

MINUTES

DIRECTING THE WINDS OF CHANGE

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1991

The current state of the National Student Organization

PRESENT:

University of Alberta	Marc Dumouchel	Alex Ross
	Katrina Haymond	Ian McCormack
	Randy Boissonnault	
University of Alberta GSA	Ken Ross	
University of Calgary	Shannon Zwicker	David Nygard
	Heidi Kutz	Garth Lyon
University of Calgary GSA	Greg James	
Concordia University	James Brown	
University of Lethbridge	David Legg	
University of Manitoba	Susan Forestall	Paul Kemp
McGill University	Karla MacDonald	
Mount Allison University	Mark Arsenaull	
Queen's University	Terri Lohnes	
University of Regina	James Burton	Richard Bruce
	Mark Suggitt	
University of Saskatchewan	Wayne Ingjaldson	Mark Magnuson
University of Waterloo	John Leddy	Lisa Brice

1. CALL TO ORDER
Meeting was called to order at 9:40 by Martin Kennedy.

2. PRESENTATION
Discussion was lead by Terri Lohnes.

Delegates were informed that Queen's was no longer a member of the Canadian Federation of Students. Reasons cited for the decision were:

- primary concern was the lack of weighted voting.
- the pursuit of personal agenda(s).
- was an ineffective lobbying body and it was unable to teach skills related to this.
- concern over CFS' financial stability.
- Queen's felt that there was a need for a unified voice to address universal problems faced by post secondary institutions and that CFS did not fill this role.

3.

DISCUSSION

Two discussion groups were formed, one discussing the positive aspects of the national student organization the other discussing the negative.

At 10:40 the delegates regrouped to discuss their results.

Marc Dumouchel presented the findings of the positive discussion group.

-CFS has good potential, there is no other comparable group in the country.

-CFS performs good research, and offers good services

Mark Magnuson presented findings of the negative discussion group.

-Currently CFS is very fractured and polarized.

-Both the mandate and policies of CFS are presently vague.

-The National Executive of CFS do not have enough authority to be effective.

-Individual students have no real voice in the national organization.

-Observers are often unwelcome.

-Feel that larger use of the provinces should be made in the national organization.

-Decisions do not always reflect members' wishes.

-Lobbying is not done effectively, the group felt CFS acted more as a protest group.

-Services provided by the national organization are accessible to both students and non-students alike.

Changes the group felt should be made were :

-CFS should become more decentralized.

-CFS needs a clearer mandate.

-Altered structure to prevent polarization.

-Deprioritization of social issues.

-An effort must be made to change the image of CFS in non-student communities.

-Discussions need to remain more focused.

-Presently the government is not listening to CFS, more attention is being paid to provincial lobbies.

Committee of the whole:

Boissonnault: Felt that the frustration with CFS was not necessarily worth the effort.

Legg: Hard to justify paying fees to an organization that doesn't seem to represent them effectively. Need to decide on a method of lobbying. Need to discuss the direction of CFS.

Zwicker: Should look at what can be salvaged in CFS, and do we want this done? Is it worth working for change from within or not. If we have a car and want a boat, do we build the car into a boat or just build the boat?

James: U of C GSA is having a pull out referendum. Polarity frustrates the decision making process. Are not prepared to pay to work with present process.

Dumouchel: What is the ideal student organization? This should be the starting point for a national organization.

Burton: There has never been a proper effort to change CFS. Any reforms have been incomplete, an ideal has never been presented. Non CFS schools complain about CFS without putting in the effort to reform CFS.

Bruce: Prefers to change the CFS from within, but most important is that the situation be fixed. Nothing substantial presented to change CFS.

A. Ross: Since CFS exists we should be prepared to work to fix it. However fiscal responsibility calls for planning. Should be prepared to take a stand on commitment to CFS.

Leddy: It will take a long time to change CFS. Need to look for alternatives. There is a lack of continuity in CFS which is damaging to student efforts.

McCormack: Should stop complaining. If CFS cannot be used, then what else can be done? Need to come up with creative solutions. Must use resources to come up with alternatives.

Arsenault: Agrees with James, 2/3 majority is formidable.

K. Ross: CFS is worth saving. Grad students may form their own parallel organization. Is the national organization fulfilling the needs and goals that were set out? Should work with what is there; start with the constitution. Political divisions must be coped with.

