

**STUDENTS' COUNCIL MEETING  
DRAFT MINUTES**

The eighth meeting of the 2006-07 Students' Council was held on **Sunday, December 3, 2006 at 12:30 p.m.** in the **Multipurpose Room** of the **Student Life Centre**.

**Members Present**

Eric Logan  
Jeffrey Aho  
Chris Neal  
David Evans  
Michael Pawliszyn  
Drew Adams  
Lu Jiang  
Caitlin Cull  
Kate Daley  
Robert Allie  
Swiss Nanton – Gill  
Rajat Suri  
Kevin Redmond  
Ahmed Farrakha  
Kirill Levin  
Jeff Henry, VPED  
Sai Kit Lo, VPIN  
Renjie Butalid, VPAF  
Michelle Zakrison, President

**Members Absent**

Jaisal Chauhan\*  
Farhan Pirmohamed\*  
Claudia Arasaratnam\*  
Phillip Keung\*  
Rhyan Ahmed

**Non-Voting Members/Guests Present**

Jon Fishbein, Speaker  
Brandon Sweet, Executive Researcher/Assistant  
Ryan Chen-Wing  
Jonah Levine  
David Phan  
Mohammed Alramahi  
Pavel Roshanov  
Lisa ter Woort  
Payal Agarwal  
Nicola Weston

Meeting called to order at 1:19PM.

J. Fishbein - We're starting this meeting and I apologize for the delay, although I think everyone probably appreciates the extra time.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION****1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Motion to Approve the Agenda: (E. Logan/M. Pawliszyn)

**Motion Carried.**

**2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

- a. November 12, 2006

Motion to approve the minutes: (K. Redmond/C. Neal)

K. Daley – I ask this every month but can we assume changes have been implemented?

B. Sweet – Yes.

**Motion Carried.**

**3. OLD BUSINESS****4. NEW BUSINESS**

- a. Amendment to Article 4.4 of the CASA Constitution (J. Henry)

BIRT the content of Article 4.4 of the Constitution of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations be struck and replaced with the following:

“Associate Membership shall be used to allow Student Associations to evaluate the merits of phasing-in or phasing-out of the organization. When phasing-into the organization it is required that the Student Association be approved by a Special Resolution of the Members at a General Meeting in order to become an Associate Member. When a Member wishes to step down to Associate Membership, or an Associate Member wishes to phase out of the organization a Special Resolution of the Members at a General Meeting is not required unless an abridgment or an extension to Associate Membership is being sought. Associate Members shall be assessed one half (1/2) of the full membership fee.” (J. Henry/L. Jiang)

J. Henry – I’ll speak generally to cover both of these motions and specifically. There’s a bit of a backgrounder that went out on this ROV. The way the CASA constitution is structured, extraordinary resolutions require ratification by 50% of member councils that way any changes made to the broader organization is accountable to its members, these councils. Helps you folks keep me in line just in case I’m not in touch. That’s why this motion is here. This one in particular is cleaning up something passed at June, a cleanup of changes from March, clarifying easy in easy out, holes being filled in. There’s possibility of membership voting down a council wanting to go to associate, that didn’t sound good, and those who have been sitting around for a few years can have that credited. (K. Levin arrived)

K. Daley – Thank you Mr. Speaker, I do speak in favour of this motion although with n odd not, because this Council and me personally had opposed the change that necessitated this one. We were concerned and that was in line with a previous document put out by EAC a few years back, maintaining the Easy Out part of the EIEO formula. This is a change we didn’t agree with but it is closer to the philosophical decision of this Council. This change makes sense in that context.

17-0-1 (M. Zakrison abstains)

**Motion Carried.**

- b. Amendment to Articles 4.3 and 4.5 of CASA Bylaw 4 (J. Henry)

BIRT Article 4.3 of Bylaw 4 of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations be amended to now read:

"Prior to the vote beginning, each of the regional directors upon consultation with their region shall rank the candidates on one secret ballot per region which shall be sealed in an envelope and held by the Chair, who shall not participate within his or her regional consultation at this stage in the selection process. In the absence of both regional directors, the alternate regional director may cast the secret ballot for that region. If both regional directors and the alternate regional director from one or more regions are not present, then voting must be delayed until such time as all regions have one of their directors cast a ballot."

BIFRT Article 4.5 of Bylaw 4 of the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations be amended to now read:

"In the event of a tie, a discussion will be held concerning the merits of the candidates, followed by a tie breaking vote. If a tie reoccurs, the ballots cast by the Regional Director(s) or Alternative Regional Director(s) prior to general voting are opened by the Chair and the candidate whose name of the two tied candidates is ranked highest on two or more ballots wins. If a tie reoccurs, then the Chair shall decide the winner." (J. Henry/E. Logan)

J. Henry – First I would like to say that procedurally I can't vote against this motion since I introduced it. However I urge you to vote against it. I will describe the situation. Hopefully someone else will take this up.

E. Logan – Does the VPED have some notes perhaps that I can read from?

Motion to suspend the rules to allow the VPED to speak against his motion (C. Neal/E. Logan)

18-1-0

**Motion Carried.**

Henry – I brought up the need, one of the problems with this bylaw, when they updated how the Board was structured, they forgot to update bylaw 4, but unfortunately on the floor at CASA, how can I put this, what was going on was an amendment to a constitutional amendment being made up on the fly as a patchwork, there was a belief that the Chair of the Board should not take place in consultations since the Chair only votes in a tie, I felt it didn't take place since it was a consultation so it leaves a school without a voice, it could happen, I thought it was bad to amend constitutions in a five minute recess. I couldn't support this as the Council table. Other schools will ratify but as a protest vote we should lodge a vote saying as you should not apply band aid solutions to constitutions. Procedurally I think we should lodge this as a protest vote to say that my original voting against has been ratified by Council and we should speak against stupid, That being said, it's great that they listened to me when I said bylaws should be updated to reflect organization.

0-11-6 (J. Henry, M. Zakrison abstaining)

**Motion Failed.**

c. Election Committee (M. Zakrison)

BIRT \_\_\_\_\_ be ratified as the BPP Committee member of the Election Committee

BIFRT \_\_\_\_\_ be ratified as the undergraduate student at large member of the Election Committee

BIFRT Brandon Sweet, Executive Researcher/Assistant, be ratified as the Chief Electoral Officer and Chairperson of this Committee (M. Zakrison/A. Farrakha)

M. Zakrison – So we have some vacancies we need to fill, if you are interested, nominate yourself or someone else.

K. Daley – Just to confirm, are we to understand that there is no Council member being elected?

### **Nominations**

J. Aho – Point Of Information - can I find out who is on BPP?

M. Zakrison – Chris Neal, Kevin Redmond, Ahmed Farrakha, Robert Allie.

C. Neal – Doesn't the bylaw say it has to be a current or former member?

A. Farrakha – Before I was on BPP I got on the committee as the Council member.

J. Fishbein – Farrakha was added as a Council member and that is why the Council member does not appear on this motion.

Amendment – BIRT the motion read A. Farrakha be ratified as the BPP member. (C. Neal/ )

J. Fishbein – That motion is out of order because this body would be reassigning a Council member and that would become vacant. I would remind Council that this position is available to former members of BPP.

