



1. WELCOME AND OPENING

1.1 Acknowledgement of Country

1.2 Attendance

Ollie Barrett (OB)
Jay Williams (JW)
Insiah Riaz (IR)
Reana Bose (RB)
Henry Walker (HW)
Emily Bunschoten (EB)
Julia Suffell (JS)
Ojaswi Shrestha (OS)
Yasaswi Shrestha (YS)
Hukam Kohil (HK)
Eva Coulter (EC)
Rama Sugiarta (RS)
Louis Bird (LB)
Hannah Bygrave (HB) (Proxy)
Blake Mercer (BM)
Troy Wood (TW)
Ruby Wood-Hill (RW)
Charlotte Backshall (Proxy)
Bilal Akhtar (Observer)
Ella Machionda (Observer)
Eleka Marshall (Observer)

1.3 Apologies

AJ Church (AC)
Xavier Anthony (XA)
Zen Hately (ZH)
Jennifer Woo (JW)
Tara Mishra (TM)
Hayley Paku (HP)
Zered Robinson (ZR)

1.4 Proxies

CB for TM
JS for AC
HB for XA



TW for JT

1.5 Absent

2. DECLARATION OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

JW notes that he is a disability support worker for the NDIS.

3. CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

3.1 March 25th 2026 Council Minutes

Passed

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

5. BUSINESS COMPLETED VIA CIRCULAR

6. DIRECTORS' REPORTS

6.1 Managing Director

TG says they are waiting to find out more about the merger when communication is received from the Government. TG mentions that from a structure perspective they have advertised for a student services leadership position which is an associate director role on a contract basis and there are a few potential candidates. TG adds that they are looking at doing a review as the functions and operations manager resigned last week and hope to try track what can be done better and what to change. TG notes that a lot of staff have been put on the new sexual assault disclosing training and there is a good leadership team who has undertaken that, and they are confident that things are going well. He says that the GSC team itself were upskilled to be able to handle a variety of different situations including mental health and processing welfare loans and grants. TG mentions that welfare consultant will come do a review on how staff are going. TG says in terms of the Guild masterplan update there is funding that is still being waited on based on whether the university joins the development or not and this is still pending. TG says either way the Guild will be moving forward with development as there is a lot to be done in that area and a document outlining the development plan and CRV with designs for redevelopment of the student assist area and downstairs of GSC will likely come to Guild council via circular next month. There will be a meeting next week regarding Cameron Hall with the university on stakeholders for this, and there will be a discussion about when they want to plan for various clubs being moved. TG says there should be an update on this at the May council with more of a timeline, but an architect has been appointed. As for the Guild elections, TG notes that Mary has been appointed



as the returning officer again for 2026 and she is attending the Election Culture Committee. TG adds that Chloe Keller has been doing a lot of work on the election handbook. TG also says the new website is hopefully going to be launched in August with the financial portal for clubs and Societies and EMPs being moved. TG talks about how the Alumni committee will be moving forward with a project named Prosh 100 which is in 5 years, but the process is starting now. They are thinking about writing a book but still need to talk to UWA about printing and publishing. The Guild is still moving ahead with the Venture roll out project. TG says the Guild has also been looking into a café at Ezone. To conclude, TG gives a big shoutout to the marketing team and talks about the new quokka mascot.

6.2 Finance Director

For the month of March there was a loss of 27k with a proposed income of 101k. MM says the year to date number is still looking good and is better in comparison to this time last year. MM mentions that most of these are timing differences and a lot of these are budgeted in the beginning of the year but spent now. For example, the Guild council expenditure is higher but it is still lower than budget in year to date numbers. This is also the same for Venture, where grants have been budgeted for the previous month but distributed this month. MM notes that most of the employee and staff departments are lower than budget except admin and finance. MM explains that since the new payroll system has been changed there have been some allocation payroll issues but it should be corrected by the end of the month. MM says that on the income side, outlets landed at around 10k lower than budget, and the revenue is softer than what was anticipated, due to increased cost of living which has impacted outlets significantly.

Procedural motion to move into camera passes.

Procedural motion to move out of camera passes.

6.3 Commercial

as tabled

6.4 Student Services

as tabled

6.5 Venture Student Innovation Centre

as tabled

7. QUESTIONS TIME – Directors’ Reports

BM asks about the Cameron hall situation, particularly in regards to the elevator. BM wants to clarify if the general renovations and elevator is separate.



TG responds saying that it will all occur at the same time. TG also says that they are looking at having accessibility of the elevator connected to the employability centre of which some parts will be expanding with a new pavilion and entertaining space. Due to this, architects are still trying to figure out whether to put the lift in the front or back end of Cameron hall. TG says the project should start at the end of year and be completed by the end of 2027 but notes that it means the clubs need to be out of there so work can begin.

