



LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

NOVEMBER 3, 2016

Attendance:

Observers:

Absence:

1. Call to Order

Speaker calls the meeting to order

2. Land Acknowledgement

Speaker gives land acknowledgement: "SSMU would like to recognize that it is located on the traditional unceded territorial land of the Kanien'kehá:ka, which has long served as meeting grounds for indigenous peoples."

4. Approval of the Minutes

Councilor Lawrie motions to approve last week's minutes, seconded by Councilor Century. Motion passes.

5. Adoption of the Agenda

Councilor Sadikov motions to add the motion "Regard the Creation of Democratic Process Review Committee."

VP Sobat: Why wasn't this previously on the agenda?

Councilor Sadikov: It wasn't ready to go up before this point. I understand that there's not a lot of time to look at this, so we could push it to next council, but I think that the better option would be to create the committee now, if people think that's a good idea, and then appoint councilors at the next meeting, just so we can get started on appointing members at large. Like the work with the committee probably won't start until next council. But happy to postpone if that's what people want.



Motion brought to a vote. Motion passes.

President Ger motion to add “Board of Directors Seat Allocation” to the agenda under New Business.
Motion passes.

Councilor Borgia motions to adopt the agenda, seconded by Councilor Junejo. Motion passes.

6. Guest Speakers

a. Association for the Voice of Education in Quebec (AVEQ)

VP Aird: I wanted to give everyone an update on how things are going with AVEQ and how SSMU is involved. AVEQ is a student federation that started in April 2015 following the dissolution of FERO, which was an old, long-standing federation that fell apart in the 2015 year. After this there was a meeting of student associations to see where we could go from there, and basically AVEQ came out of a group of associations that were dissatisfied with the working of FERO and didn't want to see it get repeated and so they branched off into two federations, UEQ, which is the new one, and AVEQ, the Association for the Voice of Education in Quebec. Some of its characteristics: it has anti-aggressive values, its mandate is largely anti-aggressive in its policies, positions, focus. It has a consensus-based approach, that's where things are prioritized in assemblies, decision-making, stuff like that. It has local sovereignty of universities, so we don't vote on overarching things, like there are not decisions we would have to abide by. Political independence; they try to stay independent of any political party, so they don't support any political party; they support policies, not parties. Any they're kind of a middle ground between the two other existing federations, one of them is UEQ like I said and the other is ASSE. ASSE is more focused on mobilization and very much less inclined to negotiate with government officials. They don't typically do any lobbying or government consultations, whereas UEQ is basically only that, so no mobilization of any sort really, other than a few campaigns, and they tend to be too accepting of government proposals for solutions to problems that students face.

So how as SSMU been involved? Well, we've been in the circle since the very beginning. We had a big influence on position and policy writing, so building it, the very foundations of the policies and constitution, stuff like that. We were very involved in writing those, and as such it really reflects our policies and positions, the existing ones. We've attended numerous assemblies, basically every three months; I've been to three personally. And we were involved in some interviewing and candidates for jobs over there and keeping the executive accountable; liaising with people in between congress and stuff like that.

This is what it looks like around the table: associations come with their representatives and basically we determine the workings and priorities and legislative stuff to do with the federation. The latest one was at Concordia, October 8th and 9th.



Voting structure! So how it works, how it operates, how decisions are made in the federation: one association, one vote, which is a system we've found out works very well. So nobody feels excluded, nobody feels like they're being strong-armed by the other associations, there are no internal disputes really or backroom dealings where people decide together or anything like that. So everyone has the incentive to lay everything out on the table with all their concerns whenever there's a vote. It operates by consensus; so all decisions made are passed unanimously. Decisions are ratified by official members at the ends of every congress, so that means that everyone who is an observer around the table gets to vote on things, but every decision has to be officially ratified by the official members, sort of like how the Board of Directors works here at SSMU. So people have incentive to become a member, if they wanted to officially ratify all the decisions: as it stands there are more observers than official members, so how it is right now is that these official members have the incentive to listen to everyone and agree to justly-made majority decisions, but that won't necessarily be the case in the future because more become official members there might be disagreements for ratification.