### **Nominations**

K. Daley – Nominates R. Allie

R. Allie – Just a question for Mr. Farrakha, is he still wanting to be on the committee?

J. Fishbein – Since he didn't resign he is still on the committee.

R. Allie – Nominates K. Daley

J. Fishbein – We'll proceed to a vote. I'll pick a random order for speaking.

R. Allie – this is my second year on BPP and third year on Council, I've been on the referendum committee last year, I will not be running this year, I'm welcoming your questions. That's all.

K. Daley – It is with some that I agree, I was a former member, I've been a candidate and not been able to contribute in this arena and as someone who is moving on at the end of April I would like to be involved in a tremendously important committee.

J. Fishbein – CRO for this election just makes sure this from the gallery. Is there anybody in the gallery who wants to volunteer. Mr. Chen-Wing has done this before. Don't worry. It's a really easy job.

BIRT Ryan Chen-Wing be CRO and scrutineer and Nicola Westin

J. Fishbein– I will entertain a motion to postpone definitely until ballots are counted.

Motion to Postpone Definitely (E. Logan/C. Neal)

16-2-0

### **Motion Carried.**

C. Cull – Point of Information or Order, whichever one is allowed. Point of Order, if we are postponing it, what if one of them who is not going to win, what if they want to run?

J. Fishbein – We are postponing the entire motion.

d. Election Appeals Committee (M. Zakrison)

BIRT \_\_\_\_ be ratified as a member of the Election Appeals Committee for the 2007 Federation of Students elections. (M. Zakrison/J. Aho)

M. Zakrison – we need to fill a blank.

J. Aho – I have nothing to add.

J. Fishbein – Unfortunately Councillor Yip was a member and I will entertain a motion to amend.

Motion to amend to add a second blank (E. Logan/R. Butalid)

### **Nominations**

K. Daley – Would it be in order to postpone until the conclusion on the other vote?

Motion to Postpone Definitely (K. Daley/J. Aho)

**Motion Carried.**

J. Fishbein – We are ready to hear back from the CRO and scrutineer.

BIRT Councillor Allie be ratified as the BPP member of the Election Committee

### **Nominations for At Large**

R. Allie – Nominate K. Daley (accept)

BIRT Councillor Allie be ratified as the BPP member of the Elections Committee

BIFRT Councillor Daley be ratified as the undergraduate at-large member of the Election Committee

BIFRT Brandon Sweet, Executive Researcher/Assistant of the Federation of Students, be ratified as Chief Electoral Officer and Chairperson of this committee.

16-0-2 (Daley, Allie)

**Motion Carried.**

J. Fishbein – We are now accepting nominations for two blanks for Election Appeals Committee

### **Nominations**

J. Aho – E. Logan (accept)

S. Nanton-Gill – L. Jiang (decline)

E. Logan – C. Neal (decline)

L. Jiang – S. Nanton-Gill (decline)

E. Logan – C. Cull (decline)

C. Neal – Redmond (decline)

K. Daley – Point of Information, can executive members sit on this committee?

B. Sweet – Yes.

K. Daley – R. Butalid (decline)

R. Allie – D. Evans (decline)

S. Nanton-Gill – What are the roles and responsibilities?

M. Zakrison – If an appeal is made against a candidate, it meets on an as-needed basis. It doesn't meet as often as the Election Committee.

R. Butalid – J. Henry (decline)

E. Logan – Who is serving as Chair?

J. Fishbein – The committee appoints its own chair.

K. Levin – M. Pawliszyn (accept)

A. Farrakha – None of the members can run in next election correct?

J. Fishbein – Correct.

BIRT Councillor Logan and Councillor Pawliszyn be ratified as the Election Appeals Committee for the 2007 elections.

16-0-1 (M. Pawliszyn abstains)

**Motion Carried.**

e. Referendum Committee (M. Zakrison)

BIRT \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ be ratified as the members of the Referendum Committee

BIFRT Brandon Sweet, Executive Researcher/Assistant, be ratified as the Chief Returning Officer and Chairperson of this Committee (M. Zakrison/R. Butalid)

M. Zakrison – Basically every year we have referenda and we probably have some coming up in the winter term.

K. Redmond – Just councillors?

B. Sweet – The procedure lists the membership in terms of small “m” members, it can be anybody.

L. Jiang – Frequency of meetings?

B. Sweet – At least three per week during January and February.

**Nominations**

C. Cull (accept)

R. Butalid – Can you run for office and still sit on the committee?

J. Fishbein – Yes.

K. Daley – J. Aho (accept)

M. Pawliszyn – K. Levin (accept)

BIRT C. Cull, J. Aho and K. Levin be ratified as the members of the Referendum Committee

BIFRT Brandon Sweet, Executive Researcher/Assistant, be ratified as the Chief Returning Officer and Chairperson of this Committee.

16-0-3 (C. Cull, J. Aho, K. Levin)

**Motion Carried.**

f. Referendum Appeals Committee (M. Zakrison)

BIRT \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ be ratified as the voting members of the Referendum Appeals Committee

BIFRT \_\_\_\_\_ be ratified as the Executive member of the Referendum Appeals Committee (non-voting)  
(M. Zakrison/E. Logan)

**Nominations**

J. Fishbein – No student councillors can be nominated for this committee.

J. Aho – I nominate Mr. Chen-Wing.

R. Chen-Wing – Do I have to be a member of the Federation?

B. Sweet – The Appeals Committee must be composed of members of the Federation of Students.

Motion to postpone definitely (E. Logan/D. Adams)

E. Logan – I'd like to postpone this motion. It was not brought to my attention that only non-members were eligible and I haven't had a chance to ask my constituents.

K. Daley – Point of Information. Is it considered that there would be enough time to properly put a referendum appeals committee, and it will not become comprised?

B. Sweet – There are no hard and fast deadlines for referenda and I couldn't see why it wouldn't be filled in January.

K. Redmond – This is going to be my last meeting of the term.

J. Fishbein – That may not be germane at the moment as we are moving to postpone.

K. Daley – Just I've often found it important, I served on this committee before I was a councillor, we obviously need people to fill the blanks, if we don't have any blanks we can't fill them and it would be put off, I found it impending difficult to refrain from making comments on the issues, particularly heated, and I would think that by mid-January who have made very public comments not knowing that they may be on the committee yet. It may be worth doing at this meeting to give people the opportunity to keep their mouth shut.

