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# ATTENDANCE

= STUDENT PARLIAMENT

= STUDENT COURT

= STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL

= 45 PEOPLE ARE IN ATTENDANCE IN TOTAL AS PER THE REGISTERS.

­­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# MINUTES COVERAGE:

a. #NotAllMen Critical Engagement

b. Register All Policy

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# OPENING BY THE SPEAKER Of STUDENT PARLIAMENT:

The House is informed that Parliament is currently trying to arrange for a remote for the projectors in the room because it appears that it has been locked in the safe. Please bear with them as a plan is made.

The sitting opened at 18h23 by the Speaker.

This meeting is being recorded for minute-taking purposes and the minutes thereof shall be released.

The Speaker of Student Parliament acknowledges the presence of the Chair of the Student Representative Council as well as the Chair of Student Court and welcomes all the members of parliament.

The Speaker begins his speech by giving context on the communication issue experienced by Student Parliament. Student Parliament currently does not have access to SYMPA (the mass mailing list) of which access must be given from the Communications Division of Stellenbosch University. Legal threats have been received that disallow the use of SYMPA. This is because SYMPA currently does not have an ‘unsubscribe’ option which is in violation of the POPI Act. A meeting was had with Student Governance as well as the Communications office of the university and the way forward will be given by at a later stage once the university has looked into this matter.

The minutes and the agenda of Student Parliament were not made available to send through the SYMPA because it is inaccessible to Student Parliament. The agenda was posted to the Facebook page. The Speaker asks the House to please bear with Student Parliament and ha apologises for any inconvenience caused. We will utilize all means necessary to meet that constitutional mandate. Currently, all documentation is made available upon request to [studpar@sun.ac.za](mailto:studpar@sun.ac.za).

­\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# RELEVANT INSTRUCTIONS TO ENSURE ORDERLY PROCEEDINGS TO HOUSE.

The Speaker informs the House that the sitting will commence in terms of Addendum N and reads out the following provisions:

In terms on Addendum N:

1. Every member desiring to speak shall stand while addressing the Student Parliament or the Speaker.
2. A speaker will be restricted to the time allocated by the Speaker, in consultation with the Student Parliament Committee.
3. When a point of order is raised, the member called to order may not continue with their submission and shall resume his seat. The Speaker will to his/her discretion give his/her ruling or decision on the point order. If the point order is sustained the member will act upon any instruction given by Speaker. If the point of order is overruled the member may proceed with his submission.
4. Where the Speaker cannot make an immediate ruling on a point of order he/she must consult with the two Deputy Speakers and if they should fail to reach a conclusion they may defer the matter to later or the next sitting to allow for consultation with anybody/person they deem relevant. In the interim the debate on the matter before Student Parliament may be suspended pending the ruling.
5. A point of information or exigency may be raised at any time in the meeting, provided it relates to an item under discussion; the Speaker may answer to the call or may delegate the relevant member of the House to answer.
6. No debate will be entered into arising from a point of information.
7. Members of the House will have a maximum of two minutes to make a statement relating to the agenda point being discussed.
8. Members of the House will have a maximum of two minutes to ask a question relating to the agenda point being discussed.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# DISCUSSION

# #NotAllMen Critical engagement

The Student Representative Council had a critical engagement session at Dagbreek Men’s Residence called the #NotAllMen event. A complaint was brought to Student Parliament regarding the events of that session as well as the distribution of the Inkululeko booklets.

POO: Privy to the agenda, the first point for discussion is mental health. The Speaker is asked why proceedings are not following in terms of the agenda.

Response: An agenda must be sent to students & days prior to the sitting. It does not speak of anything in relation to the changing of agenda points. However, at this point a proposal was made requesting that the point be changed. With that said, the Speaker would like to propose the change of that agenda point.

POO: The Speaker has no right to unilaterally disregard an agenda point. There is no authority to allow the Speaker to simply not address matters included on the agenda. The Speaker is asked what empowering provision he is relying upon to exercise this decision.

