



src activism
advocacy
representation

Julia Robins, Secretary to Council
secretary.council@src.usyd.edu.au

**Students' Representative Council,
University of Sydney**

Level 1, Wentworth Building (G01)
University of Sydney NSW 2006
PO Box 794 Broadway NSW 2007
t: (02) 9660 5222 f: (02) 9660 4260
int: 12871 www.src.usyd.edu.au
ABN: 597 391 306 68

MINUTES:

of the 1st Special meeting of the 90th SRC held on **11th April 2018**. Meeting held in the Professorial Board Room, Quadrangle

*A quorum count was called at 6:26
The meeting was found quorate.*

A. Meeting opened at 6:28 pm

A1. Election of Deputy Chairperson

The Chair moved that Maya Eswaran be elected Deputy Chairperson.
The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

B. Acknowledgement of Country

The University of Sydney Students' Representative Council acknowledges the traditional owners of this land (Sydney), the Gadigal people of the Eora nation. We stand on this land today as beneficiaries of an uncompensated and unreconciled dispossession that occurred over 200 years ago. Many of the descendants of those dispossessed live just down the road in abject poverty, and as young people it is important to recognise how this history of dislocation and disenfranchisement has contributed to the inequality we observe in modern society. We acknowledge both our privilege and our obligation to redress the situation as best we can: to remember the mistakes of the past, act on the problems of today, and build a future for everyone who now calls this place home, striving always for genuinely practical and meaningful reconciliation.

C. Apologies, Proxies and Leaves of Absence

Apologies and proxies were received from:

Bella Pytka to Rebeccah Miller
Andrew Lee
Hanyun Din to Clarence Zeng
Timothy Berney-Gibson
Yuxuan Yang
Kim Murphy to Vinil Kumar
Hersha Kadkol to Lily Campbell
Jazzlyn Breen
George Bishop to Dane Luo
James Gibson to Willabel Benet
Sean Young
Manning Jeffery

Environment Officer Zachary Gillies-Palmer sends his apologies
Vice President Adriana Olguin Malavisi sends her apologies

Thomas Manousaridis (arrived at 7:00)

D. Motions of Notice

D1. SRC ACTIVELY SUPPORTING THE REPUBLIC MOVEMENT

Preamble:

The campaign for an Australian Republic is a movement committed to giving Australia a greater sense of national identity independent from its colonial past as currently part of the British Commonwealth of nations. One of the most notable ways the Republic movement seeks to achieve this is through advocating for an Australian head of state to replace the British monarch shared by all member states of the British Commonwealth. As the likely subject of Australia's next referendum or plebiscite after the passing of same sex marriage, Sydney Uni's SRC needs to take a strong position on this, not only in just rhetoric but through action.

At a time where the United Kingdom has chosen to take an isolationist turn by leaving the European union, why should Australia remain in the commonwealth as one of its former imperial vassals? Why should our head of state be an unelected Briton? There should be no need to explain why in the 21st century we should accept a foreign unelected head of state who did not earn their position but were lucky enough to inherit it based on their pedigree.

In light of this reasoning, the council should be supporting the idea of an Australian Republic with an Australian head of state as a movement that is relevant to students. Given how the Yes campaign for same sex marriage was galvanised by the mobilisation of young people which was aided by the promotion of ways for students to help out the campaign last year on the SRC Facebook, we can similarly energise students to get involved in this movement for whenever the question is put to the Australian public.

Platform:

1. The SRC believes in the importance of an Australian Republic led by an Australian head of state.
2. The SRC believes the discussion of modelling should occur after the success of a YES vote referendum or plebiscite.

Actions :

1. The SRC President as the spokesperson of the SRC's political wing will promote pro-Australian republic movement content on the Facebook page at least once a month
2. Progress of the promotion of the Republic movement will be documented in the monthly reports of either the President or the General Secretary.

Moved: Brandon Hale

Seconded: Tom Manousaridis

Brandon Hale spoke to his motion. Outlining what the Republic movement is, noting that he believes Australia needs to leave the Commonwealth, and that the British Royal family has no place as Australia's head of state. Brandon continued saying that he believed if Australia was to move away from its imperialist history becoming a republic is a step in the right direction.

William Edwards spoke to the motion saying that he believed in the republic movement and was fine with the SRC promoting this but wanted to change the action points to remove 'once a month' and 'monthly' for the promotion on the Facebook page, as there seems no need set a timeline for that. William also asked to amend the motion to remove action point 2, as that is not the role of the President and General Secretaries.

Gina Elias spoke against the motion saying that they don't believe in the State of Australia as it was founded on genocide and separating from the crown won't change that history. Adding that Australia is an imperialist power now even without connections to the British empire. Gina concluded saying that removing the crown will not remove Australia from its colonial past and the republican movement is irrelevant and not a particularly progressive movement.

Caitlin Mcmenamin I intend to vote for the motion, but it even with the amendments it doesn't look at running a campaign on this, so it seems very hollow.

Vinil Kumar spoke against the motion citing it as an irrelevant motion from Labor Right. Vinil continued saying that movements pushing for national identity are not good and that the council should not be wasting their time on them, adding that the legacy of colonialism will not be separated with a separation of the crown and this was a "bull shit" motion.

Brandon Hale responded asking that while people have said it will not end, you said it's not going to end imperialism or colonialism, but are you suggesting that staying the monarchy is still a better alternative to a republic? Brandon also responded to the comment that there was no campaign being run on the issue of a republic presently saying this motion is to build presence and work towards a campaign.

Vinil Kumar added that he believed the idea of a republic of Australia was a conservative idea and that nationalism and national identity as concepts are conservative.

Brandon Hale responded saying he found the idea the others would rather do nothing unless you can reach an unrealistic ideal, than a step forward bizarre.

Pranay Jha added that there are those who see this as a step away from imperialism and those that see it as a step towards it, those who are against this motion are so because they see it as a step towards greater imperialism not less.

Jazzlyn Breen requested an end to discussion believing this to be a pointless debate and that the movers can hardly say they want to take a step away from imperialism but you voted against supporting the Adani Mine protestors

William Edwards said they fundamentally believed in democracy and would prefer for Australia's head of

state to be elected noting that it won't end imperialism but might be a step in the right direction noting it seems of for people who want to 'smash that state' want to maintain the monarchy?

Maya Eswaran noted that there are better things for the SRC to focus on and this seems like a waste of time and social media.

