

**Minutes of 5th week Council held at 2.30pm on Friday 20th February 2009
Moser Theatre, Wadham College**

Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- b. Matters Arising from the Minutes
- c. Ratifications in Council
- d. Elections in Council
- e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers
- f. Reports from the Executive Officers who wish to make reports
- g. Questions to Members of the Executive
- h. Emergency Motions
- i. Passage of Motions Nem Con
- j. Motions of No Confidence or Censure
- k. First readings of Motions to Amend the Constitution or Standing Orders
- l. The Budget or Amended Budget
- m. Motions Authorising Capital Expenditure
- n. Other Motions
 - i. motions affecting ousu members as ousu members*
 - ii. motions affecting ousu members as students at Oxford University*
 - iii. motions affecting ousu members as members of the student movement*
 - iv. motions affecting ousu members as residents of Oxford*
 - v. motions affecting ousu members as residents of the United Kingdom*
 - vi. motions affecting ousu members as citizens of the world*
- o. Any Other Business

SHAPE

a. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Points Arising from the Minutes

It was advised that the venue stated on the Minutes from 3rd Week Council was incorrect
It was confirmed that this would be amended

c. Ratifications in Council

Ratifies the changing of the BME Campaigns name to the 'campaign for Cultural and Racial Awareness and Equality (CRAE)'.

Rosanna McBeath (St Hugh's)

BME have changed their name and updated their Constitution, and have brought it to Council for Ratification. I would be grateful if you could please ratify these changes.

Move to Vote

Clearly passed

Ratifies the campaign for Cultural and Racial Awareness and Equality's (CRAE) amended constitution

Rosanna McBeath (St Hugh's)

Reiterates as above.

Move to Vote

Clearly passed

Interpretation of Motions

Lewis Iwu (New)

Responds to Chairs Ruling and advises of his interpretation of Motion

Chair: Anyone in opposition?

None – Passes

e. Reports from the Sabbatical Officers

Verbal Additions to the Presidents Report

Provided update on UCU information in his report and advised everything is under control
Advised on Rents T & A. Should be a minimum standard regarding the interaction of colleges with students and. It has been circulated to college Presidents but it is important that it circulated amongst the College bursars for discussion.

There is an on-going review of staffing in OUSU due to staff leaving; Job descriptions for the new positions will be brought to Council in 7th week

Report of JCC – this is a funding working group looking to make OUSU financially stable, and ensure that the right costs are paid from the right place. The Report will be sent out to common rooms today, please make sure consultation takes place regarding it.

Questions to President

Elliott Golend (Pembroke)

It was decided at the Complaints Committee that OUSU would publish termly accounts for review.

President Responded

Advised these would be available by the end of term.

VP Welfare

No additions

VP Women

Firstly advised about the training session that is being run for women interested in running in elections. Advised anyone interested to attend or get in touch with her

Finals Forum, to overcome the gender gap in finals, please get in touch if interested.

VP Graduate

Advised about Oxford Careers Service Fair which will be targeting final students from overseas to assist them working in the UK after their finals.

Met with University Club Committee, which is only for Graduates and University staff, with regard to senior, final and mature students being allowed. If you have any comments please contact him

VP Access & Academic Affairs

Currently writing a paper on Exam Scripts, which he will be sending out shortly.

Advised about the 'Looked After Child' campaign or Big Brother/ Sister project. He will be sending

around e-mails regarding it this week, and will need responses by Friday of 6th week

Next week is Target Schools Shadowing, which has so far been a great success. Thanks Target School Committee. They are hoping to get more schools involved with it next year.

Question to VP Access & Academic Affairs

Rebecca Morgan (Pembroke)

Asked whether they will be keeping in touch with the students.

VP Access & Academic Affairs Responded

Advised that they have to be careful building relationships with the students but are keeping in touch with the schools.

VP Charities & Community

Attended meeting with the working committee for the Oxford Annual. He has e-mailed the common room Presidents regarding this and advised it would be really helpful for the editors to have responses and submissions for the yearbook.

f. Reports from the Executive Officers who wish to make reports

Environment & Ethics Officer

Working on a paper for a sub committee regarding students attitudes to Fair Trade, he would be interested in hearing everyone's opinions even those who are anti-fair trade in order to get a wide range of opinions

Common Room Support Officer

Unable to attend Lewis Iwu spoke on his behalf. OUSU has created posters advising what it does, if you would like some to display around your common rooms, then please ask in the OUSU office for these.

