

STUDENTS' COUNCIL

Tuesday, January 23, 2001 at 6:30 pm

Students' Union Building, Room 402

MINUTES (SC 2000-17)

Faculty/Position	Name	Present/absent
President	Leslie Church	Present
VP Academic	Christopher Samuel	Present
VP External	Naomi Agard	Absent
VP Finance	Gregory Harlow	Present
VP Student Life	Jennifer Wanke	Present
BoG Undergrad Rep.	Mark Cormier	Present
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Patricia Kozack	Present
Agric/Forest/HomeEc	Andre Poulin	Present
Arts	Jamie Speer	Present
Arts	Brendan Darling	Present
Arts	Kirsten Odynski	Present
Arts	Kory Zwack	Amy Salyzyn (p)
Arts	Richard Kwok	Present
Business	Erika Hoffman	Present
Business	Paul Chaput	Present
Business	Dean Jorgensen	Present
Education	Morine Bolding	Present
Education	Janna Roesch	Present
Education	Dan Coles	Present
Education	Robert Hartery	Present
Education	Justin Klaassen	Tanis Clarke (p)
Engineering	Joe Brindle	Present
Engineering	Wayne Poon	Sean Verret (p)
Engineering	David Weppeler	Present
Engineering	Tim Poon	Present
Engineering	Kevin Partridge	Present

Law	Chris Veale	Present
Residence Halls Association	Shannon Moore	Present
Medicine/Dentistry	Andrew Schell	Present
Medicine/Dentistry	Karen Cheng	Nicole Martin-Iverson (p)
Native Studies (School of		
Nursing	Jennifer Read	Asif Ali (p)
Pharmacy	Chelsey Cabaj	Present
Rehabilitation Medicine	Leah Ganes	Present
Faculté Saint-Jean	Wendy Gall	Present
Science	Tim Van Aerde	Present
Science	Mat Brechtel	Present
Science	Zaki Taher	Present
Science	Helen McGraw	Present
Science	Chamila Adhihetty	Present
President Athletics	Tashie Macapagal	Present
Gateway / Editor in Chief	Dan Lazin	Present
Recreation Action Committee		
General Manager	Bill Smith	Present
Speaker	Stella Varvis	Present
Recording Secretary	Thea Varvis	Present

Observers

Zoe Kobluc, Academic Affairs Coordinator
Jon Dunbar, News Editor, The Gateway
Shaun Flannigan, News Volunteer, The Gateway
David Zeibin, Production Editor, The Gateway
Marcus Bence, Photo Editor, The Gateway
Chul Ahn Jeong, Feature Editor, The Gateway
Martin Levenson, FACRA President
Harvey G. Thomgirt, Gateway Mascot
Christine Rogerson, Orientation Programs Coordinator

2000-17/1**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:35pm

2000-17/2**NATIONAL ANTHEM "O Canada"****Church** led Council in the singing of the National Anthem**2000-17/3****University of Alberta CHEER SONG****Ganes** led Council in the singing of the University of Alberta Cheer Song

2000-17/4

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Brindle/Partridge moved that the agenda of the SC 2000-17 meeting be approved.

Late Additions**Harlow:**

2000-17/5a – Presentation on Students' Union Involvement Awards

2000-17/5b – Presentation on Gateway Autonomy Petition

2000-17/9d – Article VIII-Powers Regarding Finance

2000-17/9e – Bylaw 2050-Nominating Committee

2000-17/9f – Bylaw 10430-Officers of Students' Council

2000-17/9g – Bylaws-200 Speaker of Students' Council; 210 Recording Secretary of Students' Union

2000-17/9h – Bylaw 390-CREFC

As a result of the late additions, items 2000-17/9d, 9e, 9f on the original agenda were renumbered as 2000-17/9i, 9j, 9k, respectively.

