Canadian Federation of Students
CFS FCE
Fédération canadienne des étudiants

Minutes

The National-Provincial Meeting on Restructuring

Ottawa, Ontario
February 25-29, 1983

2,126 rue York Street, Ottawa. K1N 5T5 (613) 232-7394

THE NATIONAL-PROVINCIAL MEETING ON RESTRUCTURING

OTTAWA, ONTARIO

FEBRUARY 25-29, 1983

LIST OF THOSE ATTENDING

British Columbia

* John Knowles
* Donna Morgan
* Phil Link (Staff)

Alberta

* Don Millar
* Teresa Gonzalez
* Ben Freedman (Staff)

Saskatchewan

* Beth Olley
* Todd Nicholsen

Manitoba

* Erik Tatarchuk
* Jeff O'Malley

Ontario

* Helena Mitchell
* Ian Nelmes
* Guy Wright (Staff)

New Brunswick

* John Bosnitch
* Eric Roy

Nova Scotia

* Eric Walker
* Leslie MacDonald
* Peter Kavanagh (Staff)

Prince Edward Island

* Howard Beattie
* Steven Thompson

Newfoundland

* Debbie Barry
* Randy Hawkins

CFS Central Committee

* Brenda Cote
* Steve Quigley
* Charmaine Schenstead

CFS Services Board

* Rich Brook
* John MacDougall
* Andy Knight

CFS National Staff

* Diane Flaherty
* Eileen Dooley
* Bruce Tate
* Paul Post

CFS Services Staff

* David Jones

Observers

* Mike Old, University of Calgary
* Dawn Noyes, Services Board

NPM Staff

* Bev Crossman, Chair
* Anna Arioli, Translator
* Leslie Donnelly, Minute-taker

NATIONAL-PROVINCIAL MEETING ON RESTRUCTURING

1. Introduction

Brenda Cote opened the meeting and introductions were given. Brenda stressed the need to develop and evaluate on-going structures. She also pointed out the grassroots issues are fundamental to the structures and not vice versa.

She then presented a motion to ratify the Chair.

MOTION: to ratify Bev Crossman as Chair for the NPM.

Ian Nelmes/ Don Millar

CARRIED

2. Ratification of Agenda

Helena added Constitutional Recommendations to be discussed after the Relationships Between the National and Provincial Executives.

Rich noted that fee agreements would be discussed under Legal Agreements.

Helena felt that campaigns should be discussed. This would be done before the end of the agenda. She also asked that small-budgeted members be discussed in Membership Development.

Rich added Services Development to the agenda for Saturday.

AGENDA ADOPTED BY CONCENSUS

3. Procedures

Brenda pointed out that those who had donated funds for the meeting had asked that it be conducted by concensus rule. She noted that the NPM is not a decision-making body and therefore, could not present the membership with specific motions and proposals.

Ian felt that concensus could work and that it might eliminate some of the back-room lobbying.

Eric W. asked why there had been conditions placed on the operation of the NPM.

Rich, in response, asked the delegates to place the request in the context of the Board's reaction to the Central Committee's unilateral decision to hold the National-Provincial Meeting. He also hoped that agreement could be reached so that recommendations could come from the NPM as a whole, who would reach concensus through debate.

Don proposed that the NPM use voting within the meeting structure,noting the efficiency of the majority. He also stressed the need for unity in presenting recommendations to the General Meeting in May.

Charmaine wondered how the votes would be structured.

There was a good deal of discussion and confusion over who did and didn't want a voting structure.

Donna felt the "monetary hijacking" was unfair, and that a voting structure would allow for something concrete to be brought back to the members.

Helena noted that the substance was more important than the form of the meeting. She pointed out that the membership was looking for leadership and that many discussions over the results of this meeting could result in concensus.

The Chair hoped that concensus could be reached on many of the items brought forward, When necessary, motions and votes could be recorded.

Don felt that concensus was not conducive to concrete ideas.

Beth was concerned that something could hit the plenary floor without concensus having been achieved, and that discussions would start all over again.

Donna pointed out that the recommendations coming out of the NPM would not be the final form voted on in the plenary. Majority vote would be expedient and it is difficult to be concrete with concensus.

Beth asked who specifically would have votes. She felt everyone but staff should be able to vote.

Rich wondered if the recommendations would serve as notice of motion for the plenary. He also wondered how the recommendations would serve the plenary and be discussed by the plenary. The whole question of how the membership feels about the recommendations coming out of the NPM must be addressed.

Helena noted the need for recommendations on an experienced, knowledgeable level. She felt the NPM must make an attempt for leadership.

Rich felt the delegates should chose one structure and let those opposing write dissenting reports.

MAJORITY RULE WAS DECIDED ON.

Eric W. brought up the question of whether or not the staff should vote. He felt that all those invited should be able to vote, including the provincial staff.

Donna thought that everyone, including both national and provincial staff, should have a vote.

Eric W. proposed that each province be allowed three votes.

Brenda did not feel as though the national staff should vote as they are a resource body.

Helena also felt that staff should not vote, because not all organizations have staff present. She felt that each province should have 2 votes.

Teresa agreed with Helena, but felt that one vote per province was sufficient.

Beth agreed with this as well.

Charmaine pointed out that the staff does not make political decisions. That is the function of the elected representatives.

Helena felt that unorganized provinces should have 2 votes as well.

Eric W. felt that either everyone should have one vote, or every province should have one vote.

Don agreed and noted that staff could be dealt with within each provincial delegation.

The Chair ruled there was clear resolution on the point of 1 vote per province.

Don pointed out that the CC and the Board would each have one vote.

Mike Old wished to ensure that every delegate would have the right to speak.

MOTION: BIRT the meeting would function under a one vote per organization or province structure.

Eric Walker/ Don Millar

CARRIED

Andy asked about the role of staff in discussions.

The Chair ruled that staff could participate fully in discussions.

4. History of Restructuring

Brenda introduced JohnDoherty and Barb Taylor, who would give a brief history of restructuring.

John outlined the beginnings of NUS and looked at the development of a national political student movement.

Barb went over the Halifax, 1980 conference and the founding of CFS.

David gave a brief history of the workings of AOSC and how they fit into restructuring. He also emphasized the responsibility CFS has to its 65 staff members.

Brenda asked John about the composition of the NUS Central Committee.

He indicated that it had contained a Chair, a Treasurer, 1 representative per province and 2 members-at-large. At the time, it was felt that there was a need for three full time executive members, but there was no money for it.

Erik T. asked which schools had supported the idea of representation by population. He ascertained that it had been Western Manitoba, UBC, Calgary and U. Vic.

Peter determined that it was NUS which decided to have integrated membership among all component organizations.

The Chair noted that a caucus of non-organized provinces were concerned at the time that integrated membership would impose a provincial organization structure.

Eileen pointed out that restructuring is a process of development and that CFS is not the be all and end all to the student movement.

The Chair and the delegates thanked Barb and John.

5. General Evaluation of Restructuring

The delegates were presented the question of what, in fact, were the long term goals of development.

Rich, on behalf of the Board, stressed the need for credibility in lobbying and creating services. He felt that the status qou would leave room for increasing credibility. Gradual change was needed, which would allow for both keeping existing credibility and bringing in new members.

Charmaine felt that the meeting should address questions of whether or not we were meeting the needs of students, where we have gone wrong, and how successful we've been with integration and the maximizing of our resources.

Peter felt there was a need to evaluate what we want to do from what we've done wrong.

Helena referred the goals of restructuring as outlined in the restructuring document from Halifax. She wanted to look at the basic concerns before any kind of evaluation was given. She expressed concern over the disillusionment within the student movement after the Ottawa Conference.

Erik T, noted that flexibility was an essential part of change. CFS had to move to a rep by pop format or the large institutions would not see the organization as representative of their students' goals. The fee structure also has to be changed so that the more fees paid, the more say and institution has. The current structure serves as a deterrent to large institutions.

Donna wanted the delegates to remember that the Federation is the individual student unions. Grassroots participation must be stressed, because that is where our strength lies.

John B. protested the lack of translation services as an example of the failure of the organization. He also felt the concentrating on internal organizational problems left issues and activity behind. CFS must be the embodiment of student will. He added that the federations was undemocratic and the solution would be 1 vote for 1 fee given. He also protested the lack of effectiveness of the organization. He didn't feel that the average student in this country has any power. He argued for a radical reformation, the setting up of a democratic federation of equals working for a common goal as the only method of achieving anything. He pointed out that Canada was not a good organizational model to use.

Brenda pointed out that translation services would be available on Saturday night. She also noted that CFS is students and that the reality was that there were differences in needs and concerns across the country. She also stressed the areas where CFS has been successful (i.e. campaigns). She felt these structural debates sabotaged the real view of political action. CFS must commit itself to affecting students on a long-term basis. However, she also realized that we must have stability in the structures to have stability for students.

Andy stressed the need for a rep by pop structure. He didn't feel that there had been any major successes in the past few years, and that too much time was being spent on referenda. He also questioned the principle of congruent membership.

Ben felt that only an appreciation of what had gone on was being given when what was needed was an evaluation.

Brenda noted that this item was designed to develop a spirit behind the thoughts coming out of this meeting.

Rich wondered what this organization was all about and what it should be doing.

A discussion ensued involving whether or not Rich had the right to speak on this at the present time. The Chair ruled him in order.

Rich declined to speak due to the controversy.

Helena read a document about restructuring and its goals. She pointed out that a few basics had already been worked out and what was needed was discussion on more contentious issues like policy integration. She lamented the lack of focus for the concerns of the organization.