Returning Officer – Madeline Stanley

Advised that OUSU held an incredibly successful By-Election and the results are as follows;

Community Outreach & Charities Officer – Anastasya Molodykh

Academic Affairs Campaign Officer – Tom Perry

Students with Disabilities Officer – Lucy Edwards

Graduate Health & Welfare Officer – Talha Rahman

Full results are available in the OUSU Office and on the OUSU website.

Also made aware that OUSU Executive did a huge amount to ensure that all the mailing addresses were correct and thanks them for their hard work

Jack Wellby gave credit to the RO and advised Council that it was her Birthday (pause to present Madeline with a gift and sing Happy Birthday)

Graduate Academic Affairs Officer

First Meeting of MCR Pres Com, discussed library opening hours. Compiling a report on it please e-mail if have any information

Also compiling a report on college fees and the facilities provided for these. Please e-mail if any information.

College Sky TV subscriptions, some colleges are now being charged commercial rates for this. He and Jack Matthews are trying to gather information regarding this in an attempt to speak to Sky and get better rates for Common Rooms. They will be holding an open meeting so can anyone with any information relating to this please come along.

i. Passage of Motions Nem Com

Point of Clarification to the Chair

Regarding Chair's Ruling, confirming that Deadline for submission of Motions to Council is from now on 12.00 noon on the Thursday of the week before Council

College Welfare Survey Working Group

Passes Nem Com

Proposed Detention Centres

Opposed will go forward to full debate

k. First readings of Motions to amend the Constitution or Standing Orders

Proposed Amendment to Statutory Annual Election for NUS Delegates

Speech in Proposition

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

What I am putting forward came out of Council last year. It is ambiguous not to specify who should run if not enough people stand.

SFQ

Because a multi seat elections not sure how RON will work

Advised that a Standing Order only needs one term to be passed, specifies will be decided then.

James Dray (Mansfield)

Advised was RO when this was originally discussed and the problem is the same as when it was

discussed originally and you can't really have a RON in a STV election. Reason impossible in an alternative vote elections, as you rank preference in order; what happens if RON Third. Does everybody below RON get written off? How would you reallocate the preferences after RON? It does not make any sense, unless RON is somehow separate.

SFQ

Don't have RON in Council

Response – No because it doesn't work

The only practical way would be to change the election to a different system.

RO – advises this would take a Constitutional change

Move to Debate

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

Advises he is withdrawing the motion and will discuss it further with James Dray and the Returning Officer before bringing it to Council again.

Proposed Amendment to By-elections to the OUSU Part-time Executive

Speech in Proposition

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

This is currently under discussion because Exec is never full. If we do not get the positions filled then it will be necessary to have another election in Trinity. Suggests it would be better to move to elections in Council so that the Executive can be full and therefore more able to fulfil its remit.

James Dray (Mansfield)

Thinks that would have severe practical problems because of notice and because they have to be carried out in the same way as the full elections. Cross campus elections ensure that people are voted on by all students and ensures that anyone who wants to vote can vote and no one is disenfranchised.

He would favour shortening the nomination period, or reopening the elections for the positions that are not filled immediately after the close of the statutory elections, or another form of practical solution rather than disenfranchisement of the people that council is supposed to represent.

Move to Debate

Lewis Iwu (New)

Agrees with what James says about shortening of campaign period, but the problem occurs when the places are not filled, and it is necessary to have By-elections on a fortnightly basis. Do we think that this is necessary or even practical for just by-elections?

David Barclay (Worcester)

It is a question of what is fairest? Whether OUSU Council is most representative or JCR's are more representative. Feels it is better for Council to decide, as there is more chance for debate in council

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)

Haven't had a full executive for this term, or most of last term, which means there can sometimes be a problem with reaching quorum for ratifying the minutes; it would therefore be really helpful if additional members could be elected in council

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

Would like to reiterate the point regarding the fact that it would open up more debate by holding elections in council as it would provide more chance for candidates to be engaged during their hustings.

Danny Quinn (Merton)

Since we have online elections people now take time to make manifestos, and doesn't understand now that the elections are online why it should be so time consuming.

