

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

**October 21, 2003
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall**

ATTENDANCE (SC 2003-14)

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

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

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

Guests of Council: Lisa McLaughlin, Chad Moore, Justin Kehoe, Chelli Kelly, Stephen Kirkham, Sara Katz, Anand Sharma

MINUTES (SC 2003-14)

2003-14/01

CALL TO ORDER

Speaker calls meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2003-4/02

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA CHEER SONG “Ring Out a Cheer”

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

2003-14/03

SPEAKER’S BUSINESS

Speaker - Are there any appointments to council tonight?

SCHENDEL-I would like to wait 2 weeks before appointing someone to council.

OTHER SAMUEL – DIE Board is here next Friday for a complaint that Chris Jones has filed against Gregory Harlow, Paul Reikie, the Students’ Union, against the reinstatement of Paul Reikie.

SMITH/BAZIN MOVED THAT Students’ Union move in camera to release the in camera minutes to DIE Board in the case of Jones vs Harlow, Reikie and all of SU.

Carried.

Speaker - We have a brief report from the CRO.

MOORE – Included on the table is my report includes the by-election. I’ll be here until question period or please send me an email if you have a question. I’m looking at not using the accountants for the upcoming election, what it comes down to is that there are 2 advantages of using them in the past. They knew how to use the ballot machines and they gave us a sense of security. But now, we have new systems and all that is left is the sense of security. More will be coming to SU later. There is a breakdown of the by-election cost on the back page.

Speaker –I’m going to run through some of the commonly used motions. If you know the answer to the question, raise your hands. This gives me an idea whether if council is familiar with the rules of order. I’m going to call out the name of the motion: Motion to postpone, extend limits of debate, move the previous question, lay on the table, a point of order, appeal of the chair, motion to suspend rules, object to consideration of question, point of information, permission/modify motion, motion to read papers, call for orders of day, point of privilege, recess, adjourn, fix the time the assembly shall adjourn, reconsider, reconsider and enter on the minutes.

It looks like the majority of you understand them. If you don’t or want to know more, track me down, my office is on the 5th floor.

2003-14/3a

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

SAMUEL/REIKIE MOVED THAT the minutes be approved.

BOTTEN - Item 10a, Page 18, first paragraph. Replace speech with, “Up until now, I have yet to be convinced of the quote from Councilor Smith, "If however, we move to a separated system...we can gain so much more". We are talking about political ideologies. I don't mean to demean it or compare it to other forms of government, but this government is here for students. I don't think we should take this away. We are not debating specifics here and so we say, "sure, let's send this to IRB". My concern in doing so is, that when the legislative review task was sent to IRB, what came back was this, and I just wanted to point that out. Still, I would agree that there are many problems with our government - that I can't disagree with, but this is not the solution. We haven't yet looked for a solution outside of this.”

Also, on top of Page 18, insert the following to my comment “sounds like the representatives of each faculty will not be dealing with the matters of greatest importance to students, and thus will not be making decisions that affect them. These changes theoretically sound terrific, but this sounds like change for the sake of change and that is not something this body should be doing.”

WALLACE – Page 6, the question should read, “You alluded to the fact that this year there may be money from the provincial government. If there is more money will a guaranteed percentage of it go to fight rising tuition costs, no matter how much money we get from the province?”

Page 18, the send sentence should read, “I would stand as an example of someone...”, lines 6-7 should read, “...executive committee that will do what they want to do and councilors will want to oversee that.”. Lines 9-10, “The executive branch should not be a separate entity”. Line 11, “Do I think separation of powers will ameliorate”, line 18, “our budget is 9 million”.

Page 21 – “I would like to know where the Bill 43 campaign is”

2003-14/4

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

BAZIN/SAMUEL MOVED THAT the agenda be approved

PANDYA MOVED TO withdraw as a seconder from 11b.

SAMUEL/TAYLOR MOVED THAT the late addition package, with the exception of 11f be added to the agenda.

SAMUEL – 11d, c, e are important because we need these people for the next meeting.

BRECHTEL/ KOTOVYCH MOVED TO add 11f

BRECHTEL - Discussions have been going on between us and university. The process needs to be dealt with, and we need to have council’s opinion and motion.

SMITH – The motion is to approve the negotiations. I think councilors would like the time to look over this.

Speaker – I need council to decide if this meets the criteria of a late addition. So if you vote yes, it will be included in the agenda.

Will of chair is upheld (17/12/0).

REIKIE – I feel this will come to us in one time or another. We should talk about it sooner than later. I feel that it is inappropriate to discuss if there are some tags we can put on this, maybe attach some amendments to this.

Carried.

Main motion is carried.

2003-14/5

PRESENTATIONS

WEPLER - A good friend of ours, his dad just got diagnosed for cancer. We decided to do something, head shave for cancer kind of thing. So I was thinking, the last time I shaved my head, I was a camp councilor, the kids were really good one week, so I let them cut my hair. So, as a friendly competition, whoever raises the most money can shave my head on November 1st. Councilor Bazin will also be shaving his head. I'll post something on the web board. I was thinking if it would work best if it was a faculty kind of thing. I will be posting the pictures. The money is going to the Alberta Cancer Society in the name of our friend's dad.

BAZIN – It will be at Southgate mall. Just come out and watch us.

2003-14/6

QUESTION PERIOD

DUBE – for VP Academic, I attended an AAB meeting yesterday, wondering where the follow up of the meeting is and why it isn't in the minutes,

LO – It is coming within 15 minutes.

BAZIN – VP External, Like to know how the Bill 43 BBQ, did we make money, how many people showed up?