Church:

2000-17/5c – Presentation from Chief Returning Officer

Strike 2000-17/10c – CASA Lobby Conference

Add 2000-17/10c – Ratification of Deputy Returning Officers

Consensus

2000-17/5

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

a. Zoe Kolbuc, Academic Affairs Coordinator will be making a short presentation on Students' Union Involvement Award

- \$1.20 of student fees goes into Students' Union Endowment Fund. Awards available: Involvement Awards, Excellence Awards based on GPA, Gold Key Recognition Awards based on contribution to campus life and community, and SALUTE award given to outstanding undergraduate instructors
- Deadline for applications is February 1, 2001 at 5 pm
- A new monthly campaign has commenced giving students a chance to nominate their favourite instructor"

b. Jennifer Wanke, VP Student Life will be making a presentation on the Gateway re: autonomy petition

- **Wanke** asked Council to see attached "Specifics of GATEWAY autonomy" and SU position and then opened the issue for questions

Brindle: What's approved by DIE Board?

Church: There are clearly outlined bylaws but DIE Board doesn't deal with the question. There must be 2500 signatures on a petition. If this is successful by February 1, the Registrar verifies the signature, IRB then creates the question, and the wording comes to Council for approval. Bylaws only stipulate that the petition must be clear in intent. Council ensures that clearest question is asked.

Roesch: Can anyone elaborate on the \$5.00 space the Gateway asks for?

Wanke: The Gateway is asking students to grant them space on annual cost of \$5.00. This is the space estimate on the attached Gateway information sheet, but the actual cost of a completely autonomous Gateway comes to \$7/student/year.

Lazin: We're trying to maintain current service without being owned by a political body. Students already provide the Gateway with money through the Students' Union.

Roesch: You should call it properly, are you looking for sovereignty association or autonomy?

Lazin: We're looking for sovereignty association and are describing it that way. This system would be equivalent to the CBC and the government. The wording is clear. Sovereignty association saves students money.

McGraw: The autonomy plan has additional services, what's preventing these from being achieved under current system?

Lazin: Money. It costs \$15,000 to publish a summer Gateway. This is not currently available in the budget, as Council hasn't approved it.

McGraw: Why is autonomy the answer?

Lazin: It isn't, money is. With autonomy we have to ask students for money. An additional \$1.00 will provide funds for additional services. We're asking for autonomy and an extra dollar to fund extra services.

Wanke: Students' Union budgets the Gateway for it to break even. The Gateway doesn't break even in the summer. The length of the paper is determined by advertising, it's a business decision.

Hoffman: What about raises for staff: how much and is this part of the referendum?

Lazin: The specifics are not on the referendum because at this point the specifics are uncertain. We're proposing that the Editor-in-Chief decreases in pay to \$1100 and the pay of all other Editors increases to \$1100.

Brindle: Does the Gateway have profit concern?

Lazin: An autonomous Gateway would be non-profit. Any profit made after retained earnings would go to student scholarships.

Weppeler: Has there been any research done on sovereignty association by looking at other institutions that have made the transition?

Lazin: Certainly. The majority of student papers at the size of the Gateway are autonomous from their Students' Unions. Some papers have been autonomous for 20-30 years and are very successful at it.

Samuel: Can you table your budget at the next Council meeting?

Lazin: Sure.

Harlow: If your chief reason is free press, where are there examples of infringement? I am aware of one last year with the CRO, who is totally impartial, when they pulled paper, but that wasn't political, and another in 1971. Other than that there are no other infringements I'm aware of.

Lazin: You cited two concrete examples, but it's not about examples at all. This is in anticipation of trouble. There are troubles among papers across the country quite frequently. Even examples that are far and few between are unacceptable. The effect is important—we feel threatened and impeded. After an October 13 editorial criticizing the Students' Union, I was told by Jen Wanke and Dan Costigan that I was under budget and that this was cause for my termination. I consulted Anita Kuper, and this was not the case, we were actually at a profit.

