

Legislative Council Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:10pm.

2) Attendance

The attendance sheet is circulated around the room.

3) Adoption of the Agenda

Councillor Farnan motions to adopt the agenda. The motion clearly passes and **the agenda is adopted.**

4) Approval of the Minutes of Council

a. 10/11/12 Meeting

Amendments:

VP Dinel points out that "consultation" was spelled "consoltation".

The Speaker will amend this in the minutes automatically

Councillor Nam points out that she was referred to as "Councillors Nam". This is also automatically amended.

Councillor Rosentzveig motions to adopt the minutes. This motion clearly passes and **the minutes from the 10/11/12 Council Meeting are adopted.**

b. 10/18/12 Meeting

Amendments:

VP Dinel has a point of clarification, and asks if VPs should be referred to as "councillors" or "VPs".

The Speaker answers, saying that either term can be used because all VPs are technically councillors as well.

Councillor Rea points out that "Rea" was spelled "Ray" under the nominations for the Board of Directors section. This will be automatically amended.

Councillor Lam points out that under the speeches from the nominations section, "FERC" was spelled wrong. This will also be automatically amended.

VP Dinel motions to adopt the minutes. The motion clearly passes and **the minutes from the 10/18/12 Council Meeting are adopted.**

5) Approval of the Minutes of the General Assembly – 10/15/12

Councillor Farnan motions to adopt the minutes. The motion clearly passes and **the minutes from the 10/15/12 General Assembly are adopted.**

6) Report of the Steering Committee

President Josh Redel: The Steering Committee received a report from the Policy Committee regarding the conversation from the last Council meeting about how Council should act regarding motions that passed in the consultative body of the General Assembly without quorum. These motions will not go online for ratification since it is clear from Council's documents that Council is not taking on the role of the GA. Steering recommends that Council

act in the direction recommended in the consultative body. Since quorum was not kept, debate on the motions is welcomed to make them into stronger Council motions and to take into account the representation that Council has. The motions that were discussed at Council are on the agenda today and will be discussed in the order of the consultative forum. The Steering Committee recommends amendments to improve the motions. In terms of the Motion Regarding Plan Nord, which was moved from the floor, amendments will be debated upon without designating a friendly/unfriendly status. In terms of the internal/external nature of motions, Council can vote on motions that are external, but the motions cannot be external and divisive. (President Redel reads article 2.3.2 from Article Book 1.) If the motions are divisive, they require a 2/3 majority vote to pass. Steering considered all of the motions to be non-external and non-divisive, except the Motion Regarding Opposition to Canadian Military Involvement in Iran, which will require 2/3 majority vote to pass in Council. However, when the motion is called, Council will take a brief recess to review amendments. If it has changed its divisive nature, it will follow standard voting procedures

There is a motion to adopt the report of the Steering Committee. The motion clearly passes and **the report of the Steering Committee is adopted.**

7) **Announcements**

The Speaker recommends that Councillors write down their questions in advance so they are prepared for the Question Period that follows the Announcement section.

President Redel: On off-Thursdays (Thursdays with no Council meetings) Council will be holding motion-writing and brainstorming sessions. Most of the executive will be there to help work on motions that can be brought to Council. It is also time that can be used to discuss what's going on with SSMU and Council.

Also, the EUS in cooperation with SSMU will be building the Iron Rink again. They should be having a grand opening in January, and lots of inter-faculty events will be going on with the rink. People interested should email sports.eus@gmail.com to sign up for team or be put on a team.

There are 8 motions today so the meeting will be go a bit later, therefore Council will be buying pizza. He asked how many people have eaten, and if they want pizza in a few hours. It is decided that 8:00pm is agreeable for pizza. 11 pizzas will be ordered: 3 cheese, 3 vegetarian, 2 Mexican, and 2 Hawaiian.

Councillor Steward-Kannigan: Asks for the vegetarian pizzas to be ordered without cheese in recognition of World Vegan Day.

President Redel: One of the vegetarian pizzas will be ordered without cheese.

Councillor Rea: The Education Undergraduate Society is having a food drive. They are collecting cans of chicken soup for Dans la Rue. Dans La Rue works with street children between the ages of 12 and 25 providing them with food, shelter, and support through outreach programs. The EdUS will have a box in the Education lobby where people can place their donations. The food drive ends Thursday December 6, 2012.

VP Reid-Fraser: Next Thursday an event will be held in partnership with MUNACA and the Migrant Center. It is a discussion of the Conservative government's international labour policy, and of migrant workers and unionized labour under the Harper government. The discussion will take place in Bronfman 001.

Next Tuesday, the Sierra Youth Coalition, in partnership with Youth Communications, will be hosting a campus tour and day-long series of events about campaigns and actions, followed by a party later on in the night. She offers to give people information if they are interested.

Councillor Subhani: There will be a showing of *The Voice of Burgundy* in Leacock. Also, the Canadian Aeronautics and Space Association is trying to put together an event at McGill, please contact him if interested.

Councillor Farnan: The Muslim Students Association is holding Project Downtown on November 2nd. They will be meeting outside SSMU, and then will go downtown to distribute food to homeless people in the Montreal area. The event is called MSA McGill presents Project Downtown, and information can be found on the event's Facebook page.

Councillor Rosentzveig: The Funding Committee's soft deadline for funding is approaching, people should apply now if they want money before the winter semester.

Councillor Guan: On Wednesday from 10am-3pm the SUS will be hosting a Grad and Professional School Fair (which includes med. school).

VP Szpejda: It's Movember. Asks everyone to keep in mind that it goes to a great cause, feel free to donate. He says he will try to make a Council team.

8) Question Period

Councillor Rosentzveig: Regarding the costumes at 4 Floors that went against the SSMU Equity Policy, an apology was sent out from SSMU. The apology expressed regrets, however, it did not touch on why this occurred and why nothing was done. SSMU has had experience with this in the past, so he asks the VP Internal why nothing seems to have been done about this issue?

VP Szpejda: Members of the executive were available all night, but no one approached them the night of the event. They only heard from people when pictures were posted 4 days later by the Bull and Bear. If people had been offended and approached them, they would have had the power to remove people the night of the event. Also, apparently equity officers were at the door checking costumes but, unlike what was reported, the equity officers felt uncomfortable and didn't want to act as the "equity police" and remove people with inappropriate costumes. If anyone had come to the executive the night of, they would have had security – instead of the equity officers – remove people with offensive costumes. He admits that he may have overlooked this in the planning of the event, however the theme was discussed with the Equity Commission and officers. In the future, he will ensure this is more publicly announced. VP Szpejda says that people are always more than welcome to come talk to him during events if they feel they are being oppressed at the event, not 5 days later. He will consider this for the rest of the events, and wants to discuss with the Equity Committee the whole issue of what costumes are equitable and where the line is drawn.

Councillor Georges: What does an anti-oppressive measure entail? Is it just screening?

VP Cooper: Good conversations have been had in Executive Meetings of ways to work on events to make sure that equity and sustainability can be incorporated. One anti-oppressive measure could be to put something on the event's tickets or hand something out with the tickets to remind people that it is a Safe Space and what this entails.

9) Old Business

a. Motion Regarding Renewing Support for Accessible Education

VP Dincl reads the motion:

Whereas, the Quebec Government has recently canceled the proposed tuition hike of \$1778 over 7 years;

Whereas, the Quebec Government has historically raised tuition for out-of-province and international students soon after the success of a student strike;

Whereas, many members of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) come from outside Quebec and already pay high tuition rates;

Whereas, the SSMU currently has a resolution "Motion Regarding Accessible Education" (reference: page 88 of the SSMU Resolution Manual) which expired September 26, 2012;

Resolved, that the SSMU continue to uphold the following mandates on accessibility to post-secondary education:

- ◁ Support for high-quality, universally accessible post-secondary education as a human right,
- ◁ Opposition to any mechanism or legislation that would permit a non-consensual increase in student fees for any student, whether Quebecker, Canadian, or international,
- ◁ Call for a public re-investment in post-secondary education from all levels of government,
- ◁ Call for the elimination of all financial barriers to a high-quality post-secondary education, and advocate for a progressive reduction of tuition fees for all students, including the eventual replacement of any and all ancillary and tuition fees with alternative methods of funding post-secondary education,
- ◁ Work with elements of the Quebec and Canadian student movements that share these goals,

Resolved, that the SSMU specifically oppose any tuition hike proposed by the Quebec government that targets out-of-province or international students,

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Resolved, that the External Affairs Committee, in conjunction with SSMU's Political Attaché Researcher and SSMU members at large, work to develop informational materials and policy proposals regarding out-of-province and international students, in line with SSMU's commitment to accessible education for all students."

Debate on the motion begins with a speaking time of 30 seconds and a debate time of 10 minutes, although both are open to change by a motion from the floor.

Councillor Farnan: Asks if this motion is a Council motion.

Speaker: Yes, it is a Council motion and will not be ratified online.