TW asks whether the piano in the refectory can be tuned.

TG takes this on notice.

LB asks what is happening with clubs being able to transfer funds electronically online.

MM responds saying it was supposed to be launched this week but there was a technical issue and they need to go back to the developer and fix it and then it has to be re-installed before it can run. MM says the details need to flow correctly through the accounting system for it to be launched. She says it should be launched by next week hopefully and adds that the EMP transfer has already started on the club portal where everyone can access.

Directors reports passed.

8. STUDENT REPORTS

8.1 Guild President: Oliver Barrett

as tabled

8.2 Guild Vice-President: Reana Bose

as tabled

8.3 Guild General Secretary: Insiah Riaz

as tabled

8.4 Chair of Guild Council: Yasaswi Shrestha

as tabled

8.5 Education Council President: Emily Bunschoten

as tabled

8.6 Societies Council President: Jonathan Tay

as tabled



8.7 Public Affairs Council President: Tara Mishra

as tabled

8.8 Women's Officer: Hana Giltrap

as tabled

8.9 Wellbeing Officer: Jennifer Woo

as tabled

8.10 Postgraduates Students' Association President: Jay Williams

as tabled

8.11 International Students' Department President: Ojaswi Shrestha

as tabled

8.12 Residential Students' Department President: Troy Wood

as tabled

8.13 Environment Officer: Zered Robinson

as tabled

8.14 Sports Officer: Zen Hatelty

as tabled

8.15 Access Department: Blake Mercer

as read

BM thanks everyone who helped with access week including guide dogs WA and speakers union.

8.16 Pride Officer: Hayley Paku

as tabled

8.17 Ethnocultural Officer: Emma Meunier

as tabled

8.18 Volunteering Chair: Julia Suffell

as tabled

8.19 OGCs as follows



Henry Walker

as tabled

Ruby Wood-Hill

as tabled

Daniel Tyers

as tabled

Xavier Anthony

not submitted

Louis Bird

as tabled

Rama Sugiarta

as tabled

Thomas Pearce

as read

TP notes it has been a big week especially with the NDIS cuts which he thinks are horrific, brutal and extreme. TP notes that these cuts will push many people into very vulnerable places and means they will have limited support. TP adds that Students for Palestine are doing a national week of solidarity, actions, petitions, and research into weapon ties that universities across Australia have. TP talks about the DSI and how it is connected to the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan.

Hukam Kohli

as tabled

Eva Coulter

as tabled

9. QUESTION TIME – Student Reports

DT asks if the clubs that want to run for affiliation are discussed in the internal SOC meetings or if just any clubs able to present. DT used the example of the Sky Campus Happiness club which was blocked by the SOC committee from running for affiliation twice last year, but just ran last SOCPAC meeting.

TW takes this question on notice.

HB mentions the attendance forms at the end of the SOC meeting, and asks if the clubs can put their full names for the voting as it can be hard to remember all clubs acronyms.



TW takes this suggestion for JT on notice.

LB asks JT if based on feedback from the March SOCPAC meeting if JT had reviewed the focus of SOCPAC committee this year and their projects as there is a lot of feedback around the move away from the Facebook and push to digitalise various things. LB also asks why there was no finance section as part of JT's report bearing in mind he has a budget. Finally, LB asks if JT can provide his thoughts on club carnival as LB noticed that it was probably underattended this year and LB wants to know if there has been any discussion about it of why this may have been and how to revitalise it going into the future.

TW takes all these questions for JT on notice.

HB notes that one of the SOC OCM's has not been a part of any meetings and this may be something to flag to JT.

Student reports passed.

YS passes Chair to EC.

10. BUSINESS FROM THE EXECUTIVE

11. MOTIONS ON NOTICE (OPERATIONS)

11.1 The 113th Guild Council, on the recommendation of the Governance Committee, approves

- a) Approves the updated Guild regulations
- b) Exempts the 113th Guild Council from regulation 23(1)(c) where it applies to regulation 20(2)(e)

Moved: Ysaswi Shrestha

Seconded: Oliver Barrett

YS notes that the main Guild regulations were uploaded on teams five days ago and the new updated version which just came back from lawyers has now been uploaded, which was mainly grammatical edits. YS thanks TG, Chloe Keller, Aidan, OB, JW and all the 11th and 112th council members who helped.

OB notes how much work has gone into this and gives a huge shoutout to YS as the 113th Chair. OB explains point b on this motion as amended. OB explains that regulation



(23)(1)(c) is about casual vacancies and that is the specific point where it refers to regulation 20. OB explains that (20)(2)(e) refers to the eligibility for a student to hold an elective office, seeking election or appointment as a guild officer, referring to not being a member of the NUS national executive. OB says that in essence without this exemption, RS would be removed off council but given this is a changed regulation, the 113th guild council will be exempt from regulation (23)(1)(c) where it applies to regulation (20)(2)(e).

