Tuesday Sep 09, 2015
5.46 pm
SUB 6-06

ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROXY</th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justis Allard (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cody Bondarchuk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Duan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Thronson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Christensen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Patrick</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo Zhang</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUTES (BC 2015-08)

2015-08/1 INTRODUCTION

2015-08/1a Call to Order

Meeting called to order by ALLARD at 5.46 p.m.

2015-08/1b Approval of Agenda

ALLARD / ANGUS MOVED TO approve the agenda

6/0/0
CARRIED

2015-08/1c Approval of Minutes

BONDARCHUK
Suggested an amendment that his last name must not have the second "c"
ALLARD / BONDARCHUK MOVED TO approve the minutes as amended
4/0/2 (2 abstentions by ALLARD and PATRICK)
CARRIED

2015-08/1d  Chair's Business

ALLARD
Asked if meeting time is good for everyone
(Everybody discussed but no other time was decided)

2015-08/2  QUESTION/DISCUSSION PERIOD

2015-08/3  COMMITTEE BUSINESS

ALLARD
Mentioned about second reading of bill 6 through 10
Asked if everyone has a chance to look through
Said that for sake of time he wants to limit the discussion to 10 min
Mentioned that if outgoing CRO is going and the seat is vacant?

CHRISTENSEN
If the chair of committee is the CRO then technically they can only vote
if there is a tie
If CRO is unable to fill, they will be conflicts

ANGUS
Suggests to replace "outgoing" to "incumbent"

Motion:
ANGUS / CHRISTENSEN motioned to replace "outgoing" with
"incumbent"
6 / 0 / 0 CARRIED

ALLARD
Asks if there is any other debate

PATRICK
If there is conflict of interest between student and CRO, then First
Principles, being very explicit, would prevail

BONDARCHUK
Said that he doesn't think that there is a conflict of interest
To that end a lot if things could be in conflict when it comes to bylaws
ALLARD
Is there a way they can find an alternative?

CHRISTENSEN
Said he thinks it is valid if incumbent CRO could be running for an additional term

ALLARD
So, it can be kept as in first principle

ANGUS
Might be a situation that may happen and the bylaw committee makes a call

BONDARCHUK
How can you suspend a standing order? In this case if this happens, can bylaw be ignored?

ANGUS
How bylaw could have foreseen for situations where you violate it?

ALLARD
They should have an obvious conflict of interest in past
In this case it is clear, in that either the chair can be found and / or a more knowledgeable person for the role can be found

Motion:
ALLARD / DUAN motioned to pass Bill 6, bylaw 2100
6 / 0 / 0 CARRIED

ALLARD
Initiated discussion on the next agenda item

ANGUS
Mentioned about the word "preferred" in bc-15-08-02

Motion
CHRISTENSEN / ALLARD motioned to change the "preferred" in bc-15-08-02
6 / 0 / 0 CARRIED

DUAN
If people run then they will find out

ALLARD
When you leave it to the discussion on the CRO it is on the cases by case basis

BONDARCHUK
If someone wants to change something they can motion to split a bill

ALLARD
It can be split and an amendment can be made to one

Motion:
ALLARD / PATRICK motioned to amend bylaw bill#7 in bylaw 2200 and bylaw 2300
6 / 0 / 0 CARRIED

ALLARD
Should there be a notice period before cancellation?
BONDARCHUK
When we cancelled daily meeting last period everyone knew
But you won't know in advance. It is better is to leave it up to them

ALLARD
There are checks and consequences too

ANGUS
Default for candidates is 10 min

BONDARCHUK
If we are holding additional meetings that is fine

PATRICK
Is not it proper to communicate in advance if the meeting is cancelled
Doesn't change the meaning
It does say to notify

ALLARD
It is like interpretation
(Agreed that a scheduled meeting would make it clear)

ANGUS
(Agreed)

ALLARD
In the event of interpretation, bylaw is followed

Motion:
CHRISTENSEN / BONDARCHUK motioned to approve 3c
6 / 0 / 0 CARRIED

CHRISTENSEN
There are always vacancies and therefore there are by-elections
If for example Tom calls in advances then his position will be filled
30 days because the nomination package takes three weeks and there
has to be additional 9 days
For example, by-elections are for October 30th and then vacancies on
August 20th, then what are you going to do?