SAMUEL – The total cost was the gross expense was \$621.58. Gross income was \$368. We were budgeted to run the event at a loss, raising awareness for the BBQ. We ended up with a lot of frozen meat, so there will be another BBQ this Friday. The event ran a cost to the SU of about \$253. It's tough to estimate how many people came out. I would say about 200-250 bought food, but a lot more stopped by and asked about Bill 43.

PEWEARCHUK – Question for the President: I read in the bylaws that executives have to submit a final report. From last year's execs, who submitted their reports and received their full final pay and did they submit their report? And by this Friday, can get a copy of the reports?

BRECHTEL – I don't know all the details. 3 people were garnished for last year. 2 other individuals received their full wage. For next council meeting, I would be happy to find the report. I can complete my final report, but I'm happy just losing money too. Last year's VP Student Life submitted his report.

PEWARCHUK – Did he receive his full pay?

BRECHTEL – Yes. The Personnel Manager gave him the full pay

BAZIN – same question as last week about CramDunk

BOTTEN – The number I have in front of me, from the end of September, CramDunk is \$6300 over budget—better than budget, so I mean under budget. The month of September was promising. The budgeted loss was \$725. The year to actual was \$726 loss.

HUTCHISON – Would it be possible to ensure there are sufficient late addition packages to councilors?

Speaker – Yes, I will see to it.

2003-14/7

APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (MINUTES)

TAYLOR – What is Item 1b?

BRECHTEL – This letter was in response to letter to Chris Jones wrote. The letter was about requesting money for extra handbooks. The executive committee didn't think it was appropriate to give money to ESS so this to the letter we wrote to him

ABBOUD – Can the President clarify what the nature and grievance from Mr. Jones is about?

BRECHTEL – SU ran out of handbooks and ESS ran out of handbooks. In some ways, I view that as a success. However, ESS was under the impression that the SU handbook was refused to engineering students. When we spoke with the executive committee, the people at the info booth was that they told students that there were faculty specific books, but if they wanted one, they could get a general handbook. That is the situation, ESS felt that we unduly produced burden on them. Because of that, they ran out of handbooks, they took a loss and produced more handbooks, so they took a hit and they believe that we needed to reimburse them.

BOTTEN - I would like to speak to the report. I wanted to point out that items 1a and 2a are in fact the same, and this is not an administrative error. The 'current' version of Operating Policy 7.17 that you have, was approved on Sept 25, not Sept 29. Basically this policy needed some cleaning up. There was some redundancy, though the important item is that I eliminated a former point, and now conference budgets for executive members, as with all other staff, need not be approved by Students' Council after they have been approved as part of the final budget. The reason behind this was, to avoid problems from time constraints creating additional costs, for example booking flights, and it was done in hopes of having everything approved up front without the second stage of approval. Council will still receive a report after the Executive member returns from any conference.

SMITH – On 7.17, wondering if Student Council is now receiving reports of all student employees?

BOTTEN – I decided to include that there. Only because there is no distinguish employee versus executive member. I will go back to fix this to say that reports from executive members will be forwarded to student council.

2003-14/8

APPROVAL OF STUDENTS' UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEES REPORT

SAMUEL/WALLACE MOVED THAT the Eugene L. Brody Funding Committee Report be approved.

WALLACE – The United Way campaign is kicking off. All of the money is donated on campus that day will go to our campus food bank which is in terrible need right now. They need shampoo, beans, canned vegetables and soy milk. This brings out the idea that there is a serious lack of funds for students, and raises hunger awareness. The faculty associations will be doing a presentation on November 5 and the Eugene Brody Committee decided to kick this off and donated \$500. This is the first time student union is participating in this.

Carried with unanimous consent.

2003-14/9

OLD BUSINESS

2003-14/9a

ABBOUD/BAZIN MOVED the motion from “CHURCH/AGARD MOVED THAT Students' Council reaffirm support for the Travel Cuts lawsuit”

SMITH – This motion is unnecessary. If motion is carried, status quo continues, if not, status quo continues.

Carried.

2003-14/10

LEGISLATION

2003-14/10a

BOTTEN/SMITH MOVED THAT, upon recommendation of the Internal Affairs Board, Students' Council repeal Article X of the Students' Union Constitution.

BOTTEN – We've discussed before, introduced this before. Decided to scrap the general meeting motion. Let's kick this, it would be in line with decisions we've made so far.

WELKE – Which reading is this?

Speaker – This is first reading.

WELKE – Possible to collapse 2 readings?

Speaker – No.

COOK – Will this go to the committee after this? Are articles of our bylaws reference this, will those need to come in as well?

Speaker – The bylaw that outlines this is ready for 3rd reading. It still has to go back to IRB.

Carried with unanimous consent.

2003-14/11

NEW BUSINESS

2003-14/11a

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

CURRENT

27. Length of Speeches

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

PROPOSED

27. Length of Speeches

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

Speaker – For the reason of time, since we have already debated about it. I am going to limit debate to 3 speakers in favor and 3 speakers opposed.

BAZIN – During our Separation of Powers debate, when we are debating something with substance to it, speakers can't take points of order.

ABBOUD – There is a simply solution to this problem. Whoever has control of the floor can refuse the point of information. The same things happened during the Separation of Powers. With only 4 minutes, I wanted to use up all of it. I think our debate really suffered because of that. Point of information's are valuable to our process. If you think about it, we are looking at important issues later, like tuition. I don't feel it is in our best interest to limit our speaking times. If people are worried about points of information, they can deny them.

KOTOVYCH – I spoke against Samuels' initiative. I told him it was a bad idea. We've dealt with standing orders so much, so I don't want this to come back again. I agree that time should be longer, I disagree with the precedence.