RS asks why (20)(2)(e) restricts to the national NUS executives and not other office bearers of the NUS such as the state branch vice-president.

OB responds saying it does.

RS argues that it does not. RS notes that the state vice president are not on the national executive. RS says that the state vice president and the state branch vice president are not the same.

OB refers RS to the page 10 definition section – ‘NUS national executive means a student holding one of the following positions in the NUS: national president, other national officers, 12x general executive members or the state branch president.’

RS reiterates that his question was why this does not apply to the state branch vice presidents.

OB says this can be changed and included.

RS notes that this would mean it isn't national executive anymore then, it would apply to all NUS office bearers. RS asks why this is restricted to the NUS national executive and not extended to other NUS office bearers like the state branch vice president. RS says it is not about the definition itself but why is the scope of the regulation to the NUS national executive and not all NUS office bearers.

OB says it comes to the intention behind it which looking at the current things we have in place like student reports from NatCon and the current NUS working party which is coming together and looking at the effectiveness of the NUS. OB also notes that there has been some general discontent with the factionalism and issues evolving within the NUS and this change is to proof UWA Guild elections against that coming onto campus.

RS explains that the state branch vice presidents are elected at NatCon and are typically also a member of a faction.



JW adds that to his understanding the state branch education vice president are not mandated to go to the national executive meetings every month, do not submit a report, and don't get a budget form the NUS to travel to conferences.

RS responds saying they still have to report to a national office bearer directly and they are required by the NUS regulations to do as instructed by the state branch president which is on the national executive.

YS is happy to add all NUS office bearers to the definition.

RS asks if this means a new draft scheme would be needed before voting.

OB says it can be approved with the intention of adding that amendment there.

RS asks why any eligibility requirements for members of executives of other bodies are not considered and why the NUS are singled out. RS gives the example of CAPA members or the International Students Representatives Council. RS notes that it shouldn't just be considered for this years term but also should be planned for the future.

OB says there is no CAPA working group to look at the effectiveness of CAPA and while there have been issues raised with CAPA in the past, they are very transparent and he receives emails about it detailing exactly what is being done about them. OB thinks if bodies are not causing issues why would you look to restrict them.

RS asks what the problems or issues are in the NUS as there is a working group which has not yet established problems but OB seems to have made the determination about the NUS.

OB responds saying he was going off the issues which were raised in the reports. OB says that RS, JW and other reports raised significant issues over the factionalisation of the NUS, operational efficiencies of the NUS and various other incidents.

RS asks if OB believes that there is a risk of those factions on campus which is why (20)(2)(e) has been included in this.

OB responds saying yes.



LB notes that under the current Guild regulations in section 15, it discusses referendums and it appears to imply that any changes to the membership of council must go through either a referendum or a general meeting. LB then says when looking at the incoming rules, under 28(h) composition this would mean a change as items are referring to different people. LB notes his concern that there may be another step that needs to be undertaken before the regulations can be accepted as it does change the composition of Guild council.

OB clarifies if this comment is regarding WASAC being changed to indigenous student representative.

LB confirms it is.

OB says that is different as it is not removing a position and adding a new one, but simply changing the name of a currently existing position.

TG says the lawyers have not flagged this as a problem and TG clarifies that the composition or representation is not changing.

TP asks why people are opposed to factionalism and why this is being brought in as a negative thing in the NUS. TP believes that the NUS is a political body and it should be and by nature there may be political disagreements within the body about exactly the vision of the union should be. TP disagrees that this is a definition-based problem.

OB says we can see how the NUS NatCon went and what policy chapters did not get discussed due to the factionalism. OB reiterates that many reports did term this as not a positive thing.

TP says he thinks framing it in terms of factionalism is wrong as there was a political argument about what positions and leadership should look like. TP thinks depoliticising this extremely important.

JW notes that people with all political beliefs are able to run on this campus and pitch their ideas to students and can be elected as such. JW notes that this rule change only exempts sitting NUS office bearers from participating in the Guild elections, it does not stop socialists or liberals from participating. JW adds that this rule change does not mean that all factionalism on this campus or at the NUS is banned, it just means sitting NUS office bearers cannot run in these Guild elections.



TP says that the argument OB just made was that this rule change is about factionalism being brought to UWA.

JW responds saying that he is just telling everyone what the purpose of this change and definition is.

TP responds saying he disagrees with the definition and the function of this.

JW says that TP is more than welcome to disagree.

TP says that the relationship between the NUS and the student Guild here is being undermined. TP adds that it is important that national campaigns are run with the NUS.

RS moves a procedural to have everything from the first time TP asked a question on this motion up until now to be entered verbatim into the minutes.

This does not pass.

