

**NATIONAL UNION
OF
STUDENTS**



**UNION NATIONALE
DES
ETUDIANTS**

SUITE 220, 227 LAURIER AVE. W, OTTAWA, ONTARIO, CANADA, K1P 5J7. TELEPHONE 613-232-7394

CENTRAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Meeting of June 28-30, 1977

Ottawa

PRESENT:

John Doherty
Punam Khosla
Rob Lauer
Ben Parker
Jim Payne
Ross Powell
Stu Reid
Don Soucy
Mary Thauberger

Joyce Andres (staff)
Dan O'Connor (staff)
Chris Vanneste (staff)
Gavin Anderson (hiring committee)
Gene Long (CUP)
Riel Miller (Carleton)
Pierre Thibault

Ross Powell called the meeting to order at 10:40 am, Tuesday, June 28. Members expressed regrets that delay and confusion (caused by others) meant Wayne Stewart could not attend this meeting.

1. Review of May conference decisions

Members reviewed the minutes of the May conference to see if there were motions that needed attention which would not be dealt with under other items on the agenda.

It was first noted that the organizers' manual for work on unemployment, commissioned by a motion from the unemployment workshop, had not been done. This was meant to provide assistance during the summer, when other organizing manuals were not very useful. No one had been assigned to do the manual, and there was little experience of off-campus organizing among student associations. Members quickly reached a consensus that the summer manual, as outlined, could not be done. Some felt that it should be incorporated into the larger manual for on-campus organizing that Jim was preparing. Others felt it would merely duplicate that manual. John suggested that in the fall those who gained some experience over this summer be asked to contribute their ideas. Punam felt that organizing tips were most useful when provided in the context of a campaign. Jim felt that his manual would be ready by the third week in July. Ben and Stu thought it would be good to have the manual distributed by September. Members eventually concluded that it would not be necessary to have the manual ready for the fall.

Jim remarked that many motions spoke directly to student associations, and asked how these were implemented. He suggested a letter from the office, since encouragement by Central Committee members was the only other method. Dan said

that usually the conference minutes were used to directly communicate the message, and that follow-up took place in the course of field work. Don said that on many such matters a letter or conversation from the Central Committee representative was better received than a letter from the national office. Dan agreed. Jim encouraged Central Committee members to follow up these motions.

One of the conference delegates had assumed responsibility for the manual on course unions. Jim and Dan would be able to follow this up. Original expectations were for early completion of the project. Dan would follow up the manpower training motion with a meeting to explore in detail the federal government's opposition to payment of student union fees. The votes by mail were generally favourable on this motion. Ross was continuing to do background research on academic barriers and testing. He was corresponding with others interested in the field. Members felt that the office lacked the resources to prepare the campus forums on the Berger report. Student associations would be able to carry this out on their own. Joyce had begun work on student newspaper autonomy by asking for information from campuses that had attempted various models of autonomous operation.

Members felt that further direction on the international student leaflet was necessary. John felt that it would be worthwhile in the fall in Ontario, when differential fees would be raised again, and a conference on international education held. Members seemed to feel that the information would be useful even if the new act was passed. There was a great deal of information available for such a leaflet. Dan asked about the distribution and presentation of the leaflet; whether it would be part of a larger campaign. John thought the leaflet, a brief summary of the situation and making other information available would be sufficient. Don volunteered himself and Miguel to help prepare the leaflet. Punam hoped that NUS would issue a statement if the immigration bill was passed soon. A brief discussion of costs led to the conclusion that if the leaflet was self-financing in the same way as National Student Day materials, there was no budgetary problem. Stu felt that mass distribution would be good, but acknowledged that this was up to the campus association. Don suggested that the number needed in the Atlantic could be run off by AFS, then a second printing for other areas done from the office. Ross said it would be agreeable for Don and Miguel to go ahead writing, and to work things out with the office. Stu said that a full-scale campaign was unlikely, especially when some student unions favoured the differential fee. NUS could probably just provide information and some encouragement. Ben felt that various degrees of materials could be ready, with campuses to decide how much they would do. Stu replied that this could draw away from the student aid and unemployment campaigns. Jim agreed, especially since international student issues often received attention at the local and provincial levels. It was left as a leaflet (that Don would try to have ready at the end of August) and a second printing of Pierre's paper for wider circulation.

An assessment of the federal government's past actions on the differential fee issue led members to conclude that it was unlikely they would respond positively to a NUS call for a public federal position. Further informal discovery of the federal attitudes and a few badgering letters would be enough to implement the motion on this. Members agreed that the Council of Ministers of Education was unlikely to take a public position either. Ontario was strongly against such stands by the Council. People were looking at the question provincially in a national context, realizing that one province's move affected all. The CME would

the aid
be meeting in September, and again a letter would be useful.

It was explained again that the budget committee's recommendation about part-time fees referred only to campuses where part-time students paid student union fees but their NUS fees were not being passed on. Rob pointed out that when the conference passed the motion regarding researchers' meetings they knew it could not be afforded. Members discussed briefly the trade off between a researchers' meeting and full representation of campuses at the Calgary conference. Most felt there was such a trade off, but this seemed to be the only way to afford a meeting of researchers. Riel suggested a paper on research categories and topics be prepared. Jim said that some people who send staff would still not give a high priority to sending researchers. Ben said that most researchers already had their priorities and direction from the particular organization. Ross felt that it was a straightforward attempt to eliminate duplication, and that there could be some form of staff caucus at the October conference to deal with this.

2. Office report

Members had already received reports of most office activities, including preparation of the conference minutes and vote by mail, press release on May unemployment, liaison with various groups, etc. Dan added that work on student aid and unemployment was underway. It had been discovered that the September survey of students' unemployment was not being done. The provinces had been asked to provide details of the money available under 1977-78 student aid programs. There was a letter from COPUS about AUCC and relations between COPUS and NUS. Ross mentioned criticism in B.C. of the idea of a separate organization for part-time students. Members agreed that Dan should answer the COPUS letter by mentioning NUS willingness to continue working for and with part-time students but making it clear that aspects of the relation were an open question for NUS. The IUS had repeated their invitation for a NUS delegation to go to Prague. Ross felt the request for their policy developments, constitution, etc. should be repeated. They were to be thanked for the invitation, but told that a visit was not feasible. Ged Baldwin, M.P., had written about his League for Parliamentary Control, asking that NUS help publicize it. Members thought that more information should be gathered about the league, and that in view of recent developments in the ACCESS organization NUS should resume contact with it. Membership in ACCESS might again be possible. The Consumers' Association had written about Irwin's refusal to sell soft-cover text books in Canada. Members agreed to the CAC request for support, and felt that it was worthwhile to gather more information and send a letter to campus associations.

3. Office organization

Dan reported that after some discussion he and Len came to the conclusion that it was not possible to assess the division of labour in 1977-78 until the new researcher was hired and people were able to see how they worked together. Job descriptions and Central Committee direction were the bulk of each person's work, but in an office of only four people flexibility and ability to work in a team were also parts of the job. Dan was concerned that NUS avoid the approach that inflexibly limits and defines everyone's tasks, since it would not allow for the office to monitor, assess and react to the constantly changing situation in the country and on the campuses. NUS would come close to collapse with an office staffed only by functionaries, and it was also dangerous to have only one

office position that included assessment, etc. In the past year it was usual the researcher and executive secretary who kept up an on-going analysis from details of NUS work were determined. Dan answered questions by saying that internal organization of the office, and co-ordination of people's work in the office, was steadily improving. The effect of procedures introduced over the winter was to bring more and more of the office operation under control.

John had questions about why some problems in the office seemed to drag on longer than necessary. Ross felt there was no real problem, other than the inevitable time lag involved with regular Central Committee review of office reports and organization. He felt that the setting of priorities had been successful in this review. It was usually clear who was responsible for things. Ben felt that this related to the Central Committee's accountability for NUS operations. One first had to realize a job was not done, then see why. John was still dissatisfied, feeling that past problems had not been confronted directly enough. Chris agreed. Stu said there was a reluctance on the part of inexperienced employers to come down hard, to disrupt the organization, to disagree with those who had been around much longer. John still thought that office reports should be discussed and questioned in greater detail. Don agreed that members should try to overcome their reluctance. Ross argued that it was about average to take about a year to see if a person was working out. Punam said that the main question was defining expectations of the office and staff. Ben said that organizations are always in a situation where a job has not been done, and the object was to learn from experience.

4. Conferences attended

Jim reported on the AUCC conference, which he, Don and Bob Brack attended for NUS. The conference was on the theme "The University and a Changing Society". Workshop recommendations included more polytechnicals and fewer universities, but recommendations do not get a plenary discussion or vote. The open sessions did not discuss financing of universities. The premier of Nova Scotia made a good speech which contrasted with his government's policies on post-secondary education. The few students present seemed misinformed about the withdrawal from AUCC, not knowing that it originated with students at AUCC conferences. All of them said they agreed with the stand that AUCC did not represent students. The NUS delegates circulated a brief memo on the request of the students there. The students talked mostly about nominations to the board. There was clear evidence that student unions' withdrawal and faculty's continued non-participation are having some effect. Jim felt that the only accomplishment was that the students better understood the NUS position. John pointed out that many administrators think poorly of those students who do attend AUCC conferences.

Jim said that some campuses, UNB for instance, planned to raise the matter again at the October conference. The students elected to the AUCC board said they would keep in touch with NUS. Jim felt they should be dealt with, rather than dealing only with the responsible AUCC people. The next AUCC board meeting was in October also. Ross felt that administrative members of the AUCC board should be pressured about this, and he thought some of them could be convinced to take a stand on the matter. They would press AUCC to honour the NUS position, and to deal only with NUS delegates as student representatives. Jim's impression was that administrators were avoiding the question of representivity. Don disagreed with Ross, arguing that administrators were clearly trying to maintain the myth of valid student representation through AUCC. John reminded members of the signs

of discontent within AUCC. Several universities seemed to be moving toward quitting.