VP Reid-Fraser: This motion is not something new, SSMU has previously had policies in support of accessible education and this motion is simply renewing a resolution from last year. She believes that since this effects every person in this university that this issue is one of the most important things that SSMU should be focussing on.

Councillor Larson: Asks for clarification of the 3rd bullet under the first Resolved Clause.

VP Reid-Fraser: Clarifies the point, saying it calls for commitment from governments to provide funds without having to burden the university.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Clarifies the answer, saying that discussions about this are going on in government right now.

Councillor Larson: Asks for further clarification, saying the motion is not really calling for a new investment, but for a bigger investment.

Councillor Rosentzveig: The point touches on the way that money is invested in universities.

Councillor Baker: The increase refers to an increase in the percentage of funding for universities that comes from the government.

Councillor Zidel: Asks if the movers would be open to a friendly amendment to clarify what is meant by the increase and to show what SSMU stands for.

Councillor Cybulsky: Asks if the part of the motion which states that SSMU would work with other organizations that share the same goals could entail a student strike happening at McGill and students not being able to go to class (if something similar to last year's student strikes were to occur).

VP Reid-Fraser: Going on strike is something that is done by associations. Some students at McGill did go on strike through their departments, but the way that is carried out is dependent on the students who are in those organizations. For example, to vote for SSMU to go on strike would be unrealistic because of the

spectrum of different opinions, so SSMU instead provides information about issues. It is up to individual student associations to decide what they want to do and to see what is taking place in other student associations.

VP Cooper: Striking is a tactic and this motion is the mandate, so these two things can be discussed separately. It is something students should focus on to make education accessible

Councillor Zidel: Council needs to have a clear policy on post-secondary education. He motions to amend the phrase “human right” to “post-secondary education that is not a privilege.” His rationale for this amendment is to clarify where efforts should be focussed. Post-secondary education is not a human right as some things are necessary to get a degree (i.e. desire to learn). No one with a lower socio-economic status should be denied post-secondary education, but if individuals do not have an interest in education, they do not deserve it.

VP Reid-Fraser: She does not say outright that this amendment is unfriendly, but she wants to have a discussion.

Speaker: The amendment is considered unfriendly

Debate on the unfriendly amendment begins:

Councillor Mossallanejad: This motion is saying that accessible post-secondary education is a human right, not post-secondary education for everyone. He asks for Councillor Zidel’s thoughts on this.

Councillor Zidel: He does not see post secondary as a right, but people are free to disagree. He realizes that the amendment might be redundant, due to the beginning of the sentence (“Support for high-quality, universally accessible post-secondary education...”). He withdraws his motion to amend, but still does not like the use of “human right.”

Councillor Rosentzveig : Motions to amend by striking the phrase “as a human right.”

The motion is considered unfriendly as the movers think it is stronger with the inclusion of “human right.”

Debate on the unfriendly amendment begins.

Councillor Larson: She supports the amendment because of how students across the board feel about the issue. She sees this amendment as a common meeting ground, with the focus on the accessibility of post-secondary education. The human right vs. privilege issue can be alienating, so the motion is stronger without it.

Councillor Guan: The use of “human right” makes the clause stronger. Primary education is a human right, so why should it not apply to post-secondary education?

VP Szpejda: He supports the amendment if the elimination of “human right” applies only to post-secondary education since education in general is a human right. Primary education has to be set as a human right, but it can’t be a human right that any person can just decide to go to university. Post-secondary education is different because institutions choose who they accept. It cannot be a human right that everyone who wants to go to McGill is allowed to go to McGill. It can be a right to go to a post-secondary institution, but that opens up a whole other set of issues.

Councillor Subhani: Suggests that the movers replace “human right” with “basic right.” This change maintains the strength of the motion and does not make it a human right, because while some people may not have the privilege of coming to McGill, their having access to post-secondary education should still be a basic right.

Councillor Baker: He is curious about the differences between “human right” and basic right. Human rights are in the Charter and are very different from what is being discussed. Economic rights are very problematic and people will always be debating something like this. He thinks the motion is sufficient without the inclusion of “human right.”

Councillor Georges: She agrees with the movers of the amendment, and feels as though the inclusion of the word “right” triggers memories of divisiveness from last year and is therefore alienating to students who believe post-secondary education is a privilege. For these reasons, it is best to eliminate the phrase from the motion.

VP Cooper: It is important to include the “human right” aspect of the motion because it is stronger in the sense of the broader re-conceptualization of post-secondary education: that anyone who is motivated and willing can contribute to society through learning. The elitism of McGill is a problem; SSMU should facilitate people who want to learn in society. The inclusion of “human right” is part of the broader conversation about education.

VP Dinel: Proposes that instead of striking “as a human right”, replace with “right”. This way different people can interpret it how they want to.

Councillor Rosentzveig: The crux of that line is “high-quality, universally accessible post-secondary education”. The entire resolution is not just about 18-22-year-olds, but also about adults and universities as a place for an entire society to grow and become more solid. He is trying to represent the mood of the room, and won’t mind if it is voted down but thinks it is something that needs to be thought about.

VP Dinel motions to move to the previous question. The motion clearly passes, and voting on the amendment begins.

The motion clearly passes, and **the phrase “as a human right” is removed from the motion.**

There is a motion to move to the previous question. The clearly passes and voting on the motion in its entirety begins.

The motion clearly passes with 24 for, 4 against, and 5 abstentions. **The Motion Regarding Renewing Support for Accessible Education is adopted.**

b. **Motion Regarding Ethical Investments at McGill**

VP Cooper reads the motion:

Whereas, the overwhelming majority of scientific bodies agree that carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions are contributing to rising average global temperature and climate change across the planet;

Whereas, examples of global climate change from 2012 include severe droughts in the United States, flooding in Alberta, and the lowest-ever summer ice cover in the Arctic;

Whereas, scientists predict that if the global average temperature rises by 2°C, the planet could experience increased extreme weather events, such as droughts, floods and storms, reduced agricultural output, and thus rising food prices, and increased levels of illness and disease;

Whereas, the Tar Sands represent the fastest growing source of carbon emissions in Canada;

Whereas, SSMU was mandated by General Assembly in 2010 to discontinue owning stocks in natural resource extraction companies and financial institutions with a stake in the Tar Sands;

Whereas, the above mandate helped lead to the adoption of a Five Year Ethical Investment Plan for SSMU at Legislative Council on January 12, 2012;

Whereas, information regarding investment policies on the McGill website only mentions “social and ethical norms” and “an investment portfolio managed in a ‘socially responsible’ manner”, with no clear elaboration on what that means;

Whereas, McGill University also has investments in many companies, some involved in natural resource extraction;

Whereas, the Preamble to the SSMU Constitution states that “The Students’ Society commits to demonstrating leadership in matters of human rights, social justice and environmental protection. The society shall be mindful of the direct and indirect effects corporations, businesses and organizations have on their social, political, economic and environmental surroundings;”

Resolved, that the SSMU adopt a position opposing the continued development of the Canadian Tar Sands,

Resolved, that the SSMU call on the federal government to undertake a full examination of the social, economic and environmental impacts of the Tar Sands project,

Resolved, that the SSMU lobby McGill University to divest from companies engaged in the Tar Sands, as well as other companies that have negative impacts on their social, political, economic and environmental surroundings,

Resolved, that the SSMU lobby McGill University to divest from all financial institutions that invest in or give loans to companies engaged in the Tar Sands,

Resolved, that the SSMU lobby McGill University to cut all ties with companies engaged in the Tar Sands and financial institutions that fund the Tar Sands.”

Debate on the motion begins, with the same time limits as the previous motion.

Speaker: The vote from the consultative forum was 61 for, 21 against.

Councillor Nam: Asks if there could be any economic repercussions from passing this motion that could potentially be passed on to SSMU.

VP Cooper: No, there would not be any repercussions on SSMU as a student corporation because McGill does not give SSMU money. She also doesn't see any repercussions for students but says it is important to look for other sources of funding.

President Redel: There would not be any repercussions for SSMU directly, but if there are undergrads doing research (such as in engineering) they could be impacted as individuals, but not as a society or organization.

Councillor Dziadyk: The part about negative impacts applies to all companies and needs to be addressed in this motion.

VP Cooper: Asks if it would be friendly to change it to “minimal impact”.

Councillor Dziadyk: Says this change seems like semantics.

Councillor Zidel: Motions to amend to add a new resolves clause: “*Resolved* that the SSMU continue to take into consideration the negative impacts that companies have on their social political, economic, and environmental surroundings.”

Debate on the unfriendly amendment begins:

VP Reid-Fraser: She sees what the amendment is trying to do; talking about McGill as a thing, and SSMU as a thing, and basically renewing SSMU's commitment to the Research and Financial Ethics Committee. She loves what the committee is doing

but feels that this is redundant. The wording could be different because the amendment is looking at SSMU's investments in particular.