Boissonault: Students should advance the same policy and demands, but the CFS has lost focus and direction. Plan and give time to discuss the most important student issues.

Lohnes: Sees consensus; the national organization is a good idea but there are problems with how to deal with or approach CFS. Need to look at prioritization of concerns at CFS and look at how representative it is. Look for concrete ideas to be presented at next CFS AGM. The role of CFS has to be restuctured and clarified. Lack of continuity needs to be addressed as well.

4.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:00am.

A Brief Synopsis on the Current State of
Affairs in the Canadian Federation of Students

Submitted by
Richard Bruce
National Executive
Representative (Saskatchewan)
Canadian Federation of Students

The Canadian Federation of Students is at a crossroads. Either it will fold or it will transform itself into a truly national student organization. There are two broad problems with the Federation. These are democracy and management. In my opinion, if these internal problems are not resolved the Federation will cease to exist within five years.

The problem of democracy. For all its claims to be democratic, the Federation is not. No concerted efforts are made to consult the members. But even more realistically, no concerted efforts are made to consult with the councils and executives of the member associations. Policy is not directed by the member associations. Direction for the organization comes from a handful of delegates at two semi-annual general meetings. Yet these delegates do not represent students at large. Rather a large number of these delegates are militant members of special interest groups. The Federation encourages this by giving preferential treatment to these delegates. These delegates have a choke hold on the organization. In the end, the agenda is hijacked, because the Federation has no means of requiring its to focus first and foremost on education. Yet, a more sinister factor comes into play. Those people that believe that the Federation should be a educational lobby and not the Vanguard of the Revolution have been shell-shocked. Everytime they object to the special-interest-group agenda, they are called racist, sexist, homophobic, etc. The moderates are intimidated with tactics that you would expect from members of a secret police.

The problem of management. The Federation looks more like a battlefield than a corporation--even a non-profit one. The 1990-91 auditors report told us that we ran a \$106,000 deficit. Yet the special interest group faction is unwilling to admit a problem. The same people have developed the 1991-92 budget and, in my opinion, it will most likely also be \$100,000 off in revenue projections. There is no management plan nor any meetings where the managers discuss their management strategies and policy. Even more critically, there is no long term planning and the organization has no vision. It still looks at education the same way it did ten years ago. It has not begun to grapple with the demographic, political, and economic changes that education has undergone in the last decade. It does not think of new strategies to fight for better educational policies and programs by the governments. It does not think of new services to offer its members. It's agenda is not representative, and brave are the few that object to that agenda.

MINUTES

DIRECTING THE WINDS OF CHANGE FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 1991

What is the difference between a "student" issue and an "educational" issue?

PRESENT:

University of Alberta	Marc Dumouchel Katrina Haymond Randy Boissonnault	Alex Ross Ian McCormack
University of Alberta GSA University of Calgary	Ken Ross Shannon Zwicker Heidi Kutz	David Nygard Garth Lyon
University of Calgary GSA Concordia University University of Lethbridge University of Manitoba McGill University Mount Allison University Queen's University University of Regina	Greg James James Brown David Legg Susan Forestall Karla MacDonald Mark Arsenaault Terri Lohnes James Burton Mark Suggitt	Paul Kemp Richard Bruce
University of Saskatchewan University of Waterloo	Wayne Ingjaldson John Leddy	Mark Magnuson Lisa Brice

1. CALL TO ORDER
Meeting was called to order at 11:25.

2. PRESENTATION
Presenters: Karla MacDonald
James Brown

Brown: Issues can be defined in to three categories.

- 1) Educational issues
- 2) Campus issues
- 3) General issues

-Difficult to define and limit categories at times.

-Real Debate: Should student associations address issues that don't directly affect them or campus life?

-How involved should student associations be in effecting change?

-All issues that affect general society reflects on at least a segment of student body.

-Student associations have potential to be most progressive.

MacDonald: This is an important topic at McGill and there is a strong core educational platform for McGill's students. There is a fear of being embroiled in the national unity debate. "Token stances" taken: policies without action which undermine importance of issue (tokenism). It is important to stay focused on education issues, in order to maintain cohesive student body. Other issues can be addressed by clubs. McGill Students' Union provides opportunities for social issue education without taking a stand themselves. Classifying issues is difficult, look at the mandate and position of students. The essence of the question: What are the roles of student associations?

3.

DISCUSSION:

Burton: Read Regina's bylaws outlining the Students' Union responsibilities.