Wanke: All supplements are in the middle of the Gateway – that is protocol. When the Gateway didn't do that, people complained. The editorial was in retaliation for having to put a supplement in the paper: As for the threat: certain policies must be followed – they should have printed 12 pages but Lazin printed 14. We just reiterated what his contract cited. The threat they feel is self-imposed, the content is up to their discretion.

Church: We have operated the Gateway from a publisher's perspective for the last 90 years. The Students' Union has a role in development of one of the best student papers. The Students' Union has defended the Gateway and fielded complaints. Editorials and cartoons are not representative of students but of the Gateway agenda. The new board would be much like the Gateway Advisory Committee but with a few changes. I question what the proposal achieves by maintaining the present situation minus the Students' Union. The Students' Union is not a government, you can't buy in or out. Where is the accountability? Should students be liable to cover Gateway mistakes or should the Students' Union, a strong organization?

Coles: Didn't council not allow for a features editor?

Lazin: As editors we felt we could serve students best by adding the position of features editor. The extra cost of the features editor is quite low. We had to send many proposals and we just don't want to spend that much time in bureaucracy. It is not time-effective.

Coles: If an autonomous Gateway is for the students, shouldn't students through council have a voice?

Lazin: Yes, we're not denying students. The composition of the board would have Students' Union representatives. Gateway business is controlled by Council, not the Board of Directors, this is a problem. Council takes its own interest into consideration but the Gateway can make the best decision for itself.

Wanke: Yes they had to go through a long process for Features Editor but that's necessary. Council is not the most accurate representation of students. The Gateway is saying students not entitled to give feedback. It's not yet proved that their proposal is more accountable to students and gives them accessibility.

Moore: It's not bureaucracy and redtape, but a body of students -that's how your held accountable.

Jeong (sp. by **Samuel**): It had to go through two terms of Students' Union VP Student Life to get Features Editor. We're not being hostile but the best relationship is autonomous. We have supporters from the Globe and Mail and the Journal. It is just a natural step, we do not want hostility because we still have to work together autonomous or not. Greg Harlow left out that when the newspapers were confiscated DIE Board didn't agree but James Brown did. A summer newspaper may be a loss financially, but students lose out more without access to information. To publish a summer paper we must go through a series of proposals. The Gateway should be autonomous to protect editorial license.

Lazin: To talk of us removing accountability is not reality. The vast amount of student concern with the Gateway comes directly to me and only a small portion to the Students' Union. The proposed board has students' voice.

Adhietty (TJ)(sp. by **Roesch**): Last year other newspapers were trying to get on campus, the Gateway asked the SU for help and won't you lose that advocacy?

Lazin: the SU didn't think that the threat was real enough to prevent the Journal from distributing papers on campus. The SU should protect what it sees is a valuable student service-has nothing to do with ownership of the Gateway.

Harlow: I'm on the board of CJSR, and I went to its general meeting . It's open to all, only 50 came, and they were not students. Does that board in that composition represent students more than this council? No. The Gateway and CJSR boards are not representative because diehard fans only go. This is a bad idea.

Adhihetty (C): For the reduction in fees – does that effect other services or only Gateway?

Harlow: It was selfish to reduce SU fees without consulting the SU. We have to keep organization afloat.

Adhihetty (C): Were you consulted about the financial figures in this proposal?

Harlow: I never saw the petition prior to its release.

Lazin: Harlow suggests that our board would be composed of Gateway hacks, this is not so. There would be 3 council members, 2 students-at-large, Editor-in-Chief sole Gateway rep, and the other 4 members would be voted on by the 5 students and the Editor-in-Chief. This is quite unlike CJSR as we won't instill own members of the board. The \$2.00 reduction in SU fees equals money SU gives to the Gateway . How does this body hold the Gateway accountable in a way this board won't?

Wanke: This body controls bylaws. Council is more representative of students.

Lazin: This board could take away our editorial autonomy, etc. This board would represent students just as well as this Council. Councillors would represent concerns of students, so what's the problem?

