

STUDENTS' COUNCIL MINUTES

Tuesday February 3, 2004 – 6:00 p.m.
Council Chambers 2-1 University Hall

ATTENDANCE (SC 2003-22)

Faculty/Position	Name	Present/ absent	Vote 1	Vote 2
President	Mat Brechtel	√	X	
VP Academic	Janet Lo	√	√	√
VP External	Chris Samuel	√	√	√
VP Finance	Tyler Botten	√	√	√
VP Student Life	Jadene Mah	√	X	X
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Roman Kotovych	√	√	√
Residence Halls Association	Kyla Rice	√	X	X
U of A Athletics Board Executive Officer	Kevin Petterson	√		X
Arts	Alex Abboud	√	√	√
Arts	Chris Bolivar	√	√	
Arts	Erin Kelly	√	√	√
Arts	James Knull	X		
Arts	Chris Laver	√	√	√
Arts	Terra Melnyk	√	√	√

Arts	Vivek Sharma	√	X	√
Arts	Heather Wallace	√	√	√
Arts	Paul Welke	√	√	
Business	Adam Cook	√	√	√
Business	Steve Smith	√	√	√
Education	Allison Ekdahl	√	√	√
Education	Christine Wudarck	√	√	√
Engineering	Josh Bazin	√	√	√
Engineering	Nick Tam	√	√	√
Engineering	Paige Smith			
Engineering	Nicholas Tam	√	√	√
Engineering	David Weppler	√	√	√
Law	Dean Hutchison	√	X	X
Native Studies (School of)	Matthew Wildcat	√	√	√
Pharmacy	Erica Skopac	√	X	X
Physical Education	Holly Higgins	√	X	X
Rehabilitation Medicine	Sarah Booth	√	√	√
Faculté Saint-Jean	Zita Dube	√	√	√
Science	Matthew Eaton	√	√	
Science	Justin Kehoe	√	√	√
Science	Shawna Pandya	√	√	√
Science	Elaine Poon			
Science	Duncan Taylor	√	X	√
President Athletics				

General Manager	Bill Smith	X		
Speaker	Gregory Harlow	√		
Recording Secretary	Sarah Kelly	√		

MINUTES (SC 2003-22)

2003-22/1

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.

2003-22/2

University of Alberta CHEER SONG "Ring Out a Cheer"

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

2003-22/3

SPEAKER'S BUSINESS

Kwong was absent, and thereby automatically expelled from Council.

In accordance with Bylaw 100, councilors **Peterson** and **Poon** were given the right to request a reprieve of their suspensions.

Wardlaw (for **Peterson**): **Peterson** had not been informed about the meetings over the summer, and as an athlete, he is forced to plan meetings well in advance.

Wallace: Will he be at meetings for the remainder of the year?

Wardlaw: Yes.

Poon apologized for missing meetings, and stated that she had not missed one since September, except due to illness, and has consistently remained until adjournment. She emphasized that she wants to be a member of Council.

Smith/Botten moved to reinstate **Peterson** and **Poon**.

Ekdahl moved to split the question (friendly).

Ekdahl: **Peterson** should be reinstated – he has done his best and is excellent on outreach.

Hutchison: This is not Council's place – expelling and suspending interfere with the democratic process. A bad precedent was set January 6, when councilors were expelled.

Rice: It would be unfair to reinstate them when other councilors were expelled on the same grounds.

Smith: We expelled **Reikie** because we were prevented by law from reinstating him.

Kirkham: Partial representation is better than no representation. Constituents, and no other parties, should be involved in this decision.

Weppler: The rule should be changed regarding attendance. But while the rule is in place, Council must be consistent: if others have been expelled, these two should be as well.

Smith: *Will Weppler concede that foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds?*

Weppler: *But as long as we're being terrible, we shouldn't be half-assed about it.*

Welke: As an Arts student, he ventured that he didn't feel he had the right to make a decision about representatives from other faculties.

Lo: The bylaws make clear that all members of Council are empowered to weigh in.