Forestell: Not fair to put in issues like South Africa in with other more immediate, consistently present concerns. General issues need to be addressed in context of access. Student leaders represent their students, and also others who feel a stake in the university. Issues like poverty, daycare, and abortion can be put in an educational context. Look at what issues directly or indirectly substantially fit into the educational context. Student groups and Students' Union must take complementary approach: neither renege or overstep on responsibilities.

Lohnes: At Queen's, student government encompasses student groups. All issues reflected on and in Student Government activities. Mission statement reflects broader concerns as well as specific student concerns. Student concerns extend beyond the academic. It's hard to find the voice of many students, try to represent most views, but it's difficult.

Boissonault: Disagree with Forestell. Must acknowledge that general issues can be and are discussed by other elements on campus. Look at importance of taking a stand, especially since often action cannot be taken. Look at who Students' Union represents.

*

Legg: Look at limited resource base, time and money. Many other clearly educational issues and concerns about student life, without branching out into social justice issues. Plus, no continuity in student government to reflect general issue policies. Policies can alienate students. Students want resources to be devoted to what are clearly student concerns, i.e. finances, access.

Haymond: Need middle ground. Education issues have to be key issues to students, but other issues like sexual harassment become key student concerns. Everything can be put in an educational context. Student politicians by virtue of being elected are representatives of students.

Bruce: Universities are forums for discussion, but strategy for management of issues must be developed. Look at how issues reflect how people get into institutions, and how issues affect their stay. Certain general issues evolve into specifics, i.e. daycare. Debate must be on-going; no outright dismissal of any issue.

Dumouchel: Resources fundamental concern. Allocation of time and money, and how decisions made are key. Every campus makes their own choices, according to own priorities and resources.

K. Ross: Student Councils should be agents of social change, but there are other forums. Sometimes when Councillors asked to vote on general issues, can't necessarily know if they reflect constituents. Also danger of fall-out and alienation of policy decisions. Tried to define "political issue." Have to trust Councils to set agenda and priorities. Can't be afraid of alienation, as long as solid policies are made.

Forestall: Thinks that Student Councils who take a stand on issues like abortion are irresponsible and does not think that student government should spend time philosophizing. But categorization of "student" / "general" issues should be evaluated - i.e. many issues overlap and those general issues that touch on student life should be addressed in some way or discussion should be facilitated. Questions ability of representatives to address concerns they themselves have not experienced.

A. Ross: Does not want to impose his own views. Appreciated open discussion of this issue, not competition among schools.

MacDonald: Feels able to represent students on educational issues, but not necessarily on social issues. Certain issues will always have clear opposition on campus. Student government must always be open to educating students, facilitating discussion creating opportunities for educating students.

Leddy: Recognize that individual schools must choose its own concerns, and many concerns must be left out of national organization, in order to avoid division.

McCormack: Universities are supposed to foster critical thought. Must draw line between "personal" and "professional" activity. Must reflect wide range of student body. Must address concerns of students on campus.

Magnuson: Feels reflective of student body. Politically active are often vocal minorities, not necessarily reflective of majority.

Brown: Student associations should be proactive, onus on student representatives. All concerns are within jurisdiction of student representatives - time/resource management, implementation of social policies, etc.

Burton: Student government makes statement on behalf of student groups on campus on specific concerns. Helps students to empower themselves to address own concerns. Other categories for issues might be "political action" and "provision of services" issues, reflecting how student government should deal with certain issues.

Legg: Not opposed to stance on social issues, but also wants to represent those students who don't hold his own views. SU government should assess its competency to deal with issues. Must be sensitive to student body. Many issues are tokenist, and the battleground for special interest groups. Undermines credibility not only of issue, but also of student government.

James: Must rely on our Student Councils: they are most flexible, resource-driven and student-driven. Constraints on topics for discussion dangerous, and possibly damaging for future student governments.

4. ADJOURNMENT 12:25.

Student Issues Versus Educational Issues:
A Discussion Paper

Submitted by

Richard Bruce
University of Regina Students' Union

Student associations and student federations are plagued with an endless debate about whether they should focus strictly on issues relating to education or on all and sundry issues that students wish to pursue. Typically, on one side are those that want to fight underfunding and tuition increases, student loan freezes, and taxation on textbooks. On the other side are those that want to discuss the environment, South Africa, and Free Trade. This debate has threatened to tear apart more than one student organization.

