

Special General Meeting
February 6, 2007

1. **Call to order**
The meeting was called to order
2. **Call for Quorum**
Quorum was present
3. **Adoption of the Agenda**
Missing Audio Of This Portion

Member Graham Lang –Motion #1

Be it resolved that:

In misusing the Code of Conduct Bylaws to attempt to intimidate and silence the College of Law’s USC Representative the Executive of the USSU acted irresponsibly in carrying out its duty of allowing fair representation at USC meetings. While the Code of Ethics and Disciplinary Committee has already totally exonerated Ms Alison Forbes, the Representative in question, this body apologizes for the Executive’s treatment on behalf of the entire USSU and chastises the Executive for its Gestapo Tactics.

Chair Leisle spoke to the motion stating that the Code of Ethics and Disciplinary Committee Bylaws allows for anyone to bring a member before the Ethics Committee; therefore, this motion is not in order.

Member Graham Lang moved to amend his motion, to remove “this body apologizes for the Executive’s treatment” and leave in that we chastise them for their Gestapo Tactics.

Chair Leisle stated that he felt that any language referring to anybody as a Nazi was not appropriate.

Member Graham Lang further amended his motion to remove “Gestapo” and replace it with “irresponsible”.

Call for any other business

Member Graham Lang: Motion #2

Be it resolved that:

The current executive did not perform adequate research in preparing for a universal bus pass referendum. It took absolutely no steps to inform the student body about the consequences. As such this body holds that the UPass referendum to be held

tomorrow does not adequately represent the will of the student body due to a lack of information.

Chair Leisle stated that the Constitution clearly states that referendums go forward if passed by 2/3 votes at Student Council after the Executive has posed it. Therefore this motion is contrary to the Constitution.

Chair Leisle reminded members that Section 127 of the Non-Profit Corporations Act, the Rules of Order, state that an AGM is not the place to air personal grievances. The purpose is to conduct business. He reminded all present that there was business that needed to be completed, as well as Constitutional amendments to discuss.

Member Ian Flett stated that he had a problem with Chair Leisle saying that their legitimate motions were vindictive. He felt that the current motion was perfectly reasonable and did not reflect any personal convictions.

Councilor David stated that the USSU has not provided accurate numbers for the bus now. They are still waiting on information that they were promised. The motion on the floor is well within reason in his opinion.

Chair Leisle stated that the intention of the motion is to negate or cast doubts on the results of the referendum. It was constitutionally passed by USC to go ahead. The results of the referendum will be a fair representation of the students who vote.

Member Alison Forbes asked what would the implications of a decision coming from this body have in the long term?

Chair Leisle stated that he could not speak to the long term.

Member Alison Forbes asked by over ruling the validity of this motion based on the Constitution of the USSU, what could happen with this in the future? She claimed that the Members in attendance want to vote on the statement. So let them vote

Member Ian Flett offered to amend the motion to remove the following “As such this body holds that the UPass referendum to be held tomorrow does not adequately represent the will of the student body due to a lack of information.” To read this “ The current executive did not perform adequate research preparing for the bus pass referendum and took absolutely no steps to inform the student body of the pros and cons.”

Chair Leisle stated that because this body does not know all that the Executive did in preparation.....

Member Ian Flett offered further amendment to the motion. “In the future the executive of the USSU will take all adequate and proper steps to prepare for any referendum. The Executive will take steps to ensure that research is done and information is provided to the student body on any issue taken to referendum. “

Member Vogeson Paley stated that it is not just the Executive's duty but also the Council's duty to examine this and to get the information to the students.

Member #34: We are waiting for the motion on the floor.

Member Tim Wedge Seconded

Motion: In the future the executive will ensure that adequate research is taken and that the information is provided to the student body.

AGM MOTION01: #34/Tim Wedge

Carried

Member Alison Forbes:

Be it resolved that:

The students present publicly do state that the USC motion 202 to increase the infrastructure fees to \$44 per term is not in the best interest of current and future undergraduate students.

Chair Leisle referred to section 127 of the Non-Profit Corporations Act and stated that there cannot be political statements made in a motion. This is a non-actionable motion

Member Daw Morris moved to challenge the ruling of the chair.

