



1. WELCOME AND OPENING

1.1 Acknowledgement of Country

1.2 Attendance

Nikhita Talluri (NT)
Oliver Barret (OB)
Annika Leunig (AL)
Aidan Kirby-Smith (AKS)
Ritika Menon (RM)
Archit Menon (AM)
Charlie Backshall (CB)
Ethan Tan (ET)
Aimee Chan (AC)
Jay Williams (JW)
Ruby Membry (RME)
Jeffery Tang (JT)
Julia Suffell (JS)
Anthony Sims (AS)
Lucinda Bartlett (LB)
Selina Al Ansari (SA)
Reihaneh Rezagholilou (RR)
Casey Taylor (CT) (Online)
Aryaman Bhoosredhy (AB)
Archana Ashok (AA)
Jude Kamalddin (JK)
Kassidy Anderson (KA)
Katrina Soares (KS)
Lachy Flavel (LF)
Naveen Nimalan (NN)
Ojaswi Shrestha (OSH)
Rama Sugiartha (RS)
Tabarek Alhaffar (TA)
Tony Goodman (TG)
Libby Bailey (LBa)
Louis Bird (LBi)
Tom Pearce (TP)



Jack Cross (JC) (Observer)
Jack Fairley (JF) (Observer)
Troy Wood (TW) (Observer)
Aveline Maglia (AMA) (Observer)
Emily Lassam (EL) (Observer)
Danica Scott (DS) (Observer)
Leo Avys (LA) (Observer)
Claudia Mulvey (CM) (Observer)

1.3 Apologies

Damien Zhang
Olivia Stronach
Finn Penter

1.4 Proxies

LBi for OS
TP for FP

1.5 Absent

Ashel Siby

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

3.1 February Council Minutes

LB mentions that she didn't have time to properly go over the minutes but there are a few errors she would like changed.

Motion to pass the minutes fails.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

5. BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

5.1 The 112th Guild Council accepts the January minutes.



Moved: Annika Leunig

Seconded: Nikhita Talluri

Motion passed via circular.

6. DIRECTORS' REPORTS

6.1 Managing Director

6.2 Finance Director

6.3 Commercial

6.4 Student Services

6.5 Venture Student Innovation Centre

TG shared that campus life has been going really well, with the guild surpassing 30,000 members, indicating a positive trajectory. He mentioned meeting with lawyers regarding guild regulations. While the audit isn't fully completed, it's nearly finished. TG highlighted that structural improvements are underway, including plans to hire new staff. They are bringing on a casual health and safety officer and are making the business case for a senior marketing officer.

TG also attended a conference where he learned about lithium-ion batteries and their potential to explode. Additionally, he met with representatives from Adelaide University and the University of South Australia. TG confirmed that the construction of the Cameron Hall lift will proceed in 2026. TG tables all other reports.

TG notes that the new finance system is almost done and due to that there are no individual breakdowns available for tonight's report. The tavern's profits are slightly lower than budgeted, primarily due to staff training costs, but TG mentioned there are some successful upcoming functions, and a strong rebound is expected. He also shared that a new CRM system is being purchased, which will streamline many processes. RSD is slightly over budget due to a timing difference, but the department has had successful sales for its ball so there are no concerns there. The rest of the departments are performing well. The profit for the month stands at \$120,000, with a \$98,000 increase compared to last year. Overall, the outlets are doing very well, currently running about 5% above budget.

7. QUESTIONS TIME – Directors' Reports



TP asks about updates on the election rules. TG mentions it must go through the governance committee. TG talks about how there are currently supposedly 2 sets of election laws. TG is still in the process of changing these regulations. TP asks if there is a timeline for this change. This will have to go through senate so TG says there will not be able to get it through until October.

Motion to accept the Directors reports passed.

8. STUDENT REPORTS

8.1 Guild President: Nikhita Talluri

as read

NT mentions that the open letter is currently sitting at 700 signatures and that she is in the process of drafting up the letter to send to the university.

