



**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 4<sup>th</sup> regular meeting of the 90<sup>th</sup> SRC held on **Wednesday the 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2018**. Meeting held in the New Law SR 344, New Law Annex.

---

*Secretary to council called for a Quorum count at 6:30pm  
The meeting was found inquorate.*

*Motion to wait another 30 min for quorum.*

*Moved: Vinil Kumar*

*Seconded: Thomas Manousaridis*

*The motion was put can CARRIED.*

*A quorum count was requested at 6:36*

*The Secretary to Council called a quorum count at 6:36pm.*

*The meeting was found quorate.*

### A. Meeting open at 6:37pm

#### A1. Election of Deputy Chairperson

The Chair moved that Nina Dillon Britton 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:**

Chanum Torres to Dane Luo

Hao Zhou

Zixuan Wei

Hersha Kadkol to Emma Norton

James Gibson to Hektor Vineburg  
Bella Pytka to Willabel Bennett  
George Bishop  
Zixuan Wei  
Caitlin Mcmenamin  
Tim Seguna

Motion to accept the apologies and proxies  
Moved: William Edwards  
Seconded: Seth Dias  
The motion was put can **CARRIED.**

**D. Changes to Membership**

**E. Electoral Report**

**F. Minutes.**

Minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> regular and 1<sup>st</sup> special meeting of the 90th SRC held on 4<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> April were circulated

Motion: that the minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> regular and 1<sup>st</sup> special meeting of the 90th SRC be accepted.  
Moved: William Edwards  
Seconded: Thomas Manousaridis  
The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

**G. Business Arising from the Minutes**

There was no business for this item.

**H. Question Time** of 15 minutes, which may be extended by resolution for a further 15 minutes.

**I. Visitor's Business**

There was no visitors business

**J. Report of the Undergraduate Fellow of Senate**

**K. Elections**

**L. Report of the President and Executive**

**L1. Executive Minutes**

Minutes of the Executive meetings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2018 were circulated.

Motion: that the minutes of the Executive meeting of the 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2018.

Moved: Harry Gregg

Seconded: Maya Eswaran

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

## **L2. Report of the Executive**

Report of the executive from the 4<sup>th</sup> April to 1<sup>st</sup> May 2018.  
The report was circulated and noted.

*The President deferred the Chair to the Deputy Chairperson.*

## **L3. President's Report**

Imogen Grant tabled a written report:

### **Sexual Assault Policy**

The University is currently establishing a stand-alone sexual assault policy. The SRC Casework, Women's Officers and myself are now involved in consultations about what should be included in the policy.

The existence of a stand-alone, coherent and substantive university sexual assault and harassment policy and procedure, together with an easily accessible reporting mechanism, can greatly facilitate reports of sexual violence and appropriate redress.

The re-telling of an account of sexual assault or harassment to multiple parties (from first responders, to university legal officers, to medical services) can be a fragmented, confusing and overwhelming experience for victims of sexual violence and can act as a disincentive to reporting. This consideration underlies the need for the existence of a simple, unified reporting process that limits the need for repeat accounts to numerous university units or agencies (but ensures their appropriate interaction in meeting the needs of the student).

It is our view that the stand-alone policy must include:

- a prominent statement of express prohibition and clear definitions of proscribed conduct;
- reporting mechanisms that guarantee anonymous and confidential reports of sexual violence;
- incorporates simple, fair, accessible and robust procedures founded on principles of natural justice that support the prompt and appropriate investigation of complaints
- provide undertakings regarding privacy, confidentiality and the secure storage of information
- be sensitively framed and culturally appropriate and should apply to staff and students across all sites of university-related activity, including residential colleges, offshore campuses, university-affiliated travel, internship programs and the use of online technology
- clarify the difference between disclosing and reporting a case of sexual assault or harassment for investigative purposes
- clarify the difference between internal disciplinary processes and external criminal investigations, and specify how complaints are handled internally by the university pending any criminal investigation
- specify interim measures available to students during the internal investigation of a complaint.

The University maintains that it is a mandatory reporter as in NSW, under s 316 of the Crimes Act 1900 (NSW), any person who fails to report information pertaining to a 'serious indictable offence' to the police without a reasonable excuse may face two years' imprisonment. A 'serious indictable offence' is any offence that is punishable by imprisonment for five years or more, such as sexual assault and indecent assault. However, depending on the facts of each case, certain individuals, 'in the course of practising or following a profession, calling or vocation' (such as lawyers, doctors, psychologists and nurses) may be free from prosecution under s 316 if they obtained the information in the course of their professional or religious duties.

This raises many concerns as it reasonably discourages victims from seeking support and medical assistance due to fears of police intervention. Despite these concerns and a recommendation by the Law Reform Commission for the section to be repealed, s 316 remains in place. As a result, the university must guarantee victim confidentiality when making reports to the police and assure the victim that their report will be de-identified.

### **AJ Documentary**

These consultations come at a time when Al Jazeera released a documentary titled 'Australia: Rape on Campus' which focuses on the experiences of international student survivors of sexual assault. The Human Rights Commission's 'Change the Course' report found that five percent (or 7665) of international students are sexually assaulted each year, with more than a quarter of incidents happening in a university setting.

Some international students are afraid to report sexual violence due to social isolation, fear they will be blamed for their assault, and due to the belief that their student visa may be affected. The threat of visa cancellation is often used by abusers.

The National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 requires universities to give overseas students information about living and studying in Australia, including information about safety on campus and while living in Australia. Education providers must comply with the National Code to maintain their registration to provide education services to overseas students. It is atrocious that universities are not giving this vital information to international students and are failing to meet basic legal requirements.

### **May Day**

Workers' rights are under vicious attack by employers, the Liberal Government, and the Fair Work Commission. Employers are tearing up legally binding Enterprise Agreements and locking out workers who try to negotiate better wages and conditions. Construction workers face special laws that try to prevent them from organising. Unions that exercise their right to strike face massive fines. Wage growth is at historic lows and 40% of Australians are in insecure work.

Notably, the FWC recently ruled against the Equal Pay rise for early childhood educators who are being paid around \$21 per hour with diploma-level or university-level training. To add insult to injury, with the new reduction in the HECS repayment threshold these workers - many of whom are university graduates - will be paying back their debt whilst they're barely earning above the minimum wage and are struggling with daily expenses. Early childhood educators are the working poor. It is clear that the system is broken and in favour of bosses.

But workers are preparing for a fight back. The Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) has recently launched the Change the Rules campaign which hopes to give all working people the basic rights they need to improve their living standards.

However, there is no prospect that the rules will change in any significant way without a serious industrial campaign by the union movement. That is the lesson of the entire history of the union movement.

As a result, the left of the union movement are calling on the ACTU to escalate the campaign against the FWC and to push for the right to strike. It is only through the right to strike that we will rebuild the power of workers and their unions.

THIS Sunday the SRC is hosting a Strike to Change the Rules Contingent at the May Day Rally. We will be meeting at 10am at the corner of Pitt St and Market St, and then march to the rally at Hyde Park North. Last week we had a very successful placard making session and we will finalise a large banner later this week.

**Details:**

**Name:** Strike to Change the Rules: Student Contingent at May Day 2018

**Time:** 10am

**Place:** Corner of Pitt St and Market St

**Link:** <https://www.facebook.com/events/562040017504718/>

**Academic Board Report Back**

**Centralisation**

The Student Administration Services (SAS) released a post-implementation review into the centralisation of faculty services and the operation of the student facing admin (e.g. the Student Centre) in general.

The 222-page report has to be one of the weirdest reports I have read in a long time. It lacks any introspection and despite being a post-implementation review does not include any feedback from students.

They refer to a drop in denial rates for special con of 7% in 2017 (compared to 2016) and attribute this to students better understanding the system now— curiously no mention of how many applications they were unreasonably rejecting in semester 1 2016, I suspect the improved assessing of applications is more likely to have contributed to the drop in denied applications.

It also includes strange feedback such as this - “Given how noisy this institution is, it was generally all low level rumbling rather than an uproar and outcry which is a good sign overall. This indicates that everything was actually well managed and that there was in fact an appropriate level of engagement generally with faculties.” I didn’t realise this was a formal way to measure performance!

Some concerns about SAS:

1. The Student Centre routinely provides student with incorrect advice. This is particularly the case where students are seeking complex advice around enrollment, transfers to new degrees, credit, increased mobility with parts of courses (and credit issues with that), mid year entry, suspensions (especially for international students), combined degrees - with many of these issues interacting together
2. This is all compounded by a loss of institutional knowledge/memory from faculty offices (because the university fired most faculty administration). Advice and decisions require significant knowledge and skill, so sometimes require quick of specialist responses from academic staff (e.g. around credit, or discretionary decisions requiring waiving prerequisites or other degree requirements, or international students suspending or reducing workload)
3. The Student Centre does not document the details of student enquiries received. Difficult to track if incorrect advice was given. It also creates difficulties tracking the progress of student issues and providing medium-long term advice for more complex issues. Follow up student enquiries are very "error-prone" because of this
4. Long wait times at the Student Centre, especially during peak periods
5. Issues around the bureaucratic application of policy and procedures relating to special considerations and special arrangements
6. Faculty Services often has to refer students to faculties for decision making. The Student Centre and Faculty Services do not have a complete list academic advisors meaning that many students are just told to "look at their handbook" or are misdirected with different and sometimes incorrect responses being received.

