

FEDERATION OF STUDENTS

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

**STUDENTS' COUNCIL MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES**

The ninth meeting of the 2006-07 Students' Council will be held on **Sunday, January 14, 2007** at **12:30 p.m.** in the **Multipurpose Room** of the **Student Life Centre**.

Members Present

Eric Logan
Chris Neal
David Evans
Farhan Pirmohamed
Drew Adams
Levi McCulloch
Lu Jiang
Michael Pawliszyn
Caitlin Cull
Kate Daley
Robert Allie
Rajat Suri
Kirill Levin
Jeff Aho
Jaisal Chauhan
Jeff Henry, VPED
Sai Kit Lo, VPIN
Renjie Butalid, VPAF
Michelle Zakrison, President

Members Absent

Swiss Nanton-Gill*
Claudia Arasaratnam*
Phillip Keung
Rhyan Ahmed
Ahmed Farrakha

Non-Voting Members/Guests Present

Jon Fishbein, Speaker
Rick Theis, Executive Researcher/Assistant
Kevin Royal
Ryan Chen-Wing
Jonah Levine
Darcy Higgins
Stephen Malo
Richard Li
Sally Jurica
Teddy Dong
Michael Davenport
Matt Colphon
Grant Vincent (GRT)

* = Excused Absence

Meeting called to order at 12:36 pm.

J. Fishbein – All right, let's get started. Sorry for the delay. There is always a delay – that's not good. But it should be expected. We are going to move to the first item on the agenda – actually before we do that I see we have a new Councilor here, Councilor McCullough, welcome. And now we are going to move to the first item on the agenda.

ITEMS FOR ACTION

1. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion to Approve the Agenda: (E. Logan/C. Neal)

J. Fishbein – Are there any modifications to the agenda? Seeing none, is there any objection to approving the agenda as it stands?

Motion Carried 19-0-0

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

a. December 3, 2006

J. Fishbein – Is there a motion to approve the minutes? (Daley/ Pirmohamed)

J. Fishbein – Are there any additions or comments on the minutes?

K. Daley – It's a question I have every month – have the minutes that I sent to the Executive Researcher been incorporated?

J. Fishbein – I believe Mr. Theis has incorporated them.

C. Cull – And mine as well?

J. Fishbein – I believe that all changes that were sent to Mr. Theis were incorporated into the minutes. Are there any further comments on the minutes? Seeing none, is there any objection to approving the minutes as they stand?

Motion Carried 19-0-0

3. OLD BUSINESS

a. **Referendum Appeals Committee** (moved by Michelle 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)
(Zakrison/Allie)

M. Zakrison – We have three blanks needed for non-council members to sit on referenda appeals committee, and uh, an executive spot to fill today. The meetings will be as needed so it really depends on how many appeals there are during the referendum, so we will be taking names for that today.

J. Fishbein – Thank you President Zakrison. Councilor Allie, do you have anything to add.

R. Allie – No

J. Fishbein – Great. We will now move to nominations for non-student councilor positions. Are there any nominations?

J. Aho – I nominate Sally Jurica

Declined

M. Zakrison – I would like to nominate a student I spoke with earlier who accepts the nomination but could not be here today Stephen Eaton.

J. Fishbein – Any other nominations

C. Neal – I nominate Stephen Malo – accepted

J. Fishbein – any other nominations?

R. Butalid – I nominate Matt Colphon – accepted

J. Fishbein – are there any further nominations? Seeing none, I have 3 names for 3 blanks. We will take those names to be inserted into those blanks. We will now move to nominations for Executive member of the Referendum Appeals Committee non-voting. Are there any nomination?

R. Allie – I would like to nominate the Vice-President of Administration and Finance. – accepted

J. Fishbein – Are there any other nominations? Seeing none, we have one name for one blank – we will fill that name into the blank. We now have a full motion.

BIRT Stephen Eaton, Stephen Malo and Matt Colphon ratified as the voting members of the Referendum Appeals Committee.

BIFRT Renjie Butalid be ratified as the Executive member of the Referendum Appeals Committee (non-voting).

Motion Carried 19-0-0

4. **NEW BUSINESS**

a. **Education Advisory Committee** (moved by: Jeff Henry)

BIRT _____, _____, and _____ be ratified as the Student Council members of the Education Advisory Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

BIRFT _____ and _____ be ratified as the At-large student members of the Education Advisory Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

(J. Henry/L. Jiang)

J. Fishbein – Vice-President Henry, would you like to introduce your motion?

J. Henry – Sure thing. As I say every term, the Education Advisory Committee is perhaps one of the more fun committees to be on that is, of course, if policy is your “thang”. Again, as I sent out in the email to council, the Education Advisory Committee is responsible for creating policy and setting some direction and giving me some advise in terms of education and academic matters. Really everything outside of my co-op portfolio falls under the auspices of education advisory committee to advise me on. As well, in particular our external lobbying groups, some oversight given to them, and certainly updates much more broad than those received by council are received through Education Advisory. It is a good time – you can

ask former members of the committee who I hope will join us again, though we are always open to new faces.

J. Fishbein – Thank you Councilor Henry. Councilor Jiang, do you have anything to add?

L. Jiang – no.

J. Fishbein – Alright, with that we will now move on to nominations. Are there any nominations?

K. Daley – C Cull – accept

E. Logan – C. Neal – accept

L. Jiang – E. Logan – decline

K. Daley – L. Jiang - accept

J. Aho – K. Daley – decline

J. Fishbein – Are there any further nominations? Seeing none, we have three names and three blanks – we will fill those names into those blanks, and move on to the At-Large Student Members. Are there any nominations?

C. Neal – Stephen Malo – accept

J. Henry – I would like to nominate Asim Hussein, who is not here but has accepted via email

J. Fishbein – Are there any further nominations? Seeing none, we have two names and two blanks – we will fill those names into those blanks, and have a complete motion.

