

## **Minutes of 5<sup>th</sup> week OUSU Council**

Held on 16<sup>th</sup> February 2001 in the Harris Lecture Theatre, Oriel

### **a. The minutes of 1<sup>st</sup> week Council were presented.**

### **b. Matters arising from the minutes.**

Pedro Wrobel (St Anne's) raised the issue of the omission of a question from Mr Daniel Paskins to the President in the minutes. The question was regarding a letter the president was mandated to write to the University considering their handling of the issues surrounding the visit of the Austrian FPO politician Peter Sichrovsky to Oxford last term.

Viv Raper (Mansfield) wanted the inadequacy of 1<sup>st</sup> week minutes noted.

Kirsty McNeil (President) stated that the inadequacy of the minutes was due to the conduct of George Callaghan, who had been taking the minutes for 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> week Councils.

John Storey (Somerville) stated that the fact that the recorded vote on the no confidence motion in R. Adam Storch was not appended was a matter of concern.

A request was also made for more copies of the minutes to be made, as there were not enough copies for all those who wanted one.

### **c. Ratifications in Council**

Melanie Marshall (Christ Church) was ratified as a member of Elections Committee.

Belinda Beaton (St Peter's) was ratified as the co-chair of Mature Students Committee.

### **d. Elections in Council**

Matt Shouler (Merton) was the sole candidate for Election Tribunal (Reserve Panel). He was not present at Council.

Heenal Rajani offered to hust on his behalf.

Mel Marshall (Christ Church) objects on the grounds that Mr Shouler did not appoint Mr Rajani to hust on his behalf.

As a result of this objection, it is decided not have a hust for Election Tribunal (Reserve Panel).

Eleanor Fletcher (Worcs) is the sole candidate for Publications Board.

She husts. In her hust she says that, as VP-Finance-Elect, she feels it would be important for her to serve on this committee.

R. Adam Storch (Univ) asks whether she will take action to close down the Oxford Student.

She replies that she has no power to do so.

Vinothan Sangarapillai (St Hugh's) is the sole candidate for Publications Complaints Board.

Dan Johnson (Corpus) asks him if he has any experience of journalism.

He replies he has none at university but has some from school.

He was asked if he was familiar with the complaints procedure.

He replied that he knew the outline of the complaints procedure but not the full details of it.

He was asked if he would treat complaints from the right and from the left equally.

He said that he would.

Pedro Wrobel (St Anne's) asked if the candidate would do a good job.

He said that he thought he would.

**e. Reports from sabbatical officers**

The reports from sabbatical officers were presented. Sabbatical officers then spoke if they wished to add anything to their written reports.

Tony Lord (VP-Welfare) announced that he wished to do a condom run. He wants to know which JCRs already order condoms so he can find out where the best supplier to get them from is.

Adam Storch (Univ) asked why he wanted to obtain condoms.

He replied that it was for purposes of student welfare.

Dan Johnson (Corpus) asked the president if she thought it was a good idea for OUSU to back the protest held at the Bod.

Kirsty stated that OUSU's standing policy remains one of supporting peaceful protests in defence of free education. The decision made by the university to close the libraries during the early stages of the occupation of the Divinity Schools was a unilateral decision which she didn't feel was at all logical.

John Storey (Some) asked if she felt this protest would hamper the OUSU campaign against the reduction of the opening hours of the Bod.

She said that she felt it would not.

Pedro Wrobel asked Kirsty whether she had written the letter to the university she had been mandated to do by a previous Council. This was the question asked by Daniel Paskins (Magd) during 1<sup>st</sup> week council.

She said that she had written to the University and had yet to receive a reply. She suspected they didn't reply because they knew that she already knew their point of view on this matter. They feel that they have a statutory duty to uphold free speech and that is what they feel they were doing when they allowed Sichrovsky to speak.

Adam Storch asked that, if the university had a statutory requirement to uphold freedom of speech, why OUSU had "restrictive" election regulations.

Kirsty pointed out that the OUSU election regulations were duly approved by the Proctors.

Dan Johnson (Corpus) asked the DRO (in the absence of the Returning Officer) whether she thought the JMB was unbiased, given the lack of information from Mr Storch in it.

Catherine Wallis (DRO, Keble) said that she felt it was, given the fact that no campaigning group for the "no" side had been registered.

Adam Storch asked if the sabs would apologise for their poor treatment of himself and George Callaghan.