Jim suggested that the best follow up would be to wait and see what the students who attended did next. Dan pointed out problems with this. He was concerned that students who had pressed for the "informal caucus" motion also attended the AUCC conference, thus undercutting the value of the caucus idea. There was also the unanswered question of who the students on the AUCC board were representing, since they agreed AUCC did not represent students. He suggested that the work on the informal caucus be accelerated, and that both the Central Committee and the non-attending associations write to the attenders. He felt that some student associations had not fully considered the matter, and letters would prod them to do so. Riel thought that a report from the NUS delegates to the campus associations would also be useful in the relatively near future. John commented that the near-nomination of Bob Brack was a point in favour of having all future reps from the Central Committee. Don felt that the effort should focus on the next NUS conference, not on convincing the students who actually attended. It was agreed that the Central Committee would encourage the letters about AUCC attendance, that Dan would work on the NUS-CAUT-AUCC caucus and the NUS reps would work on a delegates' report.

Dan reported briefly on the Canadian Association of University Business Officers conference. There were several hundred delegates, and the main interests were unionization and accounting practices. The opening session with Ian Macdonald of York University displayed a strong anti-union and anti-faculty bias. He, the Ontario deputy-minister and the president of Harding Carpets were on a panel about university financing. The business rep pressed for much higher academic standards and full-cost tuition fees, plus student aid reforms. The government rep claimed there was no financial crisis. The provincial granting bodies or ministries were in attendance, plus about 20 university business officers. The audience clearly favoured the business representative, and were dubious about the government rep. They displayed no liking for the student position. Ross and Rob heard feedback that the question of public opposition to fee hikes had the most impact.

John reported on the Ontario Federation of Students conference. It was a low-key conference, by design. Student aid and unemployment were the major issues, with two aid pamphlets planned for the fall. One would be distributed at registration, the other (in late fall) would discuss guaranteed annual income. There was uncertainty on how to deal with unemployment, so a committee was struck to look at it. It will start on contacts with other groups about willingness to act, and looks to a conference in late fall or early winter. OFS was moving toward services, as illustrated by an orientation conference held simultaneously with their own and a planned services conference. There was also a simultaneous colleges conference which proceeded fairly well. Stu said that autonomy was one focus of the colleges. He felt that the orientation conference had suffered from different expectations among its delegates. John said that the conference struck many committees, the first move to permanent committees in OFS. The full-time chairperson's position was left vacant and Miriam Edelson was OFS chairperson. Stu saw the women's caucus as particularly strong.

Jim had attended as AFS rep. He found the conference slow and smoothly organized, but found the women's caucus to be the only productive part. It had

usually
from
at

worked to run three simultaneous conferences, or to schedule plenary-type workshops. Stu said that, surprisingly, a newly formed presidents' caucus went well. Riel liked the way dissidents were handled at the conference, but admitted that services and lobbying had been set as the OFS tasks. John was asked if cutbacks were a priority, as the program of action presumed. He said that the workshop was mainly a roundtable of campus experiences, and the only action was documentation to assist the student aid and unemployment work. The next OFS conference would look at cutbacks. Punam remarked that NUS rejected financing/cutbacks as a campaign issue because provincial organizations would be doing it.

Stu said that the move toward services was strong and growing. John said that it was being encouraged by the OFS executive as an aspect of the organization's development, and something which could only benefit it. Stu thought this would surface at the next NUS conference. Dan said that some aspects of the conference, especially the exclusive approach to services and lobbying, were worrisome. He knew that the OFS executive wanted to do more than that, but wondered if this conference would contribute to a rejection of anything else by student unions. Ross asked what the expectations of OFS were now, at a time when organizations should be preparing students to mobilize. Jim said the conference showed no intention to mobilize students or organize on campuses. Riel said there had been anticipation of a major split in OFS, and it was averted. He thought that with the current resources services could only be developed at the expense of political work. John responded, pointing out that a lot of serious problems with the organization were dealt with, and its activity/successes were reviewed. It was an accomplishment that people with problems and objections left feeling that they were being dealt with in a positive way. He disagreed with Riel about services and politics. Stu said that it was wise to move toward services, it was necessary for OFS to keep and gain members. Ross also said that services and politics were not opposed. However, he also felt it was different to say that mobilization is a first priority but services are possible, than to say there will just be services and lobbying.

Stu mentioned that the OFS executive report included sections on integration of NUS and OFS, and participation in student organizations. They were left until the fall conference. Ben compared the OFS conference with that of the Students' Association of Manitoba, which opposed serving and representing as ideas. People there acted more as student administrators than as student leaders. They were caught up with relations rather than decisions. Ross felt it was a similar debate but a different problem, since one organization had a degree of momentum while in Manitoba they were still building up some awareness of what political decisions are and their effect on students. The context made it a different problem. Punam felt that services, as an issue, differed province to province but that it had the same effect on NUS.

Ben reported on the SAM conference. It was poorly organized, looked at the formation and direction of SAM and chose a preliminary executive for the organization. The organization was not yet founded. Delegates did not want a link with the Central Committee, and seemed to be afraid of students. They were unsure about working apart from government, and seriously proposed that research tasks be contracted out. There was no fee structure or solid direction yet. Joyce commented on the mutual distrust among delegates, highlighted by a walkout. Job creation programs and the development of a student aid plan were research priorities. Joyce said there were some people who wished to see movement on major concerns.

5. Upcoming conferences

The International Union of Students was co-sponsoring a symposium on unemployment in West Germany, and were pressing NUS to attend. John would be in England at the time, and said he would attend if possible. He would pay travel costs, and NUS would reimburse his conference fee. People agreed to this, directing him to attend as a non-voting observer to gain and give information, acting only on NUS policies.

There was an invitation to have a representative on a panel at the fall Association of Canadian Community Colleges conference. The topic was "Viability of National Student Organizations" and some members were offended by its implications. NUS would have representatives there anyway, but people wanted further details on the panel before making a decision.

Don was to attend the August seminar on unemployment being held by the Student Christian Movement. If he could not attend, alternatives would be considered.

6. Hiring

John reported the hiring committee's recommendation that Marie-Andrée Imbeault be hired as researcher. She had done a series of articles on cutbacks for Le Droit, seemed to grasp the issues NUS dealt with and to have solid plans for approaching the job. She was completely bilingual. The committee also recommended that the Western fieldwork position remain open for further applications. They had further work to do before recommending the hiring of fieldworkers.

MOTION: Reid/Doherty
That Marie-Andrée Imbeault be hired as NUS researcher.

Members questioned committee members about the procedures they followed, the number of interviews and the other leading applicants. Andrée had been a journalism student at Algonquin College.

CARRIED

7. Location and relocation of fieldworkers

This was a topic of some concern to the 1976-77 Central Committee, and it had been referred for Central Committee debate by the negotiating committee for the current collective agreement. Staff had decided that it was a question of NUS's direction, to be decided by the political leadership, rather than a question of working conditions. Bilingualism was a factor in this, since Atlantic and Ontario fieldworkers were required to be fluent in English and French. The general rule had been that fieldworkers decided questions of location and relocation, using seniority or general agreement as the determining factor. Dan reminded members that there had been concern that the present rule could mean a fieldworker was being forced upon a region. The rule came from the concept that all NUS fieldworkers are "national" in the sense that they can, if necessary, work in any part of the country.

Members looked at the possibility of a bilingualism requirement for the western fieldworkers. It meant that a person could transfer from east to west, but a transfer in the opposite direction was not necessarily possible. Jim and

Pierre
require

Punam favoured a universal bilingualism requirement for fieldworkers, to preserve the ability to move anywhere in the country as needed. Rob and Dan felt that it was an unrealistic limitation on the ability of people to get fieldwork jobs. Jim hoped that in any location/relocation matter regional advice would be sought and heeded. John suggested that some sort of union/management committee, or the staff liaison person and the shop steward, could take care of this. He felt that in the extreme situation of a fieldworker who was unacceptable on most or all western campuses, that person's ability would be the main question. Stu felt that staff discretion would be sufficient in most cases to deal with any location/relocation problem, but the committee was a good idea to ease friction. He also opposed bilingualism as a requirement for fieldwork in the west. Joyce pointed out that peer pressure within the staff often resolves problems and personality conflicts.

People were concerned that, under the present rules, a fieldworker could be forced to move by a more senior fieldworker at the year-end review of locations. This, combined with the bilingualism requirements, could force a good unilingual fieldworker to resign if s/he lost any chance of a western position due to relocation on the basis of seniority. Dan declared that most of the situations causing alarm would exist only when NUS was in severe trouble and had internal turmoil. The usual co-operation and trust within the organization had worked so far.

MOTION: Lauer/Reid
That questions of location and relocation of fieldworkers shall be handled by the staff,
That in the event of a dispute the question goes to a committee composed of the shop steward and staff liaison person, either of whom shall be replaced by an alternate if personally involved, and
That final appeal on questions is to the Central Committee.

Rob also said he would introduce a motion denying fieldworkers the right to force another to move on the basis of seniority.

CARRIED

MOTION: Lauer/Reid
That field staff members cannot use seniority rights to displace another field staff member's location unless it is mutually agreeable.

Rob said that this motion was done in the context of staff control/seniority and the usual annual reassessment of locations. Ross and several others questioned the necessity of the motion, since the previous motion modified the old rule so the committee or the Central Committee could settle the question as they thought best. Stu and Rob felt that the committee might still be bound by the seniority approach, and this motion would let them ignore it if advisable. Mary felt there was no objection to a person losing their position due to relocation on the basis of seniority, since there could be a good reason for the move. Pierre and Dan pointed out that normally the staff would be consulted on this before a Central Committee decision, since it affected working conditions directly, but they had chosen to make no recommendation or decision. Several members again argued that the motion was unnecessary since a dispute about displacement of a fieldworker would be settled by the committee in any case. Rob and Stu agreed.

WITHDRAWN

Pierre felt that it should be clear people were not saying that bilingualism requirements, and the effect on unilingual people, was "bad". He pointed out that in most country-wide trade unions and companies, bilingualism was recognized by higher wages for bilingual employees. It was no discrimination to require people to work in a second language (and so to learn it), but rather an upgrading of job qualifications.

The session ended at 8:20 pm, and resumed at 9:40 am, Wednesday, June 29.

PRESENT:

John Doherty
Punam Khosla
Rob Lauer
Ben Parker
Jim Payne
Ross Powell
Stu Reid
Don Soucy
Mary Thauberger

Joyce Andres (staff)
Dan O'Connor (staff)
Chris Vanneste (staff)
Gene Long (CUP)
Isa Bakker (Carleton)
Doug Coupar (Carleton)
Riel Miller (Carleton)
Pierre Thibault

8. Standing committees

Members reviewed the initial stages of the standing committees established or elected at the May conference.