BIRT Caitlin Cull, Chris Neal, and Lu Jiang be ratified as the Student Council members of the Education Advisory Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

BIRFT Stephen Malo and Asim Hussein be ratified as the At-large student members of the Education Advisory Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

Motion Carried 16 - 0 - 3 abstain (C. Cull, L. Jiang)

b. Internal Administration Committee (moved by: Sai Kit Lo)

BIRT _____ and _____ be ratified as the Student Council members of the Internal Administration Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

BIRT _____ and _____ be ratified as at-large members of the Internal Administration Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

(S. Lo/K. Daley)

J. Fishbein – Vice-President Lo, would you like to introduce your motion?

S. Lo – Sure. The average time commitment is an hour each week, sometimes longer because they like it a lot. Need to be able to research. Need to have a basic understanding of clubs procedure and constitutional design.

J. Fishbein – Thank you Vice-President Lo. Councilor Daley, do you have anything to add?

K. Daley – Uh, yea IAC.

J. Fishbein – We will now move to nominations for the Student Council positions. Are there any nominations from the floor?

E. Logan – I nominate Councilor Neal – accept.

K. Daley – I would like to nominate Councilor Suri – declined.

S. Lo – I would like to nominate Councilor Jiang – declined

F. Pirmohamed – I would like to nominate Councilor Levin - accept

R. Butalid – I would like to nominate Councilor McCulloch – declined

J. Fishbein – Any further nominations? Seeing none, and as we have two names and two blanks, we will fill those names into those blanks and move on to the At-Large positions. Are there any nominations from the floor?

C. Neal – I have two. I nominate Richard – I don't have his last name. He is also sitting in the back there. I also have a second nomination.

J. Fishbein – Let's just deal with one nomination at a time please. Richard, what is your last name?

Richard Li – Li

J. Fishbein – Do you accept

R. Li – I do.

J. Fishbein – and the second nomination is?

C. Neal - Sarah Noonan – accept

J. Fishbein – And she accepts

C. Neal – yes

J. Fishbein – Any other nominations?

L. Jiang – I nominate Sally Jurica.

J. Fishbein – Ms. Jurica, do you accept? You have been nominated for an IAC position

S. Jurica – ohh no.

J. Fishbein – Is that a declined?

S. Jurica – I decline.

J. Fishbein – Any further nominations? Seeing none, we have two names and two blanks – we will fill those names into those blanks, and have a complete motion.

BIRT Chris Neal and Kirill Levin be ratified as the Student Council members of the Internal Administration Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

BIRT Richard Li and Sarah Noonan be ratified as at-large members of the Internal Administration Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

Motion Carried 17 – 0 – 1 abstain (K. Levin)

c. Internal Funding Committee (moved by: Sai Kit Lo)

BIRT _____ and _____ be ratified as the Student Council members of the Internal Funding Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

BIRT _____ and _____ be ratified as at-large members of the Internal Funding Committee for the Winter 2007 term.
(S. Lo/R. Butalid)

J. Fishbein – Vice-President Lo, would you like to introduce your motion?

S. Lo – Ok, this also is an hour to two hours a week to look at funding applications. It is also fun, much more fun than IAC.

J. Fishbein – Thank you Vice-President Lo. Vice President Butalid, do you have anything to add?

R. Butalid – no.

J. Fishbein – We will now move to Student Council nominations.

K. Daley – I would like to nominate Councilor Evans – declined

R. Allie – I would like to nominate Councilor McCulloch - declined

R. Allie – I would like to nominate Councilor Pirmohamed - accept

C. Cull – I would like to nominated Councilor Jiang – accept

J. Fishbein – Any further nominations? Seeing none, and as we have two names and two blanks, we will fill those names right in there and move on to the At-Large positions. Are there any nominations from the floor?

R. Butalid – I would like to nominated Farhan Lalani - accept

K. Daley – I would like to nominated Michael Davenport – declined

R. Allie – Councilor Cull – accept

BIRT Farhan Pirmohamed and Lu Jiang be ratified as the Student Council members of the Internal Funding Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

BIRT Farhan Lalani and Caitlin Cull be ratified as at-large members of the Internal Funding Committee for the Winter 2007 term.

Motion Carried 16 - 0 - 4 (F. Pirmohamed, L. Jiang, C. Cull)

d. Winter 2007 Service Coordinators (moved by: Sai Kit Lo)

BIRT the following Service Coordinators be ratified for the Winter 2007 term:

GLOW

Alex Chunaco

Sue Weare

Women's Centre
Margarita Osipian
Rose Schmidt

Food Bank
David Phan

CRT
Jessica Laks

UWSP
Tegan Renner

ISC
Michelle Lim

OCD
Ashley Teeter
Diana Arsene
Alison Lang
(S. Lo/J. Aho)

J. Fishbein – Vice-President Lo, would you like to introduce your motion?

S. Lo – I would like to add two more names to list.

J. Fishbein – Ok let's move for amendments when we move into debate. Councilor Aho, do you have anything to add?

J. Aho – Can we move to divide the question by service at this time?

J. Fishbein – no.

J. Aho – Ok. Then nothing at this time.

J. Fishbein – Ok, then let's move into discussion, which I am sure there is a lot of. We'll start out – is there anyone wishing to discuss this motion?

J. Aho – I move to divide the question by service (R. Allie)

J. Fishbein – I believe this motion is not debatable, so we will move into a vote.

Motion Fails 4 - 8 - 7 (R. Allie)

J. Fishbein – Any further discussion on this motion

S. Lo – I would like to make an amendment, and add two names to the list – Moe Furui (UWSP), Michael McWilliams. (K. Pirmohamed)

J. Fishbein – We will now move into debate on this amendment. Vice-President Lo, would you like to introduce your amendment?

S. Lo – I just added two names because I just got confirmation from them recently.

J. Fishbein – Councilor Pirmohamed, do you have anything to add? No, then we will move into debate on this amendment.

K. Daley – This is technically a question for the mover. Just wondering went this confirmation was received and if there was any opportunity for this to be sent out to council list prior to this meeting?

S. Lo – I got it on Thursday. Because it is the beginning of term, some students still organizing.

J. Fishbein – Any further debate on this amendment? Seeing none, is there any objection to approving this amendment as it stands?