Like most federations, AVEQ has an annual campaign, which is what they chose to focus on for the year and it is decided upon every year. So this year's annual campaign was four parts: it focuses on representation, so how we can represent student interests on the provincial level and work together to effectively serve as a representative body and advocate for students. Austerity, so a strong stance against austerity. Mandate, so focusing on campaigns, including on our own, focusing on research around that. Feminism and inclusion: one of the ways we were working on that was to work alongside existing campaigns for sexual assault policies, for instance, so we're reworking right now with a group called Quebec Mobilité Sexuelle, which is the newly formed group that is trying to pass laws in Quebec forcing every university to have its own sexual assault policy and to create a higher body where students could go to complain if their university is not going through with that policy. And the environment, so assisting in environment campaigns on campus, climate change awareness, stuff like that. Those are the four themes this year.

That was the last mobilization we had where we learned about these four themes and came together with other students. There were workshops, so anti-oppression workshops, skill-shares, know your rights, cyber-offense, how to do an ATI, so these are all skills that we can use and have served me well within my position and my job as an executive. Networking with other student associations, so building a relationship to see how we can work together, form a consensus on what we want to advocate for.

Advocacy representation and research, stuff they've done so far: so they've met with the Minister of Education, they are involved in government consultations, especially surrounding the creation of the Quebec University Council. So this is a new body that would act as a lobbying body through various member universities and they would fight for the interests of all the universities in Quebec, not just McGill but the whole system in general, which is something that we want to prioritize because unfortunately as it currently stands our administration has a bad tendency to think of McGill as distinct within the broader Quebec Education system, and in some ways it is, but we do strongly support



solidarity with other universities in Quebec and keeping all the education accessible in Quebec, not just McGill.

Public announcements; so they do keep the government accountable on certain things, basically doing research in how policies affect students, what the government is not following through with in terms of promises that it's made. It does a lot of research, so right now we hired a person at the beginning of the year to look into the situation of international student health insurance, that's been ongoing. So if you're an international student, I encourage you to fill out the survey that is currently being distributed on their website. They also do a lot of research surrounding public policy in Quebec and specifically education policy in Quebec.

Austerity in Quebec: the 80 millions dollars that was given to Quebec from Ottawa, this was federal money that was given back to the province marked for the purpose of education, there are government consultation going on from that as to what to do with this money and AVEQ is very much involved. And finally, partnerships with civil society groups: this is a joint initiative denouncing the blocking of university funding, partnered with other federations and other student associations, so there are cross-federation partnerships going on. Also very much with unions, workers unions and groups that are non-government groups that do have influence over the political process. That's pretty much it!

Councilor Templer: Since we are not a fully committed member, are they as receptive to our involvement?

VP Aird: We're still an observer and we still have the equal amounts of influence around the table, that hasn't changed.

Councilor Chin: My question is, something that hasn't been mentioned is the players involved, is it possible to highlight the nature of that student associations that contribute to this federation? Are there any in our situation where there is participation but no endorsement from their students, are there any in this category that we're in?

VP Aird: There are associations which have a mandate to be observers, there are associations who are part of more than one federation. Concordia, Education Faculty to UQAM [lists some schools]. There are usually around ten associations, PGSS comes, the Faculty of Engineering du Ecole Supérieur. I'm probably forgetting some as it changes from assembly to assembly, but those are some.

Councilor Chin: I noticed that it is very hard in general online to find out who is actually part of AVEQ. On their website I can't find any information, so maybe you could let them know that's not there.

VP Aird: Yeah, sure. As it stands right now, there are only two official members, so there are referendums being passed this year for more associations to join the membership. You can see who has attended every congress by looking at the minutes that are posted on the website.



Councilor Prillo: I have two questions, the first is, since I don't know the history, why are we a non-voting member of this association – with the two other ones, are we checking in with them to see if they're a better match for us? My second question is, assuming that joining this federation, assuming we ever decided to be associated with it, how much is it to join each of these three federations?

