

## Meeting Minutes of the SSMU Legislative Council

### **1) Call to Order 6:16**

2) Attendance

### **3) Adoption of the Agenda**

The agenda was adopted.

### **4) Approval of the Minutes – 11/17/11**

Under 7) Announcements, the spelling of CASCO was incorrect and will be amended to “CASCO”.

### **5) Report of the Steering Committee**

President Knight welcomed commissioners who will give their reports later in this meeting. The motion re. General Assembly Reform was discussed in depth. It was considered that the motion to require that all ratifications online was unconstitutional, and those were stricken, and amended so that the previous GA documents will take their place.

The report of the steering committee was adopted.

### **6) Guest Speakers**

#### **6a. Chris Bangs, Student Inquiry Representative**

Amelia Bagnoli, Alison Delling, Chris Bangs, Matt Philips, and Herman of the student inquiry spoke. They said that the independent student inquiry was formed on November 11<sup>th</sup> to make as much information public possible on November 10<sup>th</sup>. They have just finished their preliminary report. Methodology and data collection are a part of the preliminary report. Historical chronology has also been addressed in this preliminary report. The Council will get a pdf copy of the report by e-mail after the meeting. Psychological impacts on the people involved will be discussed as part of the inquiry. No recommendations by the team were published as a part of this report. Recommendations will be put forward as a part of the final report in January.

Herman said that in terms of methodology, there are four pillars : total transparency, open-based decision making and confidentiality. All information will be made public except respondents' identities, should they wish to remain anonymous. Any information obtained by the inquiry by means of solicitation will be clearly published as solicited information. Anyone is open to participate in the inquiry. The inquiry will hold interviews subject to the consent of the interviewee. The interviewee must approve the person who is interviewing them. Anybody involved under the pillar of transparency must identify themselves as an author of report. All authors of the report must identify themselves. Any decision made by the inquiry requires at least a three quarters majority vote, however, the inquiry is dedicated to consensus based decision-making unless there is a deadlock. Unless any source of information indicates otherwise, their testimony is confidential. Testimonies will be disseminated by the four individuals leading the inquiry unless otherwise indicated, and a copy of the statement signed by interviewees is available on the website. For the first half of key findings, please look at the preliminary report. The first of the key findings is that throughout the night, McGill staff members conveyed misinformation to students who were unaware of their rights. McGill security blocked access to Dawson Hall where students could have escaped riot police. Another key finding is that there was no violence by the fifth floor occupiers. Protest police communication contributed to general confusion. Students called the police when they arrived but this was not great contribution to the deployment of riot police. Also, the McGill emergency system should have been used. Lastly, McGill security called the police and there was no refutation of that action. There were administrators in the building on the night. The presenters asked Councillors to please read the report.

Questions:

Vice-President Fraser asked whether the preliminary report be available  
There is a pdf on the website, [www.independentstudentinquiry.blogspot.com](http://www.independentstudentinquiry.blogspot.com), and the inquiry is working with campus media to disseminate the information widely.

Vice-President Fraser asked whether the inquiry is still collecting testimonials,  
Yes, until final report is published they would love to hear from anyone else.

Councillor Dinel asked how the group considers itself as independent or more independent than the investigation led by Dean Jutras

The group is not under SSMU and are really just a group of students. They have been transparent that they have their own biases, but are creating an open website with as many testimonials as possible one way to keep the inquiry honest. They are trying to be as independent as possible. Herman said that since we base ourselves on open to anybody, we do encourage as many people as can find the time to come out and help to balance out whatever biases they may see in the report.

Councillor Paterson asked with the exception of the phone call to HMB during her web address, was there another attempt to contact others for further information for use in the inquiry,  
Yes, there have been attempts to contact the administration, and security. The inquiry has also been in contact with Dean Jutras and has submitted information requests to McGill and SPVP. They have also e-mailed principal and asked to speak to staff members in person. The Principal has refused to give an interview or any information to the investigation.