SAMUEL – I believed shorten speaking time would enhance debate, but it has done quite the opposite as seen during the Separation of Powers. What I think happened here was that it was an ideal process. Council tried something new and council should go back to what we had before. I think it is a valuable process to go through as a body. I think it will streamline the process council goes through. Please vote in favor of the amendment.

DUBE – I speak against it. I think we are forgetting about the people who waste time. We would have a more efficient council if we are forced to be more coherent and succinct in what we say. I feel we need to consider that when we are voting on this motion.

BOTTEN – If you wish to extend speaking times, are there rules that will allow this?

Speaker – Yes, you can move to informal consideration

SAMUEL – Would it be possible for the amendment to become immediate after it is passed.

Speaker – Probably should continue to wait till next meeting

Defeated (17/22/1).

2003-14/11b

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

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

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

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

WALLACE – This initiative has been before SU for 3 years. This is my first motion and I'm very honored to bring this. If we go to referendum, then we have something to bring to the table. Every time we go to city council, they want to know if students support it. Truth is, we just don't know. So many people told me last year that ETS won't bring their price down. I work for Edmonton Transit and I've sat on their advisory board watching it come down the pipes. The whole process is very interesting. They've provided their quote. I have a universal bus pass and it has helped me save a lot of money. I don't have to put in my \$2 every time I take the bus. A monthly bus pass is \$53. Student loan accommodates \$4 of that. On-campus students, the idea of this is to support students who think about, "Do I have to buy food, or go to the food bank?" I believe that if we bring this forward maybe we can bring something to the table when negotiating to bring Sherwood Park and St. Albert into this. Students and other SU types say that at \$60, we can win in referendum. This is an opportunity for us to get leverage. This is good time with something to fall back on. Hopefully what the federal government might do is offer us a grant. If ETS won't budge, they want an opportunity to vote on this. It is our chance to be bold. My fear is that we will be run over if we just sit where we are. So, this is an opportunity to find out if it is something the provincial/federal government will support.

SMITH – I support the intent of the motion. I support that we finally have a vote on this issue so we can put it to bed if students don't want it. I commend councilor Wallace for bringing this forward.

SMITH/SAMUEL MOVED TO refer 11b to the External Affairs Board

WEPLER – This is a great idea. It is a complex issue and is better managed by a smaller group.

SHARMA – How long will it take before it gets back to us?

SAMUEL – Estimate production, probably in 2 council meetings, which is still before the election. Still ample amount of time.

SCHENDEL – One point to bring up, fan of concept of U-pass. But I need to speak of the propriety of referring. While there are lots of students that would benefit. What about the opt out cost, places that don't have transit (Spruce Grove)...

WELKE – It is not really related to the motion.

SCHENDEL – Perhaps I'll just chat with the EAB members afterwards.

Motion to refer to EAB is carried with unanimous consent.

2003/14/11c

WALLACE/PANDYA MOVED THAT

Whereas the potential of the Bill 43 campaign has yet to be developed to the point of having any significant impact on the passage of legislation of critical importance to the Students' Union, And whereas this is not a failure on the part of the Executive but of a system upon which the Executive must rely to formulate and implement its political advocacy efforts, And whereas it is unacceptable for the Students' Union, whose primary function is to provide political representation for the undergraduate students' body to the University, provincial and federal governments and general public, to allocate less than one-eighth of the Students' Union membership fee towards political advocacy: Be it resolved that no less than one-third of the monies collected from the Students' Union membership fees be directed exclusively towards political advocacy in the 2004/5 budget.

Be it further resolved that:

- 1.) The External Affairs Board (E.A.B.) prepare a report to define political advocacy, and to establish guidelines for the resources needed to effectively implement its political advocacy efforts.
- 2.) The Executive Committee provide recommendations, based on the report from E.A.B., outlining the structural staff and administration changes necessary to build up infrastructure for effective political advocacy.
- 3.) The Financial Affairs Board take the recommendations from the Executive Committee and determine the financial impact.

4.) The product of these actions should be the submission of a proposal to Council no later than November 18th, detailing the areas that are currently lacking in resources, and would stand to benefit from additional funding. This proposal should also detail areas that will be implemented, and an approximation of the resources needed for these new areas. Most notably, FAB should provide an approximate breakdown of resources, and an estimation of feasibility.

WALLACE – This gives us the opportunity to regain our focus. Political advocacy has a huge impact on our students. I've heard the argument that it is not tangible in results. I would argue that it is not even a focus or a priority. I've worked with Councilor Cook, VPs, Sara Katz. This is something that is very timing. We don't have a federal lobbying group speaking in our favor, keeping an eye on what the government is doing is part of political advocacy. There needs to be a balance between advocacy and the other services that we provide. So, the infrastructure – services are number one, if something happened to the VP Op/Fin, nothing would change. If something happened to our VP External, there would be nothing to support it, no infrastructure and that would be problematic and takes a lot of time. We need researchers. What is political advocacy? Who am I to tell the SU what it is. That job falls to the External Affairs board, which is where this motion will go next. If I could bring you all our information, I would have brought it. I realized this is a job for our committee. This is a reallocation of funds, didn't want to ask our students for another 4 bucks, so this is not new money. We just want a chance to take a look at our budget. This will be nailed down by FAB. I don't have the numbers, it is a huge job and they are willing to take it on. Why the 1/3? It is important to have an ideal, simply a guideline. The message that I hear is that the SU building is more important than fighting government matters. People who say that we will never win is right, the ball is in the government's court and we need the ball to win.

WALLACE/DUBE MOVED THAT the 2nd part of this motion, starting from be it resolve points 1-4 to refer to the External Affairs Board.