Fundamentally, student federations lobby for better educational policy and provide services to improve the daily life students during their stay on campus. The Canadian Labour Congress does not lobby the federal government on its space program, unless there is some specific concern about workers and their rights and working conditions, etc. A student federation should follow the same strategy. Yet this does not solve the problem so easily. Currently the federal government is embarking on constitutional change. Does this have anything to do with education? Yes. Education is a provincial responsibility. Students still seek to have provincial governments actually spend the dollars earmarked for education spent on education. Constitutional amendments could actually force them to do so. Does this mean that the whole constitution is relevant to education. Probably not.

However, let us take another issue. Daycare. Does daycare policy affect students? Given the demographic changes that have occurred over the last decade, post-secondary institutions have undergone significant changes in their membership. It is a fact of life that many people that graduated ten or more years ago from high school or even from a post-secondary institution are now returning to school. Gone are the days when the eighteen to twenty-two year old age bracket made up a majority of our members. When very few people in our schools were parents the whole issue of daycare was not an issue for our members. Now it is. Given the absence of available and affordable spaces many students are put in difficult situations because of the government's lack of substantive daycare policy.

But one can still ask if daycare is an educational issue. Sure it does affect many of our members, but so does air pollution. The bottom line is that the absence of available and affordable spaces affects the status of our members. It affects where they will apply to go to school. It affects which classes they take. It affects their student loan disbursements negatively. It

MINUTES

DIRECTING THE WINDS OF CHANGE SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1991

Underfunding and Lobby Campaigns

PRESENT:

University of Alberta	Marc Dumouchel	Ian McCormack
	Randy Boissonnault	
University of Alberta GSA	Ken Ross	
Augustana University College	Sandra Rein	
University of Calgary	Shannon Zwicker	David Nygaard
	Heidi Kutz	Garth Lyon
University of Calgary GSA	Greg James	
Concordia University	James Brown	
University of Lethbridge	David Legg	
University of Manitoba	Susan Forestell	Paul Kemp
McGill University	Karla MacDonald	
Mount Allison University	Mark Arsenault	
Mount Royal College	Sandeep Dhir	
Queen's University	Terri Lohnes	
University of Regina	James Burton	Richard Bruce
	Mark Suggitt	
University of Saskatchewan	Wayne Ingjaldson	Mark Magnuson
University of Waterloo	John Leddy	Lisa Brice

1. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 11:10 by Martin Kennedy.

2. PRESENTATION

Mark Arsenault and Randy Boissonnault each presented on lobbying and underfunding. Randy B. presented on Indirect Lobbying.

Boissonnault: Two groups undertake lobbying for the province of Alberta, ACTISEC and CAUS, the Alberta College and Technical Students' Executive Council, and the Council of Alberta University Students. They speak to various political groups, chambers of commerce, schools boards and the like. A brief presentation is followed by questions from the audience. Many stereotypes of students are found, e.g. students are whiners, foreign students are stealing our children's' places in university. The first year, audiences were hostile, and we soon learned to develop policies regarding what we wanted. e.g. What policy should we have regarding tuition? It needs a determined effort to do this, both in terms of time and resources.

Kemp: We have a similar program with good financial support and have 1-2 presentations a week in Winnipeg. We had over 80 presentations in the summer, reaching almost every municipality in Manitoba. We have a year end report available.

Forestell: The education minister finally met with us after our program was underway.

Boissonnault: After CAUS started, 5 ministers and MLA's attended a Student Union function called University Night.

Arsenault: Mark spoke on direct lobbying. Lobbying means dealing with the issues behind closed doors. Protest groups versus lobby groups. Protest groups are detrimental when they scream at government. This is a last resort. You should influence people indirectly with meetings.

Leddy: When do you know you are at a 'last resort'?

Arsenault: You will feel that you are at a stalemate. You need facts and goals. Then you can influence others. We have professional resources at our fingertips. Know the limitations of the people whom you are meeting with. You also have to make them understand yours. When you go to meetings, bring information for everyone. Have an executive summary, e.g. we want..., benefits for us..., benefits for you... .

3.

DISCUSSION

Burton: Give people you are meeting with a briefing paper before meeting with them.

Arsenault: This is lobbying, not protesting. Negotiation will have success, especially if you provide them with realistic alternatives.