BM wants to clarify that sitting office bearers cannot run, but you could run and then be appointed as an office bearer. BM asks if this would this mean the position is vacated,

JW responds yes.

TP speaks against this motion and notes problems with this motion and that it fundamentally undermines the relationship of NUS which is a peak representative body for students and the Guild here. TP notes that he thinks a significant amount of power the Guild here has is in its connection to the NUS which has been able to run national campaigns which have been transformative for many students, including contributions that activists and other students at UWA have made. TP talks about the national campaigns that were run in 2014 against Tony Abbott and ones run for Palestine. TP says it is undemocratic to cut UWA off from these student body unions. TP notes that this motion is also anti-unionist.

JW has a point of clarification on whether TP said the only real power the Guild has is to run national campaigns.

TP says he did not say that, but that an important power that the Guild has here is its connection to the NUS.



RS speaks against this motion but first thanks everyone who worked on the regulations. RS says his opposition is rooted in (20)(2)(e) and RS is concerned that the logic which is applied is not equally applied to other affiliations that the student Guild has for example CAPA and the International students representative council and other groups that may emerge over time. RS says this council has outlined fundamental issues with the NUS but continues to affiliate with it and has not taken action to stop it. RS agrees with TP's point that it is against union ideals. RS notes that this would undermine the Guilds ability to work and cooperate with the NUS and that it would make UWA the only student union in Australia with the exception of Monash that has this policy with a political purpose to stop someone from running on their campus. RS feels that this was an oversight because it was not included in the original regulation and it feels like a very last minute inclusion.

As a point of order, OB says it was flagged a few weeks ago but just got the exact wording finalised.

RS feels that is not enough or an acceptable amount of time but thanks OB for the clarification.

This motion passes.

11.2 The 113th Guild Council, on the recommendation of the Governance Committee, approves the updated Election Regulations.

Moved: Ysaswi Shrestha

Seconded: Oliver Barrett

YS says elections regs were uploaded in teams on April 21st and a new version has been received by lawyers with grammar errors fixed. YS flags (18)(4) changing to NUS office bearers, with the definition the same as the previous one.

OB has nothing to add.

No questions for the motion.

No speakers for or against the motion.

This motion passes.



EC passes Chair back YS.

11.3 The 113th Guild Council approves the appointment of Laasya Chava, Chloe Burns and Gabriel Houbart as the UDub Radio Managers for the remainder of the 113th Guild Council term.

Moved: Oliver Barrett

Seconded: Insiah Riaz

OB says these were some great candidates who applied, and discusses how two of them came as a pair and one came on their own. OB thinks that they will be able to do some great work together when teamed up and gives them a big shoutout.

LB asks whether it is supposed to be 2 or 3 UDub radio managers.

OB says there has previously just been 2, but this year they thought 3 would work better and allow them to have some extra support and get different things going.

HB notes that the appointments of these UDub radio managers has come up quite late and asks if there are any plans to make this process start/get the role sorted earlier next year.

No speakers for or against the motion.

This motion passes.

12. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE (OPERATIONS)

13. MOTIONS ON NOTICE (REPRESENTATION)

13.1 The 113th Guild Council:

13.1.1 Recognises that large fossil fuel corporations such as Woodside Energy and Santos Limited generate substantial profits from exporting publicly owned gas resources while contributing limited public revenue, at a time when students, are facing a worsening cost-of-living and energy affordability crisis.

13.1.2 Supports the introduction of a minimum 25% tax on gas export revenues to ensure Australians receive a fair share of profits derived from national resources.



- 13.1.3** Acknowledges that this imbalance represents a fundamental inequity, where publicly owned resources generate private profit while many students struggle to meet basic living costs, and that such a tax could generate significant public revenue to support cost-of-living relief, investment in renewable energy, and improved energy security during the transition away from fossil fuels.
- 13.1.4** Calls on the Australian Government to implement stronger taxation and regulatory mechanisms on gas exports.
- 13.1.5** Encourages student engagement, education, and discussion on the fair taxation of natural resources, including the promotion of relevant student advocacy initiatives and campaigns

Moved: Ruby Wood-Hill

Seconded: Troy Wood

RW notes that multinational gas companies are making billions exporting publicly owned resources and giving very little back. She asks if everyone is expected to make a “fair, reasonable, and proportional contribution to the nation’s economy”, including students, workers and small businesses, why aren’t gas giants. RW talks about how Instead of asking billion-dollar corporations to pay a fair share, the burden keeps falling on everyday Australians, on students and vulnerable people, while massively profitable industries are let off the hook. RW thinks it is important to take a stand against this because public resources are being turned into private profit right in front of us.

TW adds that we need to start taxing our natural assets in Australia. TW notes that money should be invested and we should call on the government to invest this money in cost-of-living initiatives, especially for students as they are the ones experiencing a lot of the impacts of cost of living. TW thanks RW for her amazing work on this motion.