Peter noted that the building blocks were there in theory but were not established in practice. He noted the problems of congruency and integration as examples of this.

Don felt that structures must be dealt with now so that the organization would be able to work on issues.

Dawn outlined some of the major problems facing the organization: a lack of integration in the structure, communication problems between the Board and the CC, the lack of a vehicle to have the Board and CC work together. She emphasized the potential for grassroots work within the structure and the need to remember that students needs and issues are dynamic, not static.

Brenda worried about the lack of commitment among student leaders. She felt that the structure must facilitate growth and change.

Charmaine read the Statement of Principles and pointed out that these were the building blocks. She also noted the problem of policy-making and implementation and felt that it must be addressed.

Donna emphasized the need to work together, without a sense of competition among the national and provincial components. There must be a greater affinity for the federation and this federation must always include the membership.

Phil pointed out that students must pool their resources to work on common concerns for specific goals.

David referred to the Statement of Principles and outlined the need for the organization to be a catalyst for meeting student needs. Given the nature of the discussion so far, he felt that the delegates should question whether or not the fundamental principles were still valid. He noted what was at stake in terms of monetary and political support that already exists.

A straw vote was taken to have a discussion of principles and objectives. It passed.

Teresa gave an update on the effects of cutbacks in Alberta as well as outlining the difficulties in organizing on Alberta campuses. She noted that CFS Alberta was not a likely option in the near future.

Guy felt that there was basic agreement on the structure and that the major problem was the question of congruency. The structure exists, so the content must be worked on.

John B. felt that there was a need for a discussion of principles and he went on to describe the structure for the Student Alliance of New Brunswick.

Brenda went over the various opinions and concerns of the delegates.

Peter ascertained that sections IV and V under the Report from the National-Provincial Meeting,Ottawa, September 1-3,1980 would be discussed.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF RESTRUCTURING

This discussion was to clarify the meeting's position on the basic principles.

1. One National Student Organization

Reorganizing students into s single nation-wide assiciation would help solve problems of profile, image, communications, co-ordination and efficient allocation of resources. It would encourage unity, although it must allow for diversity.

This was agreed upon as a principle.

Helena felt that this was not followed in reality because of the split between the CFS and CFS-S and the existance of seperate provincial organization.

Don noted that this is not being achieved and must be a priority.

2. Provincial Components to Exist in All Provinces.

The students of each province should have an autonomous structure within the national organization through which they can make their own decisions.

The initiative for developing such components where they do not now exist must come from within the province but the development should be a co-operative effort with the national organization and should be carried out in awareness of a national student movement.

Eric W. felt this principle was crucial in terms of allowing provincial organizations to determine their own membership.

Beth point out that this notes only provincial co-operation and that this hasn't been achieved.

Helena wondered if this was a feasible goal.

Eric W. worried that this would hasten the demise of provincial organizations.

John B. questioned the principle of congruency, but noted that provincial organizations were necessary for representation to the provincial governments.

Phil felt that there was a difference between "component" and "organization". He stressed the seperation among components was a legal one only, and the real importance remained in the unity of the total federation.

Ben noted that two concepts were being discussed: componency and congruency. He also noted that the second could exist without the first.

3. Referendum Base

> Membership in a national student organization including its provincial components must basically be by referendum vote of students. Only in this way is grass-roots democratic decision making ensured for the organization would have to go directly to individual students. The need for periodic refinancing would ensure that the organizaiton goes back to students at regular intervals of several years.

There was no debate on this item.

4. Services and Politics Together

> These two functions of student organizations should not be seperated at provincial and national levels because they complement and reinforce one another. Both arms of the student movement need a prominent profile. Democratic membership involvement and free communications and all of these things are far more easily achieved through joint structures. A confused and splintered image with low student participation does not help any component of the national student movement. We need one organization reflecting the total needs of all students.

Donna asked what exactly the line was between services and politics.

Phil felt that there was little difference between the two and that it was short-sighted to try and divide them.

Erik T. disagreed. He felt the division was a good one. He believed the politics sometimes hurt the services and because of this, locals should be able to join one branch without the other.

Don pointed out that history did not support Erik's claims. Efficiecy of resource sharing demanded that they be linked.

Donna explained that this arbitrary division between services and politics wasn't done at the local level and shouldn't occur at other levels either.

Eric W. pointed out the differences, both actual and perceived,between the two areas. He felt that the components should either integrate or be cut adrift.

Erik T. felt they should be cut adrift.

Phil pointed out that no local has two has two student unions, one services and one political and he questioned why the national should.

Beth asked how much CFS owed CFS-S.

David estimated the amount to be between $50,000 and $60,000.

Beth noted that the services wing is the stabilizing force, and that there was a need to integrate the two to maximize that benefit.

Dawn emphasized the need for one membership and one plenary.

Ian agreed and pointed out the need to bring the two organizations' policies together.

David examined the structures in other countries and outlined them.

Helena wanted the organizations to examine the communication links between them.

Phil asked whether the group wanted one organization or two co-ordinated bodies.

David pointed out that if CUTS Travel goes broke, so does CFS-S. He added that if two plenaries were needed legally, then there should be one plenary and an all-encompassing vote in the other one.

John B. agreed with the need for one organization and one governing body.

Erik T. disagreed with this, feeling that what happens at the local level should not necessarily be imitated or adopted at the national level.

Rich outlined the necessity for solving the problems of jurisdiction and the co-ordination of joint activities.

John B. stressed that democratic centralism should control services.

At this point, Brenda rose on a point of personal priviledge, asking that delegates not use the words 'girl' or 'Chairman'.

Erik T. reiterated his feeling that student unions should have the opportunity to join one or both of the political and services branches.

5. Quebec Students' Right and Desire to Organize Seperately

It was pointed out that Canadian students outside of Quebec have repeatedly been asked by Quebec students over the last fifteen years to recognize that Quebec students want to organize themselves. Granting this recognition is an essential prerequisite to working with Quebecstudents and since working with them is an important goal, it was generally agreed to acknowledge their desires while encouraging co-operation.

It was also mentioned that this situation results from the special circumstances of Quebec society and politics and from the fact that Quebec students have been forced to deal directly in their own right with federal powers and programmes.

Brenda, as the Quebec liaison, pointed out that Quebec students did not want to join a national organization.

John B. noted that New Brunswick was 40% Francophone and that they had a bilingual organization. He felt this was unnecessary and one national organization was essential.

Ian asked someone to explain the principle to Mr. Bosnitch.

Helena felt it would be in the interest of CFS to provide a paper on the history of the relationship between Quebec and the national student movement.

Dawn emphasized the need to respect Quebec's wishes in this matter.

Don wanted more information on this subject and wished to discuss it further. He felt it was too much a taboo subject.

Brenda informed the delegates that l'ANEQ is drafting history of student activity in Quebec and that it will be available when completed. She noted the priorities for l'ANEQ are very different from those of CFS. She was uncomfortable discussing this as is it up to Quebec students to decide.

John B. didn't feel Quebec should be treated differently than other provinces. He stressed the importance of CFS as a national organization.

Dawn noted each province's right to organize autonomously.

Ben pointed out that the 'Nationale' in l'ANEQ's name says it all.

Beth added that Quebec considers its representation to be national.

MOTION: to leave discussion of section 5 and not re-introduce it during the NPM.

John Knowles /Brenda Cote

Brenda had an amendment.

AMENDMENT: WHEREAS there's a lack of information on Quebec's status, and a document will be forthcoming,
BIFRT information for discussion be provided at the next CFS conference.

FRIENDLY

Ian felt that it was only John who needed the information and that someone should enlighten him.

Helena felt the document should explain why Quebec isn't a member and why it isn't interested in joining.

John B. noted that deferring this item was deferring discussion on a national student movement.

Ben pointed out that a motion to table this item might be the best thing to do.

Charmaine added that the conference document will explain the question.

John M. also added that l'ANEQ should be here when a discussion of Quebec was being undertaken.

MOTION: to table until Saturday afternoon

Beth Oley/ Helena Mitchell

CARRIED

PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND TO RESTRUCTURING

1. The Full Involvement of All Canadian Students in Discussing the Future of the Student Movement

This was considered fundamental to the new approach to restructuring. All national and provincial organizations,all local associations, and all students are encouraged and invited to contribute their views and desires to the discussion. Restructuring can occur as a co-operative process with the full understanding, involvement and commitmelnt of everyone concerned.

Beth felt that this was a good principle, but also noted that it was not happening. She hoped the meeting could look at why not and change it.

Don agreed, feeling that this has been a big part of the problem.

2. A New National Organization to Replace Existing Organizations

The second point of the new approach to restructuring is that all existing national and provincial student organizations must combine or give way to form one new organization. This is the logical result of accepting that thorough restructuring is necessary and that minor modifications to organizations that now exist will not achieve thae purpose of restructuring. Only the idea of building a new organization allows and encourages all Canadian students to become involved and allows us to overcome the limitations and particular interests of existing organizations.

Helena stressed that this philosophy did not exist in practice.

Eric W. agreed.

David noted that more people needed to be involved in restructuring. Old organizations got stuck in their current level of membership, but what was and is needed is more broad based input.

Helena pointed out this is a step towards congruent membership.

Rich added that congruency was a problem on the national as well as the provincial level.

The Chair noted that congruency would be discussed later.

3. Provincial Components and National Services and Politics Components To Continue to Exist

Although a new organization would be created, existing structures that have evolved to meet students' needs would not be abolished. They would instead be combined, rationalized and linked together. The different components would have strong and interrelated individual roles. They would be linked together by common structures for communication and co-ordination and by a basic statement of principles so that they could be more effective in meeting the student movement needs.

