

MINUTES

Annual General Meeting of the Simon Fraser Student Society – East Gym
October 25, 2006 • Simon Fraser University, Burnaby Campus

The meeting was called to order at 2:46pm, October 25, 2006

An approximate count of members present (excluding Directors): 50.

1. RATIFICATION OF THE CHAIR

AGM-10-25-06:001 MOTION

Moved/Seconded

Be It Resolved That Neil Monckton be ratified as Chair for this meeting.

CARRIED

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND REVIEW OF MEETING RULES

AGM-10-25-06:002 MOTION

Moved/Seconded

Be It Resolved That the agenda be adopted with the addition of receipt of the report of the Ombudsperson.

CARRIED

3. ADOPTION OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS' MINUTES

AGM-10-25-06:003 MOTION

Moved/Seconded

Be It Resolved That the minutes of the 2005 Annual General Meeting be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

4. NEW BUSINESS

The required quorum of 500 was not met and – as per the Society's By-Laws – no new business could be considered.

b. Receipt of Report of the Ombudsperson

Laurine Harrison, Ombudsperson for the Simon Fraser Student Society delivered her report. She stated that the Ombuds Office at SFU was the first one of its kind at a University in North America. The Ombudsperson's report is appended to these minutes.

5. RECEIPT OF REPORT FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Member Services Officer Glyn Lewis delivered the report of the Board of Directors as best he could. He briefly outlined the salient points in the report. He spoke at length on topics such as the Canadian Federation of Students, transit service for students, the privatization of education, the issues surrounding privacy and intellectual property and turnitin.com, Chartwell's, the Society's campaign to secure common room space, the drive to a green Society and University, discussions surrounding a Student Union Building, Canadian Students for Darfur, and the general topic of membership development.

The Member Services Officer then discussed other aspects of the report such as services provided by the Society. He then discussed a number of events that were organized and or funded by the Society and were successful.

6. RECEIPT OF REPORT FROM THE TREASURER

Treasurer Vanessa Kelly delivered the report of the Treasurer. She highlighted some aspects of her report. She stated that the Society has run a slight surplus, and that the Society is in a good financial position.

Directors Dunnet and W. Li entered the meeting at 3:16.

Directors Dunnet, W. Li, Hunsdale, and Pollock exited the meeting at 3:17.

The Treasurer provided an update on the Highland Pub and other aspects of food and beverage services.

Member Justin Wong asked a question regarding the decrease in activity expenditures.

The Treasurer stated that there were fewer events held last year.

7. RECEIPT OF REPORT FROM THE AUDITOR

Auditor Gary Wozny delivered his report. He briefly described some of the aspects of the report.

Director W. Li entered at 3:21.

Director W. Li exited at 3:21.

Mr. Wozny informed the membership of assets and liabilities.

Count of members present (not including Directors): 31

Director Vanessa Kelly left the meeting at 3:23pm.

8. APPOINTMENT OF THE AUDITOR FOR THE COMING YEAR

AGM-10-25-06:004 MOTION

Moved/Seconded

Be It Resolved That Tompkins, Wozny, Miller and Co. as the Society's auditor for the 2006-2007 Financial Year.

CARRIED

9. ADJOURNMENT

AGM-10-25-06:005 MOTION

Moved/Seconded

Be It Resolved That the meeting adjourn.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 3:09pm.

DRAFT MINUTES

Special General Meeting • October 25, 2006 • Convocation Mall, Simon Fraser University
Simon Fraser Student Society • Local 23 Canadian Federation of Students

2:32 pm – the meeting was called to order by the Forum Chair, Titus Gregory

(Applause)

Titus Gregory announced that 504 students were present at the meeting and explained that this number meets the quorum requirements of 500 students. He explained that on September 27th, Forum met and voted to call the SGM for this date. He introduced Patrice Pratt as the chairperson recommended for this meeting by Forum, and requested a motion from the assembly to ratify her as chairperson.

1. APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR

SGM:06-10-25:01

MOTION

2:38 pm

Clea Moray / Nick Schmid

Be it resolved that Patrice Pratt be appointed chairperson *pro tem* of the Special General Meeting

Titus repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly.

(Applause)

Clea Moray explained that Forum had voted to recommend Patrice Pratt as chairperson for this meeting, that she has excellent qualifications and that she would be an excellent chair.

Matthew De Marchi asked for more information regarding Patrice Pratt's credentials.

Patrice Pratt explained that she had been in the union movement, that she had recently retired from the BCGEU, had chaired large labour conventions of about 3,000 people, had chaired provincial council of a political party with many contentious issues on the floor, had chaired the Four Pillars Committee for the Downtown Eastside for the Vancouver Foundation, and had chaired the Success by Six Committee for the United Way. She then asked if anyone wanted to hear any more.

(Applause)

Matthew De Marchi spoke against the motion because of Patrice Pratt's close union ties. He indicated that due to the nature of this SGM, that it is related to the union and to CUPE, Patrice Pratt is not an acceptable chair.

James Richardson spoke in favour of the motions, stating that students at SFU are part of a student *union*.

(Applause)

James Richardson then called the question.

Paul Browning called a Point of Order, indicating that a member can't call the question after debate has been made.

Titus Gregory upheld the Point of Order.

Clement Apaak stated that Patrice Pratt has the necessary credentials to chair this meeting. He suggested that the opposition to this motion had an agenda of their own that seemed to be similar to the agendas of those members of the Board of Directors that the SGM seeks to hold accountable. He then encouraged the vote to take place.

(Applause)

Titus Gregory repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly.

SGM:06-10-25:01 CARRIED

(Applause)

The Chair thanked the assembly for their confidence in her ability. She indicated that since coming to campus she has been made aware of the nature of this meeting and realized that it would be a challenging one. She announced that campus security had expressed their concern that some students from this meeting might want to disrupt the AGM taking place in the East Gym and indicated that members should be fair and respect the other meeting. She also pointed out that the harassment of any Board member whether or not the impeachment is successful is just as inappropriate. She reminded members of their obligation to follow the Student Code of Conduct. She also noted the two heat stations that were located in the back of the meeting space that members could stand near if they became too cold.

2. AGENDA AND REVIEW OF MEETING RULES

The Chair asked that members state their name clearly before speaking for the purposes of the minutes. She explained that every member of the Society was eligible to vote at this meeting and that all students have the right to have their voices heard and participate. She reminded members present to be respectful, whether speakers were in favour of a motion or opposed to it. She outlined the procedures that would be used throughout the meeting, indicating that there were two microphones at which members could speak to motions, one microphone for speakers in favour, and one microphone for speakers opposed, asking that all members reflect the nature of their point by standing behind the appropriate microphone. She asked that statements be kept to three minutes in length and explained that when there are one minute or 30 seconds left during a time period, a sign would be raised. She explained that she had asked Titus Gregory to keep time and that when that time is up she would ask the speaker to leave. As well, speakers would alternate between those in favour and those opposed unless there is no speaker to the contrary. She stated that 16 minutes of debate should happen for each motion. She requested a motion to this effect.

Krystle Kalanj called quorum.