Lily Campbell spoke against the motion saying that she doesn't think the existence of the Monarch has much of an effect on the SRC, or on Australia as an imperialist states. Lily noted that Australia has 182 military bases around the Pacific Region without the British Monarch's active involvement, adding that this as a country it has often had imperialist policies and actions separate to it's head of state being the Queen. She continues that one of Australia's closest allies was the United States of America, which is the biggest imperial power. Lily concluded saying that suggesting that making Australia a republic so they have the right to self determination is just insulting to Palestinians who have no self determination and Indigenous Australian's who also have no self determination thanks to the Australian government, and If you support the project of Australia, then you can't be called left or progressive, as this is the most racist country in the world.

Brandon Hale responded to comments saying that while he understood the concerns, he can't understand how asking to remove and unelected head of state, in another country is regressive? Brandon made an appeal to the council asking that if they don't believe that Australia's head of state should be unelected and appointed by birth to vote for the motion.

Procedural motion to move straight to a vote

Moved: Vinil Kumar

Seconded: Williams Edwards

The procedural was put and **CARRIED**.

The motion was put and **FAILED**

D2. Productive Action Regarding The Red Zone Report and Continuing College Culture Issues

With the Red Zone Report clearly highlighting a myriad of issues within many if not all of the colleges, it is clear that now needs to be a time of change. It is also clear that the colleges aren't going anywhere any time soon. This means that the SRC and its affiliated Collectives need to be productive and effective if we want to see change occur within college culture.

As a freshman at college, you are instantly dropped into the deep end of college life, inclusive of a heavy drinking culture and unwavering comradery. At many colleges entitlement is also deeply engrained in many students in attendance, which could be seen as a key reason that students find it their right to take sexual choices away from others. While each college (as far as I'm aware) makes their freshman attend a session on alcohol and a session on consent and sexual harassment/assault, clearly it is not sinking in and not creating change.

Comradery is one of the best but also the worst thing about college and it is stronger at college than in potentially any organisation at USYD, political groups included. There is an immense sense of belonging to the place where you eat, drink, party and sleep. You know almost every person that walks down the corridor and they probably know you too. This is what makes college sell too - not just to the morally questionable attendees, but also to the hundreds of rural and international students (many of whom may be offered a scholarship) who are very limited in their

choices for accommodation (given that places like Urbanest are almost as expensive and don't feed you). This sense of comradery is great and wonderful for students - until something goes wrong. There have been many accounts of students who have fallen ill, or had a falling out with someone at college or had a mental health crisis and they suddenly become the most ignored and/or hated person in the building.

Cases of sexual assault unfortunately provoke the same response. Because everyone knows each other and because everyone is a "comrade", the moment you think about reporting a person for sexual harassment or assault you become an outsider. Your 'friends' at college will likely tell you not to report it or look at you differently if you do, particularly if the perpetrator is well liked. The college itself may even try to talk you out of reporting the incident if it risks 'ruining a career'. The victim who is facing this though, can thankfully turn to the SRC for support - or can they?

It's no secret that SRC protests in particular tend to be very outward with their hatred of all colleges and their students, even if it's not intended towards all college students such as these victims. Take 2018 for instance. It was noted among many stall holders that there was a large absence of college students at O-Week - perhaps to do with the negative media in the weeks before, or the classic "burn the colleges" motto being spread around campus earlier in the week. While we should be protesting these significant issues, we are not coming at it from the right approach.

In 2015, as a fresher, I was never once told about the SRC while at college. I highly doubt that has since changed, which means all the freshers who were told not to come to OWeek probably don't know about the SRC at all. That means that the majority of the victims of The Red Zone are probably (if they work up the courage) going to face an uphill battle if they try to report their incident at the colleges, and the organisation in place to help them outside of college has convinced them they want to burn their new home down and share vehement hatred towards them.

This has to change. As I said, protest and freedom of speech are good and needed. **But**, as representatives of an organisation meant to be helping **all** students we need to be very careful about the messages we are portraying, because we are inadvertently causing victims to turn away and not receive the support they need.

I hope I speak on behalf of everyone when I say that 1 more victim of sexual harassment or assault, no matter their background, religion or political affiliation, is one more too many. We need to unite on this issue if change is going to be created. We need to not only be mindful of our portrayal of the SRC, but also work towards productive action by working with the colleges and the university rather than yelling at them in the hope it will change things.

In light of this, I propose that the SRC puts into place the following actions:

1. That all SRC and Collective protests, whether in person or through social media, refrain from using phrases like "burn the colleges" and other overtly violent or aggressive messages or slogans.
2. That the SRC actually approaches Michael Spence or similarly influential figures at the university, about the lack of consequences for perpetrators at the university's colleges and work with the university to see that this be changed – eg. Sports representatives at colleges found guilty of sexual assault lose all rights to their scholarships at the university.
3. That the SRC contact the colleges about including an information pack about the SRC and its services within the fresher information package they give each student as they enter

college, specifically with information about how a student can report sexual harassment/assault cases if they don't want to work with the college on those matters.

Moved: Sarah Cutter-Russell

Seconded: Manning Jeffery

Sarah Cutter-Russell spoke to her motion saying that the Council needs to be aware, and conscious that we can't support victims of assault and harassment who attend the colleges if we constantly threaten to burn their houses down.

Harry Gregg spoke against the motion saying that before he continues they would like to acknowledge their privilege as a man, and that the majority of the victims of assaults are women. He will be voting against this motion as he believes in collective autonomy, the women's collective has chosen to take things down this route and they are alas the ones working with the women who are coming forward. He acknowledged that yes there does need to be communications with the colleges but time and time again Office Bearers' in particular the women's officer have gone to the Vice Chancellor and management but nothing has happened. Harry concluded saying that he thinks it is important that we protest these institutions and reach out them, he is happy to go up there hand out information on our policies and services.

Maya Eswaran spoke against the motion saying that it doesn't do much, that the women's officer have already been doing action point two and three meaning the on point up for debate is action point one and this is pointless.

Mitch Gordon spoke to the motion saying it was about the need for a change in rhetoric with regard to the colleges.

Lily Campbell spoke against the motion asking the council to think about what the colleges are and what they represent. To here they are institutions for the elite and a playground for the rich and powerful and it is this culture that allows vile sexist behaviours to continue. Lily continued saying she felt it was contemptible to tell women they can't say "fuck you" to those institutions that allowed these things to happen and covered them up. Lily added that all monuments and sexist institutions should be got rid of and the council should not be working with the university it should be fighting against the university and that being polite and pandering to the colleges is wrong.

