

# STUDENTS' COUNCIL

September 9, 2003  
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

**ATTENDANCE (SC 2003-11)**

Faculty/ Position	Name	Present/ Absent @ 6pm	Present/ Absent @ 9pm	Vote 1	Vote 2
President	Mat Brechtel				
VP Academic	Janet Lo			X	
VP External	Chris Samuel	X		X	
VP Finance	Tyler Botten			X	
VP Student Life	Jadene Mah			X	
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Roman Kotovych			Absent	Absent
University of Alberta Athletics Board Exec Officer	Kevin Petterson	X	X	Absent	Absent
Agric/Forest/Home Ec					
Arts	Alex Abboud				X
Arts	Chris Bolivar (Michelle Kelly)			X	
Arts					
Arts	Erin Kelly			X	
Arts	James Knull			X	
Arts	Chris Laver	X		X	

Arts	Terra Melnyk			X	
Arts	Heather Wallace			X	X
Arts	Paul Welke			X	
Business	Adam Cook			X	X
Business	Steve Smith			X	
Education					
Education	Allison Ekdahl	X		X	Absent
Education	Christine Wudarck (Mandeep Gill)			X	
Engineering	Josh Bazin			X	
Engineering	Paige Smith (Cole Nychka)				X
Engineering	David Weppler				X
Law	Dean Hutchison				X
Residence Halls Association	Samantha Kelch		X	X	Absent
Medicine/Dentistry	Jesse Pewarchuk				
Medicine/Dentistry					
Native Studies (School of	Matthew Wildcat				
Nursing					
Nursing					
Open Studies					
Open Studies					
Pharmacy					
Physical Education	Holly Higgins			X	
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth			X	

Faculté Saint-Jean	Zita Dube (Dave Arsenault)				
Science	Anne Aspler	X		X	Abstain
Science	Tereza Elyas				
Science	Aisha Khatib	X		Abstain	
Science	James Meeker	X	X	Absent	Absent
Science	Shawna Pandya				Abstained
Science	Elaine Poon				
Science	Steven Schendel	X		Absent	
Science	Duncan Taylor				
Science	LeeAnn Lim				
President Athletics					
General Manager	Bill Smith	X	X		
Speaker	Gregory Harlow				
Recording Secretary	Shirley Ngo				

**Guests of Council:** Chad Moore, Mike Kolinsky, Graham Lettner, Mimi Simon, Stephen Congly, Matthew Eaton, Kyle Kawanami, James Crossman

## MINUTES (SC 2003-11)

**2003-11/01**

### CALL TO ORDER

Speaker calls the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

**2003-11/02**

### NATIONAL ANTHEM “O CANADA”

**TAYLOR** led Students’ Council in the singing of the National Anthem.

**2003-11/03**

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

**SMITH** led Students’ Council in the singing of the Cheer Song.

**2003-11/04**

### STUDENTS’ UNION CREDO

**WALLACE** led Students’ Council in the reading of the credo.

**2003-11/05**

### SPEAKER’S BUSINESS

**Speaker** – Received a resignation letter from Councilor Beamish.

**2003-11/06**

### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

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

**LO/BRECHTEL MOVED TO** add item 14b to the agenda.

**LO** – Flights changed on a daily basis and I can save up to \$200 if I book by tomorrow morning.

**Carried.**

**BOTTEN/LAVER MOVED TO** add the remainder of late addition package to the agenda.

**Carried.**

**Speaker** – Item 14a should actually appear under the Boards and Committees report, so it will be under section 11.

**Carried.**

**SMITH** – There are some political policies about the smoking ban, it will likely come back next meeting, please have a look at it. We will be looking at it next meeting.

**Main motion is carried.**

2003-11/07  
2003-11/07a

**PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION**

**Bear Scat – Presentation by Janet Lo and Stephen Kirkham**

**LO** – Some of you may know that Bear Scat is a SU service. We are going to answer questions, so you can tell students about it. Stephen Kirkham is the creator of Bear Scat.

**KIRKHAM** – On Monday Sept 1<sup>st</sup>, Bear Scat was re-launched. You can view your current schedule as well as add, drop and swap any of your courses. Bear Scat uses your CNS ID to actually gain access to it. Additional features include the ability to save schedules. Very useful especially in March when you can't register to April 1<sup>st</sup>, so you can save schedule until you can register. Also, Bear Scat will send you an email when you get a grade update. There is also a watch-list. If a course is full, add it to your watch list and as soon as a space opens up, Bear Scat will send you an email so you can register in it. There is also a suggested text book list. Instead of going through those 400-500 pages binders, you can go through the list and it will give you the title and author you need for the classes you are registered in. Another feature, after you have designed your schedule, you can click the register button and Bear Scat will try to register those courses for you.