Councillor Zidel: The actual issue is with the second part of the Resolved clause which also says what FERC does. However, nowhere in FERC's policy does it say that they must divert from an investment if they have these issues.

President Redel: He does not agree with the new Resolved clause as he thinks it makes the motion weak by getting people to look at every single company which dilutes the strength of focussing on one issue.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Has looked into student investments in the summer with FERC and would like to note how difficult it is to find ethical places to invest.

Councillor Nasr: Thinks the amendment is unnecessary.

Councillor Zidel withdraws his amendment as it was on the screen and motions to amend to strike everything after Tar Sands. (Would mean striking "as well as other companies that have negative impacts on their social, political, economic and environmental surroundings" from the third Resolved clause.)

The amendment is declared unfriendly. Debate on the unfriendly amendment begins:

Councillor Chaim: Personally, he thinks it does make the motion stronger because that line is vague and he does not like it. The motion seems more concise and directed without that phrase.

Councillor Nasr: It is clear from the clause Zidel wants to remove that the entire purpose of the clause is to lobby McGill to divest from companies that partake in negative acts. He wants to know how FERC came into the picture, as it is connected to SSMU's finances and not McGill's. The motion should be focussed on McGill, not SSMU.

Councillor Zidel: If we believed this, we would have to establish a whole new committee on McGill's finances, and we would have to be lobbying all the time. SSMU has limited resources and needs to focus its efforts, therefore it needs motions for specific initiatives.

VP Szpejda: Asks if he can ask a question regarding the motion as a whole.

Speaker: Can ask once voting on the amendment is finished.

Councillor Georges: The amendment makes the motion stronger. Many resolved clauses mention involvement in Alberta and climate change; if the rest of the sentence is included it is more hyperbole than needed

Councillor Farnan: Agrees, by combining 2 resolved clauses, the motion would be stronger and more concise.

Councillor Larson: Motions to move to the previous question. The motion clearly passes and voting on the unfriendly amendment begins.

The motion clearly passes, and **“as well as other companies that have negative impacts on their social, political, economic and environmental surroundings” will be struck from the motion (third Resolved clause).**

Debate on the motion as a whole resumes:

VP Szpejda: Asks what specific differentiation the Resolved clauses have, as the purpose of the last three Resolved clauses seems redundant.

VP Reid-Fraser: The last two clauses were brought in as amendments. The differentiation between them is that the third and fourth resolved clauses specifically ask McGill to divest while last one looks at accepting donations and research; other kinds of partnerships that don't involve investment money.

Councillor Cybulsky: Asks if the movers know which proportion of McGill's investments are with tar sands companies.

VP Reid-Fraser: She has list of the companies themselves, but the percentage is confidential. This information could be found through access to information requests, but currently they do not have that information.

Councillor Cybulsky: Asks if VP Reid-Fraser would be able to say which number of companies invest in the tar sands out of the total number of companies that McGill invests in.

VP Reid-Fraser: Says she can find that information in the next few minutes and get back to Councillor Cybulsky.

Councillor Steward-Kannigan: Motions to amend by adding “and other fossil fuels project” after every reference to “tar sands” in every Resolved clause as she understands the motion to be more broad.

The amendment is declared unfriendly, and debate begins on the unfriendly amendment.

Councillor Subhani: Addresses the amendment and mentions something President Redel had brought up: fossil fuels are a huge industry in Canada which contributes major portion of the GDP, as do Canadian tar sands, and Fort McMurray where oil sands have recently been discovered. Also, the engineering students at McGill have close connections in terms of internships and work opportunities with these companies. Many McGill students are employed by these companies, therefore by investing in these companies, McGill promotes employment opportunities for its students.

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Councillor Guan: Agrees with Councillor Subhani. She is uncomfortable with the amendment because she sits on FERC and if the motion is changed to refer to all fossil fuels companies, it is difficult for FERC because it doesn't leave it with a lot of opportunities for investment.

Councillor Chaim: Says that Council has just made the motion stronger by getting rid of a vague clause, and does not see why another more vague clause should be added. He points out the fact that the world does use fossil fuels.

Councillor Chaim motions to move to the previous question, and the motion clearly passes.

Voting on the unfriendly amendment begins, and the motion clearly does not pass. **The amendment will not be adopted into the motion.**

Debate on the motion as a whole resumes.

Councillor Subhani: In terms of the facts and figures, he would like to motion to reconsider the motion as a whole because of these reasons and because of how deeply this motion may affect the engineering faculty.

Speaker: The motion to reconsider only applies if the motion fails and Councillors want to vote on it again. He suggests that Councillor Subhani would like to motion to table indefinitely.

Councillor Subhani motions to table the motion indefinitely. The motion is seconded.

Councillor Zidel: Wants to comment on this motion.

Debate begins on the motion to table indefinitely:

Councillor Subhani: A lot of companies have major impacts on environment, especially oil and gas companies. He wants everyone to consider that the oil and gas industry is a major contributor to Canada's GDP and is a source of employment in Canada for engineering students.

Councillor Zidel: Does not agree with Councillor Subhani, but he would also table the motion because it does not reflect the careful phasing out of fossil fuels which is the real solution to this issue. People on campus are against fossil fuels and he disagrees with the industry, but he thinks the motion could be perfected.

VP Reid-Fraser: Talks about the larger political context of the motion: it is a crucial time for humans anywhere in the world to change the amount of carbon entering the atmosphere to prevent climate change. If a certain level of carbon emissions is reached, the world could go into runaway climate change.

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Councillor Dziadyk: Does not think the motion should be tabled because it was brought up at the GA.

Councillor Farnan: Asks if it is in order to move to the previous question.

Speaker: No, it is not in order.

VP Szpejda: This is a Council motion now, and is not going to be ratified online. He finds the Whereas clauses very one-sided and while he realizes the environmental impacts, the industry still employs 1 in 14 Albertans and every dollar made generates 7 dollars of economic growth.

Councillor Larson: Asks a point of order, wants to know if they have to wait for everyone to speak.

Speaker: Yes, they cannot move to the previous question to table until speeches are finished.

Councillor Nasr: Says the motion is called “ethical investments” but is clearly about the tar sands. He disagrees with the previous amendment because there is a significant amount of carbon produced in this area compared to those produced in other areas.

Speaker: Reminds councillors to keep comments specific to if they want to table the motion or not.

VP Cooper: The criticisms of the motion about the tar sands creating jobs is a problem that SSMU should be addressing as the tar sands are literally murdering Aboriginal people, CO² emissions are through the roof. It would be awesome if the engineers worked on alternative energy projects even if the murderous energy is profitable.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Council has a responsibility to seriously consider the motion. SSMU is not writing national policy, it can divest its investments to somewhere that it can do some good, especially since SSMU has a sustainability policy to fulfill.

Councillor Subhani: He motioned to table because the oil and gas contribution to the GDP is large. Instead of supporting the phasing out of this process, McGill dropping its investments in oil and gas would have a direct impact on SSMU.

Councillor Cybulsky: Asks if tabling this motion would be the same as voting against it.

Speaker: Says that if the motion is tabled it can be brought back later.

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Councillor Farnan: Says that it is out of line to table the motion. If councillors disagree they can bring it back to the motion and vote on it. Tabling is not what Council came here to do, the motions need to be addressed.

Councillor Georges: The motion should be tabled because then it can be brought up again later. There is not enough information available to McGill students to understand the financial implications of this decision. They don't understand the economic repercussions, can't access information on McGill's economic policy, and don't know how it pertains to McGill's finances.

VP Dinel: Motions to vote on tabling the motion.

Councillor Guan: Addresses Councillor Georges comment, says that the investment portfolio has a lot of diversification so the tar sands would have economic repercussions but they wouldn't be very strong.

VP Dinel's motion to vote on tabling is seconded and passes. Voting on the motion to table indefinitely begins. The motion clearly does not pass and **the motion is not tabled indefinitely.**

Debate on the motion as a whole resumes.

Councillor Larson: Asks the movers a question: she is unsure of what percent age McGill invests, but some portion of the investment would be lost if McGill divested. Part of the operation budget would then have to come from another budget, so how would this be good at all in terms of academics?

VP Reid-Fraser: Concerns about alternatives were also brought up at the GA. The issue is that if they do the work and dedicate the resources to look into alternatives, it is not worth it to dedicate a lot of time and energy to doing all of that just to bring forward a motion. They can make amendments to speak to that, but she would rather come out of Council with a mandate.

Councillor Larson: Rephrases her point: if any money that McGill uses for operating costs is removed, they would have to replace this amount from money that should be used for academic research.

Councillor Farnan: Motions to amend to combine the last 2 clauses to make the motion more concise. Wants to do this by adding "and from" at the end of the second last clause after the comma.

