Minutes of OUSU Council 3rd Wk HT2001

Apologies were received from Heenal Rajani (Merton), who has to leave Council at 5.15 because he had a tutorial.

a. Minutes of the previous meeting
Passed with no matters arising.

c. Ratifications in Council

Returning Officer
Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) spoke in favour of Stuart Hudson (Jesus). Sean Sullivan (SEH) questioned the truthfulness of what Ms McNeill had said and claimed that the advertising of the post left much to be desired. The Chair called for a vote on the ratification, which was clearly carried.

Deputy Returning Officer
There were no objections to the appointment of Catherine Wallis (Keble).

Co-chair of Health and Welfare Committee
There were no objections to the appointment of George Lusty (CCC)

Co-Chair of OUSU Reps Committee
There were no objections to the appointment of Daniel Law (New) and Ruth Greenwood (Somerville)

Co-chair of Anti-Racism Committee
There were no objections to the appointment of Sacha Ismail (Somerville).

Co-chairs of Finance and Funding Committee
There were no objections to the appointment of Will Straw (New), Rachel Logan (New) and Philip Thompson (St. John’s)

Elections Committee
Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) said that if she were not ratified, there would be a constitutional crisis and she would be able to be judge, jury and executioner. R Adam Storch (Univ) questioned Ms McNeill’s competence to serve. Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) said that Mr Storch’s account contained complete factual inaccuracies. Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) was comfortably ratified. There were no objections to the appointment of Steph Gray (Pembroke), Tony Lord (Wadham) and Steve Moses.

Presidential Interpretations
There were no objections to the presidential interpretations circulated with the Council agenda, and they were duly ratified.

d. Elections in Council

Clubs Committee
Andrew Small (Balliol) husted, citing relevant experience of the committee. Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) husted on behalf of Dan Lynn (Queen’s), citing his personal qualities. Sacha Ismail (Somerville) asked if either of the candidates had had such a post in the past. Kirsty McNeill replied in the negative; Andrew Small replied in the affirmative and added that he had performed the job well. Dan Paskins (Magdalen) asked what Clubs Committee did. His question was well answered by Abigail Coates (St. Hilda’s).

Rules Committee
Melanie Marshall (ChCh) husted, saying that Rules Committee met only infrequently, yet had an important role to play, for example on sporting issues. Andrew Small (Balliol) husted, claiming that he was not power hungry and just wanted to improve student representation. He had asked Melanie what the job entailed, as she had served on the committee in the past.

Joint Committee with Junior Members
Will Straw (New) husted, citing his experience in representing views to the SCR in his role as JCR President.
Melanie Marshall (ChCh) husted, saying that she had served on Exec for a whole year unlike most of her colleagues.

e. Reports from Sabbatical Officers

Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) asked people to come to Balliol JCR at 8pm on Monday, where the two candidates for NUS President would be husting.

Tony Lord (Wadham) thanked Kirsty and Rhodri for organising his welfare training.

Jane Blumer (St Hilda’s) mentioned raising money for people with eating disorders

Nick Smith (LMH) thanked graduates for taking up motions about the reduction in library opening hours

f. Reports from Executive Officers

Viv Raper (Mansfield) spoke about Accommodation committee and advertised the Reclaim the Night march.

Vino Sangarapillai (St Hugh’s) thanked people for attending the Holocaust Memorial Day secular service and encouraged people to attend Anti-Racism committee.

George Callaghan (Univ) claimed to be adopting a line of passive resistance to OUSU and said that he didn’t feel that Exec meetings achieved very much.

Abigail Coates (St. Hilda’s) asked whether Mr Callaghan’s boycott extended to not taking minutes, to which he replied that whether he minuted what people said depended on their attitude towards R Adam Storch (Univ).