8.2 Guild Vice-President: Oliver Barrett

as tabled

8.3 Guild General Secretary: Annika Leunig

as tabled

8.4 Chair of Guild Council: Aidan Kirby-Smith

as tabled

8.5 Education Council President: Jay Williams

as read

JW thanks ET, SOC president for helping him navigate the new finance system.

8.6 Societies Council President: Ethan Tan

as tabled

8.7 Public Affairs Council President: Aimee Chan

as read

AC expresses how good all the themed weeks has been so far from the Environmental and Ethnocultural departments and says that she is excited to see what we do next.

8.8 Women's Officer: Ruby Membry

as tabled



8.9 Wellbeing Officer: Jeffrey Tang

as tabled

8.10 Postgraduates Students' Association President:

Charlie Backshall

as tabled

8.11 International Students' Department President:

Archit Menon

as tabled

8.12 Residential Students' Department President

Anthony Sims – *submitted late*

as read

AS congratulates LBa and JF for the RSD ball sales for selling a large number of tickets.

8.13 Environment Officer: Julia Suffell

as read

JS wants to say a big thanks to Leigh and Alice who helped with EnviroFest and to the PROSH committee for PROSH, which she believes was a big success.

8.14 Sports Officer: Damien Zhang

as tabled

8.15 Access Department: Lucinda Bartlett &

Tabarek Alhaffar – *submitted late*

as read

LB moves a procedural motion to go into camera.

Motion passes.

AKS moves a procedural motion to move out of camera.

Motion passes.

8.16 Pride Officer: Aryaman Bhoosrheddy & Ashel Siby

as tabled

8.17 Ethnocultural Officers: Selina Al Ansari &

Reihaneh Rezagholilou

as read

SA and RR thanked everyone who came along to Harmony week or helped and gave a shoutout to Aimee and Ethan for helping.



8.18 Volunteering Chair: Casey Taylor

not submitted

8.19 OGCs: as follows

Archana Ashok

as tabled

Finn Penter

as read

TP expresses concerns about the restrictions on freedom of speech from the university particularly concerning the middle east conflict. TP mentions how students can't speak true facts if it offends someone, even though it is actuality and how horrid these restrictions on free speech are and they're not just from the university but also a much larger problem globally.

Jude Kamalddin

as tabled

Kassidy Anderson

as tabled

Katrina Soares

as tabled

Lachy Flavel

as tabled

Naveen Nimalan

as tabled

Ojaswi Shrestha

as tabled

Olivia Stronach

as read

Ritika Menon

as tabled

Rama Sugiarta

as tabled

All student reports were accepted and passed by the Guild Council.

9. QUESTIONS TIME – Student Reports



CB asks why the law transcript meeting between RS and KS was done and CB was not consulted about it despite her already working on the project. RS explains a student had come to them with the concerns but they shortly found out after that CB was working on it and left it there.

LF asks NT why there are no reasons given to why some OGCs can't make a meeting with her. NT explains it is due to timetabling issues and that she will sort it out. LF expresses how 3 months is unacceptable but NT explains she is working through it and she is checking student reports to ensure that OGCs are working through it.

AB asks ruby about the volunteering training grant and if he can have more information as it mentions nonbinary students. RM explains that it is not being publicised yet as the volunteering department only got access to the finance app that allows them to send the money the day prior. RM explains that they have asked for the grant as the grant was specifically for empowering women but she can send AB relevant emails.

LB asks JT and NT about why the guild introductory post with wellbeing and the wellbeing Instagram bio covers mental health. LB clarifies that access covers mental health and wellbeing should cover mental wellbeing. LB asks for there to be a distinction between mental health and mental wellbeing with the two departments and also asks why access was not consulted about the Mental health pop up. NT says it is still in the beginning stages, and everyone will be consulted in the right time. LB says access should be in the planning stages. NT says it is very early and how are we going to do this. LB thinks she should still be included. LB expresses she feels constantly excluded and a slap in the face. NT understands her frustration. AKS suggests they take it out of council.