BONDARCHUK
Good because it is start of school and people know if it is good time to go on or resign

DUAN
Nomination package has to out three weeks before election date -

CHRISTENSEN
So it has to 21 days and the CRO needs more time
This campaign starts 9 days prior
So exactly 30 days

ALLARD
Someone can dropout on the 30th day also

ANGUS
Said that 30 days is what they should stick with
Elections occur in consequently 2 weekdays days

ALLARD
Agrees with Cody that there will be people dropping out

DUAN
It is until first week and so it can be little shorter

BONDARCHUK
October is good

DUAN
Questioned if a nomination package is out

BONDARCHUK
Said that if they resign they resign

CHRISTENSEN
Proposes to change it

ALLARD
Agrees with that

CHRISTENSEN (reads loud)

DUAN
Said that they still can't include any positions

ANGUS
Questioned if it reflected the first principles
Motion: DUAN / BONDARCHUK motioned to amend Line 115 (BC 15-08.05) as Notwithstanding Section 16(1). If position become vacant between August 15 and 24 hours prior to the release of the nomination package of the by-election, those positions shall also be included in the by-election
6/0/0 CARRIED

Motion: ALLARD / DUAN motioned to strike plebiscite or referendum in line 245,
6/0/0 CARRIED

CHRISTENSEN
Talks about the 12 hours that it is necessary and says that it is regardless of the 12 hour rule (section 47 -4)

PATRICK
Said that he doesn’t know the exact role of the complaint
CRO can rule things regardless of there is a compliant or not

BONDARCHUK
Same issue but different ruling

AANGUS
Said that he regards time is essence and that he thinks that it is a time issue
Don’t let this hold you back until it has passed 12 hours
If it passed 12 hours the CRO should keep ruling

ALLARD
CRO should investigate afterwards but a ruling must still be made

ANGUS
Acknowledges receipt and implies judgement call (to me)

DUAN
Said she thinks it is like circumstances when they can

PATRICK
CRO has the right to investigate

CHRISTENSEN
Section 48 but this is section 46

ANGUS
Agree they don’t have to make a judgement call

ALLARD
Rulings are public
They have to complete the no estimations but have to make a ruling
Public can see that and can sway the election before further
investigation and something else comes out

ANGUS
CRO won't rule anything prematurely
CRO will finish whatever needs to be finished and will break the 12
hour rule but it has no benefit

ALLARD
But the CRO will break bylaw
I get it but can we legislate that CRO is doing a bad job
They are not doing their job

PATRICK
They can rule 12 hours and how about the 12 hours hours needs then
the ruling can be made at a later time

ANGUS
You can't legislate for a bad CRO
Asked if they can theoretically go where the complaints are received.
Said that if they operate with a good CRO then it will be a nice guideline
but it will not restrict because it will not be a substantial complaint

ALLARD
Said he understands that they interpret bylaw
If we have a bad CRO we can't do anything
Said that they can probably get the same penalties for not breaking
bylaws but like interpreting
It is like legislating against a CRO that doesn't do its job

PATRICK
Some are complex complaints
There will be expect ions
But in general ruling must be done in 12 hours

CHRISTENSEN
In most cases CRO can break bylaw and nothing will happen

ALLARD
Said that he likes this because they will have the authority to
investigate
If it is not 12 hours then they take like 3 days

CHRISTENSEN
It is like section 47-4 didn't exist

ANGUS
In spite of the fact that we must have a clause in 12 hours they can rule
ALLARD
They can rule but should rule in 12 hours

ANGUS
It says despite of this clause the CRO can rule
It totally negates the first clause

BONDACHUK
Agreed that it is clear enough from what I saw last year
For time limits, I don't see it happening

ALLARD
Making it explicit then is the way to go
You can't ignore section 47-4 to investigate

ANGUS
47-4 is tied to complaint that makes 12 hours necessary
Complaint should be clarified
Though it is necessary to have a 12 hour period but then adding time
doesn't make it clearer