Councillor Lessard asked whether any funding is needed for the gathering of data.  
The inquiry has received generous funding from the First Year Council. Access to information requests might be expensive if copies of documents are requested. Other than requests for police documents,

Councillor Clarke asked whether individuals who testified were encouraged to go to Dean Jutras as well.  
No they were not encouraged to do so, but all the public testimonials are available on the website and Dean Jutras will be given the final report.

Councillor Kunev asked how they plan to contact the Montreal media with this report.  
Nothing will be published regarding this preliminary report. The inquiry will wait until they publish the final report and then decide their course of action.

Councillor Paterson asked what exactly is being investigated (e.g. actions of police, admin, or individual students).  
The inquiry was formed to investigate the events of November 10h and to keep Dean Jutras's inquiry honest and accountable, but no specific parties have been targeted in this investigation.

Molly from the gallery said that the report was being made available to Dean Jutras. Regarding the level of confidentiality of those being interviewed, she asked whether the Dean will be taking the inquiry's report into account and be using it in his own report?  
He hasn't said whether he will use the report but the inquiry hopes he will. Many of the people appear as anonymous occupiers or protesters. If anyone requests anonymity, they will get it. This

was always going to be public, those being interviewed were made aware that the report would be made public, but every anonymity request is taken seriously.

The members of the independent student inquiry were thanked for their presentation.

## **7) Announcements**

Vice-President Clare said that the final senate meeting of the year will be held on December 7th. There should be an interesting discussion about whether Senate Meetings will be streamed in the future. The meeting will be held from 2:30-6pm in Leacock 232.

Councillor Lessard of the FYC allocated funds to help the student inquiry and would like to encourage other student associations to contribute also.

Councillor Uribe-Arango said that the IRC is holding an Irish coffee evening event. He said goodbye to no shave November.

Councillor Crawford said that he would like to give announcement of recognition for students who occupied the BOG for a more open university structure.

General Manager Gervais announced that the Council has an alcohol permit and will be serving wine and beer at the end of the meeting.

President Knight said that with the council recap after this meeting, each Council will be sent a self-evaluation which is not urgent, but she asked that Councillors please submit it before the break. Part of that will be goal-setting for next semester so that the Council can maintain efficiency and good goals for next semester. This council has been extremely engaged and productive and that was part of the reason why we decided to celebrate.

Vice-President Plummer said today is World AIDS Day. Next week therapeutic paws will be coming in Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday during the day next week. Study space will also be set up in the ballroom because the library is so full.

Councillor Kryluk said that the McGill cheerleading team is representing province of Quebec at nationals in Toronto this weekend.

Councillor Bi invited Councillors to AUS's event, Barcraft, in Gerts.

Councillor Doyle said that we should all support the toga party for freshmen events as a Council, and there is currently a toga party in Gerts.

Vice-President Clare said that in Attawapiskat there is a state of emergency and there is going to be a fundraiser on Monday from 6-9pm to raise funds for the Red Cross. The event's suggested donation is \$5 and will be held in the SSMU ballroom.

Vice-President Fraser said that the building hours for end of semester are 9am-9pm until December 16<sup>th</sup>. The hours from December 19<sup>th</sup>-21<sup>st</sup> are 12-5pm. The SSMU office closes on the 16<sup>th</sup>. Winter activities night would love some feedback on proposed new format including activities as well as

tabling. Advanced room bookings are now available in the calendar system. Groups can see if their booking has been confirmed or not. Also, Vice-President is getting a haircut next Monday.

Councillor Stettin announced from the gallery that he is resigning from the SSMU. There are many reasons foremost among them the institutional structure, the way the executive is in charge of the Council. He said this is nothing personal. It also has to do with the ability to confront what we face at this moment. Our collaboration with the administration needs to end immediately. The other institutions we participate in are undemocratic and we cannot participate in them anymore.

Councillor Dinel said that Centraide is having bar night at Gerts, on the last day of class.

Councillor Hernandez said that there is a varsity council meeting on Saturday. If you are within certain region, the Council we will be visiting your door to collect food bank donations. At the Y intersection there will be a rap battle at 1pm.

Councillor Kunev said that tomorrow's blues pub is from 2-4pm and includes free beer for those who spin the wheel of misfortune. If you are an engineer and you get free beer.

