

**Legislative Council Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University**

**1) Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:06pm by Chair Nizam.

**2) Attendance**

The attendance sheet was circulated around the room and signed by Council.

**3) Approval of the Minutes of Council – 2013.01.10**

Councillor Chaim: Motions to approve. The motion clearly passes **and the minutes of the 2013.01.10 meeting of the Legislative Council are adopted.**

**4) Adoption of the Agenda**

VP Dinel: Motions to add a Confidential Session after the Announcements portion of the agenda. She notes that it is necessary, but will be brief. The motion clearly passes **and a Confidential Session is added to the agenda, after the Announcements portion.**

Councillor Rosentzveig: Motions to adopt. The motion clearly passes **and the agenda is adopted.**

**5) Report of the Steering Committee**

President Redel: Stands for questions.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Motions to adopt. The motion clearly passes **and the report of the Steering Committee is adopted.**

**6) Guest Speakers – 5 minutes each, option to extend**

**a. Drew Love, Executive Director of Athletics**

He is at Council representing the Athletics and Recreation Department both here at the downtown campus and at MacDonalld Campus. They are going through the budgeting cycle and the reality is that they are in need of an increase in the athletics fee due to essentially inflationary factors. The increase is needed to continue offering the same level of services. They are only asking a 6% increase, and they have only had a \$1.50 increase in last six years, so they are below the inflationary rate. They may change and add to services as they are always trying to improve. They are coming to Council to ask this body to approve the language of a referendum question that would then go out to the student body as a whole. He is here to answer any questions and also to seek support for the Athletics and Recreation Department to take this question to the referendum.

**Questions:**

Councillor Rosentzveig: Are you aware of a memo put out by the PGSS who researched the fee increase? The memo states that McGill students already pay more than rest of Canadian universities, and more fees go to higher level programs that do not benefit all students. Do you have a response to that?

Love: He was not aware of the memo, but knows the questions because he helped

the PGSS get their information. It is important to know that the athletics fee is to provide services for students, although not all students choose to take advantage of them. McGill has more students doing intramurals and using the facilities than any other Canadian university. He is also curious what other universities are doing, as it is not a simple case of mathematics to decide fees since each group uses different fees and structures to get funding for its programs. When you have 7000 students in intramurals, 3000 people in the facility each day, and 850 varsity athletes trying to represent McGill, you have a wide base of students to support. There is participation beyond varsity sports such as the fan base, which is part of university culture. He is aware of what the PGSS is doing and will have further discussions with them. McGill does not have the highest fee; looking at calculations does not support all of their math.

VP Dinel: Motions to extend. The motion clearly passes and the speaking time is extended.

Councillor Zidel: As a follow-up, he reads from the memo and refers to the projected deficit of \$13 000. Why is there a large increase in the budget? He adds that it could be justified. Is part of the problem that other universities get more money from the university than McGill does?

Love: He does not have the memo in front of him, but here at McGill they are responsible for all maintenance and upkeep as well as staff and their benefits. He does not believe that the budget increase is more than inflationary. Budgets have changed for a variety of reasons, for example, one year only had  $\frac{11}{12}$  of a budget, and the MUNACA strike led to significant savings. A series events has allowed the budget to ride the crest of the fall, but we pay for virtually everything so we do the best we can to provide these services.

Councillor Rosentzveig: He notes that he is asking these questions so Love has a chance to respond. The picture that is painted is that whereas higher level athletes in higher levels of sports are more expensive (due to travelling, etc.), they pay a smaller percentage of the costs, but user fees non-opt-outable. This increases the cost of the facility and seems to be subsidizing higher level athletics.

Love: He does not think this is accurate. For example, students who pay intramurals are not significantly contributing to the overhead cost of the facility, which is the real cost. Varsity students contributed \$260 000 out of their own pockets to their own programs. This varies by program, for example, football only contributes \$65 out of their own pockets, but they have donors which bring in \$100 000s. Hockey has donor money to reduce fees as well. Some sports are market driven through ticket sales or are able to attract alumni support to successfully offset their costs, but this is not seen in the budget which can skew someone's first look at the budget.

As there are no more questions, Drew Love is thanked.

**b. Sue Laver, Director of the McGill Writing Centre**

The McGill Writing Center is only two years old. There have been a number of efforts to create a writing center, so she hopes this one is here to stay. They offer a tutorial service which provides individualized tutoring to students across the university, and they are getting excellent feedback. Students find the service genuinely helpful, although they have two complaints: they want more tutors and for the service open for more hours. The writing center is trying to provide this to students. They are offering small group work hops on a variety of topics and want to be able to offer these year round. They need a secure, stable base fund to hire and train tutors to develop the workshops that students are looking for. She is asking for support for the language of this motion.

**Questions:**

Councillor Zidel: Why is this not built into the university's budget? It is a slippery precedent to set if we are providing a fund for something that should be paid for by the university.

Laver: This would be better answered by the central administration. The writing center did receive a small, temporary seed fund. The writing center is also unusual as it has a self-financing mandate and is mandated to offer courses to the general public. They are starting to launch these to help support services through the McGill Writing Center. There are a variety of models out there for funding at different universities. There is a push to diversify funding and, like at other universities, they had talked about an ancillary fee a long time ago at Steering Committee and this seems to be the appropriate juncture to pursue this.

Councillor Larson: What is your current student capacity that you are operating at, and how much would the creation of the fund allow this to increase by?

Laver: Last year they had 900 appointments and they are on track to use that number again. They are at capacity rather than need. Given the number of students who want more hours and tutors, she anticipates that they could easily double the number with the necessary facilities. They are somewhat limited by space but are looking into other options around campus. They are also partnering with graduate and post-doctoral studies to launch new services for graduate students, which will free up hours for undergraduates. They want a service dedicated to graduate tutorials, to free up time for undergrads. The tutors are students, so part of the fund would go to support students and give them experience. There is no concrete number but the demand is high.

Councillor Lam: Motions to extend. The motion clearly passes and the speaking time is extended.

Councillor Lam: How are student tutors trained? What background do they come from? How do you recruit students, is it done through work study?

Laver: We ask students to apply through work study as often as possible. Writing is

often not recognized as an area of expertise, but we are looking for people who have been in an instructional role in teaching writing and have experience tutoring writing, working at a writing center, or teaching writing intensive courses. They have been lucky by having tutors who did not need a lot of training, but they need to be taught what the center does and does not do. Tutors are required to take notes on their sessions and identify problems. Tutors are taught to understand that they are there to assist the students, not to edit and proofread students' work. Students do not improve that way; instead tutors model some ways that they could improve and teach them how to use these skills in things they write later on. They see improvement in students who make return visits. They have interest from people such as Ann Turner from the Internships Office and the AUS Essay Writing Center to work together to create a tutor training program to spread the wealth around. The more students involved, the better.

Additionally, the writing center really needs an SSMU representative. They have an advisory committee and would love to have someone on board.

Sue Laver is thanked.

**c. Lilith Wyatt, Sustainability Projects Fund Coordinator**

She is here to ask for support to go to the referendum this semester regarding the renewal of the Sustainability Projects Fund. The fund has been around for three years; it was passed in Spring 2010. She comes to Council once a semester to update Council on the fund's activities. The projects have been led half by students and half by staff (including administration), and 90% of the projects are collaborative. The impacts of the fund are so far and wide-ranging: over 100 student jobs have been created, startup companies have been created, courses have been earned through projects, they are producing food, saving water, and more. They are doing a few kinds of assessment leading up to the referendum. The first is three year follow-up report on the projects and their impacts. They are sending a survey to everyone who participated which will be made public at the end of February. They are also convening an arms-length review committee made up of four members (one is representing SSMU). The report will be published on February 4<sup>th</sup> and will be done to inform the referendum. The Office of Internal Audit is also working with the SPF to review the fund, and will be made public along with the three year report.