The Chair thanked Krystle Kalanj for reminding her about quorum. She stated that she had already walked around the perimeter of the meeting to observe the security and registration procedures. She stated she was confident in the measures that were taken and informed the body that the attendance at that time had reached 710 members.

(Applause)

Krystle Kalanj asked what that number was based on.

The Chair indicated that registration required picture ID and a student number and that the attendance was being monitored at the registration tables with the computers.

SGM:06-10-25:02 MOTION

2:43 pm

Clea Moray / Deena Rubuliak

Be it resolved that the agenda be approved

Paul Browning called a Point of Order, stating that the SGM was out of order as it was called by an invalid meeting of Forum that was not properly constituted.

The Chair indicated she had been informed of the nature of his point and provided the minutes of the Forum meeting of September 27th, with the attendance of 15 of 28 members present for quorum, indicating that the meeting was valid and the motion had passed legitimately to call the SGM.

Matthew De Marchi called a Point of Information, asking who called the meeting of Forum.

The Chair indicated that Shawn Hunsdale had called it.

Paul Browning called a Point of Order, stating that an e-mail had been sent out before the meeting indicating that quorum would not be reached and canceling the meeting of Forum.

The Chair explained that nothing in the By-Laws suggests a meeting of Forum can be cancelled and that the meeting was duly constituted, and that nothing in the By-Laws suggests a Member Services Officer has the power to cancel a meeting.

(Applause)

The Chair stated that the meeting of Forum on September 27th was duly constituted.

Matthew De Marchi called a Point of Order, asking for the numbers of votes in favour and votes opposed at that meeting of Forum for the motion to call the SGM. He indicated that he would prefer a number out of thirty two.

The Chair requested a moment to find the section of minutes of that meeting that addressed the question.

Matthew De Marchi began whistling impatiently into the microphone.

The Chair indicated that she had been fair to him and requested that he respect her.

Matthew De Marchi apologized for whistling.

The Chair read from the minutes, informing the meeting that there had been 35 votes in favour, 0 votes opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Paul Browning indicated that it was his opinion based on the legal counsel received by the Board, that the meeting of Forum was cancelled.

The Chair indicated that she had reviewed letters from all lawyers involved and was convinced that the SGM was duly constituted.

(Applause)

SGM:06-10-25:02 CARRIED

SGM:06-10-25:03 MOTION 2:48 pm

Clea Moray / Titus Gregory

Be it resolved, as special rules of order, that speeches be confined to three minutes each, that debate on each resolution be confined to sixteen minutes each, and that speakers shall alternate between supporters and opponents of each resolution.

CARRIED

The Chair requested that members refrain from any heckling during the meeting and interrupting of speakers.

3. NEW BUSINESS AS SET OUT IN THE FOLLOWING NOTICES OF SPECIAL RESOLUTIONS

SGM:06-10-25:04

MOTION

2:50 pm

Bryan Jones / Amie Vander May

Be it resolved, as a special resolution, that Shawn Hunsdale be impeached and removed as President and as a director of the Society

Matthew De Marchi called a Point of Order, asking to move to amend the agenda to put the By-Law amendments before the impeachment motions.

The Chair explained that there was already a motion on the floor to be considered and ruled Matthew De Marchi's point was out of order.

Bryan Jones motivated in favour of the motion, stating Shawn Hunsdale, as President of the Society, had, by acting outside the bounds of ethical standards, allowed the Student Society to achieve quorum at a general meeting of the Society.

(Applause)

Bryan Jones stated that Shawn Hunsdale had mentioned that he wanted the employee that was fired gone over a year ago. He stated that Shawn Hunsdale saw the By-Laws, Policies and the Constitution of the Society broken and ensured that the firing would not be agreed upon by the Board, as is past practice, but rather done in secret. He stated that Shawn Hunsdale had spent tens of thousands of Society dollars on improperly retained legal counsel and ensured that the collective agreements had been violated over twenty times in the last three months. He stated that in the past eight years, not a single violation was noted. He stated that Shawn Hunsdale had helped break the *Society Act* and indicated that by storing the Society's financial computers in a vacant residential unit, Shawn Hunsdale saw that the financial and personal information of thousands of students and employees was jeopardized. He stated that Shawn Hunsdale had opened the Society up to lawsuits by encouraging slander and libel of the former employee yet let other Board members take the blame for it. He stated that Shawn Hunsdale had sent a threatening letter to the national office of the Canadian Union of Public Employees threatening the future job prospects of the staff. He stated that Shawn Hunsdale had consistently lied to both students and other Board members and had helped provide the Canadian Federation of Students with contracts that were not approved by the Board. He stated that as a graduate student, he took offense to the disgusting disrespect that Shawn Hunsdale had shown to graduate students in attempting to prevent the health plan that they wanted and in attempting to provoke the health care broker into suing the Society. He concluded, stating that Shawn Hunsdale was not a recognized student of the university administration and is not eligible to serve as a Director of the Society, yet he was still spending Society money.

(Applause)

Paul Browning spoke in opposition to the motion, stating that he considers Shawn Hunsdale to be a fine, upstanding individual and to be doing an excellent job as a Director of the Society. He admitted that there were issues in the summer, but that due to the fact that they were labour issues, information was not allowed to be disclosed. He asserted that actions were taken to address the labour issue and the Board members responsible were unjustly criticized. He indicated that confidentiality was required. Secondly, he stated that since this action was taken, there had been accusations made of improper acts, like the fact that Shawn Hunsdale is not a student. He asserted that at the first meeting of the Board, all Society members were required to present proof that they were students in at least one course that semester or in the immediate previous semester and at that

meeting, every member present presented that proof. He stated that the accusations against Shawn are slanderous. Further, he asserted that the motions for impeachment are politically motivated by a small group of narrow minded individuals...

(Laughter)

Paul Browning continued, stating that those narrow minded individuals were looking to impeach the democratically elected representatives of the Society, with their own narrow minded political agenda to regain power in the Simon Fraser Student Society despite having lost in previous elections. He then encouraged members to see through the innuendo and false information put forward by the so-called Students for a Democratic University.

(Laughter)

Clement Apaak spoke in favour of the motion. He stated that until May 1st of this year, he was the President of the Student Society and that he had encouraged most students to vote for the Common Sense slate in the last election, one of the biggest mistakes he ever made. He requested that students join him to correct the mistake that he was partly responsible for. He stated that Shawn Hunsdale needed to be impeached, not because he has disgraced the office of the President which Clement Apaak held, but because Shawn Hunsdale lied to students and done everything possible to ensure that he and his team were not held accountable. Clement Apaak expressed disbelief at the accusation of theft put on a 26 year veteran when she had left a note, in the presence of a witness, in the cash registered and the money she took was money owed for her per diem to attend a conference. He expressed disbelief that Hattie Aitken of leaking information to health plan brokers that would have caused the signing a million dollar contract extension of 5 years. He indicated that none of the Group of 7 were present at those meetings when graduate students spoke to the lawyer but that he himself was present. He stated that there was no information that Hattie Aitken could have possible given to the broker. He then explained that for a contract to be signed, a draft contract must first be negotiated by a team put together by the Board and then brought to the Board to discuss whether or not this contract should be signed. He stated that Hattie Aitken, who has no power, could never sign a contract that would cause the Society to lose money and encouraged members to vote to impeach Shawn and do the right thing for the future of the Student Society.