AB asks JT about the role that the guild council is playing in the Mental health and wellbeing service. JT explains that he put it in the report just because he thought the guild council should know about it. JT explains the different systems. NT further elaborates that this is a university initiative to make mental health support a 'one stop shop' so that students don't get "ping-ponged" around and that the guild council has been mostly a consultative role to the university.

AB asks about Talk Campus and what the role of Guild. NT explains it is a third-party source and the guild doesn't look at the data and it is administered through a contract with the university and the guild brought it up to the university but does not run it.



JS asks why the access report was late. LB says consistent family and personal issues.

10. BUSINESS FROM THE EXECUTIVE

10.1 The 112th Guild Council accepts the resignation of Anthony Sims from the position of Residential Students Department President.

Moved: Nikhita Talluri

Seconded: Annika Leunig

NT says with great sadness he is resigning. NT commends him on his work last year and the few months of this year and that it was a pleasure to work with him. AL commends him on his good work and says she will be sad to see him go.

OB shoutouts AS and says he has done a fantastic job.

Motion passes unanimously.

10.2 The 112th Guild Council, on the recommendation from former RSD President Anthony Sims, appoints Libby Bailey to the position of Residential Students Department President for the rest of the 112th Guild Council term.

Moved: Nikhita Talluri

Seconded: Annika Leunig

NT mentions that Libby was a recommendation from former RSD president and that she is sure Libby will do a fantastic job and excel at this big role. AL expressed excitement for Libby to come on board.

NT passes speaking rights to AS.

AS speaks FOR: AS expresses how Libby has shown a lot of potential and has done great work. AS mentions how LBa is a Tommy Moore resident and she has been the International officer at Tommy last year and developing a great profile.

Motion passes unanimously.



11. MOTIONS ON NOTICE (OPERATIONS)

11.1 The 112th Guild Council approves the 2025 Election Timetable.

Moved: Aidan Kirby-Smith

Seconded: Nikhita Talluri

AKS says that time of year again called the guild elections and mentions how the times are pretty standard and similar to last year.

Motion passes.

11.2 The 112th Guild Council requests the Managing Director write to the WAEC in order to conduct the 2025 Annual General Elections for the UWA Student Guild & NUS.

Moved: Nikhita Talluri

Seconded: Aidan Kirby-Smith

AKS thanks Tony in advance.

Motion passes.

12. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE (OPERATIONS)

12.1 The 112th Guild Council approves the business case to implement the role of a Senior Marketing Manager.

Moved: Nikhita Talluri

Seconded: Annika Leunig

NT mentions how the organisation is growing and that the marketing team currently have a lot on their plate and so a new addition to the team would make things run smoother.

RS asks why its senior marketing officer and not marketing director. TG replies that it is not the same role, they do not need another director, but they need a senior marketing officer – a capable person to bring everything together.



Motion passes.

13. MOTIONS ON NOTICE (REPRESENTATION)

13.1 The 112th Guild Council:

- 13.1.1 Acknowledges that political distress is a legitimate concern that can impact students' mental health and academic performance.
- 13.1.2 Recognises that the current global political climate may contribute to heightened political distress and/or anxiety among students.
- 13.1.3 The Guild Council directs:
 - a) Collaboration with members of the 112th Guild Council to ensure there are adequate resources and support for students experiencing political distress and/or anxiety.
 - b) Promote and support relevant services for students experiencing political distress
 - c) Advise students that are particularly affected by political distress to seek support from Student Assist.

Moved: Annika Leunig

Seconded: Charlie Backshall

AL explains how this motion is trying to reflect the students who are currently experiencing distress and anxiety from the constant political issues that are going on at the moment. AL explains that although seeing the constant political tension and news may be great motivation for some students to take action, there are a few number of students who find the current political tensions of the world distressing, and this motion aims to ask the guild to recognise that political distress is real. AL also mentions how this motion comes at a good time with the results of the state election having just come out and an upcoming election.

CB adds that anyone who has previously tried to access the mental health system before is hard and whilst this is a small step to produce some resources and encourage students to get help, CB believes that this is really important.