VP Aird: So there are currently three federations that we could join, that's ASSE, AVEQ and UEQ. There are a couple reasons why not ASSE: the GA has to be the highest governing body of the association and stuff like that, so we're not eligible to join ASSE. Individual departments and faculties within McGill would be eligible, and I believe we have one or two that are. So it's really between AVEQ and UEQ, all of last year was spent making that assessment and really it's just all things suggest that AVEQ is a better fit for McGill. There are no major reasons, well – we found that the environment around the table UEQ was a lot more toxic. My predecessor went to all the meetings of both to sort of gauge this precisely, and it was found that the small associations around the table at UEQ felt excluded because the voting procedure over there is proportional vote, so your vote counts to the number of students in the association. There were a couple problems with that, mainly that UdeM, which has almost twice as many students as McGill, had a lot of power. And we're pretty big; we're like the fourth or fifth university in the province, so we're much larger than some associations that only have a few thousand, so that was problematic. So there were alliances and stuff like that. There were multiple reasons; also it looks the same as its predecessor, FERQ, which broke down. SSMU was a member of FERQ three different times over a decade; we had to disaffiliate three times, one of which was because FERQ had endorsed a separation vote, and can't be part of a federation like that because it's just not one of our policies. And historically FERQ has had very close ties with government and endorsing specific party policies. So there was a lot of stuff like that which made us uncomfortable. So council, at the end of last year, voted to not have UEQ on the ballot when it came to referendum and not become more than an observer at AVEQ. That was the mandate given to me.

The fees: to join UEQ would be \$4.50 per student per semester and for AVEQ it would be \$3.50. And for ASSE, I'm not sure; they don't collect fees like that, you just have to give a certain amount.

Councilor Chin: Is it possible for individual faculty level associations to affiliate with provincial student federations?

VP Aird: In some cases, yes. In most cases, no. The only case I can think of is UQUAM, because they don't have overarching umbrella associations. So SSMU is the umbrella association of all the McGill faculties, basically. UQUAM is not run that way; they only operate on a faculty level. They are divided onto the faculty level, but that lets them be much powerful and have more influence. Their executives act much like our executives.

7. Question Period (5)



Councilor Sadikov: Just regarding the results of the votes that are published online, my understanding is that the reason why we have clickers is so that when the votes are taken, we can see how each councilor voted, however when they are published it is as kind of a summary graph, so I wanted to ask if it would be possible to publish the roll-call results of each council vote.

Parliamentarian: Yes.

8. Report of the Steering Committee (2)

VP Sobat: The steering committee didn't meet quorum last week, so the documents were submitted by Google doc to the committee, with some very minor changes being made. That's all.

9. Announcements (5)

VP Lawrie: The GA is this Monday, please come, it's going to be awesome, it's going to start at 3.

VP Sobat: You're required to be there actually.

President Ger: We have a new Councilor! Education just elected their new councilor, Marco.

Speaker: As Councilor Sobat mentioned, it is required for all councilors to be at the GA on Monday, I will not be there. All of you should be there.

10.Old Business

No old business.

11.New Business

a. Motion Regarding Support for QPIRG-McGill Existence Referendum

Councilor Thomas: I yield my time to the representative from QPIRG.

Representative from QPIRG: I'll just go through the motion – I don't know if people have any initial questions, if they are familiar with QPIRG. Basically QPIRG stands for the Quebec Public Interest Research Group, we're non-profit, student-run, student-funded organization on campus, our mandate is to promote social and environmental justice within McGill and the wider Montreal community. This motion asks for support for our existence referendum that is upcoming, so basically we're asking the students to



let us continue to exist, because our referendum agreement with McGill says that every five years we have to pose to McGill students whether they want us to continue to exist, and then after that vote we can continue our business. So this motion is just asking to support us, there is a 5 dollar opt-outable fee, we provide jobs for students, we have a library open to anyone, we run a research exchange program, we support a lot of working groups – Midnight Kitchen used to be one of our working groups, and we gave them the money and support to get off the ground.

VP Sobat: If people are interested, how can they get involved in supporting this important campaign?

QPIRG: The best way is to vote – but social media, feel free to spread the word, if you're interested, attend our events; otherwise we encourage you to vote.

Motion passes.

b. Motion Regarding Engineering Senator Elections

Councilor Renondin: This motion – and when the Engineering rep was running for a normal executive position or SSMU rep in engineering there's a larger voter turnout, say 900, which is higher than when they run through SSMU. I'm aware that there is one other faculty that runs their Senator elections under their own faculty elections, management, and I think it's going to help the voter turnout, that's the purpose of this motion. We feel like this is going to make the engineering senator position more appealing, and have it not be uncontested like it usually is. I think this is a good idea.