In terms of the referendum question, they are working on finalizing it and will be coming back to Council on February 7<sup>th</sup> because the ground is shifting based on the university's budget and this fee is conditional on administrative matching. Therefore the question might change a little bit between now and then. There will be more information before the next Council meeting and it will be formally brought to Council then.

There are no questions and Lilith Wyatt is thanked.

There is a two minute recess.

**d. Queen Arsem-O'Malley, Daily Publications Society Director and Nicholas Editor in Chief**

She is here to ask for SSMU Council's endorsement for the DPS referendum questions. The DPS publishes both papers as well as running two websites and mobile apps. It has been on campus since 1911 (with the Daily) and offers alternative angles on sports, science and technology, etc. Their work has been recognized nationally and employees have gone on to work for CBC, the National, and other news corporations. They teach students many skills, including how to write, edit, report, take videos, and broadcast radio.

Another speaker from the DPS presents about Le Délit. It is important to have a francophone paper at an anglophone university. Like SSMU Council, they are mandated to give all students a voice, so this endorsement is consistent with SSMU's mandate of representing all students.

Arsem-O'Malley continues on to say that McGill is lucky to have such diverse media on campus, especially since it does not offer a journalism program. She adds that this endorsement is not just a formality; it is needed for the DPS to continue to exist.

**Questions:**

Councillor Georges: She has heard different things regarding payment. Do writers and editors get paid for their work?

Arsem-O'Malley: Writers and editors get paid in honoraria, but they cannot pay contributors. Compared to universities of comparable sizes and with a similar frequency of publications, DPS writers and editors are paid very little compared to other universities. Editors for full sections are paid \$290 a month and half-section editors are paid \$145 per month. The reason they are paid is because they work 40 hours a week and people cannot afford not to be paid with such a large time commitment. In reality, they only make a few dollars an hour.

Councillor Larson: Motions to extend. The motion clearly passes and the speaking time is extended.

Councillor Larson: Can you elaborate on how more of campus can be involved in the publication?

Arsem-O'Malley: All types of writing have some kind of bias. For the Daily, we have meetings for sections where students can pitch ideas to us. In terms of structure, we have it in our constitution to bring forward referenda, so students can propose changes to the constitution.

Councillor Farnan: Asks for clarification regarding endorsements. Are they specific to the DPS or do endorsements apply to the individual papers?

Arsem-O'Malley: All endorsements are to support the DPS.

Councillor Larson: How do you feel you stand on campus? Do you think you reach everyone, or monopolize them?

Arsem-O'Malley: It would be impossible for any publication to reach all students, but the DPS does have a wide reach. This is why it is important to have diverse campus media, so more voices can be heard. The most important thing is to have an open platform for people to speak and have a voice, but if we lose this referendum, 80% of French students will not have a voice.

Both representatives from the DPS are thanked.

**e. Chris Bangs, Political Campaigns Coordinator**

He thanks Council for having him. He is here to talk about Divest McGill, a group of students and alumni working to divest from tar sands, fossil fuels and Plan Nord. He is responsible for bringing this forward and will be bringing this to the meeting of Council on February 1<sup>st</sup>. He shares the brief he has made on the social injury of fossil fuels, and is looking for public comment. It would be great if councillors could take it back to their constituents and see what they think. They have endorsements from the AUS already and will be bringing it to other student organizations. They would love to have help if anyone is looking to get involved. He can be contacted through his email address: [bangs.christopher@gmail.com](mailto:bangs.christopher@gmail.com).

**Questions:**

Councillor Larson: She thanks him for the work he has done on the document. Her comment is that she saw only one side of the issue represented. She thinks students would like to see an analysis of the pros and cons, for example the economic reasons why Canada may be pursuing these interests. It might be good for students to see the whole issue. She would also like to see ways that McGill could invest in green energy instead.

Chair Nizam: Notes that this time is for questions.

Bangs: Thanks Councillor Larson for her comments and adds that the committee requires a brief on social injury so economic benefits are not required. He is pleased with the reaction that has been given on campus; the AUS voted strongly in favour, showing strong support for a more well-rounded response to sustainability. They are now discussing how to move forward. The committee does not have the power to recommend that the Investment Committee invest in certain areas, they can only ask it to divest. However, they have been told that the Investment Committee is open to suggestions. They would love to move forward with the idea to make McGill more sustainable.

As there are no more questions, Chris Bangs is thanked.

- f. **Ian Simmie (in place of Jana Luker, Executive Director of Student Services)**  
Simmie says Luker apologizes for her absence; she is at the hospital but really wanted to be at Council. He introduces himself as one of the directors of Student Services, so he is familiar with the information Luker wanted to share with Council. He may not have all the answers, but he will try his best and councillors can follow-up with Luker at a later time.

For the last three years there has not been a fee increase for Student Services, so there are inflationary increases that need to be made because 80% of the budget goes to staff's salaries. They are also dealing with a shortfall from the last few years, so they are trying to be reasonable with their request and may ask for another increase next year to make up for the shortfall. There is an increased demand for most of our services. Both health and mental health services have huge waiting lists, and they need to be able to address these needs. In reality, we have a deficit and it will run out quite soon if it is not dealt with. He is not trying to present a scary situation, but there are hard choices to make regarding staff and services that are in high demand. Student Services is asking students to support this. It is not a cash grab, they need support for their services.

**Questions:**

VP Reid-Fraser: Her job as VP External has been to go to the Education Summit meetings and talk about financing. She wonders if some of the money McGill gets from the government can go to things like mental health services and if any money for Student Services comes directly from the government.

Simmie: The university does give per capita fee. It is a very nominal fee and does not cover the service costs. Students do not pay 100% of the budget; they do get some money from Ministry but that amount has not changed for years. As it stands right now, students pay 67% of the budget.

Councillor Subhani: Are some of the services offered covered by the university?

Simmie: It is really hard to get in-house psychiatrists, so they are covered by the province, but counselors are not. There is still the overhead cost to be covered as the province just pays for appointment fees (Student Services even pays missed appointment fees). The government pays for doctors, but they do not pay for counseling, nurses or the infrastructure needed to support the office.

Councillor Rosentzveig: He has heard some horror stories regarding accessibility, such as a half hour window to sign up for Health Services for a whole month. This is scary compared to other universities. What is it like for students to go to a clinic?

Simmie: It would be great to hear from one of the directors on this matter. Wait times are huge and the waitlist is long. There are 400 students in line for Mental Health as well as an increase in student with disabilities. They do not want to ask students for an increased fee, but they do not know how else to address the situation financially. They need to address the deficit shortfall and maintain the staff and

services that they currently have.

Ian Simmie is thanked and Council sends their best wishes to Jana Luker.

VP Cooper: Motions to suspend the rules and amend the agenda so guests can be present for the referendum questions and do not have to wait.

Chair Nizam: She will entertain this motion after the first two motions. Councillor Cooper can make this motion again after item 10b.

Councillor Chaim: Asks a point of parliamentary inquiry: where are the minutes for November 1<sup>st</sup> on Vibe?

Councillor Zidel: Motions for the Chair to reconsider. It makes sense for those people and it is easy to amend the agenda.

Chair Nizam: Agrees to do it, and **the motion to move 10d to 10a is approved and the agenda is amended.**

#### 7) Question Period

Councillor Rosentzveig has a questions for VP Szpejda regarding Intro to Quebec Week. He has been hearing horror stories from the office of the VP Internal. Francophone Affairs did not know they were giving presentations, and all events and communications are in English; these issues could have been avoided if the Francophone Affairs Committee had met more than once, and asks VP Szpejda if he could elaborate on these problems.

VP Szpejda: This is something he fell through on and he will make sure it does not happen this semester. It has been addressed and he apologizes.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Have changes been made to the SSMU Equity Policy?

VP Szpejda: Yes, this can be addressed to VP Dinel.

VP Dinel: She has been working with the equity commissioners and will be discussed in the Reports section.

Councillor Southey: Asks President Redel if there is going to be a meeting in residence at any time?

President Redel: Yes, the meeting on February 21<sup>st</sup> will be in residence in the Carrefour ballroom.