J. Aho – The gallery is likely to form one of the Yes sides in a referendum,

E. Logan – Some people, I'm in favour, some people are concerned that we can't find people but I'm confident to find people willing to remain impartial and willing to serve.

M. Zakrison – I would like to speak against postponing this because I want to make a nomination.

8-6-4

**Motion carried.**

g. Refugee Support Program Referendum (A. Farrakha)

BIRT Students' Council approve a referendum on the following question:

The Student Refugee Program (SRP) organized through the World University Service of Canada (WUSC), a non-profit, non-governmental organization, is committed to helping refugee students having fled violence and persecution, to receive a university education in Canada.

Do you agree to support the Student Refugee Program at the University of Waterloo through a refundable cost of \$0.99 per term to be paid by all full-time undergraduate students at the University of Waterloo?

BIFRT this referendum be held electronically and concurrently with the Federation of Students' 2007 elections. (A. Farrakha/D. Evans)

A. Farrakha – I have no more information to add than to present to the council package but I would ask member from the group.

P. Roshanov (recognized) – I'm involved in the SRP. So as I mentioned I'm Pavel and this is Payal and we're here to represent the local committee and the SRP issue to Council. Obviously you have been bombarded by our information over the last little while, I'm very happy and thankful that you have given us the opportunity to come and speak here, you've been very helpful and supportive. Basically the SRP that we want to talk about is brought by the WUSC, a very large well established organization, functional for more than 60 years, in various capacities to support educational opportunities and public policy making in developing countries. The program which we are particularly involved with bringing to the University of Waterloo is a very well established program. This year alone there are 40 refugee students brought to Canada by local committees.

P. Agarwal – So just to sort of go into how we hope to bring the program to UW, we have established it for one year and hoping to make it a long term ongoing program, we are looking for a commitment similar to other schools where the university community acts together to bring the sponsored student to the university.

P. Roshanov – Pursue a partnership model, we have envisioned, 50% support from university administration and 50% support from students. We have been able to get that support from the university admin, now we are pursuing a student commitment. One way is fund raising, another way is through instituting a student levy. That's what we would like to do.

P. Agarwal – In terms of the student levy, it is outlined in the constitution, it is something by the university, all the monetary aspects held by the admin, removed from any student group or feds club, it is a large budget, and should be removed from student handling and we have created a partnership by the university's VP finance department.

P. Roshanov – We are looking at a \$60,000 which students shouldn't be dealing with. As a student group we share the same kind of pitfalls that other groups have, we can fall apart like any student club, what we've been able to do is work with the admin to make sure the money is held in a transparent way.

P. Agarwal – This is a problem that has been across 85% of universities. Passionate there. A lot of universities have had this fee for 10-15 years, and now they are increasing fees. We just really feel that this is an opportunity to bring to the students of Waterloo to decide upon. Bring an extra point of view that is hard to get otherwise, along that lines we have done Imprint articles and we hope to continue if the program was institutionalized at this university. Opportunity to decide for students.

P. Roshanov – We've been able to collect nearly 1200 signatures in four days so there is evidence of support for the program.

D. Evans – Nothing to add.

What are we debating is the possibility of a referendum on this issue. Any opinions you have on the merits of this program is not the motion. The question is whether to hold a referendum in 2007, please limit your question to that.

S. Nanton-Gill – On what basis do we decide whether a referendum takes place?

J. Fishbein – No basis, GM, Council, Board, Petition. Not one outlet for a referendum.

K. Daley – Unfortunately I need to speak against the proposed referendum and this motion, this has been shared through the council list and a community editorial that appeared on Friday, I will briefly outline. While I think this is a wonderful endeavour that our students are pursuing, the question that comes to this body is different than the one would go to referendum. What is the appropriate use of line item fees on our fee statement as under provincial law it is our responsibility to ratify fees to this university, so we do have a considerable amount of importance attached to student consultation on this fee, and if there's an argument against, students would be asked, and I agreed. Asking one student to support a dollar is different than asking this body about it. Very few would not give a dollar to support a student in need. It's fair to frame the debate. How do we support charities on campus? Through independent funding initiatives or line item fees? What makes it appropriate for line item fees? Faculty societies, endowment funds, Feds, as well as a few other organizations that have complex accountability to the students who pay for them. They are also designed to meet the needs of all students in some sort of ways. They have accountability and a mandate to assist all students. I would agree that though this program would be an important one for the community, it doesn't meet these criteria. I'm generally leery of referenda, as a political science student I think about what they mean, I do think there's a different between asking an individual student a question and asking students who have been elected as representatives to look out for broader constituents. Is this appropriate to ask? We say it's okay to ask it for any other charitable organizations and clubs, and other fantastic, generous well-considered initiatives of this university. We have to consider that potential floodgate and what fees will look like on this campus, those that are controlled by the administration. I don't think it's an appropriate question, were I to move into philosophical questions I would have issues with the constitution and I would say that this body has interests to consider in a broad way, than an individual, who wouldn't support this, we all want to help, but the broader question must be asked. And that is here. The only broader thing I have to say, this goes through students, it doesn't go through us. The Board considered this question and rejected it, but that shouldn't mitigate how our Council decides on it.

M. Zakrisson – I wanted to add some historical background. I'm planning to abstain at this point. WUSC started to meet with me in July/August, and there were few avenues to consider, the Board of Directors didn't bring it to referendum for a few reasons, it would be opening the floodgates to add another line on the fee statement and we didn't think a body of 9 people should bring it to referendum as it's not as public an avenue as Council is. We felt it was better if any body was going to make that decision, it was going to be Council. I would like to commend WUSC on their persistence, they've collected a bunch of signatures, and they are prepared to go to a referendum with petition. It has been in the works since July/August.

R. Suri – What's the deadline for getting a referendum question on the ballot?

B. Sweet – There are no hard and fast deadlines.

S. Nanton-Gill – Not an appropriate place for this question but I'm speaking in favour. We already opened this floodgate. WPIRG and its various sub-groups don't fit all those criteria either. Until WPIRG is repealed I don't see how we could refuse them without being hypocritical. This is how I reconciled myself with WPIRG as I feel it's a place where students can get experience in a number of things; it serves them in furthering extracurricular activities. There are students who would be willing to refuse this fee as well, people are dealing with an increased amount of tuition costs and fee costs that they don't want to see go higher. I don't think it difficult for the No side to say that there are many refundable fees that will be in place. You'll find a lot more people who would vote now with the secrecy of the ballot box. It is appropriate for us to send it up to our boss.

L. Jiang – How does WPIRG work? It's a separate body or corporation? How does that work?

J. Fishbein – WPIRG is a separate organization to ask the Federation to put a fee on the fee statement, that may not be how it happened, but the Federation is the only body that can put.