Church: If you compare this board to GAC, this structure is almost identical to what it is now. GAC is not the ultimate authority. Journalists, faculty members are not paying for the paper, students should be who you serve. This council is elected to be the voice of students. You can't translate accountability to this board. This proposal comes from fear of what might happen.

Levenson (sp. by Coles): To clarify, all SU members are members of FACRA. CJSR is in partnership with Friends of CJSR (members of community). We have student representatives on the Board. 3 of 10 members not students, the other 7 are students including 2 SU reps. FACRA is not trying to shut out students in any way.

Harlow/Brindle moved to call the previous questions.

Vote to call the previous question: 30/0/2 **Carried**

- c. Heather Clark, Chief Returning Officer
 - **Clark** wished everyone to know she is an independent officer of the organization and wanted to empower all to step forward and run
 - There is a need for three Deputy Returning Officers, especially with the possibility of many referenda
 - see attached information sheet for important dates

2000-17/6

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **Brindle/Salyzyn** moved that the minutes of the Tuesday, January 9, 2001 SC meeting (SC 00-16) be approved.

Wanke: Money transferred to Antifreeze was spent on additional initiatives.

Samuel: The Teaching and Learning Committee will work on FEC Reforms and midterm professor evaluations .

Lazin: Misspelled: Allan (Chambers), (Shannon) McEwen, Shaun (Flannigan), Jhenifer Pabillano.

Jorgenson: The initiative to get a computer lab was successful.

2000-17/7

REPORTS

- a. Leslie Church, President
See Document SC 00-17.01
 - Applause to Wanke for Antifreeze
 - **Church** warned councilors of long meetings ahead and thanked everyone for their patience, attendance and commitment.
- b. Christopher Samuel, Vice-President Academic
Written report provided at meeting
 - Samuel attended two meetings with the bookstore taskforce ,the interim report will be tabled next council meeting
 - Congratulations to Wanke, and Engineering and Education councilors for their great faculty weeks
- c. Naomi Agard, Vice-President External
Written report provided at meeting
Not present
- d. Gregory Harlow, Vice-President Operations & Finance
Written report provided at meeting
 - **Harlow** attended and enjoyed Battle of the Bands, He also partook in sumo wrestled , which he wanted everyone to know he found very hot and sweaty.
- e. Jennifer Wanke, Vice-President Student Life
Oral report provided at meeting
 - **Wanke** wished to give big thanks to the volunteers of Antifreeze, which was a huge success. There will be new programming at the Power Plant.
- f. Mark Cormier, Undergrad BoG Representative
Oral provided at the meeting
Progress has been made in making BoG more powerful on Council as well as other places. The tuition battle was interesting, some movement toward reducing tuition was exhibited. The BoG report will probably come in next week.
- g. Education Faculty Report
 - An oral report was provided by **Bolding**.
 - Education Week successful, there were many popular events
 - Western Canadian Association of Teachers conference is approaching
- h. Engineering Faculty Report
 - An oral report was provided by **Wepler**
 - This Friday will be 1st Annual Career Fair and the Electricals will hold 2nd Annual Hawaiian Balls and Shaft Day February 2.
 - Engineering week hugely successful with many students participating in several events. Clubs donated almost 3000 cans of food to the Campus Food Bank and over \$1000 to various charities and 40 students donated blood. Thanks to Leslie and Greg for support
 - Seven students sent to the Canadian Federation of Engineering Students' Congress in Montreal – much was learned.
- i. Executive Committee, Minutes (Information Item Only)
See Document SC 00-17.02

- j. The Minutes of the various SU Boards and Committees are available on the SU WebPage: www.su.ualberta.ca

Brindle/Church moved to recess until 8:40 pm
Consensus.

Resumed 8:40 pm

2000-17/8

QUESTION PERIOD

Roesch: Could the Gateway table their proposal for autonomous association with their budget at the next meeting?

Lazin: Yes.

Coles: Greg., could you comment on the honorarium granted to chair of Preface board?

Harlow: Preface board granted \$1000 honorarium to chair of meeting, on face value that's ridiculous and excessive. I'd like to hear the rationale for it before I criticize it.