Ben was the liaison for the bilingualism committee. He was not sure what purpose the committee was to serve between conferences. Members agreed that the term of reference, "to study all matters pertaining to bilingualism" was rather broad. People had formed conflicting impressions of the committee's main goal. Chris said that the workshop had not really discussed the committee's direction, other than that it would cover both internal and external aspects. It was agreed that Ben would correspond with the francophone and bilingual campuses about committee membership, and would contact Mauril Bélanger to see what focus had been forseen for the committee's work.

Stu reported that the only work so far on the broadcast media committee was a letter that Gary Wells sent to some radio stations to start gathering information and contacts. Some stations were busy, and others did not operate in the summer, so response was poor. Stu thought that communication, information-gathering and perhaps regional meetings would be the first steps, with a national conference unlikely in the near future. Stations in British Columbia and Manitoba had expressed interest in this committee's work, members reported. Stu suggested that a regular flow of information would have higher priority than getting the committee itself underway. People had some doubts about the ease with which information from all stations could be gathered on a regular basis. It was agreed that the stations at community colleges and universities in southwest Ontario should be the group from whom the committee should be formed. Many of them were interested in this work. Stu would take the responsibility to call a meeting to get it off the ground.

Punam reported that no new members of the colleges committee had been chosen since the conference. The committee was still a mix of community colleges and

small degree-granting colleges. She felt that a community colleges committee was needed, even though it might mean there would also be a small colleges committee. She would continue working to get the committee going.

John had been in touch with some of the graduate organizing committee people. The graduate students in Ontario were working on by-laws for an organization, and their conference would be discussing relations with national and provincial organizations. Riel said that the national committee was not paralleling the Ontario developments. John said that the Ontario grads preferred to be a sub-body of OFS with a separate levy for non-OFS members and the ability to set policy on grads-only matters. Joyce reported that the three members of the national grad committee and a UBC person met in Halifax and suggested a two-day grad conference be held in Calgary simultaneous with the NUS one. They wanted the Central Committee's views on this suggestion. The purpose was to attract those grad associations that might be uneasy about NUS.

Joyce reported further that the group in Halifax felt there were three models for their relations with NUS: separation, assimilation and being a separate entity within NUS. Several members remarked on the apparent difference between the tone of the Halifax meeting and the attitudes shown in Charlottetown by the graduate caucus. Jim and Rob said that they did not like the idea of a separate simultaneous conference. Ross said that he liked the idea of graduate students organizing and developing a role for themselves within the student movement, but he felt it was problematic for the organizing committee to be willing to string along with those who oppose NUS involvement. He hoped that the committee's focus would be work and activity to benefit graduate students, not structural debates. Riel said that the separate conference seemed both unnecessary and an unwise use of time and resources. John suggested that graduate associations be approached for suggestions about the Calgary conference agenda. Don stated that neither a separate grad conference nor the Charlottetown approach was ideal, but he preferred the latter. It was agreed that the committee executive would be told that the Central Committee did not like the idea of a separate two-day conference, and that graduate associations would be consulted on the Calgary agenda.

Several members reported their province's selection of a member for the student aid committee, and others were about to choose. Ross felt that this put the committee in a position to start work. Good luck in gathering background information meant that many details of the student aid programs were already known, and the provincial comparison would be completed with less effort than expected. John said that the OFS executive wanted to see the committee both productive and in close touch with the Central Committee.

Isa Bakker reported that an information packet and two surveys were ready for distribution from the women's committee. Some positions were still open, but prospects were good if the provincial co-ordinators kept up their end.

9. CUSA proposal for a national conference on youth unemployment

Doug Coupar and Isa Bakker presented the Carleton University Student Association's proposal for a late-September national conference on youth unemployment. The conference would have delegates from student unions, district labour councils, etc. It would be divided into an Open Forum to inform both delegates and the general public in the Ottawa area, and an Action Forum (under

the auspices of NUS and the Canadian Labour Congress) to develop specific proposals for work on the unemployment issue. Doug said that CUSA had avoided a definite position on many aspects of the conference since they felt it should be organized to the liking of the CLC and NUS. The conference should be in the fall, he felt, so delegates could reach certain objectives of common concern. The conference would be the first step in a long process towards creation of a coalition on unemployment. It should be integrated into a campaign that would take different forms under the different local organizations. The CLC had been approached, and said they wanted it to be more than a conference. This meant preparatory work in July, August and September, then follow-up work. CUSA was offering to facilitate the conference, but there would be no hard feelings if NUS and the CLC did not want the conference. It was simply that CUSA was able to facilitate now. The open forum would help identify the regional situations and what was being done about them. The action forum would see how to continue and co-ordinate the activity identified in the open forum. Resolutions passed by the action forum would go to the local and regional levels for ratification once delegates returned home. The CLC was waiting to hear what NUS said. He felt it would be a large conference, with up to 500 delegates, and largely self-sustaining with delegate fees and travel pool. CUSA, NUS and the CLC would have to share some costs. Government was another possible source of funds, but finances had not been worked out nor revenue sought until the conference had NUS and CLC approval.

John said that the OFS executive and unemployment committee thought the conference should be on all unemployment, not just youth, that substantial and cross-country CLC support was essential and that the timing was premature. There had to first be general discussions at the organizational level, so the groups got to know and trust each other. Doug responded that youth unemployment was the focus to avoid being premature on full unemployment issues, and since it was a particularly severe aspect with more feelings that something could be accomplished. He felt that the CLC was supporting the conference, and just waiting for a Central Committee decision from NUS. They had concerns about the lack of preparatory time, but felt that local and regional aspects of this work would be part of the conference follow-up. He thought the CLC had the money and the time to adequately back the conference.

Doug replied to John's question about NUS's contribution by saying that it would be in the thousands of dollars, plus Central Committee travel. They had not prepared a budget until they knew NUS and CLC intentions. He further explained that both CUSA and NUS would be expected to contribute about \$2500, and that NUS could provide this partly in services. Rob said that such an expenditure this fall was out of the question. It would mean cancelling a Central Committee meeting. However, he liked the principle of the conference. Doug answered that the CLC had some worries about councils' changeover and NUS's stability, and money from NUS would be a demonstration of commitment.

Dan asked why CUSA was proposing this conference to start efforts on unemployment. Doug and Isa explained that the other alternatives they considered were smaller national conferences, or regional or local conference. They concluded that this scale was possible, and that the time was ripe. They saw no role for CUSA outside of conference-facilitating. Dan repeated questions about the focus on youth unemployment, and Doug said that if it was general unemployment trade unionists alone, not NUS, would be prime movers. The young were suffering more than others from unemployment, and various youth groups had experience to share.

He agreed that the conference would have to treat youth unemployment as part of the overall problem. It would be more about youth's efforts to fight unemployment than about youth unemployment. Isa said that such questions would be up to NUS and the CLC. Doug explained that the action forum would begin on the second day, with delegates' gaining information through the first day of the open forum. NUS would have to provide manpower over and above cash, since the CUSA-NUS-CLC conference committee was to be very active in directing conference preparations. This meant assignment of a NUS staff person to the committee. He thought that this conference's recommendations would go straight to the workshops and plenary of the NUS one three weeks later in Calgary.

Don said he liked the idea, but there were many complex questions to be settled. He agreed that youth unemployment was just a manifestation of the general problem, and so it should just be a conference on unemployment. This better suited the goal of an eventual CLC-NUS coalition, also. Doug pointed out that the CLC sees a need for it to better deal with young trade unionists, and so it favours a youth unemployment conference. Don asked how the conference would fit in with an on-going program on unemployment. Doug said that there was local and provincial work everywhere except Alberta, but that a national face-to-face meeting was needed to overcome people's isolation and help link up the many small efforts. There would be no national scope, and poor information exchange, without such a conference. Riel said that youth unemployment had more political and emotional impact, and did not seem as overwhelming as the overall unemployment problem. He felt it would be critical for a committee of several national organizations to prepare in advance an action proposal which would be given prior approval by the executives. The conference would then unite rather than split between various ideas.

Ross stated that he was concerned about the focus on youth unemployment, and about the ability of both NUS and individual student unions to pay for the conference. Doug mentioned some sources of funds for the conference, and guessed that the total cost to a delegate might be \$200. Ross said that it was not even certain that the B.C. Students' Federation could afford to send a delegate. He felt that calling the conference youth unemployment was not a major problem if people could discuss larger aspects. Ben saw a problem with the conference being conflicts between the people who came to get educated about unemployment and the people who came to get action on unemployment. The action recommendations had to come from common assumptions. Doug felt that the format allowed for a full spectrum of knowledge and views among delegates, and that everyone could find something satisfying.

Stu recalled that at the May conference workshop, many felt that they were not ready, and their campus was not ready, for a coalition on unemployment. They were uncertain about what could be done on campus, and many questions of a NUS campaign and strategy were left until October. A third national conference would be a strain, especially for small campuses. They would not be able to attend, and could be alienated. He had doubts about the time needed to prepare the conference, and thought it would be almost a full-time assignment for one staff member. He questioned the necessity of the open forum, and thought the conference could be damaging if it had the same kind of debate as at the NUS one. He asked about the length of the conference, and Doug said three days. John said that the Ontario Federation of Labour's reluctance to work along these lines worried him with reference to the CLC's involvement. Doug acknowledged

Part of
employment
to NTC

the differences within the CLC, pointing to the Quebec federation. John said he would like to see some solution to the problem of NUS trying to do two conferences with limited resources. Doug said the conference must first be approved, then NUS and the CLC would have to work such things out. Rob said that people seemed to have no objection to the principle of the conference, but it could not happen in the fall unless the CLC provided all funds and organization for the conference. Spring or summer looked like better times.

MOTION: Lauer/Doherty
To approve in principle a national convention of unemployment,
co-ordinated by the CLC, CUSA and NUS.

Rob stated that Doug had heard the debate, and could go to the CLC with this. Punam said that she wholeheartedly supported the conference in principle. She saw feasibility problems with timing and money. She also had doubts about starting work with a conference, and thought the on-going work would suffer. A late September conference would have delegates who did not know their potential for work in this issue, and the provincial effort for coalitions would not have developed. The national conference had to co-ordinate and expand the perspective on something that was already happening, not pass something from the national to the local and provincial levels. She felt that April would be the best time, in terms of campus delegates having some experience, NUS having the needed time and money to help organize the conference. Now, when endless efforts to get something going at the local level were just starting to succeed, was not the time for a national conference. Mary said that she liked both this motion and the CUSA proposal.