Motion Carried 15 – 0 – 4 (K. Daley)

J. Fishbein – We will now move back to debate on the amended motion. Is there any debate on the motion?

J. Aho – I will be voting against ratification. I didn't want to vote against the entire ratification, and I had hoped to split it for service. My only issue is with the Women's Centre ratifications. I was upset with these two individuals over the last term, especially with their dealing with the "y" in the Women Centre, particularly their discussions with media in which they demonized Engineering and Science, male Engineering and Science students in the national media. As well as some of the information they passed on to the media was in fact incorrect and as well, there was an event they held this term, which was solely for women, which, for a centre on gender issues was inappropriate. And no action was taken. So I will be voting against the motion.

D. Evans – Point of information. How are coordinators chosen for the position. Is it a by-election within the service?

J. Fishbein – I am going to have to pass that on to Vice-President Lo. Vice-President Lo, can you comment on how these coordinators are picked to be coordinators?

S. Lo – They are elected by their own members and then go through me and I look at it, and then I bring it to council.

K. Daley – I am speaking in favour of the motion, largely in reaction to comments already made in the debate. I become concerned Mr. Speaker, when we start using service coordinator ratifications as opportunity to assassinate people's character when they are not here, available to defend themselves, I'm assuming not knowing that it would become an issue. I am also concerned when we turn service coordinator ratifications into discussions about the identity, and function, and direction of our services, which should not be happening in reference to any particular individuals, but rather should be happening as an ongoing and continuing analysis of our organization and it's parts which I believe is happening through the service review committee at this particular time, and would also fall under the jurisdiction of the Internal Administration Committee. So it would seem completely and entirely reprehensible for this body to not approve these service coordinators when our processes have been followed properly, when they have been reported properly, and when we are all here ready to have these volunteers here ready to do the work that we ask them to do, in the services that we design and we control.

M. Davenport (recognized/R. Allie) – I just had a question for Councilor Aho. Now I was wondering if you were referencing the Women in Islam marriage event, because that in fact was run by the AMSA, or if there was some other event that I was not aware of.

J. Aho – No, it was a bust-casting event. That is the one that I had referenced.

J. Fishbein – My speaker list is exhausted. I will re-read the motion before I call a vote.

BIRT the following Service Coordinators be ratified for the Winter 2007 term:

GLOW

Alex Chunaco
Sue Weare

Women's Centre

Margarita Osipian
Rose Schmidt

Food Bank

David Phan

CRT

Jessica Laks

UWSP

Tegan Renner
Moe Furui
Michael McWilliams

ISC

Michelle Lim

OCD

Ashley Teeter
Diana Arsene
Alison Lang

Motion Carried 17 – 1 – 1

- e. **Universal Transit Pass Referendum** (moved by: Michelle Zakrison)

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

“Do you support a non-refundable \$41.67 per term fee to support the implementation of a universal bus pass system to be paid by all full-time undergraduate students at the University of Waterloo?”
(M. Zakrison/D. Adams)

BIFRT this referendum be held concurrently with the Federation of Students elections in February 2007.
(M. Zakrison/D. Adams)

J. Fishbein – President Zakrison, would you like to introduce your motion?

M. Zakrison – Please excuse me, I am sick so my voice can't project as much as I would like to. So I hope you all read the package I sent out on Wednesday evening. In planning for the bus pass question to students, I solicited input from the survey, as you guys know, from Office of Research Ethics in the fall, negotiated service improvements with GRT, which their staff are here today to answer any questions, and I have done some work in the logistics for a potential refundable fee. The survey results were presented to Council in December, and I followed up with some answers to the questions raised, and all that information is in this package, which I hope you've read. On this agenda there is a question for a non-refundable bus pass. I know there has been some concern over having a refundable versus non-refundable pass, and that's the issue we are going to debate today. There is going to be a motion to refer back to Executive Board to see in fact if you want further research for a refundable pass. If you guys are prepared today to vote for a non-refundable bus pass, then that option is here today. If you would like, and prefer a refundable bus pass in your dealings with your constituents and that's what they would prefer, then I would encourage you to

vote in favour of that motion. So basically I will start the PowerPoint presentation on the service improvements and what would be offered for a non-refundable pass, and likely a refundable pass because how a refundable pass would be implemented would be the Federation of Students administered. We would probably have to change the price because it would probably have to be higher do to those opt-out rates and the Federation of Students would have to administer that and we don't know how much that would cost, and we would have to add more staff etcetera.

See presentation (available online, and discussion at radio.feds.ca)

J. Fishbein – Thank you President Zakrison. Councilor Adams, do you have anything to add?

D. Adams – Not at this time.

J. Fishbein – Alright. We will now move into debate on this motion.

J. Henry – I would like to move (see sheet) that Council refer bus pass matter to the Executive Board in order to fully investigate the feasibility of a refundable bus pass.

BIRT Council refer the bus pass matter to the Executive Board in order to fully investigate the feasibility of a refundable bus pass.

(J. Henry/M. Zakrison)

J. Fishbein – We will now move to debate on this motion. Vice-President Henry, would you like to introduce your motion?

J. Henry – Sure. As President Zakrison layed out, both earlier today and earlier via the Council package, there was a question ongoing regarding refundable/non-refundable. But aside from the philosophical underpinning of whether you actually want one or not, what is key in the package was identifying that there hadn't been time, based on when all these things started, in order to fully investigate all the logistics surrounding what a refundable pass might look like. There were some interesting, intriguing early steps that gave some ray of hope that something was possible; something that having conferred to the Executive Board that we truly believe we can find something in terms of managing the Federation's risk and be able to implement something like that. But we need the time to be able to do it. So what this motion is introducing here today is to...given the commitments that have been made, and the statements that have been made over numerous election campaigns, and certainly by President Zakrison at this body and at other places, for moving forward on giving students a question that we at least had from Students' Council a mandate to go ahead and do this given everything that had been said. So simply why we are putting this forward today is to say that we need more time to look at something we truly feel will be able to benefit not just the 60% of students that say yes that they want one now, but also the 40% that have said that they probably, or definitely don't want a pass. And so it important to mind those things, and to do all the due diligence we can to get to a place where all students can derive some benefit from this potentially, and so we can bring back a full costing of options to Council for a complete understanding, for a complete and fair decision – and that is what we are moving here today.