Legg: 3% loan tax. We needed alternatives to offer them, and sometimes it is hard to offer any correct or feasible alternatives.

Arsenault: You can give them general alternatives, e.g. income surtax repayment scheme; we could use a national network to focus ideas.

Zwicker: You don't need to provide solutions, they should change allocations.

Boissonnault: We managed to present to local M.P.'s both problems and solutions, and they liked it.

Arsenault: Bitching doesn't work.

Dhir: Our government doesn't care to negotiate with students. Various reports such as the Smith Report, offer credible alternatives. Repriorization of funds is also a solution for underfunding.

Arsenault: Protesting is the last straw, and should be used when you are at a stalemate. Maybe you should lobby those who do have the ability to influence others at higher levels.

Dhir: If education becomes a priority, then the government will fund it.

Arsenault: CFS is too aggressive in attacking politicians.

Ross, Ken: I disagree, cozy collegial approach is what university administration does and it doesn't seem to work. Lobbying is a

The agenda was amended at the end of the meeting to discuss an Income Surtax Repayment Plan in the case of the 3% loan tax. This amendment passed with more than a 50% majority of the delegates.

4.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m. by Martin Kennedy.

long-term process, we should tell people to make education a priority.

Discussion ensued regarding the merits or lack thereof of a poster of Mulroney.

Arsenault: CFS is failing to give input for student loans, society feels that a 0% tuition policy is unreasonable.

Leddy: Lobby campaigns should be directed towards public.

Ross, Ken: We need to educate our own constituency too.

Dumouchel: We get waited out, as government is in power for 5 years, and we are only in power for 1 year. We therefore need efforts that are long-term in nature.

Arsenault: CFS in New Brunswick met with the minister of labour, regarding venture grants for students in the summer and successfully influenced the way they are administered. This was helped by the fact that members of the Liberal party and businessmen had been convinced to 'come on side' prior to the meeting.

Burton: Unfortunately, one individual told the Saskatchewan Minister of Education to "fuck off" and now we don't have a new students' union building. We needed money for roof repairs and at a social, I spoke to a politician. The end result was that we got the needed funds.

McCormack: What do we feel is effective from those who lobby us? This will give us an idea of what tactics we could use well.

MacDonald: A too strong protest we had failed, but when alternate proposals were given, the Quebec government reacted and is reacting favourably. We discussed methods of indexing fees. The public is viewing us as more realistic.

Dhir: A comment to Ian; we have all had negative experiences with clubs lobbying us on campus. We do make the assumption that politicians will meet with us in good faith. Students in Alberta are getting frustrated with politicians. We need to offer other alternatives.

Legg: Boards of Governors on campuses are appointed by the government, and are credible to them. We need to approach them. We spoke about international students to the Board and then resolutions were made by them and taken to Gogo.

McCormack: We should not show that we are getting frustrated with lobby efforts. We need to offer constructive criticism.

Lohnes: Ontario schools are split on lobbying. This damages our credibility.

Arsenault: Organization and alternatives are important.

Lohnes: CFS and individual schools disagree.

MacDonald: Compromises are important so that you have a united front at a provincial level.

Arsenault: Many schools in provinces are at the same level. Lobbying occurs mostly at the provincial level.

MINUTES

DIRECTING THE WINDS OF CHANGE SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1991

Income Contingent Loan Repayment Plan

PRESENT:

University of Alberta	Marc Dumouchel	Ian McCormack
Augustana University College	Randy Boissonnault	
University of Calgary	Sandra Rein	David Nygaard
	Shannon Zwicker	Garth Lyon
	Heidi Kutz	
University of Calgary GSA	Greg James	
Concordia University	James Brown	
University of Lethbridge	David Legg	
University of Manitoba	Susan Forestell	Paul Kemp
McGill University	Karla MacDonald	
Mount Allison University	Mark Arsenaault	
Mount Royal College	Sandeep Dhir	
Queen's University	Terri Lohnes	
University of Regina	James Burton	Richard Bruce
	Mark Suggitt	
University of Saskatchewan	Wayne Ingjaldson	Mark Magnuson
University of Waterloo	John Leddy	Lisa Brice

1. CALL TO ORDER
Meeting was called to order at 1:35pm by Martin Kennedy.

3. DISCUSSION

Kennedy: A presentation made to a group of Edmonton MP's is being passed around. In addition, we are also distributing a survey which should be completed and handed back at the next meeting.