CARRIED

Mary said that the arguments against the CUSA conference had not convinced her. The conference would spark implementation of already-approved provincial and local motions on unemployment, not force something on the provincial level. The conference could be an effective part of the fall campaign, and could draw in campuses that might stand aside otherwise. Ben was now bothered by the objection that students were not ready, since all groups feel they are unprepared for a major effort. He was not sure that various problems and misconceptions had to be hidden, especially when a problem was educating people about the issue. He did not think it would take too much staff time. Riel thought it would take only a few hours a week of NUS staff time. Local work could only benefit from the reduced isolation and alienation. A spring conference would focus people on talk at the time of year when student action was most likely.

Dan said he had practical objections to the proposal. National Student Day and the October '76 NUS conference had fully shown the difficulty of getting most campuses involved in something at the start of the year. The last Central Committee meeting had agreed that the first weekend in October was too early for a NUS conference. He was sure that considerable staff time would be involved in informing and preparing student unions for this conference. This would draw from preparation of the NUS conference being held three weeks later. Student associations had limited funds, and attending this conference would be done only at the expense of attending others. Finally, the unemployment workshop held six weeks earlier had shown much caution about work with others on unemployment, being unwilling to approve the concept of a coalition and not giving serious consideration to the idea of a CLC-NUS conference on unemployment.

had to
be
summed
up

Jim disagreed. He favoured a youth conference oriented to action, held in the fall. He did not think the conference had to be large. Provincial organizations could be represented, but not local unions. Rob said there was no possibility of a conference that needed NUS funds. Jim said that CUSA could only help with a fall conference. Doug agreed, saying that September 30 to October 2 was the latest possible time for CUSA. Stu objected to a fall date, which would mean that staff had to do all of the planning with little Central Committee help and direction. He was certain, from CUSA's proposal, that it would take most of a person's time. He asked which aspect of NUS work would be dropped to support the conference's preparation. He preferred a spring conference of a reasonable size, perhaps 120 delegates. John suggested May or September 1978 for the conference, pointing out that the much smaller NUS conference in Charlottetown took six months to prepare. In the meantime the organizations would increase liaison, NUS would refine its own position and actions at the Calgary conference.

Don said that a date and structure had to be settled before people could build towards the conference. He liked the open forum / action forum structure, since it gave some unity for demands and strategies. He opposed a focus on youth unemployment, since this would exclude some from eventual action. The considerations in setting a time were that the conference was part of a process, held to consolidate work, and not a stepping-off point. More analysis of the time was needed, but he felt September 1978 was too late. Some long-term planning would make it possible for local groups to fully prepare, thus it would be a democratic conference that truly unified. Dan repeated his arguments about the mandate given by the May meeting, and urged that the final decision be left to delegates in Calgary. Riel liked a late winter time, March or April, since the conference should help build momentum and put pressure on governments. He felt that the decisions of a particular workshop with limited time and at a particular conference was a false obstacle. The Central Committee was there to lead and mobilize. Jim said the idea should go to the October NUS conference. Joyce reviewed the practical problems with the CUSA proposal. She suggested that more discussions with the CLC were needed, and that this aspect could be developed with an eye to the October conference. Ottawa was a prime site for the unemployment conference, and CUSA could be approached at a later date.

MOTION: Reid/Lauer
That staff investigate the feasibility of a national conference on unemployment to be held in late winter/early spring of 1978, and That the Central Committee direct a special workshop on such a conference be held at the October NUS conference.

Stu said that he thought the feasibility should be done for the next Central Committee meeting. Don liked the motion, and said that pacing and patience were needed. The feasibility aspect would include a meeting with the CLC to look at a more clearly defined proposal for a conference. He was not certain that a special workshop would be needed. Dan thought that this direction would fit in with that given by the Central Committee in May on liaison with other organizations. Don said he would like the Central Committee to provide more direction on details of the conference, such as its objectives. Riel said the conference should build a movement, should solidify a movement, and should not be a stopping point.

AMENDMENT: Khosla
That staff work to set up an August executive level meeting with the CLC.

CARRIED

Stu said that the Central Committee had to first determine its own position. Punam said that technical feasibility was to be checked, that political feasibility had to be made certain at this meeting of the Central Committee. Riel felt that political feasibility had to be investigated before logistics were. Ross said that if the conference proceeded, it would be a co-operative venture in which others' ideas played a role. This was a reason for investigating. The CLC was not being asked to make a commitment, this was simply an attempt to get more concrete about the unemployment conference idea. There would eventually be a debate in the Central Committee and at the October conference.

CARRIED

Punam thanked Carleton for sparking the Central Committee debate on the conference.

10. Minutes of May 14 & 15

Rob noted that the minutes omitted the motion, passed early in the meeting, that Rob Lauer and one of Punam Khosla, Dan O'Connor or Ross Powell be the signing officers. Members agreed that such a motion had been passed. No other corrections were made.

11. Student aid

Dan reported that since the conference the collection of information about 1977-78 aid programs, and the letter about the income tax waiver, were all that had been done. He felt that follow up to the post-secondary student survey should be done soon. Ross said that many provinces were reviewing criteria and processing procedures. He sensed that they did not expect a new plan to be in effect by 1978-79. John noted that Ontario aid officers were being encouraged to throw away the federal booklet describing Canada Student Loans, since Ontario had cut back from the federal allowances and criteria. There was an impression there that the Department of Finance was making a greater effort to distribute its booklet. It appeared that Ontario was going to reject the advisory committee recommendation of an optional loan and needs-related grant system.

Ross suggested that the office should go ahead to try and feel out events in the review of Canada Student Loans and on the question of participation in the preparation of a new act. The student aid committee would soon begin to discuss the aspects of current programs where people felt they could make advances. There was some discussion of how the lobbying effort done by the aid committee and the on-campus student aid campaign, would relate. One factor was the possibility of new federal legislation. A position on what the new plan should be, or a direct response to proposed legislation, could be the focus of the campaign. The Central Committee should provide some direction to the student aid committee, and in timing this work people should try to be ready for on-campus work when the school year began. Ross said that the workshop had thought that secrecy would be the major focus of on-campus work.

John said that Ontario was thinking of presenting four specific demands for changes in the student aid plan for the start of their campaign. Dan suggested that there should be some attempt to co-ordinate the various provincial efforts to prevent duplication or competition among the national and provincial levels of the campaigning. Jim and Don felt that the focus of the national campaign was to be involvement in negotiation of a new plan. Punam liked the idea of

consultation about specific demands, to help the committee make its recommendations. Ross asked what involvement the Central Committee should have in the development of the campaign. One extreme was that the office and student aid committee would work together, using the campus input, to produce materials. The other was that everything wait for Central Committee endorsement. People seemed to prefer having developments and drafts circulated with the Central Committee letter for any input or reactions they had. Dan reminded people that if there were delays, consultation was likely to be cut if necessary to get materials ready in time.

It was concluded that the student aid committee would work on three projects: the report on provincial programs; the national lobbying effort - where to move; the national on-campus campaign, with the input and direction of provincial executives and the Central Committee. Ross felt that these goals could be met. The committee would work to complete these projects by the end of July, although Ross warned that this would be difficult for the on-campus campaign. Members and staff had various ideas for mechanical details such as printing, design of materials, distribution, etc. These were left to be worked out as suggestions for a campaign timetable, documents, etc. were developed.

12. Student radio

Dan reported that he was trying to give some time to detailing CRTC attitudes toward student radio (especially low-power FM) and to liaison with the Canadian Broadcasting League on the organizing of student radio stations. He felt that some degree of central involvement was implied by the motions passed in May, and that it was necessary to make sure work in this area was not simply a token effort by NUS. Members agreed that limited staff involvement in this area should continue, so long as it did not exceed a few hours a week.

13. AOSC-NUS relations

John, Stu and Dan reported on a meeting they had with Dave Jones and Rod Hurd of AOSC (Association of Student Councils) to review relations and possible merger of the organizations. AOSC was the travel department of the Canadian Union of Students. It was separately incorporated in 1969 to handle the flights that had been arranged when CUS ceased operations, and continued to operate as a national services organization. The founders of AOSC always assumed that when a national students' union was renewed, it would re-enter as a services/travel wing. The idea of a merger was raised by Dalhousie in early 1975, and a joint report by Dan and Rod Hurd, outlining a path to merger, gained cautious approval by the Central Committee and inaction from the AOSC Board of Directors. The AOSC board and members were now more favourable to the idea, and the joint meeting had suggested a committee of three people from each organization to look at possible ways to merge and report by the end of the summer. The AOSC board felt that this was in accord with their members' wishes, and had chosen their members of the joint committee. Some of the models mentioned included a merger of AOSC and NUS, with non-NUS members in AOSC to receive shares in Canadian Universities Travel Service, a wholly-owned travel agency of AOSC. Another model was for NUS to receive a majority of the shares in CUTS, while AOSC itself continued as a minority shareholder with its current membership. A third idea had been amendment of the AOSC and NUS constitutions to merge the membership, with AOSC to continue as a separate corporation. There were probably other models. A proposed timetable was that the joint committee proposals receive executive-level consideration in late August, and then go before the members of each organization

in late October.

Certain elements of a merger seemed clear already. One was that delegates could not legislate a travel department in the same way that other NUS matters were dealt with, since many aspects had to reflect travel patterns rather than a principle such as equal service across the country. A probable benefit to AOSC would be reduction of the \$27,000 they now spend on board meetings and conferences. AOSC would also gain a more direct link to the national student movement, something they needed to survive. NUS would have access to a cash flow much larger than its own, and to sources of credit now available only to AOSC (such as other national student unions). It was anticipated that there would be problems satisfying anti-NUS members of AOSC. There are 63 student unions in AOSC, and they pay no fees.

Rob was concerned that there might be risk or financial liability for NUS under some merger models. He did think it was interesting and a potentially good services for campuses, so NUS should look into it. Dan said that AOSC people seemed anxious to avoid financial liabilities between the two. John explained that AOSC's three years of deficit spending were a result of changes in air travel regulations, and the resulting adjustment. They were steadily reducing the deficit, and hoped to break even this year. The sources of revenue were being diversified more each year. AOSC's survival through the early and mid 1970s was a better record than that of other national student travel services. Ross said that some AOSC board members were pessimistic about its survival. John said this was often the case, since student unions were not as capable of handling recurrent deficits, and because they had a sense that the board was not in control. Dan said that the potential uses in Canada of the International Student Travel Card were another reason to look favourably on the idea of a merger.