No questions for this motion.

TP speaks for this motion and agrees that it is outrageous how Australia manages these corporations and the profit they bring in for themselves. TP notes that he read somewhere that nursing as an industry, who are some of the lowest paid and most exploited in Australia pay more total tax than gas corporations. TP talks about the Labour Party and how he views them as pro-capitalist and pro-profit. TP



talks about an active campaign that is fighting against militarisation and agrees that taxing these organisations is important.

RS speaks for this motion and says this motion is well written and commends RW and TW for moving it. RS adds that he would implore people to consider if they may any conflicts of interest when they choose to vote for this motion or not.

JS speaks for the motion and notes that nurses, teachers, students with HECS debts, retail and health care workers pay more tax than the fossil fuel industry and reiterates how crazy that is. JS adds that climate change is a massive issue which is worsening and thinks this is a very important issue to be talking about. JS thanks RW and TW for bringing this motion to council.

No more speakers for or against this motion.

This motion passes.

13.2 The 113th Guild Council

13.2.1 Recognises that students will disproportionately bear the long-term social, environmental, and economic impacts of climate change, and that universities have a responsibility to act in the best interests of current and future students.

13.2.2 Notes that the University of Western Australia invests approximately 3% or around \$42 million into fossil fuel corporations. This investment contradicts the University's role as a future-focused institution and its stated commitments to sustainability and climate leadership.

13.2.3 Calls on the University to fully divest from fossil fuel companies

13.2.4 Directs

- a) The Guild president to call on the University to reinvest in ethical and sustainable initiatives that contribute to a stable climate and future for current and future students.
- b) The Guild to endorse and promote the new student-led Fund our Future (UWA) divestment campaign, including through the sharing of relevant initiatives and information on Guild platforms.

Moved: Ruby Wood-Hill

Seconded: Troy Wood



RW says this is a project she has been working on this year and it is based on the idea of when a university like UWA uses student money to invest in fossil fuels it is actually harming students and sends a message that these industries are still acceptable and part of our future. RW discusses how investments actively support and enable these industries to continue expanding, even in small percentages which still contributes to the financial stability and legitimacy of these companies. RW notes that the intention of this project is not to limit opportunities or impact professional development for studies, but specifically to call for sustainable practices within the investment portfolio. RW explains that if we divest, it shows that we as a university believe that fossil fuels are no longer socially or ethically acceptable. RW notes that we have seen this happen globally where divestment campaigns have been effective. RW mentions the people here at UWA like students, professors and researchers who may be doing important work on climate change, ecosystems, conservation and discusses that the same institution that funds this research is also funding companies that are driving the problem. RW believes that as an institution aspiring to be a leader of climate change action, UWA has an obligation to divest and students and staff should have the right and feel proud to go to a university that is ethical.

TW supports the push for UWA to divest their investment portfolio from fossil fuel companies. TW congratulates RW on her work.

RS asks whether this campaign is self-funded or if it requires funds from a Guild department or club.

RW says they are looking at external funding from climate organisations and is yet to ask about internal funding but she does not think so .

LB asks what fund our future UWA is.

RW responds that it is the campaign that is pushing for the divestment of fossil fuels from the UWA investment portfolio.

LB asks if the project it fits within the Guild or if it is external.

RW responds that she is approaching it as her OGC project, but beyond that it is still a student movement.



HB says she is for the motion but wants clarification on BHP being included. HB says from her understanding BHP has moved away from fossil fuels and has moved away from oil and gas and wants to confirm.

RW says she will do further research and get back to HB regarding that as RW wasn't aware if that was the case.

LB asks if this is targeting companies that just extract fossil fuels or is it inclusive of companies who utilise fossil fuels or large mining companies. LB says it seems a bit unclear what the angle is here.

RW responds saying she can clarify what UWA will merge their investment fund or what is included in that pre-set as they have said they invest 3% into fossil fuels.

LB asks if it is defined by mercer as fossil fuels.

RW confirms it is.

JS speaks for the motion and notes that currently to reach UWA's carbon neutral target they are investing carbon offsets to offset their emissions from their investment portfolio and JS thinks it is not a good use of money and that it could be directed elsewhere. JS thinks it would be great if the university could take a stance against fossil fuel companies and she thinks this is a good way to do that and hopefully UWA moves in a direction to divest from these companies.

TP speaks for this motion and talks about companies like woodside, BHP and Rio Tinto that contribute to the devastation of the environment. TP also notes how these projects and companies destroy indigenous land and devastate the lives of many people. TP says that all of these horrific outcomes are on the hands of the Labour Party. TP thinks that although this university positions itself as future focused, it is clearly profit driven and funded by these massive companies. TP thinks there is no contradiction between what the university does and their supposed values. TP says the Guild should critique the university based on what they actually do and not just on the policy lines they put out. He says that we should end this drive for profit and the fossil fuel devastation occurring on Australia and the world.