Councilor Chin: My question is that if this article 8.A becomes more of the norm rather than the exception, is this something that could be revisited in the future? Because I realize that with the new bylaws and internal regulations, there wasn't much change in the format of student senator elections. Given that four out of nine seats, I believe, are under these provisions.

VP Sobat: I think we're happy to look at that, if other faculties are interested. I mentioned last time that the Chief Electoral Officer should have gotten in touch with all of your associations by now to present this as an option and you have until December 1st, if you would like to request this, so by next council meeting. In terms of the internal regulations themselves, again we can revisit that but SSMU is tasked by McGill for fulfilling these seats and we do delegate them to some extent to the faculty associations in terms of representation, but we have to remain responsible for actually putting forward the names, so I think there should be some kind of central mechanism still from SSMU, and I guess that is depended on communication with other associations on a year to year basis. So we could better institutionalize that, but I would want probably to maintain some kind of consistency through SSMU to make sure those seats are getting filled and that they are representative of the different faculties.



Motion passes.

c. Motion Regarding the Creation of the Democratic Governance Review

Councilor Sadikov: Again, I apologize for having this come from the floor. Basically the main purpose of this committee would be to review some of the procedures and limits on the powers of the Board of Directors. This is mostly coming out of the changes that were made at the end of last year where the Board of Directors got increased responsibilities, a number of seats were added to it, committees transferred from the council to the board, there was an attempt to separate the jurisdiction of the board and the council. However, this was done, in my opinion, without the necessary oversight or transparency regulations for the Board, which it is expected that these governance changes will need to be reviewed once they're implemented, so I think it's good to have a committee to see that there are no major issues. I think that right now there are some issues that we can point out, and that there are ongoing regulations committed to transparency of the leaders and decisions of the Board. This is something that its democratic legitimacy kind of depends on so I think that it would be good to have a committee to review that.

In addition, if you want to scroll down to the terms of reference, this committee will "review the role and procedures required of the Board and its relationships to the other high governance bodies," it's committees as well, also I thought that this was a good opportunity to keep the call of electoral reform committee from last year, that recommended that there be a committee created to review some of the procedures of the GA. I think that this is a good place to do that, because there are integrally relationships between all these high governance bodies, and it's good to be able to make recommendations to the entirety of them. It will also consult with the ethical governance committee on the changes where that would be relevant because there would be changes to certain IRS citations with regards to the governance of the Society.

President Ger: I want to speak also in favor of this; I think it's a really great idea. As someone who is currently sitting on the Board, I have yet to be convinced that it's a perfect body for what was envisioned by this division of labor and reducing the load to make this space more accessible but also the issues with having a smaller body that has so much power and so much authority because it is legally the highest governing body, at least recognized by the province as such, though we do of course divide up what is decided on. More accountability could be there, and making sure that the body does have high expectations that should be met. Just speaking in favor, it's a great idea.

Councilor Taylor (Cleveland): I have a question about the whereas clause, "that the Board's powers are not clearly limited by the constitution and the internal regulations". They're pretty clearly laid out in the internal regulations, and so I wonder what further notations are wanted for this body. In looking at the wording in the document, I do understand the need for the review, but it seems to call into question the



democratic nature of the Board of Directors, as well as questioning the existence of it, though it is required by Quebec law.

Councilor Sadikov: I mean this motion is far from questioning the existence of the Board, and I recognize that it's legally required to a body at SSMU. The IRs and the constitution, from what I remember, require that the Board is responsible for HR, financial and operations management of the Society, but that is not necessarily an exhaustive list and it also said that the Board is the highest governing body and it has all the powers other than those that the company acquiesces to the members. That's what I mean when I say that the powers aren't clearly delimited. I think you asked something else... was there another component to your question?

Councilor Taylor (Cleveland): That answers most of it.

Councilor Sadikov: Oh yeah, to call into question the democratic nature: I don't think it was the intent to call anything into question, the intent was just to review the implementation of the changes that have been made because they have been major changes and to see if there is anything that could improve in terms of transparency.

Councilor Chin: I just have question of curiosity about the current practices of the Board of Directors, do they actually keep the minutes or is there record of the decisions that were made at the level of the Board this semester? The reason for my concern is that there's a potential, with how the set up is, that the board could push contentious issues or debate more on a high level past that of council; my question is who makes the decision with regards to whether motions or debates or discussions get presented here or the Board?

