University of Alberta Students' Union

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Tuesday February 4, 2003 – 6:00 PM
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

MINUTES (SC 2002-20)

Faculty/Position	Name	6:00	9:00	Roll Call Vote #1 (Off-campus)	Roll Call Vote #2 (APIRG)	Roll Call Vote #3 (Bylaw 2100)
President	Mike Hudema	✓	✓	Against	For	For
VP Academic	Mat Brechtel	✓	✓	For	For	For
VP External	Anand Sharma	✓	✓	Against	For	Against
VP Finance	Steve Smith	✓	✓	For	For	Against
VP Student Life	Kail Ross	✓	✓	Against	For	For
BoG Rep.	Mike Reid	✓	✓	For	Against	
RHA	George Slomp	✓	✓	Against	For	Against
Athletics Board						
Ag/For	Teodora Alampi	✓	✓	Against	For	Abstain
Ag/For	Paul Reikie	✓	✓	Against	For	Against
Arts	Chris Bolivar	✓	✓	For	Against	Against
Arts	Kyle Kawanami	✓	✓	For	Abstain	Against
Arts	James Knull	✓	✓	For	Against	For
Arts	Matt Oberhoffner	✓	✓	For	Against	Abstain
Arts	Alexis Pepin	✓	✓	For	Against	
Arts	Laura Roberts	✓	✓	Against	For	Against
Arts	Vivek Sharma	✓	✓	Against	For	For

Arts	Paul Welke	✓	✓	For	Against	Against
Business	Jamie Kidston	×	×			
Business	Meena Rajulu	✓	✓	Against	For	For
Business	Holly Tomte	✓	✓	For	For	For
Education	Charles Beamish	✓	✓	Against	For	For
Education	Daljeet Chhina	✓	✓	Against	For	
Education	Allison Ekdahl	✓	✓	Against	For	
Education	Mandeep Gill	✓	✓	Against	For	
Education	Janet Lo	✓	✓	For	For	For
Engineering	Chris Jones	✓	✓	For	Abstain	Against
Engineering	Margaret Laffin	✓	✓	For	Abstain	
Engineering	Paige Smith	✓	✓	For	Abstain	
Engineering	Michelle Vigeant	✓	✓	For	For	
Engineering	David Weppler	✓ (6:40)	✓	Abstain	For	For
Law	Paul Varga	✓	✓	Against	Abstain	Against
Med/Dent	Miranda Richardson	✓	✓	For	Abstain	
Med/Dent	Jeffrey Cao	✓	✓	Against	Abstain	
Native Studies	Valerie Knaga	✓	✓	Against	For	Against
Nursing						
Open Studies						
Open Studies						
Pharmacy	Kurt Greene	×	×			
Phys. Ed.	Holly Higgins	✓	✓	Abstain	For	
Rehab. Med	Sarah Booth	✓	✓	Against	For	For
Faculté St-Jean	Lisa Clyburn	✓	✓	Against	For	Against
Science	Chamila Adhihetty (Donal Finegan)	✓	✓	For	Abstain	

Science	Kimberly Dary	✓	✓	Against		For
Science	Katie Grant	×	×	Against		
Science	Aisha Khatib	✓	✓	Against	Abstain	For
Science	Tereza Elyas	✓	✓	Against	Abstain	
Science	Chris Samuel	✓	✓	For	For	Against
Science	Steven Schendel (Duncan Taylor)	×	×	Against	For	
Science	Kimmy Williams	✓	✓	Against	For	For
Gen Mngr	Bill Smith	×	×			
Speaker	Gregory Harlow	✓	✓			
Rec Sec	Helen McGraw	✓	✓			

Observers: Roman Kotovych, Glen Kakoske, Matt Robertson, Kris Fowler, Tatiana LoVerso, M. Mustafa Hirji, Chad Blackburn, Alex Taylor, Bequie Lake, Marika Schandt, Tracey Smith, James Crossman, Geneva Rae, Colin Bell.