### **Ramsay Centre**

During the Vice-Chancellor's report, Spence raised that the University is applying for funding from the Ramsay Centre for Western Civilisation to run one of its courses titled "Themes in the History of Western Civilisation". From memory, the course will be taught by Peter Anstey from FASS. It is uncertain what the ETA is for implementation, but it will have to be approved by the Undergraduate Studies Committee and Academic Board before it can be taught. Spence will presumably place members under considerable pressure to approve the course.

The Ramsay Centre is funded by a \$3 billion bequest by Australian businessman and top Liberal party donor Paul Ramsay. Despite Spence saying that academic freedom will be maintained, Ramsay Centre CEO Paul Haines said they will review all course content, not hire staff who have criticised Western civilisation and withdraw all funding if they don't think a course is sufficiently pro-West.

Imogen Grant spoke to her report.

Motion to accept the report of the President.

Moved: Thomas Manousaridis

Seconded: Will Edwards

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

### **M. Report of the Vice-Presidents**

*There was no report from the vice presidents.*

## N. Report of the General Secretaries

Nina Dillon Britton tabled a written report:

SSAF submitted!

- We asked for: fair pay
- Did not end up agreeing with other student organisations, I don't think anyone except for maybe SUPRA went into the negotiations with much hope of coming to agreement.
- This is much later in the year than it has been before, because SOMEONE was booted from the uni admin. Will mean that the budget is later in the year than it has been before. Can't start budget until we know how much we get from SSAF. I think this will at least be a month or two.

SRC Newsletter is out!

- As I foreshadowed a little while ago, I've added all OB and councillors to the mailing list. You can unsubscribe if you want though.
- If people have any more events they would like to promote, please let me know. We have almost 500 subscribers, so can reach new audiences.

University Data Collection

- Working on the Logistics and Analytics Committee has allowed me to have more information about the sort of data collected on students.
- A few concerning conclusions:
  - The university is collects wifi user location data.
  - There is no centralised public place where you can find out the sort of data that the University collects about you.
  - There is not even a comprehensive list of the sort of data that is collected about students. I have been told this is impossible to put together, which is concerning to say the least.
- I will be writing to the chair of the committee (Pip Patterson) about the possibility of putting even a non-comprehensive list of the sorts of data collected about students and make this publicly available.

Rad Ed Organising Meeting

- Happened tonight! Woo! I'm writing this before it has happened so have nothing to say re: that.  
Nina Added in the meetings:
- Want to make sure that this doesn't clash with services week
- We are working to get a number of events and off uni guest speakers

Survey as to experiences of students with centralised administration

- Will be working with the Casework Department. Want to put together a survey for students at Sydney Uni about their experiences with Student Services.
- Has come out through Academic Board that a recent review of this for students has not included any student feedback. Crazy!

- Should be able to put out this survey to show what we anecdotally know: that centralised student services make information difficult or impossible to find, often meaning students are given no or contradictory advice. This is as a result of the University's attempt to cut costs in its restructure, resulting in (whether intentional or not) students having to repeat units, extend their degrees or not be able to graduate when they want to. All of this results in students extending and paying more for their degrees, helping the University's bottom line.

Dane Lou spoke to the report asking if Nina Dillon Britton was aware of Clause 7.4 of the University's record keeping policy 2017 which states:

“(4) The University's business must be appropriately recorded.

(a) Records must be made to document or facilitate the transaction of any University business activity.

(i) Records can be automatically generated by a business system or deliberately made by a person involved in the transaction.”

Nina Dillon Britton said she thought that the University may believe they are compliant, and while they may have collected the data, they don't have a document that give an overarching view of what and how that data can be used. She thanked Dane Lou for bringing the policy to her attention and she would raise it with Pip Patterson.

Manning Jeffery asked for a clarification of what that university is gathering, asking if it was just the meta data or more.

Nina Dillon Britton replied that she does not have a comprehensive list of what data information the University collects but knows they collect Wi-Fi location data so could track people to specific locations.

Motion: that the report of the General Secretaries be accepted.

Moved: Harry Gregg

Seconded: Thomas Manousaridis

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

## **O. Report of Committees and Officers**

### **O1. Report of the Education Officers**

Lily Campbell and Lara Sonnenchein tabled a written report:

Today the education officers took part in a speak out organised by students for Palestine against Israel's massacres in Gaza. In five weeks of protests, 46 people have been killed, and hundreds more have been badly wounded. The action aimed to raise awareness of the issue and encourage solidarity with Palestine amongst the student population. The day was a success, both Lara and myself sought to draw the links between Palestine solidarity and our ongoing books not bombs campaign.



Our recent collective meeting agreed to take on building for the Black Deaths in Custody rally as a priority - we will be poster, leafleting and dropping a banner in the coming weeks to build for the protest. Please contact me if you'd like to help with this work and be a host of the student contingent Facebook event!

This weekend is the May Day rally and the EAG is taking part in the strike to change the rules contingent. We are meeting an hour before the rally for a speak out with the other groups involved.

In terms of political developments, it's been discovered that the university is planning on running an Arts course in Western Civilisation with the Ramsay centre - an organisation whose board includes Tony Abbott, John Howard, Kim Beazley and Joe de Bruyn. We will be looking for opportunities to protest this in the future.

Yesterday during a graduation ceremony, one of the graduates dropped a banner that demanded the university cut its ties to weapons manufacturers. This was an excellent action and shows the way forward I think with the books not bombs campaign on campus - campus actions and awareness building should continue to be a focus.

The latest budget is soon to be released by the Turnbull government - whilst it will definitely be a classic class war budget from the liberals, continuing to gut social services, especially welfare, I think it's quite unlikely to include significant attacks on education. Thus our capacity to organise a large demonstration similar to years past is somewhat limited. Regardless, we will be planning a speak out on campus following the budget in order to continue flying the flag for free education and against the militarisation of universities. Watch this space.

Lily Campbell spoke to the report, and expressed disappointment that a number of people have not been attending meetings or helping build rallies with the collective, mentioning the Labor left faction NLS in particular.

Will Edwards asked if there would be an NDA after the budget.

Lily Campbell said that as was noted in her report there will be a speak out after the budget

Motion: that the report of the Education Officers be accepted.

Moved: Vinil Kumar

Seconded: Thomas Manousaridis

The motion was put and **CARRIED**

## **O2. Report of the Wom\*n's Officers**

Madeline Ward and Jessica Syed tabled a written report:

The mid-semester break has been as busy for students as the past few weeks have been for those who have been pushing for safe access zones around abortion clinics in New South Wales. The amendment to a current public health act proposed by Penny Sharpe MLC, would make it so that it would be a criminal offence to protest within one hundred and fifty metres of any NSW abortion clinic. This would alleviate the intimidation and harassment patients are subject to when going to

abortion clinics, when there are hoards of pro-life protesters attempting to stop them from entering the facilities. It would also get rid of the unnecessary burden placed on clinic staff to counsel and reassure patients, something that they are not necessarily paid (nor qualified) to do. If one reads the bill, it is not proposed that protest is banned from the area, so staff could still go on strike if they so decide. The legislation is very specific in outlawing intimidation and harassment specific to abortion.

Abortion is an issue of public health, and access to abortion clinics an issue of public safety. No one should be precluded from accessing essential healthcare due to strangers intruding on their personal space, in order to voice their opinions. The successful passage of the proposed bill is an important stepping stone in building a solid and visible movement around abortion rights. In our opinion, it will inevitably open the door to decriminalisation of abortion in New South Wales (yes, that's right – you could still be prosecuted for having an abortion).

Your officers have been in contact with Family Planning NSW who are currently looking at drafting a decriminalisation bill along with other feminist groups. More pressing, however, is our correspondence with Penny herself. In a conference call last week, she informed us that the bill will be introduced and debated within the next month. Keep your eyes peeled for actions organised by the Wom\*n's Collective that you can get involved in helping the bill get passed. If you're a Liberal/conservative/et cetera, and you're against abortion, and you're reading this: while this bill is linked to abortion, it largely revolves around women's safety. If you can't get behind that, well, there's not much we can say to you. Otherwise, get in touch with your MPs, and get them on our side, please! The bill will be debated in the next two weeks.

To help, sign the petition <http://www.pennysharpe.com/womenneedsafeaccesszones>. We also have a weekly clinic escort service where (until the legislation comes through) we assist patients into abortion clinics past pro-life protestors, and generally do feminist things as well. We are also doing our own edition of Honi Soit later this semester. Send your ideas to the aforementioned email! We can't wait to get the ball rolling.

On another note, we will, alongside Imogen, be attending a consultation on campus sexual assault policy with director of student services, Jordi Austin in the coming weeks, and are sceptical that it will be as productive as we all like but are nonetheless hopeful that it is.

Motion: that the report of the Wom\*n's Officers be accepted.

Motion: Maya Eswaran

Seconded: Liam Thorne

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

## **P. Special Business**

There were no items of special business.

### **Q1. Say no to anti-Chinese racism**

#### **Preamble**

Australian society has seen in recent times a growing trend of racism directed towards the Chinese community. Anti-Chinese racism has seen ebbs and flows in Australian history, emerging around the time of the gold rush, manifesting in the racist nationalist agenda of the White Australia Policy, and also appearing in Pauline Hanson's vile bigotry that Australia was under threat of being "swamped by Asians" and a "yellow peril" fear that was whipped up by the Howard government to some extent in the 1990s. And today, the Australian ruling class is once again jumping on stoking an anti-China hysteria that has had some particularly brazen and disgusting manifestations as of late.