Brindle: I'm the VP Academic for my student association and I didn't get anything for it. I think this is excessive, wouldn't you agree?

Harlow: Yes.

McGraw: Chris, is a mandatory laptop program going to happen at the Uof A?

Samuel: Not this year, but this could be seen as necessary in the future.

McGraw: What's the SU's opinion if that proposal were to come up?

Samuel: There is no policy, but it could be of benefit if for example you could purchase textbook as a PDF file and it could be effective in communicating with the registrar and professors.

Cabaj: What's the policy on maintaining the SU webpage?

Harlow: No official policy at this point. I'd ask councilor to see me after meeting to express any concerns.

Jorgensen: Is there any more information on OneCards in SUB?

Samuel: We haven't met due to scheduling problems. I will approach council with any new information as soon as it's made available.

2000-17/9

LEGISLATION

**2000-17/9a
 BYLAW 10200 -
 LEGISLATION OF
 THE SU**

HARLOW / SAMUEL MOVED THAT (SECOND READING) Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the proposed Bylaw 10200 Respecting the Legislation of the Students' Union

33/0/0 Carried

**2000-17/9b
 BYLAW 100 -
 STUDENTS'
 COUNCIL**

HARLOW / SAMUEL MOVED THAT (SECOND READING) Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the proposed changes to Bylaw 100 Respecting the Students' Council

Note: As per the Council meeting of January 9, 2000, the position of Speaker is to be included under s. 3 as a non-voting member of Council. It was left struck in this version of the proposed changes to Bylaw 100 by accident.

Gall: At what point will the number of councilors be decided?

Harlow: IRB is meeting Feb. 5, I will inform council thereafter.

Poon the Elder: I don't support this, the larger faculties should not overwhelm the smaller faculties. I want the SU to pander to all faculties, large and small.

Darling: When would the new number of councilors commence?

Harlow: After the next election.

McGraw: We do already have a proxy policy, will the new policy be enforced more rigorously?

Harlow: Most of the adjustments to the proxy policy were given on the suggestion of the Speaker.

Coles: Will IRB take into account this year's numbers or next year's numbers?

Harlow: We will use the numbers as of January 30.

Jorgensen: Who do the Residence Halls Association and Athletics Board actually represent?

Harlow: Well, they represent people in residence halls. This creates a double standard as some students get double representation, but council feels these groups should have representation on students' council.

Wanke: UAB represents all varsity teams and RHA represents all residents – two of the largest groups on campus

Jorgensen: I don't see how a varsity team representative is necessary. I feel this section should be further refined before being voted on.

Jorgensen/Speer moved to divide the motion so as to consider separately s. 5(c),(d),(e) of the proposed changes to Bylaw 100
15/14/5 **Carried**

Jorgensen moved for a roll call supported by **Poon the Elder, Brindle, Roesch,** and **Coles.**

(Roll Call -Question One - attached)

Debate on proposed changes to Bylaw 100, excluding s. 5(c),(d),(e)
No debate.

29/5/0 **Carried**

Debate on s. 5(c),(d),(e)

Brindle: Athletics and Residence groups aren't academic, but they're vital to our council. Removing them will downgrade the quality of this council. They need to be represented.

Church: I agree with Mr. Brindle. We have many growing communities on campus, we better represent students by increasing representatives and hearing opinions of integral members of the SU. It is vital to hear those representatives, they represent people very important to the VP Life portfolio. We don't want to have one councilor for a set number of students because that could make council unyielding.

Moore: Residence is a very vital part of our community. The RHA represents 3400 students. That's the 2nd largest student group on campus and it's growing. It's not realistic to expect students to fit into neat categories.

Poon: I'm in strong favor of s, 5(c) and (d), but in strong opposition to s. 5(e).