[ The rest of the Exec reports were not minuted by Mr Callaghan. Heenal Rajani (Merton) said that the new Target Schools web site would soon be available at www.targetschools.com and spoke about the progress of the Finance and Funding campaign, encouraging those interested in fighting the University’s unjust treatment of non-payers to gather outside Wadham lodge at 2pm on Monday. The other Exec present did make reports, though. ]

Jane Blumer (St. Hilda’s) asked if the Executive Officers present had fulfilled their duties, to which a variety of answers were given by those members of Exec who had turned up to Council.

h. Passage of Motions Nem Com

None passed.

i. Motions of No Confidence or Censure

i.1 Motion of No Confidence in R Adam Storch

Final Reading in accordance with Constitution – Article C.1

Ruth Hunt (St Hilda’s) spoke briefly in proposition of the motion, reminding people that an abstention carried as much weight as a vote against the motion. There followed several short, factual questions.

Steph Gray (Pembroke) informed Council that a full election cost OUSU about 1000 pounds and he envisaged that a referendum would cost significantly less than that.

Adam Killeya (Balliol) asked Ms Hunt if Mr Storch had been properly elected, to which she replied in the affirmative, noting however that this was not the point of the motion: the point was that Mr Storch has been elected properly, yet his comments had given the proposers of the motion reason to have no confidence in his ability to do the job for which he had been elected.

Alexandra Dacosta (St.Hilda’s) said she had no confidence in the chair. Kirsty McNeill (Balliol) attacked Ms Dacosta’s blatant time wasting and her disrespect for Council. The vote of no confidence was overwhelmingly defeated.

Sean Sullivan (SEH) spoke in opposition of the motion. As far as he could see, the entire motivation of the proposers was that they has a “feeling” that Mr Storch would not perform his job. He claimed the motion has be politicised by the Labour Club.
sending out an email requesting comrades to vote for the motion. Mr Sullivan generously agreed to disregard the politicising of
the motion, as well as the distortion of Mr Storch’s manifesto. He said that there was no proof that Mr Storch would not do his
job and that he thought it was wrong that JCRs could vote on MCR matters. He concluded by saying that this motion was an
abuse of the no con system.

Adam Storch (Univ) reaffirmed that he had been validly elected and claimed to be competent and a man of honour. He said that
if people didn’t believe in a separate graduate assembly they should vote against his later motion to call for a referendum on the
matter rather than no confidencing him.

Eleanor Fletcher (Worcester) agreed with what Ruth Hunt (St.Hilda’s) had said earlier; she was not convinced that Mr Storch
would do his job properly. She said the cost of hiring Mr Storch would be 11,000 pounds, and this would be a waste of students’
money.

Jane Blumer (St. Hilda’s) explained that the no confidence motion was not inconsistent with Mr Storch having been elected validly,
stressing that the two issues were very much separate. She said that a referendum would be the best way of allowing all
graduate’s to have a say.

A move to a vote was clearly defeated.

Melanie Marshall (ChCh) referred to Sean Sullivan’s point and asked if OUCA had sent a similar email.

Alexandra Dacosta (St. Hilda’s) simply affirmed that she had faith in Mr Storch and, as someone who knew him personally, she
knew that he would do the job.

Jamie Gardiner (??) (Somerville) said that this was not a Left-Right issue. He was alarmed at the lack of respect for the electoral
system and disturbed that such a motion should be brought on the basis of a personal dislike.

Someone from Worcester (?? looks like ‘Jamie Gardiner’ again??!) supported what Ruth Hunt (St. Hilda’s) had said. He said that
the motion should not be politicised and that graduates should decide.

Dan Romey (??) proposed a move to a vote, saying that Council was going over the same ground; it was clearly defeated.

Andrew Hewitt (Queen’s) stated his disinterest with the views of OULC, OUCA and OUSU “insiders”. He said the issue was
that Mr Storch had said in his own manifesto that he didn’t think he was specially qualified.

Adam Storch (Univ) interjected that he was just being honest.

Antonia Bance (Somerville) stated that all the Sabbatical Officers-elect (apart from Mr Storch himself) supported the motion of no
confidence.

Caroline Dodds (CCC) said that political issues weren’t particularly important here; most graduates are free of party bias.

Peter Orloff (??) (New) claimed that the fact that Mr Storch read from a prepared script and refused to take points of information
showed that even he didn’t believe that his case was justifiable.