J. Fishbein – Thank you Vice-President Henry. President Zakrison, do you have anything to add?

M. Zakrison – Basically Jeff summed it up – so this is your opportunity to decide whether or not your constituents would prefer a refundable pass or a non-refundable pass. A majority of students that I have talked to would prefer and would support a non-refundable pass, but it is up to you as Councilors today as we've mentioned as executive that refundable pass was an issue and students didn't want to necessarily to have a non-refundable pass, and that Council has also said why not look into a refundable pass. So this is your opportunity today to discuss this as a Council and decide what you think would be best for your constituents.

J. Fishbein – Thank you President Zakrison.

L. Jiang – Point of information. The motion that we are voting on right now is whether or not we support a non-refundable pass?

J. Fishbein – No, not entirely. The motion that we are voting on right now is to refer this matter back to the Executive Board. What that will do is it will basically stop all discussion and all voting on this referendum question, take it to the Executive Board who will discuss it, and report back to Council, at which point the motion probably will re-appear maybe in an altered form. What they discuss and what they come back with is really up to them.

D. Adams – I am strongly opposed to this motion. This issue has come up time and time again for students at elections, and from the constituents I have spoken to, the majority of them are in favour of a non-refundable pass, and the majority of students are very interested in having a chance to decide on this. I think we should put this to a referendum right now and that's why I think we should all support this motion.

K. Daley - Thank you Mr. Speaker. I am speaking in favour of the amendment, but not anywhere near for the many of the reasons...

J. Fishbein – It is a motion you are speaking about.

K. Daley – Sorry, I thought that it had been amended, that we were in the process of amending it.

J. Fishbein – It's a motion.

K. Daley – Oh, it's a separate motion?

J. Fishbein – Yes – well it is a motion on top of this one.

K. Daley – How does that work?

J. Fishbein – We make a motion to refer back to a committee. It is not amending the motion, it's just saying "get rid of it".

K. Daley – Ok, thanks. In that case, I am speaking in favour of this motion, but not for the reasons that have been largely outlined here today. President Zakrison would have us believe that the question is whether or not we think the appropriate bus pass is a refundable buss pass, or a non-refundable bus pass, and what our constituents would enjoy. To be honest, I find that particular framing of this particular motion to be offensive. I will be voting for this motion because there was absolutely no way the original motion should have been put to Council at this time; it was not ready. We don't know yet whether or not a refundable bus pass is possible, and if we don't know that, how on earth can we be asked to make a decision on whether or not we should have a non-refundable one? We don't know what all the options are yet. This should have been done months ago; it should have been brought to Council significantly before January for a February referendum, and we should have the proper sort of information. I am also concerned that the background documentation has very little information on implementation outside of service improvements. We don't know yet what sort of identification will be used – Laurier uses their card. Well we can't use a WatCard because we have part-time students, full-time students, we have graduate students, we have staff members, faculty – so how are we doing that? We don't know. There is just so much missing here. I am also considerably concerned Mr. Speaker, that we would be asked, if this motion were to pass at this particular time, whether or not to have again, a non-refundable bus pass without having had the chance for Council to debate the possibility before. We are maybe 5 days away from what would be an appropriate time to have a formation of committee meeting for any referenda that would be happening concurrently with the Feds election in February. There is no time for students to have any sort of input. There is no time for students to get together and form committees so that we can have a serious discussion about whether or not this is something we want. There has been almost no opportunity for debate or for this body to come to a consensus on whether or not this is good for students. So as I would say, all of this I feel should have been presented, I would say, at the latest in December, preferably in November. As someone who put a referendum forward last year and made sure things were done on time -

ie. November or December as the final cutoff date for such a referendum – I am somewhat appalled that this is when this discussion is happening, that this is when this presentation has happened. It would seem highly misguided for us to make a definitive decision with a lack of information, and far too late in the process. So if we refer this, then I think there is a chance for us to have all the information we need about a refundable or a non-refundable bus pass, or we will at least know whether the first of those is even possible. I had come, after I had read the Council package, ready to vote against the original motion. I say this as a transit user who spends \$140 on a bus pass every term that only lasts 3 months, so I understand that there are needs here. I think that the greater question is are we going to take the time to consider again, all the needs of all of our students, or are we just going to put it sloppily to a referendum that gives very little choice, that has not been thoroughly investigated, and that allows us to count how many people on each side are willing to get out large numbers to vote for their cause. We have a responsibility to take this decision seriously. We can't take it seriously under the current circumstances, so please support this current motion.

J. Aho – I would like to speak strongly in favour of the motion. Many of the things I outlined in a letter I sent out to the Council list, and I won't repeat them. Basically we are not prepared for this. We can run a referendum at any time. We have the means to do that, and it doesn't have to be held concurrently with the elections. We have processes to do it without that. And because we are not prepared for it, because from what I have heard from many of my constituents, they would like to at least pursue the fact for a refundable bus pass, which is already in the process; we can continue with it. I strongly support the deferral, and then we can receive the information back.

D. Evans – I am in favour of the motion. I don't really have an argument for it per se, just maybe, perhaps more food for thought. Both a refundable, and a non-refundable bus pass would be compromises in some way. A non-refundable is compromised in the fact that 27% who were not in favour, or strongly opposed are being sacrificed if you will – their needs are not being met. On the other hand, a refundable bus pass presumably would not be able to offer the same amount of service upgrades that a refundable would. So I think, given that, I would be interested to see which would be the better compromise of the two. And for that reason I would like to see some information given back to us about what a refundable bus pass would look like. I also have a point of information I would like to refer to the executive: how long would this take? If we sent this back to you, do you guys have a timeframe? How long do you expect before you could give us back information regarding the analysis of a refundable bus pass?