R. Chen-Wing – Students being the authority was established in 1994, WPIRG was in existence before that. And never went through a referendum or vote at Council.

D. Evans – I will be supporting this, that is saying that my constituents support it. I think with that degree of support being shown, we should allow students to have that voice. Floodgates open, I agree, but with the secrecy at the ballot box, the students will determine how many fees are available. If that cutoff is decided to be WPIRG and the SRP, it will be decided. I don't think it will ever get to the point of \$300 fee, our individual feelings and concerns that this table while important perhaps we are thinking at a different level, if individual students are willing to pay the fee, they should be allowed to say so.

L. Jiang – I'm going to be speaking against, I'm not saying I'm against this issue, I don't think, you know, as the Federation Council, our goal is to represent all students on campus, we all believe in that, one thing that makes the university so great is the mix of people, background and interest, Feds shouldn't be making a value judgment on this issue. Just as how some people like pasta or spaghetti, others prefer different things or not at all. Another intuitive argument, why not give all pasta to everyone and ask people to refund it, imagine all the people being confused and annoyed by having it thrust among them, asking them to go to several different locations, we open the floodgates and make a statement about the quality about the charity and its ability to follow through, many charities are good, why do we accept WUSC and deny other organizations?

J. Fishbein – Keep your points on the question.

L. Jiang – I think asking students is an excellent idea, either through a random sample or asking all people, extremely difficult to get a random sample, people who feel passionately, asking everyone, it's not going to happen and people aren't going to respond, even if we did get the random sample or everyone on campus, what if we have a 60/40 result, what do we say to those 40 percent who disagree, can we as council say to those 40%, 'because you are ten percent off, we have to turn our backs on you.' So say 50% +1 we'll set an arbitrary number, what about people who disagree, just because people dissent doesn't make it less valid.

E. Logan – I'm opposed to the motion at hand, those who have spoken against, I'm not opposed to the action of WUSC and I commend them for their valuable program, my opposition is philosophical, I have issues with how this has been brought to us. I have made it one of my hobbies to study on parliamentary behaviour. The Board did not send it to Council, the Board did not refer to council and said no. If student support is as broad as they claim, bringing it to petition should be easy. My issue stems from the fact to look at why Council wishes to hold a referendum, if a student society has an issue it should be brought through us, for example, Universal Bus Pass. There are mechanisms in place for students who wish to bring a referendum forward. Allowing student council to do this is an end run around our mechanism. Referendum on topic X, to allow us to paint bananas blue and beat each other with them. My feeling has not been allayed by the fact that this Council is more representative. We have ignored why we allow referenda to be brought forward by petition. I cannot support the motion at hand.

R. Allie – thank you very much, although I have been working with WUSC, I am against it. 1200 people and signatures, how many of those students saw the package and getting change, and read or understood what is going on. I have a series of concerns. The problem with the question is that it makes no comment about the constitution, which shows a lack of transparency. Right now, the constitution is what they are saying they want to do and nothing binds them. No guidelines on executives or membership, and concerns me, three directors. The next issue is that looking at current funding system and future budget, you have to consider refundable fees; campus average is 30% and that takes off a lot of their money. The idea here, we are dealing with people, this isn't a project that if the funding falls through we won't run an event, this is a person who we are responsible for bringing a person in. To run out of money in the last 4-6 months is scary. The university has contingency plans but those have to be repaid. Again I'm concerned that this keeps changing. A new package presented to us last night with significant changes, most are quite good, updated the amount of contingency fund, according to constitution, they would bring in another student once they have hit the contingency. The finances are sketchy. I can go through this again and again. There's basically a veto in the budget, 66% of directors must vote to veto budget. We don't know who

these directors are, they could be administrators and not students. Council should not be voting on something that isn't prepared.

L. Jiang – Is WUSC a club under the Feds?

S. Lo – They do have club status.

J. Fishbein – The constitution for the club has been approved by the IAC.

P. Roshanov – While UW WUSC is a club we have separated the RSP from WUSC as a separate club and it isn't involved with finances.

K. Levin – Can I ask, my question is, if the Student Refugee Program is separate, what is its status?

P. Agarwal – The way it is handled, for the student, we handled the finances of the student, one of the differences is the student is only supported for one year which is legally what we are allowed to do. We want to bring them over for more than one year, get over culture shock. The money we manage is less than what we hope to manage. The role of the local committee would be picking up the student, basically non-monetary helping of issues.

L. ter Woort (recognized) – I'm a staff member. Students put together a budget and all financial aspects of this project in terms of accommodation and levy have been operating through the university. Right now there is one bank account with the Federation labeled UWSRP, and it is sitting there, in terms of accountability, it is sitting within the university administration.

R. Allie – WUSC is going through financial problems and they could clarify, the first line item on the budget is \$5000, is that towards offloading, at least their budget is lacking, and the money fee is going to be increasing?

D. Evans – I don't see how this is germane?

J. Fishbein – The comments are straddling "germanity" if that's a word. Councillor Allie is directing his comments to constitution.

R. Allie – what I'm saying is, let's not rush into this, this can come up another time, we can have the ability to force the referendum at a later date. We don't have to tie it to our election dates. They are already working on a petition. Wait until they are done.

R. Suri – I am opposed to this motion. I'm not going to speak but rebut. WPIRG is on the fee, how can we not allow another, well first of all I'd like to remind you of the WPIRG referendum, that was nullified, but it could have gone either way, but we've seen indications, we've seen our constituents split. Another argument was that the floodgates were opened so why close them now. That's not a convincing argument. If you think a mistake was made in the past, you should not continue pursuing a policy. It's better to be hypocritical than by wrong in what we are doing in serving our purpose here. Representative democracy, it's our job to investigate the issues, if the issue goes to referendum, it may pass, but the individual students voting, I can see clearly how most students would not say no to that, and there will be a lot of work to educate both sides, but I think, I want to talk about they don't have a history of funds.

J. Fishbein – This is about the question not the question itself.

R. Suri – I don't see how it isn't germane.

J. Fishbein – Asking for a referendum not asking for money.

R. Suri – I still, even when asking for a referendum we should consider this group on campus and their record. I have question about the fee. This is supposed to be a refundable fee, what happens if you get it all refunded. I really applaud the members for their cause and commitment to social issues.

J. Henry – I'm forced to speak against this particular motion. I'll refrain from tossing another platitude of support for their work. I won't repeat Councillor Daley's excellent comments or councillor Logan regarding the role of its body in terms of referenda. I will keep my comments to the scope of a trustee of the Federation. Those of you are arguing that you are either delegates or trustees. I am a trustee, I look out for best interests of students and accountability of money that students pay. What would happen if the club failed? I have had numerous dealings with the Provost and won't repeat the comments, but it is a troubling thing to take the student controlled fees from 1993 protocol, all other fees within the purview of the Feds, and take it to the university. There are mechanisms of accountability at other institutions, WPIRG, CKMS, Imprint, we don't turn it over to be run through a third party without our control and I worry about the control of the funds that we would lose when the university starts running the fee. I share Councillor Daley and Logan's concerns and would offer those aspects up to look for the interests of the students at the university of Waterloo.