Johnathan Mooney from AGSEM announced that the teaching assistant bargaining committee reached tentative agreement which received a vote of 77% in favor at the general assembly. Highlights of the agreement are 3 hours of paid pedagogical training for TAs and current TAs will be eligible for that training. Pay increases of 3% for 2 years and 1.2% in third years. Course supervisors and TAs have to meet. This will be cut with the TAship and written commitment to improve teaching support for undergraduate courses. This should not just maintains but put forward making that clause much stronger.

Sheldon said that AGSEM represents TAs, course lecturers, and invigilators. In the last weeks, there have been two bargaining meetings with the administration. McGill cancelled two of the sessions. Next Tuesday, they are waiting for pressure tactics including strike mandate. Next Tuesday, depending on Monday goes, there is a strike vote on the table of the general assembly (for invigilators).

## **8) Questions**

Councillor Paterson asked "How does one become and invigilator?"

Sheldon said that you have to be a graduate student. He said that they do not want a strike but want to force McGill's hand in their contract by placing a strike vote on the table. They will give a global offer so that McGill can approve or make modifications. They are hoping to bring the vote into play and not actually have to use it.

Councillor Paterson asked whether students can write exams without invigilators.

Sheldon said that managers can step in and help. McGill will have policies in place and is well aware of the announcement that a strike vote is on the table.

Vice-President Clare asked how many are unionized.

Sheldon said that there are mass hirings of invigilators at specific times, so there are 500 invigilators employed around exam times. Demands are right now \$10 across the board and they are asking for

an increase to \$15.75 per hour with pay increases depending on seniority. The AGSEM representatives Sheldon and Johnathan thanked SSMU for their support during the TA bargaining.

Vice-President Clare made a motion to suspend the rules to amend the agenda and move item 9e. forward to 9a. This motion passed.

President Knight made a motion to amend the agenda to move question period after the reports by commissioners. The rules were suspended and agenda amended to continue the question period after reports by Commissioners.

## **9) Reports by Commissioners**

### **9a. Library Improvement Fund Commissioner**

Yonan said that all undergrads contribute to this opt-outable fund, and this is matched by alumni funds to provide for library services that students wouldn't otherwise have at McGill. For this year, Yonan is managing fund. The Committee is comprised of Councillors Crawford, Niu, Hacker, Vice-President Clare, and three members at large, and the Dean of Libraries. He started off this year by re-writing the bylaws for the Committee because they didn't reflect the way that the Committee has operated for several years. He has sent out requests for members at large, and the first meeting was last week. He talked about how the Committee will operate and how meetings will be scheduled. In upcoming meetings, the committee will be working on publicity with student leaders in different faculties, publicizing what the committee has to offer, and trying to gather information on what students really need. In the long-term the committee will be sorting through all of these project proposals and determining what the money will be for. In the past, Yonan represented the SSMU in the senate committee on libraries. People from various levels of libraries are represented on the Committee. The Committee aims to make recommendations to Senate on changes that should be made to libraries.

Yonan was thanked for his attendance.

### **9b. Environment Commissioners**

Environment Commissioners Cameron, Aria, and Tanya introduced themselves. They sit on the environment committee act as a resource for different campaigns and groups on campus. The Commissioners have been paring out the environmental policies that SSMU has. This involves a lot of administrative work with environment committee meetings, the planning committee, senate environment meetings, and making sure students know what's going on with events and campaigns. Aria's campaign encourages student gardening projects. A vermi-composting project aimed to help reduce waste in favor of composting. This is part of a larger plan to encourage gardening, and future projects will include seedling sales. Funds from class action projects are spearheaded by the sustainability coordinator. There are plans to draft a greenhouse behind the environment building. Regarding the bottled water ban project, the Committee is working with offices of sustainability on the position of McGill on water. This has been delayed because of strike but entails that McGill catered events would not have any bottled water. Other than that giant workshop for bottled water free day march 15<sup>th</sup>. Also, there are new water bottle fill stations on campus. There is a document which outlines the installation of more fill stations. There is a waste audit regarding coffee cups which will be used to further a reusable mug campaign. A third campaign is for raising awareness in terms of energy usage and encouraging students to use less energy. Lighting and energy audits will begin next semester with concrete actions starting January. Stickers and posters will be put up reminding students to turn off lights and to use machines in a more energy-efficient way. The