Phil emphasized the need for the integration of all three levels.

Helena felt that different roles for different components should be clearly established.

Rich said that we have to develop mechanisms for working these things out.

Jeff felt we would have to determine the roles of each component and then determine whether or not they should be maintained.

Donna found the passage confusing.

John B. asked if Quebec was always excluded.

The Chair responded in the affirmative.

4. Common Membership in All Components by Individual Students Represented by Their Local Councils

It was felt that in the long run, one common membership in all components of a new national organization would be essential if communication, co-ordination and effectiveness were to be achieved.

This membership would be held by individual students according to their desires expressed in a referendum and a vote would be cast by their local association on their behalf in all plenaries

Rich suggested this be discussed later.

5. Flexibility

Delegates maintained strongly that flexibility would be a fundamental principle of the restructuring process. This was dictated by the need to involve as many people as possible and by the need to allow development of local,provincial and regional implementation plans tailored to specific circumstances.

There was also general agreement that this flexibility should not be open-ended in the sense that it must express and be accimpanied by a commitment ot a firm goal. Delegates felt that provinces should develop guidelines for working towards congruent membership. These guidelines would have to be developed by each province and would not be seen as rigid timetables. Various interim measures in various locations should lead in definite ways towards specific objectives. The final objectives would be the construction of agreed upon common structures that would link components into one network or organization.

Andy wanted the deadlines that were set to be extended.

John B. pointed out that membership is determined by a vote on a fee. He felt the fees were too high, and that there should be a set fee. He didn't think CFS should exist mainly to fight referenda.

Dawn told John to look at the CFS budget.

Donna expressed the need for pooling resources and working collectively.

John B. reiterated his feelong that one cannot impose a fee per student without giving that student an equal voice.

Helena, on a point of order, wondered if John's comments were on topic.

The Chair clarified the intent of the discussion as a point of principle.

John felt he had had not input on behalf of his province on this basic principle.

He was ruled out of order.

This principle was accepted with an unqualified yes by the other delegates.

6. Relationship and Development of Organized and Unorganized Provinces

Eileen introduced the topic.

Helena asked for a round table on the stage of development in each province.

Ontario

Helena pointed out that OFS would be CFS-O by 1985. Currently, there are 6 full and 13 prospective members with ten members of OFS not presently interested in joining CFS. She had some concerns over the timeline alloted to OFS, announcing that the changeover would not take place unless 2/3 of the membership have joined. She did not feel as though OFS had the resources to fun the number of referenda required in the time allotted.

Jeff asked whether she meant 2/3 of the member institutions or 2/3 of the membership.

Helena responded that this was vague and has never been resolved.

Nova Scotia

SUNS outlined its present membership and organizational structure. They noted that CFS doesn't seem to serve small institutions, so many in Nova Scotia won't join.

Diane asked about the non-involvement of Saint FX and Acadia.

Leslie responded that the provincial organization is growing quickly.

The Chair went over the success of the Atlantic Federation of Students at its peak.

Jeff noted the major large institution problem is the question of rep by pop and the major small institution problem was their restrictive budgets.

Leslie noted the concerns of the large institutions couldn't override the concerns of the organization as a whole. She added that the question of weighted voting hasn't really been addressed.

Eric W. said that SUNS isn't anti-CFS, but that the local membership certainly was. In answer to a question, he added that congruency was a possibility in the future, but not at this point.

Prince Edward Island

John M. outlined the situation in the province, emphasizing the need for more fieldworking and greater in-provincial communication.

Phil asked why the referenda were not passing.

John M. said that a lot of students were not convinced of merits of CFS because of the problems at the Charlottetown Conference. There is too much talk on structures and not enough on issues.

Newfoundland

Debbie said that the position of Newfoundland was similar to that of PEI. There is no CFS presence in the province, and no fieldworker. the Atlantic needs another fieldworker and a new awareness of CFS.

Phil aske whether or not it was up to the council to do a lot of the work needed.

Debbie responded that the councils were told too often that fieldworkers would be there and yet they never show up.

Randy added that students expect results.

New Brunswick

John outlined the structures by which the Student Alliance of New Brunswick operate. He also noted the development of the Student Party of New Brunswick.

Eric R. commented on his inability to participate in the discussions because he cannot read the documents in English or follow the conversation.

Diane asked about the Moncton question and the CFS fee structure.

Eric R. responded that that would be dicided by referendum.

Helena ascertained that only UNB has a party structure on its council.

Jeff noted the demise of SAM, and added that the chances for a new provincial organization are slim. The major issue seems to be rep by pop and weighted voting.

Charmaine ascertained that the U of W supported the principle of congruent membership.

Saskatchewan

Beth gave an update on the situation of CFS-Saskatchewan.

Alberta

Don reported on the demise of FAS and the situation surrounding the CFS referenda that were being run. He also noted the development of ACTISEC.

Rich asked what role B.C. and Saskatchewan could play in developing the student movement in Alberta.

Don felt that B.C. couldn't really help, but that Saskatchewan might be able to. He added that Albertans love research and asked for more.

Mike Old gave the perspective from the University of Calgary.

Beth asked how strong the commitment is to CFS in Alberta.

Don responded that it was not great, and that many delegates felt very alienated at the last conference.

Don and Teresa cautioned the NPM delegates of the danger of the delegates to the Saskatoon Conference being treated in a similar fashion.

British Columbia

Donna announced a victory in the Kwantlen referendum. She went on to explain the situation at CFS-Pacific. Phil added that a conscious effort was being made to downplay CFS-National.

Rich asked what problems there were.

Weighted voting and the general political climate were major problems.

Donna concluded by saying that CFS-Pacific is the regional manifestation of the federation.

David provided and overview of the roundtable discussion.

John B. made a number of criticisms that the delegates lined up to denounce.

The meeting was recessed for the night.

The following day, there was some discussion over whether or not to deal with legal agreements first. It was decided to take care of it later, and continue with The Relationship Between Organized and Unorganized Provinces.

a. Provincial Development Grants

Steve explained that provincial development grants were given on occasion to fledgling provincial organizations. The CC was considering making this a regular part of the CFS budget.

Eric W. explained the nature of the grant SUNS had received from CFS in order to hire and executive officer.

Diane asked if they should give that kind of money to the provincial organizations directly or invest it in increased fieldstaff.

SUNS felt it depended on the intent behind providing fieldstaff and whether or not they would help specifically to organize the province.

Rich asked for a history of this grant.

Eileen explained the Charlottetown grant to SUNS was the first attempt at such and endeavor.

Jeff added that Manitoba might request something similar within the next year or two.

Teresa said that Alberta was also a potential candidate.

Helena felt if would be better if the provincial development grant requests were brought forward as a report to the plenary and the allocation would be up to the province. She felt that a fund should be developed so that funds would be readily available upon request.

Steve hoped the delegates would discuss the role of the national office concerning provincial development and also the nature of that assistance.

John wanted to see this kind of money going to organizations who wish to support the national organization.

Jeff stressed that provinces must determine their own needs vis a vis cash grants and staff time. However, he felt the grant should be controlled by member institutions and requested by full and prospective members of CFS.

MOTION: BIRT CFS National begin to develop a fund for the use of the development of provincial organizations, and BIFRT those funds be dispersed at the plenary's discretion for a use specified by the members of CFS in that province.

Jeff O' Malley/ Teresa Gonzales

Eric W. spoke in favor of the motion.

Rich asked whether or not a motion regarding the use of the funds had to be sponsored by full or prospective members.

Jeff answered in the affirmative. The decision would be made to grant money by the plenary, but the use would be determined by the organization itself.

Helena wanted more specifics.

Jeff responded that the members of CFS would decide the best use of these funds.

Helena expressed concern that CFS members would have overriding decision-making power in determining where that money would go.

Peter expressed similar concerns about a CFS member asking for funds to set up contradictory organizations or attempting to control the direction of student organizing.

Erik T. felt such an arrengement would deter people from joining CFS.

Rich asked for a withdrawal of the motion.

John B. pointed out the primacy of the plenary and didn't feel the hands of the plenary should be tied.

Jeff responded that the plenary would not be tied, but that they would make decisions based on a guideline. It is the principle of the provincial development grant that should be supported, while the pros and cons of a particular request would be debated by the plenary. It is also important that those who cintribute should have some sort of say as to where the funds go.

Teresa withdrew her second, as the motion was contradictory to FAS objectives.

Brenda Cote seconded the motion.

Rich noted the positive aspects of the provincial development fund and supported the need for one.

Helena felt the motion was too vague. She suggested that timelines and specific goals be included in any proposal for receiving funding.

Jeff hoped the NPM would be used as a forum to discuss the implications of various proposals to be returned to the provincial organizations as well as to the conferences.

AMENDMENT: BIRT CFS develop a provincial/regional development fund to further the development of CFS through the work of the provinces/regions, and

BIFRT member institutions bring forward proposals for the dusbursement fo these funds at CFS conferences, and

BIFRT all proposals must have expressed goals and be accompanied by a potential time frame for development of the province/region with the intentions of CFS, and

BIFRT the recipients report back through members and users of the fund to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposal.

Helena Mitchell/ Ian Nelms

Helena noted this motion provides for participation by non-member provincial institutions and would facilitate the growth towards a national student movement's principles and goals.

Rich agreed.

AMENDMENT AND MAIN MOTION CARRIED.

Peter asked if this was realistic, or would it be a severe drain of cash flow for this organization.

John M. pointed out that the plenary would decide that.