President Ger: When it comes to things that are being double reported on or areas of what goes to the board versus what goes to council, it is outlined within those broader areas of HR, legal, financial and operational matter will remain at the Board, as well as committees, as well as some reports. Like we do have double approval procedures, if you go to the committee terms of reference you can see that some do still have double approval. However, that division is not properly outlined to some extent, there are matters where the Board ends up dealing with something that could foreseeably be seen as a political matter because it is tangled with something that is legal. There is definitely room to further define, at least in my opinion, that division.

Counsilor Sadikov: In terms of minutes, the last publically available minutes for the Board is from July, I believe. In terms of the scheduling of meetings, they haven't really followed the calendar that closely.

President Ger: Yeah, this is a good point. So when it comes to meeting minutes, they are recorded and posted online, there is a schedule that is posted online when you go to the calendar section of the



website and look there. But this is another reason that I really do support this, because I have found it to be an unreliable body in terms of making sure that it can meet and it might help to send out stricter regulations surrounding that. When it comes to meeting minutes, those are public; I think the ones posted online, unfortunately, even though they are spares, do reflect the amount of times the Board had to meet.

VP Sobat: I just wanted to add a few points, hopefully without repeating anything. Just to summarize some of the issues to note: within the Board, there is a question of the governance role and what exactly should go there and not to council or vice versa, and where we can be on the safe side while still retaining the goal of having a division of labor so that council doesn't have to deal with everything, because it's just been too much in the past. But also some inconsistencies in our governing documents; for example the constitution gives members, council, and the board the power to perform referendum questions, but the internal regulations of the electoral reform only apply to council members, so there is effectively no regulations on the board because of that, that is just an inconsistency and something that was missed, unfortunately, when it was restructured, I think this can be addressed. The President just brought up another important issue, which is the administrative overhead of having a second governing body that is substantial. It's gotten to the point where it hasn't been an effective division of labor because it hasn't quite established itself as a stable board, so I'm thinking that this committee can also consider what kind of resources or support are needed so that the board is effective in being directors, and how some of those committees can take on some of the workload better so that they do.

Councilor Chin motions to extend debate by six minutes. Motion passes.

Councilor Prillo: So the purpose of this committee is basically to examine the structure and comment on it and make suggestions to the board of directors? Does that differ enough from the equitable governance reform committee, and how so?

President Ger: At least in my envisioning of how this would go, they are very different bodies. Equitable governance reform is basically focused on bringing more voices around the table, making sure that this is an accessible space for people who are unrepresented in the different processes that we do have, and equal space for the folks who are represented here. So this is more focused on making sure that there is consultative practices, that there is a strict outline for how it functions democratically.

Councilor Taylor (Cleveland): I have a question in regard to the fact that the review of the General Assembly is kind of just noted as seemingly an active, but it's only mentioned once. I'm wondering, since reviewing and presenting a report on the general assembly is a task in and of itself, if both reviewing the Board of Directors as well as the General Assembly will have adequate attention within this singular committee.



Councilor Sadikov: I think that's a good point and I definitely hear your concern, I think that the main priority of this committee will definitely be review the Board of Directors, that said, all of these governing bodies are bodies that interact. If we can to, for instance, impose limits on the power of the Board of Directors, we have to ask ourselves like where these things are going and it's good to have a wider gaze in that sense, from the committee. In terms of the actual procedures of the General Assembly, I don't think that this committee will be proposing large overall internal regulations or something like that, but I guess if there is time the committee could look into that once those conditions for the Board are looked at. Maybe, like the committee that looked at internal regulations from last year, we could make suggestions in a staggered manner to the governance documents in a progressive way.

Councilor Chen: Two quick questions: number one, what's the timeline of this committee and number two, if someone could clarify what do you mean by the interim regulatory Board?

Councilor Sadikov: The timeline is to make recommendations by the end of the year, if there are any constitutional amendments then ideally by the referendum period so that it could be brought to referendum. Could you repeat your second question?

Councilor Chen: The interim board.

VP Sobat: So the term of the Board of Directors now is one year but when we did the restructuring there was a membership that is only until now, like December 15th or something, from May 1st or June 1st, so there's a new Board being elected right now, which is why it is being called an interim board.

