

SOGS COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

APPROVED

September 24, 2009

6:15 – 9:05 p.m.

Middlesex College Room 105b

Chair: Alison Braley

Recording Secretary: Olga Sauer

1. Approval of Agenda

Times are part of the agenda, unless suspended by assembly.

Ratified

2. Guest Speakers

- no speaker

Amy Ratcliffe (Geography) asked to speak to Council and read letter (Appendix B) to the assembly.

3. Announcements

Councillors were welcomed to the SOGS September Council Meeting. A special welcome was extended to new Councillors.

Quorum was 29.

Next meeting will be on October 29 room in this room.

Reminder that all returning Councillors will have to submit nomination forms by mid October for the 2009-2010 session.

International Student Identity Cards will be processed on September 30 and October 1 in the Grad Club from 9-3:30. After that, ISIC will be produced in the SOGS Office. If required, pictures will be taken for one dollar.

The Council year is from October to October. If you are here as a new representative, your attendance will not count towards department grants. You are welcome to stay and observe. New councillor nomination forms will have to be submitted by October 15 for the 2009-2010 year.

A reminder, you must sign with the correct time at the beginning of Council and if you leave the meeting prior to it being adjourned, you must indicate the **correct time** on the sign out Council Attendance Sheet. If you leave once the meeting has been adjourned there is no need to sign out.

Decorum in the course of debate. While Speaker is informal to things that aren't important, she will become very formal about the nature of decorum and debate. If a councillor stands to speak to a motion, they must state whether they are speaking for or against the motion. They should speak to the motion and not to the motivation or intention of other councillors. There should be no cross-talk. All comments should be directed through the Speaker.

J. Meyer asked that all councillors sign a get well card that was being sent around for Mark Brigham.

J. Meyer asked for a volunteer to attend the Western Library External Review on October 1 and 2. If anyone is interested, they should speak to Jonathan after

4. Speaker's Ruling

Speaker read final paragraph of her ruling.

R. Telfer (President) – appealed ruling

Speaker removed herself from Chair – M. Burrell (Deputy Speaker) stepped in.

R. Telfer – well rounded overview of ruling. General Meeting was called for the sole purpose of making a particular constitutional change. Surprised to find that another motion was added under New Business and a motion was passed. Disagreement with fundamentals of this ruling. Ask Council to make a decision for themselves rather than have the decision made by one person.

B. Sherar (Senator) – had a meeting and new business was added to the meeting. If it is on the agenda, it should be added.

A. Braley (Speaker) – original intention of calling the meeting was that it was to be a Special Meeting. Special Meetings do not allow for additions. Had been unaware that this was a Special Meeting. Had half a Special Meeting – half a regular meeting. Executive and those who knew it was a special meeting were less likely to look at the Agenda and less likely to make a special effort to come out to the meeting. Executive members and others who are privy to this information should not be held to a lesser standard of information than general members. The expectation should be that they are more on top of things coming out of the SOGS office. Several considerations had to be weighed and Speaker's ruling was that people had sufficient time to counter the admissibility of new business at the meeting.

J. Meyer (VP Finance) – put forward the original motion. At beginning of meeting, asked Speaker if the addition of new business was a mistake. There was no objection to the inclusion of new business at the meeting. There was no contention at the beginning of the meeting. There was a majority vote to include it the motion. Due process was not broken.

D. Dechene (Engineering) – forwarded the motion for consideration at the meeting. Asked Speaker as to whether new business was admissible. 2/3 majority vote to bring to floor as well as a 2/3 required to pass.

Sustain Chair's ruling -

Over-rule Chair's ruling – 1

Abstentions – 5

Ruling is sustained.

[Timelines experiment that failed.]

M. Davenport (VP Academic) – how soon will the letter be written an posted?

Speaker – 15 days start tomorrow.

5. Reception and Approval of the SOGS Council Minutes of August 27, 2008

M. Huard – held proxy vote Mr. Khadivi

D. Jacques – page 12 should read inaudible

R. vanderZanden – page 9 should read “Regarding Mr. Telfer's platform, how can we get better food options on campus?”

R. Williams – page 12 should read “CASA has one autonomous graduate student union that is a full member of the organization. In addition however, they also have associate members that are considering affiliation, or are part members. They also have graduate student representation from smaller schools that do not have separate organizations for graduate and undergraduate students.”