Brenda felt direction should be given to the provincial development committee and the Treasurer. They should determine long and short term needs and the potential drains on the fund.

b. The Role of National and Provincial Conferences

Brends noted the importance of creating a link between National and Provincial conferences. This would facilitate discussions at the provincial level before national campaings, etc. are planned.

Eileen outlined some suggestions which had been made about the different roles each conference should play. Conferences themselves are seen as accomplishing three major things: 1) Facilitating education and info sharing, 2) Facilitating decision-making, and 3) Facilitating unity among regions.

Helena asked which provinces have conferences.

Ontario has three, Saskatchewan has none, B.C. has two, SUNS has four, New Brunswick has ten, Alberta has two and Manitoba has a pre-CFS conference meeting.

Leslie noted the difficulties in linking with the national conferences because of a lack of information.

Rich felt that conferences need to tuoch more on grassroots issues.

Helena agreed, feeling that conferences now involve too much navel-gazing. Delegated must have a sense of accomplishment when leaving.

Erik T. also felt that conferences should concentrate on info-sharing.

Jeff, as a member of the Agenda and Priorities Committee of the CC, noted the difficulty in getting time for everything. He suggested the restructuring be geared towards having theme conferences.

John M. stressed that too much time was being spent on structure and not on issues.

Phil emphasized that the primary function of conferences is decision-making.

Brenda agreed that too much time was spent on structures and not enough on issues, and there is a need to start organizing again at the grassroots level.

Eileen addressed the concept of unity. She also noted that concept must facilitate change and growth in the student movement.

Peter felt the NPM should be looking at what things can be done best at a conference. He noted that info sharing can be done through the info bank, but that a conference can facilitate an understanding in areas of student concern. He also gave a definition of a conference.

> Definiton of a conference: Conferences are an equalization payment transfer system for institutions too small to enjoy petty politics.

Don noted that the delegates' primary contact with CFS is through the conference, and that the prime goal should be maximizing their return. Delegates must be able to contribute to the conference and come back with something concrete.

Bruce outlined the major points and problems arising out of this discussion.

1. The Info Bank will provide the info-sharing service.

2. There is division between structures and issues.
   He noted there is a tendency to drive a wedge between structures and issues whil it is necessary to deal with both together. There is some feeling that conferences should not deal with discussions on structures because of time limitations, and that delegates' time would be better spent on other things.

3. The priorities at the conference should be Unity, Education and Decision-making.
   Bruce noted that if one doesn't occur, the three are void and that action is not seperate from education. The three are a part of a process.

Rich noted that Bruce's points didn't answer direct questions about the next conference. He asked for solutions.

Erik T. felt that political action services should have time given to them at conferences.

Bruce added that education and info-sharing on the political issues can be done in congruence with discussion of the general issues.

Jeff agreed with these points.

Peter felt that time limitations should aslo be taken into consideration.

Steve agreed with Peter but wondered who should be entrusted with priority determination.

The Chair gave a brief summary of what had been said.

Helena felt there was a need to define conferences in terms of a campaign.

Phil re-emphasized the decision-making aspects of the conference.

John M. felt that conferences should be tailored to the delegates, and that member institutions should be asked about what they would like to discuss four or five months in advance.

Helena outlined the difficulties inherent in that.

Rich suggested that services topics be dealt with in the first one or two days at the conference.

Andy agreed with Rich.

Peter pointed out that that kind of structure would lead to 2 national organizations once again. The principle of integration would be defeated.

The Chair went over the reasons for integration and noted the need to incorporate all kinds of people into all of the discussions.

John M. agreed the there was a need for a wider diversity of people attending conferences, dealing with all levels of local student union problems.

Helena stressed that delegates must not feel confined in any way. She also felt that more information was needed prior to conferences so that delegates could make more informed decisions.

Peter expressed his confusion at Rich's points.

David noted that CFS-S was needed to run the political side of the organization, both because of its revenue base and its profile. He also emphasized the need for integration.

Teresa agreed with the idea of having a theme conference on info-sharing.

Ian noted that info sessions tend to be redundant and relatively useless. This could be mitigated by using visuals during issues presentation and by including a brief summary of the research papers in the conference kit. There needs to be a more interesting and systematic approach to informingpeople.

Charmaine felt the NPM needed to come to some conclusions about conferences. Nothing concrete has yet come out of the debate.

Jeff also noted that the Agenda and Priorities Committee had considered all of these things when drawing up the agenda for the Saskatchewan Conference. What should be discussed is the role of provincial and national conferences as they relate to each other.

Phil asked for a copy of the Saskatoon Agenda, which would be discussed later.

The Chair noted there had been no resolution, but that the problems had been delineated. She added that it was possible for the role of conferences to be discussed at the conference.

c. Congruency and Other Constitutional Matters

There was some discussion as to whether the press should stay for these discussions. In a straw vote, the press was allowed to stay.

Brenda asked for a short round table on congruency.

Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island felt that congruency was not an issue in their provinces.

Saskatchewan had no major problems with the principle.

Manitoba is divided over the issue. The University of Winnipeg has no problems with the principle, although it supports an extension of the timeline, while the University of Manitoba is not to keen on the whole principle.

British Columbia supports congruency in their province, but accepts that other provinces might have trouble with it.

Ontario has no legal problems and they are moving towards congruent membership, but some of their membership has problems with it. They would support an extension of the timeline.

Nova Scotia believes in componency but would never impose congruency on its membership.

New Brunswick agrees with Nova Scotia.

Alberta noted that congruency was not possible right now in that province because it was felt there were too many long term disadvantages.

Steve felt that perhaps CFS should reconsider its approach to congruency and not ram it down people's throats.

Peter noted that the founding principles of OFS state that each province should have an autonomous provincial component. He wondered what was meant by autonomy and whether or not it included the right to determine membership.

Brian Iler, the CFS lawyer, noted that CFS can set up whatever membership criteria it wished.

Andy noted that the members of OFS were somewhat sceptical of CFS and congruency, and that CFS would have to prove itself before some of them became members.

Peter asked by what mechanism CFS could change its membership requirements.

Brian answered that legal agreements could set up the specifics and that alterations could be made to those agreements when necessary.

Peter asked if CFS could change contracts without consulting provincial components. The answer was yes.

Helena asked if each agreement was the same. The answer was yes.

Helena asked what would happen if a provincial organization voted to discontinue with CFS and where would that leave them for funding.

Brian was unable to answer her at that time.

David noted that the provisions for congruency were a logical extension of the principles of unity and representation on all three levels. He emphasized that no student should be denied that kind of representation.

Jeff asked for reactions of B.C., Saskatchewan and Ontario to regional differences on componency without congruency.

Erik T. asked if CFS could accept componency without congruency.

Brian responded that there were now no official components, and therefore no obligation for congruency.

Erik repeated his question.

Brian noted that legally this could be done.

Rich wondered about the question of congruency nationally.

Donna explained that B.C. had voted at its plenary for componency, but had wondered about the question of the national component making a decision without consultating the provincial component.

Peter wondered about an amending formula.

Brian noted that this was possible but cumbersome.

Don asked about the implications of forming 1 executive body for the 2 national components.

Brian would be covering that later on.

Beth said that Saskatchewan was willing to compromise on non-congruency provincially but not nationally.

Ben emphasized that noone was questioning the ideal of one national organization, but that there are objections related to the problem of putting theory into practice.

Helena wondered if CFS-S had signed an agreement of componency with CFS.

Brian answered that it had not yet been signed but that people were operating on the intent of such an agreement.

Helena asked if NUS was dead yet.

Brian responded that it has existance in law but not in fact.

Brenda added that the NUS plenary will continue as long as NUS still exists.

Helena asked if any agreement had been reached on what document would be signed between CFS and its provincial components.

Charmaine pointed out that the Charlottetown Conference had adopted the agreement between CFS and CFS-O as its format.

Jeff asked Helena to respond to his question on non-congruency.

Helena felt Ontario would urge members to achieve congruency without forcing anyone to do anything.

Jeff wondered if SUNS agreed with componency and what relationship a link between SUNS and the CC would have within SUNS.

Peter agreed with componency but not with congruency. He responded that the component would elect the CC rep and that it would be the component which would represent Nova Scotia students.

Brenda felt the delegates were losing sight of the issue of building a national student movement, and that should be the direction of the meeting.

Donna wanted to see CFS taking form as a unified body, and she felt that the provincial plenary should decide on componency based on what happens in the national plenary. She asked if congruent membership would ever be possible in SUNS.

Peter responded that this would not happen in the foreseeable future.

Donna then asked if SUNS wanted to see a national student organization.

Peter responded in the affirmative, adding that it must be without congruency.

Donna suggested that, since the unification of the student movement was essential, there was a need to development a prospective provincial component structure where congruency was not mandatory.

Beth wanted to see congruent membership, but felt that CFS couldn't impose that structure where congruency was not mandatory. She also had questions about national services being given to non-congruent provincial organizations. She felt that provincial field staff should be used to work non-member institutions and that congruency would have to be the ultimate goal.

Steve noted the problem that occured with not holding the NUS plenary in Victoria. Because NUS did not approve CFS business, there would be problems disbursing NUS funds.

Jeff emphasized the need to discuss details in order to achieve conclusions.

Charmaine asked if people felt the principle of congruency was wrong. She asked if the problems were more a question of timelines.

Helena agreed with Jeff's points. She felt that lines of responsibility must be drawn up.

Don felt that the meeting should be looking for a structure which would not be exclusive, but would acknowledge affiliation and/or status quo.