J. Fishbein – Can a member of the executive board comment on that please?

M. Zakrison – Originally in, I believe, it was in early December, when the first time I started thinking “hey you know what, I think we might be able to do a refundable pass if we administer it, et cetera.” We just have to figure out logistics of the pricing et cetera. That was early December. Until then, until now, or last week, or the past few days, that's been about a month. We've been able to research everything that I have outlined in this document. It was Christmas holidays. Some people did not get back to me, so that was an issue as well. So I'd say at least – I'd only thought it might have taken a month. But since I have only had this information presented to me, I would say at least a few months to get substantial information about this – seems to be taking a long time. I think it will continue to take a few months at least to get an answer on refundable pricing structure.

D. Adams - A point of information. What has GRT said about the possibility of a refundable pass?

M. Zakrison – GRT can speak to that, or I can.

J. Fishbein – Is there a member from GRT who wishes to answer that question?

Grant (recognized/M. Zakrison) – I am the Director of Planning for GRT, and we have been in discussions with the Federation of Students for a few months now. As far as a refundable pass goes, in the discussions we have had, we would not accept a refundable pass. However, what we would be looking for is some kind of lump sum payment. We are taking quite a bit of risk, our Council is taking quite a bit of risk in terms of the number of buses we would be putting on the street, and the service improvements. So I can't

recommend to them to take any more of a risk in terms of how much of an opt-out might occur through the refundable pass. So we are willing to work on the concept, but that sort of a lump sum payment covering the \$41.17 is the payment we would be looking for in order to cover our costs that we would incur if we were to go ahead with the service improvements for the students at Waterloo. I hope that answers your question.

C. Neal – I am going to speak against the motion, simply because I have spoken to a wide variety of my constituents and they all want the non-refundable fee. They want to be asked this in a referendum, and hey, if this referendum fails, there is nothing stopping us from researching a refundable form of it. So St. Jerome's is against this motion, and wants to be asked this question in a referendum.

K. Levin – I will be speaking in favour of this motion. In speaking with most constituents, it was a pretty much uniform voice that they do not want a non-refundable pass. They mention various reasons, from service that doesn't affect them. In places where they live, GRT does not affect them because the buses just don't pass through there. Also there was some worries about...this package does not outline very well, what would happen in the springtime. Considering a very large portion of my constituents are on coop, they will have classes during the spring term, and it is important for them to know that if it is the same deal...they need to know what will happen during the spring. Also, I just generally believe that this motion is not entirely ready. I don't feel that I am informed enough to really be able to direct this to referendum.

R. Allie – Thank you Mr. Speaker. So I am for the deferral, and so for the motion. At the last Council meeting, I spoke against the WUSC referendum, not on the basis of the referendum itself, or the concept behind it, but simply on the basis that their constitution was not ready, which I think made a fairly significant decision for us to actually deny the question being put on to referendum. I think this is the same problem that we are having here. The question as it currently stands is “do we support this amount of money going to GRT, which will get us a bus pass.” We do have, theoretically I guess, a soft contract, or at least these have been the ideas expressed, that will be added service improvements. But we still don't have anything in hard copy, signed, that shows what exactly the students will be getting for their money. On that basis, I would like to defer this to allow further consultation with GRT and the Federation of Students. Thank you.

L. Jiang – I am in favour of this referral. The first thing is the timing again. I do agree. I mean it logistically makes sense that the Feds election will draw out more voters to the referendum. However we have to keep in mind that the voting pool in the Feds election is going to be pretty polarized, and depending on the party or person that they are voting for...I don't know. I just feel that the happy middle is the kind of people we need to figure out the opinions for, and that usually those are the people that are lost. If we look at the responses of the people from the survey, we can see that only 700 or so people of the 2000 actually returned their opinions. That is not even half. Another thing – based on the research now, it seems that if we were to have a refundable fee, the amount that we give out to the people who decide to get a refund, will be placed on the heads of the people who decide to keep the bus pass I think? That's how it is going to work right? So, like instead of paying the forty-some dollars, they will pay an extra amount on top of that, so that we will have a pool of money to give out to the people who decide they don't want the pass right? Or something like that. I just think that it is not clear enough to me personally, how that is going to work, and I think that needs to be outlined in detail before we put this to referendum, because I think we have a responsibility to our constituents that question that comes out of Council is a question that is backed by full research and signed off on.

R. Butalid - I will be speaking in favour of referring this back to Executive Board. Looking solely at the refundable bus pass issue, I think one of the biggest questions we need to ask ourselves is how much financial risk is the Federation of Students willing to take if we were to pursue a refundable bus pass endeavor. We need to find out what the price point would be, because it would clearly not be \$41.67 and as well, we need to sort of guess-timate how many students will be opting out of the refundable bus pass. And then, given all that information, or given all that research, we need to find out whether it is even feasible to implement such a refundable bus pass system on campus at Waterloo. Time did not permit me to deal with this with President Zakrison started investigating the feasibility of the refundable bus pass

because I was away on holidays. But I think, given the next couple of months, with some hard work and some due diligence, we may be able to come up with a proposal for a refundable bus pass.

R. Allie – Can I ask for a point of information? Is there any remaining names on your speakers list?

J. Fishbein – No there are not.

R. Allie – Then I withdraw.

D. Adams – I am still opposed to referring this to the Executive Board. I think it is about time that all the students on campus had a chance to vote on this. \$41.67 isn't an outrageous fee to have everyone pay. It is a tank of gas, or a night at the bar. This is a fee that students can afford, and is something that is going to put cash back into the pockets of our students, that is taken out too often. This is less than half the national average that other schools pay for this pass. This is not another line item fee. This is a service on par with the health or dental plan. If 60% of our students in the survey that President Zakrison had were either in favour or strongly in favour of the idea, then I think that this is enough of an indication of people's opinion of campus that we should allow a referendum to take place on the issue. I am objecting to the referral.

J. Levine (recognized/K. Levin) – Hi. For those of you who don't know me, I'm Jonah. About a year ago I, being the policy nerd that I am, talked with friends and Feds insiders about this issue, and I just had one idea of the top...well at the time that I was developing, we could have a non-refundable pass at \$41, and then top that up with an additional \$10 - \$15 that would go into a slush fund. It provides services for that 27% of students identified in the survey who aren't serviced, or won't be serviced by the bus pass. That is just one idea – sorry, I should say that I am in completely in favour of referring to board. That's just one idea that board might be able to discuss. There is that and a number of other win-win scenarios that might not be brought up in a refundable versus non-refundable scenario. So think about that when you are deciding whether to refer this to board or decide the matter right now.