**LO** – We feel this is going to be a valuable tool. Please let as many students you know.

**HUTCHISON** – Can this handle a lot of students at once?

**KIRKHAM** – Yes, Bear Scat will not have any problems.

**PANDYA** - Would it be possible to send an email out to the councilors about this (Bear Scat)?

**LO** – yes

2003-11/08

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**BAZIN/SMITH MOVED TO** approve the minutes.

**BAZIN** – Laver was not my proxy. I was here.

**BOTTEN** - Page 7, response to Wudarck's question, 4<sup>th</sup> line should read, "...and we decided to approve it, that was based on the knowledge I had on the topic with my background as Information Services Director". 6th line - "referring to" should be "referred to" ... also "in prior rates" should be "at the old rate". 9th line, should read "Residential Tenancies Act". 13th line - Marc's name is with a 'c' not a 'k'.

Page 10 - following ABOUD's comment - I'd like to strike the entire comment and replace it with: "If we don't have the authority to perform a thorough review of the CAUS budget or impose any controls, is the cost to CAUS really an issue here?" Page 12 - Aber" should be "APIRG" (same goes for SMITH's comment just above that) and it should be the "fees and funds not yet disbursed from two years ago" (not last year), change "fuller" to "full", and "embed" to "discuss". Item 14a (page 13)

should start off as "Councilor Laver", 14b (page 14) 4th line - should read "In the proposal that was sent to the University, Council already approved the amount to be spent." 7th line - remove "something offered with"

Page 15 - 2nd sentence - should read: "Regarding the liability issue - that would have been great to bring up when the initial proposal was brought before Council." Last sentence - should read: "The issue before you is that the University has given us a cheque for this purpose and we would like to have the agreement from Council to make the necessary purchases, for which the money was expressly provided to us."

Page 19 -14d, 1st comment: should read: "FAB had the opportunity to hear a presentation from FACRA on the budget. We are providing their proposed budget for the upcoming year, and would like to release the funds collected for 2003/2004." 2nd comment: should read: "I looked at minutes from last year, and I could not find a strict motion to disburse funds to FACRA anywhere. If anyone has a problem with this being approved here, they can move to strike it. It is not customary for the budget to come to Council, from what I can see, but having it approved in this fashion is my interpretation of the relevant bylaw."

Page 21 – Announcements, "CRAP" should be "CCRAP"

SMITH - Page 5 - The SMITH quote should read "Question for the President. What changed between July 27th, when the President assured Council that the Council "meeting" on August 16th absolutely needed to be a formal meeting, and August 15th, when he suddenly decided that it wouldn't be a formal meeting after all? Why could this not have been decided more in advance of the meeting?"

Page 6 - The SAMUEL quote should be a SMITH quote and should read "To clarify, I had asked what changed between July 27th and last Friday. All of the answers thus far provided by the President are things that could have been, should have been, and were by some people understood July 27th."

Page 9 - The SMITH quote should read "Speaking against the motion by Kotovych. CAUS is meant to represent the university students of Alberta on all issues, not just Albertan ones."

The KOTOVYVH quote should read "Yes, this is an issue that is important. But to lobby at a provincial level, is it important? Why are we trying to change CAUS into CASA?"

Page 12 - The first SMITH quote should read "Under Bylaw 4300, IRB is required to review the structure of the Students' Union on an ongoing basis. That alone is sufficient mandate for IRB to make this sort of recommendation. Quite apart from that, Council directed IRB to do a full review of Students' Union legislation. Some people have held that this was meant only to "clean up" the form of our bylaws without altering the structure, but why would Council have bothered to move such a motion if the intent was only to re-arrange some paragraphs and examine our sentence structure? I very much resent the President's suggestion that IRB will be constrained only by what it considers appropriate; in fact, IRB will be constrained by what Council considers appropriate. If Council does not want IRB to expend any more effort on discussing separation of powers, it should simply defeat this motion on September 9th. The next meeting of IRB is 4:30 pm on Monday August 25th; I hope to see councilors there."

The second SMITH quote should read "I notice that the disbursements of the GSJS and FACRA funds are coming to Council tonight. What is the progress on the disbursement of the APIRG Fund?"

The third SMITH quote should read "I won't go over this in too much detail right now, since Council has already seen the intent of this motion twice before. We are trying to restructure the way we amend legislation, as well as clarify and entrench the role of IRB as the drafting body."

Page 13 - The SMITH motion should read "THAT section 4a be changed to section 5, "Notwithstanding [...] for students in those faculties" with the rest of the bylaw to be renumbered appropriately"

Also, it should be minuted somewhere that both the SMITH amendment and the JONES amendment were accepted as friendly.