Peter stressed the noone in Nova Scotia questions the need for a national student organization and that congruency would maximize the resources on all three levels. However, if congruency should mean, in an instance, the death of a provincial organization, they would not be maximizing student resources at all. There must be compromise.

Eric W. asked about AOSC and its status.

David noted that less and less business was being run out of AOSC.

Brian added that there are problems with winding down NUS and AOSC as long as Waterloo and Atkinson are not CFS members.

Donna asked what would allow for provincial development while retaining the long-term perspective on congruency.

Brenda emphasized the need to deal with concrete proposals when the principle was not in question, but the practical application was unworkable. Unity must be achieved through commitment not imposition.

MOTION: BIRT a provincial organization may be accepted as a provincial component of CFS at the discretion of the CFS plenary even if its membership is not congruent with CFS, and

BIFRT such status shall be conditional upon achieving congruent membership within a fixed time frame determined by the CFS plenary.

Brenda Cote/ Todd Nicholsen

Beth supported this in principle but felt it should be more detailed.

Peter determined that these components would be different from other components working towards congruency. Their status would be different in that membership would not have to be congruent. The question of contractual agreements was left open.

MOTION: To table until tomorrow morning.

Jeff O'Malley/ Debbie Barry

CARRIED

d. The University of Toronto Question

Diane went over the situation of the upcoming referendum in Toronto. After much discussion, it was decided not to discuss this.

7. Fee Agreements and Collection

Steve noted the membership agreement procedures. He emphasized the need for supplemental agreements which would estimate enrollment and collection dates.

David noted that the ideal would be to set up a single billing system for all three components.

Donna agreed with David and brought up the problem about who would be the first to receive the funds coming in from the members.

Phil added that more information was needed on the adaption of this agreement to provincial fees.

Brian noted that the agreement applies to all components.

Jeff asked how we are to deal with mis-billing.

Rich felt that it should be up to the local associations to have the administration sign a verfication of enrolment statements.

Steve was somewhat nervous about CFS collecting fees and distributing them to the provinces. There is a need to be clear about a system of money transfer from provinces to the national component.

David suggested that billing could be based on letters from collecting bodies estimating when fees will be dispersed and giving enrollment predictions. The onus would be on the student union to get verfication from the administrations. A national fees fund might be easy to set up which could be used to take out funds.

Phil asked if the fees agreement could be adjusted to those institutions who collect their fees on a pro-rates basis.

Beth wondered what happened to those who don't pay their fees.

Brian responded that the ultimate threat was legal action.

Beth asked how difficult it was to collect fees.

Diane informed her that there are problems with at least one or two institutions every year.

Helena noted that Ontario has had problems getting people to sign these agreements. She felt that provincial components should get these agreements signed immediately upon an institution achieving full membership. She added that Ontario wanted no part of a central billing system.

Donnafelt there was a need to trust institutions rather that administratio

Phil added that B.C. occasionally had problems with people who overpay.

Steve noted that a motion would be forthcoming at Saskatook outlining specifics of how to deal with members who don't pay.

Don felt it was necessary to take strong action against those who refuse to pay.

Beth asked if there were currently any outstanding fees. Glendon's were.

Brian noted that verifying statements are needed to avoid problems with component fees breakdown, and that this would minimize any potential conflict.

Donna stressed that fees are "us pooling out resources" and that it is necessary to understand that special circumstances arise. Trust, she felt, was essential.

Jeff suggested that enrollment verification should be changed to dollar amount verification.

Don reiterated his point that CFS must collect students' money.

c. Congruency

MOTION: To table indefinately the motion on congruency.

Eric Walker/ Don Millar

CARRIED

MOTION: To ask press to leave on the condition they would be briefed later

Eric Walker/ Helena Mitchell

CARRIED

Helena noted the necessity for something concrete. The basic problems involve provincial alienation, and that question can't wait until Saskatoon.

Don felt the goal was to strengthen CFS based on the founding principles. The national component needs the provinces in order to gain more members. Ther is also a need th define the role of provincial organizations, so that they provide a behicle for input and implementation at the local level. The membership wi weary with discussions about structural concerns. He recommended a constitutional amendment which would institute the National Provincial Meetings, with the final authority resting in the plenary. It would be composed of:

1. Provincial organizations
2. Representatives from unorganized provinces chosen in caucus

Other principles should be:

1. Every provincial organization should support the congruency goal.
2. Congruency must not be imposed.
3. Provinces must determine their own strategies and timelines to achieve congruency.
4. Componency will be defined as an organization miving towards congruency. Their strategies, etc. will be determined by the province in consultation with the other components.
5. Once congurency achieved, there must be a commitment that it will not be lost.
6. A bond of trust is implicit in this.

MOTION: BIRT this NPM accept in principle the ad-hoc position put forward by Ontario, Alberta and Nova Scotia, and

BIFRT the NPM forward to the national plenary a recommendation that the national plenary approves constitutional changes necessary to establish a National/Provincial Meeting structure, responsible for reflecting provincial viewpoints to the total organization and responsibility for monitoring the ongoing functioning of CFS and, when necessary, putting forward to the national plenary possible constitutional changes, and

BIFRT the NPM ask the national plenary and the provincial plenaries to adopt and implement the proposed definition of componency. The NPM suggests taht all components consult and seek to enhance this definition of componency.

Eric Walker/ Debbie Barrie

Charmaine asked what would the NPM deal with.

Don responded that it would deal with legalities, structures, agreements and by-laws.

Charmaine asked Eric to elaborate on the definition of congruency.

Eric noted that provincial organizations would lay down timelines and strategies for congruency.

Charmaine didn't feel this had answered her question, so she repeated it.

Rich asked about a cost-sharing arrangement for the NPM, and how could organized and unorganized provinces contribute.

Helena responded that provincial components should contribute funds, and that more specifics would have to be worked out later. She pointed to to NUS socument "Building for a Better Future", which outlined the need for an integrated membership and for provincila organizations in every province.

Peter stressed the problems with a lack of trust.He felt this proposal would mitigate some of these problems.

Donna noted B.C.'s opposition to the expulsion of the press. She also objected to the motion, feeling that it was creating yet another level of bureaucracy. The CC slhould be discussing these problems. She didn't feel this was changing anything, and that real solutions had het to be discussed.

Don emphasized that restructuring is an ongoing process, and that they must be continually building towards and on the founding principles of CFS. This proposal has that kind of flexibility necessary to encourage people to join the organization. It is not usurping the role of the CC.

Jeff felt that these proposals should go to the national plenary. He noted the SUNS constitution says nothing of congruency with the national component and he asked if appropiate changes be made to encompass these principles.

Peter answered in the affirmative.

Beth felt thatthe CC was a sufficient forum for this kind of discussion.

MOTION: To divide the motion to deal with the BIRT on the NPM seperately.

Beth Oley/ Phil Link

Beth felt the two issues were seperate and should be discussed seperately.

Helenanoted that the CC has no time to discuss congruency and integration. As well, the question of structure cannot be made solely by the CC because the is no representation from the provincial components at the CC level.

Rich was concerned about regression, and that those attempting to achieve congruency should not go backwards.

Peter admitted that there were problems with this proposal,but felt it still has some merit. He noted the NPM structure had evolved because of a need to discuss restructuring with the provincial reps. The structural issues are weighing down the organization and must be dealt with. This seems like the best method of doing so.

Jeff spoke in favor of the motion to divide, feeling that a discussion of the role of the NPM might best be taken care of after a discussion of the roles fo the CC and Board.

Beth agreed with Jeff, adding that there is a need to discuss congruency and not the issue of instituting the NPM.

Don opposed the motion to divide, feeling that this motion would be a new and improved method of dealing with congruency.

Helena emphasized the necessity of doing something now. Any changes to the CC would be a long time in coming and there is no need to refer this question until later.

Peter reenphasized that NPM and componency issues and interrelated.

MOTION: to call the question to divide

Jeff O'Malley/ Beth Oley

CARRIED

MOTION TO DIVIDE DEFEATED

MOTION: to amend to read, in addition,

BIFRT within the bylaw changes, that provincial organizations that presently have a CFS component (Saskatchewan, Ontario and B.C.) must maintain their policy of congruency pending signing of agreements, and

BIFRT the funding for the NPM be the joint responsibility of CFS, all provinces and all components.

Beth Oley/ Todd Nicholsen

Beth reemphasized the principle of progression, not regression.

Phil asked why this did not apply to PEI, Newfoundland and Manitoba, where congruency already exists.

Erik T. opposed this because, as an unorganized province, he wanted the national organization prove itself first although they wanted a provincial organization now.

Beth said she just wanted to make sure that no steps backwards are taken.

Helena called the question.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

Jeff proposed another amendment.

AMENDMENT: to amend the main motion to delete, in the 2nd clause of the main motion , the responsible clauses and insert

" the responsibilities and parameters for which will be discussed by this NPM tomorrow morning"

Jeff O'Malley/ Teresa Gonsalez

AMENDMENT FRIENDLY

It was made clear that the intention of the motion was to prevent regression while not interfering with the definition of componency.

Rich stressed the need to unite, not play up on the differences.

Donna pointed out the principle of congruency was fundamental to the national organization, and there must be a commitment to that principle in all areas where congruency exists.

Helena noted the status of CFS-O's congruency with CFS.

Peter did not feel that the three unorganized provinces were congruent because there had not been a conscious decision made to be a congruent component.

Don felt that the most important goal of CFS was ensuring student representation on all levels, and that this motion was the best method of ensuring that. Any other principle cannot take precedence over that goal.

Charmaine wondered what mechanism would be used to determine timelines to achieve congruency.