This motion passes.



13.3 The 113th Guild Council

13.3.1 Supports and endorses the Nakba Rally organised by Friends of Palestine WA on Saturday the 17th of May, at 12pm in Forrest Place.

13.3.2 Recognises that the Nakba is a historic and significant day for Palestinians, which marks the mass dispossession of Palestinians through the violent expulsion of over 700,000 Palestinians from their homeland and the destruction of hundreds of Palestinian villages.

13.3.3 Notes that the dispossession that marked the Nakba has continued since 1948 and that Palestinians continued to be denied the right to return and face ongoing apartheid and occupation by the state of Israel in both the Gaza Strip & the West Bank.

Moved: Thomas Pearce

Seconded: Rama Sugiarta

TP notes that the Nakba is a horrific moment in the history of Palestine and marks trauma and displacement of Palestinian people. TP says it is important to recognise what Palestine looks like and what Palestinians are going through. TP explains that the war in the middle east is catastrophic and has caused mass displacement of people in Lebanon. TP notes that the genocide has only expanded and gotten worse and that there is huge increase in the amount of settlements in the West Bank. TP notes that only Palestinians can receive the death penalty in Palestine when they are facing political trials and this was celebrated. TP concludes by reiterating that the Nakba rally is really important for the student Guild to recognise and that the ongoing Palestine movement is something that needs to be reinforced.

RS adds that this motion aligns with the Guilds previous stances and says it is a great event to go to and is a good entry point for people who have not been to a rally before. RS talks about how it is important to recognise that the conflict is ongoing and there is no resolution in sight.

No questions for the motion.

No speakers for or against.

This motion passes.



13.4 The 113th Guild Council

13.4.1 Condemns the government's proposed cuts of \$15 billion to the NDIS, which is projected to remove more than 160,000 recipients off the NDIS.

13.4.2 Acknowledges that previous cuts to the NDIS have caused dramatic reductions in the quality of life of those on NDIS as well as preventable deaths, such as that of four-year-old Koa Gibson last year, and future cuts will leave disabled people even more vulnerable.

13.4.3 Supports the demand for a fully publicly funded disability support scheme, not one dependent on for-profit, private disability service providers.

Moved: Thomas Pearce

Seconded: Rama Sugiarta

TP notes that cuts to the NDIS are inhumane, barbaric and extreme. TP notes that the number of people that would be impacted is greater than 160 000. TP declares how important it is to acknowledge that people would die from this and people would experience huge decreased quality of life and a loss of dignity and ability to connect in their community. He also thinks that disabled people deserve more than what the NDIS has to offer and that it was always going to be a bare minimum profit driven institution. TP thinks everyone in Australia should get support for disabilities and it should be a publicly funded scheme. TP reiterates that the cuts are horrific and should be opposed and that they come with a broader campaign and project with the Labour party which is to cut down on social services and cut down the things which are given to the working class to make their lives easier and funnel money into militarisation and war.

RS adds that it is shameful that the Labour government has decided to change the NDIS system in this manner and that it will result in people currently on the scheme not being able to access this support in the same way they know, but RS notes that the support goes beyond the basis of human survival. RS says the model of the NDIS is systematically flawed as it encourages people to seek a specific type of diagnosis rather than assessing the actual needs of an individual. This mismatch has resulted in the rapid growth of costs for the program. RS thinks it is shameful that the Liberal party has not taken a firm, productive or cooperative stance in doing anything to support disabled people.

BM asks why no effort was made to reach out to the access department in regards to this motion given it relates to people with disabilities.



TP says that if BM wanted to move his own motion on the NDIS he could have, and that their visions of what this motion looks like would be very different. TP believes that OGCs have rights to move motions and do not need to consult or attend to all relevant groups or departments. TP asks BM whether his question was based in a substantive political disagreement within the motion itself or if BM was just asking about why he was not involved.

BM says he does have a substantial political disagreement but that is not why he asked that question. BM clarifies that his question was just why the access department was not consulted with.

TP says again that OGC's have the right to move motions and do not need to consult every single necessary body.

TG point of order: TG notes that Guild counsellors are supposed to defer to the department and have discussions with other counsellors and that this is the best practice and happens often. TG says there is a considered position that one would at least talk and consult with that particular department because they are the representative body for that. TG says it does not mean the motion cannot be raised on that basis but generally the idea of having these departments is to have a generalised consultation process.

TP responds saying the motion was moved on notice so in his view, comments and collaboration on this motion would have been welcomed.

No more questions for the motion.