Councillor Subhani: Regarding minicourses, many of his friend have registered for them and have not received any details as to if they are actually registered?

VP Cooper: Minicourses are handled by the VP Finance and Operations. Today they have just finished sorting out the rooms for minicourses as it is always a project to sort out once they have the numbers confirmed.

VP Briggs: Everything is on track for the winter semester and everyone should be hearing shortly if they have not already.

**8) Announcements**

Councillor Chaim: Updates everyone on the McGill cancer auction during Management's Carnival. They have raised \$11 000 at the auction and \$20 000 in total has been raised for the Canadian Cancer Society.

VP Szpejda: On Saturday at 11:00am a bus will leave the Roddick Gates to observe the Woodsperson Contest at MacDonald campus. The bus will be returning at 6:00pm and the cost is \$10.

Councillor Farnan: Is there an entry fee?

VP Szpejda: No, the cost is just for the bus.

VP Reid-Fraser: Regarding Intro to Quebec Week, there have been a few hiccups such as one presenter coming down with the flu. Tonight is the party portion and around 10:15pm there is going to be a really fun bilingual rockabilly band called Les Lazy Lovers in the Ballroom. It is free and there is a service. She invites everyone to join her there afterwards.

Councillor Giannakakis: There will be a red carpet charity event, a blacklight night, on February 22<sup>nd</sup>. It is a formal event and a huge party. There will be glow in the dark drinks, a band, and DJs. She has tickets, each of which include four hard liquor drinks, one beer, and bagels. If anyone is interested in buying or selling tickets, feel free to contact her.

Chair Nizam: The Director of Student Services is now here, so after Announcements she would entertain a motion suspend rules for questions before the notice of motion.

VP Cooper: On Monday from 4:00-8:30pm in most of the SSMU building is SSMUFest! Performances will be from 5:30-8:30pm. SSMUFest is a week of activities for clubs and will include workshops on funding 101 and how to make a budget. There will also be a strategic summit on student space including visioning for the building, student consultation, and more.

Councillor Lam: The Ampersand will be having a night at Gert's: Canadian Night 2.0. There will be lots of games and drinks and it is also a fundraiser because they need money, so he invites everyone to come out. Also, the National Research Conference will be coming out soon; the deadline is February 8<sup>th</sup>.

Councillor Rea: Education is having its career fair soon and anyone who wants to work or teach abroad should come by from 10:00am-2:00pm in the SSMU Ballroom.

President Redel: It is his pleasure to announce that the SSMU Building is becoming available in interesting ways. They will not be renewing Voyage Campus's lease, and so they can start making dreams a reality as of May 1<sup>st</sup>. They are asking the student body what they want to do with this space as there are endless possibilities, such as the student-run café, etc. He invites everyone to think of ways to make their voices heard and offer consultation on how to reform

the space. Next Friday, February 1<sup>st</sup>, at noon in the Madeleine Parent room there will be a summit on student space. While there are many factors to take into consideration, such as the financial situation, they want to create a space that will look into the needs and wants of students. It may take a year or two, but the Executive team is very hopeful.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Thanks Councillor Boytinck for putting on an Activities Night in residence, he is so happy that the event happened.

Councillor Lubendo: The First Year Council will be having an event in collaboration with the Inter-Residence Council and many other first year groups on February 7<sup>th</sup>. The event is for both residence and off-campus first year students. He asks councillors to put this item on their listservs: tickets will be \$8 and the event is for all first year students.

Councillor Chaim: Would like to welcome hockey back.

Chair Nizam: This is her final meeting of Council. She has really enjoyed her time with Council and adds that working with everyone is inspirational as they are all driven and dedicated. She asks that councillors please treat Mike well.

Councillor Nam: Motions to suspend the rules and amend the agenda to move 10k. to 10a. The motion passes and the agenda is amended.

#### 9) In Camera Session

At 7:26pm Council enters a confidential in-camera session. There is a brief recess for the gallery to exit the room.

Council resumes at 7:42pm, after a 3 minutes recess for the gallery to re-enter the room.

#### 10) New Business

VP Dinel: Motions to move the other motions regarding ancillary fees so they can be discussed in the presence of the gallery.

Chair Nizam: Notes that there will only questions, and not discussion, for the notices of motions.

The agenda is amended and motions regarding ancillary fees are moved to the beginning of the New Business section.

##### a. Notice of Motion Regarding Student Services Ancillary Fee Referendum Question

President Redel reads the Resolved clause:

“*Resolved*, that the SSMU Legislative Council approve the following question for the Winter 2013 referendum period:

‘Do you agree to increase the Student Services Ancillary Fee by \$8.50 to a total of \$141.50 per term for full-time students with a corresponding increase of \$5.00 to a total of \$85.00 per term for part-time students, with the understanding that a majority “no” vote would result in the absence of such a fee increase and the inability to maintain current service levels?’”

There are no questions. President Redel thanks Student Services for being at Council.

Councillor Farnan: Motions to suspend the rules and amend the agenda to move all notices of motions before motions. The motion passes and **the agenda is amended.**

**b. Notice of Motion Regarding Athletics Ancillary Fee Referendum Question**

Councillor Chaim reads the Resolved clause:

“*Resolved*, that the SSMU Legislative Council approve the following question for the Winter 2013 referendum period:

‘Do you agree to increase the athletics ancillary fee by \$7.25 to a total of \$127.75 per term for full-time students with a corresponding increase of \$4.35 to a total of \$77.26 per term for part-time students, with the understanding that a majority “no” vote would result in the absence of such a fee increase and the inability to maintain the current programming and service levels?’”

As there are no questions, the visitors are thanked.

**c. Notice of Motion Regarding Creation of a McGill Writing Center Ancillary Fee Referendum Question**

Chair Nizam reads the Resolved clause:

“*Resolved*, that the SSMU Legislative Council approve the following question for the Winter 2013 referendum period:

‘Do you agree to establish a Writing Centre Ancillary Fee of \$1.50 per term per undergraduate student, with the understanding that a majority “no” vote would result in the absence of such a fee and the inability to meet McGill students’ writing support needs?’”

Councillor Chaim: He is curious as to why the fee should not be opt-outable. If it were, it might be able to gain more support and would still gain more funding.

Laver: Wonders why the fee will be more attractive if it is opt-outable?

Councillor Chaim: Restates his question: seeing as we keep creating fees and adding to existing fees, every dollar adds up and some students may be unable to pay these fees. Every student votes on this so some students might be more inclined to vote in favour if they have the option.

Laver: Being able to write well and consistently improve is in the interests of every single student, no matter the discipline. The writing center meets support needs of all students, so she thinks it would be odd to make it opt-outable because writing is the defining feature of university life.

Councillor Zidel: Wonders if she is aware of the likely percentage drop in money if the fee were to be opt-outable?

President Redel: It totally depends on the year, but they would lose anywhere between 5% to 15% of their funding.

As there are no more questions, Sue Laver is thanked.

**d. Motion Regarding Endorsement of Daily Publications Society Referendum Question**

Speaker Nizam reads the Resolved clauses:

*Resolved*, that the SSMU Legislative Council endorse a “yes” vote to DPS existence referendum question in the winter 2013 Referendum,

*Resolved*, that starting January 25, 2013 this endorsement will be posted prominently on the SSMU website during the campaign period from 9am on January 25, 2013, until 5pm on January 31, 2013.”

Debate on the motion begins:

Councillor Larson: She would like to speak in favour of this motion. After thinking long and hard and after speaking with a former CEO of CBC earlier, she has realized that as much as she disagrees with how the Daily might function, it offers a good way for students to speak to and for students. We need to change what we do not like about it, however, it should remain in existence.

VP Cooper: They are historically recognized as being an important part of student life. The DPS is important because McGill does not have a journalism program. This is a source that everyone on Council should be reading as it is very much the role of SSMU.

Councillor Farnan: Speaking to the movers, he asks if there is a way of following up with unconstructive criticism that is published? Even after retractions were made regarding certain stories, is there a process of apologizing, or following up?