Dube: The attendance regulations should be taken seriously or got rid of.

Rice/Eaton moved to call the question.

Carried

Peterson: 15/9 **Failed**

Poon: 12/10 **Failed**

Pandya's abstention was noted.

Smith's votes in favour were noted.

Hutchison's abstention was noted.

Smith/Rice moved that **Wardlaw** be appointed to the University Athletics Board seat, as the incoming President of UAB.

Consensus

Hutchison's absence was noted.

Taylor/Lo moved that Steve Kirkham be appointed to a seat representing the Faculty of Science.

Kirkham has attended most meetings of Students' Council this year, and without his appointment, less than half the seats on Science will be filled.

Hutchison established that **Kirkham** had not yet been elected to any post.

Botten asked **Kirkham** if he would be willing to resign his student-at-large position on the Academic Affairs Board, and he replied that he would.

Abboud: Why was this not dealt with earlier in the evening? Is this simply an attempt to make a point?

Kirkham was asked to leave Chambers.

The Chair expressed concern that the motion was a reaction to a decision made earlier by Students' Council.

Weppler: This contravenes all bylaws, and should not be under discussion.

Taylor: The election process is not without fault – Science currently has very little representation and can use all that is offered.

Hutchison: This decision is not for Council to make. **Kirkham** has no legitimacy in this body.

Pandya: Council needs to stop dealing with its own housekeeping and begin representing constituents again.

Botten/Hutchison moved to call the question

Carried
10/12 **Failed**

This does not preclude UASUS appointing Kirkham at a subsequent meeting.

2003-22/3a

Approval of the January 20, 2004 minutes.

Tam was marked absent despite the fact that he was not yet a councilor.

Hutchison's comments went largely unrecorded.

Brechtel: on page 7, "ACI" should read "ACUI".

Carried

2003-22/4

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Brechtel/Bazin moved to include item SC 2003-22/10c to the agenda.

Pandya/Weppler moved to include item SC 2003-22/10m to the agenda.

Consensus

2003-22/6

QUESTION PERIOD

Wallace: What is happening with the Advocacy Committee?

Brechtel: This is a priority item, but no specific dates have been set. Hopefully there will be a meeting either on the 10th or the 24th of March.

Samuel: The committee has been short-handed, which is why it has been slightly behind. In particular, the lack of an Advocacy Director for two months was disabling. But now that someone has been hired, things should progress smoothly.

Wallace: An Arts student in ETLC could not access computers in the laboratory there; is there a policy reason for this?

Lo: Technically a student from any faculty should be able to access computers in any building, but each faculty has different rules, and some laboratories have limited access.

Weppler: There are certain Engineering laboratories that carry specific programs that Engineering students would not be able to access anywhere else, so naturally use of these computers is restricted, generally, to Engineering students.

Rice: Recently, the library in the department of Political Science closed due to lack of funding. Is this happening elsewhere?

Lo: There are serious revenue gaps at the moment, more than was anticipated. The best person to speak to about this issue is the Vice-President Academic of the Arts Students' Association, but more "expense reallocations" (read: budget cuts) should be expected in future.

Cook: How many funds are left in the Project Reserve?

Botten: Approximately twenty-five thousand (\$25,000) dollars remain in the Project Reserve, meaning that it has been half-spent. More specific figures will be made available to Council in the near future.

Bolivar: Is there an update on the efficacy and success of the computer laboratory on the lower level of the Students' Union Building?

Botten: The laboratory is continually full of students using the computer: this could be used as a gauge of success.

Cook: Is there any plan to rectify the poor business of RATT and the Power Plant this year?

Mah: **Botten, Mah** and General Manager Bill Smith are currently working on a solutions document, in consultation with Marketing, bar staff, and reference to prior surveys. Work can be done this year, and also be transitioned to the next Executive Committee for their consideration.