This is a friendly amendment and will be adopted into the motion. **The last 2 clauses will now be combined.** The new clause will read:

"Resolved, that the SSMU lobby McGill University to divest from all financial institutions that invest in or give loans to companies engaged in the Tar Sands, and from companies engaged in the Tar Sands and financial institutions that fund the Tar Sands"

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Councillor Zidel: Motions to move to the previous question. The motion is seconded but does not get a two-thirds majority and does not pass.

Councillor Farnan: Motions to amend because the new clause sounds bad, wants to change the wording.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Would turn it around to read “Tar Sands, and from all financial institutions that invest in or give loans to companies engaged in the tar sands.”

This is a friendly amendment, and **the revised clause is added to the motion.** The new clause will now read:

“*Resolved*, that the SSMU lobby McGill University to divest from all financial institutions that invest in or give loans to companies engaged in the Tar Sands, and from all financial institutions that invest in or give loans to companies engaged in the tar sands.”

Councillor Mossallanejad: Points out that most financial institutions give loans to the tar sands.

Councillor Nasr: Discussing the impacts of McGill divesting is futile, they are just fulfilling SSMU’s green mandate. McGill isn’t necessarily going to divest immediately, Council just needs to mandate to give SSMU the opportunity to push for it. They shouldn’t be discussing the impacts yet because it is too early.

Councillor Boytinck: Lots of students work in the tar sand. As we promote access to education, is this isolating students?

Councillor Chaim: Motions to extend for 5 minutes with a 30s speaking time. The motion is seconded and clearly passes. **Debate on the motion is extended.**

Councillor Chaim: He is hearing from the room that we feel this is not limited to the economic impact. We are lacking a lot of information on the tar sands project, especially in the one-sided Whereas clauses. He would like to see a motion considered to divide the question to promote inquiries into this issue, not directly choosing a side (which is an opposition to development).

He motions to amend the final 2 clauses by adding “to divest and cut all ties with companies” to the second-last clause, and striking the last clause.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Thinks it is better worded as “divest from”, and to take out the second “with”.

This amendment is friendly and will be added to the motion. The last clause will now read:

Thursday, November 1, 2012

“*Resolved*, that the SSMU lobby McGill University to divest from and cut ties from all financial institutions that invest in or give loans to companies engaged in the Tar Sands.”

Councillor Zidel: Motions to amend. Asks if people would be more comfortable if the Environmental Committee and Senate were to come up with something better. He is willing to keep the motion the same as it is here, and this way it could be pushed further so that the McGill aspect goes to Senate and then comes back to Council. He would replace the McGill clauses and make them points under one Resolved clause: “*Resolved*, that the Senate Caucus Committee and Policy Committee undertake efforts to implement the spirit of this motion in the McGill context, in hopes of lobbying McGill on the following points:” The resolved clauses from the motion would then follow as drop points. He is concerned with people not having enough information to effectively lobby.

VP Reid-Fraser: There has been talk about how this would happen. CAMSER, a committee of McGill that hasn't met for a couple of years could meet to discuss this. For this to happen, they need to get 300 students to sign a petition saying that one of McGill's investments is effecting a social injury and outline what the injury is. This would force them to meet and talk to the people in charge of the investment committee.

Councillor Larson: If this is about advocacy, shouldn't the Senate Caucus be talking about this because it's about academic issues, not governance?

President Redel: Regarding CAMSER, the PGSS president is working to try to get the committee to meet, however all committee meetings are confidential.

Councillor Steward-Kannigan: Speaking against the amendment, says the issue is with the shock that will be created and the need to start the phasing-out process. The motion as a whole gets McGill to divest from everything, which is the lobbying process we want to engage in. If SSMU adopts this motion, the phasing-out process can be started.

VP Cooper: SSMU's political staff person shows in documents that only 11 out of the 645 companies McGill invests in are tar sands companies. Hundreds of students are in the School of Environment and related studies, and that is legitimate as well. This is not the only way of lobbying; it could create opportunities for students to get involved in SSMU issues.

Councillor Zidel: Withdraws his amendment, says he wanted to know if it was divisive.

Councillor Farnan: Motions to move to the previous question. The motion is seconded and clearly passes.

Voting on begins on the motion as a whole. With 9 for, 7 against, and 4 abstentions, the motion passes. The **Motion Regarding Ethical Investments at McGill** is adopted.

c. **Motion Regarding Opposition to Canadian Military Involvement in Iran**

Councillor Nasr reads the motion:

“Whereas on 7 September 2012 the government of Canada ordered the closing of the Canadian Embassy in Iran and expelled Iranian diplomats from Canada, indicating that the government of Canada will not seek a diplomatic resolution to conflict with Iran;

Whereas the government of the United States has repeatedly stated it considers military intervention in Iran to be an option, and has recently participated in large-scale naval drills in the Persian Gulf;

Whereas the number of nuclear warheads possessed by Iran is zero, and the number of nuclear warheads possessed by the United States is 5,113;

Whereas universities, including McGill, conduct research for defense ministries and military contractors, sell many of the skills required for the administration of military action, allow military recruitment on campuses, and invest in companies that profit from armed conflict, and are in these ways complicit in war;

Whereas hundreds of McGill students are directly from Iran, have family in Iran, and are adversely affected by sanctions and military action;

Whereas the SSMU has historically opposed war and military intervention as a method for solving problems;

Whereas the SSMU has an equity policy that explicitly opposes all forms of oppression, which include imperialism and colonialism;

Whereas the SSMU has a resolution that registers its opposition to unethical investment and research in McGill;

Resolved, that the SSMU firmly oppose Canadian aggression towards Iran and oppose any military action that may be taken by Canada alone or in concert with other countries;

Resolved, that the SSMU oppose all ties between McGill University and any military efforts, including investments in military contractors and weapons manufacturers, weapons research, and research for government agencies that contributes to military action;

Resolved, that in the case of a military intervention in Iran, the SSMU provide information resources about the issue, as well as support to students who may experience stress, trauma or other difficulty as a result of military activity.

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Resolved, that the SSMU create a policy opposing military activity and McGill's relationship with military industries by the end of the Winter 2013 semester, and that this resolution be in effect until that policy is adopted."

Speaker: The vote from the consultative forum was 32 for, 14 against, and 8 abstentions.

Councillor Farnan: Asks how many motions he can make.

Speaker: Need to separate them.

Councillor Farnan: Regarding the Resolved clause that indicates military intervention in Iran, would it be friendly to remove the fact that it is with Iran, and give support to students not just for this one case of military intervention? The third Resolved clause would read:

"Resolved, that the SSMU provide information regarding Canadian military issues, as well as support to students who may experience stress, etc."

The amendment is considered unfriendly. Debate on the unfriendly amendment begins:

VP Reid-Fraser: Regarding the phrase "Canadian military issues", would change "issues" to "military involvement". She understands the spirit of not limiting the motion to Iran.

Councillor Steward-Kannigan: The motion is trying to take a stance right now on a time sensitive issue and she feels like it addresses the issue well.

Councillor Rosentzveig: The motion is strong because it speaks to a specific case. The amendment might make a good resolution on its own to help structure the issue.

Councillor Farnan: The reason for the amendment is because great attention is being attached to a two-sided contentious issue. If SSMU is going to align itself with foreign policy, there will always be two sides.

Councillor Dziadyk: Motions to move to the previous question. The motion is seconded and passes.

Voting begins on the amendment. The amendment passes. **The unfriendly amendment is added to the motion.** The third Resolved clause will now read:

"Resolved, that the SSMU provide information regarding Canadian military issues, as well as support to students who may experience stress, etc."

Debate resumes on the motion in its entirety:

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Councillor Larson: Asks if the movers can explain what Canada has done today directly in aggression to Iran (and vice versa).

Councillor Rosentzveig: Canada has closed its embassies and has cut off diplomatic contact.

VP Szpejda: A lot of the clauses deal with US policy and are not relevant to Canadian military involvement.

VP Reid-Fraser: There has been clear support by the Canadian government of Israel in this situation, which can be seen by looking at the issue as a dichotomy between Israel and Iran.

Councillor Steward-Kannigan: Canada has been imposing sanctions on Iran since 2010. UN reports show that child mortality goes up under sanctions (data from 1990s). Secondly, she speaks to VP Reid-Fraser, saying that there is lots of support for Israel. They can't take a side on a divisive issue, but would be implicitly taking a side (that of Israel) if they did not oppose military involvement.

Councillor Dziadyk: We are dealing with the possibility of war with Iran, but are disregarding that this could happen and is not certain. It might be more effective in terms of proactive change to support the Canadian government re-opening diplomatic relations.

Councillor Larson: Motions to amend the first Resolved clause by replacing "aggression" with "diplomatic aggression" and adding "in the future" to the end of the clause.

Councillor Zidel: Doesn't understand diplomatic aggression as policy issues. Canada has aggressive policies diplomatically to Iran.

The amendment is declared unfriendly. Debate on the unfriendly amendment begins:

Councillor Rosentzveig: Aggression was an umbrella term; the amendment leaves out economic aggression.