James Dray (Mansfield)

Says once online elections have been done, doesn't understand why it should be very difficult to do it again, and is it really all about efficiency.

Might be more efficient for Parliament to elect a member from the members of the House of Commons but it is not really democratic.

JCR and MCR can get involved in the democratic process at the moment shouldn't be taken away from the electorate.

Elliot Golend (Pembroke)

Elections shouldn't just be about who has enough friends.

Returning Officer

Answers questions about how time consuming elections are. Not that time consuming, what took the time was the issue with code changing, which will probably be a regular feature. The by-elections are not as time consuming as actual elections but there is still quite a lot of admin. What we should really be concerned about is the fact the Executive will never be full as the system stands at this time.

Lewis Iwu (New)

The analogy with the House of Commons is unfair. We are three people down in OUSU, which means we are understaffed as an organisation. If we have more people then we can deliver services better and more quickly. Happy to have constant elections if council believes that the people who fill these positions are elected in full cross campus by-elections but in that case then feels that all committee members should be elected through these as well.

Move to Vote

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

Everyone had points about practicality but the benefit of a full Exec outweighs the 2 weekly elections. Feels that voter turnout could be driven down by constant elections, and all colleges are represented in council.

James Dray (Mansfield)

There won't always be constant meetings. Not a question of having current system versus a new system. Limiting the timings for nominations would help speed it up. It is important not to take away the ability of all students to vote in the by-elections.

Passed by a simple majority

In Favour: 31

Against: 30

No recount

Proposed Amendment to allow Sabbatical Officers to run for more than one term of Office

Martin Nelson asks to leave the Chair. Madeline Stanley Returning Officer takes the Chair.

Martin Nelson (LMH)

Moves that this motion should not be read. He honestly believes shouldn't be read because it was discussed less than a year ago. He has listened to 3 sets of sabbatical officers go through this. Everyone says council is inconsistent and it will be if it ignores what council decided less than a year ago. Shouldn't insult the people who were standing in your posts last year. Should ask the question, has anything changed, is there any reason the ruling is now incorrect, anything occurred that necessitates this be changed? NO, the answer is NO

Speech against Move that Motion not be read

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

Proposed this because he feels that it did not get enough debate last time it was brought to council, as it was one amendment among many reforms to the constitution and in addition it was not taken seriously. He is not proposing out of personal ambition but because we are one in three universities in the country who do not have a 2 year system in place.

No 2/3rd majority so Motion will be heard.

Speech in Favour

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

Promise no more motions, he has not brought this out of personal ambition; he just wants to hear council thoughts on this. Having a 2-year sabbatical officer should not be feared it would just help with continuity. He is not proposing having perpetual offices. If a sabbatical isn't doing a good job then they won't be re-elected. Feels that there are policies put in place, which won't be seen through. Hopes that OUSU is not a closed group. Need to place credit in the electorate, could be preventing a really good sabb from standing. Other universities can handle it. Two terms can be put to good use.

Speech Against

Alex Bulfin (Univ)

Points to Motion itself and says that just because we are one of the only universities that doesn't have this system in place doesn't mean it's a good reason to do it. Doesn't affect the continuity just means that have 2-year peaks and troughs rather than 1-year peaks and trough.

Can't claim you learn that much in 6 weeks that you know you want to run again. What happens if you lose the re-elections. What mandate does that give you. The quality of candidates at Oxford is different to most other universities; there are so many avenues for people to get relevant experience to be a good sabbatical officer.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)

Advises all his points have been added.

Lewis Iwu (New)

Suggests it is good that we are debating this. Continuity is a good thing as it means that people can see policy through which usually takes just under two years, things like JCC Funding report. Members of university committees often comment what a shame it is that don't get to see policies through. Get better over time, when look to country other universities have probably had the same debates so shouldn't ignore them. Choice of the electorate can make reasonable judgement on someone over 4 weeks. Have been in job for over 5 months. Gives sabs an incentive to ensure they get something done over the summers. People might lose re-election and might feel gutted but would still continue to their job. People could lose concentration over elections but should weight up the pros and cons.

James Dray (Mansfield)

Agrees with both Alex and Lewis, but if you do this it is completely tied in with when you hold the elections / if do this then should change when the elections are held. Elections should be held much later.