There has been ongoing scaremongering whipped up in the media, and reinforced by politicians from both the Liberal and the Labor parties, which has taken the form of stoking fear of Chinese influence in Australia through property buying and political donations. From stalwarts of the conservative press through to more supposedly left wing or liberal sources like the ABC, many an 'investigative' piece has expressed deep shock and concern at Chinese political and business influence-peddling and investment in Australia. This is not about politicians and the media cracking down on business' interference in politics (they media regularly remains silent about Australian companies paying \$0 in tax, or on the donations of other foreign Western business people to Australian political parties) - this is a cynical and hypocritical scaremongering campaign aimed at whipping up anti-Chinese hysteria.

And the latest notorious example of this, is the publishing of Clive Hamilton's book *"Silent Invasion: China's Influence in Australia"*, which says that the Chinese Communist Party is manipulating the Australian Chinese population to erode the Australian government, a claim likened by critics to the paranoia and fear of yellow peril conspiracies seen in the Cold War. Clive Hamilton is a member of the Australian Greens who himself came second as a Greens candidate in the 2009 by-election in the seat of Higgins, in south-east Melbourne. The publishing of this book (or more accurately, racist propaganda) was lauded by former Greens leader Christine Milne and Greens politicians such as Ben Pennings in Queensland - despite Pennings often having good stances on refugees or Indigenous issues, it appears anti-China racism is one bandwagon he's happy to jump on.

It's worth being clear why anti-Chinese racism is making such a comeback. China has established itself in the past few decades as the key economic and imperialist rival to the world's biggest superpower, the US. China has become the world's second-largest economy and is expected to overtake the US by 2020. Obviously, this is unacceptable to US capitalism and is a threat to the Western establishment aligned with the US. The relative decline of America as a world power, and the rise of China's economic and military capacity, is threatening America's position in the world order, and we've seen the growth of tensions hinting towards war between these two superpowers. Australia's remains a loyal ally of the US and its aims of maintaining its position as global superpower. Australia has followed the US into war in Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq - and now the Australian political class is happy to gear up towards confrontation with China. The stoking of anti-Chinese racism by the media and politicians is part and parcel of this imperialist agenda. Anti-Chinese racism has also played a role as a scapegoat. Foreign Chinese political and business influence has been blamed as the cause for exorbitant house prices and the rising cost of living, drawing attention away from the real cause - the anti-working class policies of successive ALP and LNP governments.

Last year white supremacists at Monash and Melbourne universities put up posters in stilted Chinese saying that all Chinese international students were not welcome and could be deported. The far-right have jumped on and ran with the anti-China scare that has been opened up by the mainstream media and politicians, and now members of the Greens are proudly putting their name to this same whip-up of anti-China racist hysteria that we've seen give gall to the far right.

As the SRC, we need to stand stridently against racism in all its forms, and stand with the Chinese student body in the face of this racist beat-up coming the Australian political class has been concocting. And in an era that looks to be potentially leading up to the break-out of another imperialist conflict, we can't be regurgitating or endorsing the kind of xenophobic propaganda that our government will be using to justify war.

**Platform:**

1. The SRC recognises the rise in anti-Chinese racism that has been fostered by the Australian political class and the press, as war tensions between the US and China increase.
2. The SRC opposes any and all forms of racism, including anti-Chinese racism.
3. The SRC denounces the book *"Silent Invasion: China's Influence in Australia"* by Clive Hamilton, and recognises it for the racist scaremongering that it is.
4. The SRC unreservedly stands in solidarity with all Chinese students at the University of Sydney, as well as the Chinese community in Australia that are victims of racism at the hands of the Australian state.
5. The SRC stands firmly against war, is not on the side of any ruling class, and will oppose Australia's involvement in any imperialist war that may happen in the future.

**Action:**

The SRC is committed to creating an anti-racist campus at the University of Sydney and endorses any efforts or actions in order to achieve this.

Sophie Haslam spoke to her motion saying that anti-Chinese racism has been present in Australia for decades, and while it never went away, it is returning in popularity with the looming China-American trade war.

Emma Norton spoke to the motion saying this is a really important motion and it is important to note that it is a material thing happening here, and it's a response to China's growing economic power and challenge to American Hegemony. There has been a rise in racism in media such as Clive Hamilton's book, which blames Chinese Students for supposed espionage and other anti-Chinese hysteria. I think that the way Sam Dastyari was treated was a reaction, not to corruption but it was racist reaction. We should be standing with Chinese Australians and Chinese students.

Harry Gregg spoke to the motion saying a number of Green MPs endorsed the book not just Christine Milne but also Jeremy Buckingham and Justin Field among others.

Manning Jeffery spoke on the motions noting that he found that condemning a book said a lot about the motions positions adding that he felt being concerned about that rise of 'a non-democratic country' having significant international power wasn't racist.

Moved: Kim Murphy (Social Justice Officer)

Seconded: Sophie Haslam

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

Manning Jeffery Abstained.

## **Q2. SRC supports Change the Rules campaign**

### **Preamble**

The Change the Rules campaign is a welcome move by the ACTU to put Australia's anti-worker industrial laws back into the center of the political arena. Key demands include ending the use of sham industrial agreements, where employers use one or two unionised employees to get up a dodgy Enterprise Agreement, rolling back employers' ability to terminate agreements, boosting the legal minimum in industry awards, such as providing a living wage, and most importantly, strengthening the right of workers to withdraw their labour.

Australia has some of the harshest anti-strike laws in the developed world. In the UK for instance, workers can take industrial action at any time to defend their conditions, such as when bosses violate contracts. In contrast, workers here can only take "legal" strike action during negotiating periods once every few years, and only then after jumping through arduous bureaucratic loopholes such as secret ballots and giving bosses three days notice. Even then the right to strike is not guaranteed. Earlier this year, the ironically named Fair Work Commission banned legal industrial action that rail workers planned to take in order to secure a decent pay rise from the NSW government, on the grounds that the strike would cause significant economic damage. The message this sends to workers is that according to our laws, if a strike is effective, it is illegal.

The UN International Labour Organisation (ILO), hardly a bastion of militant unionism, has condemned Australia's industrial laws as anti-worker and in violation of human rights. ACTU secretary, Sally McManus, hit the nail on the head in her famous interview with Leigh Sales when she said "it shouldn't be so hard for workers in our country to be able to take industrial action when they need to". Even the ILO recognises that strike is the principle means by which workers can improve and defend their economic and social interests.

However, the campaign cannot afford to let Labor off the hook. Many of these unjust laws, although upheld by Liberal governments, were in fact written into legislation during the Hawke Keating years and the Fair Work Commission is a product of the most recent Labor government. Notably, the ALP does not seem to be endorsing the campaign. To successfully challenge the state of industrial relations in this country, the union movement will need to confront whichever party is in power, with the key demand being around the right to strike.

The ACTU has called for demonstrations around May Day, with a weekday demonstration called for May 9 in Melbourne. Workplace meetings are being organised in some industries to discuss the campaign and upcoming demonstrations. This is an opportunity to mobilise workers in a campaign that has the potential to build enough political pressure to change the trajectory of the union movement in this country and win much needed labour reforms.

This motion recognises that the SRC has a responsibility to support and participate in the campaign.

## **Platform**

1. The SRC recognises that industrial laws in Australia are anti-worker and must be challenged
2. The SRC supports the Change the Rules campaign especially the demands around the right to strike
3. The SRC supports the ACTU's call for national demonstrations as part of the campaign

## **Action**

1. The SRC endorses all demonstrations taking place as part of the campaign.
2. All members of the SRC will attend the 'Strike to Change the Rules' contingent to May Day.

Kim Murphy spoke to the motion saying that the ability of the Fair Work Commission to shut down a legal strike is concerning. She noted that that workers have had their protections, wages and rights stripped back over the years and the ACTU's *Change the Rules* campaign is an important step but that believed that its aim of getting the Labour party elected would not create the change that is needed as many of the current rules and systems were put in place by former Labor governments.

Macy Reen spoke to the motion saying as a students' it's important that we stand with workers and that simply saying vote for labour isn't enough.

Zach Gillies Palmer spoke to the motion saying he felt it was a really moderate motion and thought that it should go further and discuss what the right to strike means. He continued saying it's more than the *Change the Rules* campaign which talks about the right to strike during an EBA negotiations but that we should be pushing for an unqualified right to strike.

Felix Faber spoke to the motion saying that he felt that it was important the council take a strong stance on this issue and that we see the right to strike as an inalienable right.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying he believes that it is important that the union movement is pushing for these changes, and that it should fight of the inalienable right to strike, but as students we should be supporting the unions campaigns and helping build the union movement in general. Adding that they best way to do this was to stand with the change the rules campaign at the May Day rally and that we should not just be looking at the Fair Work Commission but putting demands directly on the Labor party to remove all the anti-strike policies they introduced so that some amends can be made to the damages they have already caused.