environment committee sat down voted on upcoming projects. Official volunteers on the committee have been coordinated. Mary is a science advisor providing green facts and researching signage. A community coordinator has been organizing campaigns including pumpkin carving event in Gerts. This year there will be an inter-campus environment project in Montreal. Environmental coalition meetings take place for those events on specific campuses. An inter-faculty liaison person works with one project group and hopes to start survey in the new year for incorporating sustainability in the curriculum. In October there was a project regarding the concept of sustainability. There was also a “winterizing your apartment” workshop. People went home with information and supplies for reducing energy consumption in their homes. Sustainability ambassadors have been selected on campus. The ambassadors work very closely with student staff members, the green events coordinator, and green building coordinators. Green events coordinators helped the plate club during 4Floors and have been revising Styrofoam free policies and revising green events checklist with Fraser and getting groups to approach them to make them greener. The green building coordinator has done a lot in terms of monitoring status of Shatner building and where info is lacking and trying to fill those gaps, for example, leading the lighting and energy audit. A lot of work focuses on developing strategic plans between SSMU and McGill, and working with the sustainability coordinator, Dave, to plan for strategic summits, develop a strategic plan on sustainability for SSMU (to be presented to the Council in March), and working with office of sustainability to develop strategic plan for McGill university as a whole. The five year plan was formulated through the committee but is now being managed through a working group. The environment committee is also looking into e-waste disposal sites and has been helping with plate club. This semester, sustainability caucus meetings took place. Those meetings voted on what projects should be pursued, and allowed sustainability coordinator roles to check in and talk on meta level about responsibilities. The green corner working group began with last year’s environment committee and has continued this year. Roadblocks have disrupted the use of the space, but the environment committee has implemented different signage. The green corner is now space for organic campus. The committee is thinking of other way to utilize the space and see how they will be able to effectively use the space as a meeting space. It has been a great semester. An initial slow start picked up and the committee will continue with campaigns next semester. The committee will persevere and hopes to increase support and networking with green groups in order to be more of a resource for them.

### **Questions:**

Councillor Dinel asked about the relationship of the environment committee to Mac campus. One of the important things is to work with green groups downtown and at mac campus including the environment coalition group. One thing discussed in the report in terms of challenges is increasing contact with different green groups. There has been some collaboration.

Councillor Uribe-Arango asked whether there is a plan to reduce plastic bottles in residences. The conversation has been going on for the past 3 years. One of the main barriers in reducing plastic water bottles is that students will buy plastic bottles of other drinks, and there is a worry that students will buy less healthy drinks instead. One of the main points is to have better infrastructure fill stations before eliminating them from vending machines. President Knight said that they have moved sustainability projects forward this semester. This has been a particularly hectic semester and she was not able to support as much as she would have liked, though the committee has still shown great results.

### **9c. Equity Commissioners**

Cassy said that a report was sent from the November 17<sup>th</sup> council. Ryan said that they are open to questions.

#### **Questions:**

President Knight asked whether this was a successful semester and if equity complaints have been up or down in terms of last year.

Vice-President Clare said that specifics of equity complaints can't be discussed, but they are down since last year.

Councillor Paterson asked what equity commissions would say to students or student groups in regards to equity.

Ryan said that the first step is opening our minds and ourselves to the idea of education, an important part of that education is about how we treat each other. We can be wrong. A lot of people say that they said they may not do equitable things always. What we do or have done doesn't define who we are or who we want to be. Transformation means constantly seeking broader forms of education, which is important to living and learning.

Vice-President Clare asked them to discuss possible changes to equity policy.