A debate was entered into at length concerning whether the Speaker may choose to not address points of the agenda. The House is called to order by the Speaker.

The Speaker decides to set the proposal to the House and vote on whether this point may be changed.

**For** :21 **Against**: 15

The Speaker rules that the agenda point will be set aside.

POO: The Speaker is asked to please give context as to why the agenda point was changed. All agenda points tabled are of equal importance. If changes occur, the Speaker must decide along with the Deputy Speakers.

The Speaker agrees and informs the House that the matter was discussed at the previous Student Parliament Executive meeting that the executive agreed to move past this point. These minutes are available upon request.

POO: If we understood why this was moving then it would settle all disagreements and the House could move on.

POO: If a member of Parliament has contextual knowledge to nourish the house with, should they not then info rm the House?

POO: You can’t give a point of order on top of a point of order.

Response: With that said, the reason for the change of the agenda is because the persons who were going to nourish the House with the relevant information have contacted Student Parliament to say that they have certain religious obligations that they may not change.

There is no specific provision that says agenda points cannot be changed, but yes, in considering S18(1) of the Student Parliament Constitution the executive must set the agenda. The executive is aware of the agenda point alteration and have agreed. This point has been ruled on.

The House is called to order by the Speaker.

The Speaker calls upon any willing member of Student Representative Council to give feedback on the point. Addendum N point 4 under ‘Order of Proceedings at sitting’, the Student Representative Council are invited to speak as guest speakers. They have the right to not respond.

No Student Representative Council members opt to respond.

POO: The nature of Student Parliament is to create a space for critical engagement and debate. If the Executive (Student Representative Council) of our university is informed on a topic and present at the sitting, I deem it fair to ask the Speaker to require them to respond.

POI: The member in questions states the he is aware that he is under no obligation to give feedback. Is it not more efficient to ask Parliament to respond to the house with the information that was given to Student Parliament during Parliament correspondence with the Student Representative Council manager as well as the complainant?

Response: There is a difference between accounting and giving feedback. Nobody is obligated to respond. Therefore, the Speaker sustains the request by the member of Parliament to read their response to the House.

POC: How was this tabled as an agenda point because the agenda concerning this event went out before the minutes of the Student Representative Council meeting were made available to students informing them of the issues. If an agenda has been tabled through a complaint, then Student Parliament has the obligation to give context on the point, not the Student Representative Council manger.

POC: There is a difference between the Student Parliament Executive and their Committee. Please consult the Student Parliament Constitution for the distinction. All decisions of the Executive Committee must be ratified by the Committee. Student Parliament must be open to student engagement. How did the recordings of these meetings where agenda points were discussed occur and in what manner?

Response: The Student Parliament Executive is aware of the altered agenda and has approved it. At the executive meeting, each point was discussed, and the issues thereof were tabled for discussion.

POC: Please give context on the nature of the specific agenda point because the Student Representative Council manager has given clarity regarding the agenda point raised. The Student Representative Council was asked to present of this at the Student Representative Council meeting. Please discuss why the agenda point was added to Student Parliament’s agenda if it had already been responded to at the prior Student Representative Council meeting.

Response: Members of Parliament must please refrain from assuming that just because a point discussed during Student Parliament, that it was the only complaint regarding the matter that bought to Student Parliament. The point wasn’t tabled to Parliament only once. Parliament values anonymity and not much can be said on the nature of the complaint on that fact.

POO: The member states that he didn’t make an assumption. The Student Parliament agenda was sent out before the minutes of the Student Representative Council meeting which discussed the matter came out. The Speaker is asked to please explain the nature of the agenda point and give clarity on how this was added to the agenda.

Response: Under Point 4 of Addendum E outlines the requirements of asking Student Representative Council members to account. We did not receive a request to account by the house in terms of Addendum E, so we cannot call upon the person in question to give context.

POO: What distinguishes a Student Representative Council member from a Student Representative Council manager. The Student Constitution says that they enjoy all the benefits of a Student Representative Council member, but does that mean they are under the same obligations too?

Response: Addendum E has procedures only for asking members to account.