Speaker: Councillor Larson is saying that military aggression has not happened and that "in the future" represents the possibility of it happening, but "diplomatic" shows what is actually happening. The phrase "and economic" is added to the proposed amendment. (It now says "Canadian diplomatic and economic aggression" instead of "Canadian aggression".)

VP Reid-Fraser: She feels like we are going to be biased anyways on fact and what had actually happened, and thinks defining terms might be a restriction.

Councillor Farnan: Asks if the motion is still on the floor.

Speaker: It is being discussed now.

Councillor Subhani: Canada has not taken aggressive military action. NATO can have ships sent to that area and Canada is part of NATO so military action has been taken (not aggressive action though).

Councillor Larson: Clarifies the amendment, saying it talks about the current policy that Canada has in place. This clarifies the motion for people who aren't here (at the Council meeting) and won't understand the question.

VP Cooper: Says the clarification does not make sense, but she would be willing to add another Resolved clause calling for SSMU to lobby for opening diplomatic ties, which is in the best interests of the Iranian Students' Society.

Councillor Zidel: Wants to revamp the entire clause to say that SSMU likes a diplomatic approach to conflicts, taking a non-military line.

Councillor Larson: Does not disagree but that would be a separate Resolved clause, this clause still needs clarification.

There is a motion to move to the previous question, which is seconded and clearly passes.

Voting begins on the unfriendly amendment. **The unfriendly amendment passes and will be adopted in the motion.** The first Resolved clause now reads:

“Resolved, that the SSMU firmly oppose Canadian diplomatic and economic aggression towards Iran and oppose any military action that may be taken by Canada alone or in concert with other countries in the future;”

Councillor Farnan: Motions to amend to remove “military action” and *“Resolved, that the SSMU oppose all ties between McGill University and any military efforts, including investments in military contractors and weapons manufacturers, weapons research, and research for government agencies that contributes to military action;”* in regards to a student at the GA who pointed out the past and future issue. This amendment makes the motion less offensive for people who have dedicated their lives to their country.

The amendment is declared unfriendly. Debate begins on the unfriendly amendment:

Councillor Farnan: Speaks in favour of the amendment saying the existing language is offensive, oppressive, and hurtful to students who may currently be involved in the military.

Councillor Steward-Kannigan: Speaks against the amendment, saying that opposing this section of the motion is opposing the motion as a whole. It makes more sense for people who disagree to just to vote against it.

Councillor Larson: Supports the amendment and points out that even though we are not in a wartime where we are directly in conflict, there is always the question of the university's place in society. For example, if medical students are going to work on helping people. States that not all military involvement is bad.

Councillor Giannakakis: Agrees with the amendment. In addition, the military could have humanitarian consequences. It is the government that will make a decision which will then be carried out by the military.

Councillor Nasr: Is interested in amending to the motion to say "aggressive military efforts".

VP Dinel: Is in favour of this amendment as it is important to note that not all of McGill's partnerships are negative. For example, they were involved in putting out flyers in Iraq.

Councillor Nam: Thinks either "negative" or "aggressive" should be added to the motion to make it more clear and less general.

VP Szpejda: This could be offensive to people who work in the military whose job it is to protect us; it is their job to defend Canada. Also, if we're opposed to all military connections, one of the most accessible education opportunities is through the military, and they have just voted to support accessible education.

Councillor Southey: Motions to move to the previous question. The motion is seconded and clearly passes.

Voting begins on the unfriendly amendment. The amendment passes and will be adopted to the motion. **The phrase "military action" and the second Resolved clause will be removed.**

Debate on the motion as a whole resumes:

Councillor Georges: Asks if the movers can provide Council with other information on McGill's military involvement aside from the Wordpress account "Demilitarize McGill". Some information is from 2010, 2002, 2006, Dr. Frost. Are there more external resources to add legitimacy?

Councillor Chaim: Would like to say that, when talking about opposing any military involvement, people need to realize that some of most important inventions and discoveries come from the military. Engineering and science students can have the opportunity to work in research for medicine and weapons, which translate to other areas (for example, sonar radio).

Councillor Giannakakis: Military intervention starts with the government. It is the government that makes the decision to get involved, not the military itself. The phrasing is aimed at the military, yet the decision itself is something entirely different.

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Councillor Rosentzweig: Speaks to the resolved clause that was just amended, bringing up the role of the university – should we take money from defense contracts and should we be doing all of this research into weapons? He thinks the university should work on technologies that are of use to everyone.

Councillor Larson: Motions to divide the question.

Speaker: That would have to be done in voting. Points out that it would be easier to combine the Resolve clauses, and could then motion to divide the question once the debate is closed. Before the vote is taken, clauses 1 and 3, and clauses 2 and 4 could be combined, and then they could be voted on separately. However, they can no longer be amended during voting procedures.

Debate on the motion continues:

VP Reid-Fraser: Regarding what is happening at McGill, she hasn't gone through all of the information yet, but people are working on it right now. More current stuff is happening and she is trying to go through it now and can elaborate on it later.

Councillor Subhani: Wants to address VP Reid-Fraser's point regarding research. He says that out of the money spent on military research, people cannot determine what money goes towards weapons and what money goes towards other areas of research that help society. The ethical investments motion passed, so if you support McGill's involvement in the military, you can't define what the money is invested in.

Councillor Steward-Kannigan: Says that people can find out what McGill is researching through access to information requests.

President Redel: Says that is not what he is asking.

Councillor Steward-Kannigan: There are 5 or 6 professors at McGill in Engineering working in shock force, as well as professors working in weapons, hyper spectral imaging, etc., all of which have military implications.

Councillor Zidel: Wants to see the documents on this and cannot vote until he does so. He is surprised by what Steward-Kannigan has said and wants to know more on the Iranian issue. He brings up the constituents who may not know what is going on. The reasons issues like this come up at GAs is because people who attend Gas tend to know what is going on. People cannot be knowledgeable on issues they don't know about.

Councillor Chaim: Motions to table the motion indefinitely until more information is provided. This motion seconded.

Voting begins and the motion passes. **The Motion Regarding Opposition to Canadian Military Involvement in Iran is tabled indefinitely.**

Councillor Southey: Motions to recess.

Speaker: This will be entertained after the old business is finished.

d. **Motion Regarding Plan Nord**

Speaker: Introduces the new Nursing Representative: Shane Anzovino. He is in his 3rd year of Nursing and was elected last week to replace Vanessa Lauzon

Councillor Anzovino reads the motion:

“Resolved, that the SSMU actively oppose Plan Nord as a form of continued colonialism on unseeded indigenous lands,

Resolved, that the SSMU work to support indigenous communities in their resistance to Plan Nord by striving to form solidarity networks with these communities and others that already work with them,

Resolved, that the SSMU do this by allocating resources, holding educational events, producing informative materials, and pressuring the McGill administration to divest from mining (and other) companies profiting from Plan Nord.”

Debate on the motion begins:

VP Szpejda: Is curious why the movers were not asked to add any Whereas clauses.

Speaker: The motion was submitted from the floor a few minutes before the deadline (3 hours before the GA) as a one-clause motion. They were sent the full motion with the Resolved clauses after the deadline. The Resolved clauses were added at the GA as friendly amendments, but it is not possible to add Whereas clauses as amendments. It is possible that the motion can be withdrawn, restructured, and resubmitted as a Council motion with two councillor signatures. This way the Whereas clauses could be added with communication with the movers.

Councillor Nasr: Motions to amend “pressuring” to “lobbying”.

Speaker: Council will discuss every amendment without giving it either friendly or unfriendly status as this motion was moved from the floor.

Councillor Chaim: Motions to move to the previous question. The motion is seconded and clearly passes.

Voting on the amendment begins. **The amendment passes and is adopted to the motion.** The final Resolved clause now reads:

“Resolved, that the SSMU do this by allocating resources, holding educational events, producing informative materials, and lobbying the McGill administration to divest from mining (and other) companies profiting from Plan Nord.”

Thursday, November 1, 2012

VP Cooper: Points out that “unceded” was spelled wrong. This is automatically amended and added to the motion.

Councillor Farnan: Asks who councillors should direct questions to since the movers are not present.

Speaker: Can ask the room.

Councillor Farnan: In terms of allocating resources, what does this motion entail in terms of budgets?

President Redel: If there are financial allocations, the VP External has a large budget which can go to projects such as this, and can hire researchers or get volunteers.

Speaker: The vote from the consultative forum on this issue was 44 in favour, none against, and 2 abstentions.

VP Szpejda: Is curious as to the fact that McGill has a Mining program, and wants to know how it is viewed to ask McGill to un-invest in its own students.

Councillor Rosentzveig: McGill has investments in 14 countries benefitting Plan Nord and has connections to a law firm lobbying for Plan Nord. The motion doesn't involve all mining, it involves specific mining for specific reasons such as unceded land and environmental reasons.