Arsem-O'Malley: The piece in question was edited and the individual apologized, they printed a letter to the editor from students who were upset, she spoke with President Redel, and she met with the individual in person.

Councillor Chaim: He is not really sure, but Council did discuss its role in endorsing referenda and voted that it should endorse things. How will this pertain to our role? He would like to build on the ideas from the previous discussion.

VP Reid-Fraser: She has been thinking about this a lot after the conversation regarding the CKUT question, and one thing that is an important distinction to make is that this is not about increasing a fee, this is about something continuing to exist. They are not asking for a monetary increase, voting in favour would be saying that we support these papers' existence on our campus.

VP Dinel: This is very much a part of SSMU's mandate to allow students to express themselves, which is important because everyone cannot sit on Council. She is strongly in favour of this motion.

Councillor Rosentzveig: He has sent Councillor Chaim the minutes from the CKUT discussion.

As there are no more speakers, voting on the motion begins.

With a voting count of 21-0-6, the motion passes and **the Motion Regarding Endorsement of Daily Publications Society Referendum Question is adopted.**

**e. Motion Regarding an Exceptional Referendum Period**

President Redel reads the Resolved clause:

*“Resolved, that the SSMU Legislative Council deem the Winter 2013 referendum period an exceptional referendum period with no change to the current electoral timeline of Elections SSMU.”*

President Redel: Clarifies the motion: according to our constitution we can only do a few referenda each semester, and they thought it would not be prudent to do another one on top of the current one. Marking this one as an exceptional referendum period allows us to do fee levies and change this in the constitution.

No speakers, move into voting:

The motion passes unanimously and **the Motion Regarding an Exceptional Referendum Period is adopted.**

Councillor Rosentzveig: Asks a point of personal preference, can he look at the agenda?

**f. Motion Regarding Installation of New Microwaves in the William Shatner University Centre Cafeteria**

Nizam reads the Resolved clauses:

*“Resolved, that SSMU allocate an amount not exceeding \$800.00 from the Funding Committee’s Space Fund allotment for the acquisition and installation of two (2) new microwaves for the William Shatner University Centre’s 2nd floor cafeteria, to be set up in the northern half of the room,*

*Resolved, that the Legislative Council mandate the Executive to purchase and install said microwaves in the manner prescribed, deliverable by December 31st, 2013.”*

Councillor Rosentzveig: Our mandate should support this as it promotes healthy living and eating. Also, when half of the cafeteria is closed some of the microwaves cannot be accessed.

Councillor Farnan: Will the full \$800 limit actually be used? Would you consider getting more microwaves with that money?

Councillor Rosentzveig: This is amendable if councillors feel it is too large.

President Redel: It does seem like a lot at a glance, but there is a big difference

between microwaves used at home and those used in a cafeteria where they are used very often. The amount is enough for commercial microwaves.

Councillor Chaim: Can we have signage so that people do not put in forks and spoons in the microwaves, turning them into miniature weapons of mass destruction?

Councillor Lam: Has there been discussion about what kind of microwaves we want?

Councillor Zidel: Is it responsible for Council to decide exactly what the Executive should do to fulfill their mandate? Can we not just trust them?

There is a motion to amend “by December 31, 2013” to “by April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013” so it is done by the end of the semester. This motion passes and **the motion is amended.**

The final Resolved clause now reads:

“*Resolved*, that the Legislative Council mandate the Executive to purchase and install said microwaves in the manner prescribed, deliverable by April 16th, 2013.”

As there are no more speakers, voting on the motion as a whole begins.

**g. Motion Regarding McGill Free from Fossil Fuels**

Chair Nizam reads the Resolves clauses:

“*Resolved*, that the SSMU reaffirm its position opposing the continued development of the Canadian Tar Sands as adopted by Legislative Council on 11 January 2012.

*Resolved*, that the SSMU adopt a position in favour of a rapid transition to a carbon-neutral society.

*Resolved*, that the SSMU lobby McGill University to divest its holdings in companies engaged in fossil fuel production, and from financial institutions that invest in or give loans to companies engaged in fossil fuel production.”

Councillor Stewart-Kanigan: This divestment strategy is one part of a larger system. It is one thing that we can do that will have a direct influence here at McGill. This is an important first step in a global issue that can be shaped at McGill.

Councillor Farnan: He is in favour of this motion and thinks it is a good idea.

Councillor Subhani: How do the movers plan to move forward with the Resolved clauses? SSMU should decide what McGill should do, and then be mandated to move forward.

Councillor Baker: Could the movers please elaborate on the actual procedures which would be used to follow through with the third Resolved clause? What actionable steps would be taken?

Councillor Rosentzweig: It is hard for students to have a say in how McGill manages its money, so they are not confident in any actionable steps.

Councillor Stewart-Kanigan: Cedes her time to Chris Bangs.

Chris Bangs: What would help is letter to the Board of Governors outlining SSMU and the members it is composed of, and detailing how important addressing climate change is to its members. We could also add to the Political Campaigns budget to discuss this issue. Right now we are talking about the tar sands, but we can add to that.

Councillor Bissky-Dziadyk: It seems as if there is a very clear purpose here, but this is not stated in the motion; this is attempting to support Divest McGill. Why are these steps not in the motion, instead of just saying they have a specific goal in mind?

VP Dinel: Asks for a clarification from the movers: do they mean a carbon neutral SSMU society or a carbon neutral general world society?

Councillor Rosentzveig: It is very difficult to decide how to come up with that, and it was discussed in steering. They want to stop the harm that our carbon does nationally and internationally. This is open to amendments.

Councillor Larson: She does not think it is clear enough in this form to be ready. She says that if this is truly something that SSMU should adopt as an overall theme, a Council motion might not be the best way to do it as it only lasts for a year. Instead, they could possibly add it the Sustainability Policy.

Councillor Baker: He understands that it is hard to come up with all of the steps, but it is not hard to come up with a Resolved clause to develop a timeline, or more specific steps. The motion is incredibly broad and they cannot start a process for this to be attained without knowing how it will occur.

Councillor Subhani: The Motion Regarding Ethical Investments has a Resolved clause stating that McGill should cut ties with companies involved with the tar sands and he does not think there was any follow-up done on this. He does not know how this current motion is any different than the previous one.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Cedes his time to Chris Bangs from the gallery.

Bangs: This is part of his job and he is starting to collect signatures to present to the Board of Governors. This is the starting point of the process.

Councillor Rosentzveig: In response to Bangs, he would love this document to be policy. It is at Council now because there needs to be something done now. The point was to give a mandate to the people at SSMU who are working for this to continue their activities. There are things to be done immediately, passing this motion allows for it to move forward

Councillor Subhani: Says that this motion may or may not follow-up with its objectives.

Councillor Baker: The reason for his criticism is that it is a systemic problem with many motions. Repeatedly saying that SSMU should have a mandate and then proposing the same motion again and again is institutionalizing the same problem. Council can have a discussion about how to ensure that these measures are put into motion, even if it just refers to the actionable body that can actually do something. These are procedural issues, not substantial ones.

VP Cooper: She will vote yes because it is in line with her beliefs, but she also sees it from another perspective. It is more than just a position, it is a project students want to work on. She would want to motion to amend the motion to say that the political coordinator and political affairs office lobby McGill, instead of just saying that SSMU should do something.

Councillor Zidel: He disagrees with VP Cooper saying that we should endorse things that people agree with just because they bring them forward. He disagrees with Councillor Baker because there are clearly processes that have been brought forward. In this case, there will be directives that follow, but we need this to pass so we can write a good letter.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Asks for a straw poll regarding an amendment that would read: "Be it further resolved that SSMU Council mandate the Political Campaigns Coordinator and External Affairs Committee work on this."

A straw poll is taken.

Councillor Larson: Is this an extension of the report Bangs gave at the beginning of the meeting? How is this not reflected in the motion?

Chair Nizam: Is the motion meant to be distinct from the report?