Tony Lord said that there was no need for any sab to apologise to Mr Storch or Mr Callaghan.

**f. Reports from those Executive Officers who wish to make reports.**

Viv Raper (Mansf) made a report. She said a new co-chair was needed for Accommodation Committee.

She advertised the Women's Committee debate on whether you need to be a socialist to be a feminist. She said men were welcome for a portion of the event.

She said the candidates for the NUS Women's Officer would be husting before Women's Committee.

She said that the Reclaim the Night march was a success and she thanked everyone who came along.

John Storey asked what part of the meeting men were welcome to.

Viv said they would be welcome for the initial part of the debate but not necessarily later on in the meeting.

Pedro Wrobel (St Anne's) asked her if men were disenfranchised by not being able to attend Women's Committee fully.

She said that she felt it was good to have an all-female environment sometimes.

Repeated questions then flowed from Mr Storch and Mr Storey pertaining to whether there should or should not be a men's only institution to debate issues such as the debate Viv was promoting.

Jane Blumer (VP-Women) objected to the repeated line of hostile questioning of Viv, saying that she felt it bordered on harrassment.

Regan Early (Wadh) announced that Environment Committee was trying to organise a university-wide energy saving campaign. She appealed for help from JCR presidents in order to get in touch with college environment reps.

Tony Lord asked her if Wadham was participating in the energy-saving campaign.

She said it was.

Adam Storch asked if she agreed with the Burns Report that hunting was good for the environment.

Regan said that it wasn't in the remit of the committee. She said that Mr Storch was welcome to come along and express his views on this issue before Environment Committee, though.

Heenal Rajani (Merton) said that the Target Schools website was up and running. He thanked all those who came along to the occupation. He said it showed the university that there was still support for non-payers and the non-payment campaign. He mentioned the NUS national shutdown which will be held on the 1<sup>st</sup> of March. Flyers were being circulated for the events that would be taking place during the week (7<sup>th</sup> week) that the shut-down was taking place in. People who wanted more information could contact Rachel Logan (one of the F & F co-chairs).

Marcus Walker (Oriol) protested that Heenal mentioned the occupation when it was not an official OUSU event.

Adam Storch asked why there was a blasphemous image on the flyers being circulated for the club night.

Kirsty McNeil said that the design of the flyers was approved by Finance & Funding committee. No one there thought it was blasphemous.

Alexandra Da Costa (St Hilda's) said that she felt the image of a monk on the flyers was blasphemous.

Kirsty said that it couldn't be as you can only blaspheme a God. You can't blaspheme a monk.

Adam Storch said he accepted the image might not be blasphemous but it could be sacreligious.

The Chair ruled this line of questioning out of order as he felt it wasn't really relevant to the exec report given by Mr Rajani.

George Callaghan (Univ) voiced his discontent with a letter from Kirsty saying that he may be punished for his neglect of his duties on exec. He also said that he should get some credit for paying the fees of a non-payer and thus ensuring that this non-payer did not get kicked out of the university. He also added that, like Mr Storch wishes to take graduates out of OUSU, he wished to take undergraduates out of OUSU – thus leaving it with no members.

Adam Storch asked him to elaborate on his fees action.

He said he paid the fees of James Rowlands at the University Offices against the will of Mr Rowlands.

Tony Lord asked him whether he had done his duty morning and, if not, whether he had sent his apologies for this.

George Callaghan answered “no” to both questions.

Jane McTaggart (Harris Manchester) asked him if he had attended NUS reps committee.

He said he had attended it once or twice.

Eleanor Fletcher (Worcs) asked him if he ever planned to do his duties as an exec officer.

Mr Callaghan said he would if they took his fancy. Otherwise, he would continue his policy of ‘passive resistance’ to protest against the treatment of Mr Storch.

Tony Lord asked the Chair which executive officers were present.

The response was that Viv Raper, Regan Early, Heenal Rajani, Vino Sangarapillai, Sean Sullivan and Sonia Sodha were present.

Adam Killea (Balliol) asked which delegates were present.

According to the sign-in sheet Adam Killea, Eleanor Thompson, Anatole Pang, Alex Da Costa and Julian Hudson were present.

Pedro Wrobel moves a procedural motion that Constitutional Motion 2 on sub fusc not be put.

Mr Storch objected.

The procedural motion is carried. Constitutional Motion 2 will not be put.