Don noted this would be decided by the provincial organization in consultation with other components.

Charmaine wondered if it was reasonable to assume that specific strategy would be brought to conferences to be brought forward to the other components.

Don felt that this might best occur at levels other than conferences.

Brenda agreed in pronciple with this idea, but saw two major problems. This first was the question of a commitment to the long- term principle of congruency and the second was a concern of the attitude of the student movement working together.

Peter emphasized the need for a national organization and for congruency. He added that congruency must be encouraged and not imposed.

Helena hoped people would start working together and look for common ground. She did not want to delay movement on this motion.

Jeff rose on a point of priveledge, informing Helena that the best solutions were brought about by discussion and that people were not delaying movement on this motion.

Don felt the a realistic assessment of who does what withing the organization was needed and that this wasn't being done.

Rich was glad to see that Nova Scotia was ready to make a commitment to the organization, but noted that B.C. felt it was a compromise of principles. He didn't think so, but felt that it allowed for an acceptance of diversity and would expand the viewpoint and philosophy of the organization.

Ben noted the organization was not in a position to impose anything on anyone and that it can't afford to be high-handed.

Phil clarified B.C.'s position, noting that CFS is a federation of 65 student unions, each a part of this sum. Non-congruency doesn't make sense in this light. The NPM should be a meeting of parts of a whole and not of sovereign bodies.

Donna said that people were confusing componency with congruency, and noted that this motion does not move CFS any closer to unity, and it doesn't affect change towards a national student movement.

John K. agreed with these points.

David noted that this would be solving short term problems, but felt that this was being decided in isolation of considerations of principles.

MOTION: to call the question

Peter Kavanagh/ Eric Walker

CARRIED

MAIN MOTION CARRIED.

8. Policy

Charmaine hoped that the NPM could look at policy congruency among components, and wondered if they should look at defining what are national and what are provincial matters. One idea was that the national branch should look at structly federal matters and national concerns, while the provinces should look at provincial concerns.

Guy agreed that the NPM should look at where the division of labour should be and how policy making should be shared.

Peter raised many of the same points.

Charmaine agreed with the need to look at this question.

Peter asked who would normally try to figure these things out.

Charmaine responded that it would be the Policy Committee.

Jeff stressed that no component could impose policy on another, although some form of ratification process could be decided upon.

David noted that there are basic provisions in the Services constitution for policy-making and ratification.

Donna didn't feel there was any real need to discuss policy congruency between national and provincial components and that there was nothing wrong with disagreements at that level.

Charmaine read the section in the constitution on policy jurisdiction.

Helena noted that all OFS policies had been ratified by CFS-O and she wondered if each component should look at any of its policies related to national issues and remove them.

David noted that much policy was not binding on the member institutions.

Jeff added that disagreements among components couldn't be avoided.

It was decided that these concerns would be taken to the policy committee at the Saskatoon conference

David suggested that perhaps the NPM should categorize policies before organizations put together their policy manuals.

Helena noted that the Policy Committee should allow for any differences among the provinces.

9, Membership Development

a. Problems

Helena felt that any other development problems would be best dealt with at the conference.

Rich wanted to incorporate into CFS running leadership seminars to give smaller and newer institutions the benefit of greater experience to ensure a smooth transfer of ideas being considered.

Ian pointed out that bigger schools are not necessarily better organized.

b. Representation by Population

Erik T. felt that it was the goal of CFS to provide political and other services and taht representation by population was consistant with principles of democracy. He felt it fundamental that a majority of students should determine the policy. He noted that the organization can only prosper and meet the majority of student needs if it caters to the big schools without losing the input from the smaller institutions.

Phil stressed that one vote per institution is democratic and that it is the most equitable manner of voting which exists.

Teresa pointed out that FAS had come up with what it feels to be the most equitable solution: that 50% of the colleges and graduate associations and 50% of the universities must agree on every motion.

Jeff felt the FAS system has wider advantages than a rep by pop system.

Erik T. noted that he was not only concerned about monetary input, but that every student should have an equal say in what happens re policy and decision making powers.

Donna felt the current system was the most fair.

MOTION: to reaffirm theCFS position of one vote per institution.

Donna Morgan/ Debbie Barrie.

Rich suggested the NPM should solicit and review briefs on this question. He found it was necessary to accomodate the larger institutions without being dominated by them.

Donna determined that the NPM was not designed to represent institutions, but provincial and national components.

Helena felt that B.C.'s position was inconsistent with it's own policy regarding weighted voting within its own structure.

Erik T. wanted the CC to look at the pros and cons of weighted voting.

Ben clarifies the status of weighted voting in B.C.

Debbie withdrew her second to this motion.

Phil Link provided a second.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Ian noted that the one vote per institution system allowed for a representation on the basis of what the individual council believes. Weghted voting would not allow for more input by students, but only for more power to the larger institutions. This could lead to a reaction by the smaller schools, and more block voting to mitigate the power of weighted voting. This would be less and not more democratic.

Helena felt that Rich's idea had some merit and should be followed up on.

Peter agreed.

Phil asked Erik T. why the question of weighted voting did not come up with AOSC, and he concluded that the reason must be money.

David felt that this issue is a first indication of dissatisfaction with the way the organization is run and with its ability to deal with its mandate. He hoped the question would be looked at with a holistic approach to the whole organization.

Rich looked for someone to move a motion asking the NPM to consider briefs on the question.

Guy agreed with this.

Andy also supported this idea.

MOTION: BIRT the NPM encourage provincial organizations as well as local institutions to come up with alternate proposals or positions on the question of voting structure within the federation through an on-going process (May conference and other meetings), so that an eventual firm and well-thought out decision be made by the plenary.

Brenda Cote/ Don Millar

Don felt it would be encouraging to larger schools if they saw this question was being discussed.

Jeff noted that issues affecting institutions are provincial issues. He also urged caution over the promiscuous use of the term 'democracy'.

AMENDMENT: to replace "voting structure"with "voting and representation structures"

AMENDMENT FRIENDLY

The term 'representation' was included so that the question of interest groups could be included.

John B. defined democracy as a"rule of equal members". He felt that CFS should be a federation of all students and not just a federation of federations. He thought CFS should realize that money has a role in modern life and that money makes CFS, as the Capitalist Federation of Students, go round. He felt there was a need to tie monetary contribution to power within the organization.

AMENDMENT: to delete 'voting and representation' and replace it with the term 'participation'.

AMENDMENT FAILS FOR LACK OF A SECOND

John M. also felt that money was an issue. He noted that the addition of non-member institutions would bring in $795,000.00 to CFS, and this was one of the reasons rep by pop should be looked at.

Erik. T. took exception to Phil's comment about money . He felt that the question was one of principle. and that this question must be treated seriously.

Brenda called the question.

MAIN MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

c. Role and Integration of Services

Rich outlined some of the problems facing the Board, involving accountability, regionalization, institutional involvement, and information dissemination. He imparted some of the Board's suggestions of how to deal with these problems. He looke at the projects the Board is getting involved with and emphasized that the Board was a full participant in this organization with similar problems and benefits. He ended with the observation that the Board was student leaders, not corporate managers.

Peter noted that it was the perception that the Services wing views itself as a business and not as a student service.

Debbie asked about the CFS deficit.

Rich noted that revenues from CUTS and fees were their only source of revenue and that there were no reserves available.

David cleared up some of the misconceptions of the Dalhousie problem, noting that the Business Manager at Dal was aware of the situation across Canada re rent payments and that CFS was willing to pay rent to the Dal Student Union.

Peter felt that, regardless of the past history of the situation, something had to be done about it.

Rich reiterated his earlier point that CFS-S was a service more than a business.

Peter felt it might be difficult to convince students of that, given that new offices were being opened which didn't serve students ,but the general public. He wondered if CUTS was a revenue base for CFS-S or a service to students.

Andy noted that, as occurs at the local level, businesses can be services as well. He did not feel that this presented a conflict.

John K. felt this was a national problem, and that the major issue to be discussed was the integration of CFS-S into CFS.

Don noted that it is the services which sell CFS during the referenda, but that they do not play a full role in bringing members on line. He also noted that the fact that CFS-S does not contribute to fieldstaff is a reflection of the larger problem of a lack of integration.

Rich informed the delegates that these questions were being looked at and that currently CFS and CFS-S do work together on many levels.

David added that many of the problems stem from the fact that the two are seperately incorporated. The staff structures would be reviewed, but many of the changes must take place over a period of time. As to the question of service vs. business, he felt that CFS-S and CUTS were very much both, and that there was no conflict in this.

Eric R. asked why there were so few services in New Brunswick.

David noted that the UNB student union had reneged during negotiations and that there were not any full members of CFS in New Brunswick. As a result, there has not been much demand for their services in the province.

Donna felt there was a problem in dividing political from other services.

Helena hoped that a cost-sharing arrangement for staff would be looked at for all components.

David noted that a protracted debate within the CC and Board had led to a decision that Paul and David should investigate this question.

Helena also felt there was an additional question of who should give direction to the fieldies. She suggested there should be one fieldie specifically for referenda.

John M. noted a need for a translation service. He also noted that the perception problems of CFS-S as a business and of CFS and CFS-S being seperate were just that: perceptions.

John K. disagreed with this, postulating that what actually existed were two seperate organizations trying to integrate and what should be done is to try to continue and facilitate this process of integration.

John B. wanted to see services come under direct and ultimate control of the CC.

MOTION: BIRT CFS-S come under direct control of the CFS governing body.

John Bosnitch/

MOTION FAILS FOR LACK OF SECOND.

Don emphasized the need to talk about integration and membership development and why there is so little coordination between the Board and the CC.