Rachel Cummings (Somerville)

Agrees with need to push elections back if this is going to happen. In Cambridge having their elections now, sabs can run for two terms because elections later at other universities, Oxbridge are different. If we run against JCR Presidents then this would present a conflict, as we are meant to represent them.

Alex Bulfin (Univ)

Motivation, 2 year plan where is incentive if you lose.

Kat Wall (LMH)

Would be incredibly difficult to manage to roles. Should do the best job you can do for people, and not run against them.

Steven Parker (Worcester)

Feels gives a massive advantage to those who are already in the roles. As it makes it difficult to lose second time round might as well just have 2-year terms.

Jim O'Connell (Univ)

Apologises to Paul for his inflammatory comments in the Cherwell they were not meant personally. Feels it is impossible to run a campaign and be a sab not too healthy for people to stay in Oxford for too long. Sabs do a very good job but need to move out into the world.

Dani Quinn (Merton)

Not a good idea to have elections later as people have to sign contracts for permanent contracts. There is a issue with no confidence, just gives you lack of authority if you lose. Feels

that is not as important to have continuity, as the introduction of a SAFAM will help to create an institutional memory. Need to encourage people to run for these positions and ensure a competitive election. It is good that not accountable as can vote as they feel. Campaigns are time consuming, and there is a problem with scrutiny of sabs whether they are doing their job or spending too much time campaigning.

Amendment

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

Does not accept the amendment.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)

Agrees with all the arguments he has heard against this change, believes that all can be solved by these amendments. If when you are running for a second term to have to have left and come back, then you may wish to run again. This amendment means that you can. If say you leave and then come back and then do a Masters, and then decide to stand for election for sab again. Wouldn't apply to many people but doesn't mean it's not an important amendment. If we pass this and pass substantive motion would be solved.

Advised of Typo in second amendment "Sabbatical" should be changed to "Any".

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

Opposes amendment. Completely changes entire motion, wrecks whole motion. If think that people who come back after time out working can bring much to the role of sabbatical officer, doesn't see why the same can't be true of people who are actually working as sabbatical officers.

Andrew Scott-Taggart (Wadham)

Amendment would not affect most people, so should just get back to the actual issue.

James Dray (Mansfield)

None of the supposed advantages of Paul's motion appear here. What is the positive thing we will add by passing this amendment?

Elliott Golend (Pembroke)

If you don't like the motion then it plugs the gaps and stops it being used. There are grey areas around elections, needs to be a way of improving the constitution.

Lewis Iwu (New)

Doesn't add anything to the motion. There seems to be a suspicion that Sabs won't do work if have to campaign. Maybe there is an argument to be had that people spend too long campaigning. This is only something that seems to have started happening recently, so maybe there is an argument for changing the culture.

Move to vote in favour of the motion

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)

Just because something only affects a few people, doesn't mean it isn't important. Whilst sabs don't have time to run when in office, this solves the problem by allowing them to run later. The benefits of the institutional memory are outweighed, and it makes sense to help the minority.

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

The original motion addresses these issues. These issues should be debated in the full motion not just the amendment.

Amendment failed

Move to Vote

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

We have other motions to get onto, and you've heard me speak enough on this, I think we should move to vote automatically.

Summary speech in favour

Paul Dwyer (Keble)

I don't think we should be fearful of two-year sab terms, should have faith in the electorate. It will provide them with extra time to get on with what they are doing. I don't accept the 'lame duck' argument; we should trust the electorate and the sabbatical officers. Don't accept the argument against sabbatical officers not being committed if they do not get elected for a second term.

Two year terms would be good for the quality of OUSU, as when you start your role you may find out it is different to what you thought it was, this could mean that you may apply for a different sab role for your second term. I think we should give it a go, and offer people the chance, they may or may not want to take it.

Alex Bulfin (Univ)

Continuity isn't necessarily a good thing, people may introduce bad policy rather than good policy, which would mean this would take longer to be reversed.

Oxford is different because, Oxford has a massive pool of potential leaders who should be given the chance to run for these positions. Would be discriminating against them.

In favour:	7
Against:	Many
Abstentions:	3

Motion overwhelmingly fails.

Martin Nelson takes back the position of Chair.

Amendment of Standing Orders - Voting on issues that affect students indirectly

Speech in proposition

Thomas Haynes (St Catherine's)

From what I've seen people are dissatisfied with the way OUSU rules work with regards to issues that don't affect students directly.