Councillor Stewart-Kanigan: No, it is not meant as a direct companion to the report.

Chair Nizam: Clarifies, saying that the motion is considered to be distinct from the report and the Political Campaigns Coordinator.

Councillor Farnan: Was the discussion about the potential of moving forward to divest related to this motion specifically, or is it distinct? Specifically, the part in which he met with the head of investments at McGill?

Councillor Stewart-Kanigan: It is not necessarily directly related, although this motion would give us a mandate to support these kinds of conversations.

Chair Nizam: This is a motion specific to SSMU Council mandating further action on this motion.

Councillor Baker: He will leave it to Councillor Rosentzveig to amend, but he would want him to edit the third clause to identify a mandate to send to Bangs regarding how he should interact with the Board of Governors and define what they are attempting to lobby. They could list certain companies or provide a causal list, and then bring this back to Council.

Councillor Zidel: Motions to amend, as they could theoretically change the third clause to say that SSMU will come up with a draft plan as to how they will lobby, and then bring it back to Council. He does not want to send it to External Affairs as they are bogged down. The amendment would be added after the third Resolved clause and would read:

“*Resolved* that the Political Campaigns Coordinator draft a plan detailing intended efforts to encourage McGill to divest from holdings in companies engaged in fossil fuel production, to be brought back to Council at a later date.”

VP Reid-Fraser: Suggests adding the Environment Committee.

Councillor Zidel: This is unfriendly because the Political Campaigns Coordinator can just go talk to them or go to a meeting with them.

Councillor Rosentzveig: Motions to change “encourage” to “lobby”. This is decided to be friendly and is added to the amendment.

Councillor Stewart-Kanigan: For continuity, she would like to add, from the third Resolved clause, “production and from financial institutions that invest or give loans to companies engages in fossil fuel production.” This is decided to be friendly and is added to the amendment.

The friendly amendment passes and is added to the motion. It’s final version reads: “*Resolved* that the Political Campaigns Coordinator draft a plan detailing intended efforts to lobby McGill to divest from holdings in companies engaged in fossil fuel production and from financial institutions that invest or give loans to companies engages in fossil fuel production, to be brought back to Council at a later date.”

Councillor Bissky-Dziadyk: Asks the movers to explain why they want McGill to divest from financial institutions as well?

Councillor Rosentzveig: Investing in financial institutions is another way to pursue things that the motion has a mandate to oppose, so it seems counterproductive to not include this in the motion.

As there are no more speakers, voting on the motion begins.

With a voting count of 13-3-8, the motion passes and **the Motion Regarding McGill Free from Fossil Fuels is adopted.**

**h. Motion Regarding Support for Indigenous Peoples and Allies**

Chair Nizam reads the Resolved clauses:

“*Resolved*, that the SSMU adopt a position in support of the Idle No More movement and in support of the struggles of the Society’s First Nation and Inuit members and allies.

*Resolved*, that the SSMU support campaigns to lobby the McGill administration to identify and divest its holdings in companies that do business or that lobby to do business on native land without the permission of the communities there.

*Resolved*, that the SSMU take reasonable steps to divest its holdings in those same companies, and that the FERC be mandated to research means by which this may be achieved.”

Councillor Giannakakis: States a conflict of interest: she works for Red Cross and has been asked not to participate in any vote on this issue.

Councillor Rosentzweig: Apologizes, he did not intend to make the meeting so long. This is the biggest aboriginal movement we have seen, and this motion is to express support for them. We want SSMU to support the Idle No More movement by supporting existing campaigns. This is also related to Divest McGill, to lobby McGill to divest from the companies involved. They want FERC to divest because they do not want to be hypocrites.

Councillor Zidel: He is not convinced that every indigenous group in Canada supports the same movements, so he does not like supporting a cause for someone else. He is okay with the last two clauses because they state that it is without their permission, but he does not think it is appropriate on his behalf as a councillor.

VP Reid-Fraser: One of the interesting characteristics of grassroots spreading movements is that there are informal spokespeople and the movement can evolve. There are discussions going on within the movement to figure out what it wants to be. She is not necessarily disagreeing, she just wants to speak to what he’s saying.

VP Cooper: From the anthropological perspective, she gets where Zidel is coming from and would like to add something along the lines of “allyship” to show that. It is a changing movement and is not unified, so they could more specifically list what they support. She does not like that it says it is without the permission of the community, because some companies think they do have permission. This being said, she supports the spirit of the motion.

Larson: Can the movers update Council on the current status of the movement, given the end of the hunger strike?

Councillor Stewart-Kanigan: Idle No More is a nonhierarchical movement, so they do not like having leaders. The reality of the movement is that there are many different pockets.

Councillor Farnan: He believes that Idle No More has publicly distanced itself from Chief Spence.

VP Cooper: Would people be more comfortable with an amendment along the lines of allyship and Bill C-45?

A straw poll is taken on the position of direct support or the position of allyship.

VP Reid-Fraser: She has an idea for an amendment: that SSMU adopt a position in solidarity with aboriginal people struggling with the occupation of their land.

Chair Nizam: Reminds councillors that they can also propose an amendment and then vote.

Councillor Chaim: He says that VP Reid-Fraser's idea sounds wonderful but it is way too big and he does not see the advantage.

Councillor Baker: Following the general tone of this discussion, it shows that there are a lot of complex things going on. Many different issues being addressed in this one motion. To try to encapsulate that in a motion is very difficult. How do you take these parts and put them together into a motion? He does not know what he is voting on, so how can people know what to vote for?

Councillor Larson: Asks a point of inquiry: she is wondering if through this discussion Council may have discovered that this motion is both external and divisive? She motions to deem the matter external and divisive.

Councillor Zidel: Does anyone in this room think that the second clause, which implies the third clause, is possibly divisive?

Larson: Is it only possible to divide the question in voting?

Chair Nizam: Yes.

Councillor Larson: Can we vote on the first clause as external and divisive and the others as external and not divisive?

Councillor Farnan: Motions to move to the previous question and move forward to divide the question.

Chair Nizam: If we make it external and divisive we cannot vote on it, only a GA can vote on it.

Rosentzveig: What vote is required to make it external and divisive?

Chair Nizam: Likely a simple majority.

Councillor Chaim: In the past we have decided at Steering Committee that if it is external and divisive, and it has already been deemed as such, it is in order to refer this to the GA. Motions to refer this to the GA.

This takes precedence, since the Steering Committee has already deemed it external and divisive.

Debate on the motion to commit this motion to the GA begins:

Councillor Chaim: It seems as though this is external and divisive so it should be decided by the greater McGill community. Council cannot take a stance on something divisive.

Councillor Rosentzveig: The subject matter is time sensitive so putting it off might harm the goal of the motion. Also, Steering did not deem it to be external.

Councillors Chaim and Larson: Motion to suspend the rules and motion to reconsider the motion to adopt the report of the Steering Committee.

Chair Nizam: Will allow them to comment on whether or not it is external, and then Council will decide on whether or not to commit.

Councillor Larson: It was decided that it was external but not divisive. Also, why is it time sensitive, when it seems like it is a long term goal?

Councillor Stewart-Kanigan: In terms of time sensitivity, the global day of action is in four days. It is an ongoing movement, so they are not sure what the status of the movement is going to be in two weeks. If we are going to take part in this motion, we could organize a contingent to go to the day of action.

Councillor Farnan: Where are we?

Chair Nizam: We are debating the motion to commit the Idle No More motion to the GA. The argument is that the motion is time sensitive.

Councillor Farnan: He would vote against it. He feels like the first Resolved clause makes sense could move forward, but the second and third Resolved clauses have the same issues that were resolved in the previous motion. He could suggest that the movers draft a plan and bring it back to SSMU when it is complete. Therefore, he would like to divide the question to do this.

Councillor Chaim: We are talking about committing this right now, so if we are trying to get a position before an event that is in four days, why is that not in the motion?