President Allan stated that if the proposals for these motions had been submitted in advance these motions would not have been put forward because they do not meet the requirements of the Non-Profit Corporations Act. The intent is to prevent the situation that is here.

Call for order.

President Allan ruled that the Chair was in order.

Councilor????? Moved to remove all non-members of the USSU except for the minute taker.

AGM MOTION02: ???/Renee Tuck

Carried

Chair Leisle was asked if he was a member. He replied No. He was then asked to remove himself.

President Allan took the place of Chair Leisle.

Member Jeff Galbraith moved that the Chair Leisle be allowed to chair the rest of the meeting.

Member Jeff Galbraith reminded everyone that the chair is under contract to chair the meetings.

Member Evan Cole stated that he felt that???? would be an appropriate chair
Member Katie Kirkness stated that this meeting will not be able proceed without a chair.

Member?? questioned why the Executive did not want to hear what the students had to say?

Member Josie Steeves ?????

Member Ben David ????

Member Jan Lovering stated that the previous chair already breeched Roberts' Rules of Order. Section 24 in reference to appeal clearly states that it will be majority judgment of the members present.

President Allan reminded that the law takes precedent

Councilor David: Moved that Evan Cole be appointed as chair.

President Allan deemed the motion unfriendly in the spirit of the original motion. Asked Member Jeff Galbraith if he accepted the amendment.

Member Jeff Galbraith stated that no he did not accept the amendment.
Move to call the question ???.

Seconded by Member Barbra Bailey

Motion to return chair Lisle.

AGM MOTION03: ???/Barbra Bailey

Defeated

Member Ben David moved that Evan Cole be put in chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Seconded by Shane Wagner

Debate:

Member Kelly Thompson called the question

Questioned is called

AGM MOTION04: Ben David/ Shane Wagner

Carried

Meeting called to order.

Member Graham Lang moved to accept the written names and Student Numbers of new arrivals.

AGM MOTION05: Graham Lang/Maurice Collard

Carried

Member Graham Lang

Be it resolved that:

Due to the irresponsible behavior of the Executive of the USSU, including their tyrannical use of the Code of Ethics and Discipline Bylaw, irresponsible preparation of the UPass Referendum, and negligent increase of student fees without adequate research, this body does not approve of the action of this Executive to date, and further, this body has no confidence in the Executive to carry out any further actions.

Member Benjamin David Seconded

Call to question.

AGM MOTION06: Graham Lang/Vogeson Paley

Carried

???? Stated that the motion represents libel. And that they can expect the Student Union to be sued. The minutes of the meeting are public documents. Such derogatory minutes put into writing and circulated amongst the student body in my opinion constitutes libel.

Call for order.

6. Constitutional Amendments

Call for order

Member ???

Proposed Constitutional Amendments

6.1 Proposed Amendment to Section 4:

The Executive Committee shall insure that all motions appearing under the heading of business are emailed to councilors or available at the USSU office in hard copy no later than 48 hours preceding the USC at which they will be heard.

Second Graham Lang

Member Alison Forbes stated that she feels that they need to ensure that motions are being prepared prior to the meetings.

Chair Evan Cole called the question.

6.2 Proposed Amendment to Operations and Finance Board. Section 3

Move to amend the Section to read: Reviewing University of Saskatchewan Students' Union originating student fees in order to assess their value and impact on the members of the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union and developing long term strategies for Administration of these fees that exhibits the guiding mission of the University of Saskatchewan's Student Union.

Call to question

6.3 Proposed Amendment to Paragraph 10 of the Constitution.

Move to amend the paragraph to read: Quorum at General Meetings and Student General Meetings shall be 55 members of the University of Saskatchewan Students Union.

END OF TAPE

Constitutional Amendments

Chair Taken Back by President Allan so that Member Evan Cole can speak to his motion.

Member Evan Cole stated that the reason for this amendment is because there is currently no way for students to call a Special General Meeting. This is in conflict with the Non-Profit Corp Act. This act states that 5% of the student body can vote to have an SGM. This motion makes that clear to the student body.

Moved by Member Evan Cole Seconded by ??

President Allan stated that he felt that it was unnecessary that this be added. Because the act already states this.

Point of information: Is this stated anywhere so that the students would know this?