Pedro moves a procedural motion that Constitutional Motion 1 on the need for an OUSU chaplain not be put.

Objection made to this by Mr Storch. He wishes to oppose the procedural motion as he feels we need to give more respect to the Established Church.

This procedural motion is carried. Constitutional Motion 1 will not be put.

The Chair warns Council that he will take action if people keep disrupting council by making animal noises.

A move is made not to put Motion 5 (Silly Motions).

This procedural motion is carried. Motion 5 will not be put.

George Callaghan moves that Motion 1 (Recording Votes) not be put.

This procedural motion fails.

Pedro moves that Motion 7 (Council of Ten) not be put.

Opposition to this procedural move comes from Mr Storch.

A motion of no confidence in the Chair is proposed.

Anthony Fairclough (Some) vacates the chair. Catherine Wallis provisionally acts as chair for debate on this no confidence motion.

Adam Storch speaks in favour of no confidence in Mr Fairclough. He says he feels the freedom of speech and freedom of debate in Council is being unfairly curtailed by the actions of the chair.

Jane Blumer (VP-Women) speaks against this motion. She says she believes Anthony is a good chair and has presided over Council well.

The motion of no-confidence in the Chair fails.

Anthony Fairclough resumes the Chair.

The procedural motion not to put Motion 7 passes.

Mel Marshall moves that Motion 6 not be put. She says she feels it is time-wasting.

Marcus Walker speaks in opposition to Mel's procedural move.

The procedural motion is carried. Motion 6 will not be put.

Adam Storch moves that Motion 3 not be put.

Will Straw (New) speaks in opposition to this procedural motion.

The procedural motion fails.

Pedro moves that Motion 8 not be put. He says he wants to get rid of silly motions from the agenda so that the time of council is not being wasted.

Storch speaks in opposition to this move.

The procedural motion is carried. Motion 8 will not be put.

A second motion of no confidence in the Chair is made.

Anthony Fairclough vacates the Chair for the duration of debate on the motion. As before, the chair is taken by Catherine Wallis (Keble).

During debate, Adam Storch asserts there is a "totalitarian left-wing plot" to silence him.

Anthony Fairclough (Some) speaks in his own defence. He points out he is merely accepting procedural motions which members of council have moved. He points out that if people don't want to have debate on certain motions and wish to move that motions not be put, that is their constitutional right.

The procedural motion of no confidence in the chair fails. Anthony resumes the chair.

Pedro moves that Motion 9 not be put.

George Callaghan speaks in opposition.

The procedural motion fails.

Marcus Walker moves that Motion 4 (Lonely Planet) not be put.

Ben Newton (Jesus) speaks in opposition to this procedural move. He says it is the result of a lot of ethics committee deliberation and thus should not be ignored.

The procedural move fails.

A proposal is now made that Motion 2 (Childcare) not be put.

Anthony Fairclough feels this move is disruptive. He thus feels he is empowered to rule that the procedural motion not be debated.

A proposal is made to overturn the ruling of the chair on this matter.

During the course of debate on this issue, Catherine Wallis takes the chair in place of Anthony Fairclough.

John Storey speaks in favour of the move to overturn the chair.

Kirsty speaks in defence of the ruling of the chair. She reminds Council of the proctors warning against disruption of Council which was read out at the start of 1<sup>st</sup> week Hilary Council.

### **g. Emergency Motions**

The sole emergency motion is the one on the University Police.

Kirsty McNeil, the proposer of the motion, speaks in favour of it. She mentions the need for adequate policing before permission to demonstrate is granted. She says that the University police can provide this necessary policing for free whereas Thames Valley Police would charge OUSU for policing OUSU-backed demonstrations, rallies and protests.

She is asked what the university police's view on OUSU's current policy of non-recognition of it is.

She says that the university police are concerned at the fact that the student union doesn't recognise them.

It is stated that, in the past, Thames Valley Police would have policed demos for free. Kirsty is asked why the situation has changed.

She replies that budget cuts have forced the police to cut back on the level of policing they would formerly have provided for demos. She says the police are now prioritising other areas such as crime prevention over public order matters.

George Callaghan asks whether policing a demo could count as crime prevention.

Kirsty says that is a question that could only be answered by the Thames Valley Police.

Alex Da Costa asks why OUSU doesn't recognise the University Police.

Kirsty explains that it flows from the heavy-handed policing of an anti-fees demo in the past.