A G E N D A (SC 2002-20)

2002-20/1 CALL TO ORDER 6:05

2002-20/4 SPEAKER'S BUSINESS

Sarah Booth was appointed as the councilor from Rehabilitation Medicine.
Holly Higgins was appointed as the councilor from Physical Education and Recreation.
Steve Smith's birthday is on Friday and there will be a little to-do at the Plant

The following people were appointed guests of council: **Roman Kotovych, Glen Kakoske, Matt Robertson, Kris Fowler, Tatiana LoVerso, M. Mustafa Hirji, Chad Blackburn, Alex Taylor, Bequie Lake, Marika Schandt, Tracey Smith, James Crossman, Geneva Rae, Colin Bell.**

2002-20/6 APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

HUDEMA/SAMUEL MOVED TO approve the agenda

SMITH MOVED TO add all items on the late additions

Carried

SMITH/HUDEMA MOVED TO make New Business a special order

Carried

OBERHOFFNER/BOLIVAR MOVED TO strike 12f (Political Policy: International Relations) from the agenda

Defeated

Carried

2002-20/8 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

SMITH/SLOMP MOVED TO approve the minutes of the 21Jan meeting.

Brechtel: (p. 18) committee is CAAST, not CASS

Carried

2002-20/9 QUESTION PERIOD

Samuel: Did we contribute to the study on the benefits of government spending on post-secondary education that was recently commissioned by the Alberta Association of Colleges and Technical Institutes?

Sharma: We're working with that board but we weren't directly involved with the study.

Gill: Will we be sending support to the U of C tuition rally in March since they supported us at the U of A decision?

Hudema: We will encourage and facilitate support as much as possible. RDC students came up for our tuition decision and we will be going down for theirs tomorrow. The RDC tuition decision is quite controversial: they worked with their school all year for a 4% increase and were locked out of the BoG meeting where 8% passed.

Beamish: Recently an education student came to me, homeless, hungry, and naked. I took her in, fed her, clothed her, and she had a question for me: is it true that all of the one- and two-bedroom apartments in the new International House will be reserved for international students?

Ross: That is the plan. 60% of the residents will be international students, 40% local. All the one- and two-bedrooms are reserved for international students.

Lo: What is the current status of VIDS?

Smith: The equipment is dormant, neither costing nor making us money. We have yet to find any real, effective use for it.

Ross: We will be ripping them down post-haste.

Kawanami: I enjoy the new computer lab in SUB but whenever I go down there it's just a collection of hacks checking the webboard. What steps will be taken to alert other students to its presence?

Smith: I'm not convinced that the status quo is a bad thing and I recall opposing the existence of this lab from the start. Nonetheless, I do agree that its existence should probably be promoted.

2002-20/10 APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (MINUTES)

Please see document SC 02-20.01.

Kawanami: For my personal erudition, what was the Gateway deal?

Smith: It is a run-of-the-mill sponsorship deal: The Gateway will be a sponsor of SU events, allowing us to do inserts as we always have.

2002-20/13 NEW BUSINESS

2002-20/13a
Referendum
Special Order #1

SMITH/REID MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the following referendum question to appear on the ballot of the Students' Union general election, March 5 and 6 2003:

"Do you support:

a) the elimination of Article VIII, Section 3e of the Students' Union constitution, which reads: "Pursuant to a referendum passed on 6 and 7 March 1991, the sum of One Dollar and Fifty-Eight Cents ($1.58) per Fall, Winter, Spring or Summer Term, from each full-time and part-time student's Students' Union fees will be allocated to the Student Financial Aid and Information Centre Fund." And the cessation by the Students' Union of the collection of this fee, which totals approximately $110 000 per year;
b) an amendment to Article VIII, Section 2 to increase the Students' Union fees of each full-time and part-time student's Students' Union fees of $1.58 per Fall, Winter, Spring or Summer Term, which would offset the loss of the $110 000 in (a); and
c) a transfer of those funds currently in the Student Financial Aid and Information Centre reserve to the Students' Union's general reserves?"\

Smith: Funding for SFAIC currently comes from a dedicated fee, which is a really silly way to bankroll an SU service. It is unfortunate that the only way to rectify this error is through a

referendum.

Hudema: I agree that this should be sent to referendum but not with this wording because people will not be able to understand what they are voting on.