Ryan said that the equity policy was ratified last year. That was written by former VPUA Rae Dooley. It filled a void in SSMU procedure and mechanisms filling a dearth of SSMU policy at large. The previous equity policy contained several vacuums and outdated terms. For example, members of equity committee had specific roles in the terms of reference. There was a committee member for women's issues, queer issues, etc. but that structure contains issues of tokenization and limitations because issues of representation may not be filled by one person in the chair: the way that members are termed, referenced, and selected were clarified in the new procedure. Other possible changes include more education for SSMU members. Councils could stand to be more equity-minded and training for council and exec, consultative members, and committee members. Another change would be to allow appeals if someone feels that their complaint has not been adequately addressed. The new equity policy will be submitted in January or February to the Council.

### **9d. Francophone Commissioner**

Marie-Élise introduced herself and completed her presentation in French (the following is translated). Her co-commissioner could not attend today, but together they attend to Francophone affairs on campus, including raising awareness and promotion of francophonie at McGill. This year in January they will have an event celebrating francophonie. This semester was a documentary film shown on la vie francophone. Francofête has not yet been scheduled but will be focused on literature this year. One of the professors is from U de M and political panel on bilingualism and cabane a sucre and cheese event on campus. This year the members of the committee are trying to work with first year office and develop better support for francophone students starting their first year at McGill. The committee would like to bring forward francophonie which is not a focus at McGill.

Councillor Jean-claude asked when Sherbrooke will be presenting at Francofête.

Francophete will in January or February. Anyone interested should join the francophone facebook page where all events will be posted. This will also be on the SSMU listserv.

Councillor Kunev asked who the musical artists at Francofete will be. There are professors coming to present, but this year there will probably not be a music event. Marie-Élise said she is not sure whether there will be a musical event. There is not really a market for hiring a musical act and selling tickets. Right now there is no one booked.

Vice-President Pedneault asked her to talk about barriers of francophone students from their first year.

She said that she has been the commission and most francophone students come from CGEP and comes before groups are formed and that creates difficulties with interaction with peers and then language is an additional problem. This decreases over the years. They would like to work with first year office primarily. They would like to integrate students generally and want to make sure that Anglophone and francophone students are paired together in a special program.

Councillor Uribe-Arango said that one of the residence representatives do not speak French and he would be interested in having someone come in and speak to the inter-residence Council.

Marie-Élise said that she would be open to that idea.

Councillor Jean-claude asked whether students could be connected through an initiative to bring anglophone students into French-speaking neighborhoods.

They would like to organize other events in Montreal but does not have anything right now.

Councillor Diné asked whether the committee has coalitions with other places in la monde francophone.

On campus there are a few groups that they are connected with. This year there are people from Acadia and other places who they are connected with.

The francophone commissioner was thanked for her attendance.

#### **9e. Academic Research Commissioner**

Murt said that as the academic research commissioner he has only been working for about a month. His first task was to compile student complaints about how MUNACA has affected them and has been working with students to do research SSMU and looking at how student services have been involved. He has found that there are a growing number of ex-officio positions on senate and met with Jana Luker to look into how the strike has affected students. Another avenue of research has been in regards to committees, and he is looking into e-mailing student executives at Canadian universities to get a sense of election results and representation.

Vice-President Clare explained that this is first step for the structure of committees. This is for a broader look at governance in student unions.

#### **Question Period**

There were no questions.

#### **10) New Business**

##### **10a. Notice of Motion Regarding Five Year Ethical Investment Plan**



Because this is a policy change it requires 3 readings. The second reading will be at steering committee in January which precedes the first Council meeting in January. The first Council meeting in January will be the third reading.

**Senator Dinel read the whereas and resolved clauses of the motion.**

President Knight asked if Councillors have time before January to read this and have comments or questions will they be circulating that feedback in advance?

Vice-President Patel said yes, Councillors can give their feedback in advance and comment on the motion before the first meeting of Council.

Councillor Bi asked whether they are looking into current stocks and what will be happening to those stocks.

Vice-President Patel said that sustainability coordinator discussed looking into it.

Councillor Clarke **said that 2.5%** seems arbitrary but is wondering why that number was chosen.

Vice-President Patel said that it is not arbitrary, and they wanted to provide realistic numbers. This is a five-year plan but hopefully FERC will revise it.