Page 16 -The first SMITH motion (the one you minuted) was accepted as friendly. Immediately after I moved it, I moved another one, to read "SMITH/BAZIN MOVED THAT "the President" be struck in favor of "an individual elected by and from the committee's permanent membership." This motion was eventually withdrawn at the top of page 17.

Page 17 - The first SMITH comments should read "If, as the President says, the intent of the board is solely to act as an advisory board to the Executive, it is sensible that the President should chair. I would like to withdraw my amendment in favour of another one."



The SMITH motion on this page should read exactly as it does, except without everything from "striking councilors" in the first line to "be open to all councilors interested" in the fourth and fifth lines, so that it should read "SMITH/BAZIN MOVED THAT the motion be amended by striking "to examine and provide recommendations on tuition based issues" and replacing it with "to monitor, participate in [...]" and so on.

My second comments should read "The President has asserted that this committee is meant only to be an advisory committee. I am simply moving an amendment to establish that in the motion, and remove its existing ambiguity. It would also direct Council's existing committees to do their jobs on this issue and draft appropriate political policies to advise Council."

My third comments should read "If the President would prefer a date other than October 31st, I am open to that. however, on the actual content of the motion, he is attempting to have it both ways. He claims that he should chair the committee because it will be nothing but an Executive advisory body, but he refuses to entrench its status as such in the motion."

Page 18 - My comments should read "This would not make sense, because we appear to be asking this committee to do something very important on behalf of Council, but the President also appears unwilling to state, in the motion, exactly what that something is. If we are striking a committee, we need to at least clarify its mandate and to whom it reports. That is the intent of my amendment."

Page 19 - I would like the first line to read "BAZIN nominates SMITH, SMITH declines as he does not wish to be associated with a committee with a secret mandate."

My comments at the bottom of the page should read "The Vice President (Operations and Finance) is correct. Last year, FAB considered that it was acting on delegated authority from Council, and brought the disbursement to Council only in the form of an item in the Financial Affairs Board report. I believe that this is authority that is best delegated to FAB, and that we should have faith in it. that said, I will abstain on this motion due to conflict-of-interest."

**BRECHTEL** – Spelling of my last name, please correct. Also, wherever it says "GATTS", it should be "GATS".

2003-11/09

### QUESTION PERIOD

**TAYLOR**- Question for the VP student life – Lots of students came to our office asking about handbooks. Anything that can be done to tweak the number of handbooks.

**MAH** – Last year we ran out of handbooks in a day and a half. This year, we ran out of handbooks right away on day 1. Given what I know about the scenario, I'll make sure we'll have some handbook report debacle to ensure that the 2004 handbooks will be less painful than the 2003 debacle.

**BRECHTEL** – The reason we ran out is because we produced as many as we could from selling ads. The number we bought is according to how many ads we were able to sell.

**ABBOUD** – Question for the CRO. People are inquiring me about by-elections for Students' Council. I couldn't find any sort of poster that indicated that there are by-elections. What method is the CRO taking to promote this so students know they can run for council?

**CRO** – In addition to the Gateway, we will have some posters tomorrow or Thursday. I sent out an email today to recruit some people to do some classroom speaking.

**BAZIN** – Question for Botten: How he felt barbeque Canada went.

**BOTTEN** – As I mentioned to some fellow in the journal. It was a success, except that we ran out of food. We had some buns left over, goal was 6000 but we hit about 5500 people. Everything was good. Thanks to everything that helped out.

**HUTCHISON** – Question for VP Student Life: Does the SU rent barbeques?

**MAH** – Yes, Jenifer Bloomfield books one or another and so does L'Express. Call the front desk. 492-4936 and they will point you in the right direction. As long as you are a student group, then you will be able to rent one.

**CONGLY** – Question for the BoG: Concerning the smoking ban, will you be voting in favor or not, and why?

**KOTOVYCH** – I'm not in favor of the smoking ban. I remember in Jr. high, students would go off school property and smoke in other people's property. This is not a good way to build relationships. There are other measures that can be instigated by the university.

**WALLACE** – The ASA has a website that has yet to be updated in the last 2 years. When will it be updated?

**KNULL** – This is in no way pertinent to SU. I invite councilor Wallace to come to me after council and talk about this.

**BOLIVAR** – With respect to Bear Scat, does the SU own the intellectual property of that system?

**LO** – SU does not own the rights of Bear Scat. It is retained by the creator.

**HUTCHISON** – Question for the President: The issue of handbooks is with sales of advertising space. Law has been going to SU for advertising help, but the help has been pretty dismal. What steps has been taken to get extra advertising dollars? Who has been looking after it and how can a great job be done?