Jazzlyn Breen spoke against the motion noting that she knows it does not come from a place of malice, however she will work through each of the action points and the issues with them. When speaking on the first point she reminded the council it cannot stop collectives from saying what they want, furthermore in this situation there are a number of women who went to college who are all for saying "burn the colleges". Jazzlyn continued noting for points 2 and 3, that the women's officers have already had meetings with Vice Chancellor Michael Spence, and they did try to engage with the colleges at o-week, however after one of the people they were contacting blamed some survivors the women's collective were supporting they chose to cut off contact with that person.

Caitlin Mcmenamin spoke against the motion noting that everything she wanted to say had been

said, the women's collective have and are always fighting for the rights of sexual assault survivors on campus and this motion is insulting to the work they do, we should not be policing how survivors of assault express themselves.

Madeline Ward spoke against the motion and read a statement from fellow women's officer Jessica Syed which outlined that actions that had been taken by the women's officers to engage with the colleges noting that due to intimidation of survivors by their contact with the colleges they had to cease those communications.

Madeline Ward continued telling the council know that while the position of Women's Officers is seen as and paid as part time, in hours worked it's closer to a full time job. Madeline added that as well as her position as Women's Officer she also has a part time job to pay the bills as she doesn't have the money or rich parents who can afford to send her to a college. To afford to go to a college means being in a privileged position, so she has little sympathy for those who can afford to go there don't want to be called out for their actions. Continuing she added that it is difficult to disassociate the behaviours around sexual assault and hazing on colleges and a sense of entitlement. Madeline concluded saying action point 1 was "ridiculous" and would not be followed regardless of the motions success, and points 2 and 3 have been addressed in our reports and here, we have 250 college specific bags in the Women's Officers office, and she will be happy to take them up to the colleges if anyone would like to help hand them out

Imogen Grant passed the chair to the deputy chairperson

Imogen Grant spoke against the motion saying that the women's collective always speaks to college students, they speak to the ones who come looking for support and that's how we know what happens in the colleges – because the officers and collectives have spoken to college students. As a former Women's officer Imogen said that she didn't feel that speaking about the colleges in these terms is isolating to college students. Imogen continued saying the University has known about these issues for decades, this isn't a new campaign many years of women's officers, and that it's reports like the Red Zone report by End Rape on Campus that draw attention to the statistics that universities want to keep out of public attention as they can impact enrolment numbers. She went on to describe those who are being groomed to enter the Australian business worlds as having a flimsy ethical framework and one that is built and developed in the colleges. Adding that of the 30 St John's college students who were responsible for almost murdering a fellow student during hazing, while there was a push for them to be expelled most were protected and just suspended, and 7 of those students were then elected to the student council – their names were published in the Sydney Morning Herald, if you look them up on LinkedIn today they are all in very high end business jobs at large corporations. Imogen concluded noting that it was the stance of the SRC's women's collective that the colleges be dismantled and that on campus housing should be accessible to all students not just those who can afford \$600-800 a week.

Sarah Cutter-Russel said that she was taking all criticism on board and would like to apologise to the Women's collective if they thought the title was rude and targeted them, adding that she had written this on her lunch break. Sarah amended action point one to say "". Adding that a lot of people has said that the university and the colleges have never worked with us and never will but she feels like there is a lot of social change occurring at the moment and that this is a time to work

with the Vice Chancellor to push for consequences to these actions, she admitted she did not know if Michael Spence will do that but that is what she would like to see a push for. Sarah concluded apologising for not being at the SRC stall at O-Week as she was the Science Society stall all day.

The motion was put and **FAILED**

D3. Students support West Virginia and UK education strikes

Preamble

Education workers from London to Charleston are in the grips of significant and inspiring battles for wages, conditions and dignity. In the face of a decades-long onslaught on conditions, and declining union militancy, these workers provide a rousing example to workers across the world. The attacks faced by workers in both the UK and West Virginia are unsurprisingly similar: wage stagnation, pension cuts, and a repressive environment for the labour movement. But by standing together and taking industrial action, they have proved both the undisputable power of the organised working class, and the value of rank-and-file union militancy.

Buoyed by a resurgent political left, the UK's University and College Union (UCU) voted recently by an overwhelming majority for an escalating strike of nearly 40,000 members, primarily in opposition to pension reform that will leave individual staff more than £10,000 worse off upon retirement. The process of organising and balloting for action created a core of union activists, and began to breathe life into the union from below. With the prospect of strikes at the forefront, the union grew 10% overall during the two months of organising to take industrial action. Some campuses recorded further 25% spikes in membership in just the week leading up to the first round of strikes.

The experience of the UCU proves, that when given a lead from the union leadership, members can be emboldened to fight. Initial reports from the large and lively picket lines have indicated huge public support for the strike, as well as widespread enthusiasm amongst university workers, and renewed belief in their collective strength. Workers are not searching for halfway solutions to the vicious attack on their pensions, but for a total victory. That the Universities UK (UUK) have already begun to fracture in their response to the strike after three days is testament to the enduring power of workers in struggle, but also the resolve and unity of the striking UCU workers. West Virginia's remarkable all-out school strike is further proof of the industrial strength of education workers. Facing falling wages, and massive attacks on pension eligibility, West Virginia teachers are well into their second week of an illegal strike. For a long time, the strategy of education unions has been electoral support for Democratic Party candidates, such as that of current governor and coal magnate Jim Justice in 2016. Justice's defection back to the Republican Party in 2017 embarrassed the union leadership, who had pinned hopes of progress for teachers to his election.

Frustrated with the directionless leadership, union members have gone out on strike to defend their rights, shutting down all of West Virginia's schools. In the course of the strike, the union's ranks have swelled with thousands of new, enthusiastic members.

The unity and vitality of this new rank-and-file network has sustained the strike through setbacks and potential dangers. Rather than accepting the in-principle agreement made between union leaders and the Governor, teachers have universally refused to return to work until a bill is passed securing a 5% pay rise, and the issue of pensions is addressed. In what is essentially now a wildcat strike, West Virginia's teachers, bus drivers, and cleaners have proved the power and determination of workers who dare to struggle against restrictive laws, apprehensive union leaderships, and the state.

Education workers in both the UK and West Virginia are teaching us a valuable lesson in struggle, and have indicated a strategy for union revival all over the world. In the face of repressive laws, diminishing rights and conditions, and political attacks on the union movement – all hallmarks of contemporary Australian capitalism – the only viable option to turn the situation around for ordinary working-class people and students is to exercise industrial power through strike action.