K. Redmond – I'm going to be speaking against this motion, though many charities are worthy causes, I don't think one charity should be given special benefits. I think charity should be a choice out of their own generosity to give out of their own hearts, not laziness. Our current system is flawed. The onus should be on the organizations to ask for money, not for people to ask for their money back. I do like this program, but under our current system it is not the time to allow a fee to put on the fee statement.

J. Fishbein – You are talking about the fee not the referendum.

K. Redmond – I'm talking about students getting their money back. I don't feel students should be able to choose to have a referendum to add a fee with the current system in place. We are digging a deeper hole into a problem that needs to be fixed.

L. Jiang – Is there any way for a line item to be withdrawn from the fee statement?

M. Zakrison – It is my understanding, a referendum and a recommendation to the Board of Governors, it's the same way to get it on as it is to get it off.

S. Nanton-Gill – First of all I would like to apologize to Councillor Redmond for interrupting. I think it is dangerous to fear that our constituents are not able to make decision for itself. The inappropriateness of the fee is a simple thing for the No Committee to state and they might win. If we turn WUSC down it is my opinion that we will see a question of the existence of WPIRG. If there is sincere opposition this will fail. No law is passed universally. Information must be presented by both the sides in a referendum. It is our role to decide whether this is a relevant line item. If it does fail at council I hope WUSC gets the signatures.

M. Pawliszyn – I'm speaking against this motion, I agree with Logan, and I agree with Nanton-Gill, the students have a way of deciding and it's called a petition.

J. Fishbein – By our bylaws.

M. Pawliszyn – There is a method of doing this.

Motion to Call the Question (D. Evans/D. Adams)  
10-6-3

**Motion failed.**

K. Daley – Having been the first to speak on this topic, I am still speaking against this motion. Comments about WPIRG, I would disagree that they are comparable. Organizations are supposed to be serving all

students in some capacity, in WPIRG their mandate is to support students who come in and want to organize on certain issue's they also have mechanisms of accountability through students and more broadly therefore a diverse and accessible service to students. I don't think it is the same case in Nanton-Gill's comments that WPIRG doesn't meet criteria, that's another question. Addressed through mechanisms. Saying that one organization that is supposed to be accountable but isn't, is not a reason for adding another organizations that aren't accountable. I believe that the role of referendum and students' council are different, we are asked to answer questions. What is our role, to whom are we accountable? This may come through with a petition as it would seem that a number of our students would raise their voice, and there's nothing we can do about that. Nor is it our responsibility. I don't believe so. I will note that there was a lot of discussion of UWUSC and the SRP, while it's true that the funding will be somewhat separate, and I'm leery to go into too many details, my first concern is that it isn't getting approval in any way, my other question if I'm understanding this properly, the directors under this constitution are club executives, raising precedent of how we fund clubs, once the link has been made to the university, who are given control of student fees, I would argue that the larger question is where council fits in, I don't think it is an appropriate referendum to be put forward at this time, and I would also say that in some of the dialogue online that other universities have been known to fund their student refugee programs, and I am leery of that precedent after talking to Queen's. The vote on all their fees every year and that is 30 questions. Unlikely for fees to be removed without due cause. It's a question for Council that is pertinent when we are asked to approve this. I would also note that referenda aren't asking every student what they think. We have this aggrandized idea, but a referendum is for two polarized sides to counter each other. Especially when it's a polarizing issue like this one.

L. Jiang – I would say I'm still speaking against this issue. I agree with Councillor Daley in terms of how we think about the overriding issues here today. If this were instated? What do we think about tuition instability? Asking every year we have different line items on the list, in response to Councilor Gill and not everyone agrees with a law, the idea of a referendum, I believe it should come from students themselves, we have mechanisms in place, they are halfway there already, going back to Councillor Redmond, if we say it's an issue for students, we are taking away student initiative. It isn't appropriate for us to discuss it here. In terms of Councilor Allie talking about the amount of support and problems that have to be resolved. They have gotten a number of signatures so far from people who are passionate, if this goes to referendum or charity on any organization, we are removing the basic idea of our society, that people should have the right to decide on whether to pay something, to give it to them first and then ask for it back. There's a shift in the way this society functions.

R. Allie – Just to summarize, we are being asked if the referendum question should be asked through council, not the referendum itself. This question through its constitution is not ready to be presented to students and that's why I can't vote for it.

2-14-4 (A. Farrakha abstaining)

**Motion failed.**

### *ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION*

5. **OLD BUSINESS**
6. **NEW BUSINESS**
7. **REPORTS**
  - a. Report on Universal Transit Pass Survey Results (M. Zakrison)

Motion for 15-minute Recess (E. Logan/R. Allie)

18-1-0

**Motion Carried.**

J. Fishbein – Please stay in your seats.

*Michelle Zakrison presented a report on the universal transit pass survey reports. To listen to the audio, click on <http://radio.feds.ca>*

K. Daley – The last time I saw this was Dental Plan when Council wanted it to happen and then take it forward. Why is this relevant if we're not being asked to make a decision whether or not it is a good idea?

M. Zakrison – I thought there were 5000 students on campus and students who lived within 1 km of campus, and then the emails started pouring in, and we started to look into it. I bumped into the GRT transit coordinator and he was there for a TV interview and we started chatting and even then, I don't know if our students wanted it, more emails kept coming in, I think students wanted it, and we entered into negotiations, asking how it would not be a cash group. All service improvements would be based on how much money we get from students. I thought I would go through steps up to now, I would determine and campaign on a survey to see if students were interested, and the survey was much higher than before, and I think 60% versus 38%, since it hasn't come to a referendum in ten years I think students want to meet, I hadn't thought about how the Dental Plan was brought to council, I was thinking about how students at large were contacting me and from the survey gathered from students at large, that's how I came to this.

K. Daley – No, what I was wondering, why is Council being presented with these survey results, is it because students want this and we want to pass a referendum? What's the purpose.

Zakrison – This is part of my update. I hadn't decided until I got the surveys that I wanted to get to a referendum. I wasn't comfortable bringing it to referendum with 45%. This is my decision making tool and I didn't know until I brought it to Council.

J. Aho – What is the current price that Laurier students pay?

M. Zakrison – In fall it was \$41.16. Theirs increases with CPI. They had a temporary 1-year contract and had a referendum to keep fee. That's what I would plan to do.

