accountability work into this?

Partridge: Why did it go from \$2.00 to \$2.50?

Harlow: We never felt that the budget put forth by the Gateway was accurate. \$2.50 is accurate.

Murphy (sp. by **Brindle**): I care deeply about this. I oppose this motion strenuously. We have a referendum and then we're going to negotiate – this is backwards. In my experience, I don't think that the relationship between the SU and the Gateway is a poor one. I think there's a personality conflict. When I was on Council the relationship was fine. There are times when the business side needs to mediate the editorial side. Nobody ever likes their boss, everyone always wants more autonomy. It'd be better to address specific problems and make bylaws for them. The SU is there to provide support for the Gateway. You have to stay accountable to your advertisers. I urge you to oppose this.

Poon, T.: I wondered what the Gateway felt about their question being modified.

Lazin: As my hair attests, I have been ill. I haven't looked at the question closely. There are a few points where the lack of clarity is troublesome. I don't have any strenuous objections. I'd very much like to see this be referred back to IRB.

Samuel: What comes first, the referendum or the terms? To negotiate the terms is a grueling process. Once we get some direction from the student body, then we will negotiate new terms. That way we get a clear mandate that will allow us to negotiate clearer terms.

Harlow: We do have financial accountability right now and there is no editorial accountability – that is up to the Gateway's editorial staff. It gets sent out there and we pick up the pieces. This can't be solved unless one of us becomes Gateway editor, which will not happen. So we must move past editorial accountability. I believe that this gives us far more flexibility to determine a future relationship that will be more accountable than the present one. Better that we act now as opposed to sit back and wait for events to be dictated to us. Take a leap and vote in favor.

Coles: To Church or Agard, regarding the policy on Gateway autonomy – Council voted in favor for that policy. This goes against what was said the previous week.

Church: I still have concerns about these particular points. The fundamental principle is re-addressing this relationship.

Jorgensen: Was the full Executive present at the meeting?

Church: No.

Jorgensen: Who was absent?

Church: Wanke

Harlow: What was being proposed before was wrong and should not be supported. This is not that. We either seize the situation or be dictated to by the situation.

Partridge: What is the VP Student Life's stance?

Church: I can't speak for her.

Gall: I have trouble actually voting for this because I don't know what it will look like in the end.

Salyzyn: I still can't understand that if the Gateway is a break-even organization, why is there more funding being requested?

Harlow: There is to be some division between the Gateway and the SU. For example, you can't have the same staff under both the Gateway and the SU. The reality is that if you split them up, additional costs will occur.

Salyzyn: Do you see a corresponding decrease in SU fees?

Harlow: It's possible, but I don't know. Who knows what is exactly going to come down the pipe?

Lazin: We spend a great sum of money each year on equipment and the SU will not have to pay for this any longer. This year the Gateway is budgeted to lose money. The extra money is probably more money than I'd like to ask for. Keep in mind that some of this money will go to additional services.

Webster (sp. by **Spencer**): I think we've all acknowledged there is a problem, but this question says nothing. If it were put in front of students it would probably pass because there is nothing there to oppose. I don't think this is in the interest of the students, students enjoy the paper as it is now.

Clark (sp. by **Samuel**): The wording of the referendum question must be clear in intent, it only goes to IRB for word-smithing. This referendum that you pass tonight must be clear in intent. As CRO I need clear intent to run Gateway ads to ensure a fair No campaign is run.

Church: This is by far the most complicated issue that I've had to deal with this year. There will never be an instance where all the specifics of an arrangement are in a referendum question – that is out of the scope of a referendum. If you're not comfortable with this question or the intent, I do not want to push it through. There are alternatives. We could undergo third party mediation.

Murphy (sp. by **Brindle**): To the average student, there are no problems with the Gateway. On the point of accountability, we are already at arms-length with the Gateway. The issue I'm talking about is the issue of libel, these things do happen. We'd be divesting our ability to print an apology as a publisher. We'd open ourselves up to legal censure. We don't know what this means. This is giving autonomy without knowing what it is. There is no certainty here. We don't have a budget to look at. I encourage you again to vote this down. We shouldn't make compromised decisions in advance of something that might happen in the future.

Gall: Could someone explain to me what would happen if this doesn't pass?

Clark (sp. by **Samuel**): Council has full reign on election referenda. It's your job to decide this.

Lazin: I think it's very telling that everyone who works at the Gateway feels that this is an issue. The newspaper can be better. We could get enough signatures. We will get our other 60 signatures and submit them to Ms. Clark. It wouldn't be fair to postpone the referendum for a year.

Roesch: I don't think we should put through a motion that we only half support.

Kwok: If the chief instigators of this motion support it, we should too.

Kurran (sp. by **Poon, W.**): The signatures and nominations the Gateway has collected – can those be applied to a new referendum?