J. Chauhan – Yes, I would like to speak in favour of the motion. Just regarding what Vice-President said of the risk that we would be willing to take. For example, if this motion fails, and is brought to referendum, there is 40% of the people against it and 60% for it, but there is still 40% of the people who are not going to use the pass, hence they would be subsidizing the other 60% of our school. It has been mentioned that \$41.67 is quite a low price for 4 months, considering that a pass per month is a little more than that. If the statistics were to say that 40% of the people were against it and 60% were for it, would a refundable plan say that you could sort of multiply \$41.67 time the 60% of the people to get the equal amount of money paid out by students that \$41.67 would get for 100% of the population.

D. Higgins (recognized/D. Adams) – Thank you. A couple of comments and a question. I agree with Jonah that there are good situations – I think Simon Fraser University uses a discount system through local stores, and that's what goes on with their card, and they get a lot of buy-in by adding on other incentives. As well, after bus passes, I think it was Trent that had a second referendum with 90% support after quite a while so that increase is much stronger. I just have a question for the mover I guess. Do you know of any other Canadian universities that have a refundable bus pass?

J. Henry – In response to that I will go a bit broader than that. We know that there is an American example – in this case, the University of Utah – and I believe that was presented at the previous meeting.

M. Davenport (recognized/K. Daley) – I am not allowed to actually have an opinion in public, but a point of information. I believe that the survey results were, off the top of my head, 60% for, 27% against, and the remainder were apathetic, so it is kind of disingenuous to claim that 40% are against.

E. Logan – I would like to call question (M. Pawliszyn).

J. Fishbein – This motion requires a 2/3rds majority.

Motion Fails 9-7-2

Matt Colphon (recognized/R. Butalid) – I was just wondering, will the bus pass be able to be used during coop as well as academic terms for students?

J. Fishbein – Is there anyone from Executive Board who can answer that?

M. Zakrison – I can answer that. Well if you are not paying fees that term, then you should probably not use your WatCard for that purpose. I don't know if GRT can speak to that? If, for a term if they are on coop, if they are in the area, then that would be feasible?

T. Dong (recognized/R. Allie) – I am both a student at Waterloo and Laurier, and the Upass is an excellent idea. I mean, take a look at what Laurier has done - use them as a model, as a cookie-cutter, using existing universities like Kingston and Trent as a cookie cutter. See how they have done it. See what they have done in the past, see what bates they go on. Let's follow suit and see what we can do. We have lots of things to offer in life beyond ring road.

K. Daley – A point of order Mr. Speaker. Is this related to the question that was asked earlier, or is this a separate speaking turn? I am a little confused.

J. Fishbein – This is a separate speaking turn, and he has been recognized.

K. Daley – Thank you Mr. Speaker.

T. Dong – So what I'm saying is I have had the pleasure of going to Laurier and being exposed to what they have to offer. They go downtown, they have life beyond their campus. So perhaps we could follow suit and do the same thing. In my 2nd year this was put through the referendum and it did get turned down. I am about to graduate right now. How much longer do we have to put this through so that our students can enjoy the benefits that Laurier has. Thank you.

K. Daley - Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think my outrage was sufficiently expressed earlier, so I will endeavor to be brief. Part of this conversation has come around to whether or not it is time for students to decide – that tends to be that way that this is phrased: students decide. I tend to challenge that notion when it is expressed as equivalent to a referendum. I think this is also a way that students decide. That is what we are all doing here. We are either elected or appointed, which...er, not appointed, but acclaimed - which I will remind everyone is technically equivalent and really philosophically equivalent – to represent our constituents and consider the needs of all of our students. The fact that 60% of respondents to a survey said that they would like a bus pass does not mean that we abdicate our responsibility for looking after that 40%, or for considering whether the proposal that is put forward is in service to everyone or not, whether it is prepared, and that sort of thing. And I find myself additionally frustrated because I know I am going to be in a Senate meeting tomorrow night, where I am going to ask Senate to own it's decisions. I would also ask Council to own it's decisions. Whether we decide to send this to students or not, it is our decision, it is our responsibility that that proposal be up to snuff, that it had been thoroughly considered by this body. That's our decision. We have a tendency to say "Wait a minute. Somebody else can make a decision for us? Whoff! Glad I didn't have to deal with that!" But no, that is what we do here once a month. We come here, and we are asked to speak for students. We are asked to speak for students aren't going to participate in a referendum. We are asked to speak for students who are going to vote on the losing side of any referendum that we might put out. We are asked to speak for all students, and if we don't take that responsibility seriously now, then I don't know why we bother. This is exactly the sort of thing that we are doing here. Is this proposal ready? Have we considered all of our students? I really don't think so, and that is why this motion needs to pass.

D. Evans – Yes thank you. A few things. Number one, I will be changing my position to not in favour of referring the...the motion to defer. First off, Michael Davenport points out, and I am going to use part of yours to reiterate this because it is a personal pet peeve of mine. 40 % are not opposed to this. 27% expressed opposition or strong opposition. 60% were in favour, and 12 were neutral. Lumping those 12 neutral into the opposed category is strengthening your argument, and it is doing so falsely. If anything, if

you want to have a just one or the other, divide that 12% in half and it can be viewed as 66 and 33, which then you are still looking at 2/3rds that are in favour. So that's that. My other concern is the time it would take to look at a refundable bus pass. While I do value that research takes time and that's a necessary evil perhaps, I am worried that what's going to end up happening is that this will be passed to another Council, another group of Councilors, which has happened in past, and I think there are a long list of problems - you could debate whether they are problems - that happen when you start passing things from Council to Council, and good ideas can get lost, not because it is no longer a good idea, and not because you are no longer representing the interests of the same student body, but just because a new Council may not be fully informed on the issue. Thank you.