Paul McCulloch indicated that he was speaking neither for nor against the motion. He indicated that he had recently moved to Burnaby from Winnipeg and that the first thing he saw when he arrived at SFU was signs about this controversy. He explained that the more he heard, the more he realized that there wasn't enough information being disseminated to the students to make any clear decision about what was going on. He indicated that the only information available was from either Students for a Democratic University or the SFSS Board and that both sides squabble incessantly in *The Peak*. He complained that debate had taken up almost all of the content of the paper. He stated that he thought the controversy was a mark of shame on the University and the student movement in general and that no quorum, of 500 or 700 could make up for the silent majority of people who have no idea what is going on. He stated that he didn't feel that the assembly could make any decision unless full information was given and everyone knew exactly what they were voting for.

(Applause)

Krystle Kalanj called a Point of Information asking the chair to define the word slander.

The Chair indicated that she could not define the term as it was a legal one and did not fall under her position as Chairperson of the meeting. She explained that often, in cases of slander and libel

people go to court and debate it there. She affirmed that she was not aware of the nature of the politics taking place at this meeting and reminded the members present that she was acting as a neutral chair. She suggested that if members feel they are not able to participate in the meeting because of potentially slanderous comments made, they can call a Point of Personal Privilege.

Krystle Kalanj stated that the chair's goal of the meeting was to uphold order.

The Chair stated that thus far she had not heard anything that she would consider reason to shut a member's discussion down. She stated that if Krystle Kalanj would like to debate whether statements were unfair or wrong, that the member could debate the issue in opposition to the motion.

Eric Simlen spoke in favour of the motion, stating that this body was not a small group of people and reiterated that it was not just SDU, that there were over 700 members present, this being the first time quorum had been reached in over a decade for either an AGM or an SGM, indicative that this was what students wanted.

Andrea Sandau spoke in favour, introducing herself as the University Relations Officer of the Society. She explained that at the Sept 15th meeting of the Board of Directors the U-Pass was shown as proof of registration. She further pointed out that the U-Pass wasn't an appropriate indication of proof. She explained that when she tried to get the Board to present further proof of registration, the debate that ensued lasted over an hour. She further explained that the *University Act* defines the student as a person who is presently registered in a credit class. She continued to point out that Shawn Hunsdale admitted that he was taking a Continuing Education class that was not for credit. Andrea Sandau further clarified that students in Continuing Education classes are not members of the Simon Fraser Student Society and fees are not collected from those students. She questioned the validity of Shawn Hunsdale's Presidency based on this information. Following up, she indicated that she would be speaking to meetings in which she had been present whereat Shawn Hunsdale acted in his capacity as President of the Society to coerce other Directors of the Society to keep the Graduate Issues Officer off of the University Relations and Graduate Issues Coordinator Hiring Committee. She indicated that in that meeting, Shawn Hunsdale had stated that he wanted someone who was pro-CFS on that hiring committee and that Margo Dunnet was on that committee to keep both of the graduate representatives off. She further explained that on September 8th, when it became apparent that the petition to impeach was going to be received, a similar meeting was held at which she was present, wherein Shawn Hunsdale and others spoke to strategically hold the Annual General Meeting at the same time as the Special General Meeting, to prevent the SGM from obtaining quorum.

The Chair ruled that the speaker's time was up and reminded the members to be respectful, in response to Krystle Kalanj's earlier point.

(Applause)

Alex Hemingway spoke neither in favour nor in opposition to the motion. He expressed his concern with the dichotomy of the speaking procedure. He indicated that he was troubled by some actions of the Board, specifically those of the cancellation of Forum and the lack of response to the number of signatures on the petition. He indicated that the impeachment campaign was launched when he didn't have enough information to determine whether the actions of the Board constituted impeachable acts and he wasn't sure how he would be voting at this meeting either. He stated though, that if he was going to vote to impeach, that he would do so for what has happened since the petition was circulated. He expressed his concern that it was difficult to follow what is going on due to the rhetoric from both sides and mused that perhaps the Board and SDU do have a political

agenda to push. He indicated that, listening to the rhetoric coming from both sides, it seemed neither side wanted to get to the core of the issue. He stated that the discussion would have benefited with more of a debate, but encouraged members to vote with their conscience at the meeting.

The Chair repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly and pointed out the vote counters located around the edges of the meeting floor. She stated that a $\frac{3}{4}$ vote was required to pass the motion.

Mathew De Marchi called a Point of Information, asking who the vote counters were.

The Chair stated that she would answer the question after the count had been conducted.

SGM:06-10-25:04 CARRIED (724 votes in favour, 6 votes opposed, 13 abstentions)

Noted abstentions: Amanda McQuaig, Earl Tapia, ana kresina, and Sean Wilkinson

(Loud applause)

SGM:06-10-25:05 MOTION

3:16 pm

Brianna Turner / Nick Schmid

Be it resolved, as a special resolution, that Margo Dunnet be impeached and removed as External Relations Officer and as a director of the Society

Brianna Turner motivated in favour of the motion, stating that Margo Dunnet had been the most vocal and instrumental executive in carrying out the plan that Shawn Hunsdale laid out. She stated that rather than using her voice to answer students' questions and responding appropriately to the growing concerns of students, Margo Dunnet repeatedly engaged in slandering the names of former staff and had lied to the student body. She stated that on the first day that staff had been sent home in August, Margo Dunnet lied to the Graduate At-Large Representative, claiming that she was unaware of the whereabouts of the staff and that the computers were being taken out of the office for repairs. She stated that since then, Margo Dunnet's behaviour had been shameful. She stated that Margo Dunnet knowingly engaged in slandering the name of the employee that was terminated through the Member's Update. She stated that Margo Dunnet lied to Board members and students. She stated that in a letter to *The Peak*, Margo Dunnet attacked several students, questioning their academic records and their personal relationships. She stated that not only was this behaviour shameful and inappropriate, it demonstrated a complete failure to address the issue at hand. She stated that Margo Dunnet had repeatedly demonstrated that she is unwilling or unable to respond to students concerns in a professional manner and has also engaged in violations of the Collective Agreement. She stated that Margo Dunnet had threatened SFSS staff members, telling the employees of the SFSS with whom they are permitted to speak. She stated that Margo Dunnet had tried to coerce other board members into voting a particular way and had prevented them from putting motions on the floor. She stated that Margo Dunnet had actively worked to exclude other Board members, particularly the Graduate Issues Officer, from gaining access to information and from having a voice in hiring the staff member directly responsible for resourcing graduate students. She stated that Margo Dunnet had actively engaged in attempting to dissuade students from attending the SGM by lying and confusing students and that she could only conclude that Margo Dunnet was utterly uninterested in adhering to the democratic process which put her in office. She concluded, stating that Margo Dunnet had been party to virtually every flawed process that the Board had undertaken and had violated agreements, provincial statutes, and the ethical standards of a public representative. She stated that she has lost sight entirely of what is required from an elected representative.