Councilor Mehrotra: Are we nominating councilors to this council right now?

Councilor Sadikov: My intention was to receive nominations from the floor, but if you want we could split the question and vote first on the existence of the committee and then, if it exists, nominate councilors next week. An option would be to appoint those councilors who know that they want to be on it and then fill the other positions next council.

VP Sobat motions to divide the question. Motion passes (question is divided between the existence and the appointment of councilors).

Motion passes.

d. Motion Regarding the Board of Directors Seat Allocation

President Ger: I happy to talk to it, eager to talk about what the Board does. There are four seats currently open to councilors. The Board largely deals with HR related matter, legal matters, financial matters and



operational matters, which means like the operations at Gerts, the SRC, building related activities, HR is always super fun. The financial stuff; so like budgetary stuff that doesn't have double approval like large SERF approvals. It's cool. It's every second week; meetings are scheduled for two and a half hours, sometimes they go a little bit longer. Because it is a legal body and governed by Quebec legislation, you cannot be an international student, you have to be from Quebec, and you cannot have a police record. Sorry, from Canada.

Councilor Mehrotra: How long would you be sitting on the board for?

President Ger: You would start halfway through November and you would go to the same time the following year. So there is commitment throughout the summer as well; you would have to be available to me three or four times throughout the summer, it's fine if it's via Skype.

Councilor Junejo: Last year, I heard that there is one position available on the board for international students. Is that still available?

President Ger: The international student position, which is being referred to, is an advisory position that doesn't have voting power on the board because to be registered at the Regi-Uni, you need to unfortunately be a Canadian citizen. However, that position was actually put out for members-at-large, for people from the general community to apply for and there has been an application for it.

VP Sobat: Just wondering if we could open the requirements for Directorship. Could you read those?

Speaker: Do you, or have you ever had a liquor license revoked? The correct answer is no. Do you have a criminal record? The correct answer is no. Have you been in charge or associated with a municipal register of an alcoholic regarding the distribution or sale of alcohol? The correct answer is no. Have you ever declared bankruptcy? The correct answer is no. Are you a Canadian citizen? Correct answer is yes. Do you live or have residence in Quebec? The correct answer is yes. Are you able to serve until November 14th, 2017? The correct answer is yes.

Councilor Sadikov: I think for this position it's one of the two: either a Canadian citizen or a Quebec permanent resident.

VP Sobat: I just wanted to make a plug for this exciting opportunity, the President wouldn't let me post this on Facebook but it's a bunch of 20-somethings running a multi-million dollar budget, it's lots of fun. Come hang out with us!

Councilor Templer: My question is regarding the date of service until November 14th. Do you have to be a resident of Quebec through the summer as a member of the student society?



Speaker: Yes.

President Ger: You do not have to live in Quebec (for the duration), you just have to be a Canadian citizen. But someone should probably double check. I was under the impression that you had to be a Canadian citizen and not just a resident of Quebec.

Councilor Sadikov: If you are a Canadian citizen, you don't have to be a resident of Quebec. If you are a permanent resident of Canada, you have to be a permanent resident of Quebec. There are probably some weird rules about how long you've been here and stuff.

VP Sobat: So there's Canadian citizenship and premiere resident status, which is different from regular residency. In terms of living here, I don't think that's a concern, for over the summer.

President Ger motions for five-minute recess. Motion passes.

Councilor Taylor motions to vote on the nominations, seconded by Councilor Junejo. Motion passes. Nominations are ratified.

12. Reports by Committees

Students Society Programming Network (SSPN)

Councilor Mansdoerfer presents the SSPN report.

Councilor Douglas: I just have question about the wording, at one point it says that it "sold out very well", so I was wondering if you meant that it sold out, or?

VP Lawrie: In order for us to sell out, we would have had to sell a thousand tickets, but in order for us to break even we only had to sell 850 tickets. We managed to sell close to 900 tickets, so that's clarification.

President Ger: I was wondering if either a member of SSPN or Councilor Lawrie would like to outline what the SSPN mandate is and what they do, for the rest of council? As well, I also want to personally congratulate you since last year's [4floors] didn't do very well, so great job.