Platform

1. The SRC unconditionally supports striking workers in their fight for conditions
2. The SRC expresses its admiration for the UCU workers and West Virginian teachers currently out on strike.
3. The SRC recognises strikes as the most effective method of fighting
4. The SRC recognises industrial action as the sole force capable of reviving union militancy
5. The SRC recognises the vitality of rank-and-file organising to the union movement

Action

1. The SRC will publish two statements of solidarity. One in support of the UCU strikers, and the second in support of West Virginian teachers.
2. This SRC meeting will take solidarity photos supporting the strikes for social media circulation.
3. The SRC will pay for solidarity pizza to be sent to both the West Virginian teachers protesting in the Capitol building, and the UCU university workers picket lines.

Moved: Harsha Kadkol

Seconded: Kim Murphy

Lily Campbell asked to amend action point three to read "The SRC will pay for solidarity pizza to be sent to both the Kentucky teachers protesting in the Capitol building, and the Oklahoma teachers picket lines."

Vinil Kumar said it was being amended as the West Virginia Teachers has already won, so this is to update the motion.

Motion to Amend action point 3 to read:

"The SRC will pay for solidarity pizza to be sent to both the Kentucky teachers protesting in the Capitol Building, and the Oklahoma teachers picket lines."

Moved: Lily Campbell

Seconded: Vinil Kumar

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

Thomas Manousaridis moved an amendment to remove action point 3.

Tom Manousaridis spoke to the amendment saying he thinks the motion is fine but that it doesn't student money needs to be spent on pizza for the other side of the world.

Vinil Kumar responded saying that this isn't just about student's is about supporting workers and asked why Thomas would be against sending teachers some support, but for spending SRC resources on promoting the idea of a republic.

Harry Gregg spoke against the amendment saying he agreed that sending pizzas to striking workers is important as when workers go on strike they forgo wages, going on strike an important part in the fight against capitalism. Harry wanted to know if there would be vegetarian options.

Lily Campbell spoke against the amendment saying that the SRC spends money on these sorts of things all the time, like stickers and pizzas for collective events, she feels this is a better cause to buy pizza for. Lily continued saying that this is an amazing political campaign and showing workers support is important. Adding that she feels student unionism seems to have this weird obsession with students and not look at the broader effects on education like that students are affected by their teachers' conditions or that student come from all over the world.

William Edwards said he was appalled by the proposed amendment. Adding that he thought it was disgusting that the mover refuses to show solidarity. Will continued saying that solidarity isn't just a motion it's action and that while she is not sure if the mover of the motion has ever been on a picket line but people get really hungry, and you need all the moral support you can get, something like sending a pizza can do a lot of good for moral.

Brandon Hale spoke for the amendment saying while he liked the motion and the idea of sending pizza, but as the council was elected to represent the students of the University of Sydney and their SSAF should go to their benefits and so the money should be spent here and not elsewhere in the world.

Tim Seguna spoke in favour of the amendment and asked that if those who have suggested the SRC is anti-Capitalist where the pizza's they wish to send would be coming from?

Adriana Olguin Malavisi asked why being obsessed with students is a bad thing as a student organisation, that the council is elected to represent students, and Office Bearers are paid by students.

Connor Wherrett asked for a clarification on the wording of action point three asking if the council is to order the pizza here and send it overseas, wouldn't that mean it would be very cold on its arrival adding he felt the whole thing was stupid.

Jazzlyn Breen spoke against the amendment and asked how the movers couldn't understand the purpose of action point three saying that we don't exist in a bubble and that sending support to a strike elsewhere sends solidarity and builds up movements everywhere so they can grow little by little.

Amendment to remove action point 3

Moved: Thomas Manousaridis

Seconded: Brandon Hale

The amendment was put and **FAILED**.

Discussion returned to the motion on notice.

Walter Rosales spoke in favour of the motion saying that the council should support teachers and fight against education cuts, and against the commodification of education and health happening around the world.

Emilia Bode spoke to the motions saying that staff conditions are student conditions and that there teachers are striking against attacks on education funding adding that art teachers have only \$2 funding per student, the school is cutting off power to save money, and that the textbooks being used are from the 90s and this is not good enough. She continued saying that the West Virginian Government passed a motion that allows police to shoot at workers at a picket line, and these teachers still went on strike. Adding that striking is the best action of power of the working class and as the student council that stood beside the NTEU during their negotiations here we should send this pizza and support teachers fighting for education around the world.

Sarah Cutter-Russel spoke against the motion saying that if the council tried to give pizza or money to every good thing that is happening around the world it would run out of money fast, and that is this was happening here she would be in support of the motion.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying if the funds were there he would suggest the council fundraise for it, but they are there. Adding that he would send pizza to every strike if he could, that it was not about money but the political statement.

Adriana Olguin Malavisi said that she would be happy to send the Pizza if everyone here put in \$10 instead of taking it from SRC funds.

Pranay Jha spoke to the motion saying that is annoying that some have suggested that we should only focus on student issues when in the same meeting they have put forward motions to support the republican movement. Adding that if they believed that money should only be spent on Student's then they should be for giving it all back to students, yet they've never suggested that. Concluding that saying 'but there are a million of strikes around the world' is a lazy argument against solidarity.

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

D4. Motion to Condemn The USU, Lifechoices, The Sydney University Conservative Club, and anyone who participates in Pro Life Activism or holds Pro Life Beliefs on Campus

Lifechoices is a dangerous and bigoted Pro Life organisation that has no place on campus. Its website claims that *“We aim to promote the dignity of human life from conception to natural death, through reasonable and informed discussion on the issues of abortion and euthanasia in Australian society.”* The notion that human life begins at conception is a false one, and the entire basis of LifeChoices as an organisation is built on lies and deception. The Pro Life philosophy is not about saving lives, rather it is a means to control Women and those with uteruses by restricting their access to reproductive healthcare.

It is deeply disgusting and shameful on the part of the USU that people who have accessed an abortion in particular had to witness the presence of LifeChoices at O-Week. An abortion is a deeply personal decision that is the business of no-one but the person having it. An organisation such as LifeChoices being given such prominence at O-Week is distressing in the extreme. Pro-lifers often say that Abortions cause depression and anxiety- to that I can say with absolute confidence that the dark months following my abortion were not due to the procedure itself, but because of groups such as LifeChoice peddling unscientific and hurtful nonsense. I wish for every person who is a member of LifeChoices, as well as those who hold Pro-Life beliefs, to know that they are deeply wrong and immoral, and that they personally contribute to the suffering of an immense number of people.