Margo Dunnet expressed her concern that there was no way in three minutes she would be able to tell members the entire story. She stated that everything she had done was because she believed it was in the best interests of students. She stated that she didn't believe that the terminated employee was working in the best interests of students. She stated that she didn't believe that the graduate students on the working group were working in the best interest of students. She stated that she didn't believe that signing the contract with Gallivan and Associates was in the best interest of students. She said that the people who tried to signed the three year contract extension were not looking out for the best interests of graduate students. She stated that there was no way to limit price increases on that contract. She suggested that if they had been able to sign, graduate students would have been locked into a 5 year contract. She indicated that the contract had already gone up by sixty dollars in its first year. She stated that had the contract been accurately quoted, there was no way it should have gone up by that much. She indicated that the investigation uncovered stacks of evidence regarding what the terminated employee was doing in her relationship with Gallivan and Associates. She stated that the employee in question had talked to Gallivan and Associates about how to set up a negotiating committee and discussed the details of that negotiating committee with Mark Healy, telling him not to let the Board know of their discussion. She questioned how the terminated employee's actions were in the best interests of students. She said that the employee was giving away confidential information. Margo Dunnet stated that she was elected to represent students, undergraduate and graduate students, and that that is what she had done. She stated that she thought that graduate students, people like Clement Apaak and people on the Graduate Student Health Plan Working Group took the investigation personally. She indicated that she had not stopped the graduate health plan and that it would continue to be in place long after her term. She stated that the next Board will have the ability to renegotiate the health plan and that she will never have that ability. She stated that she was not trying to take away anyone's graduate health plan and that she was not trying to stop graduate autonomy, that graduate students can do whatever they want to do if they want to separate. She stated as well that she did not think that Joel Blok was the right person to be on the hiring committee and she did tell people to vote for her because she thought she would uphold the best interest of students. She stated that Joel Blok had walked out of Board meetings, that he hadn't been there, and that he doesn't work in the best interest of students. She stated that she had been giving up everything she had for students

Matthew De Marchi called a Point of Information asking that the two people in front of the Chair move out of the way as it was hard to see the chair.

The Chair indicated that she believed those students were trying to keep order, but that she would stand, as it was warmer for her anyways if she stood up.

Randy Galiwan stated that he thought enough debate had been had and he called the question.

SGM:06-10-25:06**MOTION**

Randy Galiwan

Be it resolved that the question be called

Paul Browning called a Point of Order, stating that Randy Galiwan had made a point of debate in saying that he thought enough debate had been had to the motion, and that he was not able to call the question.

The Chair ruled the point out of order, and explained that she believed that debate had been heard for the motion and against the motion.

Mathew De Marchi called a Point of Order, stating that he thought there was a complete lack of debate.

The Chair ruled that point out of order as well and requested that Mathew De Marchi sit down.

(Applause)

The Chair stated that she was here to chair the meeting and to relay to the assembly *Robert's Rules of Order*. She continued to explain what calling the question meant.

SGM:06-10-25:06 CARRIED

The Chair requested that the earlier Point of Information regarding who the vote counters were be answered.

Titus Gregory clarified that the vote counters were appointed by the SGM Oversight Committee and that that committee was struck by Forum at its meeting on September 27th, the same meeting that called the Special General Meeting in which all members of the assembly were currently in attendance.

The Chair repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly.

SGM:06-10-25:05 CARRIED (613 votes in favour, 14 votes opposed, 61 abstentions)

Noted abstentions: Amanda McQuaig, Earl Tapia, ana kresina, Sean Wilkinson, and Ali Hassannia

Noted opposition: Vanessa Kelly and Marion Pollock

(Applause)

SGM:06-10-06:07 MOTION

3:34 pm

Jan Gunn / Yang Zhao

Be it resolved, as a special resolution, that Wei Li be impeached and removed as Internal Relations Officer and as a director of the Society

Jan Gunn introduced herself as one half of SFU's 'power couple', thanking Margo Dunnet for the title, a former employee of the Student Society, and a former IRO (Internal Relations Officer). She motivated in favour of the motion, stating first that a Collective Agreement is a legal document negotiated jointly by the employees and the employer of the Simon Fraser Student Society whose purpose was to lay out the governance of the workplace as well as to establish a process for resolving disputes. She stated that Collective Agreements are under the authority of a piece of legislation called the *Labour Relations Code* of BC. She stated that the IRO's primary responsibility was to uphold and enforce the terms of the Collective Agreement and in this respect, Wei Li had failed spectacularly. She explained that there were currently over 25 grievances brought against the SFSS and that this was galactically stupid when compared to the 1 or 2 grievances filed during her term, admitting that one of them was due to a mistake she had made. She indicated that over 25 grievances were not due to the mistakes of a young, inexperienced IRO, but rather that they were deliberate and wilful violations of the Collective Agreement. She stated that the employer was warned that their actions would result in grievances and that they indicated they did not care. She stated that every grievance may not go to the Labour Relations Board and be heard by an expensive arbitrator, but that every grievance cost the Society money, whether it be for a \$345 per hour lawyer to provide advice, the wages and stipends paid to cover the time spent in grievance meetings, or the loss of productivity in staff and directors. She indicated this could cost thousands and thousands of student dollars and stated that that was incredibly irresponsible. She continued, stating that all members of the Society were workers and that they know how they would like to be

treated by an employer. She indicated that as IRO, it was Wei Li's responsibility to foster a smooth and efficient work environment but that instead he had created the most toxic workplace she had ever seen. She stated that her former coworkers have been disrespected and that Wei Li had created an environment where people daily fear for their jobs and where the long-standing tradition of cooperation had been destroyed. She stated that people who were once valued for the skills and guidance they brought to new inexperienced directors had been made to feel useless and had been told that their opinions don't matter and occasionally that their advice was not welcome. She stated that the employer had run roughshod over workers and that this was the kind of workplace that takes a toll on the health and well being of workers. She indicated that she had been told of sleepless nights, anxiety, and increased sickness brought on by high stress and stated that nobody deserved to be treated like that.

(Applause)

The Chair announced that Wei Li wanted to speak to the assembly but that he was not eligible to enter the space of the meeting because he was not a student this semester and requested a motion to allow him to speak.

SGM:06-10-25:08

MOTION

3:38 pm

Jessica Stanley/ Michael Caulkins

Be it resolved that Wei Li be permitted to speak

CARRIED

Wei Li thanked everyone for the opportunity to speak and announced that he did take a class last semester, indicating that he was still a student. He continued to explain that in January and in August, members of the Board found something that an employee did that was wrong and that he had to terminate this employee for it. He indicated that he understood that it had a very stressful impact in the workplace. He stated that he and Sam Bradd, the union representative from CUPE 5396 were working to improve the workplace. He stated that the allegations that he didn't care about the workplace were not true. He stated that he did care about the workplace very much but that it was inevitable that his actions would change the workplace. He stressed that it is difficult to terminate someone and repeated that the decision was stressful. He stated that he understood that many grievances were being handled but declared that grievances are not always a breach of the Collective Agreement; rather, they are used as a communication tool from the employee to the employer. He said that the nature of grievances could be constructed dependant on how he and the union representative work on it. He said that he believed that the political climate within the office became even worse due to the proposed impeachments and increased the stress on the Directors of the Society. He stated that if the pressure of impeachments wasn't there, that it would be easier for the employer and the employee to mend this situation. He concluded, stating that his goal was first, to not be impeached, and second, to work towards a healthy working relationship with employees. He stated that was always his intent and that he didn't understand the allegations to the contrary.