Daniel Johnson (Corpus) speaks in opposition to the motion. He says he feels it shows a lack of respect for the university police to take such a critical attitude towards them. He also says that the motion displays a form of double-think by enshrining a situation whereby OUSU does not officially recognise the police but still uses them.

Kirsty responds by saying she feels the motion is an interim measure. In the long-run, she says this situation may not continue. Circumstances may change.

Jane Blumer says allowing OUSU to use the university police for the supervision of demos would prove very useful for campaigns and marches like Reclaim the Night.

Connor O'Neil (Wadh) says the university police have inadequate training. Their policing of the picket of the Sichrovsky meeting was said to have been of poor quality. He said he felt OUSU was conceding too much to the university police by letting them supervise our demos.

Sean Sullivan (SEH) says the motion puts OUSU in a situation where it is open to ridicule. He says it makes a mockery of the idea of principled objection to the University Police.

Alex Dacosta moves an amendment. She wants to add to the text of Council Believes 2 "commendation of all actions, particularly those which use unnecessary force".

Kirsty opposes the amendment. She says it doesn't take account of other theoretical objections to the University police.

After a summation speech by Miss Da Costa, a vote is taken on the amendment.

The amendment is carried.

The debate on the emergency motion resumes.

Kirsty says that the inadequate training the University Police receive is not too much of a problem for the kind of demos the motion was intending to apply to. She states OUSU will have stewards there at those demos as well who will be able to help with maintaining order.

A move to a vote is made. The procedural motion is carried nem con.

Daniel Johnson makes the summation speech in opposition to the motion.

The motion is carried.

#### **h. Passage of motions nem con**

Motion 3 (NUS National Shutdown) is carried nem con.

#### **i. Other motions**

Motion 1 (Recording Votes) is proposed in debate by Viv Raper.

Viv says she feels the motion will help make exec more accountable. She says JCR reps already are in a situation where they are accountable to their JCRs for the votes they cast in OUSU Council. Exec are not in such a situation. Thus, she feels it would make sense for them to have to record their votes so that Council and the student body of the University as a whole can see how they cast their votes. She said the sheets listing the way exec had voted would be completed by the exec officers concerned themselves. She said this was in order to make administration easier.

Jane McTaggart (Harris Manchester) asked how votes on procedural motions would be recorded.

Adam Killea (Balliol) said he didn't think there was a need to have them recorded.

Jane Blumer asked how it could be ensured that people would fill the sheets in honestly.

Adam admitted this might be difficult. He said he trusted the honesty of most people, though, and so it shouldn't be too much of a problem.

Daniel Moore (Queen's) asked why the same system was not being introduced for JCR reps.

Adam pointed out that OUSU had no power to mandate JCR reps to do anything. It would be up to their JCRs to decide how they would ask their reps to record their votes for purposes of accountability.

Will Straw (New) asked what would happen if members of exec refused, for one reason or another, to fill in the sheets at all.

Adam said that we could cross that bridge when we came to it.

Jane Blumer made a speech of opposition. She feels the proposed system for recording votes would be time-consuming and open to abuse.

An amendment is proposed to alter a split infinitive. "To truthfully fill in" is altered to "truthfully to fill in" in Council Therefore Resolves 2. This is accepted.

Tony Lord proposes an amendment which would form a new Council Therefore Resolves 2. It is:

"The Office Manager shall never be responsible for the administration of this system"

He says that the Office Manager is overworked enough already and does not have time to administer this system. The amendment is passed.

A move to a vote is proposed by Will Straw.

Jane opposes a move to a vote.

The move to a vote fails. Debate is to continue.

Caroline Dodds (Corpus) says that people will not take the time or the trouble to actually look at the records of how members of exec and sabs voted. Thus, the scheme will, in her opinion, be an unnecessary extra layer of paperwork.

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

Adam Killea speaks in summation of the case for the proposition. He says that there will be people who weren't at council who will want to see how the members of exec they elected voted.

Caroline Dodds says, in summation for the opposition, storing these records will take up a lot of space and that, because of the potential for abuse, the sheets will mean nothing.

The motion is defeated.

Motion 2 (Childcare).

This motion is proposed by Jane Blumer, who makes a speech in support of it.

She is asked why, if OUSU already has policy for having a Childcare Officer, it needs to be proposed once again as a motion to Council.

Jane says that, due to policy lapse, a motion has to go in after 5 years to renew an existing piece of OUSU policy.