WoCo protested the stall on Friday, resulting in a video created by Lifechoices Australia that has garnered over 25 thousand views and many shares and comments, including some from the University of Sydney Conservative Club. This video has resulted in thousands of comments directed at the students in the video: comments suggesting that we should have been aborted, that we are fat, ugly and unfuckable, that we are terrorists, satanists and bolsheviks. We concede all of this as true apart from the ugly and unfuckable part: as mentioned in our council report we are both very attractive and get laid *a lot*.

Nonetheless this kind of behaviour is unacceptable, and commenting on a woman’s physical appearance in such a manner is misogynistic in the extreme. Thus, we move to condemn LifeChoices, the University of Sydney Conservative Club, the USU and any councillors or office bearers who hold these views for the above behaviours.

Action

1. That the SRC condemns the above mentioned
2. That the SRC affirms its status as pro-choice and in support of the safe access zones bill as proposed by Penny Sharpe
3. The SRC collectives use gender neutral language when talking about reproductive rights

Moved: Madeline Ward

Seconded: Jessica Syed

Madeline Ward read out the motion.

Lily Campbell noted that while she agreed that Life Choices and associates are “utter filth”, that abortion is a right and she thinks picketing an abortion clinic is horrible the exclusion zone policy is concerning. Lily elaborated saying that policies that prevent protests are concerning as they more often will affect those in the left, while picketing an abortion clinic is disgusting this is something to be aware of. Lily spoke to issues with point three saying that she completely agrees that Trans people should have safe access to reproductive control it’s wrong to remove women from the fight for reproductive rights, there is nothing wrong with saying anti-abortion policies are sexist and that the majority of people affected by them are women, stopping women from referring to this as a women’s issue can become both confusing and a form of censoring them.

Harry Gregg spoke to the motion saying that while he can understand Lily Campbell’s concern the Safe Access Zones policy is about the safety and wellbeing of women accessing an abortion. He continued noting that he doesn’t think saying ‘let’s not change the law, let organise a counter protest’ isn’t helpful. Harry felt it was selfish to say that this is about activists when it’s about making sure that those who need this service, are supported and protected.

Madeline Ward responded to Lily Campbell’s comments saying that she understands the concern about the Penny Sharpe Safe Access Zones Bill, and while she is not a lawyer she’s been told it is very specific to the clinics. Madeline noted that she is not for stopping protests in general, but she knows what it is like for people who help women get safely to the clinic and when people do counter protest it causes greater distress for those seeking the clinic’s services as they cannot tell who it who. I don’t agree with your comments on action point three about it censoring speech, it is about being inclusive.

Sarah Cutter Russel spoke against the motion saying that while she is pro-choice she doesn’t believe the council should be for shutting down people having a stall or from expressing their opinions, I think it’s important not to push those opinions underground where they can become more dangerous.

Chanum Torres said that the comments on Facebook were deeply misogynistic and were not made by members of the society and added that he agreed with Sarah Cutter-Russel that the council should not support shutting down Life Choices.

Lily Campbell said she doesn’t think that raising concerns around limitations on protests is self-indulgent or putting activist about the women seeking an abortion, she wanted to make the political point that the council should not support anything that prevents protests especially considering that much of the women’s rights movements have been fought through protest. She posed the question of what the right of workers would be if they wanted to strike and picket the clinic they worked at, would the proposed bill stop them making it easier for scab workers to be brought in?

Adriana Olguin Malavisi said that she was for shutting down anti-abortion groups as she is pro-choice but wasn’t sure why this motion talks about the USU and asked if they had the capacity to stop students creating a society.

Imogen Grant clarified the history of Life Choices as a society with the USU and the level of oversight the USU has over its clubs and societies, and that they can refuse to fund or support a society and have done so in the past.

Adriana Olguin Malavisi said she has some issues with the freedom of argument and asked where the issue is directed at the USU and not those running the society

Madeline Ward said that the USU had oversight as to who can have a stall at O-Week and she encouraged that those worried about freedom of speech to go tell someone who needed and abortion that the people at Life Choices, those who protest clinics, make death threats and rape threats against those women that they deserve their freedom of speech, and said if you do that are you really pro-choice.

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

D5. Rest In Power, Patrick Fisher

At our last council meeting I raised a developing news story of yet another murder of a black man at the hands of the police.

Thirty-one-year-old Patrick Fisher, father of three, was at his girlfriend's apartment on 7 February when police kicked down the door with a warrant for his arrest. Patrick was chased over the apartment balcony and plunged 13 storeys to his death. According to his family, Patrick's girlfriend, the only witness to the crime, was swiftly sedated and put in psychiatric care.

This is an appalling, but not uncommon story - Redfern police are infamous racists and have a history of murdering Aboriginal people with impunity. TJ Hickey, a young Kamilaroi man was murdered by police 14 years ago. Each year since, his family have marched for justice, protesting the outrageous injustice.

All around the country, the criminal justice system targets and tortures Aboriginal people. This is part of the ongoing genocidal and racist practices of the Australian state. A solution for this problem cannot be found within any of the structures that maintain oppression - the fight for Aboriginal rights will be won on the streets.

On May 12, FIRE have called a protest to stop black deaths in custody.

Platform:

1. The SRC reaffirms its commitment to standing against the oppression of Aboriginal people and in active solidarity with their struggle.
2. The SRC heavily condemns the actions of Redfern Police.

Action:

1. The SRC facebook page and all other collective facebook pages will strongly promote the upcoming May 12 rally.

Moved: Lily Campbell (Education Officer)

Seconded: Emma Norton

Lily waved her speaking rights to Gina -

Gina Elias spoke to the motion saying that this was a tragic event that was an example of the culture of police violence towards Indigenous people, and it was also an example of how the police are not here to serve and protect but to systematically target vulnerable people and groups. Gina continued saying she condemned the actions of the police and the lack of oversight and repercussions for police brutality.. Gina concluded encouraging everyone to both promote and attend the Rally on May 12 to End Black Deaths in Custody.

Paul Bova spoke to the motion, highlighting the protest and noted that shows like Sunrise want to encourage a second stolen generation, and that when people counter protested those statements they were silenced by sunrise showing old footage of an empty martin place.