**BRECHTEL** – We hired someone to help us. She thought she would sell more ads and it was her first time doing it. Our handbook is under review. I hope we will be able to figure something out for next year. Hopefully we will be able to sell more ads next year.

**MAH** – The handbook is a SU service. The handbook is something we need to look at it, not just selling ads, but look at the entire project of the handbook. This is something that we can send to the student life board.

2003-11/10

**APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

**BRECHTEL** – The policies we approved are in the late additions package.

**BAZIN** – Item 4d, what is it going to be used for?

**SAMUEL** – Going to be the first annual seniors day, hosted by U of A SU. We're bringing in about 100 seniors to experience what the U of A is like. Great event for building the coalition we need, such as political lobbying. It will hopefully be a very successful event.

2003-11/11

**APPROVAL OF STUDENTS' UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEES REPORTS**

2003-11/11a

**BOTTEN/BAZIN MOVED THAT** Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Committee for Council Reform and Progress, accept the proposed changes to the Standing Orders of Students' Council (first reading).

**BOTTEN** – CRAP has finished its work in updating its standing orders. The committee has had several different compositions. We met every 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday after council. The new standing orders are included. I will briefly go through the significant changes. Scrapped the national anthem, credo, and Cheer song. These will be included in the swearing in. Where the Speaker has additional powers which he doesn't currently has, such as deciding what the orders of the day will be and adding late additions at his own discretion. Speaker may discipline members of council. This was debated at length and the Speaker can be challenged on any items. Items 14 to 16 deals with the minutes. The minutes will be recorded verbatim. Council may submit changes to the Rec Sec or Speaker. Written questions were added. Council can submit questions prior to the

meeting and written responses can also be submitted. This is for someone who gets a lot of questions and it would be helpful to have the background information with them.

There will also be a 10-minute recess, 90- minutes into the meeting. Not necessarily designed to be smoke-break. Items 26 and 27, speaking times-members can speak no longer than 8 minutes. Also scrapped oral reports for the BoG, the BoG will submit written reports. We don't know if all these are going to work. But general consent of the committee says to give this a shot. It was a lengthy but valuable process. It was a nice process to be a part of.

**SMITH/SAMUEL MOVED TO** limit debate on motion for 30 minutes.

**Carried.**

**SMITH/BAZIN MOVED TO** amend the motion by restoring the approval order of agenda in standing order #1 and strike standing order numbers 9, 29 and 38.

**SMITH** – It is important for council to approve their agenda. It is a way for council to approve what will be debated. General rationale on #29, I've seen what happens in university committees, limited in hands of the chair, tends to do so freely, #38 – can be very dangerous to have a speaker that can have people kicked out. Therefore, would like to see these changes made.

**PANDYA** –Can we divide it into 2 parts? 1<sup>st</sup> part, re-insertion of the agenda, and 2<sup>nd</sup> part is striking 29 and 38?

**PANDYA/KELLY MOVED** to divide the amendment into 2 parts. The first part deals with the re-insertion of the agenda and striking number 9. The second part deals with striking 29 and 38.

**Carried.**

**PANDYA** – re-inserting agenda and striking #9 is one amendment. I agree with this amendment.

**BOTTEN** – I don't believe that doing that is one of the same. #9 is created because members of the committee has heard more often that if things on the agenda has been organized a certain way, things would go more quickly. Rather than having to deal with this first come first serve basis, I don't think it is too terrible to give it a shot.

**SMITH** – I would consider it friendly to strike my strike. So the motion will only be to re-insert the approval of the agenda.

**BRECHTEL** – Will the Speaker be able to set the sequence that council approves the agenda?

**Speaker** – The amendment now is just to re-insert the approval of the agenda.

On the amendment to re-insert the approval of the agenda

**Carried.**

**Speaker** - Now, dealing with the amendments to strike # 29 and 38.

**SMITH** - On 38, it is noted that this is never ever done.

**BOTTEN** – Let's say the speaker was elected, will you be in favor of this

**SMITH** – Conceivably.

**CONGLY** – Concerning the proposed article 38 of new standing orders, I've noticed at times the breach of decorum. Disrespect to the Speakers, insulting of other members of council....I don't see anything wrong with having the Speaker being able to discipline. If councilors feel that this proposal is giving the speaker too much power, maybe have attached to this report, basically allowing council to overrule, or 50% or 2/3<sup>rd</sup>s majority.

**WEPLER** – The reason why they are the Speaker, is that they have to run the meeting. They are selected in a way better process than student councilors. The Speaker is very qualified. The discipline thing is going to be a very rare thing. I don't imagine anybody is going to get kicked out. As for eliminated debate, I think it is a good idea.