MELNYK – Would this be the time to make a motion to amend?

Speaker – Yes.

MELNYK – There is no way for this to happen before November 18.

ABBOUD – Is it an order to refer a motion, the way a motion moves now, I don't see how referring it is any different than from passing it.

Speaker – The plan itself is moved through the various committees, but the principle would already be approved. A motion to refer means to refer to the committees.

WELKE – Would you consider the motion is divided?

Speaker – Yes.

WALLACE – When I included these specific guidelines, it was to give more information to the student councilors. I would rather council look at this and decide if this is something we should look at or no, and not waste EAB's time. I would be fine with Dec 2nd.

WALLACE/REIKE MOVED TO amend the date to December 2nd, 2003.

DUBE – I am concerned of this date. The outcome of our later conversation may impact how EAB's hands are tied till later. Wondering if this particular motion can be held off till at least we know where we stand and how busy EAB will be.

SHARMA – This is a rather ambitious, with Bill 43 much short term, I would echo the comments before, and that should not affect the battles in the short term.

PANDYA – What about a month before the next year's budget is due?

BOTTEN – The final budget is due at the end of April. Hoping that FAB can get to it at the time of Reading Week, but that is a very large hope and we'll probably be scrambling in April to get it done. We will have the time to debate it. Amend to kick EAB out of there to the executive committee- they have the staff and knowledge for this.

DUBE /BAZIN MOVED THAT item 11c be tabled until debate on the multi-year tuition proposal.

WALLACE – Pretty much what EAB is doing is creating a wish list. Send it off to Executive Committee to do all the work that needs to be done. Putting it off to Dec 2 is way enough time. Let's get it done.

Speaker – I'm afraid I am in error. Motion to table goes to a vote.

Motion to table is defeated (13/13/0).

COOK – On the amendment to refer, whatever date we pick, it affects the total of the 3 actions. Should we put dates on each one of those?

Speaker- So proposing an amendment to amendment, by adding 3 dates.

COOK/SHARMA MOVED TO amend by adding 3 dates.

Speaker – Considered friendly. So now we are back to propriety to refer. With the change that there is a Nov 18 report date for EAB, Jan 6 for Executive Committee and Jan 31 for FAB.

BRECHTEL – I would like to let council know that this motion has the intent of retooling our advocacy. We lost one of our individuals in our advocacy department, and hence also currently retooling.

SMITH/BAZIN MOVED THAT the following amendments be made: Point 1 under “Be it further resolved that:” strike, “and to establish guidelines for the resources needed to effectively implement its political advocacy efforts” and under Point 2, strike, “based on the report from EAB”.

SMITH - I don't think the EAB is a good place to come up with a wish place. They are good with political policies. EAB does not seem to be the best equipped body for political advocacy efforts. I don't think EAB is the best way for this.

SAMUEL – EAB is not the drafting of the wishes, more appropriate role for EAB to play is to allow me to set documents and embed it appropriately. Something like that would be easy to do. As such, this process will be hurting the final document.

BOTTEN – This would be quicker for him to produce a document. If time is of the essence, there is nothing in the motion that stops the VP External to bring this to the External Affairs Board. But the way it reads right now, EAB is taking a month on this, but I don't think it would take a month. Allow this amendment to carry.

The amendment is defeated.

BRECHTEL – Congratulations to Councilor Wallace for bringing forth these motions.

Speaker – Kudos to Councilor Wallace. Now, after 90 minutes of debate, there will be a 10-minute recess.

2003-14/11d

MAH/SMITH MOVED THAT Students' Council appoint one (1) councilor to sit on the Recreation Action Committee for the remainder of the 2003/2004 year.

MAH – The Recreation Action Committee needs a councilor for their committee. They look at how the campus recreation programs can benefit students.

SMITH – Friendly amendment to put “voting member of students' council” and strike “councilor”.

Speaker – It is considered friendly.

Motion is carried.

BOTTEN nominates MAH, MAH accepts.
Congratulations to the VP Student Life.

2003-14/11e

MAH/BRECHTEL MOVED THAT Council select one (1) councilor to sit on the Safewalk Director Nominating Committee

MAH- Our Safewalk Director is no longer with us. In interim we have put Samantha Max in as the acting director but we need to put into place a process to select an official director.

SMITH – Same amendment, strike “councilor” and insert, “voting members of students' council”.

MAH – Yes, this is a friendly amendment.

SMITH – Was the previous director dismissed? If so, by whom?

SMITH/TAYLOR MOVED THAT Students' Council move in camera.

Carried.

WELKE/SMITH MOVED THAT Students' Council move ex camera.

Carried.

Main motion is carried.

SMITH nominates **TAYLOR**, **TAYLOR** accepts

KELLY nominates **RICE**, **RICE** accepts

TAYLOR – Familiar with the service, volunteering for the 3rd year.

RICE- 4 years, would like to see the organization in good hands, I was the dispatcher, spent a lot of time with them.

Congratulations to Councilor Rice.

2003-14/11f

BRECHTEL/DUBE MOVED THAT upon the recommendation of TUPAC Students' Council approve the opening of negotiations with the University of Alberta regarding multi-year tuition subject to the Students' Council approved conditions.

BRECHTEL – Multi year tuition means nothing more than tuition decided on more than a 1 year term. Once the university began discussing with us, this process is negotiation, and they would like to debate the principles with the conditions given to you. So whether we, under those conditions would like tuition decided under a 2 year term. Now what happens from that, some of them are necessities, some of them aren't. That 2nd step, will be in camera. I believe that it would nice for several members who have been involved with the process to be here before going in camera. Something the provost said - this is not a commitment to do multi-year sentence.