Boissonnault: Requested a quick poll of the number of delegates familiar with the Income Contingent Student Repayment Program (ICSRP). Less than half the delegates indicated yes. An ICSRP was referred to in the Smith Commission report which also recommended that students' tuition fees should pay 25% of the operating costs of universities. The recommendation for higher tuition fees was made contingent upon the implementation of some form of ICSRP. The report itself contains all of these details.

What are the benefits of such a proposal? Greater accessibility to loans and thus to education.

The pay back of student loans would be accomplished through a surtax added to the income tax paid by graduates. The repayment rate would be based upon the income level of the of the student. This would also allow the government, through

Revenue Canada, greater power in controlling the default on loans. The statistics show that in Alberta, 1 in 6 students default on their loans. Upon further analysis by the U of A Students' Union, it was found that 66% of the loans defaulted were by students enrolled in a program of 1 year or less. These facts were presented to a group of Edmonton MP's who were surprised with the statistics. The presentation was felt to have made a favourable impression.

Brown: How much research was done by the government before this 3% loan guarantee was imposed?

Zwicker: Agreed that the government should have looked at this.

Dhir: The 3% loan guarantee has been under consideration since 1989. The government has also blamed banks for poor enforcement and collection on bad loans from students.

Brown: Questioned that the government wasn't aware of this information.

McCormack: Noted that it wouldn't have been in the government's favour.

Boissonnault: Three factors affect the collection of student loans, a) easy to default, b) banks have fewer resources to collect student loans, and c) banks (at least seen) as being less vigilant, than the government could be. If Revenue Canada was granted the power to collect student loans it would eliminate those three problems.

Dumouchel: One idea personally seen as positive for the ICSRP is that it removes the burden of fear from students who are unsure they will be able to repay their student loans at the end of their degree program. The basic idea of the ICSRP is good, the question seems to be one of implementation. It is a tremendously complex issue. One thing we should get out of today is what we like about the ICSRP.

Boissonnault: I would like to throw this idea out and get your input. We also have some examples of this system in action, such as in the U.S.

Forestell: Noted that in Australia there is no welfare or UIC system as such. Rather there is a state wage which is paid to all citizens. For students, they receive this state wage as opposed to receiving loans. Afterwards, they have to repay based on a

percentage of their income. Also questioned if the surtax for the ICSRP is progressive or straight-line.

Dumouchel: The type of surtax imposed would depend upon the implementation of an ICSRP.

Forestell: Questioned if this should be a straight-line or progressive tax.

Dhir: Assumed that contingent referred to a progressive tax.

Boissonnault: Agreed.

Forestell & Brown: Disagreed.

Lohnes: Spoke of work done by Milton Friedman(sp?) on such income contingent systems. All that is implied is that greater income results in larger payments. It is in economic terms a government subsidy on university education. In Australia they implemented a 3% flat surtax in 1989 for annual income levels exceeding \$36,000 (US). For those people falling below this level, there was no repayment asked for, as it was seen that their education had not been of sufficient value to demand repayment. In the U.S. there were three states which implemented similar programs in 1989. All have folded. The reasons cited were the cost of the programs. One problem is finding the revenue base to support these programs. In addition, there is also the logistics in working out repayment structures between the various levels of government, federal and provincial. Implementing ICSRP in Canada is estimated to cost between \$500M and \$1B.

Kennedy: Asked for each school to offer their opinions on this issue.

Arsenault: Noted that the initial start up cost could prove to be a problem.

Lohnes: Mentioned work done by a David Steiger. An idea put forward was to use some for of education bond to finance the start up of such a system.

Brown: In Quebec the idea of a post-graduate tax was proposed. It was studied and the opinion was that it was unfeasible from a provincial stand-point. It would be more feasible from a federal level. Noted it would be difficult to achieve consensus between provinces.

An item of concern for student lobby in Quebec is the existing loan system. In order to be classified as independent,

you must either be married, have graduated or worked outside of school for a minimum of two years. Many students fall through the cracks of such a system. Advises that there needs to be more than an after graduate tax. There must be sufficient corporate contributions and government support. In Quebec there seems to be a focus on having students pay for more of their education. This raises the question of what proportion of their education students should pay for.

Leddy: At the present time, the middle and lower class, by means of taxes, pays for the majority of educational costs. In turn these are the groups of people with the least access to higher education and thus are failing to receive the benefits of what they are paying for. Need to look at the current costs involved in our existing system not just the costs of a new system.