Motion moved by SMITH/BAZIN that #29 and 38 be struck.

**Defeated.**

**BAZIN/ABBOUD MOVED TO** strike section 26 and 27 from proposed standing orders.

**BAZIN** – 4 minutes isn't enough time to speak. When people have points to make, they can't always make them in 4 minutes. Restricting the time of debate will decrease debate and is not healthy for our assembly.

**SAMUEL** – Sitting in the CRAP meetings, I think what came out with is that an average speaking time is about 4 minutes. The debate we had was originally a debate time of 3 minutes. It is more important to me as a representative to hear multiple views, instead of certain views. One way to do is to shorten speaking time. I think that this council is interested in expediency and if we want to do things quickly, it is more important to retain the ability to have different points of view.

**WEPLER** – Is it accurate that you have spoke for 1.30minutes and has made several points.

**SAMUEL** – Yes

**WALLACE** – Last council, we timed our speeches, and none of them went over 4 minutes.

**PEWARCHUK** – You can obtain the consent of the assembly to continue past 4 minutes if you have important things to say.

**ABBOUD** – Generally, councilors don't take more than 4 minutes to speak. Just because you don't speak past 4 minutes, is no reason to limit speeches to 4 minutes. If we had limited debate to 30 minutes and 3 councilors took up a good 8-9 minutes, then it becomes an issue. But this is not an issue at this point. I don't think our current speaking minutes discourage anyone from speaking. Most councilors do get around. I urge council to strike this section. We don't need it. There is nothing wrong to give someone 10 minutes if they have 10 minutes of important things to say.

**SMITH** – If carried, when will these amendments take effect?

**Speaker** – We will start at the next meeting of student council.

**POON** – It encourages conciseness and efficiency. Saves everybody time. And people have short attention spans. If you want to be heard, make it concise.

**CONGLY** – Can the time limit for debate be extended?

**Speaker**- Through the approval of SU.

On the motion that 26 and 27 be struck

**Defeated.**

**KOTOVYCH/TAYLOR MOVED TO** amend section 42, roll call prior to adjournment.

**KOTOVYCH** – We’ve had this debate before on how best to deal with attendance issues. Reasons why this was brought forward and received well at CRAP - if you have 2 roll calls, you can eliminate the fact that people will show up late and skip the meeting, or people that may have to leave before the meeting, shouldn’t be penalizing these members. Provides a balance...so if you come in late or leave early, you will have half an absence.

**WEPPLER** – Basically, I don’t like it.

**SAMUEL** – I don’t recall CRAP voting in favor of this.

**Speaker** – This didn’t come forward in the CRAP report. We have about 2 minutes left to consider it.

**Amendment is defeated.**

**WELKE/SAMUEL MOVED TO** strike standing orders 2 and 3.

**WELKE** – Right now we know that council meetings are on Tuesday at 6. If we start giving the Speaker the power to call a meeting at different day, then this may be cause a problem.

**Amendment is Defeated.**

**PEWARCHUK/TAYLOR MOVED** to extend debate by 5 minutes.

**Carried.**

**PEWARCHUK** – The MSA wants to know why the national anthem is removed.

**TAYLOR** – Most legislative bodies sing the Canadian anthem. It reminds us why we are here, reminds us of tradition.



**POON** – I'll like keep the national anthem because of the status quo. I think it is a shame to remove it. It is nice to have the tradition to have the national anthem be sung at the beginning of the meeting.

**EKDAHL** – The national anthem isn't specific to SU. But the Cheer Song is.

Motion to retain the National Anthem, standing order number 1 and 4

**Defeated. (13/20/2)**

**Main motion is carried.**

**SMITH MOVED** to make items 14a and b special orders.

**Carried.**

**2003-11/14a**

**BRECHTEL/BOTTEN MOVED THAT** Students' Council appoint two (2) councilors to sit on the DIE Board Selection Committee (Interviews are scheduled for Friday September 26 @ 5:00pm).

**BRECHTEL** – DIE board is selected on special terms. I don't think there is much detail to it, I encourage you all to take part.

**BAZIN** nominates **SMITH**, **SMITH** accepts

**ABBOUD** nominates **WELKE**, **WELKE** accepts

**Congratulations to councilors SMITH and WELKE.**

**2003-11/14b**

**LO/BOTTEN MOVED THAT** Students' Council approve a budgeted expense not to exceed \$1110.00 for the VP Academic to attend the Canadian Academic Round Table 2 Conference, October 15-19, 2003, in Kitchener, Ontario.

**LO** – Part 2 is the 2<sup>nd</sup> part of the conference you sent me to earlier in May. Dealt with some fairly general issues at that conference. People who have been planning the conference is geared towards more of the things that we will be working on. I think it will be a great opportunity. It's under budget.