QUESTION TIME

NN asks if there is anything that is actually actionable in this movement and if that it is different from what guild already does for anxiety. CB replies about making



resources more specific and tailored towards geopolitical stress. AL mentions that political distress/anxiety doesn't always mean the student experiences anxiety and so ensuring there are resources targeted specifically around that.

NN asks if the other motions passed previously have points that are more targeted at creating support for students surrounding those topics. AL replies that although they might be, there are many events and political issues that the guild council does not cover that may be distressing to students and that this motion tries to cover as many students as possible. CB mentions that all students have their own subjective experience with the news.

LF asks if there is anything that triggered this motion. AL explains it was her own idea as she herself was more ignorant to political issues before joining Guild Council but after 2025 already having many distressing political events and many students she speaks to just mentioning their anxiety about the future, AL thought it would be a good motion to pass. AL also mentions having spoken to NT and AC about the motion and getting their opinions.

AB asks that if this motion passes, do we still need to pass motions about other political things or is it all encompassed here like AL said. AL clarifies that what she meant was that this encompasses all events, especially those we don't pass motions on in guild council however, that this motion does not say we shouldn't pass political motions. AL says if anything, this motion is encouraging that because she believes more political motions should be passed but as more political tensions are rising, the guild should also make sure there are proper resources for those who need it.

DEBATE

LB speaks against the motion due to in her opinion, lack of action points and that she doesn't understand why this particular moment in time calls for this motion. AL replies that tensions globally are rising and with the rise of social media, this is a time that there is a high political tension. AL also expresses she understands LB concern that this motion is general however AL believes this is the point of the motion is to be able to speak for any student experiencing political anxiety no matter what event and for them to get the help they need. LB still says she doesn't understand what action points there are. AL points out 13.1.3 which directs guild to do in her opinion actionable points. CB also mentions that they will reach out to



all the relevant departments and develop resources together after the motion has been passed if this is something they want to get behind. LB expressed concern that after a motion has passed that they are bound to do it so that if it is broad she doesn't understand what it will direct them to do. RM believes this was covered in the motion and asks to move the debate on.

LBi speaks against the motion as he believes this motion is asking the guild council to not pass future political movements and he doesn't understand why this motion would be passed unless we wanted the guild to refrain from passing specific motions and LBi believes the term 'political distress' is ambiguous in its meaning. LBi adds that this motion echoes what the university is saying about 'distressing' politics and restrictions of freedom of speech. AL replies that she doesn't really understand why this motion is asking the guild to not pass future political motions and she would like to clarify that this motion is about ensuring there are correct resources and not about the actions of students are 'distressing'.

TP speaks against as well for similar reasons to LB and TP thinks that it is pretty clear that students are feeling distressed about the politics and they should feel distressed, because it is disturbing. TP thinks the motion follows too similarly along the logic of the university about the restrictions of free speech. TP disagrees the guild should just send students to student assist; TP believes the guild should put out their left-wing positions on the world. AL would like to clarify that she once again did not intend for the motion to be to stop future political motions but just to provide students support if they need it.

JW speaks for the motion. JW thanks AL and CB for their work on the motion. JW believes nowhere on the motion it argues any of the points that the other speakers mentioned. JW points out that it acknowledges that political distress is a real thing and acknowledges that the current global political climate can contribute to this stress, and it also asks student assist to tailor resources. JW says nowhere in this motion that students' thoughts can't be challenged but rather says if they find any issues they hear distressing or if they see videos on social media, then they should be able to get tailored support.

AC speaks for the motion. AC mentions that as we are all university students, it is important and the prime time to take part in politics and to be activists but what



we often forget to do is to take care of ourselves. AC mentions how this motion directly addresses the mental health of both people fighting on the ground, doing protests and participating in activism and also for people witnessing everything and as a guild council AC believes we should be in charge of making sure everyone is supported.

LB speaks against this and believes this motion is tokenistic at best. LB expresses she doesn't think this is what the function of the motion are meant to be.