Kemp: The ICSRP would also act to get students through school faster. Currently many students are forced to work during university in order to survive and end up spending six years to complete a four year degree. Noted that on December 9-10, provincial education ministers are gathering for a meeting. This would be an opportunity to present this idea for their consideration. Questions if group believes in this idea.

Forestell: Regardless of the start up costs, this will be of great benefit to government in lower default rates. Also should present the ICSRP in the form of the benefits which the government would enjoy from this program. Cautioned that there could be backlash from professional faculties to the idea. A progressive surtax would be view negatively.

Burton: There would not be a lot of wrong ways that this tax could be implemented. There is a need to get business on side with this idea. They feel the need for skilled workers. It has already been seen that business taxes don't work. What is needed is to simply get the idea across, period. Also noted that student groups lack the necessary skills to accomplish this task alone.

Suggitt: When it comes to raising start up funds, private industry should also be considered.

Ingjaldson: This seems to be a problem of ironing out details. In the short run there will be issues related to cost, but the long run will be concerned with the benefits which will result from this. As it stands now, many students are unable to pay back their loans. A change is needed. If an ICSRP works then we should advocate it.

Legg: There is already a lot of money invested in the student loan program, and we are not starting in a vacuum. This will result in the restructuring of an existing system but these are really only short term considerations. Also feels that this should be accomplished with the aid of experts.

Dhir: It is necessary to present realistic alternatives to the government. In Alberta only 61% of university's funding comes from the provincial government with students, the public and private industry contributing the remainder. There has to be an alternative side to the argument of students paying more. A report issued recommended to Ontario that an additional \$91M be granted to education, student loan limits be raised, tuition fees be indexed to the level of government funding and an ICSRP be put into place, but only when accompanied by the previous changes. There is \$150M annually lost to the default on student loans. Within 10 years this would repay the cost of instituting such a system. This does require not only short term, but long term planning. This also means that several changes need to be made, not just an ICSRP.

Zwicker: There are a number of concerns with a ICSRP. One is that one report suggested that the amount repaid back should be double the amount of the loans provided. The basis for that is to allow the system to be self sustaining by making up the shortfalls lost to people who go on to jobs with only marginal pay or elect not to work at all. Thus we need to go to students to solicit their response. Noted that she personally agrees with an ICSRP even if it does require a pay back of double, and that it's better to pay a higher specific tax than a lower, poorly used tax. However, this proposal will face opposition from those seeing education as job training.

Dumouchel: This proposal is not clear, simple and easy. Rather it is incredibly complex. There are common characteristics and there is a need to effect change. What we should establish here is what you like about an ICSRP and come to a consensus. Details are unanswerable.

McCormack: There does seem to exist a broad consensus that this is a good idea. What is also needed is some sort of solution to offer the government.

Dumouchel: Disagrees that the government necessarily knows that student groups are in favour of this.

Boissonnault: Noted that we can't feel guilty about not being experts. When the U of A Students' Union went to the Edmonton MP's it was only based upon ideas. Perhaps having

agreed in principle to this idea we should work separately to influence politicians on this issue.

4.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:00pm.

MINUTES

DIRECTING THE WINDS OF CHANGE

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1991

Why have a National Student Organization?

PRESENT:

University of Alberta	Marc Dumouchel	Ian McCormack
	Randy Boissonnault	
Augustana University College	Sandra Rein	
University of Calgary	Shannon Zwicker	David Nygaard
	Heidi Kutz	Garth Lyon
University of Calgary GSA	Greg James	
Concordia University	James Brown	
University of Lethbridge	David Legg	
University of Manitoba	Susan Forestell	Paul Kemp
McGill University	Karla MacDonald	
Mount Allison University	Mark Arsenaault	
Mount Royal College	Sandeep Dhir	
Queen's University	Terri Lohnes	
University of Regina	James Burton	Richard Bruce
	Mark Suggitt	
University of Saskatchewan	Wayne Ingjaldson	Mark Magnuson
University of Waterloo	John Leddy	Lisa Brice