**HUTCHISON** – What is the 30/day?

**LO** – Covers the eating expenses.

**Motion is carried. (LO abstained)**

**2003-11/13**

**LEGISLATION**

2003-11/13a

SMITH/BAZIN MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the

recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve amendments to

Students' Union legislation based on the following principles (FIRST and

Second Readings):

(a) that those bodies ultimately responsible for the interpretation of

Students' Union legislation be separate from those bodies ultimately

responsible for formulating and implementing Students' Union

legislation.

(b) that the body responsible for the formulation of legislation be

Students' Council;

(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; and

(d) that no individual receive a voting position of a body in one of the

legislative, executive, or judicial branches of government by virtue of a

position in one of the other branches of government.

**SMITH** – Separation of powers – each responsibility of the SU should be put in the hands of the entity best able to discharge it effectively. Power should be given to a number of entities. A system of checks and balances shall be placed on the entities. Responsibilities are repeatedly given to people that are not supposed to have this.

Power should be divided sufficiently so it is not concentrated in 1 place – SU is powerful, the exec committee has abused its position, power is too concentrated. Therefore it can be abused.

We have a legislative board, but it is impotent. It is unable to do much. Our system needs an overhaul. The IRB submitted to SU, is to set up 3 branches of government. One branch, the SU – council is responsible for making all legislation. These are the issues that SU is the most component to deal with. The executive body is not the most competent to do this. Example, there were 3 opinions I heard from ordinary students. 1<sup>st</sup> opinion, increasing tuition is not a problem, 2<sup>nd</sup> opinion - Why are we going so much student money to CJSR, who does not concentrate on student issues? 3<sup>rd</sup> one, orientation is a waste of \$100,000. The 2<sup>nd</sup> branch is the executive committee. It is responsible for implementing the law set by Students' Council. Student council will not have the ability to interfere with the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is responsible for these decisions. Both the previously mentioned branches will be kept in line by the DIE board. Members of the Executive Committee will no longer be voting member of council. Other major change is that, the Executive Committee reports will not be approved by student council.

Myths – this will make the Executive Committee an impotent plaything of Students' Council. Instead, the Executive Committee will finally have authority to do it job. Conversely, the next myth is that it gives execs too much power. Correct, but if you want to prevent abuse of power, council is not the entity best poised to make the decision.

Next myth – the system works, why mess with it? The system isn't working. The Executive Committee withholds information from council.

I've spoken to executives across the country, we shouldn't be looking at other student associations as models here.

**WELKE/BAZIN MOVED To take a 10- minute recess. Carried.**

**Speaker** – Under the new legislative process that was passed last council, we have a 3 reading system. The 2<sup>nd</sup> reading takes place 2 weeks. But the Claus does not allow the motion to be read a 2<sup>nd</sup> time on the same day, unless 5 members of council objects. So a 2<sup>nd</sup> reading of this will be read next student council. Yes, 5 members objects.

2003-11/13b

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

(a) that there be the following types of Students' Union legislation:

- Bylaws;
- Political Policy; and
- Miscellaneous Motions of Students' Council.

(b) that a Bylaw is any directive from Students' Council perpetually requiring or prohibiting the Students' Union from following a given course of action.

(c) that a political policy is any expression of the opinions or beliefs of the Students' Union.

(d) that a political policy does not require or prohibit the Students' Union from following a given course of action.

(e) that a Miscellaneous Motion is any non-procedural motion not adopting Bylaws or Political Policy.

(f) that a Bylaw is adopted, amended, or rescinded upon the approval of two (2) motions by Students' Council to that effect not less than seven

(7) days apart.

(g) that a motion adopting, amending, or rescinding a Bylaw requires the support of a simple majority of the members of Students' Council voting on that motion.

(h) that a Political Policy is adopted, amended, or rescinded upon the approval of a motion by Students' Council to that effect.

(i) that a motion adopting, amending, or rescinding a Political Policy requires the support of a simple majority of the members of Students' Council voting on that motion.

(j) that a Bylaw does not expire.

(k) that a Political Policy expires on the April 30 occurring not less than three (3) years and not more than four (4) years from the date of its adoption.

(l) that a Miscellaneous Motion expires on the April 30 following its adoption unless otherwise specified in the motion.

(m) that the form of political policy not be stipulated in bylaw.