AB speaks against and says they understands what this motion is trying to do but as is written they believes that they cannot support it. AB believes it doesn't convey the idea behind the motion correctly and that it might be easily misinterpreted.

AKS asks if there is any limit on what a student can go to student assist for. TG replies that there is no limit, and that student assist are always trying to keep up to date with current issues.

NN speaks against the motion and echoes some of the concerns before but also brings up concerns about the point talking about resources for student assist. NN thinks we should be thinking more about the structure of student assist not necessarily resources.

JK speaks against the motion. JK explains how she agrees with the sentiment of the motion and that she believes it's great to provide students with support for political distress. However, JK speaks against as she is worried that student assist will be stretched too thin and can't make the resources. JK thinks it would be great to revisit this in the future. NT clarifies that this motion is more about letting students know that they can go to student assist for political distress and anxiety and that their feelings are valid in this matter.

Motion passes.

NT moves a procedural motion to take a welfare break. Motion passes.

14. MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE (REPRESENTATION)



NT explains this motion is late due to her only seeing the article about this matter a few days ago.

Motion to hear the following passes.

14.1 The 112th Guild Council:

- 14.1.1 Condemns the decision by the Trump administration to cut research funding to seven Australian universities — including the University of Western Australia — on the basis of opposition to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) programs, “woke gender ideology,” and climate action initiatives.
- 14.1.2 Recognises that this action reflects a broader political trend that seeks to restrict academic freedom and depoliticise higher education under the guise of combating so-called “woke” or progressive values.
- 14.1.3 Expresses concern about the increasing influence of this type of rhetoric in Australian politics, particularly within segments of the federal Liberal Party, and its impact on public trust in research, education, and social progress.
- 14.1.4 Affirms the Guild’s support for academic independence, respectful political discourse and defending the role of universities as spaces for open inquiry, social progress, and diverse perspectives.
- 14.1.5 Directs the UWA Student Guild Marketing Department to publish this resolution on Guild social media platforms to raise awareness of the implications of these developments and affirm student opposition to regressive attacks on education.

Moved: Nikhita Talluri

Seconded: Charlie Backshall

NT notes that this will affect UWA so she believes it is important to call out Trump on his behaviour. CB adds it is disappointing to cut into funding for research and that it is hard enough to be a HDR student as it is and especially when funding is cut.

QUESTIONS

LB asks if we understand what kind of scope of the impact is on the university yet. NT explains that currently she is unaware of what the scope is and that this motion is more to call out Trump’s behaviour. NT mentions that this reflects a much broader political trend

that is seeking to restrict academic freedoms and depoliticise universities. CB adds that they were shown the numbers in senate but will not go into further detail on what the numbers were as it was said in senate.

LB then asks why they didn't wait to write the motion as they cannot pass motions that are too similar to past motions. LB asks if we don't know the impact why they wouldn't wait until the next council meeting. NT replies that regardless of the scope, it is important to call out the behaviour now and it doesn't necessarily stop us in the future from taking further action. LB then asks for clarification on what benefit passing this motion will have for students rather than waiting a week and then passing the motion via circular rather than adding it to the agenda less than 48 hours before the meeting. NT does not reply as she believes she has answered this.

DEBATE

LB speaks against the motion as she feels the level of consultation is subpar at best and she was unaware this motion was happening and was not consulted. She believes passing this motion now will prevent the departments from expressing how they're impacted in the future. NT responds by saying that we can keep updating students on the impact that this has, and she believes taking a stance on this now doesn't hinder our ability to continue to work on it.

TP speaks for the motion and expresses how awful what is happening. TP expresses how they believe that universities should always be a hub for political activity and activism for attacks just like this. TP expresses how the effects of Trump have finally arrived at the university, and they believe this motion is a good step the the right direction.