Smith: IRB did consider the wording of this question and concluded that there is no good way to make this clear to anyone who does not understand the SU elections system. The actual amendment to the constitution is required to be included. The number of people who are interested in Article VIII of the constitution can probably be counted on two fingers.

Carried (30/6/1)

2002-20/13b

Referendum

Special Order #2

SMITH/WEPPLER MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the following referendum question to run during the Students' Union General election, March 5 and 6 2003:

"Do you support an increase in funding to the Sexual Assualt Centre, funded through an increase in the University Students' Services Fee of $1.00 per full-time student per Fall and Winter Term, $0.50 per part-time student per Fall and Winter Term, and $0.50 per student per Spring and Summer Term (approximately $60,000 per year)? The University Student Services Fee cannot be reduced by referendum, only by the University Board of Governors.

At present, $1.00 per full-time student per Fall and Winter Term, $0.50 per part-time student per Fall and Winter Term, and $0.50 per student per Spring and Summer Term is dedicated to the Sexual Assault Centre, pursuant to a 1993 referendum."

Smith: The Sexual Assault Center submitted a valid petition and this wording was agreed upon unanimously by IRB and the petitioners.

Carried (34/2/2)

2002-20/13c

Referendum

Special Order #3

JONES/VIGEANT MOVED THAT Students' Council approve a referendum question dealing with the zero-rating of off campus fees during the Spring and Summer Terms to appear on the ballot of the Students' Union general election of March 5 and 6 2003, and that, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, the wording of such question be:

"This question will determine if off campus students will pay Students' Union fees during the Spring and Summer Terms. Vote YES for them not to pay. Vote NO for them to pay

Do you support the insertion into Article VIII, Section 2, a point

(e) to read "Pursuant to a referendum passed on 5 and 6 March 2003, notwithstanding Section 2 (c) and Section 2 (d), no student not attending courses on the University of Alberta Campus shall pay a membership fee during the Spring or Summer Term."

Jones: As many will recall, there is a problem with the way fees are collected from off-campus students during the summer term; this referendum question will allow students to decide whether to rectify that inequity.
Vigeant: Off-campus students will still continue to pay fees for the fall and winter terms; this just addresses the inequity of the summer months.
Hudema: A person on co-op during the summer is a student then, just like anyone else taking classes in the summer months; off-campus students should be paying fees because many SU services can be accessed away from campus.
Jones (POI): Is it not true that most of the fees collected from UofA students at RDC is turned over to that school to help our students access services at Red Deer College?
Hudema: I would disagree; we worked out an agreement that was equally unfair to both sides, proportionate to the services from each institution that can be accessed from RDC. If you want this referendum, the question should be on whether off-campus students should pay fees at all.
Ekdahl: How much money do you make on a co-op term? How much support do you get from the UofA during that time?
Smith: [lots of numbers about how much money on- and off-campus pay in various fees] The total cost to the SU would be about $40,000. Next year is a bad year to be taking big hit, but I believe the benefit to the fee structure justifies this budget cut.
Brechtel (POI): The last time off-campus student fees were changed, the amount paid by all other students was increased proportionally to make the policy revenue-neutral.
Smith: From a financial standpoint, that would be a good idea. However, passing this is akin to admitting that we shouldn't have been collecting this fee in the first place, so making it revenue-neutral would be unjust.
Reid: Council is deciding whether this should be on the ballot or not; this is not the place to be debating the merit of the question itself.
Beamish: What co-op students pay currently?
Smith: If I had the floor, I'd say $27, including dedicated fees.
Sharma: Council needs to have a long discussion about off-campus fees. It is unfair to burden next year's executive with this
Oberhoffner: This motion will even things out: I don't pay fees when I'm on a summer job; why should other students have to pay fees when they're working?
Beamish: What does someone who pays fees have access to that

someone who doesn't pay fees does not?

Williams: What about students on exchange? They pay SU fees as well.

Slomp: The SU offers more than just services: advocacy, negotiations with the university, etc. benefit off-campus students too.

Weppler: The last time there was a referendum on off-campus fees, the change was revenue-neutral and the question was clearer; I'm hesitant to go through this again only two years later.