The Chair reminded the assembly to be respectful and requested that the murmuring at the back of the assembly cease.

Jessica Stanley introduced herself as an independent student and Called the Question.

SGM:06-10-25:09

MOTION

Jessica Stanley

Be it resolved that the question be called

SGM:06-10-25:09 CARRIED

The Chair repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly.

Daniel Green requested a roll call vote for every motion and then retracted his request.

Chris Lindberg called a Point of Personal Privilege, stating that the large crowd of people standing at the microphones were distracting and requested that those people sit down until they were called to speak on a motion.

(Applause)

The Chair ruled the point in order and indicated that there were nearby chairs that members could use.

Ken McCarthy called a Point of Personal Privilege, asking whether or not Wei Li’s vote was counted even though he was not supposed to be admitted.

The Chair stated that Wei Li’s personal vote was not counted.

Paul Browning stated that under the SFSS By-Laws, students in either the current or past semester are members in good standing and while the administration’s list may only include students who are registered in classes this semester, he believes that Wei Li’s vote should be counted.

Titus Gregory clarified, reading from By-Law 1, noting that an “Active Member” meant a student who was registered in a course, program, or graduate program for the current semester. He stated that By-Law 2 section 4 states, notwithstanding the provisions of these By-Laws, in order to be eligible to run for office and to be eligible to vote at Annual General Meetings and at Special General Meetings, a student must be an active member of the society. He noted that Mr. Li was not an active member in good standing, but that he was a member in good standing according to By-Law 5, section 1. Because he was not an active member in good standing, he did not have the right to vote at this meeting.

The Chair ruled the point out of order and then called a Point of Personal Privilege of her own, declaring that there should be a warming station on the stage with her.

SGM:06-10-25:08 CARRIED (573 votes in favour, 20 votes opposed, 45 abstentions)

Noted abstentions: Earl Tapia, ana kresina, Sean Wilkinson, and Gregory Campbell

Noted opposition: Marion Pollock

(Applause)

SGM:06-10-25:10 MOTION 3:52 pm

Peter Lypkie / Sarah Caufield

Be it resolved, as a special resolution, that Glyn Lewis be impeached and removed as Member Services Officer and as a director of the Society

Peter Lypkie introduced himself as a past Vice President and Treasurer of the Computing Science Student Society and a member of the Society off and on for ten years. He said that throughout his membership with the SFSS, Hattie Aitken had been an excellent influence on his time at the University and in helping out with the Computing Science Student Society. He stated that when he heard she was fired, he decided he wanted to find out what was going on and that was when he began attending meetings where he could see the Board members in action. He indicated that when he started attending those meetings, he was neither in favour nor against the decision. He stated

that he didn't know what was going on, and that prior to this, he had been on friendly terms with Shawn Hunsdale. He stated that during the time between the firing and the SGM, Glyn Lewis and others were acting contrary to the democratic ideals that he holds. He stated that in the meetings he attended, they acted in any way they could to prevent students, graduate students, and staff members from having their voices heard, and from doing the right thing and that he was disappointed with meetings he had attended and with the actions of Glyn Lewis. He requested that students stick around until the end of the meeting because it was important to get all of these people off of the Board because of their actions and he didn't want to lose quorum.

(Applause)

Peter Lypkie stated that it was particularly important to get Glyn Lewis off because Glyn Lewis tried to cancel a Forum meeting that he was a member of previously as a representative for Computing Science. He asserted that Glyn Lewis tried to cancel a meeting when there were clearly enough people who wanted to attend and for that reason alone, he should be kicked out.

Glyn Lewis introduced himself as the Member Services Officer. He stated that he thought a lot of what had happened at the SGM was not right. He stated that he thought that students were coming out in numbers because they care about something. He stated that what he wanted to think was that students who came for democracy and who want to hear his side of the story would let him tell his side of the story and not call the question and not cut him off. He stated that something as serious as impeachment deserved somebody else's point of view.

The Chair reminded Glyn Lewis that the assembly had voted on a 3 minute limit to discussion.

Glyn Lewis asked whether that was a 3 minute limit on what he could say and the questions he could answer.

The Chair confirmed that was the case but that her time used speaking would be deducted from his time so that he would have a full 3 minutes to speak. She repeated that those were the rules agreed to at the beginning of the meeting.

Glyn Lewis stated that he thought he should be given more than three minutes to speak.

(Laughter)

The Chair called the assembly back to order.

SGM:06-10-25:11

MOTION

3:59 pm

Glyn Lewis / Krystle Kalanj

Be it resolved that the speaking period be amended to 10 minutes for speaking and answering questions

The Chair reminded the assembly that the meeting was not a debate and advised that a 2/3 majority vote would be required to change the rules of order for the meeting. She then repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly.

LOST

The Chair indicated that because of his confusion, she would allow him three minutes further to speak and requested that he watch the stage for cues to wind up.

Glyn Lewis pointed out that not allowing a student to have their voice heard who is up for impeachment is not right. He questioned how the assembly claimed to stand for democracy and transparency, how they want to ask questions and how they want two sides of the store when they wouldn't give him ten minutes to say what he has to say and to answer questions. He stated that he

was not trying to be disrespectful or make accusations but he was just trying to make his voice heard. He questioned how there were so many people at the meeting who had never met him, who had never talked to him, who had never come to a meeting, who didn't know who Glyn Lewis was or what he stood for.

(Heckling)

The Chair reminded the assembly that Glyn Lewis had the floor and to be quiet and respectful.

Glyn Lewis thanked the Chair out of respect. He asserted that the people at the meeting were putting his name and the other students' names on the chopping block. He indicated that he could see that the people were impassioned and that they care about everything that is going on, and that he could see that inside of himself, but that it wasn't fair not to hear him out and to not see who he is and to see what kind of Member Services Officer he wants to be. He stated that he wants to be a representative that represented students. He stated that he had dedicated sums of his life organizing events on campus that he was not getting paid for because they were two years ago. He thanked the assembly very much, and stated that he dedicated an entire summer of his life to putting on an event on this campus because he believes in students on this campus and if the assembly didn't want to see it and didn't want to hear it, that was fine. He stated that if the assembly actually cared about the other side, democracy, and to hear somebody out before putting their head on a chopping block then that is the only thing that is right.

SGM:06-10-25:12

MOTION

4:03 pm

Daniel Green/ Margo Dunnet

Be it resolved that a roll call vote be taken for every motion

The Chair explained that a roll call vote required a simply majority vote in favour to pass and explained what a roll call vote meant.

Margo Dunnet called a Point of Order, stating that a request for a roll call vote doesn't go to a vote. She declared that a roll call vote must take place on the request of a single member.

Titus Gregory read from page 405 of *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised*, 10th Edition, noting that Robert's Rules of Order provides that a roll call vote is not to be used in a mass meeting.

(Applause)

Titus Gregory asked if Margo Dunnet would like him to read the paragraph explaining that a majority vote is required to have a roll call vote on a resolution, or if she accepted that it was the case.