Emma Norton spoke to the motion noting that there were two things she felt the left should be doing for the *Change the Rules* campaign. One of these she stated was putting strong demands the Labor party, which has not been criticised but the ACTU even though it was the Labor party that implemented many of these policies now being fought to begin with and so the Labor party should not be given a blank cheque of support. The other is applying pressure to the ACTU to not back down on the right to strike but to refocus on it instead of looking to institutions such as the Fair Work Commission which has weakened workers right to strike, noting that while there is little that can be done for little can be done about what the ACTU want the council can support demands for change.

Manny Jeffery asked to amend the motion to call for a removal of the Fair Work Act completely

It was not amenable to the movers.

Amendment to the motion to add Platform point 4: The SRC calls for the removal of the Fair Work Act.

Moved: Manning Jeffery

Seconded: Sarah Cutter Russel

The amendment was put and **FAILED**.

The motion was written was voted on.

Moved: Clara da Costa-Riedel

Seconded: Lily Campbell (Education Officer)

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

### **Q3. Left-wing activism and free speech**

#### **Preamble**

1. Free speech is essential for the left. We need to have the freedom to express our political ideas to organise and take action around those ideas, with protests and strikes, without a cost to our livelihood.
  - a. This is because we rely on collective mobilisation to achieve our aims.
  - b. Institutions such as the justice system, representatives in parliament, the police force etc, are responsible for the injustices that we wish to end. These institutions are props of the capitalist system and maintain its order.
  - c. Therefore, institutional avenues for rectifying social injustice are largely closed to us, as our fire has to be directed towards them to achieve our aims.
  - d. Often these institutions themselves police dissent and constrain our free speech. They do this in order to stave off any challenge to the system. Those who run the system cannot simply tolerate the proliferation of the ideas and actions of the left; they must at least be put under limits.
  - e. Institutions like the media and the education system set limits on what ideas are promoted, and often exclude left-wing points of view.
  - f. It's clear therefore that free speech isn't something simply afforded to us as the left, considering our aims. For example, outspoken supporters of Palestine in the US such as academic Steven Salaita have been hounded, and in Salaita's case sacked and blacklisted in the academic establishment.
  - g. Contrary to the common conception, society is not a free marketplace of ideas. Ideas that legitimise the system are promoted over ones that seek to oppose it, which is why right-wing ideas are dominant and normalised in the ordinary functioning of capitalism.
  - h. This is why the issue belongs to the left historically as a point of mobilisation. For example, the Berkeley free speech movement of 1964, which is basically the origin of the modern student movement, was centred around the right of the left to organise civil rights activism on campus, against the wishes of the university administration and the Bay Area establishment.

2. The political right has a very different relationship to free speech.
  - a. Their ideas align with the interests of the system and the maintenance of its institutions. As stated earlier, therefore the right has their ideas promoted in society by all the capitalist institutions, even ones that seem to be more democratic or neutral like parliament or the university administration.
  - b. Effectively free speech exists much more for the right than for the left, since their ideas and actions run with the flow of capitalist society. Often they have wealthy backers in sections of the ruling class as well.
  - c. For example, the oppressive politics of the No campaign were far more promoted in the press than the majority politics of the Yes campaign. Proportional to their influence in society, the No campaign had financing from wealthy backers which allowed them to promote their ideas more widely.
3. However, the conservative and far right have recently painted themselves as the defenders of free speech.
  - a. For example, the No campaign consistently claimed they were under attack from LGBTI people, that their freedom of religion was being infringed upon by a campaign for civil rights.
  - b. The way the right defended Bill Leak's racist depictions of Indigenous people was to take the critics to task for being concerned with "political correctness".
  - c. In some ways this defence is not new, since the ruling class and supporters of the system have always tried to characterise the system as epitomising "freedom" and "democracy", because they have nothing else to say in its defence.
  - d. There's been a recent phenomenon of the far right in particular claiming its ideas are under attack in order to increase their reach and garner sympathy for their cause.
  - e. Far right commentator Ann Coulter lamented, "It's sad day for free speech," when her appearance was cancelled at University of California, Berkeley to avoid the disturbance of counter-protests. This is the same individual who has praised the destruction of civil liberties by former FBI head Joe McCarthy in the pursuit of anti-communism.
  - f. To do this they conflate grassroots opposition from the left with institutional measures that close their meetings or stop them publishing. For right-wing think tank the IPA, the threat to free speech presented by left-wing speech and protest is greater than that presented by the authority of university management. So one of the five worst threats to free speech in 2017 on campus for them was the counter-protest organised at University of Sydney against a screening of men's rights film *The Red Pill*.
  - g. In reality, their ideas and actions are far more tolerated by the establishment than those of the left.
  - h. University administrations in the UK have shut down pro-Palestine protests and disciplined student activists including last year at Manchester University. However, far right-wing groups are able to operate freely on campuses across the Western world, including affiliation of their clubs to student associations and hosting events which are protected from challenge by the presence of university security.
  - i. Pro-life demonstrations, such that on April 18 this year, are protected by police from contestation from the left despite overwhelming support in the population for pro-choice.



- j. In Georgia, US on April 21 this year, a small group of neo-Nazis celebrating Hitler's birthday were protected from confrontation by an anti-fascist counter-protest by heavily militarised police. In the demonstration they burnt a huge swastika and did the Hitler salute without intervention.
  - k. In addition, the political right actually argue for censorship of left-wing ideas. For example, when Yassmin Abdel-Magied tweeted that on ANZAC Day we should not forget the lives lost in Syria, Palestine, on Manus and Nauru, making an implicit criticism of the racism and imperialism of the Australian state, she was hounded by the right which argued that she should be censored and persecuted for her views. In the US, the far right wanted to ban expressions of "disrespect" to the national anthem like Colin Kaepernick "taking a knee".
4. This raises questions about how the left should respond to the far right in our project of fighting against injustice.
    - a. The increasing trend is for the left to rely on the authorities, including the institutions of the state, instead of organising collectively to challenge the right.
    - b. This, however, is ineffective because the institutions themselves are the natural home for right-wing politics. They are part of the system, therefore cannot be a tool for left-wing aims against the far right.
    - c. Relying on these institutions instead have the opposite effect of strengthening them, which cannot be the aim of the left as these institutions perpetuate oppression and inequality.
    - d. Further, this approach disempowers the working class and social movements, which is problematic as it is only our collective strength that can both take on the far right and also begin to challenge the injustice that is built into the system.
  5. We shouldn't abandon free speech as a commitment just because the right are attempting to claim it as their own territory. Instead, we have to reclaim free speech as our battle.
    - a. The only effective way to fight the far right is to organise the largest possible force of people that are prepared to oppose them. We need to fight for our free speech in order to carry out this project.
    - b. Activist should continue to mobilise on the basis of "people power" rather than relying on the institutions that are counter-posed to the interests of a collective movement.
    - c. This strengthens our side as we seek to challenge all kinds of injustice produced by the system.

### **Platform**

1. The SRC recognises the importance of free speech to movements for social change.
  - a. The SRC demands that activists have the right to promote political campaigns on campus through means including but not limited to postering, leafleting and giving lecture announcements.
  - b. Further, activists must have the right to protest on campus.
  - c. Staff on the campus should have the right to total freedom of expression, including in their academic work and in their teaching.
  - d. Further, staff should have the right to organise industrially on campus through whatever means they deem necessary.
2. The SRC condemns the cynical invocation of free speech by right wing advocates to oppose the left.

3. The SRC recognises the lack of efficacy of looking to the power of capitalist authorities in the fight against the far right.
4. The SRC endorses an approach to combating the far right which relies on collective mobilisation to confront them.

### **Action**

1. The SRC will not call on the authorities to deal with the far right on our behalf. Activists in the SRC:
  - a. must not call upon the university administration to remove individuals from campus, to discipline individuals with regard to their enrolment, or to put individuals through university tribunals for breaching code of conduct. This principle should be adhered to regardless of the political affiliation of said individual.
  - b. must not call upon the Clubs & Societies administration of the University of Sydney Union to exclude from affiliation or disband clubs or societies based on their political views or any breach in the university code of conduct.
  - c. similarly, must not call upon the university administration to police or shut down any events hosted by clubs or societies, regardless of their political affiliation.
2. The SRC will continue to organise and promote actions against the far right that rely on collective mobilisation. Activists involved in the SRC will seek to involve as many students and others as possible in these actions.

Gina Elias spoke to her motion saying that we cannot get free speech through institutions of power as they are built and maintained by shutting down speech and controlling it.

James Morched spoke to the motion wanting to emphasise the council should not be going to institutions as a way of combatting hate speech on campus. And that the council should not look to the University to shut them down, as they would just as happily shut down a Palestine support group and not the far right.

Procedural to limit speaking time to 2 minutes per person

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Thomas Manousaridis

the procedural was put and **CARREID.**

Brandon Hale spoke against the motion citing an issue with action points 1 and 2, saying, if these conservative groups are reporting non-violent action why can't we report them in return.

Kim Murphy spoke to the motion saying that a complaint had been made against her to the university on contradictory circumstantial evidence and nothing else on this basis they fined her \$1000 which when appealed has another \$300 added and was included in her record, calling the process was intimidating and threatening. She continued saying that power uses power to oppress people and minorities and when people call on these institutions – police, campus security, university management, you give them credit and validity. Concluding she said that these intuitions are not allies of the oppressed.