Jazzlyn Breen spoke to the motion and hoped that no one in the council would vote it down adding that when people go to protests and rallies they need to remember that they are not once a year they need support year round so if people care don't just come to the Invasion Day rally, come to these smaller ones.

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

D6. Uncap CAPS

Preamble

The National Union of Students Wellbeing Report, conducted in 2016 alongside mental health organisation Headspace, found that 98% of university students aged 16-25 had experienced at least one symptom of a mental health problem which impacted their ability to study, 65% experienced high or very high psychological distress, and 35% experienced suicidal ideation or thoughts of self-harm. While these numbers are lower for mature aged students, their statistics too are far from ideal. Given the impact university education has on students' mental health, universities have an obvious moral obligation to provide mental health support services to the students whose mental health they damage.

At Sydney University, mental health support is provided primarily through Counselling and Psychological Services. Students have long expressed mixed views on the efficacy of CAPS — unsurprisingly given the complicated, deeply personal, and often unique factors which drive

individual mental health problems — but the service is clearly flawed. According to the Higher Education Standards Framework’s Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching Student Experience Survey (what a name), USyd is the lowest ranked Group of Eight university in terms of student support services, scoring only 58.7%. And while CAPS isn’t the only student support service and can’t be wholly blamed for that score, there are some features of the service which even students with generally favourable views of CAPS recognise as flaws.

The most jarring of these is that CAPS enforces a strict cap on the number of counselling sessions it will provide each student: 6, per year. Most students have 26 weeks of class each year, excluding Summer and Winter schools, in addition to 2 weeks of mid semester breaks, 2 weeks of stuvac, and 4 weeks of exam periods. That’s 34 weeks of class, study, assessments, and exams, of which they can receive mental health support for 6. While for some students with relatively minor and short-term mental health issues 6 weeks might be helpful, for anyone with moderate to severe mental health issues, which usually require long-term treatment options, 6 weeks will barely scratch the surface. Even if they were to seek mental health support outside of the university in addition to on-campus support, Medicare only covers 10 sessions per year, leaving them covered for a maximum of 16 out of 34 weeks at university unless they’re able to afford private mental healthcare. But even this best-case scenario is misleadingly optimistic because mental health problems, whether caused or merely exacerbated by university, don’t just disappear over the holidays; with CAPS as it currently stands and Medicare combined, students have 18 weeks of study and 36 weeks overall without any mental health support.

Adding insult to injury, Vice-Chancellor Michael Spence and the university administration defend the lacklustre condition of student mental health support services and the restrictions imposed upon them by suggesting it is “out of the Education Budget to run University health services”. The implication here is that students can’t have both a quality education and quality support services, an incredibly manipulative argument because Spence and the administration set these budgets in the first place. They could choose to fund health services out of any other section of the budget than education, such as marketing or executive remuneration; they choose not to. It is worth noting that Spence himself is paid \$1,400,000, which is just over 20 times the average salary of a counsellor.

Platform

1. The SRC demands that Counselling and Psychological Services uncap the total number of counselling sessions it offers each student per year.
2. The SRC demands that all additional funding required by Counselling and Psychological Services to uncap its counselling sessions be reallocated from sections of the budget other than the education budget.

Action

1. The SRC will publicise the position outlined in this motion through its regular publicity platforms, including but not limited to all its official social media account.
2. The Welfare Officers, in consultation with the Disabilities Officers, will organise a campaign on campus to achieve the demands outlined in this motion.

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Rebecca Miller

William Edwards spoke to his motion noting he was happy that the council had reached this motion and thanked councillors for attending. Williams went on to explain that support services and CAPS on campus have mixed reviews but that a consistent issue across the board is that there are only 6 sessions per student available per year and that is too few. William read out the motion's statistics noting that the excuse of the Vice Chancellor was that they can get more on Medicare, and this is not acceptable. International students are not covered by Medicare and having to constantly change providers poses its own issues as building a relationship of trust is needed for therapy to be effective. William suggested if the University needed to find the funding to increase the number of sessions available to students they could take if from Michaels Spence's salary and bonuses. William concluded asking the council to support the motion, as the University of Sydney is the lowest ranked of the G8 universities in this area.

Rebecca Miller spoke to the motion noting that William Edwards has covered a lot of the content adding that just 6 sessions is not enough and that the welfare department are planning to run a campaign on this matter.

Thomas Manousaridis spoke in to the motion noting that this was particularly hard for students who have to travel long distances to get to University and they should not have to seek external services that might not be adequate where they are.

Tim Seguna spoke to the motion saying he was shocked by USyd's ranking.

William Edwards added that he has begun research on this and is hoping to work with other student organisations to see what is working at other universities.

Imogen Grant spoke to the motion noting that USyd's ranking lowest in G8 in almost every area, which is why they are starting to look at the student experiences more. Adding that sadly they seem focused on short term fixes.

Dane Luo spoke to the motion saying that she has experience working with student services at the university here and that there are number of students that find these services valuable but agreed that even with Medicare supplementing it's still less than one appointment per fortnight, and that there needed to be more funding for CAPS.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying the Vice Chancellor Michael Spence made things worse for students, student have a higher rate of stress as they need to take on more work to keep up with the high costs of living, large class sizes and cuts to education noting this it is understandable that students mental health would suffer.

Rebecca Miller added that there was no limit raise set in the motion, as she did not feel there should be a limit on students getting the help they need.

The motion was put and CARRIED

D7. Stand By Me

Preamble

The NSW Government will cut all funding to disability advocacy organisations across the state from 30th June 2018. While the NSW Government is using the diversion of funding to the National Disability Insurance Scheme as a pretext to justify this total funding cut, the NDIS does not undertake any disability advocacy whatsoever; its funding exclusively covers service providers, rather than advocates. In fact, the federal Productivity Commission's Report into the NDIS explicitly states "that Australian State and Territory should continue to fund disability advocacy organisations" as other states are doing. This is because the NDIS cannot and was never intended to undertake disability advocacy.

Yet in NSW, without state funding, up to 50 specialist disability advocacy organisations will be forced to close after 30th June. This would be disastrous for people with disability for several reasons. Professional disability advocates undertake individual and systemic advocacy as well as information provision, representation, and capacity building. Their work is vital to defending and improving the living standards of people with disability, many of whom experience exploitation by businesses, political groups, and even non-profit services and who rely on the support of expert disability advocates to resolve these issues and to pursue reforms which prevent them from rearing down the line. Yet from 30th June, chances are there may be no available disability advocates they can turn to if they have issues with education, discrimination, health, justice, transport, employment, access, etc — all areas not covered by the NDIS. These disability advocates already operate on shoestring budgets and struggle to meet community demand; they should be expanded, not closed.