Poon/Jorgensen moved to divide the motion so as to consider separately s. 5(e) from 5(c),(d).
19/11/4 **Carried**

Debate on s. 5(c),(d)

Samuel: Life is full of anomalies and we can't ignore them or we forsake diversity. The voice of residence and athletics are vital. I urge all councilors to vote in favor of this.

Coles: I represent 637 students. If anyone of them had a concern, whether they lived in a residence or were an athlete, I would still bring that concern to the council. Are there other groups that are being overlooked? Foreign students? Blondes?

Brindle/Chaput moved to extend Council 45 minutes (until 10:34 pm)
30/2/1 **Carried**

Resumed debate on s. 5(c),(d)

Church/Gall moved to call the question
22/8/4 **Carried**

Vote on main motion
26/5/2 **Carried**

Debate on s. 5(e)

Poon: It was said that the reasons we separated councilors on faculty basis was incidental, but I disagree. Different faculties have different concerns and need. This is how it should be so we can allow for fair representation for small faculties.

Harlow: This council has established that it will accept other students outside of faculties. I don't see how adding 7 more councilors will create such a disadvantage for smaller faculties. One-sixth of our population is excluded from this council. I think this is a decent compromise.

Samuel: We have to decide what trade-off we will accept. The current system penalizes large faculties, the proposed system does not penalize small faculties but accommodates them. We must consider appropriate representation. Council has never been divided along faculty lines. The faculty system is just an easy way to create a system. I don't think larger faculties will ever overwhelm small faculties.

Ganes: I get my input from Rehabilitation Medicine: we share values, and ideas. I acknowledge there is variety within a faculty but there is a reason to be divided by faculty. I think bigger faculties will overwhelm smaller faculties. I think we often do vote based on our faculty.

Brechtel: Science is not organized. We do not vote in blocs. And we don't talk to each other. There is apathy in our faculty, but I believe that is due to our underrepresentation. I would like to reach more science students than before.

Lazin: The intent of this is to make council more democratic. On the faculty lines issue: differential tuition sees definite lines drawn among faculties.

Gall: Just because faculties are divided now, doesn't mean they always have to be. We've seen it this way so we can't envision it in another way. I represent 450 students, so technically I shouldn't have a vote but I do, so SU values smaller faculties.

Weppler/Bolding moved to call the question

22/9/1 **Carried**

Vote on main motion

23/8/2 **Carried**

**2000-17/9c
BYLAWS
1700 - EFFECTIVE
LIFE OF SC
MOTIONS AND
1400 - POLITICAL
POLICY OF THE SU**

HARLOW / SAMUEL MOVED THAT (SECOND READING) Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee repeal Bylaws

- **1700 Respecting The Effective Life of Students' Council motions**
- **1400 Respecting Political Policy of the Students' Union**

30/0/1 **Carried**

**2000-17/9d
ARTICLE V111 –
POWERS
REGARDING
FINANCE**

HARLOW/SAMUEL MOVED THAT (FIRST READING) Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, approve the proposed changes to Article VIII – Powers Regarding Finance

Harlow introduced the motion.

All funds must be looked at from time to time. We need some mechanism that that will look at specific referenda fees. Any dedicated fee passed after this year will be examined in no less than four years and no more than five years. Students will decide whether they wish to continue their support. The majority of people who have passed these referenda have moved on. These changes were discussed and approved by FAB.

At this point, the floor was opened for questions and debate from Council.

Salyzyn: Referenda need informed student opinion. Is there any mechanism that ensures both sides will be represented?

Harlow: There is legislation to set aside money for this. An organization choosing to make referenda is healthy.

Salyzyn: Are we going to alienate services that are not on the same side as the official position of the SU? How will this plan pan out in the future?

Church: We have resources to address this – elections. Ever five years seems reasonable to me. I acknowledge that SFAIC and the Access Fund are critical.

Brindle/Veale moved to extend debate for an additional 30 minutes (until 11:04 pm)

14/12/5 **Failed**

Poon moved for a roll call, supported by **Samuel, Wanke, Hoffman, Ganes** (Roll Call -Question Two - attached)

24/6/2 **Carried**

Debate resumed.

