Argument in Opposition to the Referendum Question

Making membership opt-out, as opposed to opt-in, means that graduate students may end up paying for something that they never use

The opt-out process has been proposed as a singular event during annual re-enrollment. Therefore, a student who forgets to opt out will be forced to pay for full membership without the opportunity for a refund. Furthermore, the membership fee cannot be prorated, putting visiting students -- who may only be around for a single semester -- at a disadvantage. While the GCHC anticipates a reduced annual fee as a result of the increase in dues paying members, the reduced fees will not change the fact that students who do not go to DBar (and who forget to opt out) will be paying for a service they do not want. The fact that non-resident numbers have historically been so low indicates that most graduate students are not inclined to sign up and/or utilize membership benefits; by making the process opt out, students who otherwise would not sign up for a membership may find themselves saddled with an unnecessary charge.

Extending GCHC membership to the graduate student body may impact GC resident representation

The GCHC membership extends voting rights to students who do not live in the GC. Presently, non-resident GCHC members represent only a minority of the total membership. With this new proposal, the voting members that live outside of the GC will outnumber the residents of the GC, which may present issues in future elections. For example, the concerns of residents could be overshadowed if outside members elect a candidate unfamiliar with the current concerns of the GC. Admittedly, this concern is partially mitigated by a policy that requires that President and Vice President of the GCHC must live be residents of the GC.