Smith: There is effectively no difference in the services available to on- or off-campus students. Any student has theoretical access (practical access is limited by geography). The idea that this is revenue-negative is appealing: the SU, like any organization, wastes a lot of money. This would provide an impetus for us to spend our money more wisely, which doesn't arise often when our fee levels are entrenched in the constitution (as ours, through some fallacy, are). Our businesses are currently underperforming but I'm confident that this will be rectified by the end of the year.

Jones: Co-op students don't receive support from the UofA or SU/ Many co-op students are unable to find jobs; they make no money. Other students make different amounts; there is no minimum students must be paid. Last summer the co-op office was giving students jobs that paid $1000 for 4 months (<$1/hr). We are debating whether students should have a right to chose on this. If you are in favor of democracy, you will also be in favor of this motion. The question is not the dollar amount; what is the price of fairness? What is the price of equity? The anti-democratic Sharma says we need discussion on the issue, but I believe that elections are the time when we discuss issues. Students haven't had the opportunity to discuss because we have not yet had a campaign. Exchange students are classified as off-campus students and thus pay approximately half the SU fees as other students. All students who are not registered in courses during the summer benefit from advocacy without paying fees.

Williams (POI): Will you run both sides of the campaign since you believe in democracy so much?

Jones: Unfortunately, elections rules prevent one person from running both sides of a referendum campaign.

KAWANAMI/WELKE MOVED TO amend the question to read "This question will determine if off-campus students will pay Students' Union fees during the Spring and Summer Terms. Currently these students pay these fees. Vote YES for them not to pay. Vote NO for them to continue to pay."

Carried (18/11/3)

Hudema: The referendum process and procedures are

undemocratic; it is not possible to give voters an adequate amount of information during a one-week referendum campaign. Off-campus student are still able to access SU services; this possible inequity is not worth the hit to the SU budget. We need to deal with this when we have a better referendum question and are in a more sound financial position.
Jones (POI): Was your election then undemocratic?
Hudema: The campaign isn't long enough for people to make an informed decision. But it's a different ball of wax when you're dealing with a candidate, rather than a referendum question.
Vigeant: There is a clear distinction between co-op/internship programs and one such as education where students do a practicum: the former programs are longer and more time is spent off campus.

WELKE/KNULL MOVED the previous question.
Carried

Roll Call (Jones, Samuel, Oberhoffner, Lo, Reid)
Defeated (18/23/2)

2002-20/13d

APIRG

Special Order #4

SMITH/REIKIE MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Financial Affairs Board, approve the disbursement of $56 272 from the APIRG Fund to the Alberta Public Interest Research Group.
Please see document SC 02-20.05.

Smith: Is APIRG meeting its mandate under the referendum question with the budget it has proposed to FAB? Whether this is the most effective use of funds is not strictly relevant. The referendum question was so vague as to make it difficult not to meet their mandate. APIRG is certainly acting how they promised to act during the referendum campaign.
Samuel (POI): What mechanisms are available to evaluate whether this money is being spent effectively?
Smith: There is a difference between misappropriating and spending unwisely. APIRG representatives are elected and their board meetings are open, if anyone is concerned about how the group chooses to spend their funds. This money must be dispersed.
Ross: Students didn't know that the vast majority of the funds would go to day-to-day operating expenses, rather than supporting student initiatives as promised.
Reikie: Nearly all of the money goes to the operation and effectiveness of working groups.
Sharma (Councilor): How much of this money was spent on set-up costs? Holding educational events was part of the mandate; International Week was money well-spent.

Hudema: It is not up to this council to evaluate how well these funds are being spent, only whether the funds are being spent in fulfillment of the mandate. If councilors are concerned about how the funds are being allocated, they need to go to an APIRG board meeting to make these concerns known.
Lake: We will probably not spend the full amount budgeted for staff and office costs. Administration (not staff) costs can hopefully be reduced next year. If you have ideas for other places we can live, please come talk to us.
Ross (POI): Did the SU not offer APIRG space in SUB?
Lake: There were various discussions over the year and a half of standoff. When we planned to open our office, it sounded like there would be no space available in SUB.
Bolivar: Students were under the impression that most of the money would go to working groups. Some costs put up red flags. e.g. $4,000 for phones? Misc. costs add up to over $12,000 or over half the money collected. I abstained on this question on FAB because I think that this budget is not informative enough.
Tracey Smith: We have 1 phone and 1 fax line. We're budgeting conservatively right now and will certainly funnel money into other areas if this is too much. All working groups have access to the phone, copier, and fax machine, so these are all services for working groups.
Carried (26/6/10)