VP Szpejda: This is unclear, why is it not in whereas clauses? Council cannot pass this motion on to the student body without clarification.

Councillor Southey: Regarding accessible education, Quebec has the largest debt of any province, and people need to be aware that Plan Nord is one of the initiatives Quebec is using to gain revenue. People need to take into account that this motion would have many effects, including implications for accessible education.

Councillor Larson: The motion poses questions; people know it will affect the world we live in. Students will go get jobs involving Plan Nord and this will help students now. A more positive motion would be to look at what programs McGill offers to its students.

Councillor Georges: Council has gone through pretty external motions so far, but this motion is not supported with external resources. Council needs to vote on issues that affect the student body as a whole. Voting on this without lots of resources is sketchy and irresponsible.

Councillor Steward-Kannigan: There is no reason that you can't look up information on your own time; it's part of your responsibility as a councillor.

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Councillor Zidel: In response to the Iran issue, you could take a year long course on that issue. People should not assume we have the time to do all this research, but we can vote and take a stance.

President Redel: If you say you need to do research on both sides, there is currently a lot of research against Plan Nord. He would encourage research to be brought up on both sides .

Councillor Southey: Motions to table the motion until the next GA or indefinitely. Because of these issues it should be tabled for the now, although this could change with a change in government.

VP Cooper: Debates the motion to table, saying she thinks it is good that students are interested in this issue and want to research it. Wants to know if councillors could bring it back with Whereas clauses.

Councillor Zidel: Asks if it is possible for people to send documents that might be relevant to council beforehand, and to have speakers at council.

Speaker: Yes, anything can be done.

Councillor Nam: Asks if it would be okay to bring the motion back to the movers, maybe by email, and get them to refine the motion before it is brought back to Council. Motions to table the motion and to suggest to that it is brought back to the GA after it is hashed out so that the movers can bring back a full motion to next GA.

Councillor Georges: It should set a precedent that if we want to debate important issues, it needs to be done properly. She did do research, and when she searched Iran's military involvement and research on the subject, the only source she found was the Wordpress site. A motion should have more than one source, and more than just a Wordpress account.

Speaker: The motion is not unconstitutional, it can be submitted to Steering Committee. It is up to Council to decide the democratic elements of this motion.

Councillor Farnan: Regarding the allocation of resources, if the motion passes, would it be included in external mandate immediately? What is the mandate?

VP Reid-Fraser: Because the motion is related to an issue that is largely external to McGill it makes sense that it would fall under external affairs.

Councillor Farnan: He backs the motion, says it is a lot clearer now and has reasonable arguments. It is something that could fall under the portfolio of the VP External and is something she might be dealing with normally, so it is good for SSMU to discuss this.

A motion is made to move to the previous question. It is seconded and clearly passes.

Voting on the motion begins. With 18 for, 8 against, and no abstentions, **the Motion Regarding Plan Nord has been tabled.**

President Redel: Motions to recess for 15 minutes to eat. The motion clearly passes and the meeting enters a brief recess.

10) New Business

a. Announcement of New Councillors to SSMU Committees

Councillors Southey, Mossallanejad, Lubendo, Steward-Kannigan, and Anzovino have been elected to committees. They will be processed by the next meeting.

b. Motion Regarding CKUT Fall 2012 Referendum Question Endorsement

VP Cooper reads the motion:

“*Whereas*, CKUT provides McGill students with news, music and arts & culture programming, radio training, journalism experience, internships, employment, and with many former student members going on to successful careers in journalism;

Whereas, radio is a public good and all members and non-members have access to the airwaves as listeners, and may attend events CKUT organizes on and off McGill campus, including many co-sponsored festivals and concerts;

Whereas, in its 25 year history CKUT has been consistently voted the #1 or #2 radio station in Montreal in the Mirror's Best of Montreal Readers Poll;

Whereas, since 1988 the fees that McGill undergraduate students pay to support CKUT have remained unchanged at \$4.00 each semester for full time students and \$2.00 per semester for part time students;

Whereas, \$4.00 in 1988, when indexed to the rate of inflation, is worth more than \$7.00 in 2012;

Whereas, the costs of running a campus-community radio station increase each year, although opt-outs have decreased CKUT's revenues;

Whereas, the SSMU's Constitution mandates the SSMU to “support the student groups that make up civic life in the McGill community, while providing services to strengthen the educational, cultural, environmental, political and social conditions of our membership”;

Whereas, Radio CKUT is a significant student-initiated, student-run, student-supported and student-controlled organization existing on McGill's downtown campus since 1988;

Whereas, it is an official policy of the SSMU to support student life on campus;

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Resolved, that the SSMU Legislative Council endorse a “yes” vote to CKUT’s one dollar fee increase referendum question in the Fall 2012 Referendum period.

Resolved, that this endorsement will be announced in the SSMU listserv and posted prominently on the SSMU website during campaign period.”

VP Cooper: She is on the Yes Committee for CKUT, asks if she has to leave the meeting.

Speaker: She can stay for the debate but has to leave for voting.

Councillor Larson: Has a question about SSMU Council endorsing referendum questions, wants to know what that means.

VP Cooper: It is important because CKUT is an ISG so SSMU has a mandate to support it. It’s cool when SSMU endorses motions as it gives them legitimacy.

Councillor Georges: Wants to know if any student papers are supporting this motion.

Councillor Farnan: CKUT is cool and it has his backing.

VP Reid-Fraser: Newspapers are independent of SSMU as they are independent student groups. This decision is for SSMU as council.

Councillor Larson: Says that since there are people on council who are not VPs and have different mandates from SSMU, she wants to know why this issue doesn’t just go to the Executive. For example, she represents Music undergraduates.

Councillor Zidel: Says that anything that happens under SSMU matters because other groups can’t really do anything on their own (like Music), and these groups will still have an opinion on the issue.

Councillor Subhani: Wonders why SSMU wants to enforce this since the entire student body will have to vote anyways. He wants to know if supporting the Yes Committee is the same as passing the motion. He doesn’t see the purpose if both questions are being proposed to entire student body.

Councillor Zidel: Says that this makes sense, because if there is a Yes Committee there can also be a No Committee.

VP Szpejda: SSMU represents all students, wants to know if we aware of a Yes and a No Committee. Clearly students feel both ways, if SSMU picks one how is it representing all students?

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Councillor Larson: Building on Councillor Subhani's points, she wants to know if it is subversive to support a Yes Committee since this is not supporting all students and doesn't give them freedom and space to make up their minds.

VP Reid-Fraser: There is not a No Committee from what she understands. CKUT as a resource for students is awesome and they haven't increased their fee in a long time. This shows that now their ability to provide these services is in question, and they need to be able to broadcast these services in the best way possible.

Councillor Georges: The goal is not to question CKUT, the goal is whether or not SSMU should take a position on this issue. If there are Yes and No Committees, obviously students don't all agree on the same issues.

Councillor Zidel: Agrees that SSMU shouldn't take stand on issue but it can, so if Councillors don't think they should take a stand they should just vote against it.

Councillor Chaim: Says in reference to the accessibility of education motion that this is still an ancillary fee, and SSMU has a mandate against it, even if it is small.

Councillor Rosentzveig: That is not entirely true because "ancillary" usually applies to administrative fees. If students want student services they can opt in and pay for them.

VP Cooper: The opt-out system was implemented to make it accessible for students who can't afford it. The act of Council supporting the Yes vote doesn't mean that everyone in SSMU has to vote for it, it just lends CKUT endorsement as an organization.

Councillor Georges: SSMU taking positions on issues doesn't sit right with constituents and alienates students with different opinions.

VP Szpejda: Reminds people to keep in mind that the referendum to make fees non-opt-outable failed last year, so there is no support for this.

Councillor Larson: Motions to move to the previous question. The motion is seconded and clearly passes.

Not everyone voted, so there is a re-vote. VP Cooper leaves the room.

Voting begins on the motion. With 11 for, 11 against, and 4 abstentions, **the Motion Regarding CKUT Fall 2012 Referendum Question Endorsement does not pass.**

VP Cooper is called back into the room.