D. Adams – What's the difference between co-op students and all students?

M. Zakrison – It didn't include co-op versus non-coop. I don't think we have the demographics here.

R. Butalid – Can I direct a question to Brandon Sweet, can he speak to whether this adheres to our policies and procedures?

B. Sweet – All different ways.

K. Daley – From a numerical perspective, I'm wondering given that 60% students either very or somewhat supportive, what do we know about the 40% who aren't. What information specific to them do we know particularly about appropriate price for bus pass, how was that information incorporated.

M. Zakrison – A lot of that information would come through the comments. I can find out from the office of research ethics, who is the independent body who conducted this survey, maybe they can get a correlation, this is the summary we get, we don't get the raw data, maybe I could make a request, this is all that we have, except for the comments, the only thing about the suggested price, a lot of those people would be in the \$20 or less, would have said zero I think, but people were asked what a reasonable price. There are numerous ways to taking these statistics.

L. Jiang – Is it possible to obtain the demographics used to supply this representative sample? You mentioned split by gender or year status,

M/ Zakrison – Which other demographics are you interested in?

L. Jiang – I don't know if gender is a factor, off-campus vs. on-campus, co-op versus non-co-op, more pertinent. Proximity to campus, that sort of thing.

M. Zakrison – I'll see. I don't know what the raw data they can re-constitute.

J. Henry – I apologize, this is the first time I've had this in front of me when we're both in the same room.

First I notice in page three that they don't think the distribution is underweighting the first year students since they are most likely to support the fee. That's a problematic assumption. If there's nothing broken down in year of program, not backed up with their assumption.

Looking at the 22% that walk every time, that's an important demo to look at in terms of their opinions. 66% have taken the bus, that means 34% haven't used the bus once in six months. That's important to figure out. These aren't so much questions as points that require more data. 13% have parking passes. Will they take the bus? A piece of data broken down on environmental question. 70% never drive, that broad 30% is the question I really have from the environmental pass.

The only question I have that you don't need data for, looking at terminal on campus, since that would require the university to give up land, how does the university think about that.

M. Zakrison – I haven't spoken to the university about that point but they are in discussion with that and the university, and they are seeing how that would work into the campus master plan, I think students appreciate it but we aren't going to be able to incorporate every service improvement but I have to take the most from what students say about service improvements to determine what they decide.

J. Henry – We'll probably need that data by January.

M. Zakrison – The service improvements isn't on the question.

A. Farrakha – The survey was based on opt-out, non-opt out?

M. Zakrison – There was no data collected on whether students preferred opt-out.

S. Nanton-Gill – Have we asked what GRT would charge if we had a refundable fee?

M. Zakrison – They are strongly against it. The University of Utah gives a guaranteed income, there's space to opt out, the problem identifies was that they wouldn't be able to offer service improvements. They would be buying new buses for this and they cost \$450,000 each, so there would be less service. Doesn't seem like a favourable option. It would be very important to advertise that this is a non-refundable fee.

D. Evans – Point of Information – I don't know what the cost is at Laurier,

M. Zakrison - \$41.16 raised by CPI. They had administrative fees as well. Rounded up, ran the trial period.

D. Adams – Councilor Daley brought up the point, those students who said they were not in support, there was a note that 22 students didn't respond to that question, I would say that GRT would keep the same price for both universities.

J. Aho – What was I going to say? Is it going to be on the Watcard?

M. Zakrison – I think the Watcard is the easiest way, part time students don't get the Watcard.

J. Aho- How does Laurier's work?

M. Zakrison – They have a sticker for students. We don't even represent PT students.

C. Cull – I had an extensive discussion with the VPUA at Laurier, every week we get a list of 40 students caught cheating the system. They have no way of checking. They also have students selling their ONE Card and it's rampant abuse.

R. Allie – One of my friends is a double degree with Laurier, because they pay their ancillary fee through Waterloo, they've been issued a blank ONE Card, it may be possible to reissue Watcards but they aren't going to be happy.

M. Zakrison – There were thoughts about a sticker system. If students don't want it, but there's a lot to talk about.

b. Business Review Committee Report – Phase 1 (R. Butalid)

R. Butalid – I apologize for my lateness, with the events of the past week it's been hard to focus, I hashed things out yesterday. I decided to write that last night and send it out. How many people have read it around the table?

So I focused on Aussie's first of all, Suzanne Burdett contributed a large portion of this report when she sent me a long-term business plan, there are three main issues, profit margins, management of cost of sales, and location of the store.

### **Profit Margin**

Minimal. What we rely on is volume, but as you know with the location it is hard to keep that going, makes it a destination location not a convenience location, led to the discussion to convince our BoD to allocate funds towards relocation and renovation project.

### **Management and Cost of Sales**

One of the things we found was that the cost of sale was extremely high, a lot of product walking away from the store, we increased the inventory counts of our products and counted cigarettes, chocolates, phone cards, we did it from weekly to daily, so we would know how much we had in our store.

### **Location**

We recently got approval from the SLCMB to go ahead, the Board has approved \$260,000 and the SLCMB has given us the approval to move the store, the SLCMB oversees. The turnkey desk has indicated they will remove items of convenience, and Ann Simpson would like to focus the desk on information not a mini-mart because they've had an insane amount of lineups, they want to focus on providing information instead. One possibility is maybe moving Scoops into the new convenience store, either freeing up space for Wasabi or some kind of business unit. There's always potential for expanding it to some other Asian food thing there, or increasing Wasabi.

### **Fed Hall**

It has always been an issue time and time again, and more so evident in the last four years when the bars closed. Some of the biggest things was because we had very high fixed costs, there's really nothing we can do about it because that is the amount that the university charges us, 50 maintenance, 50 janitorial, 50 utilities, since the university operates on its own electrical grid, it's about the amount of space we occupy on campus, even if we kept it closed we always have to pay the fixed costs, there has been a decline in student attendance all ages, having said that, because it was opened to all ages, the majority of students were 19+ where we could recoup our costs, now that most of our first years were underage it's hard to make money on our bar sales. We need to readjust our strategies, when we hired Thomas Strehl two years ago we could supplement our student events with our catering, we're continuing to promote the venue as a multipurpose venues, some of the biggest things we're doing is a wedding show in January 2006 and we've had success since then and we're doing it again this January. We've put ads in magazines, our marketing

department has been phenomenal, we have a catering website. We've also done the celebration dinner, started out last year where we invited companies, faculty and staff to buy out tables and make that dinner their company or department dinner for the seasonal celebration. This past Friday was the first one, there were ten tables, and it was a good time. Most of our full time staff were there, other tables were occupied by outside people, and we recently had a professional photo shoot two weeks ago at Fed Hall where we completely decorated Fed Hall to make it how it would look like at a wedding.