Margo Dunnet stated that that was fine.

Titus Gregory asked Daniel Green if he agreed.

Daniel Green agreed.

LOST

SGM:06-10-25:13

MOTION

Brody Murfin

Be it resolved that the question be called

CARRIED

The Chair repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly.

SGM:06-10-25:12 CARRIED (607 votes in favour, 22 votes opposed, 23 abstentions)

Noted abstentions: Earl Tapia, ana kresina, and Sean Wilkinson

Noted opposition: Vanessa Kelly and Marion Pollock

(Applause)

The Chair reminded the assembly that there were only a few more impeachment motions to go through and then two By-Law amendments at the end of the agenda and encouraged members to stay until the meeting was finished.

Paul McCulloch stated that the climate of the room seemed to be overwhelmingly in favour of the resolutions. He stated that every time someone calls the question, the meeting becomes a witch hunt. He moved that every motion get full debate.

The Chair stated that everyone who came to the meeting had an issue and saw the meeting as a way to resolve this issue. She stated that she had to follow *Roberts Rules of Order* and that *Robert's Rules of Order* state that the assembly governs how the meeting proceeds. She stated that if the assembly declares that they have heard enough debate and call the question, the Chair, as the servant of the assembly, must go directly to the vote. She declared that Paul McCulloch's motion was out of order.

Paul McCulloch stated that he was just trying to speak to the majority that won't show up, the people that won't know what was going on.

The Chair stated that if those members were not here and had not registered into the meeting then they were not members of the assembly.

SGM:06-10-25:14

MOTION

4:15 pm

Andrea Sandau / Steven Anas

Be it resolved, as a special resolution, that Vanessa Kelly be impeached and removed as Treasurer and as a director of the Society

Andrea Sandau spoke in favour of the motion, stating that, throughout the period of the labour investigation this summer, many students went to the Board of Directors asking questions about what happened. She stated that while there were many issues that had to be raised with them about the nature of the investigation, many students decided to focus their attention on the costs of the investigation. She stated that Ms. Kelly was asked at a Board meeting on August 9th about the costs of the investigation and if she could provide any estimate on how much it had cost and how much it could cost going forward. She stated that Vanessa Kelly promised to get those answers to students as soon as she could. She stated that students have been waiting for over two and a half months now, with several more students asking. She stated that ana kresina, the former Treasurer of the Simon Fraser Student Society, had been asking for quite a while for financial documents and membership lists of the Student Society but to date ana kresina has not received those either. She stated that this motion was not simply about Ms. Kelly's failure to perform one small part of her job, but because Vanessa Kelly has allowed her own politics to come before her responsibility to the Society members. She stated that if Vanessa Kelly had any concern for the Society and its finances, she would not have endorsed and participated actively in the firing process of an SFSS employee. She stated that Vanessa Kelly should have known that that action would lead to many repercussions with the staff union and with the students and should have had more respect for the private information of students. She stated that Vanessa Kelly should not have been involved in a dangerous classroom speaking process where she routinely broke the confidentiality provisions of

the Collective Agreement with the staff and therefore exposed the SFSS to the possibility of legal actions seeking damages. She stated that Vanessa Kelly should not have worked to create a toxic work environment for the employees of the Society whose job it is to serve us as members. She stated that what Vanessa Kelly should have done, was shown that she was there to serve students and the Society and not her own political agenda and the agenda of her cohorts. She stated that Ms. Kelly had, over the past three months, demonstrated clearly that she does not care about students or the SFSS and does not deserve to serve as a Director of the Society or to be its Treasurer.

(Applause)

Margo Dunnet began to object to the consideration of the motion.

Andrea Sandau called a Point of Order, requesting that Margo Dunnet stop heckling people quietly under her breath as they walk by or while they were up at the microphones.

Margo Dunnet requested that Andrea Sandau stop telling lies about her, stating that Andrea Sandau had been consistently telling lies about her for months, and that requested that students cease to believe her.

Andrea Sandau called a Point of Order, stating that Margo Dunnet was not speaking to the motion on the floor.

The Chair reminded both parties to respect each other.

Margo Dunnet objected to the consideration of the motion, stating that it was not a valid meeting as it had not been called in the proper fashion.

The Chair ruled Margo Dunnet out of order, stating that debate over whether the meeting was valid had already been had before she arrived at the meeting and that she had already pointed out why the SGM was duly constituted.

(Applause)

Vanessa Kelly called a Point of Order, pointing out that Margo Dunnet had moved a motion and that she would like it to be considered.

The Chair asked what motion Margo Dunnet had moved.

Vanessa Kelly stated that Margo Dunnet had objected to the consideration of the question.

The Chair stated that Margo Dunnet should vote against the motion.

(Laughter)

Paul Browning called a Point of Order, indicating that *Robert's Rules of Order* provides that the motion to Object to the Consideration of a Question is in order.

The Chair requested clarification from Titus Gregory.

Titus Gregory read from *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised*, 10th Edition. He noted that, according to *Robert's Rules of Order*, the motion to Object to the Consideration of a Question has eight standard characteristic descriptions, whose third standard characteristic describes when an to Object to the Consideration of a Question is in order. He stated that the third standard characteristic states that an to Object to the Consideration of a Question can not be moved once debate on the main motion has begun.

The Chair stated that Titus Gregory was a parliamentarian extraordinaire and reminded the assembly that the meeting was attempting to run democratically and logically. She stated that, customarily, and she has chaired many large political conventions, when a resolution comes to the floor and a lot of people are mad about it, they vote it down.

Titus Gregory stated that if members want to Object to the Consideration of a Question, the appropriate time would be right after the motion has been read from the Chair, before any motivation has been spoken.

The Chair ruled the motion out of order.

Vanessa Kelly spoke in opposition to the motion. She stated that she would speak to the point that Andrea Sandau had made. She indicated that the documents that ana kresina requested will be given to her on Friday. She indicated that ana kresina had made the request two days before she had gone on sick leave, leaving her without the opportunity to fulfill this request. She stated that she had been busy with the Annual General Meeting and that her request would be fulfilled on Friday. She stated that she has done her duties to the Society as best as she could and would like to share some of her knowledge as Treasurer with the Society. She stated that Directors are provided a stipend, with Executives receiving a stipend for the 60 hours that they work, bi-weekly. She stated that, on average, she works 80-90 hours for the Society, explaining that 30 hours are worked, bi-weekly, that she is not paid for. She stated that she had done many, many things that she believed were beneficial to the Society that far outweigh any opposition that people may have. She stated that she had been working very closely with Students United for Disability Support, in making sure that they had equipment within the Society for their needs. She stated that she had been working with many different constituent groups, and hours upon hours on campaigns, much more than just the bureaucracy that is the job of the Treasurer. She stated that she hoped that members of the assembly would take this into consideration and allow debate to happen, to allow themselves to make an informed decision. She indicated that there were people present with information and those people would like to give it to the assembly. She requested that the assembly allow them to do so. Lastly, she stated that she would like to ask those people that are consistently abstaining, especially to things like calling the question, to allow debate to happen. She stated that there were at least 60 people for every motion abstaining who may be able to make up their mind if debate occurs.