A lengthy debate ensues about whether the Student Representative Council manager can be compelled to respond to the House or if he may exercise his right to refrain from responding to the questions of the House.

The House is called to order by the Speaker.

Response: Speaker is not being asked in front of the house in terms of Addendum E. He is only giving information out on the topic. The Deputy Speakers are currently locating that email to read to the House.

The House is called to order by the Speaker.

POO: The meeting started late, and we have since just been arguing procedure. Please make a ruling so we can continue with substantive matter.

The Speaker asks for a moment to convene with the Deputy Speakers. The Speaker feels things have been going back and forth and the sitting is not progressing.

The Speaker informs the house that the Student Representative Council manager is not invited in terms of addendum E. He is asked to give context to the house. S47 of the Student Parliament Constitution speaks of cooperative governance. If he chooses, he may engage the House.

POO: In terms of S47(b)(3), nobody can act out of their constitutional obligations and powers, so how is he being asked to account?

POO: Parliament has wasted an entire hour at this point. Being a Student Representative Council member, he knew that he is a public servant. He knew he was going to speak to the house so please ask the manager to address the House.

Response: The Student Representative Council can only come before the house in terms of Addendum E to account unless they willingly decide to take the role of a guest speaker. He is not asked here to account. He has declined to shed light on that point. He asked that instead Parliament present his email response to the House.

POO: Was he unaware that he would be present? He is here, we want to hear the information from him.

Response: The Student Representative Council manager has been spoken to, he has clearly stated that he is willing to have his email response to Student Parliament read out to the House to nourish them with the relevant information. Parliament intends to do so.

POO: Can the Parliament Executive explain the nature of this point brought to House as he has been asking this continuously and it has not been responded to. It is the responsibility of the Executive to give context, not the manager. Speaker, you should give clarity.

POE: Please note S27(4)(a), (b) and (c) of the Student Parliament Constitution. If this is not the case, then can the sitting please move on. If not, use that provision to ask a member to account in a positional authority.

POO: That previous POE is unwarranted. Interpretation is only open to the Student Parliament, not to the House. Such judgement calls may not be made. The Student Parliament Constitution stipulates how things ought to be interpreted.

POO: Remember that the country has moved to a culture of justification not of authority. The Speaker cannot just make a ruling that is unsubstantiated. Please rule on this.

The Speaker asks the House if there are any Student Representative Council members who would be willing to respond to the House.

POO: According to the preamble of the Student Parliament Constitution, Parliament promotes democratic processes. If a member of the House does not want to speak and is not constitutionally obliged to give feedback, the Speaker should take that into account.

Response: The Speaker rules to not compel the Student Representative Council manager to address the House. He will call on the Deputy Speaker External of Student Parliament to read out the email response to the House.

POO: Speaker, if the email in question relates to anything of the Student Representative Council manager in question and his event, I’m not sure we can read it out because parliament has not ruled whether this man has the same obligation as that of the Student Representative Council and whether he is constitutionally mandated to provide that feedback

Response: Ladies and gentlemen, the Speaker has been given permission by the Student Representative Council manger in question. With that said, please take due process into account. The said member can not be forced to do so himself, but is he chooses to make the information available through a different avenue, I would like to allow that because me must progress with this sitting.

POO: Where is the constitutional backing for this consideration because you have not engaged with due process.

Response: Considering that point, members, Parliament wants to highlight that this man is not called to account. He has asked that this information be made available.

The Speaker states that the arguments are becoming repetitive and he does not wish to keep rehashing and address the same topics. Even if this man is on the Student Representative Council, there is still procedure to be followed.

The email was read out to the House.

**[PLEASE FIND THIS EMAIL ATTACHED AT THE END OF THIS DOCUMENT]**

POO: It sound like the person who wrote that email is trying to justify what Dagbreek did. Why were the booklets necessary in the first place?

The member is asked to please speak through the Speaker.

Response: The reason that the booklet was made available was because it was a condition for access to the venue. We got permission from the Dagbreek HK and they allowed them to hand out.