R. Suri – I withdraw.

J. Henry – I am going to obviously still be speaking in favour of the motion I originally proposed. I am going to do something that I don't normally do, and have been challenged to be able to do, and that is to speak positively about the spirit of "why not." We are here in the 50th anniversary of a very unconventional university that has acted as a trailblazer in so many ways. I was put the question earlier of "is there another Canadian example of doing a refundable bus pass?" There isn't. Was there another Canadian example of coop education in Engineering or anywhere else? No, we did that. Everybody looked at us funny, chastised us, ridiculed us, and here we are and everybody is copying us these days. Do we copy other people at this University, because they are doing it and therefore it must be a good idea? No. We find ways and we think of things that other people have not thought of before. We investigate things that people haven't thought of before. We look at the world and ask "why not", dreaming of the way things might be. I think you will be able to say...you know I chastise the President for saying this as an excuse for everything, but it makes sense. It is incredibly unusual for us to sit here and just assume that somebody else's solution must be the best for us, and must be the best one out there. I think we should challenge ourselves to find a solution that can actually accommodate all students - the 60%, speaking nothing of the 40% - there are still 40% who have needs that are not exactly met, because they are indifferent, or they don't want it. Both of those are valid, and both of those need to be considered. Can we find a solution that we can get 90, 95, 100% of students on board, that suits everybody's needs. This is why we need to do more work. We need to go out there and see what's possible. And only when we know what's possible can we make a good decision about what we should do as the Federation of Students at the University of Waterloo. I think we can trail blaze here, I think we can do something that no one else in Canada has done. I think we can find a way to serve all of our students, get them out to the community, connect through our transit system into every far reach of the community that we helped to build as a University, from doing just what it is that we propose to look at right here - to examine what can be, and embrace the spirit of why not. That is why I am still voting in favour of this motion, and why I think all of us should - so we can have the information, whatever it takes to make the best decision for students.

L. Jiang – I absolutely agree, and I feel bad speaking after him as I don't know what to say. I am maintaining my support of the motion, and in favour of deferring this to a later date. Just to add on, we are being a bit hasty here. I think we are all a little bit frustrated here. This is an issue that has gone on and on and on. It's like Canada and health care. Every single time, or every single meeting, it's always "what about the U-Pass?" And then we push it and push it and push it, and it never gets done. I myself am also a bit frustrated by that because we want to get things done here. But we also have to be careful not to be hasty. We can't do something just for the sake of doing it and saying "whew, it's done, it's finally off of our plate. We are not really fulfilling all our obligations if we do that, and we cannot support moving without all the information we need. We should trailblaze in the spirit of why not, and if this takes another council or two, that is our responsibility and duty to do. We have to wait until we have all the information that we need. I am completely in favour.

J. Chauhan – I am still in favour of the motion, but just to bring up one other point. The initial plan would be to have \$41.67 for all the students for all the students, yielding a certain number or whatever. So if our referendum, from a negative point of view, hypothetically says 50/50, we could multiply that number by 2 and yield a safe number that the non-refundable fee would get you. So 50% of the people who don't want to use it wouldn't pay anything, and the other half would just pay twice what the initial plan would be, and that would be less than the average cost of the U-Pass programs in Canada. So, I am sure the referendum

will produce higher numbers than 50% of the people in favour of this. So I still believe that a refundable plan, a strategic plan for a refundable pass will provide decent cost for those who are willing to use it, even though it may be higher than \$41.67

J. Fishbein – My speaker list is now exhausted.

K. Daley - Can I...

J. Fishbein - Councilor Daley, you have already spoken twice, so you can either make a motion or...

K. Daley – I would like to make a motion for a 7 min recess (R. Allie)

Motion Carried 16-0-1

J. Fishbein – We are now in recess. We will reconvene at 2:03 pm

J. Fishbein – I would like to call the meeting to order (2:05 pm)

D. Evans – I will be offering an amendment – That we will add a the line to the motion so it would read:

BIRT that Council refer the bus pass matter to the Executive Board in order to fully investigate the feasibility of a refundable bus pass, and present their analysis at the March Council Meeting. (Zakrison)

K. Levin – Point of information. The point of this amendment is to make sure that there is a report that comes back to Council in a timely manner?

J. Fishbein – That is correct.

K. Levin – Thank you.

J. Fishbein – Councilor Evans, would you like to say something about your amendment?

D. Evans – The goal is pretty clear here. My goal as Councilor Levin stated is to make sure this comes back in a timely manner. However, it is worded in a way that there analysis, when it comes back...it it worded to keep the report from being delayed for months and months and months.

J. Fishbein – President Zakrison, do you have anything to add?

M. Zakrison – No, not at this time.

K. Daley – I will be speaking against the amendment, largely for reasons and concerns discussed earlier – because it wasn't ready, and it came here anyway. I am not a fan of putting energy into something not well prepared...difficulty of people being away from the office during the time when deliberations need to take place...

L. Jiang – I agree, I like setting a deadline, but we are repeating what we are already doing, pushing something on students without the right information...I think everyone realizes the seriousness of this issue, a deadline will not change this

C. Neal – I am in favour of motion, as it is a reasonable amount of time. Why can't we finish what we started?

R. Butalid – I will be speaking strongly against the motion. We have talked about \$41.67 as the per-student cost of implementing a bus pass, but this is a \$1million + decision for the Feds to make. The financial risk needs to be properly assessed. As well, if this was the only issue facing Feds, a 2month deadline would fit.

But there are 2 other major issues upcoming which makes a 2-month deadline infeasible. I would rather this plan be fully thought out...

J. Henry – I will also be speaking in opposition to the amendment. The scenario, if this passes, would mean that the Executive Board would have to have a presentation for March, which can be done as the motion does not stipulate what quality of presentation we need to have. If this moves forward, we could end up with an April or May referenda question, which is not very ideal at all. The results are not going to be what we would like

R. Allie – I am against the motion. As a historical reference, last year, council asked for a March report from executive, and the report was not nearly what we were looking for. Also to reiterate what VP Butalid suggested about what is on our radar. 3rd, we are most likely going to lose exec through elections.

L. Jiang – against the motion.

J. Fishbein – My speaker list is now empty. Are we prepared to vote on the motion. Seeing no opposition, we will proceed to a vote.