Councillor Bi asked the movers if they have looked into the websites and whether they have affiliations which may not be in line with SSMU. Someone worked with Ralph Nader

Senator Dinel said that that is probably not relevant to this policy. New companies which SSMU will be investing in will be screened more carefully

Councillor Kunev said that the goal is for this to be long-term policy and asked if goals of this policy, as such, are set too low or too high.

Vice-President Patel said that he is mandating a five-year plan and wants to be as realistic as possible with the numbers. He wants it to be as feasible and mildly conservative as possible. These types of companies might that would be invested in should be new and fresh.

Vice-President Clare asked if the SSMU owns anything to do with pornography.

Vice-President Patel said that he does not believe so.

Councillor Bi asked how someone might get more involved in the planning phases.

Vice-President Patel said that Councillors are welcome to come by for explanations. Suggestions and feedback are always welcome. If you know if any companies are ethically adequate we'd love to suggest them.

FERC was thanked for their contribution with this notice of motion.

### **10b. Motion Regarding Executive Contracts and Job Descriptions**

President Knight read the resolved clauses. It is difficult to hold Executives accountable to the constitution because it is very vague and has no rules or termination systems except impeachment. If anyone wanted to resign they could just do so immediately. These descriptions could potentially help candidates for next year's executive evaluate whether they have the skills because these things have not always been clear. Last year's executive were not able to all collaborate effectively to have job descriptions approved last year, so this year's executive completed these descriptions here today.

Councillor Winer asked about the second page of the contract, bullet 4 which reads that executives should “not undertake the pursuant of or engage in...” work outside of their portfolio. He asked what kind of cases this would cover and what kind of cases this would not cover in the future. Is concerned that this description may be too broad.

President Knight said that this is in addition to the other policies including the conflict of interest policy. The contract was reviewed by SSMU’s lawyer. Executive members are paid to work for SSMU for an average of 60 hours a week. If any executive was undertaking other work that undermines their work in SSMU (e.g. paid to be a blogger against student unions), such employment would not be permissible. Devoting substantial amounts of time to something else would not be permissible either. Anything undermining an executive’s ability to fulfill their duties is not acceptable. There are procedures set in place for things that might violate those concerns.

Councillor Burnett asked how this changes existing powers of Council to oversee executive. President Knight said that this makes no change but clarifies procedures. This is more stringent and more clear. It makes it easier for Council to hold executives accountable for their actions.

Councillor Uribe-Arango asked whether tax is paid on the executives’ salary.

President Knight said that the amount on the contract is before taxes.

Councillor Paterson asked if this is adopted now, will it only be adopted for one year and what is the process for making this policy more permanent?

President Knight said that adopting this policy would allow for further review later. She wanted to get this together in time for anyone running for executive positions next year would be able to look at the terms this year.

Councillor Paterson asked whether this will be published during the spring election period and whether it could be distributed at the candidates meeting.

President Knight said this would be posted on SSMU website as soon as possible. About executive positions next year, they will be making students who approach them aware that the description exists.

Councillor Paterson made a motion to previous question.

**The executive contract and job descriptions passed.**

### **10c. Motion Regarding Reform of the SSMU General Assembly**

President Knight said that cannot change motion itself in the text that is presented originally. To change this document, the Council has to formally amend things. In a second, smaller document package there are 2 documents, the track changes definition of the motion and a short document of best attempt to summarize achievements. These changes are not exhaustive and does not preclude debate. There was a three-minute recess to discuss this motion. President Knight furthered that this motion includes feedback from the presidents’ roundtable and from different faculties.

### **Debate began on this motion:**

Councillor Kunev asked the President to explain how online ratification, as it was suggested, is unconstitutional.

President Knight said that online ratification is unconstitutional according to article 28. With the quorum requirements met, the decisions can be made online only on a certain number of things.

Changing bylaws would be restricting the power of GAs according to the constitution. All interpretations are subject to review at the judicial board if anyone would like to review them.

Councillor Bi would like to make a friendly amendment where the online verification solely be made to motions on the floor.

It was clarified that this type of decision is not unconstitutional to move to online ratification, and is an option open to this Council.

Councillor Clarke said this relates back to the steering committee question he asked whether the general assembly is a physical assembly of students whereas online voting is part of the general assembly.