BM speaks against the motion as he thinks that the motion makes a few mistakes being that each point raised has errors or things he disagrees with. BM talks about how there is no recognition made in the motion about how the numbers given are over decades and the NDIS is a yearly programme, so it does not make sense to compare the two. BM says the cost of the NDIS, assuming that the NDIS costs stop in 2032 would be close to 4 trillion dollars which is in BM's opinion the more appropriate comparison to make to the AUKUS programmes. BM notes that this itself would not fix the NDIS and that the problems are well known and undeniable. BM says he agrees that the NDIS should not continue in this current state but says that the 15 billion dollars is a prediction of the future and it is more accurate to say that this is limiting the growth of the program. BM says the



programme has been projected to increase in cost and this is unsustainable and it would within half a decade be more than 10% of the federal budget.

TP invites Ella to speak because she helped draft the motion.

TP moves procedural to invite EM (observer) to speak.

Before the vote is conducted, EM begins speaking and YS names them for the first and second time while explaining that observers cannot speak until the procedural passes.

The procedural motion to invite EM (observer) to speak passes.

EM says the comments made by BM and TG earlier about having to talk to the access department is irrelevant as it is a broader political attack on people with disabilities all across the country. EM talks about how there are so many students at this university who have disabilities and would be impacted by these cuts and do not know about what the access department, or the Guild can even do for them. EM notes that this motion is beyond just the access department and that it effects every person who has or knows someone with a disability and EM thinks it is an unfair and ungenerous argument. EM says that BM's points before are just making Albanese's argument and talking about accounting, but EM believes it is a good thing if money is put into services that support people who struggle to live daily due to their disabilities. EM questions whether anyone has read any articles about the attack on the NDIS that are written by people with disabilities and outline the importance of the funding that the government gives to them so that they can pay for services that benefit their lives. EM reiterates that 160 000 people will be cut by 2030 by the NDIS and it will continue to reduce over the years. EM thinks this is a serious attack on the rights of some of the most vulnerable and oppressed people in society.

YS and EC give the 2 minute time warning and EM continues to speak.

YS names EM for the third time and asks them to leave the council room.

BM responds and clarifies that he does not hate disabled people but BM says some things in this motion mispresent what these cuts are doing and simply are not true. BM says it is important to note that the federal government is working in collaboration with state government to provide state level support for people with lower support fees who are the people who will be taken off the system and notes that this is how the NIDS was originally supposed to run. Before state



systems were taken away. BM discusses how these reforms are about going back to what the NDIS originally intended in 2013. BM says these are simply necessary reforms to get back on track and that if these reforms are not passed it is not sustainable and the NDIS will cease to exist.

TW speaks against the motion on the caveat that motions should be going through heads of departments. TW notes that he himself is a head of department, who has no vote on council and only has a voice, so they have to rely on voting members to consult and work with them. TW says he himself is a person living with a disability and thinks that the NDIS cuts are atrocious. TW mentions that he will be going to protests with the youth disability advocacy network and working with his partners within the youth sector against this. TW concludes by thanking TP for bringing this motion up and says he will be advocating for this issue but as a head of department he hopes in the future to see more collaboration and want to be consulted as they are here to represent their cohorts and do not have a vote.

HW wants to support what TW is saying and notes that there is a reason the organisational structure exists and that there is an access department and standing orders. HW thinks this is the best way to represent students and that everyone should follow the understanding that they should consult with the head of department/counsellor who is relevant to the issue as they can give insight.

TP says it is ridiculous that people are begging him to consult for this motion. TP adds that the reason BM gave are just from the Albanese Labour government, and reiterates that so many people and families rely on the NDIS and will be impacted by this dramatic loss of care and will have to accommodate ways to support people with disabilities. TP thinks that what BM says is utopian in claiming that all the money that goes to the NDIS could be spent on other things. TP says that the argument for why the NDIS is being cut has been made very clear and that it is because they need to make up for the loss in the defence and they will do that by reprioritising Australia and dramatically cutting services that are deemed unnecessary. TP says that it is disgraceful that the Access department is not supporting this motion.

BM responds saying that is it not fair or true to dismiss this as just what the government says and explains that the fact is that the NDIS funding is going through the roof. BM suggests that with the amount of money the NUS is costing, the military budget could be doubled and cutting it for militarisation is a



ridiculous thing to say. BM thinks that some logic in the motion is flawed and had there been proper consultation, he could have raised this and it could have been overcome.

LB suggests a to strike 13.4.3. LB does not want to get involved in the discussion of the rest of the motion but striking this point may be less contentious and better placed to recognise the reason and real issue that cuts to the NDIS will affect many peoples lives. LB recognises that there are other issues on this motion but thinks the focus should be kept on the NDIS and strike the things about AUKUS and changes to defence budget as he thinks that draws away focus to NDIS which is the main concern.