We can do everything from running your event if you give us a budget and offering the use of Fed Hall as an establishment, and more reasons to book Fed Hall, for their enjoyment, that's happening with the catering portfolio and as well we just became members of the KW Chamber of Commerce and we are hosting the business after 5 trade show, we are giving free use of the hall for the Chamber of Commerce and we get our name and logo on the merchandising. Talking at the entertainment managers meeting, we may give them a reason to book Fed Hall within a year, special discount and then there are a limited number of conference centres in the area, and sponsoring this trade show puts our name out there for companies to consider when hosting a conference or event.

Looking through the sales summary, May 2005 to November 2006. The majority of events were student events, and the rest were outside catering events. Even though our focus should still be our students, we can't deny the fact that outside catering is important to sustain fed hall for our students. So what we're doing right now in terms of generating student interest, in the committees, talking about brand marketing in general, first years have a negative view of Fed Hall either because the events weren't great or there was a stigma attached to it. Having sad that, we decided to stop the bar nights after the first two Fantasy Thursdays weren't doing so well, at the same time we did not have a Fed Hall manager in place. It was open for about 7 months, dealing with some of the issues arising that summer with Bomber renovations, all our energies were focused elsewhere, once we got down the details we looked for a manger. Anne's been phenomenal, we hired Anne Pezzak, she sat down with Melissa to plan for bar nights. We decided to focus on large events to promote large events to get students up there, to see that students are attending events and they are cool events. They would want to come back, they aren't left with a negative image, we've had several concerts up there, recently Tony Lee, Halloween bash, The Trews, Theory of a Deadman, Diversity Campaign, lots of student society events, CUBE, Science Ball, leadership awards banquet, Taiwanese Student Idol competition and so many other things, this is for the Engineering councilor's some brought up issues with IRS, we're going to make sure if there's a way to have it on campus this year. Trust that it is being discussed. Our focus on large events is happening for next year as well. Generate hype for the big events. That's what we hope to do next semester. We are also hoping to continue to pursue outside catering events to supplement our revenue streams.

One of the biggest things from a marketing standpoint is a clear direction and focus for the Bard Night, to see which group of students who prefer having a bar night in a huge atmosphere. With 300 people the Bomber looks packed but 300 at the Fed Hall doesn't look great. There are big clubs and there is a demand for the big night club atmosphere, it's a matter of targeting that demographic so what we've done, with Fed Hall and Marketing Director working together, we've come out with a new slogan, we're going to continue with larger events and catering we may be taking a risk, so we're calling it Mint Thursdays – Get Fresh. We're calling it Federation Hall too, you can't really call the SkyDome the Rogers Centre while believing, Federation Hall invokes a classier newer feeling, and we're going after the 19+ crowd and it is clear to us, all ages bar nights do not work, because we do not recoup our finances. One of the biggest things we are doing different, we're getting students to DJ these nights, and the nights are January 11, 18, 25, March 1, 8, 15, 22<sup>nd</sup>, and we're breaking for midterms. The person we hired, DJ Silver, he's the resident DJ for the Canadian Asian Students, he's also an executive member for CASA s well, we're looking to use his marketing draw to hype up the night. Business cards for VIP access as well to avoid lineup and promote the indoor lineup. Something extra would be appreciated. He's got his picture and logo, as incentive to promote himself.

We're hoping that this works, because of the large capacity, we're going after larger clubs, CSA, ACS, if people call ahead we can give them VIP no problem. Because there are 800 people, we could put 300 on the VIP list and the rest can wait in line, but if they get early they can wait indoors. I think this will work, I really have nothing but good words to say about our Marketing Department, I mentioned this before, this

was the first year we wanted to go 19+ for Halloween and go all ages at the Bomber. Both were phenomenal.

J. Aho asked a question.

E. Logan asked a question.

K. Daley asked a question

L. Jiang asked a question about DECA.

R. Butalid – Fed Hall was an item for discussion but DECA didn't want to touch it because they already did it once, but the silkscreen thing was something they wanted to do it. We will be heavily promoting in the residences for a licensed area trying to keep it away from POLAR Jam, hosting non-bar events, we know we've had a lot of rock concerts, but focusing on other styles and comedians. Tony Lee was here again and the majority of the people there were first year students.

R. Allie – You had already mentioned Mint Thursdays, you've renamed Fed Hall to Federation Hall, its proper name, and something I was thinking about gathering clientele, is there a thought to rename Fed Hall to something classier?

R. Butalid – I would pick Federation Hall and we've revamped our logo for the new direction. Prior to do that we had never done catering events. Now in the rise of technology companies in the are, them looking to generated student interest in their company on campus, one company was willing to throw a free concerts for our students. We found that interesting so that's the general direction we're going in.

S. Nanton-Gill – Are there any plans or solutions to develop to streamline access to non-Waterloo students?

E. Logan – I would consider such mechanisms to be within the purview of the Federation Hall manager, it would be her job and less of our job, keeping a high level view of our businesses.

R. Butalid - With the bar closures prior to 2003, we were able to run our bars as we saw fit, we said we owned them and once that happened in 2003 they had a stake in how we control thing. The Fed Hall manager would have to push for more non-UW students into events, as long as the bar directorate is okay with that and the knowledge that things will be safe and secure, right now the university is very concerned about their public image.

## **8. EXECUTIVE REPORTS**

### **a. Vice President, Internal**

S. Lo – Just an apology for the late report, the report took much longer to do due to the recent event that happened. I wanted to make some comments to service review and Tamil. Service review is going very smoothly and the same with the Tamil Memorial day, I don't feel there were any things to worry about. It's a good thing.

J. Aho – Could VP Lo give us an update of Campus Communications Committee?

S. Lo – Now that the function is fulfilled without requiring a committee to always oversee that, that is mainly just me and the marketing department, and now we allow people from club, service and faculty department to book display case, they are doing a good job, I'm going to look into utilizing the committee in a different way and we won't be meeting in the near future until maybe after Christmas.

J. Aho – Is it a standing committee?

J. Fishbein – It's an ad hoc committee.

K. Daley – I’m wondering if you could talk about how you recognize clubs, candidates.

S. Lo – This program is in its beginning stage, we were looking into criteria, we have already come up with some draft criteria on how to select people. The way to recognize them is to create a certificate for an outstanding individual. The first person we are still thinking about from the Caribbean students association, he would be one of the first, the exact structure and timeline still has to be hammered out.

K. Daley – I’m still a little concerned about selecting people for criteria that haven’t been established, should that be codified before we start handing out awards?

S. Lo – It is still being developed. What I’m saying is, there are some draft criteria in paper form, it will be codified later.

R. Allie – This is the question regarding the IFC club issue, thought they had approval from IFC? There’s a group claiming that the IFC had granted funds and looking for reimbursement/

S. Lo – Can you give me detail and context?

R. Allie – That’s what I was looking for. “Claims that the fund that the IFC granted them,” sorry I read this wrong.

b. Vice-President, Administration & Finance

J. Fishbein – Mr. Butalid, do you have anything to add to your report especially after your business review presentation?