Councillor Nizam: Clarifies that Councillor Farnan listed that as an alternative. Also, as Speaker it is very evident that it is very serious when someone brings up something as possibly being external. This room is not necessarily representative of people that might attend a GA, so it might be inappropriate for Council to move forward and pass this if it could be deemed external.

VP Cooper: Asks for clarification of what was decided at Steering Committee.

Councillor Chaim: At the time, it was decided that it was external but not divisive, but now at Council it seems like it must be divisive.

Chair Nizam: Article 28 states that Council cannot pass external matters, although it does not necessarily say that they cannot pass divisive matters.

VP Cooper: Is it external? Are we on stolen native land? How do you measure if it is divisive?

Chair Nizam: It is true that it is hard to measure, but if people in the room feel this way, it is clear that this is common. She would rather Council not make this decision independently.

Voting on the motion to commit begins. With a voting count of 13 – 13, there is a tie. There cannot be a tie on procedural motions.

There is a one minute recess so Chair Nizam can consult with previous speakers.

Chair Nizam: It seems as though it would be best to not pass the motion to commit, and then divide the question and then commit the items that are determined external. She recommends they divide the question and then they can commit the necessary items and move forward.

There is a re-vote on the motion to commit. The motion is unanimously opposed and does not pass. The motion is not committed to the GA.

Debate on the motion in its entirety resumes:

There are no speakers, so Council moves into voting procedure on the motion.

Councillor Larson: Motions to divide the question by voting on the first clause individually and then voting on the remaining two clauses together.

Councillor Farnan: Asks a point of parliamentary inquiry: will there be debate on this motion?

Chair Nizam: We will not debate it if other divisions are proposed.

Council moves forward with the division, with speakers for and against.

Councillor Larson: Speaking in favour of dividing the question. She would prefer to divide it this way because the general consensus is that the first clause is external whereas as the second two are similar to each other and are both related to McGill.

Councillor Rosentzveig: His issue with dividing the question is that the second and third Resolved are clearly not external to SSMU and if they are adopted without the first Resolved clause which outlines support, we would be embarking on a campaign without support. If we send this to the GA it is essentially killing the motion, as

there is no way we will get 500 people to vote on it.

President Redel: Well that's up to you, isn't it?

Chair Nizam: The sad reality of GAs cannot influence decisions.

As there are no more speakers, Council moves into voting procedure. This motion passes and **the question is divided.**

Voting on the first Resolved clause begins.

Councillor Farnan: Motion to suspend the rules to make a comment.

Chair Nizam: This is out of order as it is an abuse of Robert's Rules.

Councillor Farnan: Wants to comment regarding the division of the questions.

Chair Nizam: The decision has already passed.

VP Reid-Fraser: Motions to amend.

Chair Nizam: This is not in order because of voting procedure. The only things that are in order are a motion to commit and anything else that would impede a motion to commit.

Councillor Larson: Motions to commit to this clause of the motion to the General Assembly.

Councillor Larson: Reminds Council that this has already been debated.

Councillor Farnan: Regarding his last comment, it is useful to separate the question because this is less controversial. Adopting positions of support for the indigenous movement seems reasonable, but the second two clauses seem problematic regarding a draft of sorts.

Councillor Boytinck: Asks a point of parliamentary inquiry: why does it say "indigenous" and then later says "First Nations and Inuit"? Can we amend to fix this?

Chair Nizam: Because this was not brought up earlier, we cannot change it now unless there is a motion to suspend the rules and reconsider.

Councillor Larson: Some people may ally themselves with this while others may not. People on Council feel strongly about it, but it may not be how their constituents feel. Council should not decide on it and this lack of decision does not stop anyone from going to the day of action.

Chair Nizam: Clarifies that it is external.

Voting on the motion to commit the first clause begins.

Councillor Chaim: Can you tell us if there are no abstentions?

Chair Nizam: There are no abstentions.

The motion does not pass and the first Resolved clause is not committed to the General Assembly.

Chair Nizam: Does not know if it is appropriate for it continue. This motion is extremely external and should not be decided in Council.

VP Cooper: In the SSMU constitution, SSMU commits itself to demonstrating support in matters of human rights (in the preamble). This points out that this is not inherently external.

Chair Nizam: Our body here defining the choice here is not necessarily appropriate.

Councillor Zidel: Procedure should be that the Chair commits it if she feels it is external and divisive. Councillors have decided what they want and are not going to revote.

Councillor Farnan: Motions to reconsider.

Chair Nizam: A motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted against the motion.

She is going to make her final statement on the matter. If Council decides to pass it, they should keep in mind that there is an ethical clash here. In her mind, 30 students making this decision on the behalf of 20 000 other students seems unethical. Why does this small group get to choose the position on this motion for all other students?

President Redel: What is being read from the constitution does mean that the motion should not be deemed external. It says that SSMU should do this, but it does not say that this particular body should make this decision. This decision should be made at a General Assembly.

Chair Nizam: Her point is that this is not inappropriate as a motion, but needs to be voted on at a GA.

Councillor Southey: Motions to reconsider.

Chair Nizam: This vote on reconsidering requires a 2/3 majority to pass.

VP Cooper: Makes a point of personal privilege, says that this is ignoring the Society's indigenous people.

Councillor Larson: That's assuming that they all agree with it.

Chair Nizam: This is external to the Society's day to day function. That is all she's saying.

Voting on reconsidering the motion to commit begins. There are no abstentions.

The motion passes with a 2/3 majority and the motion to commit will be reconsidered. There are no abstentions. This vote will decide whether Council will vote on the motion to commit again.

The motion passes with a 2/3 majority and there will be a re-vote on the motion to commit.

Council re-enters debate on the motion to commit.

Chair Nizam: She apologizes she did not make this clarification earlier, but asks Council to keep her decision in mind.

VP Reid-Fraser: She is speaking in favour of committing the motion. She has changed her mind and this is why. It has been confusing, but she supports committing it because any motion that does not make quorum at the GA comes back to Council anyways, so we would be voting on it again regardless. She understands the time sensitive issue, but does not think this prevents us from helping out with the cause. She has real commitment to GAs and procedure and thinks she has lost her feeling that they need to bring more motions to the GA. Right now it just has one motion; we need to make GAs stronger. There is a group of students that are involved, such as Idle No More McGill, and it would be great to have them speak at the GA.

VP Cooper: She still thinks this falls within their mandates and roles as councillors. We have Council for a reason and it is our job to make decisions. If Idle No More is too divisive, we should keep the second part of the clause because members of the McGill community are involved in it. Realistically, this motion won't pass at a GA.

Chair Nizam: Right now it is external to this body, but to the GA it will not be external unless they decide it is external at the GA.

VP Cooper: We would want to split or re-phrase it so that they can demonstrate that this is in line with SSMU mandates.

Councillor Zidel: Motions to move to the previous question.

This motion passes and voting begins on the motion to commit.

Chair Nizam: Says she can assist VP Cooper with her intentions after this.

The motion to commit passes, and **the first clause of the motion is committed to the upcoming General Assembly.**

Chair Nizam: Clarifies that the second part of the question is still within SSMU's mandate, only the first part will go to the General Assembly.

Voting on the second grouping of the motion begins.

With a voting count of 16-3-8 the motion passes, and **the second two clauses of the Motion Regarding Support for Indigenous Peoples and Allies are adopted.**

**i. Notice of Motion Regarding Poll Clerks**

Chair Nizam reads the Resolved clause:

*“Resolved, the SSMU Legislative Council approve the changes below to Article 20 of SSMU By-law Book I.”*

President Redel: Hopes everyone has had a chance to read this. This motion is to have the by-laws reflect that the online system is the only method used for voting. Regarding poll clerks, they are nice for visibility but cost \$800-900 for poll clerks to run. The system is out of date and these changes would be reflected in the motion.

Councillor Bissky-Dziadyk: In the proposed changes, it says that only one poll station is accessible to wheelchairs and disabilities. Why aren't all poll stations accessible?