2002-20/13e
Nom Com
Special Order #5

SMITH MOVED THAT Students' Council select:

- One councilor to serve on the Director of Information Services nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Weppler**

- One councilor to serve on the Student Distress Centre Director nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Chhina**

- One councilor to serve on the Ombuds nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Rajulu**

- One councilor to serve on the Safewalk Director nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Lo**

- One councilor to serve on the Student Groups Director nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Jones**

- One councilor to serve on the CRO nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Roberts**

- One councilor to serve on the Academic Affairs Coordinator nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Kawanami**

- One councilor to serve on the Community Relations Coordinator nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Williams**

- One councilor to serve on the Student Activities Coordinator nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Vigeant**

- One councilor to serve on the Athletic Campus Events Coordinator nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Ekdahl**

- One councilor to serve on the Environmental Conservation Office of Students Director nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Alampi**

- One councilor to serve on the Speaker of Students' Council nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Welke**

- One councilor to serve on the Recording Secretary nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Rajulu**

- One councilor to serve on the President's Boards nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Laffin**

- One councilor to serve on the Vice President Academic Boards nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Gill**

- One councilor to serve on the Vice President External Boards nominating committee;

Congratulations to **Beamish**

- One councilor to serve on the Vice President Operations & Finance boards nominating committee; and

Congratulations to **Knull**

- One councilor to serve on the Vice President Student Life Boards nominating committee.

Congratulations to **Ekdahl**

Please see document SC 02-20.06. for meeting times and locations.

2002-20/13f

High School Travel Tour

Special Order #6

BRECHTEL/ROSS MOVED THAT Students' Council upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the proposed travel budget for the High School Tuition Tour.
Please see document LA 02-20.03

Hudema: We will be doing a whirlwind tour across central and southern Alberta high schools talking about issues facing post-secondary education. We'll be sending out press releases for every city so hopefully we'll get local media attention. Forums are planned in Medicine Hat and Red Deer.

Welke: Who all will be going on the trip?

Hudema: Everyone who isn't running in the election.

Smith: **Hudema**, **Sharma**, and **Ross** (a majority of the exec) will be going. The information officer is also going but her expenses aren't included here as they just need to be approved by the exec.

Samuel: Why are we sending **Ross,** except for the fact that he'd be all alone in the exec offices with sole power...oh, wait, I understand...

Kawanami: Will EAB have a say in the positions espoused?

Sharma: This is in conjunction with CAUS (which has only 13 policies, if you want to find out what will be espoused) and EAB will be meeting to discuss this. **Samuel (POI)**: What is the rationale behind sending **Ross**?

Ross: In addition to keeping these two in line, prospective students often have questions about residence life that I can perhaps be of help answering.

Hudema: The format of our presentation is a Jeopardy game; Kail and Mariel were instrumental in putting the presentation together. Most days we will hit 3 or 4 schools and do a general town hall in the evening.

Laffin: How much time will you be spending at each school and is it worth it?

Alampi: High schools won't allocate more time to you anyway. As a recruiter for both the university and my faculty, I can say that this budget is very reasonable.

BOLIVAR/SLOMP MOVED the previous question

Carried

Carried (36/0/2) (Abstaining: Hudema, Sharma)

2002-20/12 LEGISLATION

2002-20/12a
Article XII

SMITH/SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the proposed changes to Article XII of the Constitution (THIRD Reading).
Please bring supporting documentation from the January 21, 2003 meeting.

Carried (32/2/2)

2002-20/12b
Bylaw 2100

SMITH MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the proposed amendments to Bylaw 2100 (SECOND Reading).
Please see document SC 02-20.02.