President Allan stated that if the students did not read the Non-Profit Corporations Act then they would likely not be aware of this.

Member Ian Flett made the point that if it is in the constitution then it would be more clear for the student body and should be included.

Member Andrew Trapp moved to call the question Seconded by ???

AGM MOTION09: Evan Cole/???

Carried

Chair returned to Member Evan Cole

Proposed Amendment to Article 11

All referenda questions will be required to be stated in both the affirmative and the negative.

Moved by #106 second by #23

Member Jan Lovering spoke to the amendment stating that both sides of a referendum need to be represented equally. Currently only the stance of the question originally posed is represented. For example the current UPass question is Are you in favor of...

Member Alison Forbes spoke against the motion. Stating that no election has the option to vote against a candidate.

Member Ian Flett asked how this will simplify the question's in a referendum.

Member Dylan Griffithes stated this would simplify that the question would then be posed, as are you for or against.

Member Katie Kirkness spoke against the Amendment for being unconcise.

Member 133 spoke against the motion.

Motion to call the question

AGM MOTION010: Graham Lang/Kelly Thompson

Carried

AGM MOTION011: Jan Lovering/Graham Lang

Defeated

Proposed amendment to Article 11

Change the final sentence to read such a referendum shall pass if, and only if, a 20 percent voter turnout of the membership is recorded and there is a two-thirds majority.

Moved by #106 Second #20

Member Jan Lovering spoke to the motion stating that referendums are passed by a few. There is no real fair representation of the student body. There must be voter turn out for these decisions.

VP Lang spoke to voter turn out. VP Lang also spoke against the 2/3 turn out being unfair. He felt that it should be left at 50% +1.

Member 133 spoke to the motion being unclear. He felt that the requirement for student turn out was unrealistic.

Member Benjamin David spoke to the importance of having good voter turn out. He also spoke to the 2/3 turnout, he felt was undemocratic.

Member Ian Flett passed on his turn to speak.

Member Dylan Griffithes moved to amend the amendment to read 50%+1 but leave in the required voter turn out. This will give a fair representation of the student body.

Member Graham Lang spoke in favor of the friendly amendment and moved to make the further amendment of : A referendum shall pass if and only if a 10% voter turn out of the membership is recorded and there is a 50% + 1 majority.

AGM MOTION012: Jan Lovering/Mike Rowe

Carried

Proposed amendment to Article 20

Increasing Student Fees (new section)

A. The University of Saskatchewan Students' Union shall hold a referendum if they wish to increase student fees by more than two (2) dollars (\$CAD) above the Consumer Price Index.

B. Reasonable effort will be made to get information concerning the change out to members of the University of Saskatchewan Students' Union, outlining the pros and cons of the idea so as to foster adequate debate on campus.

C. Any fee changes that have been approved by either referendum after this amendment, or by the University Students' Council prior to the amendment, must have a second reading before the University Students' Council once the Board of Governor's has scrutinized the application, before it is applied to students.

D. Upon second reading the University Council must either:

- i. Vote unanimously to pass the increase or
- ii. Vote by a majority to pass the increase providing that majority includes a "yes" vote from the representative from the College of Law and one of the Representatives from the College of Arts and Science.

In order to finalize the increase and apply the charge to members.

E. If the fee increase does not pass the second reading, then the increase is of no force and effect and cannot be applied to students.

Moved by # 4 Seconded by member Ben David

Point of information: This would be for each fee.

Member Ashlee Smith spoke against the motion, especially with the Health and Dental plan because there is no control over this cost. This would not be reasonable to have a referendum every year.

A friendly amendment to exclude the Health and Dental plan.

Accepted

Member Katie Kirkness spoke against the motion. The chance to have endless referendums where the potential for lack of voter turn out could cause the referendum to be void. There is the potential for a big waste of money

Member Ian Flett moved to make a friendly amendment to exclude the Health and Dental Plan and that the dollar amount be raised to five (5) dollars.

Point of information: UNCLEAR

Member Maurice Collard spoke in support of the motion and to restricting the executive and their power to make arbitrary decisions. This will make them accountable.

Member Anna Cole spoke in favor of the motion. Infrastructure fees have gone up and we need to put an end to the constant increases.