Moved:

Seconded:

Unanimous consent

6. Elections

VP Academic – Natalie Szudy - acclaimed

VP Finance – Duncan Sutherland – acclaimed

VP Finance, Jonathan Meyer, thanked Council and expressed his hopes for a better financial year.

Margie and Jonathan were thanked for their tenure as SOGS Vice Presidents.

SOGS Committees

Margie Davenport – is there a limit to the size of Committees?

Speaker – not at the moment, BCC might want to look at this

SOGS	Academic Committee	Stefanie de Jesus	Anatomy & Cell Biology
SOGS	Bylaws and Constitution Committee	Jonathan Meyer	Biochemistry
SOGS	Equity Committee	Kalin Penev Chelsea Mohler Mehrnoush A. Joobaneh	Engineering Health & Rehab Sciences Linguistics
SOGS	Finance Committee	Jonathan Meyer Melanie Columbus Jordan Harel	Biochemistry Biology Sociology
SOGS	Grad Club Committee	Jonathan Meyer Philip Baiden Ryan vanderZanden Christine Cullion	Biochemistry Sociology Engineering Health & Rehab Sciences
SOGS	Bursaries & Subsidies Committee	Jonathan Meyer Philip Baiden	Biochemistry Sociology
SOGS	Graduate Student Issues Committee	Shakir Chambers Diana Bumstead Stephanie Vieille Paul Kim Barbara A. Becker Becky Ellis Mahdi Hassan Matt Dunnett Trevor Tovel	History Geology Political Science History Sociology Anthropology Computer Science Political Science History
SOGS	Health Plan Committee	Siamak B. Tajali Sunwei Li Selma Saadaldin Taesung Ahn Andrew DeLong Dan Dechene Marsha Brown Matt Dunnett	Health & Rehab Sciences Engineering Medical Biophysics Engineering Computer Science Engineering Sociology Political Science
SOGS	Policy Committee	Matt Dunnett	Political Science
SOGS	AD Hoc Sustainability Committee	Sonja Teichert Vanda McNiven	Biology Biology

K. Penev (Engineering) – do nominations have to be cleared through Council?

M. Davenport (VP Academic) – WGR Editorial Board currently has enough people for the profiles being worked on.

N. Szudy (Kinesiology) – students will be welcome to join as places become available.

Speaker – currently not strictly enforceable.

J. Meyer (VP Finance) – chairs of committees can set numbers for their committee.

R. Telfer (President) – that is incorrect, Council can set rules, committees cannot set rules.

7. Orders of the Day

a) Motions Arising from the President

No. 1 — Decorum Memorandum:

BIRT the Speaker be directed to produce a memorandum, for permanent inclusion in the monthly Council package, summarizing the decorum requirements/guidelines (in accordance with the Society's parliamentary authority, Robert's Rules of Order) for meeting conduct.

Seconded: M. Pirie

R. Telfer (President) – some of the meetings have gotten heated as of late and basic rules need to be followed. A one page reminder in every council package as a reminder of what constitutes polite and professional conduct.

J. Meyer (Point of Information) – didn't we already do this?

R. Telfer – it had been discussed, but nothing implemented.

D. Jacques (Point of Information) – will that have anything covering what is an evasive answer? If not, could that be added.

R. Telfer - Question is loaded with innuendo.

D. Dechene (Engineering) – against – sustainability - packages are getting quite large – adding more paper is getting ridiculous. Speaker said that she will uphold decorum.

E. Price (Biology) – against – 99% of know what proper decorum is.

J. McLauchlan (Chemistry) – against – people break decorum, not because they don't know what decorum is, but because they speak passionately. Adding more rules might be a waste of paper.

J. Meyer – the way it's written against, but the idea is okay. Against because there is a better way of reminding councillor to upkeep decorum.

P. Baiden (Sociology) – for motion – one page won't hamper sustainability. Those who want to print and bring to council can.

J. DeMello (Biomedical Engineering) (Point of Information) – is this the same or different information that we already have?

R. Telfer – normally Robert's Rules of Order summary is included in Council package.

Speaker – will continue to include Robert's Rules summary. During speaker's term this will be included. Entertained a motion to postpone indefinitely.

Moved – J. Meyer

Seconded – Ryan vanderZanden

C. Gray (Education) – you said that you will do this of your own accord, will it be distributed in the package or separately.

Speaker – will send as part of package, but it's not necessary to print the package.