- c. **Motion Regarding M-SERT Fall 2012 Referendum Question Endorsement**
Councillor Rosentzveig reads the motion:

Thursday, November 1, 2012

“Whereas, the McGill Student Emergency Response Team (M-SERT) is the only established student-run volunteer service that has been providing first-response services to McGill students, events, and the Montreal community since 1999 and is one of the SSMU's 21 student-run student services;

Whereas, the SSMU is mandated to primarily support its student clubs and services, and the SSMU Constitution preamble states: “The Students' Society ... shall provide a wide variety of services to its different constituencies. The Society shall strive to provide excellence and quality of service at all times, and shall commit to enhance the quality and scope of these services;”

Whereas, M-SERT has been expanding its coverage for the last 7 years from just upper-residence on weekends from 11PM-7AM to all downtown residences, every night, from 6pm-6am:

Whereas, M-SERT covers events including, but not limited to, intramural hockey, frosh, faculty association events, convocation, and events in the Montreal community;

Whereas, M-SERT plans to continue to expand coverage requiring more equipment, recruiting, and training;

Whereas, M-SERT has independently generated approximately sixty percent (60%) of their operating costs through their Red Cross first-aid courses;

Whereas, M-SERT is currently financed by a \$.25 fee per student per semester as part of the “Safety Network” fee within the SSMU base fee;

Whereas, M-SERT requires an increase in the fee of \$.50 to cover the current costs as well as the planned expansion;

Resolved, that the SSMU Legislative Council officially endorse M-SERT's 50-cent fee increase referendum in the Fall 2012 Referendum period,

Resolved, that this endorsement is announced in the SSMU listserv and displayed prominently on the SSMU website during Fall 2012 referendum campaign period.”

Debate on the motion begins:

Councillor Larson: Says that everyone has an opinion on things in general, motions to move to the previous question. The motion is seconded and clearly passes.

VP Cooper leaves the room.

Council enters voting on the motion. Motion to move to previous question is negated by a motion to reconsider, which is seconded and clearly passes. Voting on the motion does not occur.

Debate on the motion resumes:

President Redel: The difference between independent student groups and student services is that if this doesn't pass it can have a negative impact on the SSMU budget as a whole.

Councillor Rosentzveig: This is vital on campus. M-SERT literally saves lives, does things like going into residences and dealing with drunk kids.

Councillor Chaim: Point of personal preference, corrects the pronunciation of Councillor Rosentzveig's name.

Councillor Georges: Points out that M-SERT is non-opt-outable.

President Redel: Clubs and services are the most important part of SSMU. They act in favor of the constituents, but also in favour of SSMU.

VP Dinel: Everyone should support and vote yes. Motions to move to the previous question. The motion is seconded and clearly passes.

Voting on the motion begins. The motion clearly passes and **the Motion Regarding M-SERT Fall 2012 Referendum Question Endorsement is adopted.**

VP Cooper re-enters the room.

d. Motion Regarding Creation of the Student Advocacy Resource Committee

VP Dinel reads the motion:

“Whereas, during the 2011-2012 year, the Independent Student Advocacy Service (ISAS) was approved for interim club status which was confirmed by Council;

Whereas, this group was created in order to help guide, empower, and advocate for the needs of McGill students;

Whereas, members of both the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 SSMU Executive have shown interest in such a group and their ability to provide neutral and free information and guidance to students, working with elected officials to improve access to the correct channels;

Whereas, it is a goal of the SSMU to promote service, leadership and representation and to engage and empower all students;

Whereas, the SSMU can provide valuable support to this organization for the betterment of its activities, so that it may reach and serve more students and be held adequately accountable;

Resolved, that ISAS shall become a Committee of Council,

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Resolved, that the ISAS be renamed “the Student Advocacy Resource Committee (SARC)”,

Resolved, that the Committee be subject and accountable to its terms of reference,

Resolved, that the SARC be supervised by the Vice-President University Affairs,

Resolved, that this committee be given a trial period ending March 15, 2012.”

VP Dinel Cedes her time to guest speaker David Berebault from the faculty of Medicine, who will present the motion.

David Berebault: Gives some insight into his background: he was last year's Council president and his mandate was to increase advocacy on campus of first years. This project grew into its own service outside of Council, called the Independent Advocacy Council. It is neutral, nonbiased, non judgemental, and helps students who want to bring something to campus but don't know how to do it. It does this by helping them formulate their case, do research, and find pathways to get the case resolved. They do not act as lawyers, legal advice, or a legal clinic. They deal with things regarding systemic change, such as wanting to change the Green Book, etc. They do not take the place of the pathways, just help students find the pathways. SARC has been restructured with VP Dinel's help and hopes to become a committee under SSMU so they can drop “advocacy” and become “stewards” by helping students with work. They refer to students as requesters, not clients. They have 2 hour meetings with requesters to find allies. It requires a lot of effort to take on cases, so they help with the burden, bringing cases where they want to go. He says he is happy to take questions and that the Appendix explains the structure of the SARC Committee, which would be accountable to the oversight of the stewards.

Councillor Larson: Motions for a 5 minute question and answer period. The motion is seconded and clearly passes.

Councillor Larson: She wonders what the necessity for this committee is when councillors already have to bring constituents' issues to Council. She wants to know if constituents would get more help or less.

Berebault: SARC would never super cede or do a councillor's job. Individual councillors can't take on a large case load, and cases need to be developed so SARC would work intimately with councillors to bring their constituent's case forward and to show how the motion could move forward. In this way they would act as an aid team to councillors. Also, councillors can have different views of their mandates, and SARC would make sure that students who don't agree with the mandate are also given a voice. The group helps students if Council is unable or unwilling to help. SARC can't take every case; it has to work within SSMU equity norms and bylaws. Every case is a sensible case, but might be that of a minority, a student uncomfortable with working through the official channels right away, or students who might need someone who can give them a lot of their time.

Councillor Chaim: Asks if it is an interim club.

Berebault: Yes, they have not applied for club status.

Councillor Chaim: The ISAS has been trying to link students with councillors. They have only had operations from this year onwards since they were granted club status at the end of last year. They are still trying to figure out the structure and have 2 ongoing cases (1 is currently stalled). They will be effective and need the trial period to give them the time to figure out things out and to give them the resources to do the things they need to get done.

Councillor Larson: Motions to extend the question and answer period by 3 minutes.
Speaker: Yes, with a one minute answer period.

Councillor Larson: Thinks that the reasoning for the SARC may be because students are unsure of which channels to move through. This is a communication issue on the part of student associations. How would the SARC communicate that and make itself available?

Berebault: The group is not connected just with SSMU and student associations. The idea is to get their name out there and make it noticed, hold office hours, and make the “brand” obvious on campus. He does not think students have an issue knowing that student associations exist. One method is making sure communication works actively; once students know the ISAS/SARC exist to do the nitty gritty work of helping them work with faculty, administration, etc. it will be able to function more effectively.

Councillor Larson: Wants to know what “the headache” for councillors doing their elected job is, and what is the gap that Berebault sees.

Berebault: Councillors are incredibly busy and are necessarily going to have certain positions on issues. A resource like SSMU should provide a neutral resource which helps students if they feel as if their elected representatives are not serving their personal perspectives. Secondly, a lot of students have the idea that they feel lost in the shuffle of student associations. The ISAS allows students to remain proactive while issues are prioritized within associations.

VP Szpejda: Imagines that this year, since the ISAS would be going from a club to a committee, that Berebault is assuming the Executive (of the club) would assume the committee positions. How would this happen in the future?

Berebault: There are different stewards to represent different issues. There is no Executive because everyone is considered part of the Executive. They would elect people to represent them on the SARC Committee from those who are nominated. Any changes the working committee wants to make would have to be approved by Council, as it has the final say over all amendments.

Debate on the motion begins:

Thursday, November 1, 2012

Councillor Zidel: Supports the spirit of the motion but cannot vote for it. He feels like the structure is forced on SSMU and that it seems like an unsustainable goal. They need to do better if they are going to provide advocacy; it should be a university situation. Council could maybe create a working committee on how it could have a better advocacy group.

Councillor Larson: She is still confused about the place for this within the structure. Students go to their councillors and are pointed in the right direction. Also, she does not want to have to work with students from other faculties.

Councillor Chaim: Wants to see if ISAS can reach out more. Would this be better done as McGill club where they can book places and get funding?

Councillor Rosentzveig: Appreciates the idea of a “one stop shop” for advocacy as the structure is daunting and complicated, leading people to not even try to navigate it. He supports the trial period until March to see how it goes.

Speaker: Suggests a friendly amendment to extend the trial period to 2013.

VP Dinel: Motions to amend to extend the trial period to 2013.

The friendly amendment is adopted and **the trial period is extended to 2013.**

Councillor Larson: It is difficult to navigate through the bureaucracy, but adding a new committee doesn't make it easier. This committee would be very different, and she is still uncertain as to how it would work.

VP Cooper: The neutrality aspect is concerning because she does not know if this is possible. Students already have stances and opinions, so she would rather see people taking stands on issues instead and getting involved that way.

VP Dinel: She will be voting in favour as she sees this as an important resource to students and a way of disseminating information. Asks councillors to give it a trial run to see what it can do during the year because it has not had enough time to show its potential.

VP Szpejda: Because this is a fairly large and unique committee, it is important that if it is given a trial run, we have to be fully committed to the trial run. Are there 3 councillors who are interested in running it?

Straw poll: Are there councillors interested in sitting on seats of committee? (3 are needed.)

By a show of hands, it is clear that there would be enough councillors interested in sitting on this committee.