That being said, I would hate to walk to the table with a list of things to the university and agree and then say "Sorry that is not what we want". There will be something that will come back to council, so imagine what we set out today that you would be interested as a council to entertain it. So, try to be clear whether you would like to entertain it. Up to today, I am devil's advocate. So I will try to take everybody's point. Under multi year tuition, is that he suggested that we would have to agree to maximum tuition, so that is not on the table. If we agree, we can still fight against having multi year tuition increase. The multi year tuition increase will not stop us from fighting in the community. So, if you are concerned that the SU can no longer hold a protest or lobby without the administration, then that is not the case. What the admin see- the restrictions they see on us, is very limited. For example, we won't discuss tuition every year. So, the point is, the center of the debate is, do you trust the administration? And councilor Wallace shakes her head. I don't disagree with that. Part of this is, if you don't see the SU ever trusting the admin, this is not something you should entertain. If you would like to see more trust between admin and SU to work together, this should be something you should entertain. I don't want to walk into the room and give him my trust and have him turn around and not do it, hence a contract.

ABBOUD/DUBE MOVED THAT Students' Council move to informal consideration.

SAMUEL – Is it possible to move in camera in informal consideration?

Speaker –Yes.

SMITH- Can you rise on a point of order in information consideration? This motion is out of order, in its entirety, by virtue of the 4th bullet under the tuition.

Speaker – What is the 4th bullet point? When you are passing 11f or not, these are the approved conditions that you are passing along 11f. They are also up for amendment if you wish.

SMITH – We are opposed to all tuition increase, even 1 less of the allowable is blah of our tuition policy.

Speaker – Does not bind us to accept a tuition policy greater than. This Claus has no effect.

SMITH – It refers to a tuition increase.

Speaker – Motion is out of order as a whole.

BRECHTEL – There is such thing as a negative increase.

Speaker – As many is in favor of upholding the chair, vote yes=kill

Will of the chair is overruled.

DUBE – Can we vote on going informal?

Motion to move to informal consideration is carried.

BRECHTEL – It is important to consider whether it is possible or desirable to have trust with the admin. The major thing SU gives up if we agree, is the ability to run an awareness campaign in January. Now, the 2nd central point, is whether you believe that the SU can, without the BoG- can still find something to rally around, whether there can still be a way SU can still draw attention to tuition being too high, because our goal is to raise public awareness. So that to me is the 2nd central point in this debate.

WEPLER – I speak in favor, but 1 little point. When you are preparing a budget, it is better to plan. The university looking for the maximum increase, I would like to have it the same for several years, so it takes away the uncertainty.

SMITH – It is better to have certainty, but the fact that the university is an entity that is in control of its revenue. Points 2, 3 and 7, why we are demanding the board to do things. Point #1 under government relations, the decision should be general faculty councils.

SMITH – Under the institution process, points 2, 3, 7 are requesting things that the University Administration does not have permission to grant. They are things for the BoG to do. Point 1 is under General Faculty Council. Under point 10 of Gov/Public, voting against is insufficient. Point 11, intent is correct but not clear. It needs to be against all aspects of Bill 43. Now, I want to address the overall spirit. The president has said the issue is to whether or not council trust U of A Administration. I disagree. The core issue is whether any of these things that we want to get from the university administration is worth giving up a one year time frame and surrendering the annual campaign. Going back to the meeting before, in which he kept saying that none of this things he is offering us can happen without multi-year. We are talking about cooperation between SU and U of A administration to go to the provincial government, we say it has to happen, to silence that one time every year, in exchange with that...I'm fine with going with this. This document is flawed, however points that are not flawed, so shut this off now, let's not delude ourselves that admin will give us anything and that we won't be giving anything up for moving to multi-year.

DUBE – I view the multi year issue from a different perspective. I have run an informal forum and contacted other university about this, I've done my homework. First of all, I am going to have to disagree with Mat and agree with Steve. This is an issue of an investigation of what the possibilities are. This is opening the doors to something that we don't know. This is a legal matter, if they breach this, we go to court. So we should stop thinking that we've been screwed over in the past. We need to get over it. A lot of proposals coming up this year have been extremely exciting and council is scared of change.

We don't know if the information that we have put out is sufficient to make a decision for 36000 students. What if they like it? Heaven forbid that students think the SU should try something new. We talk and talk and still come up with a maximum tuition almost every year. This is a question of opening a door. We don't know what is behind the door. Is there something to lose? Yes, we can lose. But time has given, TUPAC has met on a holiday to talk about this. Throwing this away is much a waste of time of going with this. The media is here for us. They come because we are performing, if we give them something, they will come. Because, more over, what we are doing is refocusing our attention. Both sides which are usually enemies are uniting to say that government needs to take a look at this issue. If the government does give us more money, question of political strategy. How are we going to focus our political knowledge. Let's see what is behind that door and let's take a chance to see what we can accomplish when we try a new strategy.

SMITH – What happens if we pass this motion? Does this subject to all the motions? I have no idea?

Speaker – A direction to the executive who would begin to undertake this process. I see no difference from this and a political policy. This is council giving order to the executive.

SMITH – May I have this categorized as a political policy? The only difference between them is the 2/3.

Speaker –Political policy requires 2/3s majority and a miscellaneous motion requires a bare majority. Councilor Smith has argued that there is no difference between this and a political policy. Under Bylaw 4400, this could fall into that category. So there is a no definition as to what a miscellaneous motion is. So the legal issue that needs to be looked at is, what is the diff between the 2, so I would suggest that, the difference is the degree of detail in which they are described. That being the case, the opinion of the chair that the proposal put before us is very detailed and closer to a miscellaneous motion. So the point of order is not well taken and be permitted to be debated. Quite frankly, it is a very good point of order and maybe something you can refer to DIE board for judiciary reference.