ALLARD
Agreed and said that 8 days is not adequate but more than adequate

ANGUS
It nulls and voids the power that it exists

CHRISTENSEN
(Reads out)
I think we should be specific to be complaint
The issue should be in contact of complaint made

ANGUS
Disagreed
Said that suspect may be anything

PATRICK
It confirms the scope of adequate

CHRISTENSEN
Mentioned that contravention is not complaint

ALLARD
Said he is confused about the bylaws

PATRICK
This might be one the sections
It is not specific to disqualifications
ANGUS  Makes sense because it is like all the penalties

BONDARCHUK  Rebecca and / or Deborah must be updated to update the wiki

Motion:  PATRICK / ANGUS motioned to use the word "Notwithstanding section 47(4) the CRO is empowered to take adequate time to investigate and rule upon every complaint pertaining to contravention of this bylaw" in Line 313
6/0/0 CARRIED

Motion:  ANGUS / BONDARCHUK motioned to use the exact same wording to line 245
6/0/0 CARRIED

BONDARCHUK  Whether you have one question do ten the process remains the same
As it added additional students to it
I mean the worst that I can see is that there are two referendum questions and we don't bring them up, as there will be plebiscites

ALARD  Agreed but stated that it would be the proper way because there are certain words where plural sounds similar to singular

BONDARCHUK  Said he thinks referenda is correct
Proposes adding plebiscite (within brackets)

BONDARCHUK  Referendum is correct
Referenda is multiple of referendum

Motion:  ALLARD / CHRISTENSEN motion to make plebiscite plural
6/0/0 CARRIED

(ANGUS leaves the meeting room)

BONDARCHUK  Plebiscite and referendum are part of the election
Let’s leave it for now because as it stands it not wrong but could be grammatically different
Motion:
ALARD / PATRICK motioned to accept line 313 (first two paragraphs) as amended
5/0/0 CARRIED

(Discussion about polling station, started and went on)

PATRICK

On a side note, he said he found a spelling mistake

ALLARD and BONDARCHUK
Mentioned about an editorial mistake

ALLARD
Because technically that is changing
Separate things and so that later

(Discussion related to 2015-08/3f went on)

BONDARCHUK
Good polling is made online and is made explicit

ALLARD
Said that they do not use physical polling station
Polling stations are provided by bylaw and the goal is to eliminate them
Shall we say eliminate polling station or reference polling station

BONDARCHUK
Example DFUs are opt-out-able only online
Last year polling were used and 18 people used them
Extra principle would to craft something
Can talk more about ballots

ALLARD
Said that they can tell that “we eliminate polling by saying we are creating something to eliminate polling stations”

BONDARSCHUK
Said that they should say physical polling stations
If it is not physical but it is on phone then that’s not what they want

PATRICK
Polling station do exist in the real world
They have real polling station, but that’s online and should go to council

BONDACHUK
Said he thinks they should regulate that voting should only be done
When you have, somebody like a CRO, and voting online, we can't have paper and pen ballots then it can destroy elections. But can we completely eliminate it?

ALLARD
It has definition but you are changing the method
You also don't want two different methods to cast votes and it complicates
Said he is okay with it

BONDARCHUK
If it is a polling station then it is okay

ALLARD
Said that so they should just get rid of physical polling stations
Keeping with first principles to eliminate polling stations

CHRISTENSEN
Bylaw committee should be amended to reevaluate the polling process

Motion:
CHRISTENSEN / DUAN motioned to add a third line to section 2015-08/3f, which is "Bylaw shall be amended to reevaluate the election voting process"
6/0/0 CARRIED

Motion
ALLARD / BONDARCHUK motioned to strike the word "physical from number 2 point"
6/0/0 CARRIED

Motion:
ALLARD / DUAN motioned to amend the whole 2015-8/3f as amended
6/0/0 CARRIED

(Committee discussed section 2015-08/3g)

CHRISTENSEN
Is using second principle and information item, against university policy

ALLARD
University policy does apply
So it must implemented in bylaw

BONDARCHUK
People will have issues
Sid he agrees with not providing devices
In certain circumstances they work, like real world
You have implicit obligation for the person
Said he thinks that candidates should not be supplied devices