R. vanderZanden – call the question

K. Penev – seconded

2/3 majority needed to call the question

Question called

Motion to postpone indefinitely.

Motion passes

No. 2 — Executive Reports:

Be it resolved that executive members be directed to format their regular written reports to Council in two sections, as follows:

1. Mandatory work summary of activities since the previous meeting of Council (to be entitled "Work Summary")

2. Optional supplemental information about matters of importance and interest (to be entitled "Supplemental Information")

Seconded – J. Peters (Sociology)

R. Telfer – two division will make it easier for Councillors to gage work done by Executive.

J. Peters – good for council to have guidelines.

J. Meyers (Point of Information) – mandatory activities is that only of the Executive member or the committees under the portfolio also?

R. Telfer – good question – report of attending and participating in committee meetings important to include.

M. Davenport – Ammend to read- #2 - Comprehensive report of information from meetings attended and other matters of importance.

Seconded – G. Keller

M. Davenport – more information needed than just a list of meetings attended.

D. Jacques – This should be referred to Executive Committee.

Seconded – R. vanderZanden

E. Price – against referring to Committee

P. Baiden – against motion – doesn't see any grounds for this motion

J. McLauchlan – for motion - should have been dealt with at the Executive level

R. Telfer – for motion – agrees it will be good to have all Executives, including new ones, consider this information.

Refer to committee

Motion passes

No. 3 — Priorities Forum:

BIRT the "Executive Council" be eliminated and that the bylaws be amended accordingly.

BIFRT the SOGS Executive be mandated to hold an Organizational Planning and Priorities Forum twice annually, first during June and then again during October.

BIFRT the following parties be invited to attend each Organizational Planning and Priorities Forum: all executive members, the Speaker, SOGS office staff, the Grad Club Manager, committee chairpersons, graduate student Senators, the graduate student representative to Western's Board of Governors, and all graduate student representatives to Western's Graduate Education Council and the Council's subcommittees.

BIFRT the purpose of the Organizational Planning and Priorities Forum be to review and discuss the Society's two primary domains of activity: (1) member services, benefits and programs; and, (2) collective advocacy efforts.

BIFRT the Executive be assigned responsibility for drafting and revising an annual strategic plan, for Council's consideration and approval (first in July, then in November), based in part upon the discussions of the Organizational Planning and Priorities Forum.

Seconded – D. Dechene

R. Telfer – move to refer to BCC. Could be quite time consuming to deal with in Council. Will attend BCC meetings when this is being discussed.

Seconded – P. Lea

Motion passes

No. 4 — 2009-2010 Advocacy Efforts:

~~BIRT Council endorse, in principle, the following advocacy efforts as organizational priorities during the 2009-2010 academic year:~~ BIRT Council refer the following issues for discussion as follows:

For referral to the Graduate Student Issues Committee:

1. Awareness-raising initiatives regarding the following post-secondary education issues:

- a. tuition fee increases and their consequent diminishing of accessibility (and the related issues of student debt and government funding);
- b. equitable funding for Category II and second-year Master's students at Western;
- c. intellectual property rights;
- d. copyright reform; and,
- e. the dangers of research commercialization.

For referral to the Graduate Student Issues Committee and Grad Club Committee:

- 2. A campaign that encourages all Western students to advocate for improved (i.e., healthier, more diverse, and less costly) food options on campus.

For referral to the Sustainability Committee:

- 3. An up-to-date sustainability audit of both the SOGS office and the Grad Club for the purpose of ensuring that our internal organizational practices are environmentally friendly in accordance with commonly utilized industry standards.

For referral to the Equity Committee:

- 4. An awareness-raising initiative about racism on campus.

Seconded – K. Asquith

R. Telfer – motion with extensive scope. Recognizes new academic cycle. Committed at last Council meeting to bring up new commitments and begin dialogue for platform.

K. Asquith (Media Studies) – important to members – seems like logical follow-up.

R. Feldman (Medical Biophysics) – change wording to “BIRT Council refer the following issues for discussion as follows:”

Seconded – E. Price

R. Feldman – if not debated at Council then shouldn't be “endorsed”

K. Penev – committees know better than Council – this will be good guidance.

J. McLauchlan – endorsing is too strong, but it should be up to committees

M. Huard (Engineering) – for amended motion – good for committees to decide on their priorities

R. Telfer – for amended motion – exact intention

D. Sutherland (Chemistry) – call the question

Seconded - R. vanderZanden

Question called

Amended motion passes

J. Meyer – Amendment

Motion #2 –referred to Grad Club Committee

Seconded – K. Penev

J. Meyer – Grad Club provides food for graduate students.

K. Penev – would the Grad Club Committee be able to interact with other food outlets on campus

R. Telfer – opposed to change – campus wide – not just Grad Club; Economics student group already has an initiative. Campaign to deal with the campus wide

D. Jacques – against change – operationally Grad Club Committee can only deal with Grad Club not advocacy for the whole campus.