LF speaks against the motion as he believes the US administration does not necessarily owe the university any money. LF believes if anything, we should be asking the Australian government for more money, and it seems out of our place to criticise someone who has given us money for a considerable number of years. LF thinks the motion assumes why the cut to the funding was done when he believes this goal of the US administration is to lower the US deficit by cutting excess funding and doesn't believe the reason for the motion is correct.

RMe speaks for the motion and thinks it is very important we set our stance now and that guild departments can then work on their perspectives on it in the future.

JW speaks for the motion. JW thanks NT and CB for the motion. JW stated that, as NT had mentioned, the motion is a statement of fact that condemns Trump for cutting funding to universities based on diversity, equity, inclusion, gender, and climate action programs. JW clarified that the motion does not take a stance on the merits of these programs, but opposes Trump's actions that negatively affect students, particularly HD students, due to these reasons. JW also noted that the pushback mirrors similar rhetoric being used by Peter Dutton and the Liberal Party in Australia and should be condemned. He emphasized that the motion is simple and factual, and that if new, materially different information arises, it can be addressed separately.

TP agrees with JW and says how they believe it is a politically motivated action and motivated on the ideology of being anti research. TP says we need to stand against this including against the Liberal party and even the Labour party.

LB would like to propose an amendment to point 14.1.2 to:

“14.1.2 Recognises that this action enforces a alarming political trend that seeks to restrict the promotion of human rights, diversity of students in higher education, academic freedoms and politicise higher education under the guise of combating so-called “woke” or progressive values”.

Amendment is friendly.

LF would like to respond to a few statements. LF asks if there is a direct quote for the Liberal party and how they would cut research funding. NT explains that its more the rhetoric of Trump's influence being present around Australia rather than the actual cutting of the funding. CB also would like to add that the university gets a substantial amount of funding from the Australian government and that could all change if the Liberal party gets elected and that CB can send the actual numbers to LF if he would like. CB then reiterates that it will absolutely make a difference if the Liberal party gets elected. TP then adds that the Liberal party has said they want to cut funding to medical research. TP claims the liberal party will slash funding. JW also responds to LF by stating that the Liberal party are using the similar rhetorics mentioned in this motion. LF thinks the guild should be careful and not misrepresent the reason behind the funding cuts. LF believes without a direct statement from the administration about the reasons behind the funding cuts, the guild should not just assume.



TP passes speaking rights to DS.

DS explained that the reasons for the funding cuts are quite explicit. Students lose points on their research if they answer "no" to questions related to protecting women and children or if their work involves topics like environmental justice. Additionally, students lose points if they can't demonstrate that their projects are beneficial for America. DS emphasized that the funding cuts are exclusionary and essentially anti-progressive. NN adds that one of the questions on the list asks if the country has any reliance on the UN or WHO, and those who answered yes had points docked. NN expressed how insane the list is and shares the link for guild councillors to look at.

LF then replies why would the government of the US hand out money if it wasn't in your interest?

AKS moves a procedural to vote on the motion. Motion fails.

LB wishes to amend a point as follows:

"14.1.3 Expresses concern about the increasing influence of this type of rhetoric in Australian politics and its impact on student life, human rights and public trust in research, education, and social progress."

NT is concerned they have taken out the liberal party. LB clarifies more than one party have expressed similar rhetorics.

Amendment is friendly.

Motion passes.

TP explains the motion is late as they only got emails cancelling events in the few days leading up to guild council.

Motion to hear the following motion passes. TP passes speaking rights to AMA.