If we are going to debate these issues in Council then they need to be as representative as possible. It shouldn't be possible for a minority to hijack the meeting. The President should not have to write letters on behalf of a small minority, then there are a huge number of issues that are important to all students that he needs to represent. OUSU exists to discuss issues that affect all students.

These difficult issues don't often come up, but when they do they take a lot of time, which could be used to discuss better and more representative issues.

SFQ

Any methods in place which would act as a check and balance on this system?

Thomas Haynes (St Catherine's)

Yes a 2/3rd majority of council to overturn. Detailed criteria in place and the decision of Chair.

Speech in opposition

Stefan Baskerville (Univ)

Vote against debate to be had about which motions affect us as students of the world; there may be some disagreements on this. This motion is not clear on which affect us and which do not, the categories are not clear. The Council agenda clearly includes the category "motions affecting OUSU members as the world". Hard to decide which issues would come under this? I am not clear where issues such as Pro-choice, Carbon admissions, SRI would fall, would they come under this?

My second point is the stance it takes towards abstentions. Contentious issues should be allowed, but if the votes of those who abstain are considered as are considered as in favour of the motion. This defeats the point of abstention. Some common room officers may come with a duty to abstain.

I am not opposed to having a debate on which motions we discuss. The discussion should take place, but not about which specific categories should not be debated.

Move to Debate

Alex Bulfin (Univ)

This would politicise abstentions and places control on them of whether the motion passes or fails. It also places too much power into the hands of the Chair, politicising the position of Chair.

There is also an implication relating to the 2/3rd's majority.

Jason Keen (St Johns)

If against this motion allows, motion political motion to pass on a tiny majority. This motion allows things to be political but should be united on perspective.

Andrew Scott-Taggart (Wadham)

Lewis Iwu doesn't actually have that much power, just because he is the President of the Student Union. Individuals have far more power. A good example of this was the bombardment of individuals calling MP's offices regarding the man who was going to be deported to Darfur; this prevented this from happening. A single letter or single call would not have had this affect. Students should do it themselves. OUSU Council is not a debating society. Lewis Iwu should focus on student issues, some students feel that this would de politicise OUSU but Council can still overrule the Chair, if they decide they want to debate these issues.

Motion overruled. Majority cannot hijack a motion if 60% of students want to discuss it. If something is divisive we are capable of understanding when something is to divisive then we can vote it down. Debate students for students 66% doesn't change the situation.

Jonny Medland (Queens)

Opposed to part of this motions. This motion gives huge power to the Chair regarding how many votes are needed for motions to be passed. Power to decide which motions should be debate shouldn't be given to one person.

The Gaza motion should highlight the importance of abstentions. Student bodies mandated abstentions, and it is not right if these abstentions then lead to a motion passing. Broader point shouldn't pass on just 51% if divisive. One of the problems with OUSU is said to be that OUSU doesn't respond quickly, which is why this motion is being brought, OUSU should respond to its members.

Robin Moss (New)

We have this policy in New College and it works. The power to decide is in the hands of the VP not the Chair, but when issues have come up the decision has not been contentious. On the one occasion that a decision has needed to be made it has not proved contentious. There was not debate in the meeting as to it being otherwise.

If people see the divisive nature of motion but would like to discuss, then the 2/3rds majority won't make a difference will still be discussed.

Sarah Hutchinson (St Cross)

Not up to us to decide or the Chair to decide what effects students as students. May directly effect some students, and their minority status may effect them as students. Most students are UK students but it is bad form to say that Gaza issue doesn't affect people as students, and that these motions shouldn't be considered.

Katherine Terrell (St Hilda's)

Council sensible enough to realise which issues are controversial, people should be allowed to come to council and discuss these.

OUSU needs to represent minorities as well. 2/3rds is not just a majority. Want to protect minorities as well as the majority

Move to Vote

Against Move to Vote

Matthew Chan (Magdalen)

The valorisation of abstention is absurd, why not make individual no's and abstentions count in favour? 66% is absurd. Vote against this motion.

William McCallum (Wadham)

Pro-choice didn't get 2/3rds which means it wouldn't have been discussed. Minority was not able to hijack a motion in terms of representation. In terms of representation, Wadham is a bigger college then most and we felt unrepresented, our voice is very strong, 650 of us taken down by a smaller college.