Motion Fails 1-16-2

J. Fishbein – We are back to original motion.

J. Fishbein – My speaker list is now empty. Are we prepared to vote on the motion. Seeing no opposition, we will proceed to a vote.

D. Adams – I motion to divide the assembly

J. Fishbein – This motion is not debatable. We will move directly to a roll call vote.

M. Zakrison – in favour

S. Lo – in favour

E. Logan – in favour

C. Neal – ney

J. Chohan – yea

J. Aho – yea

M. Pawliszyn - yea

D. Adams – ney

D. Evans –ney

L. Jiang – yea

C. Cull – yea

R. Allie – yea

K. Daley – yea

F. Primohamed – yea

L. McCulloch – yea

K. Levin - yea

R. Suri – yea

R. Butalid – yea

J. Henry –yea

Motion Carried 16-3-0

f. Election Committee (moved by: Michelle Zakrison)

BIRT Rick Theis be ratified as the Chief Electoral Officer of the Election Committee for the 2007 Federation of Students elections.(M.Zakrison/E. Logan)

M. Zakrison – We hired new ERA, motion is self explanatory
Motion Carried 19-0-0

g. Referendum Committee (moved by: Michelle Zakrison)

BIRT Rick Theis be ratified as the Chief Returning Officer of the Referendum Committee.
 (M. Zakrison/F. Pirmohamed)

Zakrison – I have nothing to add
Motion Carried 19-0-0

h. Ratification of Recording Secretary (moved by: Michelle Zakrison)

BIRT Rick Theis be ratified as the Recording Secretary of the Federation of Students for the remainder of the 2006-2007 term of office.
 (M. Zakrison/C. Neil)
Motion Carried 19-0-0

i. March 2007 Council Meeting Date (moved by: Michelle Zakrison)

BIRT March 11th be ratified as the date for the March 2007 Students' Council meeting.

M. Zakrison – The original date conflicted with both Jeff and my schedules during the CASA conference.

K. Daley – Have other dates been considered, and will additional levity be granted to those now in conflict with the date?

M. Zakrison – These were the best possible dates. And your second question, yes they will

D. Evans – I cannot be in attendance, and will vote against

Motion Carried 15-3-0

j. April 2007 Council Meeting Date (moved by: Michelle Zakrison)

BIRT April 1st be ratified as the date for the April 2007 Students' Council meeting.
 Zakrison/Logan

M. Zakrison – I have nothing to add

E. Logan – I cannot think of a more appropriate day for a council meeting

Motion Carried 19-0-0

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

d. OLD BUSINESS

e. NEW BUSINESS

f. REPORTS

g. EXECUTIVE REPORTS

a. Vice President, Internal

S. Lo – I have nothing to add. Any questions?

K. Daley – what is the criteria for awards given to clubs, as it seems they have already been done?...is there remaining ability for input

S. Lo – still working with the clubs director on awards

R. Allie – In your report, you noted that the CCC is not needed anymore. Is the VPI planning to continue the committee into the spring?

S. Lo – will be up to the incoming VPI, will make recommendations to the new VPI...there is an ad hoc committee right now trying to improve communications, which can also function

K. Levin – Withdrawn

L. Jiang – When can we expect a Service Review document?

S. Lo – Should be March

b. Vice President, Education

J. Henry – I have nothing to add

c. Vice President, Administration & Finance

R. Butalid – I have nothing to add, other than that I made it back in one piece for vacation,

R. Allie – Can you tell us about how the Tim Horton's discussions might proceed?

R. Butalid – I will be beginning discussions with Bud Walker and Lee Elkas soon. I want to look at auditing their financial statements in SLC and in the Tim Horton's across all of campus. We should be receiving our reimbursements based on revenue, not profit. We are at the initial stages of Bar Directorate negotiations, but I don't want at this point to expand beyond that.

d. President

Zakrison – I was really excited about being a precedent setting university able to bring forth a new refundable pass...will be looking at Board Procedures this term...I have to take a leave of absence starting on January 30th, Vp Ed will be taking on the duties

K. Daley – What can we do to make the Task Force on Wildlife Rehabilitation on campus from becoming a PR committee, and really tackling wildlife issues?

M. Zakrison – That's a great question...Martin Van Nierop is on the committee, which gives it a definite PR slant, whether that is right or wrong. Sai Kit Lo will be taking over duties while I am gone

h. COUNCILLOR REPORTS AND QUESTION PERIOD

MATH

E. Logan – I have been elected as Math Soc President. We will be renovating Math Soc, and are exploring the idea of a creating a capital improvement fund, as there are not many opportunities for funding to improve labs, computers etc. It would be a small increase in the Math Soc fee, which has not increased for many terms. Of course, we at Math Soc always looking to work with other societies.

K. Levin – Neal and I were discussing an email list that could be set up to reach councillors directly...general “what is going on” list.

J. Fishbein – Are you asking a question?

K. Levin – No, just making an announcement.

ARTS

L. Jiang – a lot of the different departments in ASU are up and running, but some are not, and we are looking to help with that...movies...the ASU is looking forward to bringing forward projects with the Dean’s Office to build cohesiveness in the faculty.

K. Daley – Endowment Report – will be coming back to the council with the President’s permission to add two new students to the committee to oversee the EF

K. Royal – wanted to commend the Arts Councilors for their help and participation when I was not available...we have been out making sure that sub-societies are holding elections, accessing money to promote their societies...planning both Grad Ball and potentially a speaking engagement with Sacha Trudeau...good relationship with Dean’s Office

ST. JEROME’S

C. Neal – SJU snowbowl will be held again – all are welcome to come out to watch. On a side note, I’ve found mass mailing lists to be useful in informing constituents as to what’s going on, I got a lot of responses from people who were interested in the committees.

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

R. Allie – “Time is right” pool is still open.

R. Butalid – Polar Jam on Jan 26th –tickets available

D. Higgins – There is going to be a speaker coming on Feb 9th to discuss sustainability issues.

L. Jiang – Malcolm Gladwell coming

i. ADJOURNMENT