1. CALL TO ORDER
Meeting was called to order at 3:30. N.B. from 3:15 to 3:30, delegates resumed discussion on the Income Contingent Loan Repayment Plan.
2. DISCUSSION
Dhir: Wants to recommend the income contingency loan repayment the Education Minister's Conference.
Bruce: Wants to make a formal statement issued by delegates at conference.
Zwicker: Need to consult individual student bodies. As representatives, we must take into account their council and unions' wishes.
Brown: Agrees with Zwicker. Needs to respect wishes of student body, who may not necessarily agree with the plan.
Forestell: Does not feel comfortable with some aspects of plan. Also needs to discuss with executives at Manitoba and council.
Kemp: CFS does not even consider this an issue. Does not feel need for formal statement, but does want issue of loan repayment discussed at conference. Executives should speak to provincial education minister.
Kennedy: Recommendation: Schools that want to issue a statement together should take time after the session to collaborate and discuss what they want to say.

desirable for a national organization are provided for in CFS. Perhaps changing CFS is the best idea.

Brown: All three options are undesirable. Requires too much effort to change CFS. Forming a new national organization may evade the problem of the lack of unity. Status quo is unacceptable.

Bruce: Believes two national organizations do not have to be competing. Believes we should try to change CFS but does not necessarily preclude joining a new national organization. It is dangerous to eliminate any possibilities.

Dhir: Sees consensus on need for a national organization. A conference strictly for information sharing purposes is beneficial. Agrees CFS has lost its focus. Need to address universal Canadian education concerns. Defining and limiting CFS focus could remedy divisiveness. Advocates changing CFS from within. Believes competition between CFS and a new national organization is inevitable. But better use of resources and potential unity by working without CFS.

Kemp: The University of Manitoba cannot change CFS from within since referendum rejected joining. New national organization is more possible for University of Manitoba. Ad hoc info sharing and stance-taking on issues like loan repayment plan a good idea.

James: The only aspect of CFS somewhat effective is lobbying. Resources for starting new national organization are too high. Conferences like 'Directing the Winds of Change' meet the needs not met by CFS.

MacDonald: Wants a forum for discussion, be it through conferences or a new national organization. Does not want policy making. Wants dialogue and possible joint brief submissions.

McCormack: Competition or prospect of such could be beneficial, as it could force CFS to reevaluate. Wants to see continued forums, not formal organization with an infrastructure.

Kutz: Two organizations may make student voice seem divided in eyes of government. Does not necessarily oppose policy making.

Leddy: Ad hoc basis not good for core lobby issues.

Dumouchel: Just because CFS already has infrastructure, does not mean it is the best. What is dealt with in terms of issues should be directed by constituents. Cannot come up with definitive answers right away, in terms of what is needed on national level. Most important not to undermine the credibility of Canadian students.

Legg: Important not to get tied to policy making. Wants to see a commitment to maintaining dialogue between schools.

Burton: Believes that we should have a national organization. Having a new national organization every 10 years undermines

the credibility of students. Perhaps a working group of schools should issue a notice of intent to change CFS.

Bruce: Sees need for a working group to be established now in order to ensure that progress is made.

Magnuson: Does not see potential for unanimity in CFS or any other national organization. A loose coalition would give schools freedom to be members or not.

Kemp: Students should give the government options and alternatives, two national organizations could give students more choices as well as the government.

Forestell: Sees that concerns of students change over time, but information sharing is always crucial. Believes that conferences like "Directing the Winds of Change" could meet needs of students not met by national organization. Information sharing could evolve into lobbying.

Brown: Important to allow room for disagreement and lack of unanimity. Important to take a stand on important issues: if CFS won't do it, it must be done by other methods.

Boissonnault: Loose coalition possible with an opt-out clause. Telephone and E-Mail networking could support such a coalition.

4.

ADJOURNMENT



Appendix A

Directing the Winds of Change . .

National Conference of Student Leaders
28 November - 1 December
Edmonton, Alberta

Colloque national des associations étudiantes
le 28 novembre - 1 décembre
Edmonton, Alberta

Winds of Change Resolution

Whereas there are shared concerns and aspirations among student leaders in Canada,

and whereas the free exchange of ideas is best served by an atmosphere of collegiality and acceptance of differing viewpoints.

Be it resolved that every effort be made, by the undersigned, to:

- 1. Meet physically once annually to facilitate discussion and information. Relevant resource people and student leaders from all Canadian student organizations shall be encouraged to attend.*
- 2. Share information, on an on-going basis, for the mutual benefit of all student leaders in the areas of management, demographics, lobbying strategies, and other shared concerns.*