Sean Sullivan (SEH) proposed that we move to a vote, which was opposed by Viv Raper (Mansfield). The vote was clearly carried.

Ruth Hunt (St. Hilda’s) summed up briefly for the proposition, stressing the importance of the motion.

Sean Sullivan (SEH) summed up for the opposition, saying that there was no proof whatsoever that Mr Storch would not do his
job. No confidence motions should only be sued as a last resort and this was an abuse of the system.

Sean Sullivan (SEH) proposed that we have a recorded vote. There was no opposition to this suggestion.

The motion was narrowly carried, with 84 votes for, 34 against and 3 abstentions.

i.2 Motion of Censure in Antonia Bance

Catherine Wallis (Keble) proposed the motion, saying that Ms Bance had helped to maintain the image that Oxford is elitist and
believes itself to be superior to other universities. She noted, however, that Tony Lord’s speech at NUS LGB Winter
Conference had been very good. The majority of Queer Rights campaigning group believed Ms Bance’s contribution to be
detrimental to Oxford’s image, so we should censure her.
Catherine was asked if Antonia voted differently from the mandate she was given.

She replied that Antonia had.

Andrew (surname unknown?) asked if the meeting was open to all.

Catherine responded by saying it was open to LGB delegates from all Constituent Members of the NUS.

Adam Richardson asked who sent Antonia as a delegate to the Conference.

Catherine said that it was not her college - due to an administrative error.

John Storey asked if there was any empirical evidence that Oxford was not the centre of the world.

Alex da Costa asked how Oxford has been improving its image.

Catherine replied that one way of doing this was going to the NUS and playing a constructive role in it.

Antonia now gave a speech elaborating on the precedent of not allowing straight students into LGB conference. She accepted that she had acted wrongly and said Council would be within its rights to censure her.

The motion was carried.

3. Motion of censure in Nick Smith

Sean Sullivan (SEH) proposes the motion. He apologises for bringing it before Council but feels the matter is important and needs discussion. He feels the email Nick sent on the Storch issue to gradreps list was inappropriate.

After some questions, Council moves into debate.

Nick Smith (VP-Grads) defends his email. He feels it was an appropriate thing to do. He was making graduates aware of the fact that there was an issue of importance to them coming before OUSU Council. There are few things which should concern MCR reps in OUSU Council more than the no-conning of their potential future VP-Grads.

Kirsty McNeill (President) speaks against the motion. She feels sabs have a right and a duty to speak on matters which are of importance to their job and to the constituencies they represent.

Jane Blumer (VP-Women) cited a precedent of Rachel Hall - a previous VP-Grads - who had also sent a letter out to MCR reps about an issue being debated in Council. Jane feels this was perfectly justified.

A move to a vote is proposed and carried.

Sean gives a summation speech summing up his case for the motion. He feels sabs should not express a view on issues where OUSU does not yet have a policy unless they very clearly state that they are doing so in a personal capacity.

Kirsty speaks in defence of Nick. She says it is ridiculous to say sabs can’t act if they feel there is an issue which is of importance to those they represent.

A vote is now taken on the motion. The motion falls.

4. Motion of no confidence in John Craig

The proposer (Matthew Taylor of SBH) was not present.

The motion is thus not put.

5. Motion of no confidence in Craig Nott

The motion is withdrawn by its proposer.
j. First Readings of Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders

Motions of no confidence in sabbaticals elect

Sean Sullivan (SEH) speaks in proposition of the motion. He says that it is wrong to no confidence sabs-elect because they are not yet in a position where they can do anything wrong.

Short factual questions were asked by Tony Lord and Jane McTaggart.

Jane McTaggart (Harris Manchester) asked what kind of time delay the proponents wanted to introduce into no confidence motions.

Sean replied by saying that there was no specific time delay. Instead, motions could only be brought when it was clear that a sab had omitted to do their official duties.

Karim Palant (New) asked for clarification on what Sean took the words 'commission' and 'omission' in his motion to mean.

Peter Orlov (New) asked if promising not to do their job would be sufficient to no con a sab-elect under the proposed new system.