Fortunately, this total funding cut to disability advocacy organisations is not inevitable, though without immediate community action the prognosis is bleak. To this effect the NSW Disability Advocacy Alliance, a coalition of 18 disability advocacy organisations in NSW, is running the Stand By Me campaign to save disability advocacy in NSW. The campaign's primary goal is to continue disability advocacy organisations' collective state funding of \$13,000,000 past the 30th June expiry date set by the NSW Government. This is an extremely modest amount when considered in the wider context of NSW Government expenditure, such as its plan to spend \$2,500,000,000 on just

two sport stadiums, recently revised to cost \$500,000,000 less than first forecast. While at a cost of \$13,000,000, disability advocacy organisations would cost the NSW Government just 0.65% of the \$2,000,000,000 they're spending on stadiums and would represent just 2.6% of the \$500,000,000 "savings" accrued through their revised plan. The money to fund disability advocacy in NSW demonstrably exists and is available to the NSW Government, whose decision to cut all disability advocacy funding is clearly a result, not of the NDIS or of fiscal prudence, but of a total lack of respect and compassion for people with disability and their rights.

Platform

1. The SRC endorses the NSW Disability Advocacy Alliance's Stand By Me campaign and demands the NSW Government meet all demands of that campaign, chiefly that it commit to maintaining current levels of disability advocacy funding in NSW (\$13,000,000 per annum) after June 30th.
2. The SRC recognises that the NSW Government's decision to cut all disability advocacy funding in NSW is ableist and for this reason condemns that government.

Action

1. The SRC will promote the Stand By Me campaign across its regular publicity platforms, including but not limited to all its official social media accounts.
2. Councillors and Officers will disseminate Stand By Me materials among and promote the campaign to other student groups they are active within.
3. After this meeting, Councillors and Proxies in attendance will take a Stand By Me photo petition and sign campaign postcards to be sent to the NSW Government.

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Harry Gregg

William Edwards spoke the motion saying the motion is to be withdrawn as the matter has been won and the government has withdrawn their motion, which would cut the funding to disability advocacy. He concluded saying "up with Disability Advocacy and down with Gladys."

MOTION WITHDRAWN

D8. No Title

Preamble:

The duties of the President as outlined in the SRC Constitution and Regulations shall be:

Part Two – Officers of Council:

1. The President

- (f) To attend all meetings of the Council, the Executive, and to be concerned with the activities of the Council and its Committees in all areas;
- (r) To present both a written and verbal report to each regular Council meeting.

- (w) The President shall be entitled to be a member *ex-officio* of any committee or sub-committee of the Council, and shall have a deliberative vote on every such committee except that the President shall not be a member *ex-officio* of the Staff Committee.

The SRC President sits on a number of councils including The University Education Committee and the Student Consultative Committee.

The purpose of UE Committees is to:

1. Contribute to the ongoing development and implementation of University strategy;
2. Review operational matters and consider business-as-usual matters;
3. Consider planning and prioritisation proposals within the portfolio;
4. Monitor performance against domain KPIs; and
5. Be a conduit for institutional discussion and faculty discussions in the domain.

The purpose of the Student Consultative Committee is to:

1. Provide regular consultation between the University and the representative student associations;
2. Be a channel to consult with students on policy matters relating to student experience and welfare; and
3. Have appropriate direct student representation.

The President is in the privileged position of representing both students and Councillors when they sit on these committees. They have the means of both putting forth the concerns of the student body, as well as providing their perspective on matters raised by the University. This is one of the highest platforms that a student has with University Executive, which is also of frequent occurrence. This year there have already been two UE Committees and the President has made no mention of what has taken place. It is our concern that the President is not fulfilling their duties in representing this Council, its Councillors, or the students of this University during their attendance at such meetings.

Motions:

1. That the President informs Council of upcoming University Executive Committee Meetings and of any items they intend to put forward to the Committee.
2. That the President provides Councillors a summary of the University Executive Committee Meetings at the SRC Council which follows.
3. That the President grants any Councillor access to University Executive Committee Meeting Minutes upon their request, through the President's official email. The access of these minutes by Councillors would be in accordance with any such confidentiality clause that may exist.

Mover: Tim Seguna

Secunder: Adriana Malavisi

Tim Seguna spoke to his motion outlining its content adding that the aim was he would like to see greater transparency in University committee meetings and for councillors to have access to the minutes of these meetings where confidentiality permits.

Adriana Olguin Malavisi spoke to the motion saying that this was not meant as a personal attack, and that she had great respect for Imogen Grant (President). I do think there needs to be more transparency as these are important meetings for students.

Imogen Grant passed the chair to Maya Eswaran for the duration of the motion.

Imogen Grant spoke against the motion saying while she believes it s an honest mistake to think she is not reporting back from these meetings, as she doesn't preface report backs by saying "the UE meeting this date" the reportback come in the form of letting the council know where the university is at with regards to anonymous marking, or that the university is focusing on student safety, these are the discussions that occur in UE meetings and that I report back on in my council, exec and Honi reports. Imogen expanded on this saying that much of these meetings are spent going no where and noting happened, when there are things that happen or things that are changing they are included in my reports. She added that she was not aware that there was demand for a more detailed bureaucracy oriented reports. Imogen continued saying that this motion reads like a petty factional power play, she asked that the council vote this motion down and that is it petty factionalism such as this that contributes little and makes the council look bad. She said id the council was interesting in a more detailed breakdown of every committee meeting she is happy to comply but felt that keeping the report back limited to what was directly effecting student seems more efficient, she concluded letting the council know she sits on over 10 committees so those reports could become much longer if every agenda item is to be address in every report.

Lily Campbell spoke against the motions calling it a bureaucratic right wing jab at the President. Adding that if there were things the movers would like to know they could ask about them in the meeting like is happening now. Lily continued saying this was coming from the groups it was as Imogen Grant has been targeted by them for taking more political stances as president compared to her predecessors. Concluding that she for one doesn't want to hear about what is happening in these committees but about the political work being done.

Harry Gregg spoke against the motion saying that past President Isabella Brook was a great president but he will not be voting for this motion as if we had a President that was hiding things for us this would be valid however this is not the case and there are plenty of opportunities for Councillors, Officer Bearers and students to ask her questions and that he has never felt as though she was inapproachable or unwilling to respond to any questions.