Craig – more undergrad maybe, not graduates

R. Telfer – GSIC is a catch all – encourage participation from all our members (and others)

D. Sutherland secondary amendment – add GSIC to new amendment

Seconded – J. McLauchlan

This will cover all grounds.

D. Dechene – in favor of amendments
R. Williams (GSIC Chair) – would consider Grad Club as major contributor and would consult them
P. Baiden call the question
Seconded – J. McLauchlan
Passes

Amendment – to add ‘and GSIC’:
Motion passes

First Amendment - ***For referral to the GCC and GSIC:***
Motion passes
Question called – J. Meyer
Seconded – J. McLauchlan
Question called

Main motion (with amendments)
Motion passes

b) **Motions Arising from Other Committees**

BCC - Mass Email Motion

WHEREAS the BCC was directed to propose bylaw changes regarding usage of mass emails; and
WHEREAS it is the opinion of the BCC that these matters are best dealt with at an All Candidates Meeting and not in the Bylaws:
BIRT Council accept the recommendations of the BCC report regarding this matter.
BIFRT Council recommend to all future CROs that they develop rules regarding the usage of mass emails in future All Candidates Meetings.
Moved – J. McLauchlan
Seconded – R. Feldman
J. McLauchlan – best way with present technology – rules should be set out at the beginning of presidential elections

Motion passes

BCC - Motion to deal with leaves of absence

Constitutional changes

WHEREAS Council does not have the authority to amend the Constitution; and
WHEREAS Article V of the Constitution pertains to membership in the Society; and
WHEREAS graduate students on leave of absence cannot be given the full rights and privileges of Full Membership for safety or administrative reasons; and
WHEREAS graduate students on leave of absence should maintain their health plan coverage and it would be beneficial for them to not be specifically excluded from other SOGS services; and
WHEREAS these services are exclusively referred to as "external services" under Article V of the Constitution and the Constitution should remain consistent; and
WHEREAS the phrase "external services" is currently not defined in the Constitution; and
WHEREAS every other class of membership under Article V explicitly requires the payment of membership fees and graduate students on leave of absence should not pay membership fees since they cannot be given full rights of membership; and

WHEREAS each external service is separately negotiated and carries its own fee requirements and requirements for inclusion; and
WHEREAS the status of "On Leave of Absence" is required in the Society:
BIRT Council recommend to the General Membership that Article V of the Constitution be amended to include:

Section 5.5: Members On Leave of Absence

1. The requirements for Members On Leave of Absence in the Society are:
 1. in a period of "Leave of Absence" as granted by the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies of the University of Western Ontario.
2. Members on leave of absence have the following rights and privileges:
 1. the ability to maintain their external services, subject to the policies of each service, under their previous status through their absence period.

BIFRT Council recommend that Article V of the Constitution be amended to include the following preamble:

1. Under Article V of this Constitution, the phrase "external services" refers to any services or benefits provided by an external organization to the Society's members.

BIFRT Council recommend that the Constitution be renumbered as required

Moved – D. Jacques
Seconded - J. Meyer

Discussion in Camera
Moved – R. Feldman
Seconded – J. Meyer

Out of Camera
Moved – J. Meyer
Seconded – J. McLauchlan

Motion passes

Finance Committee

WHEREAS the OSSA will provide required services for SOGS and the Grad Club to meet health and safety ministry requirements, and
WHEREAS these requirements are required by the Ministry,
BIRT Council approve the over expenditure of an additional \$8000 from the staff training and benefits line item specifically for this service.

Moved – J. Meyer
Seconded – D. Jacques

J. Meyer – Ministry served a few to do lists for the Grad Club. Grad Club met with an OSSA representative who will produce required manuals. Grad Club was to go forward with the training, but it was thought best to include SOGS as a whole (including SOGS office staff) . Decision made that it would be best if paid by SOGS.