Thomas Manousaridis spoke against the motion citing that it gave student free reign to do whatever they wanted and if protests do get violent it condemn those who take action to prevent escalation.

Harry Gregg spoke against the motion noting that while he is against the university being able to legislate against protesting as they wish there are concerns with the motion. He spoke about the Safe Access Zones bill as not being a ban on protest but the need to protect the vulnerable women entering these clinics for whatever reason. Counter protesting situations such as this are not viable and a motion like this directly opposes policies that keep people safe.

Hektor Vineburg spoke against the motion saying that while he agrees with some of the foundation of this motion he doesn't agree with the action points, saying that it comes across like applying a hammer to a situation that needs surgical precision. Adding that he thought the motion allows the Far Right to do as they wish unchecked, this doesn't protect the left, it protects the actions of the right and that he did not believe it would achieve its desired aims.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying that if those against the motion believe that policies exist to protect people then how do they explain black deaths in custody. Kumar continued saying that the university sends police to student protests and staff pickets but there is no challenge to the creating of the Ramsey Institute. Kumar said that the police and the government are used to support the agenda of the alt-right and that these institutions aren't used to attack the right they are used to attack the left, and if there is a rise of the far right on campus, it is up to the left to organise, to respond and shut them down. Kumar concluded saying that the University has always been a racist institution.

Emma Norton spoke to the motion saying that you can't fight fascism with fascism and that while Labor left may say they have a different to Labor right for opposing this motion they don't. Norton went on to say that those against the motion were actively supporting the state and that the state actively works against women, workers and Indigenous people. Norton added that it was not university policies that scared the far right of campus but people who protested them, saying that leaders of far-right groups had acknowledged that this is the case and knowing that there will be counter protests that keeps them off campuses.

William Edwards spoke against the motion citing it as the embodiment of the flaws he perceives the movers political position to have. William Edwards said that while he sees great value in protests, protests should be seen as a political strategy, a means to the ends, not the ends in themselves. Edwards continued saying he thinks that suggesting the SRC not call on clubs and societies that put student welfare at risk, or support the women's collective campaign round support for the Safe Access Zones bill doesn't seem very progressive. Furthermore he expressed concern that other groups were buying into this mentality. William Edwards said that as a society we don't throw out the law we change it, and that suggesting we allow for fascist groups to do things like burn crosses on campus without consequence is insane. He concluded saying that the movers thought that their right to yell at other protesters was more important than letting people have the right safe access to abortion.

Felix Faber spoke against the motion saying that he felt there was a false equivalence between calling the police and Vice Chancellor Michael Spence and University management fascists when they are neo-conservatives and neoliberals which is not the same as a Nazi. Adding that if we can use campus security to shut down far right movements we should. The USU is not the university but another student organisation and asking them to shut down harmful societies is not unreasonable.

Manning Jeffery spoke in favour of the motion saying that he looked forward to Socialist Alternative accepting an amendment asking the SRC to push for the removal of 18C from the Racial Discrimination Act.

The amendment not amenable to the movers.

Amendment: action point 3. That the SRC push for the removal of section 18C of the racial discrimination act.

Moved: Manning Jeffery

Seconded: Sarah Cutter-Russel

The amendment was put and **FAILED.**

Imogen Grant closed the speaking list

Procedural motion to reopen the speaking list

moved: Lily Campbell

seconded: Vinil Kumar

the procedural was put and **CARRIED.**

Dane Lou spoke against the motion saying that he has sat on a number of the University's tribunals and that a number of changes to them such as putting academics and students on the panels to ensure fairness. Adding that these institutions need the councils support not their condemnation.

Lily Campbell spoke to the motion saying that a good example for this motion is the case of Peter Dutton, the left asked Peter Dutton to ban the visa of a person calling themselves a 'rape expert', but that encouraging the blocking of a visa for him, makes it easier for Peter Dutton to block visas for people of colour. Campbell continued saying the same thing applies on campus, Vice Chancellor Michael Spence shouldn't be asked to ban clubs and societies because he doesn't like the Socialist Alternative Club, the ALP club more than he dislikes LifeChoices. She added that the police work in the same way, but they are for keeping things the same or making them worse, the police are not for making things better. These institutions are not fighting for people, Milo Yiannopoulos is a nobody in America today, that's why here came here, mass movements in America have made him afraid to speak on campus' there and the council should be using the same actions here.

Jessica Syed spoke to a clarification on the Women's Collectives position on Safe Access Zones saying that the collective saw it as a stepping stone to decriminalisation and legalisation, and they are not for getting the police involved. Adding that the collective supports the Bill because it is pragmatic, and they hate the police.

Brandon Hale asked for a clarification on law enforcement, if the alt right can report you for "bullshit" things why can't we do the same?

Emma Norton spoke to the motion saying that this is not about the ability of the right or the left to be active it is about how there is a double standard in freedom of speech that shouldn't exist. Norton went on using the example of how young Muslim men are treated, facing up to 10 years in prison for a Facebook post that was deemed terrorism by ASIO despite the lack of evidence of any actual plans. Norton continued noting that these institutions that determine what is and isn't allowed under free speech are not democratic and are controlled by the ruling class hence the inequality in what and who is protected with freedom of speech. Norton concluded that on the issue of exclusions zones she does not see this is a step

forward for women's rights as the state is not going to a better law after this one, nor are they going to pass the law the people want but the law the state wants.

Timothy Berney-Gibson spoke in favour of the motion citing that Labor pretends these institutions such are benevolent and won't admit that they aren't.

Harry Gregg spoke against the motion saying that the movers and Socialist Alternative are arguing for a world where the Racial Discrimination and the Sex Discrimination acts are repealed and that this is also the world Tony Abbott wants. Gregg continued saying that supporting the Safe Access Bill is about putting these women's safety ahead others, and that not liking LifeChoices is not going to make them go away. Gregg concluded saying he was not pro-cop.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying that the only reason anti-discrimination bills exist is because people fought for them and that they were not given freely. Kumar continued saying that the view that oppressed peoples need to use the institutions of their oppressors for protection is patronising as they have gotten their freedoms from fighting. Adding that Vice Chancellor Michael Spence had kept Barry Spurr employed for years despite being racist because that is also what VC Spence believes. Kumar concluded by saying that these institutions cannot be relied on and that asking them to shut down those you politically disagree with will result in the left being shut down while the right are able to do as they wish.

William Edwards spoke against the motion saying that the council needs to look at the consequences of the motion and that people who incite violence should not be allowed to speak. Edwards continued saying that counter protests shouldn't be the only option, banning those people from speaking is also viable. Adding that VC Michael Spence does not oversee the Clubs and Societies program, that is run by the USU and the USU should be allowed to shut down groups like LifeChoices. Edwards concluded saying that the law exists for a reason and where it is unjust or inadequate it should be changed.

Robin Eames spoke to the debate citing that while each is seeking to speak for and represent oppressed groups much of the language used has been ableist and show little regard for those groups at all.

Lily Campbell spoke to the motion saying that it is a political motion and that it is the state that upholds capitalism and that it maintains and controls the system. Adding that while some may think changing little things will improve that system she does not. And while institutions may claim to support people they make them play into the politics of victimhood, by focusing on people feelings about protesters outside an abortion clinic it ignores that the protesters are a result of the institutional oppression of women. Concluding that turning to institutions for protection gives them power to oppress and if you want to run the state you have a right-wing perspective.

Dane Lou spoke against the motion citing what is happening at the university with regards to student misconduct and used examples of cases that had come up and how the university process aims to be fair and doesn't look at the person but their actions.

Moved: Gina Elias

Seconded: Hersha Kadkol (NUS Ethnocultural Officer)

The motion was put and **FAILED.**

#### **Q4. Student organisations need to stay in student hands**

##### **Preamble**

Student unions are entrusted with the task of representing student interests. These interests are increasingly out of line with corporate universities' goals of making profits. This is seen by university managements across Australia cutting pay for staff, charging exorbitant fees to international students, pushing for fee deregulation, increasing casualization of staff and cutting funding to student information services, trapping students in their degrees and prolonging the years they are at university. This context means that student-led organisations are more important than ever. Though student unions can in some instances work with university management, introducing the university administration into the leadership of these organisations necessarily betrays student interests and the goals of these organisations.

Calls made by SUPRA presidents for the university to investigate and intervene in the leadership of the organisation endangers the position of the students they represent. It can only be expected that university management will use this as a way to quell dissent against policies that harm students. It is particularly worrying given a history of student unions being subsumed by university management in the VSU era, a trend that has harmed the students they once represented.

Problems within student organisations must be resolved by students, and the fact that the SUPRA council was not consulted before the approaching of university management is deeply undemocratic. If there are governance issues in the organisation, these should be addressed by incoming elected student representatives on council. There is no reason to believe that an unelected university administration would make these decisions better.

##### **Actions:**

1. Condemns all moves by student-led organisations to allow university management intervention into their operations.
2. Calls on SUPRA to make all decisions as to its governance democratically.
3. Calls on SUPRA to affirm its commitment to its EBA with its staff and the availability of grievance processes to assure staff can have safe working environments.

Lara Sonnenschein spoke to the motion saying that SUPRA has shifted politically to the right for example the current Presidents going to University management to intervene on their behalf because they aren't happy.