VP Lawrie: Basically the Student Society Programming Network is a group of students which plan events for the whole of the student society, so we try to finance events which range from the traditional, big budget events such as 4floors, faculty Olympics, as well as other inclusive events such as the general



assembly. We're trying to work on some other projects coming through this year, I can give you guys more details on those during my actual councilor report on some of the new projects that we're doing such as a project called LifeAid, which is life after your degree, which is a rebranding of Red-White week. But if you have more questions I will explain more during my councilor report.

University Affairs Committee (UAC)

VP Sobat presents the report.

Funding Committee (10)

VP Carolan presents the report.

VP Sobat: Wasn't the charity fund renamed to the community engagement fund last year?

VP Carolan: Oops, you're right.

Club Committee (5)

VP Patterson gives the report.

Councilor Sur: We just had some concerns regarding the constitution of Israel on Campus. Just clarification, because they talk about Israel and the Middle East populations, if they, and other groups as well that talk about those issues, just so that it's creating dialogue rather than a toxic environment. Because I know in the past, certain issues have made people not feel safe, so just how do they go about that?

VP Patterson: So in clubs' constitutions, we can't really ask that they describe different kinds of groups that they're going to be liaising with or whatever, we try to keep the constitution really specific to what that club's personal mandate is doing, but there are concerns that people have about the relationship between Israel on Campus and other clubs with a singular mandate, it's definitely something we could only address in person with that club. But we try to keep the mandates of the constitutions very club specific to what they're supposed to be doing.

Executive Committee (5)

President Ger gives the report.



13.Councillor Reports

Councillor Mehrotra (2)

Councilor Mehrotra gives the report.

Councillor Jiang (2)

Councilor Jiang gives the report.

Councillor Sur (2)

Councilor Sur gives the report.

Councilor Sadikov: Just wondering about the scope of the report on mental health accessibility, and whether it was physical accessibility or other kinds, and would you recommend work to be done around the university?

Councilor Sur: In terms of accessibility, it was both physical as well as resources to mental health, because our faculty does not have that much going in terms of mental health, even though we're working on that. But I would definitely suggest that this happen in other faculties as well, because the situations are unique to whatever that faculty is doing. I think some people from SSMU may know our mental health coordinator, so he's really great and I can connect you with him and he would probably be willing to do that in other faculties too.

14.Executive Reports

VP (Finance) (5)

VP Carolan gives the report.

VP (Operations) (5)

VP Magder gives the report.

Councilor Kouyoumjian: Do you have any students who have experience setting up gardens and compost? Will you be talking to ECOLE, will you be talking to the McGill School of Environment garden team, what's the plan?



VP Magder: I have a team of five students who are helping me with this project. We are meeting to talk about how we're approaching this. Our first task has been what do we grow and the second question has been how do we grow it? So over the past few weeks I've tasked five people to reach out to a whole bunch of different groups across Montreal and on campus, so we've reached out to Campus Crop and a whole bunch of other ones. So right now what we're trying to do is figure out what would be the best items to grow in terms of efficiency as well as our climate. Once that's done we're going to do more research into the techniques, the practices... that's where we're going to do more call outs to get more involvement. I don't think we necessarily need somebody to be on board who has worked in those cases specifically, hopefully if we get one person who has had experience over the summer to help us out and give us guidance that would be key, but right now we're just focusing getting a document together with all the specific direct tasks we can actually do to grow things, so that way when we recruit volunteers in April and May, we can hand them a list of jobs they can do. Then we'll reach out to others with more experience.

Councilor Gingrich-Hadley: Just wondering if the things grown in the garden will be used by the SRC for example, or like dedicated for some specific use of the produce?

VP Magder: That's the dream. Hopefully we can use one really be crop that you don't need a lot of to incorporate into a recipe to be used by the SRC. What I think it even more interesting is taking the food waste from the SRC and put into a composting scheme. That compost could be used to grow vegetables, which could be given back to the SRC. Truthfully it's going to be more of an educational tool for the first few years, but that's the dream, yes.

President (5)

President Ger gives the report.

Councilor Sadikov: A few questions. First, on the electoral campaign reform committee, I think it's mandated to report to council monthly, so I wondering when it will be reporting to council.

President Ger: We can report to next council, for sure. I'll be frank in saying that I hadn't scheduled that into the reports schedule, but thank you for reminding me.