Motion passes

Health Plan Committee

WHEREAS the current SOGS Health & Dental Plan now operates on an annual basis where all full-time students have coverage for a full 12 months (Sept 1-Aug 31) regardless of graduation date or academic status, and

WHEREAS Exchange and Visiting students who are at Western for no longer than 6 months in duration are considered full-time Western students while they are here, even though they pay tuition to their home university,

BIRT Council approve a reduction in SOGS membership fees and subsequent services for Exchange students and Visiting students of less than 6 months duration that would consist of the SOGS membership fee and bus pass fee only.

BIFRT such Exchange and Visiting students shall not be charged plan premiums nor granted access to the Health & Dental plan benefits for the duration of their stay at Western, regardless of alternate coverage. Such a change in membership status would alter the status of visiting/exchange students within the Society (i.e. membership services they have access to), and can therefore justify their exclusion from the health and dental plan, but still offer them the service they need.

Moved – J. Jiang (VP Student Services)

Seconded – J. Meyer

J. Jiang - Exchange and visiting students are here for less than six months and most have health insurance from their home country. It is less trouble to have them not opt into the health plan only to opt out again.

Motion passes

c) **Other Motions**

VP Finance

WHEREAS the cost of the printing for the 2009-2010 SOGS Handbook was budgeted at \$17,000,

already inclusive of a \$500 buffer for unforeseen expenses;

WHEREAS the cost of printing for the 2009-2010 SOGS Handbook has now been invoiced at \$18,034.80 due to alterations made by the President, that were not authorized by the Orientation Committee, but for which services were still provided by the printing company; BIRT that Council authorize the over budget payment to the Capital Colour Graphics Inc. for the amount invoiced. (*as recommended by the Finance Committee).

Moved – J. Meyer

Seconded – D. Jacques

J. Meyer – we have a debt and it needs to be paid – let's pay it.

R. Telfer – amendment

BIRT the motion be resolved to read

BIRT the handbook editor expense line item from the 2009-2010 SOGS budget be revised to an allocation of \$0;

BIFRT the handbook printing expense line in the 2009-2010 SOGS budget be revised to an allocation of \$18,035;

BIFRT the handbook printing expenditure overage of \$35 be deducted from the 2009-2010 SOGS budget contingency fund.

Seconded – J. Peters

D. Dechene (Point of Order) – does this not change the spirit of the motion? It's changing how we are allocating money and I think it's totally against the motion.

Speaker – You'll be striking the entire motion and replacing it.

R. Telfer – It's entirely within Roberts Rules of Order to replace a motion by way of another motion, so long as its aiming to achieve the same effect, which is to pay the bill.

Speaker – I will allow it with the recognition that it does strike out the whole previous motion. I will allow it to stand – it's not an amendment but meant to replace, that's perfectly acceptable.

R. Telfer – I was VP Finance of SOGS before and managed the largest student union in the country. The proper way to deal with overages is to amend the budget. The motion that came forward didn't mention where the funding will come from. The general assumption, the reasonable one, is that it would come from SOGS bountiful reserves. The issue at hand is staying within budget and not taking from reserves, but merely reallocating within the budget to ensure we are on budget. If I may, as part of my motivation, the affect of my motion is to take the handbook editor line item to \$0 and increase the budget line from \$17,000 to \$18,035, that leaves a difference of \$35 – that still needs to be covered and we have a contingency fund of approximately \$6700. The end result is that our 2009-2010 budget bottom line remains unchanged and our bill is 100% covered.

D. Dechene (Point of Personal Privilege, a little after the fact) – just about decorum of debate, you actually need permission to read from a quotation, you should ask for permission to read. We are talking about decorum of debate, I feel decorum was not upheld here. This is in Robert's Rules.

Speaker – small excerpts are acceptable; point not well taken. Constitutes his own report as opposed to reading from a textbook to demonstrate a point, but thank you.

D. Jacques – against – what Mr. Telfer is proposing is actually wrong and may not pass with the accountant. First, we can't arbitrarily transfer \$1,000 from editor line item. People still need to be paid for work completed in May.

R. Telfer (Point of Order or Privilege) – statements of fact that alleged particular actions need not be part of the debate. If people want to make particular statements, it must be done within the context of the motion to deal with those things.

Speaker – ruling on point of order – to paraphrase the objection – is that this has been taken from some kind of authority and arbitrarily decided by the President. That's the objection, the point of order is sustained.