14.2 The 112th Guild Council:



- 14.2.1 Condemns the escalating pattern of the University of Western Australia imposing restrictions on free speech and political expression on campus, including the general guidance issued by the University that: “If your club makes a particular statement... then the fact that statement may be objectively true does not mean that your club’s use of that statement will not breach UWA Policy... use of that statement may still be Inappropriate Behaviour for the purposes of the University Behaviour Policy because it causes harm to others (e.g. offence, distress, fear, etc, etc).”
- 14.2.2 Affirms the UWA Code for the Protection of Free Speech and Academic Freedom and notes that the University’s conduct may be in contradiction to the code, which states that “Every member of the staff and every student at the University enjoys freedom of speech exercised on University land” and that this right is not limited by “a duty to protect any person from feeling offended or shocked or insulted by the lawful speech of another.”
- 14.2.3 Condemns the University’s recent imposition of a blanket ban on lecture announcements, which stifles club culture and the activities of affiliated Guild clubs.
- 14.2.4 Demands that the University:
- a) Immediately rescind all restrictions on freedom of speech
 - b) Uphold its commitment to freedom of expression by ending blanket bans on lecture announcements and the new restrictions placed on leafleting, postering, banner dropping and other essential club activities.
 - c) Publicly affirm its support for students’ right to engage in peaceful activism without censorship.
- 14.2.5 Commits to:
- a) Publishing a social media post to the effect of this motion.
 - b) Supporting efforts by affiliated clubs to oppose these restrictions.
- 14.2.6 Directs the UWA Guild President to present the Vice Chancellor with a copy of the above motion.

Moved: Finn Penter

Seconded: Jude Kamalddin

AMA explains how free speech is under attack at UWA and that all guild councillors should fight for free speech and expresses how important free speech is for all movement in social



justice. AMA elaborates that free speech is about the right to speak truth of power and free speech is very important in the fight for Palestine. AMA emphasized that the right to free speech is essential for all progressive movements and social justice issues. AMA criticised the restrictions, including a ban on lectures and protests outside the guild precinct, as well as the cancellation of certain club events due to new rules. One example was a club's event promoting Palestinian rights, was cancelled by the university. AMA also highlighted that students could face repercussions for stating things that are objectively true, describing this as an extreme attack on free speech that the guild must oppose.

JK adds that today the Students for Palestine club event was cancelled by the university despite the event being supported by the NUS and that these things are happening all around campus.

QUESTIONS

LF asks if they can release the full email that was sent to clubs and what it bans them on. AMA agrees to send.

DEBATE

OB speaks for the motion and expresses how shocked he was that the university contradicts themselves in the code of conduct.

RS speaks for the motion, he explains how the discipline the university is doing is harsh and not just a slap on the wrist. RS explains how the processes of university discipline is unclear but can include a formal letter on your record, exclusion from units etc and can impact students who are trying to make a statement by cutting off their education.

LF speaks against the motion as he thinks free speech doesn't go without some limitations in his opinion. LF believes the motion needs to be reworded as he doesn't believe we should be harassing students to talk their ear off. JK responds by saying the university already has things in place for hate speech but she believes hate speech and freedom of speech are two separate terms. NT adds onto it that Australia does not have an absolute freedom of speech stance and so she believes that the motion is trying to get back to how it was before all the restrictions were put in place.

NT speaks for the motion as she believes that it is crazy that the code of conduct is not followed by the university itself. NT thanks Finn for his work on this motion and for reaching out to Jay, Annika and herself and to Jay who put in a bit of effort to collaborate on this



motion. NT then expresses how distressing it is to see the behaviour happening at our university.

AMA then explains how far the extent of these restrictions goes and they need to be removed.

NN proposes an amendment to as follows:

“Immediately rescind all restrictions on freedom of speech to be in accordance with the UWA Code for the Protection of Free Speech and Academic Freedom”

NT believes in the context of the motion it already kind of covers what it says above. CB expresses concern that if the university changes the code, this motion then supports the updated code.

Amendment is not friendly. Amendment is withdrawn.

AL speaks for the motion. AL says how she believes the motion is really well thought out and covers really well why restrictions for freedom of speech are harmful. AL believes the university is being lazy in their approach through a blanket ban because of a few individual situations. AL believes the restrictions is a really lazy thing for an institution to do, especially one that focuses on students. AL commends FP and JK for the motion and expresses support.

Motion passes.

AB explains how Hungary only recently passed this law so the motion was late as they was still in consultation with relevant parties.

Motion to hear the following passes.

14.3.1 The 112th Guild Council:

14.3.1 Condemns the anti-LGBTQIA+ bill passed by Hungary’s parliament and a broader crackdown on the LGBTQIA+ community by Hungary’s government.