ALLARD
If you try to block a few computer during elections or something like that

CHRISTENSEN
Said he won't pursue addition policies in #4

BONDARCHUK
Said he would include first principle with something around electronic devices

ALLARD
We are not talking about integrity of the candidates but the election
You should not stand there and offer an iPad

CHRISTENSEN
You cannot go there and tell that use iPad or phone and so on

ALLARD
Having complete set aside for polling purposes is not like a polling station

BONDARCHUK
Said they should mention like where we are going with it so that people don't get cheated
Said they can include that in the introduction too

BONDARCHUK
Said they can say regulation shall be created during the election voting days

Motion:
BONDARCHUK / CHRISTENSEN motioned to add a line between lines 4 and 5 in 4a, that should read "regulation shall be created for use of electronic devices during the election voting days"
5/0/0 CARRIED

Motion:
ALLARD / PATRICK motioned to approve 2015-08/3g as amended
5/0/0 CARRIED
2015-08/4    INFORMATION ITEMS

1. Bill 6, bylaw 2100 was passed
2. Motion was made for amending bylaw bill#7 in bylaw 2200 and bylaw 2300
3. 2015-08/3c was approved
4. Amended 2015-08/3f and 2015-08/3g were approved
5. Several other amendments were made as listed in the Summary of Motions

2015-08/5    ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn:
ALLARD / BONDARCHUK motioned to adjourn the meeting
5/0/0 CARRIED

2015-08/5a    Next Meeting: September 23rd (2015) at 5.30pm in SUB 6-06

Meeting adjourned at 7.50 p.m.

SUMMARY OF MOTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTION</th>
<th>VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / ANGUS motioned to approve the agenda</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / ANGUS motioned to approve the minutes as amended</td>
<td>4/0/2 – CARRIED (2 abstentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGUS / CHRISTENSEN motioned to replace &quot;outgoing&quot; to &quot;incumbent&quot;</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / DUAN motioned to pass Bill 6, bylaw 2100</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN / ALLARD motioned to change the &quot;preferred&quot; in BC-15-08-02</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / PATRICK motioned to amend bylaw bill#7 in bylaw 2200 and bylaw 2300</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN / BONDARCHUK motioned to approve 2015-08/3c</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUAN / BONDARCHUK motioned to amend line 115 (BC 15-08.05) as Notwithstanding Section 16(1). If position become vacant between August 15 and 24 hours prior to the release of the nomination package</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the by-election, those positions shall also be included in the by-election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / ANGUS</td>
<td>motioned to strike plebiscite or referendum in line 245</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRICK / ANGUS</td>
<td>motioned to use the word &quot;Notwithstanding section 47(4) the CRO is empowered to take adequate time to investigate and rule upon every complaint pertaining to contravention of this bylaw&quot; in line 313</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGUS / BONDARCHUK</td>
<td>motioned to use the exact same wording to line 245</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / CHRISTENSEN</td>
<td>motioned to make plebiscite plural</td>
<td>6/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / PATRICK</td>
<td>motioned to accept line 313 (first two paragraphs) as amended</td>
<td>5/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTENSEN / DUAN</td>
<td>motioned to add a third line to section 2015-08/3f, which is &quot;Bylaw shall be amended to re-evaluate the election voting process&quot;</td>
<td>5/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / BONDARCHUK</td>
<td>moved to strike the word &quot;physical&quot; from number 2 point&quot;</td>
<td>5/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / DUAN</td>
<td>motioned to approve the whole 2015-08/3f as amended</td>
<td>5/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONDARCHUK / CHRISTENSEN</td>
<td>motioned to add a line between lines 4 and 5 in 4 a, that should read &quot;regulation shall be created for use of electronic devices during the election voting days&quot;</td>
<td>5/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / PATRICK</td>
<td>motioned to approve 2015-08/3g as amended</td>
<td>5/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLARD / BONDARCHUK</td>
<td>motioned to adjourn the meeting</td>
<td>5/0/0 – CARRIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>