MOTION: Doherty/Reid
To endorse in principle merger with AOSC, and to strike a two person committee to investigate models of merger and report back to the August Central Committee meeting.

Don questioned whether the members had to be consulted on the approval of merger. The motion went beyond established policy. He was concerned that the merger might dilute the NUS plenary with debate of how to run the travel service and with delegates interested only in that aspect. Dan said that previous talks had suggested something like two plenaries, or separate delegates for travel aspects. Punam shared Don's concern. It was not expected, Dan said, that the merger would result in a big push to get private travel agencies off campus, although these agencies were taking business away from student-controlled AOSC.

CARRIED

People agreed that Stu and Dan would be the committee members, on the basis of proximity. The only direction to them was that Rob be kept informed, and that pre-audit financial statements for AOSC's 1976-77 fiscal year be requested.

14. Relations with l'ANEQ

John reported on the meeting between himself and Pierre (representing NUS) and members of the executive of l'Association nationale des étudiants du Québec. Most of the time was spent in providing background about each organization, and

Recommendations.
Development
Lee W. H. T.

14. UNC
1
40

explanations of current work. They were surprised at the similarity between the two organizations policies and immediate goals, and at NUS's links with the provincial organizations. Their program for 1977-78 included employment (coalition, job creation, full employment), student aid (a new plan proposed, then campaign), effectiveness of student unions, quality of campus life and the reorganization of l'ANEQ. They had many misconceptions about NUS, thinking it was an ally of the federal government with no provincial links. They were also uninformed about the federal role in student aid and post-secondary financing for Quebec, thinking that Quebec was totally independent in those areas. John and Pierre suggested a joint committee of six members to work out a more solid relationship and to look at possible on-going work. They were hesitant, referring to the September 1975 motion not to recognize NUS. They felt that it was a precondition for NUS to treat l'ANEQ as a national association. Opinion within l'ANEQ on independence was divided, with nationalists in favour and leftists opposed. Both sides do not recruit outside their usual "territory". L'ANEQ thought that the principle of two national unions in one country was acceptable to federalists.

Since the joint meeting, the executive of l'ANEQ voted three-to-two against reconsidering the 1975 motion, and there was some evidence that the pro-relations people on the executive were not pressing this matter since they had other, more important, concerns. The July conference of l'ANEQ would look at the referendum on independence and elect a new executive. It was quite possible that the new people would be more favourable to relations with NUS. The reliance on that 1975 motion was contradictory since all leaders of l'ANEQ had ignored it from October 1975 to May 1977. Pierre and John made it clear that they did not bend over backwards, but rather acted with some confidence in NUS's credibility and showed that l'ANEQ would have to work for national recognition and serious co-operation.

Ross suggested that the first thing was to press for a reply to the idea of a joint committee. Pierre explained that the vote on reconsideration reflected a universal Quebec orientation within l'ANEQ — the idea that all non-Quebec matters are international. It also reflected the long-time strength of the nationalist movement within youth and student groups. The two factors were mutually supportive, and worked to obscure completely the objective fact of common interests and situations between NUS and l'ANEQ. Pierre explained that l'ANEQ had never adopted a position on the national question, or on independence. There was nothing to show a strong commitment to the idea of two national unions in one country. Most felt that Quebec would decide its own future, and the rest of Canada was just unimportant. One reason for their coolness was the 1975 postponement by NUS, OFS, etc. of the pan-Canadian student conference l'ANEQ had proposed. Pierre thought it might prove useful to revive that idea to help argue for working relations. He also felt the Central Committee should maintain and improve the system of communication and information-gathering with Quebec. The maintenance of a NUS presence, although low-key and neutral, was important. He advised a special mail-out to l'ANEQ and Quebec associations about the attempts to develop relations if there was no progress by September. This would be the last resort in pressuring the leadership to deal with the issue. He still felt there was potential for a good relationship, and some associations that were most interested in joint work. Members agreed that Pierre should attend the July conference of l'ANEQ. The question of eventually doing a mail-out was left open.

14. Unemployment

Dan reported on the activity so far. The political parties had been sent copies of the Charlottetown motions. The Progressive Conservatives responded with an explanation of their policy (signed by Joe Clark) and background about their work on the issue. The Liberals kept up a flurry of phone calls about the motions, then turned the matter over to their national youth party wing. The youth group was eager to participate in the co-ordination of unemployment work, and to present some of the milder motions to the February convention of the national party. The New Democrats also sent along much background information, and invited NUS to a meeting with Ed Broadbent. They were willing to have it a well-publicized meeting, held during the summer. The office had arranged to get the monthly information on student unemployment and the performance of manpower centres for students. Manpower and Immigration was not paying for any special survey of student unemployment, and this was being checked out to see what information would be missed. The CLC had been sent copies of the Charlottetown minutes, and a meeting of staff people would be arranged. The press release issued simultaneously with the May unemployment statistics received good to excellent coverage, appearing on the front page of some dailies.

Members discussed the meeting with NDP leaders, assessing the benefits and drawbacks to both groups. It would help publicize NUS's ongoing work with this issue, but might give the impression of alliance with one political party. The NDP's concern would also be publicized, and they would be linked with a non-partisan group. Members concluded that it was worthwhile to go ahead with it. There seemed little point in pressing the demand to meet with the Prime Minister. It had already received considerable publicity. The NUS group to meet with the NDP would be a Central Committee person (either Stu, or Jim if he was within travelling distance), Dan and Pierre.

15. Katimavik

Joyce reported on the results of her visit to the Katimavik headquarters in Montreal. It was to be educational, rather than an employment program. The \$1,000 bonus was an incentive for people to finish the program. Certain details of the program's operation are known, but many are not since the projects are not yet organized, thus sites are not chosen, accomodation not arranged, etc. Education about the particular region has already been changed, because participation by third world students has fallen through. This was the first such program to be funded directly by Treasury Board, and it has no other source of funds. The board of directors are chaired, and were chosen, by a friend of the Prime Minister, Jacques Hébert. There is a staff of 150 people to support the 1,000 participants. The military option for 100 of the participants consists mainly of boot camp and trades training. This option is unpopular with most Katimavik staff, and they blame it for the disastrous public image of the program. They were not surprised to hear that NUS condemned the program, since only 3500 people applied when 10,000 were expected on the basis of past experience. The staff would probably like to be part of the Ministry of the Environment, focusing on conservation and back-to-the-land. A decision on further funding will come half-way through the pilot year. Growth, at a slower rate than desired by the Minister of National Defense, is expected. The total cost is \$8,000,000.

People had further questions. Joyce said that the military are not involved in the operation of Katimavik. They just have joint meetings with it. The military aspects seemed clearly caused by Mr. Danson's personal objectives for Katimavik.

where m
univers
to use

Dan said that many felt the program was opposed by a majority of the federal cabinet, and had been approved as a favour to Danson. Pierre said that it was a reflection of old-style belief in the value of a disciplined, military upbringing — the same mentality that produced military academies. Danson liked this philosophy, Trudeau opposed it. Such programs were also an expected suggestion in times of high unemployment, and key civil servants had been proposing large-scale job corps for over a year. Members were not sure if the motion to amend, which was referred to them, had suspended the previous motion. This would be checked before they made a decision.

16. NUS policy on campus

Len had asked that the Central Committee discuss the role of NUS policy on campus between conferences. He was alarmed and disgusted by abuses such as the closing of the chevron and the recent attendance of AUCC by eight student unions. Stu felt that McMaster would always try to get around policy it disliked. This tendency, and campus-to-campus variations, were arguments against pressing adherence to all policies. Campuses would be indignant if they felt they had to toe the line. Ross observed that the policies were not stated so that a campus had to use a particular tactic. The situation determined tactics. It displeased him to see people flagrantly go against a policy or an organization they belonged to. A member argued their point, but should then abide by the majority decision. There was no morality in letting members attend conferences, pass policies then leave and do as they wished. There was nothing to do, however, aside from fieldwork and very serious public violations that challenged the organization. A motion of censure was appropriate in the latter case, and if that had no effect, the member should be expelled. Ben agreed with Ross, but felt there were some grey areas where adherence or non-adherence was difficult to determine. The chevron dispute and AUCC attendance last week were flagrant cases. He thought there should be some work on internal methods of telling people to respect the policies.

Dan said he agreed with the approach outlined by Ross because moral suasion was the only enforcement mechanism provided for the policies. He felt the value of internal discipline had not been explained well enough. Pierre declared that to build the organization a minimum of discipline was necessary. Other organizations with similar problems found this to be the answer. He advocated motions of censure recommended by the Central Committee so the full pressure of NUS would be felt. Censure was inappropriate when policy was not followed in a very difficult situation, where provincial strategies were involved, such as U. of Alberta's eventual acquiescence to differential fees. AUCC participation was clear violation. Don agreed that violations simply undermined the organization. Nova Scotia student unions maintained strong internal discipline, and the same should apply nationally. Otherwise, conferences became just an exercise. NUS should build a sense of collectivity, and an awareness that it was traitorous to subvert a decision. Stu agreed that flagrant violations deserved censure. Ross said he would be willing to amend the constitution to expell a member that ignored a censure by the other members. Stu urged tolerance in judging if there had been flagrantly violating.

17. Ontario community colleges' co-operation

Dan reported that the community colleges conference held with the OFS conference in June had led to a second one scheduled for early July. He felt that NUS could play a uniquely helpful role since Ontario was the only province

where most community colleges did not want to join the same organization as universities. Community colleges' experience in B.C., Alberta and Quebec would be useful information to provide, and it also seemed there was a possibility of helping with the continued attempts to gain student representation on community college boards. John agreed, and felt it would also be good since Ontario community colleges knew very little about NUS. Dan suggested that it might be worthwhile for a community college person to be the NUS rep. Members felt that Punam should attend, if possible. She agreed to see if the arrangements could be made to let her attend.

18. Fall campaigns

Stu observed that many campuses liked national student day and wanted it to be an annual event. John said it had been rejected in the workshop, and others agreed that making NSD an annual event was not possible.