Nina Dillon Britton spoke to the motion saying she believed it was an important motion in the context that University management are a corporation and don't care about students' interests and that asking them to intervene allows student organisations to be absorbed into the University and turn them into an advertising campaign and prevent actual critique of the University. Concluding saying that while student unions may not always function perfectly, looking to university management rather than the student body or the democratically elected representatives is a concerning action from the perspective of another student organisation.

Imogen Grant outlined the current situation at SUPRA.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion stating that he thinks that this is connected to the previous motion, in that University management are not here for students or their rights. Adding that the motion mentions there has been a history of University management trying to destroy student organisations. At Macquarie University the student union was dismantled on the grounds that they were inefficient and have since been replaced by a 'sham body' who give the veneer of student representation. Vinil Kumar concluded expressing his full support for independent student organisations and unions.

Kim Murphy spoke to the motion saying that this was another example of the reality of University management, that they want to shut down student organisations and that this move of SUPRA's allows the University greater control over student organisations. Kim Murphy continued noting that similar to Macquarie University, Wollongong University student union was "run into the ground by Liberals" and the university tried to use that as an excuse to step in and take control, when the left won back control of the organisation, University management maintained its influence.

Sarah Cutter-Russel read out the following message from Timothy Berney-Gibson:

"I have a few points to raise:

- 1) SRC should respect the autonomy of SUPRA, as the autonomy of collectives are respected
- 2) The motion does not mention any of the racism that SUPRA Exec have experienced that have resulted in them taking such action. Which is an absolute joke when no doubt Q1 is going to pass regarding anti-racism. This motion has also been put up by two white/white-passing people who don't get to tell POC about how what action they take dealing with such racism.
- 3) SUPRA Council is an extremely toxic environment that has not had productive discussions so the expectation that this could be dealt with internally could not be ensured.
- 4) The concerns of how the Uni may or may not act are incredibly hypothetical and unknown. The uni hasn't even decided if it will investigate.
- 5) "Problems within student organisations must be resolved by students" - see point 3 and acknowledge the issue of institutional toxicity internally. Sometimes an external light must be cast.
- 6) SUPRA will not take advice from SRC if the motions pass, see earlier point about respecting student organisation autonomy

Yes, we are student unions, SUPRA is also a student union. They are in trouble and who caused this trouble is something that can be debated all night long. But they are in trouble.

It our duty to support them in these troubled times, not isolate them. Instead of these ridiculous actions, I recommend that the President get in touch with the SUPRA Presidents, and see how we can help them. And I emphasise that Imogen get in touch with the SUPRA Presidents, the legitimate, democratically elected leaders of the Association and not with someone else on the SUPRA Council who she feels more comfortable talking to. Because we can't be seen as destabilising their Council.

A question to the movers of the motion: if they are aware that the Council of Postgraduate Associations (CAPA), The National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Principals Association (NATSIPA) and the Council of International Students (CISA) have all moved motions in support of SUPRA's move?!"

Nina Dillon Britton spoke to the question from Timothy Berney-Gibson saying that if that information was read in Pulp, they made a misstate. The peak Postgraduate student board did not support going to the university not did the second organisation. Nina Dillon Britton noted that she was not aware of the stance of the 3<sup>rd</sup> organisation. Nina Dillon Britton continued saying that if the SRC was doing something similar this is criticism that should be welcomed, as generally student organisations condemn other student organisations going to university management to resolve things. Nina Dillon Britton added that in response to point 4 of Timothy Berney-Gibson's statement that the current president's term is almost over and opening up this channel to University management on their way out seems insincere. Adding that while many of the things student organisations discuss in meetings may not be productive it would be awful if the SRC President decided that because some of this debate is unproductive that they asked University management to intervene. Nina noted that she thought this was a cynical ploy. Nina continued noting that SUPRA is not an autonomous organisation comparing it to government asking if that would be considered autonomously elected, and that saying that the movers of this motion as white people can't criticise the actions of the SUPRA Presidents because the issues that they brought to the University were around racism seems cynical. Adding that what has happened was grievance procedures being abused, and that if there are issues, they should be brought to the elected SUPRA council and that the University Senate is not what one would call a diverse organisation. Nina Dillon Britton concluded noting that issues have been resolved by students in the past, not management, and so she questions some of the claims made but the current SUPRA Presidents adding that even if they are true going to University management is the wrong decision and deeply undemocratic.

Imogen Grant spoke to the motion saying that overall, she believe that SUPRA will do well to see the back of the current Presidents as they are a part of an emerging group of student politician who believe that University management align with student needs when they do not. Adding that many of the policies and accusations against staff have been made with disregard to staff's rights to become permanent as per the EBA, and claiming that a ban on student, put in place because a WHS risk to staff be lifted because that student was on the winning faction ticket they have attempted to push away these criticisms of poor conduct on their part by claiming racism is identity politics at its worst.

Harry Gregg spoke in favour of the motion calling it a great motion and that student organisations should be anti-management because first management will come for SUPRA and then they will come for the SRC. Concluding that when SUPRA and the USU fail to stand up for students if it is up to the SRC to ensure they are represented.

Emma Norton said she was amazed by Harry Gregg's ability to move from one position to another without noticing. She continued in favour of the motion saying that it is cynical to suggesting that because the complaint made were those of racism white people can't criticise the current SUPRA Presidents for making right wing decisions. Adding that identity politics was being used to make people agree with these right-wing decisions. Emma Norton continued noting that at University of



Western Australia there was a serious issue with a rape scandal and as a result the university jumped in and clamped down on the organisation, and while yes the organisation should not have held a camp where women could be assaulted but the university attacking the student organisation as a whole and threatening to take away their SSAF is not the correct response to such a situation.

Jessica Syed spoke to the motion saying she agreed with the comments made by Nina Dillon Britton and Imogen Grant. Jessica Syed continued saying that the current presidents are conservative and anti-worker and that this is an example of identity politics at its worst, and it's being used to 'suck up' to management.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying that the way in which anti-racism claims has been used at SUPRA for justification for the intervention of management when that management are overseeing the set-up of a western civilisation department has to be the least autonomous thing ever. Furthermore, SUPRA does some amazing work supporting activists, things the University does not like, it's not just about structural changes it's about changing the political nature of student activist organisations.

Mover: Nina Dillon Britton

Secunder: Lara Sonnenschein

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

**A 15 min was called as per the regulations at 9:10**

**A quorum count was called at 9:30**

**Council was found inquorate, it was believe a councillor was locked out, they were retrieved**

**A second quorum count was called at 9:34**

**The meeting was found quorate.**

#### **Q5. Disarm USyd: end militarism on campus**

##### **Preamble**

The Australian state is engaging in the biggest defence build up since World War Two and universities across Australia are increasing their ties to arms companies. This is evident in three key areas at universities nationwide, namely, governance, investments and research partnerships. Sydney University currently invests over 5 million dollars in companies that contribute to drone and nuclear warfare. For example, the University invests over 3 million dollars in Honeywell, a company that provides the engine for the MQ-9 reaper drone, which has been described as the world's deadliest killer, killing civilians in Pakistan, Afghanistan, Yemen and Somalia. The university is also engaging in deathly partnerships, with companies such as Thales Australia, and the Engineering school is in talks with Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Northrop Grumman and Honeywell.

Universities should be progressive anti-war institutions and students, the main stakeholder in the debate over the role and nature of our educational institutions should demand that they be so and act to realise this.

### **Platform**

1. That the Sydney University Students' Representative Council stands against increasing militarism and continues to promote itself as an anti-war union.

### **Action**

1. That the Sydney University Students' Representative Council actively supports USyd divesting from weapons manufacturers
2. That the Sydney University Students' Representative Council will advocate for no more university partnerships with arms companies
3. That the Sydney University Students' Representative Council advocates that Chancellor, Belinda Hutchinson should either step down from her role from Thales Australia, or the chancellery of the University.

Lara Sonnenschein spoke to her motion outlining the University's involvements with weapons manufactures. Adding that University Chancellor Belinda Hutchinson, is the Chairperson of Thales Australia, a weapons developer with which the university signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU)with and that she claims this is not a conflict of interest.

Lily Campbell spoke to the motion agreeing with the comments of Lara Sonnenschein. Lily added that she found it interesting to think about why universities are doing this research and getting this investment from such companies and it should be scrutinised. Lily continues noting that most research is funded by government or private investments, as such areas of research are guided by these influences. Lily asked the council where are universities supposed to get money from other than these partnerships when they face 2.2 billion dollars in funding cuts. Adding that this reliance on private investment pushes up the need to churn out degrees with little regards to quality and that the government encourages this by capping funding. Concluding Lily stated that as a student union the SRC should always be campaigning for free and fully funded education, but that it is also important to be connecting that conversation with broader issues in the system.

James Morched spoke to the motion stating he believed it was a good campaign that will get attention from other student organisations who's universities have similar ties and investments, and that by drawing attention to this can hopefully encourage divestment in these industries.

James Newbold spoke to the motion saying they thought it was an excellent campaign.

Moved: Lara Sonnenschein (Education Officer)

Seconded: Liam Donohoe

The motion was put and **CARRIED**.

## **Q6. Motion: Autonomous issue of Honi Soit edited by the Disabilities Collective**

Disabled people make up a fifth of the general population, and likely more than that in the University of Sydney student body given that university students are disproportionately likely to experience psychiatric disability.