2003-22/7

APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT (MINUTES)

Brechtel brought the conference motion in the Executive Committee minutes to Council's attention, and also highlighted what is called "responsibility pay" for the outstanding work of the Students' Union staff, who have been covering other positions and generally working very hard recently.

2003-22/8

APPROVAL OF STUDENTS' UNION BOARDS AND COMMITTEES REPORTS

2003-22/8a

Cook/Smith moved that Students' Council direct the Internal Review Board to examine and draft a motion for the Chair's honorarium, to be returned to Council.

Botten raised some questions about the proposition to begin providing the Chair of the Internal Review Board with an annual honorarium. He asked for the reasoning behind it, and how the committee arrived at the amount of three hundred (\$300.00) dollars, and finally asked why Executive participation or consultation had not been enlisted by this committee, given that the Executive Committee is the only body holding direct financial power.

Smith: Apart from the Chair of the Discipline, Interpretation and Enforcement (DIE) Board, the IRB Chair is the only unpaid Chair in the Students' Union. The amount of the honorarium is small, but serves two vital purposes: first, it increases the Chair's accountability; and second, it allows him/her to be fined by DIE Board.

Consensus

Carried

2003-22/9

OLD BUSINESS

2003-22/10

LEGISLATION

2003-22/10a

SMITH/BOTTEN MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, amend Article V of the Students' Union Constitution (third reading).

Smith introduced the motion.

Carried

2003-22/10b

BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, rescind Articles I, II, III, IV, IX, and XI of the Students' Union Constitution (third reading).

Brechtel introduced.

Carried

2003-22/10c

BRECHTEL/SMITH MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Internal Review Board, approve the changes to Bylaws 2100, 2200 and 2400 as tabled and amended in second reading.

Brechtel introduced the motion.

The recommendations brought to Council reflect the deliberation of the January 20 meeting of Students' Council. At this point, **Brechtel** briefly enumerated the changes for Council's edification.

Smith moved to strike Section 34 from Bylaw 2400, as well as the words *or Section 34* from Section 35. (friendly)

Hutchison moved that the words *count one ballot* be struck, and the words *count no ballots* be put in their place.

Smith rose on a Point of Order: because this was an explicitly adopted principle of the First Reading, such an amendment is out of order.

Smith's Point of Order was well-taken.

Kotovych, at this point, attempted to speak against some of the principles contained in the proposed changes, and was deemed out of order by the Chair. **Kotovych** responded by saying *Shame, Mr. Speaker, shame*, but the overall goodwill of Council remained intact.

Smith moved that the Arabic numerals used in the bylaws be changed to Roman numerals in accordance with tradition; and the extraneous apostrophe in Bylaw 2100 be omitted. (friendly)

Carried

Dube's opposition was noted.

2003-22/10e

WUDARCK/PANDYA MOVED THAT the Residents' Hall Association seat and the University Athletics Board be removed from Students' Council (first reading).

Brechtel/Botten moved that the motion be tabled until such time as the University Athletics Board representative arrived at the meeting.

Failed

Wallace/Dube moved to split the question.

Botten: The debate regarding both of these representatives will be identical; there is no reason to separate.

Smith: The debate will be similar, but the individual defenses will be different.

Carried

Regarding the removal of the Residence Halls Association representative

Cook/Samuel moved that the Residence Halls Association (hereafter RHA) seat remain, but be rendered non-voting.

Cook: The spirit of the original motion is to make Council more democratic as a body, and removing the seats' capacity to vote accomplishes this. It is unnecessary to remove the seat entirely.

Welke: Why is it not possible for a Business student who lives in Lister Hall to simply be represented by a Business councilor?

Cook: There are residence considerations and concerns that a Business councilor could not address.

Point of Information: What is the difference between a non-voting member of Council and a guest of Council?

Cook enumerated the differences, citing speaking rights and the right to remain in Council Chambers when *in camera* questions are being discussed.

Smith opposed the motion, stating that it is arbitrarily preferential: if these seats remain on Council, should *The Gateway*, FACRA, Student Groups, &c not be represented as well?