POO: We would like to understand, did the Student Representative Council ‘Critical Engagement’ portfolio manager read the pamphlet beforehand. Also, campus is huge, if this was a condition, the Student Representative Council manager could have just booked another venue.

Response: The committee did receive the pamphlet beforehand. The views expressed were divided. They decided that it was worth it. Dagbreek is known on campus for many different reasons and we felt that the venue was symbolic to the intention of the event.

POO: How does robust dialogue work in this House if the Student Representative Council manager calls the event unofficial and then tags it under his critical engagement portfolio and fails according to the Student Parliament Constitution to account? Him and his team read the pamphlet at this event that was deemed a Student Representative Council event so how does this equate to it being suited to Dagbreek? I don’t understand why the intention of the event is of such a nature that it is only/ best suited to be at Dagbreek.

Response: Committee felt it necessary because of the symbolism of Dagbreek. This is one of the more famous residences, largest and centralised. We felt it would be helpful to have a talk about toxic masculinity in a space where men would be present

It is a transformation office issue. They acknowledge the validity of their event. He spoke to a lady at the Transformation Office. They read through the booklet and while there were parts that the committee didn’t really agree with, they decided to still book the venue.

POO: The member just said that he and his committee read the booklet and that there were parts that they simply didn’t gel with but yet they continued to use that venue because Dagbreek is symbolic The house was corrected on the pronunciation of the name of the booklets. We must turn a blind eye to the fact that Dagbreek is known for… [didn’t specify].

The member then sat down.

The Speaker asked if the Executive Treasurer and the Communications Officer can please enforce the 2min submission rule.

POO: Broad general sweeping statements or stereotypes about what things stand for. Please can members clarify what they mean by their broad sweeping statements.

Point is sustained.

POO: The #NotAllMen event on toxic masculinity talk topic was misplaced because it was a direct attack on the #MenAreTrash Movement which addresses gender-based violence and does not aptly portray all members feelings and that of men. It is problematic because it didn’t address any of the substance of the actual movement.

POO: The point of the topic is to challenge concepts. The member has raised these points based on his life experiences and I’m not sure how this can equate to Parliament having this discussion. The Student Constitution and the RSA Constitution S9(3) of the listed grounds of the equality clause.

Please do not cast aspersions. One of the listed grounds is gender, that is true, however, the member has never directly attacked any of this.

POO: Why should the sexist #MenAreTrash Movement should not be open to critique.

If he wants to engage the substantive matte, and not attack the minority or vulnerable groups of the country.

The House was called to order multiple times.

The house started making remarks at the member of parliament.

The House was called to order again.

POO: Dagbreek is symbolic, to answer to the member who asked why is Dagbreek symbolic, firstly, it is racist, they don’t even know where the men are trash movement comes from and is sexist because it insults the females present that day by issuing a document that only portrayed bad news. A lot of people on campus experience racism and catcalling from men living in Dagbreek. Especially in the early hours of the morning! Nobody is unaware of these things. Even the Student Representative Council manager knew. It was unethical of the manager to still proceed and I think he should apologise to the ladies of Irene for taking them there- because those women who are oppressed by men were taken into such an oppressive space. Thank you Chair.

The House is called to order.

POO: Please don’t associate this event with Dagbreek because it is separate to the event. It was unwarranted of the Dagbreek to chime in. The member is unsure why the house is being blamed or corrected for associating this with Dagbreek.

POO: Speaker, you do not have the discretion to dismiss a point of order. All speaking my stop and attention must be given to the person rising it. In terms of Dagbreek’s chiming in by their official representation, they interjected statements and disrupted other speakers. Why is the House being blamed for Dagbreek’s involvement?

POO: The relevant members of Dagbreek, the members did not just chime in or stand on unsubstantiated grounds. These members have a relevant stance. May it be noted that the venue of the event is significant because of the symbolism that comes with it.

POO: Can the member withdraw the unwarranted statement that Dagbreek is racist?

The member responded that she would never.

Response: The House is called to order and the Speaker states that he has not recognised anyone to speak so members must please not interject. On that point, he asks the member what she is rising on.