Sean said that people should wait until the sab-elect succeeds to the sabbatical position he was elected to fill. Then only could they no con him if he actually didn’t do anything.

Sacha Ismail (Some) asked if OUSU Council was the supreme body of OUSU (except where the Proctors chose to use their legal powers to intervene).

It was confirmed that this is the case.

Daniel Moore (Queens) asked whether there should be a job description for sabs-elect so that it was clear to all what they should do.

Tony Lord (VP-Welfare) felt that no cons are a general expression of a lack of confidence in the sab in question. They need not be linked to a particular omission of a particular official duty.

An amendment is proposed by Viv Raper (Mans) and Adam Killeya (Balliol).

Short factual questions were asked of the proponents of the amendment.

Tony Lord asked if someone was an axe-murderer before their election but not after would the amendment make it impossible to no con them.

Adam denied this was the case.

Mel Marshall (Ch Ch) felt this amendment merely confirmed the existing situation but in a more confused and rambling fashion.

Kirsty McNeill (Pres) spoke against the amendment.

Rhodri Thomas (VP-Ac Af) moved a procedural motion for a vote.

Viv Raper (Mans) opposed.

The move to a vote was carried.

Adam Killeya (Balliol) gave the summation speech for the amendment.

Kirsty spoke against it. She said it was confused and dangerous.

The amendment failed.

The debate on the main motion re-commenced.

A move to a vote was proposed and approved without opposition.
Sean Sullivan (SEH) gave a summation speech in favour of the motion he proposed. He said it was essential for fairness that people could only be no conned for specific reasons rather than based on Council’s general feelings about them.

Leah Zeto (Corpus) spoke against the motion. She said it was part of the spirit of democracy that people could have no confidence in their elected sabs.

The motion failed.

1. Motions authorising capital expenditure

Steph Gray (VP-Finance) spoke in proposition of this motion. He said the OUSU server needed an upgrade as it was running out of space and had some problems.

Alex da Costa (St Hilda’s) asked what the problems were.

Steph said there were security problems.

John Storey asked about the cost and if it could be accommodated within the budget.

The reply was that the budget had set aside £2500 for matters such as this and only £500 of it had been spent so far.

Alex da Costa asked how many bytes the server storage space was.

Steph said it was 2.5 billion.

The motion was passed nem con after short factual questions as no one spoke in opposition to it.

m. Other Motions

1. Regulations for No confidence referendums

Kirsty McNeil spoke in proposition. She said that we currently don’t have regulations for no confidence referendums. She said we ought to and commended the set that was put before Council.

John Storey (Some) asked how many ballot boxes there would be.

Kirsty said there would be a minimum of 4. There might be more, but this was up to the Returning Officer’s and Elections Committee’s discretion.

Alex da Costa asked why we needed new regulations.

It was pointed out to her that each set of elections required regulations to govern them.

Daniel Moore (Queens) asked what forms of campaigning will be allowed.

Kirsty said that this would be specified in the regulations.

John Storey asked if the regulations would have retrospective effect.

Kirsty said it would apply to this referendum and the run-up to it.

Sean Sullivan proposed an amendment to have 8 ballot boxes.

It was asked how many there had been for the presidential by-election that elected Josh Bell. It transpired that there had been 5.

The amendment passes nem con as no one wished to speak against it.

2. Graduate Referendum

Jason Powell (Univ) spoke to propose the motion. He said there was a pressing need to re-consult graduates as to whether they wished to re-create OUGU and leave the jurisdiction of OUSU.
Jane Blumer asked if Council Revolves 2 was constitutional.

It was said that it was unconstitutional.

Mel Marshall asked if Resolves 1 was constitutional.

It was.

Abigail Coates (St Hilda’s) asked if the proponent was aware that CUGU had recently decided to merge with CUSU.

Jason Powell said he was unaware of this.

Kirsty McNeill asked if they had taken this proposal to PACP or to MCRs.

The proponent said he wasn’t sure whether this had been done.

Caroline Dodds (?) asked why Notes 2 on Cambridge was included when it is not the case.

Mr Powell said he would be happy to remove it.