Smith: The review process for this bylaw was fantastic; we've produced much better legislation. This represents the recommendations of FARCE, albeit not in all cases. IRB moved election dates to where they are now, not in January or March. No good time in January (exec shouldn't be on leaves of absence during the tuition campaign). Other deviations from FARCE recommendations: Joke candidates would receive 50% funding and campaign expenses would not increase.
Kawanami: I was under the impression that IRB was fine-tuning the wording; this is clearly not reflective of some of FARCE's recommendations which council accepted, particularly the January election date.
Samuel: IRB didn't grossly violate the intended principles that FARCE put forth. Rather they looked at the logistics of the proposed changes while keeping in mind the principles behind the recommendations.
Weppler: IRB was a sober second thought (and I was actually sober at this meeting). IRB has a big picture view, fitting these policies into the greater context of other SU policies.
Hudema: This represents a big shift in the way that we do voting and deserves discussion unless people are completely in favor of preferential balloting.
Sharma: Preferential balloting is indeed an experiment and we will certainly go back and evaluate it once it is in place. The $600 amount has always been a struggle; $700 is a reasonable amount.
Lo: Why was the prohibition against contacting external media lifted?

BRECHTEL/LO MOVED TO add old article 50 (media) as new 61 and re-number accordingly: "All candidates are free to pursue campus-based media as determined by the CRO, however, are

restricted from contacting external media sources. All external media must be directed through the CRO office."

Brechtel: The goal is to keep the playing field as level as possible, to focus on issues, not on people and their connections (in printing companies, media, etc.) Removing prohibition on external media would be just as bad as removing prohibitions on spending. External media are not interested student issues; they are interested only in covering stunts, scandals. This provides a highly disproportionate advantage to candidates who engage in stunts or have media contacts.

Weppler (POI): Do you think voter turnout would increase if more scandalous women ran?

Brechtel: I'd like to think not.

Welke: Skills necessary to run a campaign are vital to representing students. **Clyburn**: The media is our strongest source of support. Since the provincial government doesn't listen to student issues, any media attention is beneficial. Give candidates some credit and let them do what they're supposed to do: garner support.

Reid: Removing the media rule will have a negative impact on fairness. We do have a microcosm here: in the real world, media attention and the best soundbites may be important. Here, with our elections, we've tried to create a framework that promotes fairness and encourages the election of people based on their ideas, not who can drop a truck off the high level bridge (for example). It isn't just the ability to get coverage that is important; what you do with that coverage is what counts. This might encourage turnouut but for the wrong reasons. We don't want an election driven by uninformed voters who aren't interested in issues. How will we affix value to external media coverage.

Clyburn (POI): If electorate chooses a scandalous candidate, isn't it still their right to do so?

Reid: Yes. At the same time, as council we have an obligation to create an election framework that is fair and reasonable.

Kawananami: Our view over this is clouded by last year's election. Keep in mind that we can't tell the Gateway what to do anymore, so this is a red herring. These restrictions reflect badly upon us in the external media. It isn't good for us to have our electoral processes called into question.

Smith: A wise old man (**Reid**) once said that it's not just getting the coverage it's what you do with it. The sizable proportion of students who believe the SU to be a joke are disproportionately disenfranchised. The CRO, under this policy, does have final say in who appears in the external media. This amendment gives the CRO unilateral power to decide who can appear in the external media and for what reason. Defeat this!

Hudema: Very much out of character, I will take the middle ground on this. Coming up with a media event is a craft and there is something to be said for doing it well. The electorate can discern whether a stunt is relevant to the election or not. Right now the CRO has unilateral discretion and I'm concerned with this.

HUDEMA/REIKIE MOVED TO AMEND the amendment to include "The CRO cannot disallow the external media but will attempt to provide an equal opportunity for all candidates in that race for that external media."

Hudema: If you're putting an event together, you deserve recognition for that. But it's unfair if you just know someone who works for a newspaper and get them to do an interview; that doesn't represent any ingenuity on the part of the candidate. This still allows people to demonstrate creativity in campaigning but avoids any real unfairness.

WELKE MOVE D TO AMEND the main amendment to read "All candidates are free to pursue campus-based media as determined by the CRO; All external media must be directed through the CRO office. The CRO can not disallow external media but will attempt to provide an equal opportunity for all candidates in that race for that external media."