Daniel Moore asks what the Childcare Officer does.

Jane says that the role of the officer is one of co-ordinating relations with the University's Childcare Service and ensuring that the needs of student parents are catered for. According to Jane, the university has traditionally neglected student parents and it is only recently that they have tried to take account of their needs and accommodate them.

Ed Swann (Balliol) asks how many student parents they are.

Jane says the university has a list of 100. But, that list is incomplete. She feels the real number may be closer to 200 or 300.

A vote is then taken on the motion. Motion 2 is passed.

Motion 4 (Lonely Planet)

Sonia Sodha says that the proponent of the motion has not yet arrived. She moves a procedural motion to put discussion of Motion 4 at the bottom of the agenda, to give the proposer time to reach Council.

The procedural motion is carried. Discussion of Motion 4 will be deferred until after discussion of Motion 9 has finished.

Motion 9 (In Recognition).

This motion was originally proposed by George Callaghan and seconded by Lina Jansson. Neither the proposer nor seconder are present in Council.

Daniel Moore (Queens) agrees to take up the motion and to act as the proposer.

He makes a speech praising the government of Margaret Thatcher. He also points out that Mrs Thatcher was a graduate of Somerville College and so it is appropriate for OUSU, as an institution connected to Oxford University, to pay tribute to a graduate of it.

Questions are then asked to the proposer. Tony Lord asks if Margaret Thatcher took away free school milk for primary school children during her period as Education Secretary in Ted Heath's Conservative government (1970-4).

Mr Moore admits this was the case. He says that the cuts in school milk provision were needed to maintain funding of the Open University at an adequate level.

Will Straw (New) speaks in opposition to the motion.

A move to a vote is then proposed. The move to a vote is carried.

Daniel Moore gives a summing-up speech reiterating his support for the motion and his admiration of Margaret Thatcher.

Peter Orlov speaks in opposition to the motion.

A vote is taken on the motion. The motion is defeated.

Debate on Motion 4 now commences.

Thomas Harrison (St Hugh's) gives a speech in proposition of the motion. He says that Lonely Planet have produced a tourist guide to Burma which serves to encourage tourism to the country. He points out that tourism ensures that foreign currency is made available to the military regime there, especially as there is a legal requirement that tourists convert \$200 into Burmese currency at an artificial rate upon their arrival in the country. The military regime then uses the foreign currency it obtains to buy weapons on the international market which it then uses to repress its population. The National League for Democracy (NLD) which won over 80% of the seats in Parliament in the last free and fair elections held in Burma (in 1989) has called for tourists not to visit Burma. Tom says that Lonely Planet do not currently advertise with OUSU, but they might in the future as they are a company that produces guidebooks which appeal especially to the student market.

Daniel Moore asks why tourists have to exchange \$200 on entering the country.

Tom says that it is in order to get direct access to foreign currency at a favourable rate.

Will Straw asks what effect the advertising ban proposed on Lonely Planet will have. He also asks how OUSU will let Lonely Planet know of their opposition to them and the reasons for their opposition.

Tom says that Lonely Planet will be informed of the ban and the reasons for the ban by letter. He says the campaign against Lonely Planet is being waged by many student unions and other such groups. Thus, he feels the effect of OUSU's ban will be one of adding to the groundswell of student revulsion against Lonely Planet's decision to promote tourism to the authoritarian state of Burma.

Jane Blumer asks how long the ban will last for.

Tom says the ban should stay in place until the NLD calls off its request for tourists to boycott Burma.

Steph Gray (VP-Finance) asks who referred the matter to ethics committee.

Tom says he did.

Pedro asks Tom if he would accept an amendment which stated that OUSU would only ban adverts for the Burma guide, not for any other Lonely Planet products.

Tom said he would not be willing to accept any such amendment. He said the purpose of the ban was to affect Lonely Planet's sales and profits in general, not merely to reduce sales of the Burma guide.

Alex Da Costa asked where the ban would stop Lonely Planet guides being sold.

Tom said that the ban would only be in effect where OUSU had jurisdiction.

It was asked whether Aung Sang Suu Kyi, the leader of the NLD, had commented on the Lonely Planet guide.

Tom said she had not. He said she had made general comments discouraging people from going on holiday to Burma, though.

Sean Sullivan asked Tom if it was not the case that the Lonely Planet guide in question actually had a section at the front discussing the issue of whether or not tourists should visit Burma.