Jane Blumer proposed an amendment which Women’s Committee favoured saying that the referendum should be held at the same time as the Statutory Annual Elections.

Sean Sullivan (SEH) asked why the referendum on OUGU couldn’t be held during Trinity.

Jane pointed out that many people would have exams that term and that it would put the sabs, RO and Elections Committee to a lot of trouble. In Michaelmas, there would already be being an election and so it wouldn’t be as much trouble to print off an extra set of ballot papers on this issue.

Adam Killeya said there might be confusion among voters if they were presented with a lot of ballot papers in Michaelmas 2001.

Andrew Hewitt asked if there was a constitutional provision for the maximum length of time that could elapse between proposing a referendum and it actually being held.

The response was that this was not the case if the motion authorising the referendum itself set out the timetable.

John Craig (New) asked if candidates for VP-Grads would be able to comment.

Jane said it depended on how the election regulations were drafted.

Jason Powell spoke against the amendment. He wanted the referendum sooner.

Adam Killeya also felt the proposed delay was too long.

Will Straw (New) proposed a move to a vote. This was carried.

Jane spoke in summation in support of the amendment.

Adam spoke against.

The amendment was carried.

David Mitchell (St Peter’s) proposed an amendment to delete Notes 2.

This was carried nem con.

Council moved back into debate on the main motion.

Kirsty McNeil said that there was no evidence that graduates actually wanted to have a referendum on this issue.

Jane read out a letter from Rachel (a previous VP-Grads) explaining why she thought OUGU should not be resurrected.
A move to vote is proposed. A vote is taken on this procedural motion. It fails to gain the required two-thirds majority.

Caroline Dodds speaks against the motion.

Winston Price (LMH) says all the motion will do is refer the question to the voters. He feels it can’t do any harm.

Andrew Hewitt (Queens) feels that graduates should have the option to choose to have a referendum. But he says there is no groundswell of graduate demand for it at the moment.

Caroline Dodds proposes an amendment to delete Notes 3.

This is carried.

A move to a vote is now proposed. This time it is carried.

Jason Powell sums up for the proposition.

Caroline Dodds gives the summing up speech for the opponents of the motion.

The motion fails.

3. General Motors

Sacha Ismail (Some) proposes the motion. He feels we should show our support for the workers at Luton in their struggle.

It was asked if this was ultra vires.

It was said that it was indeed ultra vires.

Sean Sullivan said that it was wrong to keep a car plant open when there was no market demand for the cars they were producing there.

Alex da Costa (St Hilda’s) asked if it was government policy to nationalising failing businesses.

Sacha said it was not.

A move to a vote was proposed. It failed.

Sean Sullivan said that the motion was not relevant to students as students. He said OUSU should spend its time, money and energy on serving Oxford students not on doing anything else. He said left-wing students should show their solidarity with workers through means other than motions to OUSU Council. He also said that most students didn’t want to nationalise the Luton GM plant.

Adam Killeya proposes a move to a vote. He says he wants to leave Council soon and would like to vote on the motion.

Kirsty opposes this.

The move to a vote fails.

An amendment is proposed saying that Sacha should pay for the pen, paper, envelope and stamp that would be used to write the letter to John Jack (the shop stewards’ leader at Luton).

Abigail Coates asks who will pay for the president’s time while she is writing the letter.

Kirsty says she is willing to donate some of her free time to do this.

John Storey says this is irrelevant to ‘ordinary students’.

The amendment is carried.
Sacha Ismail says it is a shame that many in Council seem to take a narrow sectarian attitude and are unwilling to show solidarity with workers, particularly when the Trades Council has backed us in our struggle against fees.

A move to a vote is proposed. It is carried.

Winston Price (LMH) says the motion is political and that thus people shouldn’t vote for it.

The motion fails.

4. George Callaghan

Neither the proposer nor seconder are present.

The motion is not put.

n. Any Other Business

Concerns are raised about the referendum question by Mr Storey, Miss da Costa and Mr Price.

A move is made to reject the question in the no confidence referendum. This move fails.

Council finishes.