Friendly

Weppler: Recall the backlash two years ago when an article about university students going to Sexico conflicted with the image we to project about post-secondary students. All morals are lost during elections and people will go to any lengths to win a position. Defeat this amendment to the amendment.

Smith: I support this because it takes away all of the teeth of the amendment, which I believe is a good thing.

Matt Robertson: Going to external media won't help name recognition on campus; there is no point to external media at all.

Jones: Most of you will know me as a hardline libertarian. But no one should be permitted to talk to any media, unless we're willing to accept that all media are equal. We can no longer control the Gateway. If you know someone on the Gateway editorial board, or a staff member at CJSR you are in an excellent position to have an unfair advantage. None of these media are required to be fair. There is no difference between internal and external media.

Williams: I'm against any involvement in the external media. We should vote this down because it opens up evil.

BOLIVAR/BEAMISH MOVED the previous question

Carried

Defeated

[Debate: adding old section 50 in its entirety]
Sharma: This is way too draconian for this organization. When it comes to the media, it's fair game. You're telling people they can't go to the media and have their words heard. Elections Canada doesn't exercise such control; you don't have to be a libertarian to see the logic in allowing students to go to external media. The Gateway and CJSR are effectively external media and should be treated the same. If people can get these connections, that's life. This is different than spending money.
Weppler (POI): isn't publicity just a way to get free advertising, i.e. something that other candidates would have to pay for?
Sharma: A candidate has the right to appear in the external media in the way in which they want to be depicted.

BOLIVAR/KHATIB MOVED the previous question
Defeated

Jones: This amendment draws a false distinction between "campus based" and "off-campus" media. This is based on some notion that campus media will somehow provide more balanced and legitimate coverage. The Edmonton Journal and Sun belong to journalism boards that require them to provide fair and balanced coverage; the Gateway is bound by no such requirement. Indeed, candidates are even more likely to know a member of the Gateway editorial board.

JONES MOVED TO AMEND the amendment to read "Candidates are restricted from contacting media sources; all media must be directed through the CRO office."
Brechtel: When you're running for election you choose to not exercise all of your rights and freedoms because you're running for a position. What benefit will it provide to campus for external media to cover the election? External media are not interested in the issues that are of importance to students. The media coverage that would be garnered would not be on the issues of the campaign but rather on stunts that gather attention. Getting the media to support you on an issue is a very different skill than merely getting them to cover a stunt.
Sharma (POI): Would you not consider tuition, Upass, housing, and student life issues to be ones that would be covered?
Brechtel: You get covered on different things during a campaign and once in office.
Sharma (Councilor): What is best for students? The purpose of the election is to allow students to choose the candidate that

best represents them; this amendment is a disservice to students. Some offices, particularly VPOF, are best suited to people who are introverted and would thus not garner much media attention. Due to voter apathy, voters are not always able to discern whether a candidate's coverage is legitimate.
Hirji: If you have a good poster or web designer or a good volunteer coordinator you have an advantage. Anyone coming into an election has certain skills that they can leverage; why should media contacts be treated separately? Council is deciding what is best from students and robbing students of their democratic rights. To quote some guy named Greg who made a presentation to FARCE, "Freedom of speech and Freedom of the press are rather old battles to be waging; I would ditch the rules."
Beamish: Candidates are ambassadors of this organization; what about the rights of councilors, etc. to maintain the integrity of everything that we have worked to establish? If you have a legitimate campaign, the CRO will probably let you talk to the media. All of the money we spend on external media campaigns is wasted if we allow candidates to project any image they like.
Rajulu: This just places one more step between candidates and the media; it is not a big deal.

SLOMP/BOLIVAR MOVED the previous question
Carried

[no media contact at all]
Defeated (14/15/0)

[including section 50]
Carried (14/13/2)

OBERHOFFNER/KHATIB MOVED TO adjourn
Defeated

JONES MOVED TO AMEND section 38 to read "Any member with the exception of the CRO, the DROs, and candidates be free to act as a volunteer for or endorse multiple candidates."
SHARMA/WEPPLER MOVED TO postpone to the next meeting.
Carried

SMITH/SLOMP MOVED TO adjourn

2002-20/17 ADJOURNMENT (10:00)