Councillor Larson: It would be great if they were all accessible but at McGill having at least one is the best they can do as McGill is a very inaccessible space.

VP Dinel: Motions to move to the previous question.

Chair Nizam: This is a notice of motion, so we do not vote on it at this meeting.

**j. Notice of Motion Regarding Increasing the Diversity of Student Representation on the McGill University Senate**

Chair Nizam reads the Resolved clauses:

*“Resolved, that Article 4.3 in Part II of the SSMU By-laws Book I-7 shall be amended to read:*

*‘Seats left vacant after the end of the nomination period will be reallocated first to programs not listed in 3.1.2, including the Schools of Physical/Occupational Therapy, Nursing, and Social Work, and the Interfaculty of Arts and Science, in descending order according from the program with the most students enrolled to the program with the least, then to Faculties listed in 3.1.2, in descending order according from the Faculty with the most students enrolled per Undergraduate Senator to the Faculty with the least, according to figures provided by the Registrar of McGill University.’*

*Resolved*, that Article 4.3.1 be added to Part II of the SSMU By-laws Book I-7 as follows:

“Should one vacant seat be reallocated to the School of Physical/Occupational Therapy, Nursing, or Social Work, or the Interfaculty of Arts and Science, students in these programs would not be permitted to run for seats in faculties other than the reallocated seat.”

Councillor Larson: Can someone explain this, because at Steering Committee it took a long time to work out.

Councillor Giannakakis: Basically, if there were to be vacancies on Senate, then the schools of Nursing, Social Work, and Arts Science would be given the first opportunities to fill the. Vacancies are normally given to Arts, Engineering, and Science as per enrollment. This motion allows the other schools to have a chance to gain access to these vacancies because they are distinct faculties and it would make sense.

Councillor Subhani: How do the movers plan on allocating these extra positions to the faculties?

Councillor Chaim: Faculties are given a number of seats in Senate and people run for them. This is set out by the faculty. Any vacancies will go to the other schools first and if no one runs, they will go towards the number of Senators per student, which uses normal SSMU procedures for voting.

Councillor Giannakakis: This does not take away from the seats for Arts or other faculties. It just means that if there are vacancies, these programs would get the first chance at these seats.

Councillor Farnan: From what I understand, if the standard position of a seat is empty, then the mentioned faculties will have the first chance at running? Will they be going through their own voting procedures?

VP Dinel: Most of the voting is done through Elections SSMU, so it is not done through the faculties. The way you pool the people from the smaller faculties is from people who have already nominated themselves. This does not involve an extra nomination period.

Chair Nizam: Notes that this motion can be further clarified in great detail when it is up for debate.

VP Dinel: Suggests bringing questions to her or the other movers so they can prepare them for next Council.

**k. Notice of Motion Regarding Environment Fee Referendum Question**

Chair Nizam reads the Resolved clause:

“*Resolved*, that the SSMU Council approve the following question for the Winter 2013 referendum period:

‘Do you agree that the opt-outable \$1.25 SSMU Environment Fee, which is paid for by all SSMU members and accessible to all SSMU members who do not opt out of the fee, be renewed for five years, to start in Fall 2013, and to be charged until Winter 2018 (inclusive), and that the fee be adjusted to inflation, as indexed by the Bank of Canada CPI (Consumer Price Index), with the understanding that a majority “no” vote would result in the fee ceasing to exist?’”

There are no questions.

**1. Notice of Motion Regarding Sustainability Projects Fund Fee Referendum Question**

Chair Nizam reads the Resolved clause:

“*Resolved*, that SSMU Council approve the following question for Winter 2013 referendum period:

‘Do you agree to renew the Sustainability Projects Fund fee for the next five academic years (Fall 2013 through Winter 2018) at \$0.50 per credit per student per semester (up to 15 credits), adjusted annually for inflation, as indexed by the Bank of Canada CPI (Consumer Price Index), with the understanding that if McGill University does not agree to match this contribution, it will cease to exist? The renewed SPF would continue to be governed by a parity working group (equal numbers of students and staff) and accept project applications from any member of the McGill community.’”

There are no questions.

**m. Notice of Motion Regarding Equity Fund Referendum Question**

Chair Nizam reads the Resolved clause:

“*Resolved*, that the SSMU Legislative Council approve the following question for the Winter 2013 referendum period:

‘Do you agree that the SSMU create the Equity Fund, which will be directly funded by an opt-outable student fee of \$0.50 per semester, paid for by all SSMU members and accessible to all members who do not opt out of the fee, to start in Fall 2013, and to be charged for a duration of 3 years until Winter 2016 (inclusive) when it will be brought back to the membership for renewal, and that the fee be adjusted to inflation, as indexed by the Bank of Canada CPI (Consumer Price Index), with the understanding that a majority “no” vote would result in the absence of the creation of such a fee?’”

Councillor Larson: What is the evolution process of coming to the idea of a fee levy? This is the first anyone has heard of this, so how are they going from having nothing to proposing a fee levy? She asks if there are actually four movers. Councillor Zidel and VP Dinel, were involved, but are there two more? Steering Committee had sent it back and asked four movers, but she guesses that they did not find them.

Chair Nizam: If the motion does not have four movers it cannot be entertained at

Council. The motion will be sent back to Steering Committee.

President Redel: There were no movers when it came to Steering Committee because it was written the day of. It was sent back because it required more defining Whereas clauses for the creation of a fund as well as because it did not have movers.

Councillor Rosentzveig: He and one other councillor were movers.

Chair Nizam: If a new, updated version is sent immediately to Steering, we can move forward from there.

**n. Notice of Motion Regarding Charity Fee Referendum Question**

Chair Nizam Reads the Resolved clause

“*Resolved*, that the SSMU Council approve the following question for the Winter 2013 referendum period:

‘Do you agree that the opt-outable \$0.50 SSMU Charity Fee, which is paid for by all SSMU members and accessible to all SSMU members who do not opt out of the fee, be renewed for five years, to start in Fall 2013, and to be charged until Winter 2018 (inclusive), and that the fee be adjusted to inflation, as indexed by the Bank of Canada CPI (Consumer Price Index), with the understanding that a majority “no” vote would result in the fee ceasing to exist?’”

There are no questions.

**o. Recess for SSMU Board of Directors Meeting**

Council enters a recess at 9:43pm for a meeting of the Board of Directors.

Council resumes at 9:47pm.

VP Dinel: Motions to reconsider the Notice of Motion Regarding Equity Fund Referendum Question. It had 4 movers originally and was sent to Mike Tong, so there is a bit of a mix up, due to VP Cooper being behind on emails.

President Redel: He will assume that there were four movers at the time of the meeting of the Steering Committee and accept that people were behind on emails.

Chair Nizam: She will accept it because President Redel agrees, but this is inappropriate and should never happen again. She knows Mike was up to date on emails as he was checking them until a few minutes before the meeting.

The movers are found to be Councillor Rosentzveig, Councillor Morawetz, VP Dinel, and Councillor Zidel.

The four movers are added to the new version of the motion, which was accessed via the Speaker’s email.

The motion to reconsider is ruled in order and Council continues with the notice of

motion.

Councillor Larson: She would like the movers to talk Council through the genesis of levying a fee, and to explain why there was no notice of it until Monday.

VP Cooper: Cedes her time to Justin from the Equity Committee

Justin: Fee levies occur when the organization has identified a need in the community, such as TVM. SSMU Council wants to ask the students if they agree with this need. The idea for a fund was first mentioned two years ago by Emily Clare. He agrees that it was rushed, but they thought the referendum would not be happening until March. This is why the motion is being presented now.

President Redel: Thinks it is a great idea, but these funds are based on other calculations (like TVM's was based on their budget and deficit). To clarify Councillor Larson's question, quite concretely, what is the exact cost and dollar amount, and where does it come from?

Justin: They have based this commitment on the SSMU Green Fund as SSMU's commitment to the environment is a big priority. Equity is also a big commitment involving students that contribute to the betterment of our community. The Equity Committee needs to work on issues of diversity and equity on campus as the McGill University campus survey highlights a clear need to work on these issues.