Disability justice and liberation are not ideals that are highly prized by the university, nor historically by the SRC, whose offices are still located down a flight of stairs. And yet 45% of disabled people in Australia live near or below the poverty line. 90% of intellectually disabled women will experience sexual assault in their lifetimes. Disabled people make up 50% of the population in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. The term “ableism” has been in use since 1981, replacing the earlier “handicapism”, but people still act as if it is not only a new term but a facetious one.

Too often disabled people are excluded and ignored, sometimes because we physically cannot get into the building and sometimes because our presence is not welcome. Our voices are suppressed. Some of us are still fighting for the right to live outside of institutions. Disabled people have given a lot to this university, but it has not given back to us. In the 1970s Jacob Baldwin and Joan Hume fought for the right of people like me to be allowed to study at the University of Sydney. In 1991 Bronwyn Moye and her contemporaries led an action in which they parked their wheelchairs in the middle of the road at Broadway and blocked off the street to protest the lack of accessible buses. But we are still fighting for things as basic as lecture recordings. I am only still an undergraduate because one of my seminar professors refused to move to a wheelchair accessible lecture theatre.

The Disabilities Collective is the only autonomous identity based collective that does not produce an annual special issue of the SRC newspaper, Honi Soit. We’ve been trying to correct that for some time now. We very nearly managed to organise a disability issue last year, but it didn’t happen, and since then we’ve been bouncing around between the interim Honi editors and the SRC as to who is capable of making the decision to introduce a new special issue.

The current Honi editors have expressed their support for an autonomous disability issue of Honi Soit. If the SRC can affirm this decision as a motion then hopefully this will clear up any confusion as to responsibility for the decision at least for this year, and we will put forward a motion for a regulations change at next council meeting to set a structural precedent so that the issue can continue into future years also.

I have edited two issues of Queer Honi, in 2013 and 2014. For the 2014 issue I was the primary organiser though we chose not to appoint an official Editor-in-Chief. I have edited two issues of ARNA, the University of Sydney Arts Students Society annual journal, in 2014 and 2017, and am editing it again this year as one of the Publications Directors. I am currently finishing up a project as editorial assistant to Alice Wong on an anthology of essays written by disabled activists. I am very practised at herding cats (i.e. queers, crips, and arts students). I have the experience and skillset to make this issue happen without putting undue burden on the current Honi team or on other members of the SRC.

### **Platform**

1. The SRC recognises that disability activism is equally as important as activism on behalf of other marginalised groups, and that our struggles are interconnected.
2. The SRC affirms its commitment to fighting for the rights of disabled people, and to supporting disabled-led activism and literature.

### **Action**

1. The SRC will publish an autonomous issue of Honi Soit edited by the Disabilities Collective for the year 2018.

Will Edwards spoke to the motion, noting that there is a Queer, Ethno Cultural, Indigenous, and Women's issue of Honi, and that disabilities is the only autonomous collective that doesn't. Noting that this exemplifies the lack of attention paid to student with a disability on campus.

Jazzlyn Breen spoke to the motion and noted that its really difficult to layout a newspaper and hoped that they would have support from the current editors in getting this done asking if there was a way the council could compel the current editors to assist.

Janek Drevikousky spoke against the motion saying that the editorial team has spoken about this motion before the meeting and could not come to an agreement on supporting the creation of this edition. Adding that they feltit would be disruptive to the cycle as all the editions have been planned for the year now, suggesting that this come into effect next year or that it could be a pull-out section in a regular edition.

William Edwards responded to Jazzlyn Breen and Janek Drevikousky saying that he has edited an edition of Honi with current disabilities Officer Robin Eames in the past and she is aware of the requirements and that disrupting the Honi editors' plans is not something he places particular weight on in deciding the value of this motion, saying that they are capable or making rearrangements to accommodate

Ray Prout spoke to the motion noting that it is not up to Honi and that the only reason that the queer edition of Honi which is mandated by the regulations was because the Queer Officers had to fight the current editors for it. Concluding that the disabilities collective should be allowed an edition.

Moved: Robin Eames

Seconded: Mollie Galvin

The motion was put and **CARRIED/FAILED.**

## **R. General Business**

### **R1. An Investigation into Lecture Recording Accessibility**

#### **Preamble**

Lecture recordings are of course put in place by academics primarily so that students can go back and review the content having attended the lecture. Yes, this is often abused by people who just decide to skip class. But that's not the people I'm bringing this motion forward for. There are many students whose disabilities limit them from learning in the environment of an overcrowded

lecture theatre, or those students who must work in order to battle the ever-rising cost of living. I have heard countless complaints from students across my own years at university who have been impacted by the choice of lecturers to not record content or to purposely leave out parts of a lecture such as exam tips. I myself have been saved by recordings in my own course this semester, where the choice was affording rent and food or attending.

I know that there is argument against this on the basis of lecture attendance and staff rights such as free speech or teaching style, so I will address these.

Of course, some students will abuse the use of recordings. However, to make the argument that those already facing hardship such as students with disabilities or from low socio-economic backgrounds should continue to suffer because of the actions of others is simply not acceptable. Some lecturers have worked around this with success and I shall provide an example.

For first year psychology, obviously some of the content is covered by copyright and therefore cannot be included in recordings. As such, the staff make a verbal recording available to all and as comprehensive lecture slides as possible so that someone relying on recordings is still able to put the pieces together and face as little hardship as possible when it comes to their learning. This method also discourages completely skipping lectures if you can make them because it requires extra effort in a mad StuVac rush to put two pieces of media together.

Staff rights are of course important and I fully acknowledge the concern that they would be undermined by a push to provide recordings for every course. For staff who prefer to teach by writing or other styles, it is often seen in maths courses for example that staff use overhead projectors and clear paper so that no one is impacted by their preferred teaching style and people can view it at the lecture and at home. Freedom of speech is obviously also important on campus and to cite that a staff member voicing their opinion might have dire consequences and therefore shouldn't be recorded strikes me as interesting. If anyone has more information of staff who have been fired or faced consequences over issues like this please do say so because I would very much like to open a discussion on that. It's worth noting that recordings could mean that staff behaving inappropriately for example being racist towards international students could be held accountable.

I am not saying this is an issue without strong arguments on both sides, but I believe that it is an issue that we should address and I think we owe it to all students to act in their interests as well given it is their money that helps us operate. This is an issue I'm passionate about and one of the election promises I was elected on, so I hope to achieve real change around this.

As this is a contentious issue I won't make the argument that we should put forward an opinion of the SRC as a whole, but rather take the following actions:

**Actions:**

1. The SRC will open a dialogue with students and academics about lecture recordings and the issues surrounding this including the facilitation of an anonymous submission page for the use of students and academics to voice their concerns.

2. The SRC investigates why lectures are not being recorded including discussions with academics involved and also inquires if students with disabilities are being given access to recordings if requested.
3. Where possible, the SRC works with academics to implement recording of the reported courses or at least a solution which has as little impact as possible on students who face adversity around this eg. verbal recordings.

Sarah Cutter-Russell spoke to her motion outlining its content and saying that while lecture recordings have been a contentious issue in the past there are a number of reasons that students can't make it to lectures such as disability, health, carer responsibilities, or work and the issues with the process that prevents them from accessing their education needs to be addressed.

Manning Jeffery Spoke to his motion noting that Sarah Cutter-Russell had covered the main points.

Macy Reen spoke against the motion saying that lecture recordings are a hindrance and an attack on workers and students. Adding that it is naive to suggest that they are a positive thing as the capacity to undermine staff and students lecture recording present is a greater issue than the student who can't access their lectures. The council should be focused on getting alternatives for students with a disability not more lecture recordings.

Vinil Kumar spoke against the motion saying that he agrees with the sentiment but not the solution. Adding that there needs to be more staff, more services and more options to allow students to make it to class but lecture recordings do not do this. Lecture recordings are used to pull back workers' rights and cut back on staff, the NTEU is against mandatory lecture recordings and the SRC should work and stand with them.

Kim Murphy spoke against the motion saying that universities don't implement lecture recordings to assist student but to aid with corporatisation of universities. Adding that a Monash University for the first lecture of the year students had no teacher at all it was just a pre-recorded lecture that was played and that this is not good for staff or students. She concluded by saying that this motion falsely claims that lecture recordings are about assisting student access, this is better done by decreasing class sizes, increasing the number of classes and not engaging with neoliberal policies.

Harry Gregg spoke to the motion saying that if someone has anxiety, depression chronic fatigue or another condition that prevents them from leaving the house then banning lecture recordings excludes them from getting an education. Adding that if this motion was about having all lectures pre-recorded that would be a different issue and he would be against it. This motion is about making sure that students with a disability, working students, students with carer responsibilities are not being excluded from education.

Sarah Cutter-Russell spoke to her motion saying that as someone who has experienced chronic fatigue after glandular fever she knows that you don't have capacity to get out to class regardless of time and that while lecture recordings are not as good as being in the class they better than missing out.

Manning Jeffery spoke to his motion saying that the slippery-slope argument is unfounded. Adding that as a student with dyslexia going to the lecture is not always sufficient and that lecture recordings are necessary to properly absorb all the information, when things are not in the slides but on a board in class the need to take down that information means that things are missed and without a lecture recording to go back to later that information can become meaningless.