D. Jacques – the handbook was in a nearly finished state as of May, people need to be paid, so you can't just transfer the \$1000. Secondly you have to show the overage, so you see the changes from year to year.

J. McLauchlan – against – before May, several people worked one editing the handbook. They put in a lot of time and effort. We are still trying to find out if they were told they would be paid for their work. Taking away from that line item would be unfair.

E. Price – why are we over budget by \$1000 when we had a contract with the printer for \$17,000. Why did this change and who is responsible?

Speaker – why's don't matter to this motion, comment doesn't need to be answered. My ruling can be formally challenged.

E. Price – Formally challenged ruling.

Speaker – Challenge to Chair – it's a comment, it isn't out of order, but isn't relevant to the motion.

R. Telfer (Point of Order) – challenger must state position first and then the Chair defends.

Speaker – thank you – please explain why your question is germane to this motion.

E. Price – We are talking about potentially re-allocating money the handbook editor is now getting to \$0. If the editor was responsible for the cost overage, then they could possibly be responsible; however, if they are not responsible, then I'd say it's not the right thing to do.

Speaker – my feeling is that the issue of what the state of finances are right now is a given and this has to be dealt with in terms of what we will do to deal with the upcoming handbook and I didn't feel that knowing the reasons of how we got to here was germane to figuring out what the new budget should be. So I put it to the assembly whether or not the decision of the Chair will be sustained.

D. Jacques – please stop saying the new budget, because you don't make a new budget we're not allowed – allocate expenses.

Speaker – can we say proposed budget?

D. Jacques – no, it's an expense, please don't say that it's wrong.

Speaker – is my meaning clear? If not you won't sustain my decision.

Speaker overruled.

Speaker – Mr. Price has the floor.

E. Price – would someone please, perhaps VP Finance, explain what the contract was and why we overspent.

J. Meyer – Every year the Finance Committee goes through the budgeting process. Last year we were told by OC this would be the needed budget for this year, because there was a two-year agreement with the printer. The Contract was for \$16,000 and change. \$17,000 was allocated for some wiggle room. This year, a bill was given to me, after the handbook had been printed for the value shown (\$18,035). Neither the Finance Committee nor the VP Finance had not been consulted about the over expenditure beforehand. To say the Finance Committee is coming to Council now because we just got around to it, is wrong. We just found out about it and we needed to address this situation because it's bad to incur debts that we are not paying. Can't automatically pay out the bill because its over the \$100 room that Council has allowed in the budgeting process. So we had to come to Council. I was asked by the President to amalgamate the two line items for the handbook editing as well as....

R. Telfer (Point of Order) – I did not ask you to take any particular action.

J. Meyer – yes you did.

R. Telfer – no I did not.

Speaker – what is the point of order.

R. Telfer - Again the member is making statements about another member's actions or what have you and I disagree with that being associated with me because I did not ask for that.

Speaker – point well taken – he said/she said is not acceptable.

J. Meyer – hold on – another member of the Society asked me to amalgamate...

Speaker – you'll have to do better than that, move on please. We have no independent verification that this happened, so let's move on.

? Point of Information – is there another witness?

Speaker – with all due respect, I think we are straying a little too far from the purpose here. We all have to tread lightly.

J. Meyer – the idea was purported for reasons that I'm unaware of at this point, that the line item for editing was not going to be used and could be used to pay out the handbook remaining balance. I couldn't just make the pay out without notifying Council. The initial Finance Committee motion was set out to say we have to pay a bill. This, as the current VP Finance, I can't tell you why we were over budget because I'm not allowed to. Question might be better suited to go to the Orientation Committee.

L. Wilson (Point of Order) – our bylaw states that "12.6 Proposals for amendments to the budget shall be received by the VP Finance and shall be referred to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee shall present the proposals with the Finance Committee's recommendations to Council within eight weeks of the VP Finance's receipt of the proposals." So we shouldn't be doing anything at this time.

R. Telfer – Her concern pertains directly to this motion, proposal to amend budget must be referred to Finance Committee..

Speaker – ask for guidance from the President.

R. Telfer – this amendment has not yet been adopted by the assembly, so we haven't actually gotten to the point of proposing an amendment to the budget.

Speaker – so can I suggest a way out of this, unless someone has a better suggestion.

Can I suggest we go through the action of adopting this motion as amended here, with the proviso that the Finance Committee look into it further.

Speaker – ruled out of order. I will start a speaker's list

J. Meyer – please put me on, I was on from before.

Speaker – you have already spoken twice, I will take first time speakers first.