POO: Just because you are a leader of Dagbreek, it does not mean that he knows all the events of the residence. She asked him if he was there when all the incidents occur.

The member is called to order by the Speaker and the House is told that all points are to please be addressed to the Speaker and not to address members directly. He also highlights the rules of Addendum N.

POO: Addendum M(F)(1) the Speaker may be stopped if he is bias. The Speaker is resident at Dagbreek which serves as reasonable suspicion for bias. The Speaker is asked if he is willing to proceed with the topic at hand.

The member is asked on what grounds are you stipulating that there is reasonable suspicion because he lives there.

Response: Duty as speakers to remain impartial. Reasonable suspicion is that he is resident there.

The Speaker calls on the Steering Committee. The Deputy Speaker External holds that it is not good justification for reasonable suspicion, his residency at Dagbreek is merely circumstantial. The Speaker may resume his position if he is comfortable to.

POO: Please can the speaker rule on the comments made on Dagbreek being racist and sexist.

Response: Since the current Student Parliament has resumed their term in office, there has been no complaint bought to Student Parliament that Dagbreek is sexist nor racist. Please do not cast aspersions to the member or to the house. If you are alleging the fact, please provide sufficient evidence for the submission to stand.

POC: The Prim of Dagbreek has been known to write controversial things. Some of his articles that came out stated that he believes that rape culture doesn’t exist, and that white privilege doesn’t exist. The member tried to remember a quote and stated that

“There’s no evidence that a white man raped the black locals when they came to South Africa, and the fact that I am coloured is evidence of that”. If this was true, then how can he explain the emergence of people like her.

The House is called to order.

Response: Those articles were written by the Prim in his personal capacity. If he had written those opinions in his position of Prim, then they would be accepted by Parliament.

The Speaker asks that the house please conduct itself in an orderly fashion.

POE: The Speaker is again accused of being bias. He continued to further justify themselves, he said that he was not Prim at that time and they were in his personal capacity. He did not allow the member to defend themselves and he stepped in. The Speaker is asked to step down.

The Deputy Speaker External addresses the House to inform them that the Steering Committee has recognised the bias of the Speaker. In this event, the Deputy Speaker Internal (Accountability Chair), but continue the with the sitting. However, that member is also resident in Dagbreek.

POO: Parliament, it is your job to pronounce upon such matters. Please don’t ask the House to do your job for you by tabling everything to a vote.

POO: The matter to be addressed was already raised earlier in the sitting. Parliament does not wish to simply circumvent provisions of it’s constitution so the Deputy Speaker Internal tables it for a vote. If the House votes against allowing the Deputy Speaker Internal (Accountability Chair) to continue, the Deputy Speaker External (Secretary General) will Chair the sitting.

POO: The House has already addressed that they are not comfortable with a Dagbreek member Chairing the sitting so please can another executive member be empowered to Chair the sitting.

The house is asked whether they are comfortable to allow the Accountability Chair to Chair the sitting.

**Votes For:** 13 **Votes Against:** 28

The Deputy Speaker External (Secretary General) will Chair the sitting for the duration of the discussion of this agenda point.

**[The Deputy Speaker will henceforth be referred to as the ‘Acting Speaker’]**

The House is called to order.

The Acting Speaker begins by expressing her willingness to have people who don’t’ adhere to Addendum N removed from the premises.

POO: Can the discussion please be brought back to the actual agenda point at hand. We have now entertained the egos of Dagbreek and members of the House who attacked members who had nothing to with the event. There is a valid critique for some submissions of some members, but can Parliament stop wasting time

The House is called to order.

A member of Parliament was asked to leave the premises for their disruptive conduct after being asked to be silent several times.

The Acting Speaker informs the House that she will not refrain from asking other disruptive members to leave the premises.

The point at hand is the #NotAllMen event. I’d like to ask the House to attack the substance of the event and not the peripheral issues at hand such as the person of the Dagbreek Primarius. If there are further submissions on that point, will that please be brought to Student Parliament to be tabled as an agenda point at the next Sitting.