Andrea Sandau called a Point of Information, indicating that there were many opportunities to speak to the membership before this meeting.

(Applause)

Vanessa Kelly called a Point of Order, stating that that was not a Point of Information.

The Chair upheld the Point, allowing Vanessa Kelly one further minute to finish speaking.

Vanessa Kelly expressed her surprise that another Director of the Society for 6 months did not know her *Robert's Rules of Order*. She stated that she had had the opportunity to answer many students' questions and that she saw many faces in the assembly that she had never seen before that she would love to hear questions from. She stated that she really, really wanted to hear student concerns but she can't because of students calling the question. She repeated that members obviously had questions as they were at the meeting but they were not given the opportunity to answer them so because the question had always been called.

The Chair reminded the assembly to quiet down and that the meeting was nearly finished.

SGM:06-10-25:15 MOTION 4:27 pm

Daniel Green / Vanessa Kelly

Be it resolved we take a 10 minute recess

SGM:06-10-25:16 MOTION TO AMEND 4:29 pm

Yang Zhao / Choon Shiang Ng

Be it resolved that the motion be amended by adding the words “after the impeachment motion on the floor has been voted on”

The Chair explained what it meant to vote on an amendment to a motion and then repeated the amendment for the benefit of the assembly.

SGM:06-10-25:16 LOST

The Chair repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly.

SGM:06-10-25:15 LOST

(Applause)

Kate Millbury called a Point of Order, requesting that filibusterers of process stand at the microphone designated for opposition to the motions.

SGM:06-10-25:17 MOTION

Randy Galawan

Be it resolved that the question be called

CARRIED

The Chair repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly.

Vanessa Kelly stated that all those students with abstentions should feel free to talk to her at any time.

SGM:06-10-25:14 CARRIED (597 votes in favour, 10 votes opposed, 30 abstentions)

Noted abstentions: ana kresina, Earl Tapia, and Sean Wilkinson

(Applause)

SGM:06-10-25:18 MOTION

4:39 pm

Jason Tockman / Chris Demwell

Be it resolved, as a special resolution, that Marion Pollock be impeached and removed as a director of the Society

Jason Tockman presented his motivation for the motions, stating that while Marion was away when the investigation launched and all of this began, she had completely supported the labour committee and the investigation and the process of firing Hattie Aitken since she returned from vacation. He stated that she had never spoken out against the process used by the Labour Committee. He asserted that at a Board meeting she had been dishonest and denied knowing about the SGM when earlier that day she had been briefed about the SGM being called by Forum. She conspired to make the SGM not happen and for that reason she should be impeached.

Patrick Belleville called a Point of Personal Privilege, stating that, thus far those people who have voted against the motions or who have abstained have been ridiculed and called this an affront to both the meeting and to the democratic process and requested that it be stopped.

The Chair upheld the Point of Privilege and stated that she did not wish the meeting to be conducted this way.

Marion Pollock spoke against the motion, indicating that she was not present for the initiation of the investigation but that she stands behind the decisions of the Labour Committee because she does have access to the evidence. She outlined a process called arbitration that happens when an

employee is fired wherein an independent third party called an arbitrator, the equivalent of a judge, governs according to the labour law. She stated that arbitration entails looking at the evidence of both sides and making a decision that is binding for both sides. She asserted that the assembly did not care about an independent third party, that the assembly did not care about finding out the truth and that the assembly did not care about somebody making a decision other than a group of students on a witch hunt. She stated that by refusing to allow debate, the assembly was showing they didn't care about any of the actual truth and that the assembly was only interested in impeaching people for the sake of impeaching people and that she thinks that is reprehensible. She repeated that the assembly had made up their minds without any of the facts, that that was unfortunate and that she was not staying at the meeting anymore.

SGM:06-10-25:19 MOTION

Randy Galawan

Be it resolved that the question be called

Paul McCulloch announced that he was leaving because every time someone called the question no debate could happen and that the assembly was voting to impeach because they were told that those people had done something wrong. He stated that the person who was up for impeachment was being impeached because she supported the Board. He began to ask the assembly what the hell was wrong with them and then was cut off at the mic.

A member called a Point of Order, indicating that the question was called and had to be addressed.

The Chair stated that she was taking Paul McCulloch's statement as a Point of Personal Privilege and allowing him to speak because he seemed frustrated that not enough debate was happening.

CARRIED

The Chair repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly.

SGM:06-10-25:18 CARRIED (492 votes in favour, 20 votes opposed, 57 abstentions)

Noted abstentions: ana kresina, Earl Tapia, Sean Wilkinson, Yang Zhao, Brody Murphin, and Sana Siddiqui

Noted opposition: Vanessa Kelly

(Applause)

SGM:06-10-25:20 MOTION**4:49 pm**

Daniel Green / Paul Browning

Be it resolved that the agenda be amended to include New Business discussing an amendment to the SFU Residence policy allowing for a student who is going to be evicted to be able to have a hearing before a Board of students and not just the Assistant Director of Residence and his coworker, the Director of Residence.

Chris Demwell called a Point of Personal Privilege requesting that members who are filibustering not use the microphone designated for speakers 'in favour' of motions.

The Chair explained that Points or motions to amend the agenda were neither pro or con and any microphone could be used.

SGM:06-10-25:21 MOTION TO AMEND**4:53 pm**

James Richardson / Nick Schmid

Be it resolved that the motion be amended to make the motion the next order of New Business following the very next item of business

The Chair explained what it meant to move an amendment to a motion to amend the agenda.

Daniel Green stated that he would like to consider that a friendly amendment

The Chair explained what it meant to make a friendly amendment.

Titus Gregory stated that there was no such thing as a 'friendly amendment.'

The Chair indicated that she was the Chair and she was running the meeting.

(Laughter and applause)

The Chair asked if the seconder of the motion was in agreement.

Paul Browning indicated that he was not.

The Chair declared that the vote on the amendment would have to take place and then repeated the amendment for the benefit of the assembly.

SGM:06-10-25:21 LOST

The Chair repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly and advised the assembly that a 2/3 vote was required to carry this motion.

SGM:06-10-25:20 LOST

SGM:06-10-25:22 MOTION 5:03 pm

Andrea Sandau / Amie Vander May

Be it resolved, as a special resolution, that Erica Halpern be impeached and removed as a director of the Society

SGM:06-10-25:23 MOTION 5:04 pm

Paul Browning / Vanessa Kelly

Objection to the consideration of the question.

The Chair indicated that objections to consideration could not be debated and explained what an objection to consideration meant.

SGM:06-10-25:23 LOST

Andrea Sandau explained that Erica Halpern was the only Board member, aside from Mr. Hunsdale, who had previously served a term on the Board of Directors. She stated that Erica Halpern should know better than what she has done. She stated that by serving a term on the Board, Erica Halpern knew what the By-Laws and past practice of the Society has been. She stated that despite this, Erica Halpern allowed the Board of Directors to engage in unlawful and mean-spirited behaviours. She stated that Erica Halpern had voted to support Mr. Hunsdale and the other Directors and that Erica Halpern had never once, since July when this began, spoke out in any way against what has been done. She stated that Erica Halpern's lack of action clearly demonstrated a tacit approval of many violations that have been carried out and for this reason, Erica Halpern should be impeached.