Member Ben David spoke to the chance that there would not be enough voter turn out for referendums. This is the responsibility of the USC to build student awareness

Member Dylan Griffithes spoke in favor of the motion. UNCLEAR

President Allan spoke to the comments being made. The infrastructure fees were dropped. This was realized 6 years ago and the fee was reinstated. This covers maintenance. There is a need to improve facilities. However there is no money because of the lack of foresight from past boards. This makes it necessary to increase fees now. President Allan also spoke to the concern of continuous referendums every year. Also, this is not the only student fee there are fees for the Sheaf, the PAC, Health and Dental, etc.

Member Graham Lang spoke to the fact that this amendment will make it necessary for executives to plan.

Member Kelly Thompson spoke in favor of the amendment.

Member Daniel Martins UNCLEAR

Member Brad Bedard stated that there is a need to get the information out to the students.

Motion to call the question with amendments.
AGM MOTION013: ???/Janelle Gunderson

Carried

Member Jeff Galbraith wanted his abstention noted for the record.

Proposed Amendment to ???

Withdrawn

END OF TAPE

7. Proposed Bylaw Amendments

7.1 Proposed Amendment to Bylaw #1:

A Quorum for any meeting of members shall include at least 50% of the University Student Council.

AGM MOTION014: Ryan Allan/Cody Lang

President Ryan Allan spoke in favor.

Member Turner? Spoke against the motion.

Member Benjamin David spoke about members being concerned about these meetings and the inaccessibility of past General Meetings.

Member Portia Gana spoke to the lack of advertisement of the Meeting.

Member #79 spoke to the accountability of the Executive to inform the student body about these meetings.

Member133: ??? spoke to wanting a better representation of the student body than this motion would allow.

Member Vogeson Paley spoke in favor of the motion even though last meeting they did not have the 50 people necessary. He spoke to his awareness of the advertising that did go on.

Member Dylan Griffithes spoke to the lack of education by the Undergraduates representation to the under graduates themselves regarding AGM's. Also spoke to.....

Called Out of Order

President Ryan Allan spoke to advertising for the last AGM and the disinterest of students.

VP Ashlee Smith spoke to the disinterest and the responsibility of the student representatives to encourage involvement.

Shane Wagner spoke to his fear that passing this motion would allow the Executive to not encourage or advertise involvement for the next General Meeting.

Moved by Member Shane Wagner to limit debate to the next 4 speakers. Seconded by???

AGM MOTION015: Shane Wagner/???

Carried

Member Darla Bodnarch spoke to the advertising of AGM.

Member Alison Forbes spoke to the fact that most people were there to question the accountability of the Executive, but it was the Executive who put forth a motion that hinders the students' ability to make them accountable even more.

Member Alison Forbes also spoke to the issue of actually being heard by the Executive at the meetings.

VP Ashlee Smith spoke to the lack of respect in the meeting so far. She also spoke to the advertising for the meeting and the genuine desire of the membership to make change within the organization.

Call for vote on motion.

Motion is defeated

7.2 Proposed Amendment to Bylaw # 3

Amendment to read:

Members are required to attend all meetings of USC, or of the standing board or committee to which they belong, unless otherwise excused by USC, the board, or the committee. Any member shall face a vote for removal from office upon absence without permission from the President or Chair from two consecutive meetings, or three out of five consecutive meetings regardless of permission. Summer meetings are exempt. Sending regrets does not constitute obtaining permission.

President Allan spoke to the fact that the current bylaw does not follow the Constitution. This motion is to amend that discrepancy.

AGM MOTION016: AnnaCole/Caitlin Cottrell

Carried

7.3 Proposed Amendment to Bylaw #3

Amendment to read:

The following procedures outline the Violations Protocol to be followed in instances where potential breaches of the Code of Ethics have occurred:

3.01 All complaints should be forwarded in writing to the USSU office via the General Manager (GM) or General Manager Designate (GMD). Anonymous complaints will not be accepted.

3.02 Upon receipt of the formal complaint, the GM or GMD shall verify that the complaint meets formal (not Substantive) requirements and, once these requirements are met, issue the complaint.