After a recess for supper, the meeting reconvened.

Beth noted the necessity for an improvement in communications. She asked if it was true that fieldworkers were not allowed into Board meetings.

Rich responded that this was not true.

Eileen reminisced about the deplorable situation previously extant between NUS and AOSC. She noted that the situation was much improved and that there was more integration on a daily basis then there ever had been before. She added there was still room for improvement.

Rich affirmed the Board's support for the creation of a CFS-S Budget Committee.

Andy felt that Board members should not have to defend their position as they are elected officials designated to perform the plenary's will. He felt the provincial reps should be responsible for increased communication and that the Board must look at its own internal structure.

Donna noted the practical problems of a divided political and services wing: fieldworkers, extra expenditure for two meetings, duplication.

MOTION: BIRT by two weeks prior to the May General Meeting, the Services Board present to the membership a paper outlining the procedures necessary for and the difficulties inherent in one plenary, one office one logo and one organization.

Donna Morgan/ Ian Nelms

Don asked why the Services Board should be doing this.

Donna responded that it had been brought up in a discussion involving them.

Beth felt the motion defeats the purpose of the NPM.

Andy hoped to create a committee from the CC and the Board to look at this.

AMENDMENT: to delete 'Services Board' and insert in its place, 'a committee composed of Chairpersons, the Treasurers, and Executive Officers.'

Andy Knight/ Helena Mitchell

Donna noted that the Services Board seems to see the problems with integration and that delegates could use the information the Board has.

John B. wanted to stop referring things to the CC and begin dealing with things in the context of the NPM.

The Chair ruled that the intent of the motion was not to refer, but whether or not to provide information for this to the membership before the plenary in May.

MOTION: to table the amendment and the motion until the discussion of executive restructuring.

Peter Kavanagh/ Beth Oley

CARRIED

10. Executive Restructuring

a. Problems with the Present Structure

Charmaine noted the problems addressed in the "Report of the Committee on CC Restructuring".

Jeff asked why the NPM was dealing with CC restructuring.

Charmaine noted that anything dealing with national restructuring should be examined within this forum.

Teresa added that the provincial reps' input was essential because of their knowledge of their members' attitudes and feelings.

Phil felt one of the major problems of the CC was that it co-ordinates only part of the functions on the national level.

Rich noted that there were also problems with a lack of communication and a joint steering committee with the Board.

Erik T. felt the CC was too big and should be full time. The money for full time members could come from the reduced size of the CC and the inherent costs therein.

Teresa referred to page 3 of the report and asked Charmaine what Member-At-Large would be removed.

Charmaine responded that one would not be removed, but that it would be formalized as a link.

Teresa asked Erik how provincial representation could be achieved if there were only 5 or 6 CC members.

Erik T. responded that this could be achieved through 2 M-A-L's.

Teresa asked him if the fieldworkers would do all of the work for the provinces.

He responded in the affirmative, adding that this would be done with advice from the M-A-Ls and non-CC members.

Peter had two major complaints. First, that the organization was staff run and second, that the CC aren't accountable to anyone.

Andy felt a joint steering committee of the Board and CC was a good idea. He added that people had too high expectations from the CC and that some of that responsibility should be entrusted to the staff.

Brenda felt the major problem facing the CC was a lack of commitment from the sitting members.

John M. agreed that the CC was too large. He disagreed with the idea of full time executive members and felt that they should look into instituting some kind of hierarchy withing the staff.

Beth expressed her feeling that the Board and CC should not be amalgamated. She agreed with the idea of a joint Steering Committee.

Jeff agreed and added his support to the idea of a full time chair.

John B. had much to say on this topic. He wondered if there should be representatives of the Women's Caucus and others on the CC and made reference to the need for a Men's Caucus. He felt secret ballot elections of the CC were unacceptable, as was the calling of meetings by the EO. He proposed a centralized executive structure modeled on that of UNB.

Eileen rose on a point of personal priveledge, resenting the disparaging remarks made about the Women's Caucus and pointing out that the EO is a woman and should be referred to as such.

This was upheld by the Chair.

John B. felt that the 'she' used in the constitution was offensive.

Andy agreed with idea of paring down the CC as well as the formation of a joint steering committee.

Brenda supported the idea of a full time executive.

John B. read section 7 of the constitution which says that the EO can call a meeting.

The Chair pointed out that the constitution says 'may'.

Brenda added that it was the CC who calls meetings.

Helena noted that some of the things coming out of the discussion were irrelevant to the discussion of restructuring. She added that both the constitution and the terms of reference for the EO were passed by the plenary and therefore approved by the membership.

The Chair summarized the discussion. She noted that most people felt the CC was too large and that there was agreement on the concept of a joint steering committee between the CC and the Board.

Rich wished to note his opposition to a full-time chair because of the costs of salary and maintanence. He felt an interim solution was needed until CFS has a more stable financial position.

MOTION: to bring the motion on one plenary, etc. off the table, together with its amendment.

Peter Kavanagh/ John Bosnitch

CARRIED

MOTION: To accept Dawn Noyes as Chair

Brenda Cote/ Eric Walker

CARRIED

Discussion of the amendment resumed.

MOTION: to amend to read

"the committee consist of two link representatives, two Chairs, two EOs be struck and this committee will prepare a report outlining the steps necessary to create a single national executive. On particular, the committee will examine the FAS proposal. the SUNS proposal and will solicit proposals from individual institutions and provincial organizations. The committee will report ot the Saskatoon conference and the next NPM.

Eric Walker/ Teresa Gonzales

Charmaine asked if the intent was to solicit proposals from the Board and CC as well. This was added to the amendment as friendly.

Rich felt that the Treasurers must also ve added to this committee and that it should begin its main body of work after the Saskatoon conference.

Andy agreed.

John B. felt that the real resolution of the NPM should be to decide whether to have a central national governing boly or not.

MOTION: to call the question

Helena Mitchell/ Eric Walker

DEFEATED

Peter noted that treasurers were not added because the question does not address the financial repurcussions but only whether it can be done or not.

David pointed out that the committee should consider cost-sharing and that the treasurers were the ideal people to sit on the committee. He also felt the first stage to be looked at should be the issues and hen the proposals.

Charmaine asked what the status of the report coming from the CC on restructuring was.

Beth opposed the motion because it did not include the treasurers.

Erik T. called the question.

AMENDMENT FAILED

AMENDMENT: to amend to read

"the committee consist of two link reps, two treasurers, two EOs, and the two Chairs and this committee will prepare a report outlining the steps necessary to create a single national executive. In particular, the committee will examine the FAS proposal, the SUNS proposal and will solicit suggestions from the national executines, individual institutions and provincial organizations. The committee will report back to the Saskatoon conference and the next NPM.

Beth Oley/ Jeff O'Malley

rik T. called the question.

AMENDMENT CARRIED

PREVIOUS AMENDMENT DECLARED REDUNDANT

MAIN MOTION: BIRT a committee present to the membership a paper outlining the procedures necessary for and the difficulties inherent in one plenary, one office, one logo, and one organization by 2 weeks prior to the May General Meeting, and

BIFRT thes committee consist of 2 link reps, two treasurers, two EOs and two chairs. This committee will prepare a report outlining the steps necessary to create a single national executive. In particular, the committee will examine the FAS proposal, the SUNS proposal and will solicit suggestions from the national executives, individual institutions and provincial organizations. The committee will report to the Saskatoon conference and the next NPM.

Donna Morgan/ Ian Nelmes

John M. asked if the NPM could mandate or recommend.

The Chair ruled the NPM could only recommend.

Andy was in favor of the motion.

AMENDMENT: to add

BIFRT a recommendation for funding be made to the plenary to allow this committee to continue its work and report to the next NPM.

Andy Knight/ Jeff O'Malley

Diane pointed out the logistical problem of having the two EOs involved as she will be in Great Britain.

Rich emphasized that the committee does not have time to meet before Saskatoon.

MOTION: to call the question

Jeff O'Malley/ Erik Tatarchuk

DEFEATED

Andy suggested the committee meet after Saskatoon.

Specified suggestions on procedure were asked for.

AMENDMENT: BIRT the delegates to the NPM declare it desirable to centralize final authority in the CFS in one representative assembly (plenary) which shall ultimately direct all branches of the Federation, and

BIFRT representatives of each CFS and CFS-S make a report to the next CFS/NPM/CC on the procidures mecessary to achieve such a goal.

John Bosnitch/

AMENDMENT FAILS FOR LACK OF SECOND

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Donna was in favor of the motion on the floor.

Beth felt that May was too early a deadline.

Erik T. agreed.

MOTION: to refer this question to the Organizational Development Committee at the Saskatoon conference.

Erik Tatarchuk/

MOTION FAILS FOR LACK OF SECOND

Rich explained that the plenary generally doesn't like dealing with these atters through the OD committee.

MOTION: to recess for 5 minutes

Rich Brooks/ Don Millar

CARRIED

Ian pointed out that all that was being asked was for a group of people to do a little bit of research for the Saskatoon conference. The questions of money and time could be worked out by the CC and Board.

AMENDMENT: to amend the motion to read:

BIRT a committee consisting of two link reps, two treasurers, two chairs and two EOs present to the membership a paper outlining the steps necessary for the feasibility of one plenary, one office, one executive and one organization. In particular, the committee will examine the FAS proposal and the SUNS proposal. It will also solicit suggestions from the national executives, individual institutions and provincial organizations.

BIFRT the NPM will make a recommindation to the plenary at the Saskatoon conference for funding to allow this committee to fulfill its task, and

BIFRT the final report of the committee be circulated to provincial organizations at least one month previous to the next NPM to be discussed at the next NPM.