LO – Bringing forth AAB’s recommendations. Motions that are passed by the AAB last night. It was drafted in haste, there are a lot of errors on it. Under 1, should read, “recommend”.

HUTCHISON – on what grounds was AAB saying that it should reject it?

LO – The 2nd motion is conditional. Should council go with the multi year tuition, “multi year tuition be contingent on the student referendum question”. Several of the points raised last night- is it going to be max tuition, will it be that we are accepting max tuition from the university, would it be smart to enter into multi year decision or play year by year. There was also concern about resources of SU. We have limited resources in terms of staff. Perhaps our human resources would be better spent on Bill 43, as opposed to negotiating multi year tuition. The vote was 5/3/1.

HUTCHISON – What bearing does AAB have on SU?

LO – The way I view it is, a budget board on academics, review academic policies, draft political policies, so they help me with my goals and how I pursue them.

KHATIB – If we go into negotiations, does that bind us into anything?

BOTTEN – I want to clarify, are we dealing with these motions as recommendations from AAB?

Speaker – It is simply being introduced as an item to be debated.

KHATIB – If we going into negotiations, does it bind us to anything? Is admin obliged to follow these terms?

BRECHTEL – Should we amend those, after we move out of informal consideration?

TAYLOR – I am in favor of entering the negotiation process. Should at least hear what they are offering. There is a high likelihood that they would not grant us this, but we don't know if we don't try. But a few concerns, with respect to point 11 under Gov/Relations, that is kind of bare, assuming it is asking U of A to endorse our fight in removal of tuition cap. The 2 big ones that I have, this is a lot of give on our part, but not a give from the university. When we had the presentation, I remember it seemed very much they were dangling trinkets in front of us, saying if we take 2 yrs of max tuition, they would give us a few thank you's. This is not students taking the full, a lot of give on our part. The 2nd bit that I am concerned with, it doesn't give anything past the 2 years. My concern is that if we say ok fine, we don't make any stipulations on what will happen after the 2 years.

KOTOVYCH – Roll call.

Roll call is conducted by the Recording Secretary at 9:00 pm

WELKE/ HUTCHISON MOVED THAT Students' Council out of informal consideration.

Carried.

SMITH – First illusion I hear is that we should at least enter into it for administration, we don't owe it to them. They came here with an insulting proposal. If we go in there with no assumption of success, that is misguided garbage. We owe it to our students to do what they want. Most students consider tuition to be an issue. To agree sends a signal to admin that we are willing to talk about it. That is something that we owe to our students.

BRECHTEL – TUPAC put a good deal of effort in this.

Speaker – I understand the president's sentiment that a great effort was put into this.

SMITH – Look under 3rd point of Campaign Objectives, what does that mean? It is not clear. There is there a false assumption that we need to adopt this list. Let's defeat this, it is now owed to anybody, this list is not the way to do this.

PEWARCHUK – I think councilor Smith is under a terrible illusion that the enemy is the administration. The enemy is the government! The adversary relationship is the source of our inability to put pressure on the issue. Perhaps we will be take these negotiating principles to go and see if we can resolve this adversary relationship which is everything us and the admin would like to achieve.

CROSSMAN – I think those are 2 separate issues. To confuse council, to trick us into agreeing. Admin says that we have to agree in order to achieve any change. They are saying they won't cooperate with us if we don't accept multi year tuition. I think there are 2 completely different things here. On one hand, there is a list put forth in what we want in exchange, but what we are debating whether we should accept multi year and a united front by students and university to the government. The university is trying to take council hostage to get what they want. I think we should vote against this motion.

LO – I made a mistake earlier. Smith asked if AAB was contingent, the way AAB passed that motion, the only way AAB would recommend multi year proposal if there was a referendum of students on this campus. I think multi year tuition is a concept that is phenomenal. It has several good points. The combined approach to discussing with the government would be phenomenal to help students. What do students want? Yes, it will take time and resources. Yes it is a focus shift, it puts spotlight on exactly where we want it, on tuition. The only way I would support going into negotiation if council tells me to, but if final proposal will go back to students on referendum.

WALLACE – If we go to referendum, do we not have to wait till Feb?

Speaker – No, all referendums have to coincide with general elections.

LO – It is something we should be looking at.

REIKIE – Can we have a registered online poll?

Speaker – The purpose of the motion is to ensure we didn't have to put out the expenditure of putting out the infrastructure in place. So if you can come up with a cheap alternative to poll the students, then yes.

LO - The only way we know what students want is to poll their opinion. We need to have a better idea of where our students stand. Ultimately, the only way to bring this to students is to have something on the table. If council gives permission to proceed in that direction, then we should do that.

SAMUEL – This idea of agreeing to multi year tuition needs to be very clear that instead of fighting every year, we fight 1 or 2 years. Is our organization capable of going after admin year after year and still going after the government on a perpetual basis? I think the answer is “yes”. It’s like how councilors can disagree on issues in these chambers but still work together on other things. I think that it is something that is possible under a year to year decision making process. I think if we shoot this down now, it is not Mat saying no anymore, it is council saying no. If we say “yes” and Mat goes to negotiate and we end up voting against multi-year, it won’t be council’s credibility on the line, but also Mat’s credibility. I don’t think if we approve this tonight we have the option to later shooting it down later. I don’t think that what we are concern about. By in leverage, those years will look identical. What is going to change is the off years, they will have no component of students fighting the administration. The issue here is what is the best way to fight the enemy, the best way to get to the provincial government, the best way to do that is getting to our media which is our annual tuition debate.