R. Butalid – No.

c. Vice President, Education

J. Fishbein – Sorry, I skipped you Mr. Henry.

J. Henry – And here Mr. Speaker I thought I had gotten off without commenting on my report. Again I apologize for not sending something out, it was four days on conference two days sick and trying to get through boatload of emails.

One, you got the short ND report, if you want the full version me or Rene will send you. 152 formal meetings at the lobby con, 52 conservatives, 72 liberals, 10 NDP and 5. Economic update happened, Flaherty released “Advantage Canada” talking about strengthening PSE system by giving predictable funding, it sounds like a dedicated transfer but it isn’t, enhancing public accountability, sounds like Pan Can accord but it isn’t, the third point, modernizing student financial assistance, that sounds like an SFA review system, it could be like the HRSDC review which the way to make them more effective was to cut them. Potential good things and potential “AHHHH!” so that’s the CSA update, the OUSA front, we had 40+ meetings at the lobby conference. Those were all good, Mr. Tory and Liz Witmer, Howard Hampton stood us up, former Justice Frank Iacobucci. We ratified Millennium and Early Outreach, SFA paper, assigned a new policy, I get to write our new tuition framework policy, which should give me any number of need for Advil over the next few months. Hopefully it will be good. The lobby conference went very, very well. We see strong commitments to move forwards, our asks were reasonable and wouldn’t cost too much according to the minister, and they want to meet regularly with us to work on access issues so they can have good things going into an election.

CSC and I’m sure you’re all interested in an update, it looks like we might have an appeals mechanism, we still haven’t seen one, that will happen within a week and a half. It’s Tuesday. CSC is meeting tomorrow between 5:30-7, if you are a co-op student or know a co-op student, send them our way as there will be food, but more importantly to get feedback on mandatory months.

For GAC, I'd like to thank Caitlin and Kate for helping with the Launch of the OUSA campaign. We got a number of students coming by, it was excellent. Expect more from our new campus coordinator next term. Excellent for engaging students as we go into a provincial election, today's first year students are next year's voters so they aren't a bad target market. Hopefully you'll find people less bitter than me.

J. Fishbein – I have a difficult time believing you don't care.

J. Aho – Question for Mr. Henry. So, Dion. Good or bad?

J. Henry – hard to say from CASA perspective. It's been way too soon, I don't know if we've met with him or not, hopefully he's friendly, if we haven't, he was committed to come to the lobby conference we did have, there was a claim he was stuck in traffic, really impossible to tell, we were surprised that he committed an hour to us in the first place. This notion of economic prosperity and environmental sustainability and social justice, there are very easy things to grab onto for PSE and skilled trades, hopefully we can put him in the "good" column. Otherwise that would be bad.

d. President

M. Zakrison – Thanks for those of you who came out to the memorial today. I think it was well attended and it went really well. I had planned on making a draft committee report on behalf of the GRC, I wanted to report in draft form, but my time was taken up, I do have some brief comments but maybe I can send something to the email list. Basically it's in my exec report but we made a list of issues, we did a SWOT analysis and broke the issues down into representative, culture, efficiency, and procedure. It's been the issue, discussing the composition of Council, discussing expedience, I'll send that out later so I can send out a comprehensive document. I'd like to introduce our new Arts Councillor Lu Jiang.

K. Daley – With regard to the thanking GAC for their efforts, the president's report noted 131 students who voted at the UW polling station versus 33 at Laurier, and said this was a higher turnout at UW because of GAC's efforts. How do we know that? How many were eligible to vote at each of those polling stations?

M. Zakrison – They had no marketing. JD was too busy organizing the general assembly, because we did the booths and had the forum our turnout was higher. Even though our voter turnout was so low, it was higher.

K. Daley – I was just wondering.

M. Zakrison – I wanted to commend GAC even though we had low numbers.

## 9. COUNCILLOR REPORTS AND QUESTION PERIOD

### Arts

L. Jiang – The ASU recently held the talks in the Great Hall and had Warren Kinsella a few weeks ago and just this week we had Josie Dye from 102.1 The Edge, it was the only female in that program so it was good to talk about women in media. We also had Cory Warren from the TSN. Anyways, so we had those things going on, unfortunate these events happened so late in the year and the receptions afterward. That wraps up arts for this term, we are planning the grad ball and managed our finances very well this year.

### Engineering

J. Aho – I had sent out an email, the Dean of Engineering Office will be organizing a bus and will pay for gas, the email sent out has more detail but no red flowers.

R. Suri – I'd like to talk a bit about Janet Yip, she took her duty as councillor very seriously, she was always suggesting that we should write articles in Iron Warrior, she always came to EngSoc meetings, and listened all the time. I know I'll miss her because she was my closest friend here on council, the person I

would talk to about council, she would continually razz on my because of our different approaches we took to Council, like my being late all the time. She would always make fun of me and it breaks my heart that she's going to be the one who is too late to Council. We'll miss you Janet.

## 10. GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

K. Redmond – This is a bit of a personal note, after this term I should have completed my academic requirements, as of the end of this term I will stay on after this meeting, I will be resigning from my post as Councillor and hopefully I'll be around next term, technically, it has been a pleasure working with you all. Thank you.

M. Zakrison – This is kind of a little sketchy. We have this box of donations and Janet's family is not expecting this financial burden, instead of sending flowers I would ask that we send a cheque to her family. I had it beside me because people were coming in, also any Councillor or member wishing to go do dinner, it's kind of a tradition, we could talk about Janet.

R. Allie – Two quick things, I'd like to apologize to the VPAF for my comment, I thought we were in reports or comments, and second, is the Federation of Students planning on holding a seasonal party.

M. Zakrison – I asked that question at the seasonal party we had on Friday, and our manager said it was a bad time.

J. Fishbein – We should keep questions in Executive Reports and Question Period.

R. Butalid – I know in the past the VPAF has gone away, I will be leaving for the Middle East for the Christmas Break but I will return.

S. Nanton-Gill – I've hired Bedouin people to take Mr. Butalid out. If we don't spend anything extra on Fed Hall's heating if it's empty, can we make it a butterfly arboretum at 32 degrees because I need to be able to beat the heat somewhere?

E. Logan – A magic fairy delivered me these business cards so if you don't have them pick them up at the front.

B. Sweet – I'd like to note that there are several council vacancies, Architecture, Optometry, Independent Studies, Renison, actually I received a nomination form for Renison but not only was the person not registered in Renison, none of the people who signed his form were either. So it was the first time I had to throw out a form with nothing right on it. Also, there are three vacancies in Engineering.

J. Aho – Can I get people to contact you?

B. Sweet – I have nomination forms.

## 11. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 5:12PM.