Dan outlined some questions about fall campaigns, including the way that student aid and unemployment would be related, co-ordination with provincial organizations, scope of initial campaign effort (how many posters, leaflets, documents, etc.). John said that OFS was planning fall work on student aid, with a mail-in effort at registration, then turning to guaranteed annual income. Employment was still nebulous, with thoughts of forming a coalition in the fall, then a conference after Christmas. OFS would be asking for fall announcement of provincial job creation programs. Joyce asked about other provincial organization plans, to see what was already going forward. Stu wanted to be sure that NUS would develop its own program, not just reflect various provincial efforts.

Don said that AFS was likely to focus on financing at the start of the school year, then plug in to the national student aid/unemployment campaign(s). A questionnaire on cutbacks at the departmental level, and a leaflet on 1976-77 cutback fights, were planned. Most planning was being done in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, with New Brunswick and P.E.I. expected to pick up on these efforts. Ross said that BCSF was waiting for the national plans in student aid, so it could supplement them. Punam agreed there were no plans yet for on-campus work. An ad hoc employment committee was working toward a September conference. A student organizing handbook for councils and a registration-time pamphlet about BCSF were planned. Ross felt that interest in the financing issue would have to be rebuilt.

Mary said there were no fall campaigns planned, but during the summer work would start on student aid and unemployment. Financing and international student quotas would be issues in the fall. Ben said that things were still open in Manitoba, with some thought given to working through local issues. Joyce said there was no strong direction from the last FAS conference, but housing had been considered by the executive. John added that OFS was also preparing activities for the fall on the international education issue.

Several members said that campaign efforts up to the October conference would have an education/information approach, being provocative enough to get people interested. Don noted that there were some coalition on unemployment moves in Nova Scotia, that it could help inspire people elsewhere and so further plans for unemployment work after the conference. Ross suggested that the student aid committee would do specific suggestions for the campaign, but perhaps timing should be decided by the Central Committee. He thought employment needed more thought,

Ro
to scat
would

to develop ways of showing how the government is failing to deal with unemployment, and causes of the unemployment situation. Lectures and debates were one way of doing this. John agreed that student aid plans seemed to be proceeding. Lectures on unemployment were nice, but did not raise the issue enough, especially if a goal was action-planning at the October conference. He also questioned whether campuses would be saturated with campaign materials in the first few weeks. A news feature on the summer situation, and small surveys to identify those who cannot return to school, were possible approaches. Press conferences on the effects of summer unemployment would make the problem more concrete and identifiable. Rob said there was disagreement on the effects of high unemployment, with some experts saying it increases enrolment. Stu was concerned about how such small group efforts would fit in to a campaign, and felt orientation was a prime time to start campaigning. Dan worried that people might miss work toward the possible short-term gains on the unemployment issue by concentration on learning about the overall problem.

John said that small general meetings, of Dentistry students for example, were one feature for a fall campaign. These would focus on the particular aspects of the issue. Dan agreed that such efforts were essential, and added that perhaps fieldworkers should strongly encourage better and wider distribution of materials from NUS and the provincial organizations. Ross felt that a theme of the campaign should be how little the government has done, its uncaring and disinterested attitude. He cautioned that wider distribution of materials depended upon more attractive materials being produced. There were logistical problems, also. Jim agreed that the government's stance was an important theme in the campaign. John said that another idea was having student councillors survey people in the registration line about various issues.

John raised another point: how to give the program of action a profile in the campaigns. He felt it was necessary to help tie together the issues when necessary. Dan said one way of doing this would be a logo-type symbol for the program. Punam disagreed with a profile for the program, feeling that the word action was misleading. Ross did not like presenting the concept of a linked, concerted move. Punam said that first the program should be explained to councillors, since it was not yet a developed idea for them. John repeated the value of showing that the work is linked, not scatter gun. Ross felt that the demands, not the fact of a program, should draw attention. The existence of the program could become an end in itself, something he felt happened with National Student Day. The demands were the whole point, and government not meeting them would keep up attention and show it was an on-going effort. Dan agreed that something like a logo would not be good, but felt it would increase support for the demands to show they were part of an overall effort. Stu favoured a slogan, Ross opposed anything but the NUS logo as a tie-together for the program. Dan suggested a brief description of the program, to be included in all materials connected with it. People agreed.

Punam said that another question was how to tie together the demands and material's substance. Don felt that this could be done with an initial leaflet analyzing the whole field and the need to mobilize. Ben said that in Manitoba an overall concept like the program of action made it easier to get things going. It was preferable to a dual set of demands, providing a unifying concept and the sense of country-wide effort. An overall concept was also more flexible. Ross did not see anything else than the paragraph to tie together the demands, since they were the point of the activity. Understanding why they were put forward was the link.

employment,
way of
lectures
if a

Ross concluded that the centrality of the demands should prevent the tendency to scattering in the fall campaign. This also made it more likely that people would mobilize if necessary. Dan suggested that the right to a decent job and the right to education, working to make them more of a reality in Canada, was the point of the program. The dual rights might be the tie-together of the campaigns. He felt something was needed, pointing to the SOEC efforts in St. John's as an example of how a common organization helped tied together scattered efforts and give a sense of momentum and unity. John agreed that with the standard paragraph and the demands on government there would be enough of a profile for the program. Punam liked the idea of the leaflet, to explain the overall context and the choice of student aid and unemployment. It was something more than the two rights. Jim said that SOEC explained what was being done, but also put the efforts in the context of financing and cutbacks.

Jim argued that experience with leaflets in the January registration at Memorial indicated that it was not a successful tactic. People mainly wanted to register, and many would not read much. A large number of leaflets would not have much impact. Ben was not sure this would be the case, since leaflet-distribution helped draw in local student leaders. Dan suggested a news feature, offered to student newspapers, and an alternative. Stu liked the single leaflet, to avoid an excess at the start. This would provide a context for further work. Specialized work could then be done. Jim agreed with the specialization, something which was key to following up initial national materials. Particular problems on the campus could then be highlighted. He was uncertain about how far a prepared feature would go. Dan said that the Advocate would back it up anyway. Gene liked the idea of the feature, as one of several different ways to reach people.

Ross said that they context was that students have had continuing student aid and unemployment problems, with little government action to help. He was unsure of long, involved analysis of the attack on education. Inaction by the government was not just a side issue, it would drive the campaign home with students. John agreed, but questioned how the unemployment issue would develop. Speakers, a list of demands, small group work and surveys were some of the ideas. Stu asked how things had gone on this issue. Dan said there was the record of success on job creation matters, a focus on short-term job creation and the role of national government. Riel felt that jobs was the demand, with the jobs and education link a focus of the crisis in education. Don suggested that local councils could be encouraged to prepare for the October conference, for example by contacting labour and starting to co-operate. John felt the program on job creation could be used. Dan said the three demands put forward at the Charlottetown conference were the focus. Don felt the national conference, then mobilization, were also important. Dan agreed, but said the three areas put forward in May would lead to the October definition of specific demands. He felt the national conference would also depend on how other groups were moving. Stu suggested early February for the unemployment conference. Ross suggested that provincial organizations could look into lectures. Dan said they did not deserve a big push.

Riel said he would like to see campus told to work on a specific issue and item. Local people could then get involved. The objectives of the event, and an exact description of it, could be provided centrally. Stu thought this could be part of a manual. Jim said there could be small specific manuals, as well as the larger general one that gave means and methods. Other suggestions were an opening leaflet and poster, councils to be involved before the October conference

which would produce the specifics in student aid and unemployment campaigning. Leaflets might be concentrated in some specialized form, eg. for particular groups of students. Radio was another angle. Members agreed that there was little else they could do. Staff would work with the ideas, suggestions, areas of Central Committee agreement to produce materials, an outline of the campaigns, by the end of July. If this deadline was met, drafts could be circulated before production.

The meeting recessed at 12:30 am, and resumed at 10:00 am, June 30.

PRESENT:

John Doherty
Punam Khosla
Rob Lauer
Ben Parker
Jim Payne
Ross Powell
Stu Reid
Don Soucy
Mary Thauberger

Joyce Andres (staff)
Dan O'Connor (staff)
Len Taylor (staff)
Chris Vanneste (staff)
Marie-Andrée Imbeault (new staff)
Gene Long (CUP)
Riel Miller (Carleton)

19. Treasurer's reports

Rob circulated copies of the audited financial statements for the 1976-77 fiscal year. He said that the operating surplus of \$10,923 did not reflect loan repayments of about \$8400, meaning the real net surplus on the balance sheet should be about \$2500. This meant the extra Central Committee meeting can be held without seriously hurting the organization's financial position. Rob explained that the 1975-76 surplus had been adjusted downward since it included an institution's fee payment twice: the member had confirmed the payment as owing after it sent a cheque. John asked about the implications of skipping the order of priorities set for surplus funds' application. Rob said the budget committee meant the order to be binding, but he felt the first two items could be deferred. He advised that the budget item for telephone seemed to be underestimated, and so that item was certain to draw on the contingency. April and May phone costs had been quite high. Other items seemed to be reasonable, so far. Calgary conference fees would have to cover some of Charlottetown's deficit, but it did not look like a problem.

Dan questioned the effect of some exchanges with Carleton, particularly late payment on a loan and money advanced in September 1976. He was worried that it could result in an unbudgeted expense of \$2400. Lengthy discussion led to the conclusion that the budget took into account the late payment, but the advance was more confused in terms of accounting. It did not seem that the effect would be as severe as Dan thought it might, but members agreed that the obligations to Carleton and vice versa should be cleared up and put in writing.

Len reviewed the auditors' recommendations regarding changes in bookkeeping. Some were amendments to the system the auditors had set up, and others merely involved formalizing controls already in effect. The recommended fireproof vault was the only suggestion he did not foresee being implemented, since the expense did not seem to be justified. Ross asked that people be kept informed of developments with Carleton. Rob urged people to remember that the budget items were very tight.

20. Mailing policy and cost-based charges

Len reported that it had not yet been possible to work out the exact cost of producing materials, largely due to turnover in the CUP office. Members would be told once the costs were known. When costs were known, there still had to be a formula to apply them. Dan had prepared a report recommending division of the mailing list into members, potential members, provincial organizations, etc., with each group to receive certain materials free of charge. He said that it left open the question of having various cost-based charges for different groups, eg. large and small budgeted associations. It presumed that the current high priority for francophone, bilingual and graduate associations meant they would receive much more free material than normal. Members agreed that development of the cost-based system should proceed along the lines in the report.