Lazin: I think it should just be five years.

McGraw: Do we have a policy that requires a certain student turn out for referenda to be valid?

Harlow: No.

Orono (sp. by **Veale**): WUSC is run by the SU, if you go to referendum SU has to represent the five members of WUSC. Referenda should be the responsibility of the SU. You can't leave it to five people because we need your help. The only other way is to give WUSC an exemption. On behalf of disadvantaged students let WUSC remain accountable to you through the VP Student Life and the Students' Union.

Grout (sp. by **Veale**): I am the executive coordinator for Student Legal Services. I urge you to vote against this. This amendment doesn't promote accountability, the SLS is already entirely accountable to students. The present situation allows for long term planning and budgeting but this amendment severely constrains long term planning and goals.

Levensen (sp. by **Poon**): If you want to bring CJSR to referenda, I just want to say BRING IT ON! We're sure of student support, in fact we'd probably get more money. We already have accountability through our board. My major concern is section 12, the review of our budget. It's difficult if we have to wait on a body's decision that doesn't know what's going on at CJSR.

Samuel: I am torn over the issue of accountability. Financial accountability is not an issue. Issue accountability is important: to ask students if they still agree with referenda decisions. We need an accountability mechanism and this is the best mechanism that the Executive came up with.

Coles: Is there a way that we can bring all referenda questions to this council first?

Coles/Brindle move to refer the motion to the Executive.

Unanimous Consent

Speaker asked for the unanimous consent of Council to proceed immediately to item 10(c) due to time constraint and the time-sensitive nature of the item.

Consensus

2000-17/10c

CHURCH / HARLOW MOVED THAT Students' Council ratify Jason Curran and Bruce McRae as Deputy Returning Officers for the 2001 election.

Carried unanimously.

2000-17/9i
PP
GOODS &
SERVICES TAX
(GST)

AGARD / SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the External Affairs Board, approve the changes to the Political Policy regarding Goods & Services Tax (GST)

2000-17/9j
PP
DIFFERENTIAL
TUITION

AGARD / SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the External Affairs Board, approve the changes to the Political Policy regarding Differential Tuition

2000-17/9k
PP
QUALITY OF
EDUCATION

AGARD / SAMUEL MOVED THAT Students' Council, upon the recommendation of the External Affairs Board, approve the changes to the Political Policy regarding Quality of Education

2000-17/10

NEW BUSINESS

2000-17/10a
BUDGET
TRANSFER

HARLOW / CHURCH MOVED THAT Students' Council reallocate \$1200 (One Thousand Two Hundred) within the OmbudService budget to purchase a new computer

2000-17/10b
TRANSFER

HARLOW / CHURCH MOVED THAT Students' Council transfer \$1,013,664 (One Million Thirteen Thousand Six Hundred and Sixty Four) in Excess Reserves to the Building Reserve

2000-17/10c
CASA
LOBBY
CONFERENCE

AGARD / HARLOW MOVED THAT Students' Council approve the previously budgeted expenditure of \$2352.46 (Two Thousand Three Hundred Fifty Two Dollars and Forty Six Cents) to send Naomi Agard, VP External and Leslie Church, President to CASA's Lobby Conference from March 12-17, 2001

2000-17/11

INFORMATION ITEM

2000-17/11a
CODE OF
STUDENT
BEHAVIOUR

"Code of Student Behaviour" document is included in the agenda package as an information item only

2000-17/12

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Upcoming Faculty Reports
- Law Faculty Report
- Residence Halls Association Report

•Next Council Meeting

- Tuesday, January 30, 2001 at 6:00 pm in SUB

•Future Council Meeting

- February 6, 2001
- March 13, 2001
- March 27, 2001

2000-17/13

ADJOURNMENT

2000-17/13

ADJOURNMENT

Harlow/Brindle moved to adjourn at 11:04 pm.
(The items 9/i to 10/c were tabled until the next Students' Council meeting).