Vanessa Kelly stated that she did believe a gentleman had a Point of Information.

The Chair stated that Vanessa Kelly did not need to announce that, and that if he did have a Point of Information, the assembly would hear it.

Gilles Grafstrom called a Point of Information, stating that he was not opposed or in favour of the motion because he did not have enough information about what is going on from both sides. He stated that the Student Union seemed to want to provide information about what was going on and what this fiasco was all about and that they say they want to do that right now. He stated that he would like to hear what they have to say before he made a decision about whether or not he wanted to impeached them or whether he didn't want to impeach them. He stated that the meeting seemed like a little bit of a witch hunt to him, and he had a question for the Student Union.

The Chair stated that Gilles Grafstrom was out of order and that she was only letting him speak because the final impeachment resolution was being discussed.

Gilles Grafstrom repeated that the meeting seemed like a witch hunt and that the assembly wasn't being given a chance to let the SFSS speak.

The Chair asked what Gilles Grafstrom's question was.

Gilles Grafstrom stated that he wanted the SFSS to be able to tell their side of the story as it seemed like the debate was very imbalanced.

The Chair stated that Gilles Grafstrom had spoke under a Point of Information and that was out of order.

Vanessa Kelly spoke in opposition to the motion on behalf of Erica Halpern who could not be present for medical reasons. She stated that Erica Halpern had given so much to the Society and while Vanessa Kelly didn't even cry for her own impeachment, she was going to cry for Erica Halpern's because Erica Halpern had nothing to do with this. She stated that the motion clearly demonstrates how much of a political witch hunt the meeting was. She stated that Erica Halpern was the most sceptical person of the entire process and that Erica Halpern had abstained from decisions when she didn't know all of the information. Vanessa Kelly stated that this motion was ridiculous and thanked Paul Browning for objecting to its consideration. She stated that Erica Halpern was put up for impeachment at the SGM for the purpose of having her resign before the meeting would take place. She indicated that previous Directors knew how volatile emotionally she could be and that Erica Halpern did not deserve to be impeached at all. She stated that her proposed impeachment was a political tactic and that it was gross and reprehensible. She declared that every single person who will be voting in favour should feel ashamed. She continued to state that Erica Halpern has done nothing, and has given her heart and soul and time and help into the Society and has brought so many initiatives to the Society and that she wasn't involved in a labour investigation.

(Applause)

The Chair stated that Vanessa Kelly had 30 seconds left to speak.

Vanessa Kelly requested that members do not vote in favour of impeaching Erica Halpern and declared that in doing so, the membership will be proving how misinformed they were.

Jennifer Scott stated that she was responding to the allegation that students do not have enough information. She stated that there was ample opportunity, especially in the past two months, for the SFSS to speak out, whether in debate, meetings, or *The Peak*. She stated that she was proud of SFU students. She indicated that it was freezing cold, that the assembly had heard both sides.

SGM:06-10-25:24

MOTION

Jennifer Scott

Be it resolved that the question be called

CARRIED

The Chair repeated the motion on the floor for the benefit of the assembly.

Veronique Vachon interrupted, stating that all debate heard were from members of the Board, who the assembly does not want to hear from because students have lost trust in them but she was a student...

The Chair interrupted, stating that the question had been called.

Veronique Vachon stated that she just wanted to speak on behalf of Erica Halpern, stating that the only person speaking in favour was a member of the Board.

The Chair indicated that she understood why Veronique Vachon wanted to speak and that it was an important point, but that the assembly decided that debate would be cut and then repeated the motion for the benefit of the assembly.

A member called a Point of Order, stating that there was a person heckling the crowd during the process of the vote count at the microphone.

The Chair indicated that she couldn't hear that from her position at the front and reminded the assembly to act with dignity and stop that.

Alex Hemingway called a Point of Order, stating that he was told that the SGM and the petition that led to it suggested a debate. He also objected to the allegation that this was a witch hunt, stating that that accusation was disrespectful.

Yang Zhao called a Point of Information, stating that the SGM was not about the petition. He stated that the SFSS received the knowledge that the petition was valid but that Forum was the body that called it. He began introducing himself as a member of the SFSS who is not a member of the SDU.

Paul Browning called a Point of Order, indicating that the membership was waiting for results.

The Chair ruled the Point in order and ceased debate.

SGM:06-10-25:22 CARRIED (382 votes in favour, 60 votes opposed, 155 abstentions)

Noted abstentions: ana kresina, Earl Tapia, Sean Wilkinson, Marshed Alam, Travis Brown, Brophy Burphin, Sana Saddiqui, Kali Charumbura, Chad Warford, Vincent Lemieux, Derek Andrew, Melanie Streich, Robin Folvik, and Andrew Tardiff

Noted opposition: Titus Gregory

SGM:06-10-25:25 MOTION TO AMEND BY-LAWS

5:13 pm

Ben Milne / Nick Schmid

Be it resolved, as special resolutions, that:

By-Law 6, section 5 [a] be amended to read: 'The Board shall maintain as a standing committee a Graduate Issues Committee. This committee shall receive and have exclusive authority over an annual budget of not less than 25% of the balance of the value of the unrestricted student fees collected from graduate students.';

By-Law 6, section 5 [b] be amended to read: 'The Graduate Issues Committee shall be made up of graduate student members and be charged with discussing and addressing issues of specific importance to graduate students and advising the Board and other agents of the Society of its decisions.';

By-Law 8, section 6 [f] be rescinded; and

By-Law 8, section 6 [c] be amended to read: 'Notwithstanding any other provision in these By-Laws, the Graduate Issues Committee shall have exclusive authority to appoint an acting Graduate Issues Officer or acting At-Large Graduate Student Representative to the Board, and such appointments shall not need ratification by Forum.'

Ben Milne motivated in favour of the motion, stating that he thought it was important that graduate students be respected.

SGM:06-10-25:26 MOTION

Jason Tockman

Be it resolved that the question be called

CARRIED

SGM:06-10-25:25 CARRIED

Noted abstention: Paul Browning

SGM:06-10-27:27 MOTION TO AMEND BY-LAWS

5:15 pm

Joel Blok / Bryan Jones

Be it resolved, as a special resolution, that By-Law 17, section 1 [a] be amended to add: 'Referenda regarding fees to be levied only upon undergraduate students or regarding the expenditure of funds raised through such fees shall be voted on by undergraduate students only; referenda regarding fees to be levied only upon graduate students or regarding the expenditure of funds raised through such fees shall be voted on by graduate students only.'

SGM:06-10-25:28 MOTION

Jason Tockman

Be it resolved that the question be called

CARRIED

Geordie Dent called a Point of Order, questioning whether Erica Halpern's vote was a ¾ majority and whether her impeachment was in order.

The Chair indicated that it was in order.

SGM:06-10-25:27 CARRIED

Noted abstention: Paul Browning

4. ADJOURNMENT

SGM:06-10-25:28 MOTION

5:17 pm

Clement Apaak / Nick Schmid

Be it resolved that the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 5:18 pm

(Applause and cheering)

AvB/avb