21. April and May expenditures

Rob and Len presented the list of expenditures for April and May, for the customary perusal and adoption by the Central Committee. It was explained that Falardeau and Marois were the translators of conference documents that had to go from English to French. The costs were covered by the Secretary of State grant. Other individuals mentioned were interpreters at the conference. The NSCAD telephone bill was for calls by Brian Perkins, the U. of Winnipeg one for calls by Pete Menzies. Fieldworkers also often billed calls to the member association of a Central Committee member, the association then billing NUS.

MOTION: Payne/Reid
 That the expenditures of \$28,845 for May and \$26,630.47 for April, as circulated, be approved.

CARRIED

22. National press releases

Len reviewed the results of the June attempt to issue one release, with local details added, across the country. The attempt had been done hastily, after some thoughts on how best to use the statistics on May student unemployment. Some Central Committee members did not get a copy of the release in time, and others were too busy to do a local release. There had not been enough explanation of what they were to do with the national release. The thing to do was localize the lead paragraph, since national news must come over the wire to be used by a paper. It was clear that considerable publicity could be gained with a small amount of advance work. This release got out in time, if not too early, and Canadian Press coverage was on front pages in some provinces.

Ross felt the biggest problem had been getting local statistics on student unemployment. Don liked the idea. Ross asked that people be kept posted on the chances of something like this, if possible. Don advised that people should see about getting a story onto the regional CP wire.

Ross took the opportunity to encourage that people write in response to the Central Committee letters, to help everyone keep up on events nationally. John said that Miriam Edelson, OFS chairperson, would be his delegate while he was in England. She and Stu would be able to keep up the Ontario news end. Len stressed the need for a quick response, to get it in the next letter. John asked that

May

EXPENDITURES FOR THE PERIOD April 1, 1977 to May 31, 1977

April	1508	Charlottetown Hotel - conf. advance	\$ 500.00
	1509	Renouf Publishing - Public/Ref	9.00
	1510	Receiver General - Pub/Ref	5.00
	1511	Shirely French - C.C. travel/expense	120.80
	1512	Receiver General - Postage	200.00
	1513	Air Canada - Office travel	48.60
	1514	University of Calgary S.U. - Telephone	98.80
	1515	Bank of Nova Scotia - Pub/Ref	74.49
	1516	Ont. Fed. of Students - Grad. conf	100.00
	1517	Cash - C.C. expense (per diem)	200.00
	1518	Riel Miller - C.C. travel/expense	57.15
	1519	Jim Payne - C.C. travel"expense	47.02
	1520	Cancelled	-----
	1521	Ross Powell - C.C. expense	22.50
	1522	Mary Thauberger - C.C. Expense	22.50
	1523	Un. of Winnipeg S.U. - Telephone	50.34
	1524	Ont. Blue Cross - Benefits	72.00
	1525	Willson Office - Off. Expense	39.35
	1526	Don Soucy - C.C. travel/Expense	39.00
	1527	Cash - payable to Punam (acct receivable)	155.00
	1528	C.U.S.A. Wages	20,892.83
	1529	Fenn Graphic - Advocate printing (Dup)	861.00
	1530	Saga Foods - C.C. Expense	20.95
	1531	Un of Alberta S.U. - loan repayment interest	119.40
	1532	Un of Saskatc. S.U. - " " "	119.40
	1533	Un. of Man. S.U. - " " "	119.40
	1534	Dalhousie S.U. - " " "	86.18
	1535	Capilano College S.S. " " "	38.30
	1536	Kelsey Institute " " "	11.49
	1537	" " - Loan Repayment and "	306.42
	1538	Xerox - Duplicating	200.12
	1539	Receiver General - Postage	200.00
	1540	Jean-Noel Falardeau - conference (trans)	105.50
	1541	Landis Realty - office rent	350.00
	1542	Mrs. Hirsch - apt rent - field allowance	140.00
	1543	CUPE 1281 - benefits	132.00
	1544	Jean-Noel Falardeua - conference	170.25
	1545	Joyce Andres - Office travel/field exp	334.65
	1546	Farquhar Behtune - Insurance (office)	178.00
	1547	NSCAD S.U. - Telephone	184.11
	1548	Canadian Dominion Leasing - Postage	108.34
		Total month of April 1977	\$26,539.89
		Bank charges and interest	90.55
			<u>\$26,630.47</u>
May	1549	Canadian Universities Travel Service	606.60
	1550	Jean Noel Falardeau - conference	538.85
	1551	Gilles Marois - conference (trans)	524.40
	1552	Patty Gibson - conference	220.00
	1553	Jean-Noel Falardeau - conference	620.00
	1554	Holiday rent-a-car - confernce (staff travel)	175.00
	1555	Jean-Noel Falardeau - conference	671.80

May	1556	Gilles Marois - conference	\$ 161.00
	1557	Cash - conference advance (len taylor)	525.00
	1558	John Doherty - C.C. Expense	66.00
	1559	Riel Miller - "	66.00
	1560	Ross Powell "	66.00
	1561	Dan O'Connor - telephone	28.72
	1562	Harvey Tepner - C.C. Expense	36.00
	1563	Larry Black - Conference	42.00
	1564	Susan Johnston "	42.00
	1565	Brian Mason "	36.00
	1566	Karen Dean "	36.00
	1567	Ann Gillespie "	24.00
	1568	Jim Payne - C.C. Expense	66.00
	1569	Mary Thauberger "	66.00
	1570	Steve Cheshire " and travel	70.25
	1571	Allan White - Conference (social arrg'ts)	300.20
	1572	C.A.L. International - conference (inter'tn)	2,394.00
	1573	Mrs. Liliane Grossmen - Conf. (inter'tn)	204.00
	1574	Uof Sask St. Un. - telephone	149.47
	1575	Joan Flood - conference (typing)	148.50
	1576	Noella Benoit - " "	33.00
	1577	Jean-Noel Falardeau - conference	268.25
	1578	Bell Canada - telephone	746.48
	1579	Ontario Blue Cross - Benefits	72.00
	1580	Kerr Norton - office supplies	28.89
	1581	Holiday Rent-a-car - conf. Staff travel	54.11
	1582	Stardust Advertsing - conference (binders)	934.91
	1583	Liliane Grossman - conf (interpretation)	920.00
	1584	Jeanluc Svoboda - " "	775.00
	1585	Xerox - duplicating	228.04
	1586	Bilingual Personalle - conference (typing)	110.00
	1587	Bell Canada - telephone	525.62
	1588	Rob Lauer - C.C. travel and expense	113.50
	1589	Landis Realty - office rent	350.00
	1590	Mrs. Hirsch - apt rent - field allowance	140.00
	1591	Receiver General - postage	200.00
	1592	CAAE - membership - Pub/Ref	50.00
	1593	Can. University Press - Duplicating	1,744.89
	1594	Gavin Anderson - Travel/telep/post	185.08
	1595	C.N. Railways - Adv dupl	336.15
	1596	Canadian Universities Travel Service	3,047.00
		total month of May 1977	\$18,746.71
		Bank charges and interest	84.25
		Repayment of Bank Loan	10,014.04
			<u>\$28,845.00</u>

a high priority be given the production of Central Committee minutes, so they would be of maximum value and interest when distributed. Dan said he hesitated about the idea of a firm rule on fast production of minutes, since it could cripple other post-meeting activity of substantial importance. The National Student Day work after the August and October 1976 meetings was an example of something that overrode the minutes' importance. He agreed, however, that it was important to get minutes out with minimum delay.

23. Fall campaigns

Members wanted to be sure all had been done for this topic. Dan said he felt the previous day's discussion had indicated sufficiently the direction for detailed work. Jim felt the suggestions made were good, the task now being implementation.

24. Hiring

Stu reported that the hiring committee had continued its deliberations, and last minute work on the preferred applicants' background and abilities.

MOTION: Doherty/Reid
 That William Dodd be hired as a fieldworker.

The committee explained that the candidate was 30 years old, with excellent experience for the job. He preferred the Atlantic posting, but was willing to work in Ontario. The committee would need more time before making other recommendations.

CARRIED

25. Immigration bill

MOTION: Reid/Doherty
 That NUS support the July 9, 1977 symposium at McMaster University on Bill C-24, the Immigration bill.

Stu explained that there was no financial commitment needed. OFS and the McMaster Students' Union were among many groups already supporting the symposium. McMaster had asked that NUS also give its support.

CARRIED

26. Research

Dan suggested that for the research on student aid, several projects seemed in order. One was the updating of the 1975 Student Aid Report by Hilda Creswick, which had been a respected and influential critique of the current program from the perspective of equal opportunity. The usual comparison in point form of 1977-78 programs was underway in the office. A third project, something new, would be a comparison and analysis of student aid plans in other countries, to widen and deepen student leaders' perspective of the issue. Ross said that the third document should include some introduction to the different forms of aid as concepts.

Regarding unemployment, Dan suggested there was need for a basic document like the 1975 Student Aid Report, to critique the federal (and some provincial) efforts from the perspective of a right to decent employment. Ross said this

document should look at the debate over federal or provincial responsibility to combat unemployment. John felt this approach would encourage the excessive focus on government programs. Dan argued the perspective would prevent that problem. Stu said this document, updated frequently, would help provide information needed to advance the position students have adopted on unemployment. Dan said that if time and resources permitted a second document on unemployment could be a comparison of exactly what each level of government is doing about the problem. He saw the materials as something for on-campus distribution of some sort.

Ross asked about research in the second priority, role and operation of student unions. He had thought one approach as getting qualified local people to help produce materials. The Central Committee would identify the areas. Dan argued that central input was needed, to avoid materials that presented the topic through the particular perspective of one campus rather than with a sufficiently generalized approach. Ross also said he felt this area was designed to deal with things from scratch, so the results would not be for general distribution since councils well-developed in a field would not need them.

Punam saw the necessity of a central person to keep on top of work in the area, to compile and refine materials. Follow-up would have to be done. Joyce agreed with Dan and Punam, added that otherwise efforts would get tangled up and be of little benefit. She reported that some work on this research priority had begun in the office. A newspaper/council relations document was being prepared, hopefully to be complete by September. It was timely, in view of CUP's interest in this. Papers for people to use in on-campus organizing were also needed.