D. Jacques – please explain what just happened.

Speaker – suggestion came to me that this whole thing was out of order because it violates the bylaws – agreed that the wrong word [budget] was used – propose as to whether or not this amendment will be accepted.

D. Jacques – since it is hanging,

J. Peters – call the question

Seconded K. Penev

2/3 majority needed

Fails – debate continued

K. Penev – against – uninformed position need further information as to whether editors need to be paid.

C. Gray (Point of Information) – I'm not an economist, it seems that this is just shuffling the budget that is set up ahead of time. If you go over budget, shouldn't that be reflected instead of covering it up? It seems to me that that's what happened here.

Speaker – will allow Mr. Telfer to address

R. Telfer – I've been in this line of work for ten years and it's perfectly common to revise a budget at anytime by bringing forward reasons for doing so. One reason for doing so is because you are over in one area and under in another. It's perfectly legitimate to put forward an amended budget. The Finance Committee has the power to amend the budget, precisely for that reason. It is quite common. We had done it several times when I was VP Academic and Finance in the past.

J. Meyer (Point of Information) – should the comments of the last speaker come from the Finance Committee?

Speaker – sounds to me like this is getting back to the original debate about whether this is even in order, which I think we agreed was. So I'm going to move on. Points of Information – don't really exist, they are a way of entering into the debate by couching things in the way of a question. A real question is "I don't understand how ... actually works. I need this information before I can vote."

J. Meyer (Point of Information) – was the original motion brought forward by the Finance Committee?

Speaker – yes – the original motion was brought forward by the Finance Committee.

C. McKay (Kinesiology) – against shuffling the budget mid-way through the year. Don't you have to have accountability reasons for why you are changing the budget? This particular motion doesn't have that.

M. Davenport (Kinesiology) – against – the editors did their work, they are grad students, they are expecting this money. Taking it away is ridiculous.

Speaker – Possible solution – is there anyone who would propose a second amendment to allow them to be paid.

P. Brochu – Call the question

Seconded – K. Penev

2/3 majority needed – Question called.

Motion to accept replacement to Finance Committee motion.

Motion fails.

Original Finance Committee motion

D. Jacques – please pass this so we can pay the bill.

R. Telfer – against – fundamentally disagree with how to handle this type of overage. This motion assumes payment from overage and I don't think it should be done this way. I think we should just reallocate money in the budget and part of the reason I proposed the motion I did was because noone has been contracted to be the handbook editor. I was almost entirely Olga, Raquel and me. I am opposed due to the effect on the bottom line.

Speaker – I'll let stand. Fundamental difference in how to view this problem.

G. Keller – Call the question
Seconded – M Huard
2/3 majority needed – Question called.

Motion passes

Whereas the 2009-2010 handbook contains at least 18 full colour pages exclusively featuring CFS programs, materials, and ads.
Whereas the 2009-2010 handbook contains an additional 6 half-page and 6-quarter-page photographs of CFS protest events.
Whereas the 18 full colour pages, and 4.5 black and white pages of CFS material were not approved in content or form by the Orientation Committee.
Whereas the inclusion of the 18 full colour pages, and 4.5 black and white pages of CFS material were approved solely by the SOGS President.
BIRT council mandate the Finance Committee to negotiate for payment from the Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) its subsidiaries or agents, based on the advertising fee for 18 full colour pages and 4 black and white pages in the handbook.

Moved – J. Meyer
Seconded – M. Davenport

R. Telfer – oppose – Federation was not contacted nor did the Federation contact SOGS to include that information in the handbook. It was solely my decision – does not make sense to go to someone to pay for something they had nothing to do with.

J. Meyer – motion to amend current motion

BIRT council mandate the Finance Committee to negotiate for payment from the Rick Telfer based on the advertising fee for 18 full colour pages and 4 black and white pages in the handbook.

Seconded - M. Davenport

Speaker – I don't know if I have any legal standing but I firmly think you are wasting your time trying to get. I'm sure there will be legal protections built in here. I can't refer to anything but I'm waving that thought out there.

R. Telfer – I have no problem negotiating.

K. Asquith (Media Studies) – in that case, my comment is irrelevant.

E. Price – does that mean Mr. Telfer is happy to pay for the overage?

Speaker – the wording is negotiate. That's the only admission here.