**Speaker** – I'm quite certain CRAP changed it to 5 people.

**BRECHTEL** – What we passed is what is written.

**Speaker** – At the moment, it says 2/3rds.

**SAMUEL/ABBOUD MOVED TO** collapse reading.

**SAMUEL** – I think that IRB has given council plenty of lead-time to talk to whoever council needs to talk to, to become informed on the issue. The original reason to have the first reading is to allow council to consider the motion fully. I think that given the status of the proposal, I don't think there is a lot more that council can do to consider it further. The principles have been outlined. I would like to see this motion dealt with today. If we are serious about doing this, we will need the time to formulate the proposal.

**SMITH** – Agree with Samuel. Council should be prepared to deal with this tonight. It took 5 people to express their will for it not to be collapsed. I think that we have to defeat this motion.

**COOK** – I think that it was 2/3rds. It needed 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority to suspend standing orders.

**WALLACE** – I talked to everyone I could about this so I can be informed. I don't want to waste IRB's time. My concern is that I think that the expression that even 5 people are unprepared to discuss this tonight. There is no need to rush this. I think it should be clear to every councilor before they make this decision.

**TAYLOR** – I am confused. Is it 5 people who don't want to hear it tonight, or is it 2/3rds majority? Are we doing this to abuse a mistake of our own? Are we exploiting this loophole? Can someone inform me on that?

**SMITH** – In hindsight, Councilor Cook is correct. It was pointed out that 2/3rds is what is needed to suspend. Are we comfortable with that, sufficient to postpone.

**Main motion on collapsing.**

**Defeated.**

**Speaker** - (Reads item 13b in its entirety.)

**BRECHTEL** – This is IRB’s attempt in describing what the SU should look like. Notable changes, a – means that this is approved. Counts as a first reading. We’ve already discussed this. B and C are descriptions of political policies - one is a set of ideas, one is a set of policies. E – when it is non-procedural, it is not anything of things laid out in point A. F – 2 readings, 7 days apart. H – the political policy, political policy does expire. This is just to clarify the time. M – don’t have to follow a specific format.

**KELLY/BOTTEN MOVED** to read the motion a second time.

**Carried.**

**WELKE** – Every now and then, we will be dealing with the media and will be wondering what the SU position with certain issues is. Basically, if we have these political policies that tell people what the SU believes.

**KOTOVYCH**– One thing to bring up, while chatting with the President of Grad Institution - What they do for their president - they have political policies. If the executives feel that they can achieve a better end result by drifting away from that policy, they are allowed to do that. We should have an expression of the worth of political policy. It is important to keep in mind the wishes of students can sometimes contradict itself.

**SMITH** – My intent in IRB, is that political policy itself wouldn’t bind student council.

**SMITH/WELKE MOVED TO** amend 13b by adding – “All officers of SU, be prohibited from taking public positions exclusive of any position taken in a political policy”

**COOK/KELLY MOVED TO** amend 13b by adding “constitution” in (a), as a type of SU legislation. (b) – “That the constitution be the chief governing document of the Students’ Union subject to the legislation of the Province of Alberta” (f) “That a constitution is adopted, amended, or rescinded, upon the approval of three (3) motions by Students’ Council to that effect each of which will not be less than seven (7) days apart.” (g) “That a motion adopting, amending, or rescinding a constitution require the support of a two thirds majority of the members of Students’ Council voting on that motion.” (j) “That the constitution does not expire”

**COOK** – Basically, the constitution is our chief document. It is where I tell students to look up how SU is governed, who is on our executive, where the separation of powers are and where our fees are. That is where the heart of the SU is. It contains several things that we want entrenched in our legislation that cannot be changed by 2 readings. These things should be set aside.

**SMITH** – Even I have never done something like this. IRB received direction, council should not be able to redirect IRB.

**JONES** – There are 2 main problems with Cook’s amendments. If things are too important for council to deal with, why is council allowed to change them? It doesn’t add up. Clearly, this can’t occur. Also, it strikes me that Mr. Cook’s amendments will affect referenda. To sum up, these proposals make no sense and should not stand.

**SMITH/WELKE MOVED** the previous question.  
**Defeated.**

**ABBOUD** - Councilor Cook covered this well. To my mind, constitution is fundamental to any organization. Even if it’s not things that are currently contained in our constitution, it should have some level of legislation that is more important to other legislations. It is important to retain that distinction. What is this message that we are sending to students, is everything on the same level? I urge council to support this. There are some things in my mind that are more important and should be preserved in constitution.

**SMITH** – Abboud says that every worthwhile organization has a constitution. If we are a worthwhile organization, it is not our constitution that makes us a worthwhile constitution? Instead, we are adopting a logical coherent legislative structure. What kind of message are we sending to students? I don't think students care what we call our legislation.

**SMITH** – Give council a single good reason why council should amend this.

**COOK** – Reason why council should have a 2<sup>nd</sup> level is because of communication. Communicating to council and students that we have certain things, such as our constitution that govern us in a certain way. Things that students would take more issues with in changing than others.