VP Dinel and Councillor Rosentzveig: If we turned down everything that is complicated, we would be operating very differently. Everything requires a decent amount of work to become what it is today. The opportunity to grow and work

through issues is what is important for trial period. Do not see any negatives with giving it a trial run, and if there is a positive outcome, it is worth giving it a shot.

Councillor Dziadyk: In response to VP Cooper's comment on neutrality, there are times where councillors will vote against some of their constituents, so there is a value in having someone who is biased the other way.

Councillor Giannakakis: Agrees with passing this motion as she sees it more as an advising committee that will help students move through the channels of SSMU. She thinks the use of "advocacy" in the name is bothering Council, since it is the students who are doing the advocating and the committee would be aiding the students in moving through SSMU.

Councillor Zidel: Does not think the positives will outweigh the negatives. He does not see this as a sustainable plan (there are "bad seeds") and does not think this is the right path. Students change and so does the university over time, so this committee should be partnered with the university. If the motion fails, he wants to create a working group to figure out a way to approach this.

Councillor Rosentzveig: The only way to find out is to try it. If we think it's sustainable we'll try it; if not we will amend it or get rid of it. He wants the committee to be able to get started working.

VP Dinel: It is currently working as an interim club; as a committee under her portfolio it would report to her and to Council. It would change its structure: it has a lot of protocol in place, has taken on cases, and has an oath. They rewrote this to fit better with Council, and they do have extensive rules which govern how they operate at working group level.

President Redel: In response to Zidel, he does not follow the logic on the "bad seed" comment; he thinks it is alluding to bad people. We are not allowing things to float through our government, it is not like it is going to be able to pop things in or supersede GAs and Council. It will just bring more things to Council that we can discuss. Councillor Rosentzveig made a good point, it would be helping people bring issues to us so we can deal with them.

Councillor Larson: From the perspective of the SSMU Executive, who are more busy, the ISAS would still be bringing people to the same place. Why aren't we addressing issue of students not understanding student government within the faculties and within SSMU? Should not be teaching students to go through SSMU for faculty issues.

Councillor Georges: Asks the ISAS if there is an issue with them having too many cases.

VP Dinel: This was already answered. The ISAS has just started so they have only taken on a few cases.

Councillor Zidel: Clarifies that the seed comment referred to the structure of the good people behind it, sorry if it was taken out of context, thinks structure is not ready for the ISAS to get a trial period

Councillor Farnan: Motions to move to the previous question. The motion is seconded and clearly passes.

Voting begins on the motion as a whole. With 15 for, 5 against, and 5 abstentions, the motion passes and **the Motion Regarding Creation of the Student Advocacy Resource Committee is adopted.**

e. Motion Regarding Work on the McGill Education Summit

Councillor Dziadyk reads the motion:

“Whereas, the Quebec government intends to hold a summit on education at some as-yet-undetermined point in the next several months, as part of its election promises and following the cancellation of the proposed tuition hike;

Whereas, this summit will likely be a broad examination of topics related to universities in this province, including issues such as funding, governance, research, teaching and the role of post-secondary education in society;

Whereas, the SSMU wishes to consult a broad base of its membership in leading up to the government summit, in order to reflect the diversity of views and needs that exist on this campus;

Whereas, TaCEQ, the Quebec-wide association that SSMU is a member of, has currently adopted the topics of: university financing, tuition fees and alternatives, research, financial aid and student debt, university governance, and the role of universities in society;

Whereas, the SSMU External Affairs Committee, and the SSMU Executive Committee, have discussed possible themes and process for a McGill summit at great length;

Resolved, that the SSMU conduct a broad consultation of its membership, in partnership with Faculty student associations and other members of the McGill community, and produce an initial reflection document by the end of the Fall 2012 semester,

Resolved, that the SSMU adopt an initial list of the following topics on which to consult its membership:

- < University financing
- < Tuition fees and alternatives
- < Research
- < Financial Aid and Student Debt
- < University governance
- < The role of university in society

- ◁ Out-of-province and international student needs
- ◁ Anglophone students in Quebec
- ◁ Quality of education
- ◁ Structural barriers to post-secondary education.”

Councillor Chaim: Motions to move to the previous question. As no one wishes to speak, the motion is seconded and clearly passes.

Voting begins on the motion in its entirety. The motion passes unanimously and **the Motion Regarding Work on the McGill Education Summit is adopted.**

11) Reports by Committees

a. Interest Group Committee

VP Cooper: She is excited with the committee generally and about how club processes can work. Last year it worked on filtering clubs through the interim status process as it is hard to see how sustainable a club can be from its cover letter and member list. This process is going to be more relaxed but it will be made clear that it is a probationary period.

Councillor Zidel: Motions to adopt the report. The motion clearly passes **and the report of the Interest Group Committee is adopted.**

b. Executive Committee

President Redel: Apologizes for not structuring the report more clearly. Asks if people would like him to go through it. Since no one does, he stands for questions.

Councillor Larson: Has a question for VP Briggs about the PowerShift bus.

VP Reid-Fraser: Regarding the PowerShift bus, basically she had not received information that the funding committee had approved funding for it. She was stressed that she had not heard about this before funding. The second bus was half subsidized, and a float was in order to pay for the second half of the bus. They will get that back once they collect money from students.

Councillor Larson: Has a question for President Redel regarding the legal fees for M-SERT, wants to know why they had contracts.

VP Cooper: The contract is the one that Red Cross has for its instructors, which makes SSMU responsible for everything that any first aid responder does. It was negotiated to make this more clear, as currently it is unclear and not a great contract.

There is a motion to adopt which is duly seconded. The motion clearly passes and **the report of the Executive Committee is adopted.**

12) Reports by Executives

a. **VP University Affairs – Haley Dinel**

There is a new engineering senator, Nick Hill. He is in the process of getting started in his new committees. She stands for questions.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Said that he did not see this on Vibe.

VP Dinel: He must have just missed it, because it was posted.

b. **VP Clubs and Services – Allison Cooper**

Has been working on the club bank account form reform, making it easier to read. She is also working on freeing up room bookings, and is researching more space in general, for use of mini courses, etc.

Councillor Larson: Asks if VP Cooper is also on another committee.

VP Cooper: She is also on the Funding Committee, but was appointed after she wrote the report so it was not included.

c. **VP External – Robyn Reid-Fraser**

Apologizes that the report from TaCEQ was not available until today. She is available for other questions if people want to email her. She stands for questions, but there are none.

d. **VP Internal – Mike Szpejda**

Regarding Orientation, he has had his first OPG meeting (the group which oversees integrated orientation). There was a lot of constructive material, and they will be making a path for orientation after the sub-groups have met. He has received information on Orientation from the survey; there are 36 pages of answers so he will summarize this and send it out.

4 Floors, aside from the costume issues, went well. He thanked everyone who went and helped out. The Queens bus trip on Friday (the day after) was a great event. He thanked President Redel for his help with the trip. Next time, more advertising is needed, and maybe a venue closer to home.

VP Dinel: Asks about the status of exam time puppies.

VP Szpejda: The group from last time is available, but he is now looking into other options due to complaints with last year's group (such as that people weren't able to smuggle the puppies enough).

e. **VP Finance and Operations – JP Briggs**

The budget presentation was scheduled for today, apologizes because it was posted late. Everyone should have it well before next Council meeting. He has an update on the status of the budget process and will present it to the Executive next week, then send it on to councillors. Overall, everything is on track.

The Funding Report as of this date is a summary of the funding that has been approved by this committee. He stands for questions.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Points out that the Funding Committee is a strange and difficult job, but its decisions have a big influence on the constituents. He urges people to read the reports as feedback is appreciated.

Councillor Dziadyk: Asks what the numbers are for Gert's.

VP Briggs: Says he can send the number out, but he will have them for next Council meeting. Overall, Gert's is going well.

f. **President – Josh Redel**

The next Roaming Council will be in the Active Learning Classroom in the Education building at 6pm. They will be given quick tour for advancing education, as McGill does a lot of research in pedagogy. After this Roaming Council session, the next one will be in a residence.

The Presidents' Club had a really good meeting. There was talk of the memoranda of agreement, sports, etc.

The \$20 000 process of redoing governance documents has begun. The process is to go through all of the documents to make sure they are structurally and legally sound. They have been meeting with lawyers to go through the second draft of the constitution, which is ready to be passed on to committees.

Councillor Guan: Asks if the motion brainstorming meeting going to be happening in the same room (Lev Bukhman).

President Redel: He will email everyone in their GroupWise emails, but it will likely be next Thursday at 6 in the SSMU office.

Councillor Larson: Asks how to use GroupWise.

President Redel: There will be workshop on GroupWise at the next Council meeting.

The Legislative Council entered a recess at 10:07pm to enter into a Confidential Session. The gallery was emptied and microphones were turned off. The Council Meeting will be resumed for adjournment.

11) Adjournment

A motion to adjourn is seconded and clearly passes. **The meeting is adjourned at 10:44pm.**