POO: Someone said Dagbreek is famous for certain things and for this reason its symbolic of some things and the House wants clarity on this matter.

POO: How do you distinguish between the event and Dagbreek itself because Dagbreek took an executive decision to make the venue available to the Student Representative Council.

Response: This was not a DB event and it was an Student Representative Council event. Please refrain from asking Parliament to intervene on this point- that is not the agenda point brought to Parliament. Should you wish for that to be addressed by Parliament, please be sure to submit it as an agenda point to be tabled at the next sitting.

POO: Parliament cannot choose to dismiss POO when offered. Please give the House the enabling provision that allows you to silence members who are submitting points.

Response: Thank you member. Please refer to S52(d) of the student Constitution. The Student Parliament Speaker is ‘to promote orderly debate’. It is not orderly for a person to interrupt another person while they are speaking. Therefore, I am ruling that I will not accept a POO or POC or POE if it offered while another member is giving their submission. You will not be recognised on that basis.

POC: Does the Student Court function similarly to Parliament

Response: To my knowledge it functions similarly only to the extent…

Thank you, then why is it not defending members from hate speech of the Dagbreek Prim?

Response: Are you referring to the Constitutional Court or Student Court?

The Constitutional court because I don’t really know the SPC.

Response: Thank you, member, that point has been ruled on.

POO: Raising a POO at the honourable member who has laughed at a submission given previously. This is my second allegation on his disrespectful behaviour.

Response: Thank you Sir, your submission is accepted. I’d like to please call the House to order and ask that everyone please adhere to Addendum N. Do not target specific member and making remarks. This is Parliament and I ask that it remain formal.

POO: That members submission was laughable. It was completely unsubstantiated. Can the member please explain why that booklet is so controversial and why the claims were made.

The House is called to order.

POO: In terms of Addendum M, members must please not repeat themselves but point S2(e) states that silence can be perceived as agreement. Parliament may not disregard POOs.

Response: I beg to differ Sir. It is my job to conduct Parliament efficiently and it is in my discretion that your conduct does adhere that, I can ask you to sit.

POO: Is it not that the booklets of the transformation office must be written ito the constitution, so if he is in opposition of that fact, he’s against the constitution,

POO: Addendum N, a speaker must stand when addressing the House

POC: Can Parliament ensure that Parliament doesn’t stray any further from the agenda point brought to the house. Parliament is not her to engage petty politics such as the opinions of the Dagbreek Prim etc.

Response: Thank you. I have ruled on that matter already and points that contradict that ruling will not be responded to.

POO: This is raised on the judgement of the previous speaker. We must all be asked to substantiate our claims. Please can the member clarify what is meant by petty politics.

POO: This is not petty politics. It’s not distinguished from Dagbreek because it keeps popping up against Dagbreek. When will attack the head of the monster?

Response: Thank you. For further coverage of that submission, please submit it for consideration by Parliament as an agenda point for a future sitting.

POO: Many personal attacks have been made and casting aspersions and the matter has not been adequately addressed. Dagbreek has been called racist and sexist and now the member has left.

Another member is asked to leave the premises.

Response: The previous Speaker addressed this by asking that members not address members in their personal capacity. No racist claims have been brought to Dagbreek

POO: The member said that the articles were written based on his person opinions. Why can I not have a personal opinion that he is racist?

POO: It is also his personal opinion that the other member is a racist.

The House is called to order. Members are not here to cast options or personal attacks at each other. None of these statements are recognised. Can attention please be brought back to the agenda. If you address a point that is not on the agenda, it will not be recognised.

POO: Can I get clarity on how Parliament is defining racism because we seem to be deviating from its ordinary meaning. It’s a system of oppression and not of due incidence.

Response: That won’t be given because it will give rise to more irrelevant debate and it is not an agenda point at present.