3.03 Once issued, the complaint shall cause the defendant to be served (in person or by registered mail or electronic mail) with a copy of the complaint within seventy-two (72) hours. The complainant shall then provide written proof of service to the GM or GMD (forthwith)

3.04 Within Seventy-two (72) hours of service upon the defendant, barring extenuating circumstances, a CEDC hearing shall be called for both the complainant and the defendant to attend. The defendant may submit their statement of defense for consideration by the CEDC.

3.05 The CEDC may, at its discretion, hold additional meetings and conduct additional interviews in the absence of both the complainant and the defendant for the purpose of gathering information. However, if the CEDC wishes to use information gleaned from the additional investigation, it must have sources of the information, attend and present such information at the hearing attended by both the complainant and the defendant and both parties must be given a chance to respond.

3.06 The CEDC shall then make a decision to sustain or dismiss the complaint, based on the information presented at the hearing. Should the complaint be sustained, the CEDC must formulate a recommendation for appropriate sanctions and/or course of action.

3.07 Both parties must be notified of the CEDC's decision and any recommendation by noon, twenty-four (24) hours prior to the USC meeting where the decision and recommendation are to be reported.

3.08 The decision and recommendation of the CEDC must be submitted in written form to USC for final approval. USC may ratify, or reject the recommendation of the CEDC in whole or in part (even if this amounts to substituting its own judgment)

Moved by Member Ryan Allan Seconded by Member Ashlee Smith

President Ryan Allan spoke to the reason for this change was to match civil litigations.
The first part

END OF TAPE

.03 is to ensure that copies of the complaint are provided

.04 is to ensure that the time frame is appropriate and that both parties attend

.05 is to ensure that the CEDC has the resources they need. At the same time having the parties have access to all the people and resources that have information pertaining to the complaint.

.06 is to ensure that all the information comes forward at meetings that both parties are attending. It also changes the judgment process

.07 there was no time line for notification of the parties. As well the word recommendation was added.

.08 ????

The final authority does fall with the USC.

Member Graham Lang spoke in favor of the motion in general. He spoke to two concerns. The first in 3.02 upon the receipt of the complaint the GM shall verify that the complaint meets formal requirements...The concern is that the GM will be able to stone wall or not stone wall complaints. He would like the Chair to have the power in this case.

President Allan replied that this is the proper way for it to work. If the chair is going to have a say in judging the case they should be involved later in the process. The GM would only be deciding if the complainant had the legal standing to bring forward a complaint.

The second concern is that the USC can disregard the CEDC's decision. Why would the decision not stand?

President Allan stated that this is the way it is currently working. The USC has the final decision. Council is the highest authority.

Member Graham Lang moved to amend 3.08 to read that the CEDC has the final say on the decisions.

President Allan spoke to the fact that a sub committee could not be given this power.

Member Graham Lang moved to make an unfriendly amendment to read that the USC may ratify or reject the recommendations of the CEDC in whole or in part.
Seconded by member Maurice Collard

Decision that the motion is friendly

Member Ben David waves his chance to speak.

Call for question on the change to article 3

AGM MOTION018: Graham Lang/Maurice Collard Carried

8. President's Annual Report
Presented by President Allan

9. Auditor's Annual Report
Presented by VP Lang

Motion to adopt the financial Statement

AGM MOTION019: Jeff Galbraith/Caitlin Cottrell Carried

Motion to appoint KPMJ the Auditor for 2007/2008

AGM MOTION020: Jeff Galbraith/Graham Lang Carried

Motion to adopt the AGM and SGM minutes as presented

AGM MOTION021: Ellyse Shultz/Stephanie Parker Carried

Member Ashlee Smith called for people to attend the Day of Action

Member Stephanie Parker addressed the accusations made toward the USSU at the meeting. She stated that the Executive has a very hard job that is at times thankless.

Member Graham Lang spoke about the Day of Action. He suggested that it should be set up in the tunnel and target where students are voting. Then the MLA's who are in areas of high student population can be targeted.

Member Vogeson Paley reflected on the lack of accomplishment at this AGM. The consensus is that they are not happy with the Executive. However, these jobs will be harder in the future because of this meeting.

VP Smith spoke to the last couple of months and the accusations against the USSU and that it is not clear who people are talking about. Whether it is just the Executive, the membership of the USSU. Does this include staff? This has caused some concern with employees who see what is going on.