Beth Oley/ Todd Nicholsen

Todd spoke in favor of the motion.

Phil urged defeat of the amendment on the basis that information would not be available to the delegates in Saskatoon.

Jeff noted that time was needed to prepare briefs and consolidate the information. The amendment covers the concerns over time while allowing for a start of action.

Erik T. felt the amendment was the best compromise.

Rich asked for an alternative timeline from B.C.

Ian felt that debate was useless at this point as people had already made up their minds.

David felt people should trust the committee to provide the delegates at Saskatoon with as much information as they could.

Charmaine emphasized that the sentiment behing having information available for the Saskatoon conference was logical but not practical.

Donna said the original intent of the motion was to provide information on integration for the delegates in May. They should be able to look at all the information currently available and conduct an articulate discussion. The current motion on the floor wouldn't allow for that and B.C. objects to it on those grounds.

AMENDMENT CARRIED.

B.C.'s opposition is so noted.

MOTION; to call the question

Jeff O'Malley/Eric Walker

CARRIED

MAIN MOTION CARRIED

Rich said that he felt good about the previous discussion and hoped the provinces would deal with the services aspects of the organization.

Todd objected to alcohol being consumed during the meetings.

11. Small Budgeted Members

Steve outlined his paper on small-bedgeted members. He proposed to send and maintain a list of those available for a delegate subsidy to be cost-shared with the provincial component if possible. He wanted to keep away from a set formula if possible.

Eric W. indicated that individual institutions shouldn't rely solely on the national office for subsidy. He felt the provinces should help out.

Phil felt a number of schools were missing from the list and that the level of subsidy was too small. He felt a scaled subsidy was needed.

Steve had found a quantum leap from institutions with $60-70,000 and those with over $120,000 with few in between. He told Phil the Budget Committee would hear appeals at the conference.

Eric W. felt this idea was a good one and hoped there wouldn't be a lot of abuse of this system.

Phil promised to give Steve a list of those institutions missing from Steve's list.

12. Terms of Reference for the National-Provincial Meeting

Peter asked that this be delayed until later on in the agenda.

It was decided to deal with this now.

Helena had some ideas about the NPM. She felt the National-Provincial Meeting should be the forum of first resort for the resolution of any questions regarding CFS development and the process of restructuring. She noted that integration implies an exchange of obligations among the national and provincial organizations which might involve a yielding of sovereignty. She did not think this could occur and be governed by trust alone. She felt the NPM was the only forum which, if legitimized, could deal properly with these questions.

Guy added that this relationship must be governed by specifics. He noted that the provincial organizations were not willing to give up their sovereignty. He did not think the provincial organizations should have to be altruistic. He thought the national office should face the fact that the provincial organizations have " all the cards in their hands". The provincial organizations would not be willing to give up any of their power unless the national office does the same.

Jeff noted that the matter at hand was establishing the parameters of the NPM and that a delineation of what must be done had to be established. He stressed that the idea that agreements can't be made in trust was not relevant, but was an editorial comment on Guy's part. He opposed the use of the term 'sovereign' because it is divisive and that is not the point of the discussion. There needs, he felt, to be a more positive approach to the discussion.

Beth agreed with Jeff that the preamble was unnecessary in determining the role of the NPM.

Eileen asked if the NPM would have independent decision-making powers.

Helena answered no. She said that it would be used as a forum for crossover in the national and provincial plenaries.

Eileen determined that anything out of the NPM had to be ratified by the plenaries. She pointed out what has been done in terms of restructuring in the past three years and noted that the NPM was constructive forum designed to be productive on behalf of students and the student movement.

David spoke against the motion. He felt it was trying to redefine the principles upon which CFS was built,and was not in line with what had been discussed in regards to these principles at the beginning of this meeting. He felt the principles should be changed before adopting structures which challenged existing principles. He added that students have been struving for unity over the past three years and that that should be considered.

Helena gave some of her perceptions of last year's work. She didn't feel CFS was working to be a unified body on the basis that CFS-S was still seperately incorporated. She didn't see any devinite mechanisms to achieve congruency. The reality of the situation should be dealt with and not just the principles.

Don supported the motion. He agreed that trust was important but felt it had to grow out of a defined statement of principles in consultation with others. He felt this was the forum for consultation.

Peter agreed.

MOTION: BIRT notwithstanding other matters which provincial organizations and CFS components may refer to the NPM from time to time, the National-Provincial Meeting will be the forum of first resort for the resolution of any questions regarding CFS development nad the process of restructuring.

Peter Kavanagh/ Beth Olley

AMENDMENT: to add

BIFRT the structure of the NPM will be based on the principle of one vote per province or national organization. Where provincial organizations do not exist, institutions from a province may function as a caucus and cast its bote on behalf of the provincial jurisdiction.

BIFRT NPM's will be held not less than once per year, concurrently with the October meeting of CFS. Following the conclusion of the CFS plenary, the NPM will be convened. NPMs can be held more frequently then once per year if a simple majority of the existing provincial organizations request it.

Guy Wright/ Jeff O'Malley

Guy spoke to Eileen's points on progress that has occured since 1980. He submitted that manifest decisions were made, but not real action had been taken.

Ben felt Guy's statements were somewhat hyperbolic, but added that he felt not enough action had been taken. He felt the only thing the motion provided for us a working group on restructuring and didn't challenge the founding principles.

David stressed that certain understood principles should be reaffirmed to give the delegates a clear idea of what they are working for.

Beth agreed with David. She also asked that specifics about how the meeting would work with the plenaries should be worked out.

Jeff felt the exact wording has to include a provision for referral by provincial caucuses from the unorganized provinces.

AMENDMENT: to replace " organized provinces and national organizations" with "participants in the NPM" in the submissions and calling meetings clauses.

Jeff O'Malley/ Donna Morgan

Peter pointed out that they didn't include unorganized provinces because it didn't want to see the NPM bogged down, and because it was unclear as to who exactly is representing the students.

Helena felt such a clause could be used as " a carrot to the unorganized provinces to develop provincial organizations." She added that they could get their provincial CC rep to call a meeting for them.

Charmaine agreed with Jeff.

Donna also agreed with Jeff, adding that the structure did not need a system of provinces and territiores, but should involve equal partners.

Peter noted the NPM was not an alternate plenary and pointed out that any trouble in determining who was representing a particular province could further the perception that it was.

Beth felt all participants should be allowed to bring issues forward.

Jeff resented the undertone that people representing unorganized provinces are not representative of that province. He noted the mechanisms already in place and felt these were sufficient.

Helena presented the problem of having a non-member institution put forward something in caucus.

Donna pointed out that that was a problem inherent in the motion as a whole and not just in this amendment.

Charmaine couldn't see the relevance of Peter's and Helena's points and emphasized the need for all participants to be equal.

Guy felt it should be explicit taht unorganized provinces would work through caucus.

Jeff asked for a ruling from the Chair about the intent of the amendment.

The Chair ruled that prople from unorganized provinces will function as and through a caucus.

Peter called the question on the sub-amendment.

SUB-AMENDMENT CARRIED

Jeff wondered about the logic of timing the meeting just after the plenary given the time of the CCmeeting.

Eileen added that there was the additional problem of information overload.

Donna was confuse by the rhetoric surrounding this motion. She had problems with formalizing this providure which takes away from the democracy of the plenary.

The Chair ruled on points of order from Helena and Peter that Donna could question the constitution and structure of the NPM.

Donna felt the NPM structures as proposed would set up another bureaucracy and hierarchy which doesn't use the members as its base. She felt that every decision should come from the members.

Brenda also had problems with the motion. She felt that CFS would be coming close to adopting the federal governmental structure. She felt the NPMs should be aalled as needed. This attitude undermines the plenary's ability to act.

Charmaine asked who would organize and coordinate the NPM.

The Chair pointed out that an agenda can be worked out vy the participants.

Helena said the organization would be shared, and be dependent on where it was being held.

Charmaine determined that funding would be shared by the participants.

Helena called the question. This failed.

MOTION: to adjourn

Peter Kavanagh/ Teresa Gonzalez

CARRIED

Bev pointed out that a cohesive student movement can only be created through working together and tolerating each others opinions.

The meeting was reconvened

MOTION: To adopt Bev Crossman as Chair

Don Millar/ Helena Mitchell

CARRIED.

MOTION: BIRT notwithstanding other matters which provincial organizations and CFS components may refer to the NPM from time to time, the National-Provincial Meeting will be the forum of first resort for the resolution of any questions regarding CFS development and the process of restructuring.

BIFRT the structure of the NPM will be based on the principle of one vote per province or national organization. Where provincial organizations do not exist, institutions from a province may function as a caucus and cast its vote on behalf of the provincial jurisdiction.

The NPM may pass resolutions by 2/3 majority for its own givernance or as recommendations ot the respective provincial/national organizations for their consideration and adoption/rejection.

Matters within the jurisdiction of the NPM must be forwarded by participants in the NPM in writing at least 5 weeks prior to the NPM.

BIFRT NPMs will be held not less than once per year, concurrently with the October meeting of CFS. Following the conclusion of the CFS plenary, the NPM will be convened. NPMs can be held more frequently than once per year if a simple majority of the participants request it.

Beth Olley/ Todd Nicholson

Don moved to call the question.This passed and the question was put.

MOTION CARRIED.

Everyone then went on to talk about their campaigns planned for the National Week of Action.

The Chair was roundly applauded and thanked by the delegates.

The meeting was then declared adjourned.