The House is asked for further submissions:

Should the House have any more issues pertaining to matters raised such as Dagbreek residence, please can these be brought to Student Parliament for consideration. The House has been furnished with as much information as was available. Alternatively, a report was read to the house from the member responsible for that event, since there he is not constitutionally mandated to present or respond to the house, we trust that this debate in Parliament has been sufficient in giving insight. If not, please submit a complaint with Parliament and adhere to the procedure in Addendum E and more information can be given on the point.

POO: Personal attacks have been made which have not been address sufficiently. I leave behind two booklets so people may read them at their leisure. Please email Dagbreek with any problems that may be found with them. I now excuse myself from the sitting.

The House is called to order.

Another member is asked to please leave the premises.

POO: Please can you rule that here will be no advertisements in Student Parliament.

Response: Thank you Sir, your point is sustained. There will be no advertisements in Student Parliament.

The Acting Speaker asks if there are any further points for submission.

POO: Can Parliament please take a stance on the discussion had here and whether Parliament agrees on the labels that were given to Dagbreek Residence.

Response: It is in my view that Student Parliament is to remain impartial. The role of Student Parliament is to facilitate debate and not to pronounce upon the matters which are brought to it. In terms of remedial action, can all further issues be submitted to Student Parliament for further investigation and consideration for the next sitting.

POC: What is the Student Representative Councils stance and what are they taking from the meeting?

Response: There is no Student Representative Council member who is constitutionally mandated to respond. If there is a Student Representative Council member who is willing, I will open this up to the floor and allow for comment.

There are no takers. The member is thanked for his submission. This point is concluded.

# b) The Register All Policy.

The Accountability Chair investigated the matter brought to Student Parliament regarding the Register All Policy. Since Student Parliament cannot communicate with students via mass email at this time, can the Accountability Chair please inform the House of the findings of the report. The Accountability Chair is called to please give context and provide information pertaining to that investigation and the matter.

The complaint to Student Parliament was submitted on the 8th April 2019 alleging the unconstitutionality of the Register All Policy. The first meeting was with the complainant to get context and information and then a meeting was held with the treasurer of Student Representative Council on was on the18th of April.

The complainants sought further information on the status quo of the policy. At the time the complaint was lodged, there had been no correspondence with students and no communication pertaining to whether payment was to be received by certain persons and when.

The official report will be made available to students as soon as Parliament has the necessary means available. While this matter was discussed at a Student Representative Council meeting, the Student Representative Council is asked to provide feedback in a space where students can engage and ask questions. The recommendation of the Accountability Committee is that the Student Representative Council give feedback on the current procedures of the policy.

The proceedings were momentarily interrupted when a lady walked in to ask for the remote for the projector.

With that said, these are the findings of the report in relation to the register all policy. When the tools to communicate with students are available, the minutes will be given.

POO: S21(f) of the Student Constitution details the nature of the breach in terms of the minute availability. This matter was discussed at a Student Representative Council meeting but the minutes thereof were not released. Students have not been informed of the information of the. The office in question is the treasury of the Student Representative Council who holds the policy.

The recommendations made by Student Parliament will be considered by the Student Representative Council, but they are not binding.

POO: Clarify how the section in the Student Constitution breached.

If the member seeks a declaratory order, he can approach the necessary forum.

POO: if they are not interpreting then how can they say there is a breach

POO: feedback can be given by this member who is willing to be transparent and in the best interest of students.

Response: There is a Register All Policy by the Student Representative Council. This policy allows the Student Representative Council to receive donations and sponsorships as well as to allocate a portion of their budget to help students with the first compulsory payment or historical debt which enables them to register. If students with historical debt approached the Student Representative Council, they were referred to the Historical Debt task team and they were assisted through that channel. They must go through the university-set-up task team which will address the matter. If they were successful with the task team, the student was asked to apply to the Register All Fund.

A committee is set up which includes the Treasurer, the Chair, the Student Access Portfolio holder, any other Student Representative Council member who would like to assist in that allocation committee and a member from the university Bursary and Loans office. Applicants were considered if the student needs financial assistance to enable them to register.