Councilor Sadikov: And, concerning internal affairs, any progress of having a recording secretary?

President Ger: Oh yeah! We did to an approval concerning someone, but we're unfortunately a little late hearing back about whether or not they can take the job. But there is someone lined up to take that. But meetings are still being recorded.



VP (External Affairs) (5)

VP Aird gives the report.

Councilor Taylor: I was curious about the collection feedback from indigenous communities about motions that involve or concern them, I was wondering if that could be expanded to other motions that effect certain groups and how it should be done with those groups in general? I don't know if that's something you have considered or not.

VP Aird: I have been approached about what role SSMU can play in mediating between certain groups, where there are motions. That's more of a collective effort that SSMU, falling under equity and how governance works. It's more of a governance issue. Indigenous affairs is my focus because it's an integral part of my portfolio and it's one of the things I ran on to support, and I have an indigenous affairs coordinator, so the work is largely determined by the coordinator, so what we undertake and what we don't. That's just one of the issues that the students face on campus, that some people are pretending to speak on behalf of them when in fact they're not. It's really an issue of misrepresentation and not so much an issue of mediation.

Councilor Chin: On the same note, is it possible to elaborate more on that problematic GA motion, maybe give a bit of a history on it? I don't see it on the GA website, though it has been officially tabled to the following '16 GA. So is it possibly to clarify the status on that? A separate question would be that if there were no or little consultation with indigenous peoples, which groups have brought this motion forward? Because all I see here is that it was brought forward by an association.

VP Aird: So the motion was at the GA last semester, basically it is the motion in support for the women title holders of land, so this motion had to do with supporting a dispute between an indigenous group and McGill university, to ownership of the land. Basically the problem with it is that it was brought forward by someone – so it wasn't the case that no indigenous people were consulted, it's the case that it was seemingly only one single indigenous actor who is not part of McGill but part of the community outside of McGill in Montreal, so that was a motion brought forward by students to support that. People were initially very much in favor because it just had to do with indigenous support and people are generally down to do that, but the problem was that this particular actor does not represent the mainstream point of view within indigenous communities and in fact they've been excluded from indigenous communities. So this is a very fringe point of view and it's not held by a lot of people, so that's why it was problematic. If groups on campus had consulted about that, they would have been informed of this, that it doesn't represent the diversity of views within the indigenous community on campus. So that's something we're trying to avoid in the future. It's not currently on the agenda for next GA; it's not one hundred percent clear to me whether things that are tabled at a past GA necessarily automatically make it into the agenda. Usually the people who submitted it, if it was tabled, they ask for it to come back and they're allowed. We



didn't receive any demands, but there is the possibility that it is called back from the floor. And that's what we're trying to avoid too, so we're trying to come up with a statement regarding that.

VP Sobat: To clarify, it was tabled across session, so we don't have a clear procedure for motion by petition, the only example we have is a motion that was tabled across session where the movers indicated that they wanted it to return. What we're proposing is that it be placed on the agenda with a strikethrough indicating that it requires a vote at the assembly, ratifying to remove it from the agenda, to ensure that it does have consent. But yeah, the statement will be going out soon, indicating that plan, so that the context is clearer to everybody.

VP (University Affairs) (5)

VP Sobat gives the report.

VP (Internal) (5)

VP Lawrie gives the report.

Councilor Douglas: For the GA, have you sent out a call for volunteers yet or do you need people to help out?

VP Lawrie: Because SSPN is so awesome this year, we already have about 50 volunteers so I think we're covered.

Councilor Sadikov: For the promotion of the GA, I don't know if that the internal or president portfolio, but what efforts are being made to that effect?

President Ger: The GA advertisement is being handled by our media and promotion manager, Wendy, and the event page and scheduled post have been ongoing through the SSMU website, that's the way it's being promoted.

VP (Student Life) (5)

VP Patterson gives the report.



Students' Society of McGill University
Tel: (514) 398-3800 Fax: (514) 398-7450 ssmu.ca
3600 McTavish St., Suite 1200, Montréal, QC H3A 0G5
École des sciences humaines, Université McGill, 3600 McTavish Street

15. Adjournment

Council adjourns.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Muna Tojiboeva".

Muna Tojiboeva, President

2017 - 08 - 09

APPROVED