ABBOTT – I don’t feel that voting “yes” to entering negotiating binds us to accept. I don’t feel that it would compromise anyone’s integrity. We owe it to our students to take any strategy that might get us more funding with the government.

CROSSMAN – Why are we tying the idea of the multi- year tuition with the united front? Why are allowing admin forcing us?

ABBOTT – I don’t think admin is forcing us to do it. I do think they have a good point that the government isn’t going to take us seriously if we are always fighting amongst ourselves.

ABBOUD – I think cooperating with the admin isn’t a great idea. For me to find this acceptable, a number of things have to change. As an undergrad representative, it is my responsibility that undergrad education is the most important. That is not happening in this proposal. They get grants for research, for infostructure. This deal sells us short and codifies our place relatively low on administrative. There is no reason we have to enter a formal agreement with admin. Entering a multi year means we accept that we are not priority. Like Samuel said, the one time of year- Annual Tuition Debate, the media will be here and give us their full and undivided attention. The way to affect change is to affect popular opinion, through positive media attention, which we will get from the annual tuition. Administration will take priority and university will be a mere supporting player. There are 2 reasons you enter into negotiations, the potential result being a desirable result. Neither of those apply in this case.

KOTOVYCH – There is a difference between multi year principle and what Carl Arnheim has put forward. We are voting on whether to send Mat to negotiate some deal. There are other points we can get media one, we can get media out at other points. Worse case scenario, Mat comes back with the exact same deal and we are free to vote it down. Best case scenario, would everyone be opposed to 3 year tuition freeze, I think we would have a totally different debate. I don't see what the benefit is if we are sticking with what we have always done since they have already told us they are going with max tuition. Maybe we should pursue these things. In terms of what we owe to students, we owe them an end result. This changes year after year. Walking away from the table is not getting what is best for students. Mat is still being guided by Students' Union. It is possible where we can still fight against tuition and still work with administration. We can still say no to tuition but still work with them, I don't see no reason why we should shoot it down now.

WEPPLER/HUTCHISON MOVED the previous question

Defeated.

COOK – I agree that we should be turning this down. I don't think we need multi year, or that it is best for students. #1, we lose our public battle, so in Spring 2005, there will be an election and we could lose the tuition battle in an election year. The tuition is a public battle that happens in the media. We saw for the first time last year, it was done effectively. It doesn't mean that we won't be lobbying the government. The tuition fight is the only time of the year we get this battle. The lobbying doesn't have a lot of tangible results. There has been success in the past few years, just because it hasn't worked in the past, I think they would raise tuition a lot more than they have if we weren't there. In Lethbridge, when they froze tuition for 3 years, it was extremely hard to organize a tuition campaign, because it hasn't been done for 3 years.

EATON – The more I hear about this battle, I wonder why we can fight the admin for it? Do they think admin has tonnes have money, I don't think they have the money to give us. If we fight admin hard enough, they are still not going to give us a decrease in tuition. They can't do it. We need to fight against the provincial government.

BAZIN – Admin is scared of our success of getting public support behind us. They are trying to derail the polls. They don't want students to have support in the public eye. I think that we need to get the public to lobby the admin. I think that education should be higher on their priority list before they should talk about multi year tuition.

POON – Everybody that is opposed to it is looking that the government and the admin is the enemy. It would be better to look at it as, we don't have to cooperate with them, but we get to cooperate with them. This is a very unique opportunity. For the general public, it seems to be that it brings peace amongst everyone in general. The media will look at this as an important step. When we have something together, it is stronger than being apart. Dr. Arhmein wouldn't come to speak to us if we weren't on their priority list. It shows good faith for us to consider sending a representative out to discuss this with the admin. We owe it to ourselves and the students, even if it doesn't good through.

SHARMA – Remember who you are dealing with in this situation and never forget what their interests are. If you are wrestling with power, is it in Admin's interest to see tuition go down? No. They are here to run the university. Regardless of what the VP will say, ultimately what makes the university prestigious is one that isn't accessible to all individuals. When it comes down to push and shove, it is coming from only one place, it will ultimately come from the voters. Public opinion has increased in terms of the accessibility of tuition. If we stop and say this is okay, nobody else sends a message to individuals that we are not going to be fighting these issues, and lose the opportunity to speak with the media.

PEWARCHUK – What is the most important function – tuition? Is it not discoveries such as from engineering this week? Is it not as important as tuition?

SHARMA –Ultimately, tuition is an issue.

WEPLER – This is a negotiation. Mr. Arnheim is a negotiator. That does not mean it is his ending position. What we need to do is let Mat do his job. I don't think his attempt to get you guys involve is something that you should hold against him. Sick and tired of fighting for the little piece that they give us. I want a bigger piece, so multi year tuition could work. I believe we do owe it to admin, because we share this campus. I don't have the jaded view of administration as some of my colleagues here. They have had to go through cuts and balance so much more on their place, and we have been very narrow minded about this.

RICE – It is our job as councilors to vote, maybe a referendum isn't necessary. It is the procedure and research that makes the U of A a credible place. We can do all this work with the admin, it is negotiations and the entire world is open to us right now and it is important.

HUTCHISON – As it is getting close to 10, the more people voting on it will be better.

SCHENDEL/EATON MOVED the previous question
Motion is defeated.

ABBOTT/PEWARCHUK MOVED TO adjourn.
Defeated.

Speaker – We will continue in the DinWoodie.

DUBE – We should count for quorum, just so we know how many voting members there are right now.

Speaker – There are 29 right now.

REIKIE – A few simple amendments. The admin does not need us to agree to a max tuition increase to work together. We can work together regardless of that. It is clearly in our favor not to be squandering energy to be banging on the admin's door when they have nothing to give us. We can be redirecting our limited resources where they need to go.