Councillor Chaim: They are looking at creating a fund for \$30 000 a year for the next 3 years, but this year it seems like everything they are doing could be done through the resources SSMU already has.

Chair Nizam: Since this is a notice of motion, please clarify your questions to the content of the motion.

Justin: The current budget is \$2000 and they are working towards an undergrad equity conference which could not have done without the approval for funding from the VP University Affairs. In terms of external projects, only QPIRG has a small amount of money for student projects. We have not been able to give money to students to do projects. The fund will give students resources to do these kinds of projects. It shows that SSMU cares about its international members and that SSMU wants to help people against discrimination.

VP Szpejda: With this sort of funding, how would the services you offer differ and how would they compete with other services offered?

Justin: The SSMU Equity Fund will be a fund dedicated to students and regulated by students. This will add to the work of Environment Committee, allowing different channels to work on issues.

Councillor Larson: Why is this a referendum question instead of a question through council if it is a fee levy that will have a large cost?

Justin: There is a demonstrated need, just like there was when the need to work on green issues was brought up. This fund is SSMU saying that there is a need that we have highlighted, and we need to work on equity and diversity on our campus because students are unhappy.

VP Briggs: Who is administering the fund? Is it going to be discretionary and allocated by a committee?

VP Dinel: It would be allocated by the Funding Committee.

Councillor Lubendo: Can we add where the fee is going?

Chair Nizam: Cannot change the text, but can discuss this with the movers. She is very uncomfortable with reading this motion without having four movers. This way she does not know if they were added just to have four movers or if they actually support the motion. Procedure and rules are very important, and she does not like doing this as it gets in the way of her own belief in upholding equity.

## 11) Reports by Committees

### a. Executive Committee

President Redel: Did everyone actually read it?

Councillor Lubendo: He has a question about the four meetings. There were supposed to be meetings every semester for FUN (a first year group). Council should have been meeting with them before their big event. Will Council be meeting with them this semester?

President Redel: Yes, absolutely.

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

### b. Interest Group Committee

There are no questions.

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

## 12) Reports by Executives

### a. Vice-President (University Affairs) – Haley Dinel

Senate went well yesterday, they had their first live-streaming and talked about potential uses of RVH. The principal and Di Grappa talked about provisional protocol and how that is changing. To update Council on university-related things, she met with Chris Bangs to talk about the motion they had earlier in the year to talk about military investments. She also spoke to the VP Research and will be meeting with her soon.

**b. Vice-President (External Affairs) – Robin Reid-Fraser**

She has not had a chance to write her report from the education summit meetings, but she will do it over the weekend. It was certainly interesting, but there were no big developments. The next theme meeting is taking place next Thursday in Friday, and she will be attending as a TaCEQ observer, not as a delegate. She stands for questions.

**c. Vice-President (Clubs and Services) – Allison Cooper**

She thanks President Redel for the Council Retreat. She heard Councillor Boytinck's event in residence went well. SSMUFest is also going well, she is coordinating a large event every day until next Friday and moving around the offices on Sunday. She hopes everyone will tell their clubs to come. The student space summit will also be really cool. She is really excited about the Club Hub project, which had been postponed. The name confused people, so to clarify, the Club Hub is now called Clubpedia and the Club Portal is now called the Club Hub. She has also put a lot of time into organizing referendum questions. She stands for questions.

President Redel: Can you enlighten us on the name of the club blog?

VP Cooper: It was originally an inside joke, but it is now called the "Clog".

**d. Vice-President (Internal) – Mike Szpejda**

His report is now on Vibe. He was on vacation last week and has been doing a lot of catching up and going through email. In terms of Orientation, he is starting to get into full swing with the work groups; they have another meeting tomorrow. He is also looking to compile all applications into a single form. In terms of the yearbook, all committees are trying to meet more often this semester. The sponsorship has been approved, now they just need the final edits. The poutine crawl is happening tomorrow and people will be meeting at Gert's. He has contacted six places in the Plateau, so they will head out for 2-3 hours to sample poutine. It is pay as you go because they did not want to commit everyone to a huge amount of poutine. Also, don't forget the concert tonight. He is also starting to look into the Awards Banquet. The Woodsperson Competition is also coming up soon. He stands for questions.

VP Briggs: Did you arrange deals at the poutine place?

VP Szpejda: It depends on the amount of people, but he suggest organizing into "pou-teams" to share. If there are larger numbers, he will call ahead.

Councillor Giannakakis: Will the Faculty Olympics still be happening?

VP Szpejda: There will be a callout for committees next week. He has talked to people internally who are interested.

**e. Vice-President (Finance & Operations) – J.P. Briggs**

He apologizes as the report is not online, but it will be shortly. He has been out with the flu earlier, and advises councillors to protect themselves. He has been focusing

on the club audits since the submissions have come in. They will be processed and ready in time for the funding deadline. He is adding features beside normal reconciliation. The reports of funding that clubs have received must detail what the funding is for to make sure clubs are accountable. The global budget revision is also going on. Allison did an incredible job running minicourses and having it all going on in one building. Aside from this setback, everything is on track.

FERC is working to implement projects that were implemented first semester and is looking into possibilities for socially responsible investment. The SRC is meeting tomorrow, and he asks everyone to update their GroupWise calendars. As you now are aware, because of the Merit space, there is an official potential space for the student-run café. They will examine potential uses of that space and where it could potentially go. Investments include working on creative cash management strategies, meeting and talking to investment advisors, and getting competitive proposals. It should provide extra money at no cost, making student dollars work for us. In terms of funding, he did time sensitive applications. Councillor Rosentzveig and the Funding Coordinator have put together useful how-to documents about how to fill out forms for funding. He is also working on the funding audits.

**f. President – Josh Redel**

J Board had a good meeting with the chief. They are updating the website and then moving to a Wordpress site. They are finally working on having internal documents on how they operate so there is less fallout. He hopes everyone enjoyed the Council Retreat. People should only be using their GroupWise emails now. It will be working on phones soon. Councillors need to check emails as important information will be coming out soon, so they really need to be up to date. He will be cracking down on reports and attendance, so they should expect a Steering Report regarding this. He has asked Miriam to arrange for a council translator to translate all documents before the meeting. The faculty student society was brought together for full day event and the only negative feedback was that there is not enough juice, so he thanks VP Cooper and VP Dinel for organizing it. The GA is going along well: posters are up, standard advertizing in full swing, and a guide will be sent via email about how councillors can advertise in person, which is their responsibility as stated in the constitution. If all councillors brought four friends, it would easily pass quorum. Don't talk shit about the GA, you should all support it. The handbook going well, and they are working on a mobile app. Listservs will now have a "SSMU in 60 Seconds" feature, which is a 60 -90 second video of the Executive talking about the news. This Friday at noon, come out to the student space workshop. In terms of daycare, they can see services on campus increasing in the near future. The Board of Governors is also going well. If you work for SSMU, SSMU Zen is coming to the office, which is our new platform for maintaining a healthy workplace. He stands for questions.

VP Cooper: Proposes to call the SSMU News "SSMews".

Councillor Larson: Asks if he can stand and model his flawless blanket outfit.

There is a five minute recess. Council resumes at 10:27pm.

**13) Confidential Session**

The gallery exits the room and Council enters a confidential in-camera session at 10:28pm.

Council resumes at 10:34pm.

**14) Adjournment**

Chair Nizam: Wants to say one last thing regarding the situation with the Motion Regarding Equity Fund Referendum Question. It was the fault of the Steering Committee to maintain procedure, not a failure of process and oversight on our side, so it is not fair to hold it against the Equity Commissioner as it is not his responsibility. When she is not around to provide substantive advice, she suggests councillors familiarize themselves with Robert's Rules to help Mike out.

Councillor Chaim: Motions to adjourn. The motion clearly passes and the meeting of the Legislative Council is adjourned at 10:35pm.

FOR APPROVAL