14.3.2 Condemns the government’s decision to:

a) Ban all Pride events and Pride marches.



b) Use facial recognition software and fines to intimidate the Hungarian queer community.

14.3.3 Recognises that this decision is not isolated and comes at a time when LGBTQIA+ rights are under threat all over the world and in Australia.

14.4.4 Directs the Pride Department and Guild Marketing to release a statement decrying this decision and share support services available on campus, such as Student Assist, and off campus for queer students.

Moved By: Aryaman Bhoosreddy

Seconded By: Aimee Chan

AB explains how there was an effort to get the Hungarian president to veto the law but all efforts failed. AB expresses how they believe there is a growing atmosphere of restrictions on LGBTQIA+ rights all around the world including Australia. AB talks about how someone who is very anti-queer almost got elected to parliament and expresses how outrageous and heinous the law passed in Hungary is. AB explains how they will use facial recognition and AI to reprimand people who express support for queer rights. AB also acknowledges how this isn't just about queer rights but also asking if they take away queer rights, what is the next human right they will take away? AB also talks about the international students at UWA, in particular - the Hungarian students and they believe it is important to let them know, especially those who are queer that we do not support the law.

AC adds that it is hard to imagine that it hasn't been a long time since queer people were accepted in society and that there are still a lot of places in the world that still don't accept LGBTQIA+ people. AC explains that she believes it is really important to recognise that there is a slow creep of politicians and a lot of governments that are starting to introduce anti-queer bills and it's important that we recognise that these things are happening. AC expresses how important it is for us to not be complacent and understand that these things happen - human rights have been taken away before and it can happen again.

No questions for the motion.

DEBATE

TP speaks for the motion. TP expresses how great the motion and how he believes the far right politicians all around the world are connected and they're on a rampage



to pull back the basic human rights that we have fought for. TP talks about how the restrictions on free speech on campus also takes away our ability to talk about this on campus.

LF speaks against the motion. LF questions if we just passed a motion about political distress, if bringing up this motion about the Hungarian law, which he doubts most students would know about, if this contributes to the anxiety. LF also expresses how he generally does not like to speak on countries' issues that do not have a direct impact on us. LF is unsure why we are singling out Hungary when there are countries with even worse women rights' violations. AB responds by saying UWA represents Hungarian students on campus. TP thinks it is not correct to ask if it will make students more distressed, they think that it is obviously distressing and that is why we should pass a motion on it.

RM moves a procedural to end debate. Procedural motion passes.

Motion passes.

15. GENERAL BUSINESS

AKS mentions how the SOC club grant's policy is being changed in governance and they didn't have time to bring it up this time, so if anyone has any questions to send an email.

LB brings up the Bob Nicholson room and spoke about how it is currently very messy to the point that it is not accessible. LB asks councillors to set an example and reminds everyone that it is a communal workspace. LB also made a comment about it being a communal workspace and that it is not appropriate for private meetings and political caucuses and that guild councillors should not be barred from accessing the room.

LF brings up that he doesn't want the council to seem hypocritical and that in the last month there has been a massive massacre in Syria where 800 civilians were murdered. LF feels that the council condemning the Palestine Israel conflict speaks on some sort of hypocrisy. LF clarifies he personally does not want to support any motion that comments on world conflicts, hence why he hasn't presented a motion. But he would like to express his concern that this council could be seen as hypocritical. JK says how if he put forward the motion, she believes the council would support the motion, so she doesn't really understand what LF is trying to say. LF explains he



believes that if the council believes not condemning a massacre is being complicit, then shouldn't they comment on every massacre and that being selective in the motions he believes is hypocritical.

RM mentions how she might put a motion through via circular and asks councillors to look out for that.

16. CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for **6pm Wednesday April 30th 2025**. Please contact the Guild General Secretary (secretary@guild.uwa.edu.au) with apologies or proxies. If unable to attend, please advise which dates you are available to reschedule if a quorum cannot be met.