REIKIE/SMITH MOVED TO AMEND by inserting "and that in case of any increase in provincial funding equal to or greater than inflation" at the end of point 3, under the Tuition heading. Also, under the Tuition heading, insert point 5, "Contrary to SU policy to agree to tuition increase" and under Campaign Objectives and Messaging, insert point 4, "It is a paramount importance and mutually beneficial for the University and SU to approach the issue of inadequate provincial funding in cooperation".

DUBE - I like the amendments. I think it would be good to have them as friendly.

SAMUEL – What I think this does, the change to point number 3 under tuition. What concerns me is that opens the door to the university to lobby for funding at a rate equal to inflation.

DUBE – Would the university not be joint lobbying with the SU?

SAMUEL— In joint campaigning, both parties sometimes doesn't fully agree with each other. For example, the campaign we had with CAUS on Bill 43. I think from an admin point of view, 3% being less than inflation, or you are faced with increase of 4%. Well, the 3% increase will translate to more money, which compromises our message that the most funding possible is what we should go for.

REIKIE – Basically asking for honesty. The funding has been lower than the rate of inflation so there is an increase in funding every year but inflation exceeds that every year. But if the funding is equal to inflation, then we are getting the same money or more money than last year, for the university to go ahead to increase tuition is contravening their statement that our hands are tied, and they don't have to increase tuition.

BRECHTEL – My concern is, say they gave us 4%, I don't expect them to take their budget and wipe it up completely. If the increase of inflation was enough to offset increase in tuition, the difference is that the budget that is written right now, part of the size increase is offset by students. Whatever then number students argue it down to, if we start at 5.5 and get it down to 2, then every dollar that comes down from provincial government still goes towards it making it smaller. If it is to regain the space university lost, some of it was on tuition so for every dollar that comes in, puts it towards tuition. Council should vote on this. I see arguing that number down. So there is a fine line there.

SAMUEL – How should we vote?

BRECHTEL – I think it is a matter of trust. I can move an amendment to take that Claus out. It has wording that is unclear to me.

BRECHTEL/DUBE MOVED TO AMEND the amendment and strike “and that in case of any increase in provincial funding equal to or great than inflation” under point 3 of the Tuition heading.

Carried.

Speaker – Now back on the other 2 amendments as proposed by REIKE/SMITH that new item 5 under tuition and new item 4 under campaign objectives.

Amendments are carried.

SMITH – By agreeing to negotiations we are not agreeing to anything, which is true. But then I hear that some people concede that - don't defeat it now, but defeat it later. A councilor said that we shouldn't do the same thing every year, but we haven't been doing the same thing year after year. However, I believe that maybe we need to be more consistent. Someone said not to give up the annual tuition meeting, but the number at the interest group are high. It is entirely possible for us to disagree on campus but agree off campus. Those are 2 conflicting messages. That type of dissonance will help us in a provincial government. It is demonstrating that we both want the same thing. Councilor Crossman has said this before, there is not link at all between multi year and working with the admin. The link is not there. Looking at this list, I defy anybody to explain what happens when we pass that. Does the agreement go to referendum? Come back to council? I think it is irresponsible at this point that we need to pass that. Vote this down.

DUBE – I am going to present an analogy. I think that the point of not needing a dissonance is not to our disadvantage. Example of the Canadian Alliance - where dissonance within an organization who wanted the same ends cost them the election. Their stability and it lead to nothing but years of problems because they couldn't get along on the little stuff. We need a whole lot of momentum. I agree with harmony, it needs to fit into a scheme, the notes actually go together and are consistent. We need to approach this unified. It is the one place we haven't gone yet. It is the final frontier. The fact that it would put Mat's integrity on the line, it doesn't, but if he believes enough to say, this is important needs to be addressed. I think that as an elected official, we need to trust Mat's judgment. He is in position to open the door to something new. Mat has on several occasions said that he would not do anything without the permission of us. Based on the political culture of our province, it takes unified voices to get us there.

CROSSMAN – How does us coming together with the admin on this issue, contingent on multi year tuition? Why do we have to agree to their terms?

DUBE – I didn't realize that we were agreeing to their terms. Is multi year getting us to the end? Yes.

KHATIB/RICE MOVED the previous question.
Defeated.

TAYLOR – Due to the current number of voting members of people here, I move to postpone to next meeting.

TAYLOR/SMITH MOVED to postpone to next meeting.

Speaker – I will allow 2 people to speak to it. One in favor and one opposed.

SMITH – There is no legitimacy that we need to vote on this tonight. The president can enter into negotiations now without this motion.

BRECHTEL – I've been acting in a vacuum to this point. I don't like acting in a vacuum. There is only so far I can go with credibility. At some point there are going to say, "Are your students going to say yes to this?" I'm going to say, "I don't know, we had a long debate on this". I would like to do this tonight. It would be better to go with this right now, and later reconsider into the minutes.

PANDYA – What happens if we vote this down?

BRECHTEL – If you guys say nothing, we stay still. Because we are in the middle of trying to image the campaign - it is a different image, different vision whether or not we are going into multi year

DUBE – If we were not going to postpone this, if we were to vote this down, how would you not go to admin and say that council voted this down.

BRECHTEL – I will say what council asked me to say. So maybe we go with tuition campaign with less specific imaging. Maybe it is a better thing to fully examine it. I almost want a council meeting next week.

Motion to postpone is carried. (14/12/0)

BRECHTEL – I call a meeting next Tuesday at regular time.

SMITH/WEPPPLER MOVED TO ADJOURN at 10:51pm
Carried.