Samuel: Students' Council should embrace all of its stakeholder groups: each should have the right to speak to and debate with this body. The two opposing principles are these: that stakeholder interests cannot be represented without a seat on Council, but this defies the democratic notion that one student should get one vote only. The amendment is an excellent compromise.

Welke: The ideas behind this amendment represent a slippery slope to chaos within Council: if the principle of stakeholder interests is upheld, there is nothing stopping Council becoming inundated with three to four hundred non-voting seats, which poses staggering confidentiality problems.

Hutchison/Wepler moved to call the question.

Failed

On the amendment: 6/23/2 **Failed**

Debate resumed on the main motion.

Pandya: One person representing 3900 students is unacceptable. Removing the RHA seat restores a measure of communication between faculty representatives and their constituents. Councilors from faculties do not exist solely to represent academic concerns, but to represent students in a holistic fashion.

Rice: The only reason that there is any line of communication at all between residence and the Students' Union is because of the RHA seat on Council.

Pandya: Students in residence need to learn to communicate with their representatives.

Brechtel opposed the motion. Council does not exist solely to represent students, but to represent communities as well, and this representation is wanting as matters currently stand. Is the solution really to remove this representation? **Brechtel** urged Council not to "put the cart before the horse," claiming that such a change would galvanize remaining members of Council to become better representatives.

At this point the Chair informed Council that the twenty-minute debate limit on the motion had elapsed.

Smith/Dube challenged the Chair on his ruling that debated be halted. The Chair argued that members of Council had obviously made up their minds, and that the agenda for the meeting remained crushingly long. The Chair's ruling was overturned and debate resumed on the motion.

Weppler spoke in favor of the motion: the RHA should have a voice, but it is not appropriate for that voice to be *via* Students' Council. That it exists now exposes the Students' Union to cries of discrimination from other groups: Council exists for faculty representatives, and as such, no student goes unrepresented.

Rice opposed the motion. The rationale seems to be that the RHA seat should be removed because it represents a student group, but as a body, the RHA has General Faculties' Council (hereafter GFC) policy on the books, and reports to University Administration. This is not a small group. General Manager Bill Smith was recently heard to comment that the bonds between student unions and residence associations should be strengthened, and on that basis, the motion is nonsensical.

Tam spoke in favor of the motion. The lines of communication within residences, he claimed, are unacceptable: no legislation, no chain of command, no stability exists as it does on Students' Council. The agendas of Council meetings are public, as are the meetings themselves, and representatives from all concerned groups are welcomed to speak whenever they feel the need. They can offer presentations and recommend motions. There is a marked sparsity of motions directly concerning residences in Students' Council: representing students strictly by their faculties is the policy of the University, and this should be perfectly acceptable.

Taylor: Faculties do not understand the needs of students in residence. There already exists a poor line of communication between the Students' Union and the RHA, and currently one of the RHA's only advantages on this score is the fact that members of Council are universally accessible to the public. The notion of double representation is a flawed argument: among student groups, the RHA is particularly special.

Lo: Students' Council does deal with parochial issues: the precedent was set last year when faculty associations were removed from Council. GFC wants everyone represented, and this is detrimental, because it results in constant streams of random, counterproductive debate. GFC has standing committees, meaning that the RHA does not have a seat on GFC as such, but rather on CFRC. Finally, if there were an issue of direct import to the RHA or the LHSA, these groups would be contacted and invited to present on it.

Hutchison: Students in residences are a unique group on campus, and the Students' Union is not doing a good job of representing or inviting the cooperation of the RHA. Faculty and resident concerns are very different, and one voice is hardly sufficient.

Bolivar: Both sides of the debate recognize the importance of the RHA. However, Council is a legislative body elected by constituents, and no parliamentary bodies have special interest seats: such a measure redefines the idea of *constituency*. This should be more pragmatic and less ideological.

Higgins/Hutchison moved to call the question.

Failed

Higgins: The argument for keeping the RHA seat on Council has gotten a rare show of support from students in general, and it is natural that the good representatives from within residences would remain within residences.