Felix Faber spoke in favour of the motion saying this is not for the removal of lectures or for repeated lecture recordings, this is for student in that course at that time to have access to a lecture recording.

Hektor Vineburg asked how a motion on lecture recordings has tuned into a Marxist critique of neoliberalism, and what is the proposed alternative for students who can't make it in?

Liam Thone spoke to motion and said he couldn't understand how decreasing class sizes and having access to lecture recordings were mutually exclusive. Adding that decreasing class sizes doesn't prevent students from having to work, and that suggesting that is a way to feel superior while being ableist.

William Edwards spoke to the motion saying that Socialist Alternative don't care about students with a disability, and that there were against disabled students having the right to self-determination and that they didn't care if they were excluded from university spaces.

Emma Norton spoke against the motion saying that there are obvious issues with access for students but that doesn't mean a right-wing stance will solve it. Adding that the NTEU's stance has always been against lecture recordings because they understand the danger lecture recordings present to education. Mandatory lecture recordings are against the stance of the NTEU and the council should not support stances that are anti staff. Norton concluded by saying that the council can be supportive of sick, working, and disabled students but what the University wants to develop is a new model of education what would rather see robots than teachers in classrooms and that the council says that teacher conditions are student conditions so we shouldn't ask the University to do what they are already doing we should ask for something better.

Adriana Olguin Malavisi spoke to the motion saying that it is just a motion to investigate lecture recordings and to note that they don't even have everything on them for example when things are on white or chalkboard you will still miss them and that this motion doesn't stop campaigns being run to push for the other things raised here today. Adding that she thinks that Socialist Alternative just like yelling.

Emma Norton asked Adriana Olguin Malavisi why women aren't allowed to yell and isn't it sexist to say that she can't yell or have an opinion? Adding that she had tried to explain her position calmly but had not been listened too.

Adriana Olguin Malavisi said that Emma Norton didn't seem to have read the motion.

Vinil Kumar spoke against the motion quoting "that those who can't imagine a better world, lack imagination" (no attribution) and saying that these policies aren't about inclusivity but

commercialisation. Adding that why can't we ask for more staff to go to students who can't make it in? and that if everyone simply seems to accept what the University is offering rather than asking for more. Kumar continued saying that we should be working with staff not against them and that making it a point of pride that you are united behind students with a disability ignores that you are united against teachers and it shows a lack of understanding about what is happening in the education system in this country which prevents you from being able to actually support students.

Moved: Sarah Cutter-Russell

Seconded: Manning Jeffrey

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

### **Procedural motioned to move to R5.**

Moved: Vinil Kumar

Seconded: Lily Campbell

The procedural was put and **CARRIED.**

Manning Jeffrey dissented.

## **R5. Solidarity with Melbourne University**

That the SRC take a photo to show support with Melbourne University strikes.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion noting the what university is doing to attack workers for expressing different views on what society should be, from freedom of speech or gender issues.

Procedural to move straight to a vote

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Dane

CARRIED

The motion was put and CARRIED.

## **R2. NO CUTS AT JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY!**

### **Preamble:**

Students at James Cook University are facing course and staff cuts at the hands of a neoliberal education agenda spearheaded by JCU Vice Chancellor Sandra Harding. 32 jobs will be lost in the proposed changes with many course including creative arts courses cut. The university management has launched this attack on students and staff without any consultation.

JCU management has done this as a result of \$2.2bn in funding cuts by the Liberal government and a nation wide march towards turning universities into soulless degree factories where the only thing that matters is the financial value of a student.

Students at JCU are fighting back, shutting down the opening of a new building and taking the fight directly to the VC and Liberal Ministers present. Police at the action pushed back protesters



but they didn't give in, refusing to leave for a massive two hours before the VC received their petition of 720 signatures.

**Platform:**

1. The SRC supports the students of JCU in their struggle to keep courses open and staff employed
2. The SRC condemns university managements executing a neoliberal agenda of education
3. The SRC condemns the Liberal government for gutting university funding, denying students like those at JCU the right to an education
4. The SRC condemns JCU management for cutting 32 staff and acknowledges that staff working conditions are student learning conditions
5. The SRC acknowledges the importance of rural and regional activism and commends students in the country standing up for their rights and futures

**Action:**

1. The SRC calls on the NUS education department to provide material support to the campaign

Procedural that speaking time be limited to 1 minute

Moved: William Edwards

Seconded: Brandon Hale

The procedural was put and **CARRIED**

Harry Gregg spoke to the motion outlining the motions aims and that action point one had in fact already been done and so removed it from the motion.

William Edwards spoke to the motion asking the council to please support it.

Moved: Harry Gregg

Seconded: Will Edwards

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

### **R3. INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS OPAL CARD CONCESSIONS MOTION**

**Preamble:**

NSW is the only state in Australia that does not offer its international students concession prices on travel. It is also the largest recruiter of international students in Australia - currently home to 300,000 students, including study abroad and postgrad programs. International students contribute an incredible amount to the academic, social and cultural life of Sydney University. However they are discriminated against in many ways including being denied the same student concession travel as their domestic peers.

This is wrong, it creates an inequality that disadvantages international students on the basis of them not being from Australia. It is racist and xenophobic to deny international students the same rights as anyone else.

**Platform:**

1. The Sydney University SRC demands the NSW government offer concession travel to international students
2. The Sydney University SRC demands that any political party that forms government at the next state election offer concession travel to international students.
3. The SRC supports campaigns being run by international students, other student orgs at USYD and other universities to fix this injustice
4. The USYD SRC demands Michael Spence publicly call for international students to be allowed concession travel

**Action:**

1. USYD SRC activists, councillors and office bearers will support and attend any actions and campaigning for international student concessions
2. The USYD SRC will work with other student orgs to build pressure on parliament to pass this into law

Harry Gregg spoke to the motion saying there had been a meeting on campus about this and that University management seemed supportive of the campaign and that there was the potential to get Michael Spence to sign an open letter in support of concession Opal Cards for international students. Adding that he felt it was unfair that international students don't get the same Opal card as other full-time students, and that this was just one issues among many faced by international students.

Winston Ma spoke to the motion saying it was a great motion but would like to propose that the motion be amended to put pressure on all political parties to change this policy.

Vinil Kumar spoke to the motion saying that as well as asking for support from political parties, students will also need to fight for change.

Moved: Harry Gregg

Seconded: Jacky He

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

**R4. KEEP THE NDIS PUBLIC**

**Preamble:**

The Turnbull Liberal/National government have outsourced the call center of the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) to multinational giant Serco. There is no evidence to prove that essential services are best run by private corporations. No public service run for the public good should be compromised for corporate profit. This is the Liberal party turning the genuine needs of people with a disability into a source of corporate profits. This affects many students with a disability at USYD who rely on government support to have the same opportunities as everyone else.

In addition to this policy being wrong because privatisation doesn't benefit the public, Serco also runs detention centres and prisons. As a corporation Serco have carried out racist and discriminatory policies of successive governments, particularly imprisoning refugees, people of colour, Aboriginal Australians and young people.

**Platform:**

1. The SRC demands the NDIS remains in public hands
2. The SRC believes that privatisation is wrong and only benefits corporations over people

**Action:**

1. The SRC will publicise and support any actions the CPSU or other activist bodies take to stop this
2. The SRC condemns the Liberal government for privatising the NDIS

Vinil Kumar proposed an amendment:

To add the following as platform three to the motion

3. The SRC supports full universal public disability care and recognises that the NDIS is a move away from this.

It was amenable to the movers.

William Edwards noted that the proposed company the call centre would be out sourced to are also responsible for running the detention centres on Manus Island and Nauru and suggested that this was not an organisation you want looking after people, especially the vulnerable.

Moved: Harry Gregg

Seconded: William Edwards

The motion was put and **CARRIED.**

**R6. Budget lockup lockout****Preamble**

In order to allow journalists to scrutinise the budget prior to its official release, the government traditionally allows them a few hours to read over the documents and gain an understanding of the policies contained therein. In previous years, journalists from student newspapers including Honi Soit have been allowed to access the budget papers to provide a critical student voice in the discourse surrounding the budget. Recently, however, the government has refused to grant this access to student newspapers.

This represents a clear attempt from the government to restrict the voice of students as they introduce some of the harshest cuts to higher education in recent memory. The government's excuse of "space restrictions" is a pathetic attempt to conceal their anxiety that a student voice on the budget will reveal it for the neoliberal assault on higher education it is bound to be. In order to defend the rights of students, it is imperative that we have a voice on the issues that affect us.

**Motion**

- 1). The SRC condemns the Turnbull Liberal government for its bare-faced attempt to restrict the voice of students by neglecting to allow student journalists to access budget papers in the 'budget lock-up'.

Action:

1) that the SRC Facebook page posts a condemnation of the Turnbull government for locking the media out.

Felix Faber spoke to the motion saying that in the past the government has granted student media like Honi Soit access to the budget lock up, so they could properly examine the budget documents before they are officially released, this year they are not allowed. We asked the council to condemn the decision to remove student papers access and therefore their ability to properly report on the budget.

Hektor Vineburg spoke to the motion expressing disappointment that Honi Soit had been denied the opportunity to properly report on the budget.

Moved: Felix Faber

Seconded: Hektor Vineburg

Motion was put and **CARRIED.**

There being no other business the meeting was concluded.

*The meeting closed at 10:37.*