Both the majority and minority are under represented.

Point of Order

Thomas Haynes (St Catherine's)

Wish to withdraw motion. Following the feedback on the text of the motion would like to have

a wider less specific debate. Someone else can of course step in to take over this motion.

Robin Moss (New)

Steps in because his college has this policy and it works.

Alex Bulfin (Univ)

Problem even if you think OUSU is students for students. Doesn't solve problem that OUSU is only seen as debating motions like Gaza. Need to show OUSU does everything.

Madeline Stanley (LMH) steps out of position as RO

It is not impartial; I echo the points about abstentions, and about the Chair. OUSU is not primarily for student welfare, although it is incredibly important. OUSU represents us with everything they do. Represents us as a collective, a majority helps us be strong. We shouldn't just be cuddly; we shouldn't be worried about taking positions on issues. How do you define what is directly relevant. For example say OUSU Council condemns a company, then next term you get asked if you want to be sponsored by this, you have to represent councils decision. It is impossible to define motions into categories. Council shouldn't just avoid controversial issues.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)

I haven't heard any argument that makes any sense. Gaza important but we shouldn't just look at this motion with regard to an issue from 3rd week council. We need to look into the history, I am going to say apartheid in South Africa again, but I am also going to say Rolls Royce who were making weapons that were being sold in the early years of the conflict of Darfur. Because of Council Rolls Royce withdrew their operations in Darfur. The comment that council wastes time on these issues is completely fallacious, we have had 3 issues in 2 ½ years, and of these the policy on Nestle passed unanimously and the Fair-trade debate only comprised of 3 speeches and Darfur passed Nem Com. Council doesn't waste time on these as they come up very rarely. It is important that they are discussed in order to raise their profile. Why should we need a 2/3rds majority to discuss motions that affect OUSU members as citizens of the world, rather than any other motions, some of which take much longer to discuss, for example, tuition fees had 16 amendments in 2 mins, pro-choice comes up every year, yet they are all important issues. You could say that we shouldn't discuss Trident then as it comes under 'citizens of the world' yet it affects us as students as it affects how government allots its money. SRI directly affects students. To pass this would disenfranchise the majority. OUSU is not cuddly we are here to debate.

Sanjay Nanwani (St Peters)

Realises it needs more thought but will have to vote for it because brought the motion to council, but urge everyone else to vote against it because it goes beyond what were trying to say.

Lewis Iwu (New)

Thinks this debate isn't really about how motions are categorised. The Chair has quite a lot of power already, it is a moot issue. This shouldn't just be about Gaza, there may be other motions that will be close. It is about how divisive is the issue.

Move to Vote

Robin Moss (New)

Should all vote against this but my JCR has it, and it works in my JCR. Good for a better mandate and it shuts down people who just vote against it because the issue is divisive and it therefore leads to better debate.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)

Ridiculous policy

Vote taken

Motion clearly fails

SHAPE n. Other Motions

2. Proposed detention centres

Dom Weinberg (Balliol)

I am a member of STAR, we are holding a rally next week, which will end up outside the OUSU offices, it is a rally against detention centres. The current government policy means that a lot of asylum seekers end up in detention centres for a long time, which is inhumane.

I wanted to bring it to OUSU as a forum for bringing attention to it.

SFQ

Why do you want OUSU to pass a motion on this?

Because the rally will be finishing outside the OUSU building in Bonn square, and we would like the support of OUSU.

Tom Haynes (St Catherine's)

I will need a mandate on this. Haven't had a chance to bring it to the JCR

Noor Rashid (St Edmunds)

This is not a divisive issue; it does not need a college mandate. There are people in this meeting whose extended family are in these centres. It goes against our principals as students who are supportive of human rights.

Tom Meakin (Magdalen)

Even if you have to go back to your colleges for a mandate, you can still vote for or against, not because of mandate.

Dom Weinberg (Balliol)

The event takes place before next council therefore it will be too late if you go back to your colleges for a mandate, as it will already have occurred.

Daniel Lowe (St Edmunds)

No mandate is needed just vote.

Move to Vote

Clearly passes

No other business

Election of Pub – JD Wetherspoons

5th week hiliary term 2009

c o u n c i l m i n u t e s

PAGE 12