TW asks if TP would consider retracting this and would be willing to work on this together. TW says he is personally for this motion and in his personal life will be actively campaigning and protesting for this issue and believes that what the government is doing is barbaric and that people with disabilities have the right to thrive in Australia. As such TW requests that this motion could be withdrawn and brought to next council to make sure it is effective.

TP does not agree with TW's request and thinks given the changes people are suggesting it would substantially change the motion. TP thinks that what the ALP wants is a reorganisation of Australian capitalisation and to trim social services to be as minimal as possible.

HG agrees with LB's suggested amendment of removing the clause. HG thinks that drawing a direct causal link between increased defence funding and decreased NDIS funding isn't productive and it should be a separate discussion if the Guild wants to talk about Australia's defence spending and does not see how it is related to the topic of the NDIS.

EC is for this amendment. EC says that if the point of the motion is to advocate to people impacted by the cuts to the NDIS, making this amendment takes the focus away from the political topic and striking this point feels the most fit for this motion.

Vote for the amendment passes.



TW speaks for the motion now that there has been this amendment. As much as TW disagrees with the consultation not happening, and though he believes that in advocacy voices are strongest when people are consulted with, he agrees with the wording itself and TW supports the motion and how it currently reads after the amendment.

OB would be happy to vote for this amendment if proper consultation had occurred with the access department, the NUS disabilities officer or any other representative bodies who the Guild would endorse and recognise. As such in its current format, OB is very conflicted about understanding whether this is a good or bad thing, but does not think he can support the motion on the substantive basis of the lack of consultation throughout it.

TP says the impacts of these motion is exactly about taking a political position and is why TP thinks the striking 13.4.3 is ridiculous because it is about opposing the cuts to the disability support but also about opposing more broadly what is going on in the world and what the cuts to the NDIS is part of. TP reiterates that he believes the cuts are part of a broader project to make Australia a worse place for people to live in. TP thinks that others are making narrow minded arguments and notes that it is a betrayal of people with disabilities at UWA.

HK asks TP, disregarding the access department not being consulted, if anyone disabled was consulted.

TP responds saying there are countless arguments being put out by many disabled people that have the same views as the motion.

HK asks if TP can bring up any evidence that he consulted with disabled people.

TP responds saying he does not agree with the idea that disabled people are a homogenous mass and make these decisions all together as a group as if they do not have political disagreements and individual lives, perspectives and views of the world which are different. TP says this is a ridiculous argument to make and asks which disabled person he should have consulted, because it is not possible for him to consult with every disabled person in Australia. TP says he chooses to represent the voice of disabled people who oppose the cuts to the NDIS and he thinks that is the progressive left-wing position and he thinks that cuts to social services should be opposed.



HW asks TP to clarify if he consulted with any disabled people.

TP says he did not consult disabled people but he thinks it represents disabled people.

EC says as far as she knows, TP is not a disabled persona and he is now speaking on behalf of disabled people without any consultation.

TP reiterates that he believes he is correctly advocating for disabled people.

BM wants to agree that TP makes a good point in saying that disabled people are not a homogenous block or group of people and that it can be quite difficult to consult but he says that is exactly why we have representative counsellors and why there are officers who have that role and make that process easier.

TP responds to BM saying that BM himself as the head of the access department does not represent every disabled person, especially as BM does not oppose the cuts to the NDIS.

BM says he does not claim to represent every disabled person and that he supports the reforms to the NDIS.

RS moves a procedural motion to move to vote on the motion.

Procedural motion passes.

This motion fails.

14. MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE (REPRESENTATION)

14.1 The 113th Guild Council

14.1.1 Stands in solidarity with the Freedom Flotilla, which is attempting to sail to Palestine and break Israel's illegal siege on Gaza.

14.1.2 Recognises that Ethan Floyd, a member of Students for Palestine, has chosen to participate in the Flotilla.

14.1.3 Recognises the significant risk which comes with this kind of protest action, considering the violent actions of Israel taken against the previous flotillas, and the bravery and heroism of these activists.



14.1.4 Will sign and support the pledge to defend the flotilla, and the snap rally which is called in defence of the Flotilla by Students for Palestine, if it is intercepted by Israel.

Moved: Thomas Pearce
Seconded: Rama Sugiarta

YS asks why this motion was late.

TP says he had trouble with his emails not working.

The vote to hear the motion does not pass.

15. GENERAL BUSINESS

RS raises that an Australian is joining the freedom flotilla to Gaza and RS thinks this is a humanitarian mission and something that everyone should support and there are some great actions occurring on campus relating to it.

RS also says if anyone is interested in joining the NUS working group please email RS.

IR talks about council bonding again, and provides the option of either an escape room or laser tag. The collective agreement is that laser tag would be more fun.

16. CLOSE AND NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for **6pm Wednesday May 27th 2026**. 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.