Speaker: That's possibly an issue for DIE board to consider.

Clyburn (sp. by **Gall**): I'm a student and the majority of the student population does not know that this is an issue.

Lazin: I understand that Ms. Clark wants some direction on this. The terms now are quite unclear. I'd ask Council to refer this to DIE board with some direction on fees. You could consider the budget we put forth as a worst-case scenario.

Harlow / Brindle moved to call the previous question
Carried

Vote on main motion
14/11/4
Carried

Church: Point of clarification. Did we just vote on the question itself or on the motion to refer it to IRB?

Speaker: The vote was on the question itself, since no one actually made a motion to refer it to IRB.

Harlow / Kwok moved to reconsider the vote on the motion relating to the Gateway referendum question
Carried

Church / Samuel moved to refer the motion to IRB for consideration.

Clark (sp. by **Samuel**): What if IRB gives a question you don't agree with, are we going to move election dates? What will happen?

Church: Students' Council has approved these in principle for IRB to consider. This motion has been brought forward by the Executive. If Council is not comfortable with the wording by next Tuesday, it's Council's right to reject the entire motion. Next Tuesday night is the absolute deadline.

Spencer: Where does that leave the CRO?

Church: Campaigning hasn't started yet.

Clark : The deadline for applications for referendum campaigns is Friday, any side can run a campaign and will receive \$1000.

Vote on motion to refer the question
Carried

2000-19/10e
POWER PLANT
PROJECTOR

HARLOW/CHURCH MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee approve an expenditure of no more than \$5,915.00 to purchase a projector for use at the Power Plant.

Harlow introduced the motion.

As I said earlier, revenue at the Power Plant is down by \$40,000. It's not making as much money as we expected in the budget. The initiative to rectify this is to improve the programming. We wish to purchase a projector in order to show large-screen movies, thereby generating more revenue.

Weppler: I think this makes the poison pill easier to swallow by seeing our fees going to something as useful as this (*sarcasm noted by RS*).

Poon, W.: I think I've seen a projector there before. Was it borrowed or stolen? Where would this new projector go?

Harlow: We do have a projector, it's currently in Dewey's. We don't move it back and forth because it's highly sensitive.

Poon, W.: Where would the projector go?

Kuper (sp. by **Harlow**): There's a spot by the bar where we could hang it.

Spencer: I think this is great, as it would help student groups who want to run an event at the Plant.

Martin-Iverson: I spend a lot of time at the Power Plant. Maybe one of the reasons revenue is down is that the service is bad.

Church: Before Christmas, we approved a price increase for new initiatives like this.

Brindle: Three words: giant screen karaoke!

Lazin: I wonder why they are buying this system when better systems are available for less?

Kuper (sp. by **Harlow**): We asked our technical person to find a good projector and VCR at the best price – this was his recommendation.

Lazin: I suggest Council approve this money but look at getting a CRC projector.

Harlow: I have to trust the recommendations of my staff are correct. He has a little more information than Mr. **Lazin** has. As per service, I will go to the manager and demand better service.

(*General applause*)

Vote on motion

Carried

2000-19/10f
BSA
LINE OF CREDIT

HARLOW/HOFFMAN MOVED THAT Students' Council extend a \$30,000 line of credit to the Business Students' Association for the purpose of operating the April 2001 Beer Gardens.

Harlow introduced the motion.

Ever year groups come to the SU to request loans for their initiatives.

Spencer: Have they ever not paid it back?

Hoffman: No.

Vote on motion

Carried

**2000-19/10g
ADDITIONAL
STUDENTS'
COUNCIL
MEETING**

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

Harlow introduced the motion.

It's a no-brainer. If we don't pass this, much of what we've done today goes down the drain.

Van Aerde: Is this non-constitutional?

Harlow: We're not violating any regulation.

Veale: I'd like abbreviated quantified.

Church: I can't give a time limit, but there will be three things on the agenda: the two referenda wordings and the third constitutional readings. There will be no reports or anything else.

Friendly amendment to add the words "to deal only with referenda questions and pending constitutional amendments" at the end of the motion.

Unanimous consent.

Vote on motion

Carried

2000-19/11

INFORMATION ITEM

**2000-19/11a
STUDENTS'
COUNCIL
ATTENDANCE
RECORD**

Students' Council Attendance record from May 3/00 to Jan 30/01 is included in the agenda package as an information item only

2000-19/12

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Upcoming Faculty Reports

- Pharmacy
- Rehabilitation Medicine

•Next Council Meeting

- Tuesday, February 13, 2001 in SUB 3rd floor at 6:00 pm

•Future Council Meeting

- March 20, 2001
- April 3, 2001
- April 11, 2001
- April 24, 2001

2000-19/13

ADJOURNMENT

Adihetty / Taher moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:22 pm.