D. Dechene (Point of Clarification) – negotiation could be for both sides. As president, he negotiates contracts, I just want to clarify which side would that be for.

Speaker – this is a point of debate and I'm not sure there's any answer. What are the implications of this? We're going to move on.

D. Jacques – against – 'negotiation' either decide to garnish wages in that amount or can be challenged legally at his expense or go back to original motion and negotiate with CFS. We pay them fees, maybe something can be negotiated.

P. Lea – against – this isn't going anywhere. Decorum is deteriorating – nothing will be solved.

P. Brochu – against – it is unfair to have even brought it up – it's only \$1,000.

D. Jacques – this isn't about recouping \$1,000. This is the lost revenue that has a potential of \$6-7,000.

P. Baiden – are we speaking of the amendment or the motion?

Speaker – amendment

D. Sutherland – Call the question.

Seconded – J. Peters

2/3 majority needed – passes

Amendment fails

Main motion.

J. McLauchlan – if CFS didn't ask for this and don't have anything to do with it, I don't think they can be charged. There is a separate question as to how the material was included and that can be dealt with later.

Speaker – Indeed

K. Asquith – against – some members don't find content or images problematic. Secondly, it seems odd to charge after the fact if there was no negation before.

C. McKay – if favour – many people were offended and were not happy with the information that was included in the handbook. The addition of protesting photos...

R. Telfer (Point of Order) – what do pictures have to do with whether we will ask CFS to pay for advertising or not.

Speaker – point well taken, issue is whether or not we will ask CFS to pay for it. Whether we think it's good or bad advertising is beside the point. Restrict comments to whether money should come from them or not.

D. Dechene – challenge the Chair – look at two speakers back, they had the opposite point of view – how this affects our advertising revenue – previous member's statement is valid because he is looking at the opposite side. Valid and germane to the discussion/argument.

Speaker – the specific BIR is what tells us what we are actually moving, what the point of all this talk is BIR is whether or not we are going to ask CFS to pay for advertising.

Ruling sustained

D. Jacques – negotiate in kind advertising – longtime standing association. CFS likes to have their advertising out there, so we should negotiate.

G. Keller – someone said it's not proper to negotiate after the fact, does anyone have experience doing this?

R. vanderZanden – maybe should be moved to committee to investigate what happened and bring back what happened to Council. Motion to postpone debate until after next motion has been debated.

Seconded – M. Beyea (Biochemistry)

K. Penev – against – this doesn't solve anything to postpone until after next motion. Motion doesn't pass.

D. Sutherland – call the question

Seconded – M. Pirie

2/3 majority – question called

Main motion – standing vote

15 for

13 against

3 abstained

Motion passes

Whereas the Finance committee has to consider these charges for next year's budget, BIRT council charges the Orientation Committee to do a full report on the 2009-2010 handbook. Including, but not limited to: the reasons why it was over budget, why the CFS exercise book was included, timeline of creation and printing, expected costs of next years project.

BIFRT the President of the Society, Rick Telfer, respond within 48 hours to all inquiries made by the Finance and Orientation committees, the Finance and Orientation committee chairs, and the VP's of the Society.

BIFRT that when possible the reply will contain all requested evidence and explanations. BIFRT when evidence cannot be immediately enclosed, the reply will contain a full explanation for the lack, and a strict timeline detailing the release of the information. Whereas the VP Finance feels there was a lack of transparency in the process of this year's handbook printing and wishes to increase transparency in future years, BIRT in the future a purchase order (PO) be issued to the printer of the handbook for the maximum amount budgeted so that the final cost of printing must go through the Accounts Manager and the VP Finance.

Moved – J. Meyer

Seconded – D. Dechene

J. Meyer – as the current VP Finance this year, the Finance Committee needs to look at the budget, line items aren't changed without going through Finance Committee. The Finance Committee doesn't have a proper understanding of how to go with next budget when its reviewed. This year, the reason why we were over budget – why was the Finance Committee and VP Finance left out of the loop when it was known that the handbook was going to be over budget.

R. Telfer – will happily provide information to anyone who wants it. 48 hours may not be possible to do, regardless of whether this motion passes or not.

Speaker – is it possible to offer an amendment to time – will entertain an amendment.

L. Wilson (Medical Biophysics) – “BIFRT” clause could give an out.

G. Keller – inaudible

Speaker – entertain motion to postpone.

Quorum lost.

Meeting adjourned

Moved - J. McLauchlan

Seconded - G. Keller