Smith called **Higgins's** notion offensive, and stated his favor for the motion: the seat does not have a divine mandate.

At this point, **Brechtel** sponsored guests of Council from the RHA to speak.

Blatts called the debate "disgusting", and noted that in his status as "guest of Council," he had waited approximately two and a half hours for his chance to speak. One student representing four thousand is poor representation by population, and it seems cosmically arbitrary to attempt to solve this problem by removing the one seat that the RHA has. The seat has been considered necessary for this long, and Council should give some thought to why that is. Removing this seat is a statement to the student body that somehow, residence concerns are less important than they were last week.

Abboud spoke in his capacity as a student in residence and a member of the RHA, and stated that he was not offended by the motion. The motion seeks to rectify a practical problem, not to demean the RHA or residents in general. No student deserves double representation: this motion is less about the RHA and more about not pandering to interest groups generally.

Rice stated that she had been elected by residents.

Dube explained that the Faculte Saint-Jean is unique in this debate: the entire faculty itself is marginalized and having one seat hardly seems enough. Unfortunately having more than one seat breaks the rules: seats on Council are determined by faculty, through the principle of representation by population. This is not an anti-residence issue; it is rather about being fair. Council should seek to improve itself rather bloating it with myriad votes from myriad interest groups. The fact that residents have made their voices heard on this issue proves that they can do so without arbitrary support from Students' Council.

Samuel: Having established that lines of communication are poor, remaining *in statu quo* is not the answer. Removing this seat will give faculty councilors a better opportunity to communicate with their residence constituents.

Welke thanked Taylor for pointing out that all councilors' names and contact information are in the Students' Union handbook, and informed Council that he had voted against the smoking ban earlier chiefly out of concern for the interests of residents. Even without this seat, Council can represent residence. It becomes a question of not doing what is easy, but what is right.

Eaton/Bolivar moved to call the question.

Failed

Botten: Council has been asked to decide what it, as a legislative body, should look like. This is not a governing body, and the University divides students by faculty. Most of Council's agendas have nothing whatever to do with residence or the RHA, and most of the motions themselves concern internal, Students' Union-related matters. Council is the last place for the RHA to accomplish anything.

At this point the Chair ended debate.

Rice/Samuel challenged the Chair's ruling.

The Chair's ruling was defeated, and debate resumed on the motion.

Katz: Council meetings are very frustrating for guests, but eventually they are given the floor and can say what they like, and guests can include anyone at all on campus. The Vice-President Student Life has a standard seat on the RHA board, and has not regularly attended their meetings in years. Would that not be a better way of attempting to improve communication? Council is not the place for the needs of residents to be met.

Hogan: The RHA President does not necessarily represent four thousand students, but he does take issues such as the Universal Bus Pass and the smoking ban back to residence students and ask for their opinion uniquely as residents. Residents do not receive Students' Union handbooks, as Housing and Food Services creates one of its own, and thus does not have access to aforementioned contact information. Particular offense is taken to the notion that RHA representatives are useless on Council.

Dube: Residents were not the only students approached about these issues.

Hogan stated that as an Arts student, he was not consulted on them.

Brechtel: The question that should be in the minds of members of Council is whether or not this move actually improves Council as a body. Passing this motion would have worse consequences for Council itself than it would have for the RHA or for residents.

The question was called.

Carried

Main Motion 24/8 Carried

A roll-call vote was requested.
Carried

On eliminating the University Athletics Board seat on Students' Council

Wardlaw read a letter that had been prepared by **Peterson** for this motion, defending the seat's utility on Council.

Main Motion 23/6 Carried

A roll call vote was requested.
Carried

2003-22/11a

MAH/BRECHTEL MOVED THAT Students' Council approve the expenditure of no more than six thousand (\$6,000.00) dollars for Wellness Week.

Consensus

2003-22/16

ADJOURNMENT

Hutchison/Wallace moved that the meeting be adjourned.
Consensus