There are criteria set up, to ensure eligibility for funding. The team must consider if the Student is eligible to register and will continue with their academic year. The allocation committee takes the application and decided if the Student Representative Council can allocate funds to that applicant. This process was followed. They took register of the number of applications and funds to reconcile them and determine how much could be allocated to each student to allow them to register. The allocated amount was agreed upon and application forms from Student Fees were sent to all applicants and asked students to return completed forms to the Student Representative Council. Received forms were sent to Student Fees and processed once approved and then they were enabled to register.

POC: How does this relate to the breach in the Student Constitution? The member has not nourished us in terms of the breach to the constitution.  
In the Speakers view that the Accountability Chair should come and explain to the house how he concluded that there was a breach of the Student Constitution.

Response: Students had not received correspondence after receiving the email that they are receiving assistance from the Student Representative Council. The closing date for payment of registration fees had closed and no information had been given. To inform students continuously.

POO: The findings of the Accountability Committee should be taken to student court to address.

Response: The recommendations of the Accountability Chair be challenged at the next sitting or at Student Court.

The findings of Student Carliament Accountability Committee are as follows:

There was one meeting where the Student Representative Council discussed the matter and students was not informed of the conclusions thereof. After meeting with the Treasurer, the Student Representative Council member conceded that no information was given. An email was sent to Student Representative Council to give feedback at the sitting or provide information to students.

POO: In terms of S14 of the Student Constitution, the decision to issue the report in question cannot be a sound decision because the Student Representative Council Treasurer was not informed of the existence of the report and she wasn’t given an opportunity to respond to it.

The meeting was interrupted to ask Parliament to dissolve because the lady working overtime would not be paid.

The meeting had reached its 3-hour time-period and the sitting had to be adjourned. Another sitting will be held to address the remaining points.

The sitting is adjourned at 21h00.

# Email read out concerning the #NotAllMen event

Sent: Wednesday, 17 April, 13:58

Subject: #NotAllMen 16 April

Good day [name removed] and colleagues

Thank you for your email.

I appreciate and am reflecting on some of the concerns that you have raised regarding the #NotAllMen discussion that was hosted at Dagbreek last night.

I would just like to bring some context to the discussion for clarity.

Myself and my committee accept full responsibility for the mentioned event which formed part of our currently ongoing mini-series of informal discussions on gender-based issues, marketed as "SEX Stereotypes".

Dagbreek Men's Residence took no part in the content of the facilitator's slideshow, or any content presented by the facilitator.

However, as a condition for using their venue, Dagbreek House Committee requested that they be allowed to hand out their "Inkululeko" booklet at the venue, before the event.

The facilitator that myself and my committee chose to use at the Dagbreek session is a well-known figure on campus. He is the previous vice chairperson of the Student Representative Council and currently doing facilitation courses, which is why we found it appropriate to use him when he volunteered.

I find it important to reiterate that the intention of this event was never to push any agenda, like some similar discussions have previously done, but merely to provide a platform for engagement on these critical topics from all walks of life.

Having attended the event, I can confidently attest that the single slide that is being problematized is not an accurate representation of the event as a whole.

In fact, after presentation of the said slide, the crowd immediately challenged its proposed statement passionately. The facilitator used various methods of sparking engagement, such as playing the controversial Gillette advertisement that calls for men to hold each other accountable.

I am of the conviction that it is crucial to create such safe spaces and that they can only be truly safe if they allow and encourage genuine inputs of ideas and experiences from anyone and everyone. There is a time and a place for everything and at this specific event, the intention was to grapple with the concept of toxic masculinity and how men think and feel about the topic.

My committee has identified a somewhat unhealthy culture of engagement on campus.

We are attempting to broaden this culture by bringing people to the table who would otherwise not have come. I am very open to discourse on our points of departure and urge anyone to show further interest in Critical Engagement as a brand-new managerial Student Representative Council portfolio.

Please find the attached poster for the upcoming sessions. Our next session is "PerpetuHATE", which will be facilitated by [name removed] in the Wimbledon hub at 17:30. I urge anyone to attend if they are interested.

Thank you

[Name removed]

Student Representative Council: Critical Engagement Manager