Vinil Kumar spoke against the motion citing agreement with Lily Campbell 's assessment of the motion,

adding that this is about what the council perceives as the role of the President and he see that as an activist not a bureaucrat and that as president Imogen has been very active as an activist.

Imogen Grant said she would like to make the point that everything she made in her report to council on the 4th bar the discussion on SSAF was discusses in UE meetings.

Tim Seguna responded thanking Imogen Grant for responding to the concerns in the motion adding that this was coming from not knowing what was on the agenda at the UE meeting and therefore not knowing what was being reported back from them. Time continued saying in response to Lily Campbell's comments that this is not about what he thinks the President should be doing but what the regulations mandate they do.

Hersha Kadkol spoke against the motion saying that the council has seen similar motions this year but this was more insidious in it's presentation, unlike the one that attempted to criticise Imogen for the SRC's Facebook posts. She added that she didn't think it was the role of the President to participate in the running and managing of this institution but to represent students that they should be working on mandated from the SRC not on what a bureaucrat wants to know.

Pranay Jha said that they felt Imogen was a good president and gave good report backs as he also sits on several of these committees with her.

The motion was put and **FAILED**.

D9. Stand in Solidarity with Gaza #GreatReturnMarch

Every year since 1976, Palestinians have commemorated Land Day -when Israel illegally confiscated large swathes of Palestinian land and displaced Palestinians in order to build illegal Israeli settlements. This year in Gaza the commemorations took a mass character, with around 30,000 Gazans attending the Land Day protest.

Israel has maintained a military blockade on Gaza and its 2.2 million occupants since 2007, which has seen the continual degradation and destruction of basic living standards. Unemployment in Gaza is the highest in the world: Israel has continually confiscated land related to employment and has heavily regulated major industries like agriculture and fishing, making it very difficult for Palestinians to find work. Last year the last power plant in Gaza was shut down due to lack of resources, leaving Gazans with as little as two hours a week of electricity. Major hospitals have been shut down and those left open are barely operational. Israel's frequent bombings of the area, and the blockade which prevents building materials from entering, have put the Gaza strip and its people on the brink of total collapse and catastrophe. This is a major humanitarian crisis.

The mass character of this year's Land day is a retaliation to the breakdown of these social conditions, and is part of an ongoing movement called the Great March of Return - a peaceful protest movement with the goal of drawing attention to the plight of Palestinian refugees. This is a particularly important demand for Gazans, as 80% of the population are refugees from other parts of historic Palestine.

This mass, peaceful demonstration turned into a massacre when Israel deployed over 100 snipers to fire on protesters. Israel killed 17 Palestinians and injured over 1500. This was premeditated murder. A quote from the twitter of the Israeli "Defense" force read: "Yesterday we saw 30,000 people; we arrived prepared and with precise reinforcements. Nothing was carried out uncontrolled; everything was accurate and measured, and we know where every bullet landed".

Platform:

1. The SRC stands in solidarity with Palestinians as they continue their struggle for Self-determination
2. The SRC supports the right of return for Palestinian refugees
3. The SRC condemns Israel's massacre of Palestinians at the Land Day protest
4. The SRC condemns Israel's blockade of Gaza which has led to the degradation of Palestinian living standards

Action:

1. The SRC endorses the protest called to stand in solidarity with Gaza on May 2nd at USyd by sharing it from the SRC facebook page
2. The SRC encourages it's office bearers to attend the protest on May 2
3. The SRC activist collectives will share the Facebook event for the protest on May 2
4. The SRC will endorse future protests in Sydney in support of the Palestinians, including by the USyd Students for Palestine group.

Moved: Harsha Kadkol

Seconded: Paul Bover

Hersha Kadkol spoke to her motion noting that what is happening in Palestine with these protests is of huge importance. She said that Palestinians have always been told to be non-violent and they need to stop defending themselves, now they are protesting and demanding the right to return to their homelands which were stolen from them in 1945. She said that they have been fighting the apartheid state of Israel for this and that Palestinians in Gaza deal with constant attacks from Israel. She also noted that the Australian Government supports Israel and so it is important for the SRC to take a strong stance in support of the right of Palestinians to return.

Paul Bova amended the dates of the protests as the original protest the motion was written for had already passed. He spoke the motion noting the good attendance at the last protest

and that there has been good support from students to stand with Palestine. He added that there is a history of support for this issue and supporting BDS movements from this organisation, and that students understand that this is not a two-sided situation but a one-sided genocide of the Palestinian people.

Jazzlyn Breen advised the council that if they were not aware of what is happening in Palestine that they go watch a recording of the protest which goes for three hours and has visuals of burning tyres being thrown at the Palestinian protesters.

Dana Segall spoke to the motion saying that she fully supports the idea of the motion and think that support work is some of the best work that the SRC does. However she feels there is an issue with double standards as mentioned earlier in the meeting. While she thinks the motion's first platform point is great the people who have put this motion forward tonight are the same ones who refused to support a motion condemning anti-Semitism and shamed people who didn't want to support an amendment to that motion. She concluded saying she felt that not supporting a motion for one oppressed minority but to put a motion forward on behalf of another was a hypocrisy that tarnished the intent of the motion.

Emilia Bode spoke to the motion noting the rally the week before.

Vinil Kumar responded to Dana Segall's comment saying there was no hypocrisy, he is against anti-Semitism and has fought anti-Semitism on campus. He continued saying it was not hypocritical to support Indigenous rights and Palestinian rights as they are both indigenous peoples who are under attack. Adding that there are now 31 people dead from the actions of Israel at these protests, and that he supports the right of Palestinians to have equal rights in their own nation.

Dana Segall responded saying that hypocrisy is not in standing with indigenous peoples but the refusal to stand against anti-Semitism that you are for Palestinian self-determination but not Jewish self-determination.

Lily Campbell responded to Dana Segall saying that many abstained from last council's motion not for anti-Semitic reasons, that she has been actively involved in chasing anti-Semites off this campus, the reason for abstaining from that motion was because the definition provided allowed for criticism of the State of Israel to be called anti-Semitic. Adding that criticising a state as racist is not anti-Semitic, and that the state of Israel is, especially when they are currently rejecting Jewish African Refugees.

Jazzlyn Breen responded to Dana Segall saying that in talking about the hypocrisy she is being selective is what people said to make the point, and that in phrasing it as this side of the room against that side, and that you forget that the people behind you are the ones who had a

Holocaust denier supporting their presidential candidate.

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 9:22.