Tom said that this was the case. He said that the section was a biased one. It did not give a lot of space to arguments against visiting Burma. The guide also makes what he considers a number of factual and terminological inaccuracies in its description of the situation in Burma. Peaceful demonstrations which took place in 1988 are referred to as “riots” and forced labour is referred to as “corvee labour”.

Daniel Moore asked if Lonely Planet produced any guides to other countries considered as having unsavoury regimes.

Tom said that he was backing the call for a Lonely Planet ban because the democratic opposition does not want people to visit Burma and enrich the regime. He was not backing it solely because the regime itself is unsavoury.

Alex da Costa asked him why he hasn't proposed a motion which calls for more effectual action.

Tom responded by saying that he did not believe OUSU would want to go further than what was proposed in the motion being debated.

Ian Mulhern (Some) makes a speech in opposition to the motion. He said he went to Burma last summer. He feels that the NLD is not in touch with the mood of people within Burma. He also alleges that the NLD was described by some Burmese people he talked to as having “fascistic” tendencies. Ian acknowledges that the junta is guilty of many human rights abuses, but he feels that banning Lonely Planet adverts because they produce a tourist guide to the country is the best way of tackling it.

Connor O'Neil (Wadh) proposes an amendment. It is to add a Council Resolves 3 to the text of the motion:

“3. To raise this issue at an NUS level, with the aim of restricting sales of Lonely Planet books across all universities”.

An objection is raised to this proposed amendment because of the fact that OUSU is not affiliated to the NUS.

Connor O'Neil says in defence of his amendment that OUSU can encourage affiliated JCRs to take action at an NUS level.

A further speech is made in opposition to the motion. It is said that this amendment is irrelevant to OUSU.

A vote is taken on the amendment. The amendment falls.

Will Straw tables a further amendment to the text of the motion. He wants it added to Council Resolves 1 and 2 the phrase “until the publication is withdrawn”.

This amendment is carried. It is added to the text of the main motion.

Debate on the motion itself continues. Pedro speaks in opposition. He says he is unhappy with the idea of banning adverts for all Lonely Planet publications as he has used some of them and feels they are good.

Daniel Moore speaks in order to agree with what was said earlier by Ian Mulhern. He feels visiting Burma will help raise awareness of the issues at hand. He also feels it is wrong to make a ‘pre-emptive strike’ by banning Lonely Planet from advertising with OUSU when it has not done so as of yet.

Tom says that a pre-emptive strike against Lonely Planet is justified. He says that it would be harder to take action against Lonely Planet later on if, at a later date, OUSU had entered into an agreement with them and was accepting their ads.

A move to a vote is proposed. It passes.

Tom makes a summing-up speech in support of the motion. He says we ought to stop the military regime getting foreign currency which it can then use to buy weapons. He says that we should respect the NLD's mandate from the last Burmese elections and so pay attention to their views that tourists should not visit Burma as long as it remains under military rule. He says that 80% of Burma's population live in rural areas and thus don't even benefit from the “trickle-down” effect of tourism creating local jobs and so forth which may take place in urban areas.

Pedro speaks up to sum-up for the opposition. He feels it is an extreme approach to ban all Lonely Planet guides.

The motion is carried.

#### **n. Any other business**

Catherine Wallis announces the results of the elections held earlier in Council.

Eleanor Fletcher is declared elected to Publications Board.

Vinothan Sangarapillai is declared elected to Publications Complaints Board.

Matthew Shouler is not elected to Election Tribunal (Reserve Panel).

Mel Marshall asks for people, especially female undergraduates, to volunteer to sit on a university Disciplinary Board.

Will Straw advertises the “Divinity” gig which will be being held to commemorate the National Shutdown.

Ed Swann asks college NUS reps to contact him in his capacity as co-chair of NUS reps committee.

John Storey asks what provision OUSU makes for people with sheep fetishes and how an individual can choose to opt out of OUSU.

Kirsty McNeill answers Mr Storey. She says that she can not do anything to make provisions for people who may have unusual preferences! She says that people can opt out of OUSU by writing to the President by 1<sup>st</sup> week of Michaelmas Term. She says that people who want to opt out have missed their chance this year.

Connor O’Neill points out that it might be beneficial for OUSU if certain people did not turn up to Council. He thus says it would be desirable if the deadline for opting out of OUSU could be extended.

The meeting then proceeds to the election of a bar.

End of Council.