**COOK** – I believe the bylaws should be made clear and easy understand - if it is on 2 separate levels. Base level – how we amend them. 2<sup>nd</sup> level -communication issue.

**BOTTEN** – Respect Cook's issue. We have had this debate before. I would like to recommend to not starting over the same debate over again.

**HUTCHISON /SCHENDEL MOVED** the previous question on the amendment.

**Defeated.**

**SAMUEL** – I would encourage council to vote the way they would have originally. If you believe there should be a constitution, vote in favor of having a constitution.

**WELKE** – SU is essentially protected by provincial law. We don't have the ability to make our own constitution. We exist because the government of Alberta says we do.



**WEPPLER** – I think there is one thing to keep in mind when we considering this. What is contained in there is more important. If you combined everything under the same bylaw, there will be some bylaws that will be more important than others. You will always going to have that inequality...some useless bylaws and some important ones. Example, the way this motion is sent to IRB, we've had constitution changes in the pass that passed during the first and 2<sup>nd</sup> meetings and failed on the 3<sup>rd</sup>. The 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority that is required, it goes down to a simple majority. We don't need to be mixing...what is contained in our constitution. There is some overlap with what the University's act does. The fact is, there are bylaws/leg that are more important than others. Those different levels of importance, it should be a different level. They are more important. I am in support of this amendment.

**KOTOVYCH** – Please conduct Roll Call. It is 9:00pm

**Roll call is conducted @ 9:00pm by the Recording Secretary.**

**JONES** – Councilors Cook and Weppler missed one point in the amendments. If the amendment passes, there will be no such thing as a binding referenda. The fact the motion directed IRB to continue on the assumption that there will be no constitution, passed by 1 vote. That is the fundamental distinction. This amendment is flawed.

**COOK/ABBOUD MOVED TO** add amendment that all types of legislation can be created, amended, adopted and rescinded by binding referendum.

**Speaker** – Does that include the ability to amend that portion of the constitution on how the constitution is amended?

**SMITH** – This amendment too is complicated. It is saying that the status quo is going to exist around referendum. We shouldn't be establishing what a referenda system will look like next year. It is on IRB's list of things to do. Defeat this amendment, defeat the other amendment.

**TAYLOR/HUTCHISON MOVED** the previous questions.  
**Carried.**

**COOK/ABBOUD MOVED TO** add amendment to include section (n) – “That all Students’ Union legislation can be adopted, amended, or rescinded by a campus-wide referenda excepting the article stipulating the amending formula for the constitution”  
**Defeated.**

**Main amendment is defeated.**

**WELKE/NYCHKA MOVED to call the main question. Main Motion is carried (25/6/1).**

**2003-11/13c**

**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 (FIRST Reading);  
(a) that general meetings be abolished.

**2003-11/15**

**REPORTS**

**BRECHTEL** – Didn’t get a report done today. Last week was consumed by WOW, as well as celebration of teaching and learning. I debated a lot of separation of power stuff. Before that, an issue called Travel Cuts, trial date has been postponed because our lawyer is in Bosnia, so we won’t have a trial until later.

**LO** – Report is in the late additions. Been asked by our exec assistant to post these across campus (DIE Board flyers), looking for people to be involved with the DIE board.

**SAMUEL** – Bill 43 is coming near us. Tell everyone, get everyone involved. We have our first event, bake sale in front of the legislature. Bring constituents and anybody else that is interested.

**MAH** – Haven’t done anything since WOW. Thank you to the coordinators. We ended up getting a bike registry supported half by campus recreation and campus security.

2003-11/17

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Speaker** – We couldn't fill DIE board last year. If you know somebody that seems interested and knows about SU and is not sitting on any other SU committee, then please encourage them to apply for the DIE board. Next debate on separation of powers is going to be a lengthy one. So, I encourage everybody to look at the motion, if there is something you want to propose, write it down on a piece of paper. Also, a number of us who are joining the Dance Club on Thursdays, and if any of us who are interested in joining us, is welcome to join us.

**ASPLER** – This is my last meeting as the science councilor. Due to accommodation reasons, over-commitments and poor time management, my heart is in a lot of things...sorry for retracting all my commitments. I would like to nominate Justin who is awesome and has been telling me about issues. Learned a lot from you guys.

**BOTTEN** – Still need students for my website review committee. **KNULL** – Come to our flair bartending club meeting!

**SAMUEL** – Debate club is having their first meeting in Humanities Center 2-11 on Wednesday.

2003-11/18

**ADJOURNMENT**

**SMITH/Group answer MOVED TO adjourn @ 9:37pm Carried.**