Ross said he did not want this field to end up shuffled into low priority. On-going work was far better than last minute stop-gap products. Dan suggested that the research priorities be approached chronologically, so that the third would not be started until the first two were well under way, etc. Punam suggested a review of the May minutes, and it produced housing registries/tenant services and press relations as areas in which people wanted something. Dan said that constitutions, a comparative and an "objectives" approach, was often requested. Someone said that Windsor had done good work in this field. Ross and other members were uncertain about constitution manuals, since it was often time consuming and unproductive work. The best compromise between popularity and usefulness seemed to be an outline of the sections a constitution should have, and something on their purpose.

The general financing issue was also supposed to have some research done. Financial analysis, eg. what really is a cutback, was suggested by Dan. Ross said it would be good to have a new fiscal arrangements in lay terms, such as was done for the 1972 act. Budget breakdowns of education compared to other services were also useful. Members agreed that an on-going investigative approach was best for the general financing research, to be in addition to the papers on student aid and unemployment.

27. Revamped newsletter

Dan reported on developments since May 1976 to resume publication of the newsletter in a new format and on a regular basis. Most details had now been worked out, and it would take about a week to do an issue of the newsletter. Rob recommended that distribution be the system of 25 free per member, additional

unemployment
on unemployment
anyway.
argument

copies to be at cost for members, cost plus for non-members. It seemed that this would make it just possible to keep within the duplicating budget item. Free copies for all councillors at member associations would cost at least \$550 more. The cost of 30 cents each seemed reasonable, certainly less than a local council could reproduce the newsletter for. John felt councils could afford to pay for additional copies. Members agreed. John and Dan noted that once the newsletter resumed publication, it had to stay on schedule. It would be an inflexible demand on office time.

There was lengthy discussion of the newsletter's new name. Staff people preferred Situation, while Central Committee members were split between Notes and Liaison. It was agreed that the newsletter would be called Notes.

28. October conference

Joyce reported that rooms were being booked, accommodation had been reserved in a hotel that was a ten-minute bus ride from the college. It was the best deal available for accommodation, at \$26.00 per room per night. Food could again be included in the fee. Most members agreed that a banquet was not necessary, but that an outside speaker (not a government representative) was good. Native rights was a good topic for a speech to the delegates. Standing committee members, it was agreed, should arrive the morning of Thursday, October 20 if they planned a pre-conference meeting. Dan reported that conference stationery had been prepared, and that if time permitted a small poster and leaflet would be produced to tell people about the conference.

Members soon agreed that the theme of the conference would be action in the balance of the year, focusing on on-campus organizing. It would include evaluation of September and October's educational work. Ideas for discussion (as opposed to resource) papers included the national unemployment conference, relations with I'ANEQ, and possible national/provincial/local strategies for the year. Punam argued for one discussion paper, on the major aspect of the conference: NUS work from October to May. It would look at the alternatives. Others agreed. It was concluded that the best method for preparing the paper would be for one person to do a draft, which would then be discussed at the August Central Committee meeting. An advance outline should also be done. The Central Committee would then finalize the document at the same meeting that they themselves debated the question and prepared recommendations. The draft would help structure the Central Committee discussion, and the procedure would make it possible to circulate the discussion paper soon into September. Members agreed that this would be better than basing a paper on the August debate, then having it approved through the mails. It could still turn out that a lot of work had to be done on it after the meeting. Punam volunteered to be the person that prepared the first, rough, draft.

Members agreed that working papers should not be assigned immediately, since this would effectively exclude people working off campus in the summer. Dan said that the week of September 19-26 was a deadline that left room for translation. It was up-in-the air whether there would be a second grant for bilingualism. Members wanted the conference to be more focused than Charlottetown, although less limited than the three-issue October 1976 conference. There would just be two days of workshops. Student aid and unemployment were obviously going to be the focus. John saw the three research documents on student aid, the government

I that this
From

unemployment programs paper, a paper on the student role influencing government on unemployment and organizing as the six essential papers. Most were being done anyway. Don and others suggested that the lack of time in early fall was an argument for early starts on some papers, at least.

Dan and Joyce reminded members of other topics that the last Central Committee or the Charlottetown conference had directed. These included native rights, use of media, structural change in NUS, NUS's international role, Québec-ANEQ, course unions, the graduate students' events, possibly a COPUS meeting, tuition and cutbacks in education spending, the colleges committee, manpower training, bilingualism, academic barriers, broadcast media, housing, etc. Joyce said that for many topics other groups had materials. Dan suggested that it would be best to produce skeleton papers for many of the topics, and circulate them early enough that councils could respond and supplement the conference's written materials on the topics. Punam added that before the August meeting, people could be asked to submit topics. This would speed up preparations and save time in the hectic orientation period.

John argued for maintaining an action-orientation in preparation of the agenda. He did not like a lot of on-going but not-much-now workshops cluttering up the October conference. Several people volunteered to start work in an area, to save time later. Punam would do colleges, Ben manpower training, Jim native rights and Dan NUS's international role.

29. Chevron/Waterloo Federation of Students

Dan reported briefly on the situation, since it was the subject of Central Committee and plenary interest. The campus had received top priority for the spot fieldwork done in the absence of an Ontario fieldworker. The newspaper was now reopened, with a committee of Waterloo students being formed to study the closure and subsequent events. The referendum on refundable-or-compulsory Federation fees was proceeding with two balloting days: July 6 and mid-October. The Federation executive continued to have problems, and it was quite probable that by the time of the October conference none of the current members would be in office. Ross expressed his wish that the U. of Waterloo delegates to the Calgary conference would be present when the motion of censure was debated.

30. Sheaf controversy

Ross reported that the CUP commission, to which he had been appointed by the Western Region of CUP, had finished its work and submitted a report. He assumed the CUP executive was reasonably pleased with the commission's work. Mary said it seemed there were still problems, and strained relations, so that further trouble could be expected. Gene said the U. of Saskatchewan executive seemed, by their actions, to have rejected the commission report, but the council was expected to support the report this fall. Mary said the recommended committee into Sheaf-Students' Union relations had not been established. Ross said he would follow this up. Mary said that the commission seemed to have settled the old problems quite well, but new ones had developed.

31. Co-operative housing

Joyce told members that they could expect to hear from a group called Proaction, who do housing research. They were preparing a package on student-own co-op housing, wanted NUS to know about it, review it and perhaps circulate it.

Dan noted that the Canadian Housing Foundation, co-founded by the CLC and the Canadian Union of Students, was having trouble with its public funding. Members agreed that if possible NUS should offer its help.

32. Hiring

The hiring committee reported that there was another candidate for fieldworker who seemed qualified, but problems with the tape of the interview had created some hesitation. Members questioned the interview team and the hiring committee about the candidate and his qualifications.

MOTION: Soucy/Parker
That Jean-Robert Frigault be hired as a fieldworker.
CARRIED

It was taken that Jean-Robert would be posted to the Atlantic, William to Ontario.

MOTION: Thauberger/Parker
That applications for the remaining position remain open to August 15.
CARRIED

Members saw no need for a committee since the August meeting was certain to take place. Interview teams would report directly to the Central Committee. John would screen the applicants and set up the interviews, with the help of the office. Newspaper ads would not be needed. Pierre opposed the lack of ads.

33. Invitation to recommend members of National Youth Advisory Group

Ross read a letter from the Hon. Bud Cullen, just received, asking NUS to nominate someone, or two people, for this group he was establishing. There would be 12 to 15 members, four to six meetings a year, and two-year terms. Don said he personally did not like the idea, but felt NUS should put people forward. Ross replied that it would be useful to gain information and monitor government plans. A NUS member could help to see that the group was not just a sop to critics of current programs. He felt it might be a good group. He had concerns about accountability, responsibility and control of a member on the group. The person should be close to, or a member of, the Central Committee and willing to work.

Don said it would be interesting to see who other members might be, and to ask associations to suggest members. Pierre opposed such committees altogether, saying they were used to co-opt or slow down government opponents. NUS already had contacts and information about unemployment. Effective and productive work involved NUS saying what it had to say at the right time and place. It would be a waste to put skilled and good student leaders on such advisory groups. Joyce agreed with Ross, suggesting that the Central Committee search out nominees. Don said the person should not be closely involved in campus work, since this would be a drain with little direct benefit. He advised that the Central Committee not feel obligated to put someone forward if no one suitable is willing. Members seemed to agree with the various criteria put forward for a nominee.

Names were thrown around, and members agreed that the office should approach Pierre Ouellette, Miguel Figueroa and Paul McFadzen to see if their names could be put forward.

C and the

34. Bill C-24

John Doherty read a summary of a statement prepared by the working committee of a Toronto-based ad hoc coalition to oppose the immigration bill. Members of the coalition included the Law Union of Ontario, Ontario Federation of Labour, OFS, etc. Leo Casey of Toronto (GSU) asked for NUS support. The statement covered the misleading government descriptions of the bill, the increased control over immigrants, new infringements on civil liberties, lack of added protection for refugees and the unchanged plight of seasonal workers. It asked the government to encourage input, and the public to oppose the present bill and its rapid passage.

MOTION: Doherty/Payne
To endorse the statement of opposition to Bill C-24.
CARRIED

John presumed we were either listed as supporters or supposed to write our own letter. Members felt the conference's decision covered this action. Don asked if he could join the Halifax-based ad hoc coalition as NUS. Dan said the Central Committee or conference approved memberships, but the NUS Nova Scotia caucus could join under that name.

35. CUP special subscriber status

Dan asked the Central Committee to approve a NUS application for CUP special subscriber status on the basis of an exchange of services and materials between NUS and the CUP member papers, NUS to have no reprint rights. Members agreed. Rob noted that NUS could not pay cash for such a status with CUP.

36. Katimavik program

Dan reported that Roberts Rules of Order said nothing on the effect of a motion to amend a previously adopted motion on the previous motion. He said the logic of the rules was probably that the previous motion was in operation until actually amended, not suspended by the motion to amend. Ben asked about the policy implications. Dan said he thought the motion and amended motion on Katimavik were both implementation of the policies on full employment and decent wages. The only question was whether the Central Committee would amend the motion adopted by the plenary, as suggested by Regina.

MOTION: Doherty/Parker
To adopt the motion regarding Katimavik, moved by Regina and seconded by Saskatchewan (p. 67) and then referred to the Central Committee.

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm, Thursday, June 30, 1977.