President Knight said it was considered that students could vote online but given that quorum requirement, having an online voting system that would way would be in contradiction to the constitution.

Councillor Burnett moved to strike articles 5.5 and its subclauses, articles 5.6 and subclauses, but not 5.7.1 and 5.7.2.

President Knight asked if he would be amenable to adding those subclauses to article 9.

Councillor Paterson asked if the clauses he wishes to keep in are relevant without the other clause that doesn't exist in this version. She asked if an online vote is impossible.

Councillor Burnett said that he would like to change his motion to strike 5.5, 5.6, 5.7.1, and 5.7.2. All of these were struck as a friendly amendment.

President Knight would like to add 5.7.1 and 5.7.2 back in and also to add section 5.9 (which would have to be renumbered) regarding the ability of general assemblies to send things to an online vote should they choose to do so.

Councillor Clarke asked what is provisioned if the speaker of council can use something to stop debate for occurring without sufficient time to address the issue.

Chair Nizam said that the speaker of Council uses their discretion regarding the issue at hand when it comes to debate.

These were adopted to the motion as friendly amendments.

Debate resumed on the resolution as a whole.

Vice-President Pedneault made a motion to amend 5.7.1 and 5.7.2 to strike the words "before voting opens" from 5.7.1 and add the words "on the" before "online" and to strike "before vote"

President Knight asked, given what was just added, this should be available. She suggested that it read after "website" "in the case that any motion is sent to an online vote, it shall remain available before voting opens."

Vice-President Pedneault said that both of those things mean the same thing.

President Knight said that this has to show up eventually but does not fulfill the spirit of keeping online votes well-informed. This was a friendly amendment

Vice-President Pedneault withdrew his amendment in favor of President Knight's amendment, but would like to add "In the case that any motion is sent to an online vote" for 5.7.2.

President Knight said that was a friendly amendment.

Councillor Paterson said that a concern was raised about the salamander system. You can time out of the system in ten minutes and if you are trying to watch footage and trying to vote that would be difficult. President Knight said that ideally, students would watch the footage before signing in to vote but if they did time out they could sign back in.

Councillor Crawford brought up that the languages of this has to be on the ballot but the time-out danger is still there. There are times when voting and reading to the end of a motion takes a long time.

Vice-President Fraser said that she doesn't see the problem and students can sign in pretty easily. President Knight said that she thinks unlikely that the motions from a general assembly would be on the same ballot as SSMU executive elections. Secondly, it would be a pain to have to reload the ballot but if students who would not reload the page that are probably not going to be involved in voting anyway.

Councillor Bi made a motion to amend to strike 4.2. She said that she respects the spirit of motions coming from the floor but now something could become a motion three hours before the GA. She cannot help but feel that the 2/3 majority would allow adequate debate. She said that without online verification it is pretty undemocratic.

Councillor Burnett said that it could be a good idea to maintain the same signature requirements as other motions. Having motions from the floor is very important for accessibility.

Councillor Hernandez said that instead of three hours for the submission of motions, a minimum of twenty-four hours might be better.

President Knight said that as you can see in the feedback document there was discomfort about motions from the floor being allowed this early because of the potential that a special interest group could push something through. She said that another way to amend this would be to add in another required ratification from the floor which would probably not be unconstitutional. That would create a stronger incentive to get motions in by the earlier deadline.

Councillor Bi asked what incentivizes someone has who goes through this channel two weeks before. This would get contentious around motions on the floor.

Councillor Kunev said that controversial motions can be approved two weeks in advance. With events like that of November 10<sup>th</sup> it is important to have an opportunity to raise motions right away. Sometimes there is an element of procrastination from people who should have submitted their motions on time.

Senator Crawford said that striking this clause shows a lack of faith in the general assembly and thinks by virtue of that anything that limits the ability of the general will to tell the student society what to do is bad on principle. It questions the willingness of the society to debate a motion. This clause should be kept a motion. He said it would be interesting to discuss online voting.

Vice-President Pedneault said that a concern was raised about lack of forewarning with these motions. As someone who has mobilized people in general assemblies it is difficult to get a lot of people to vote even when there is a lot of advanced notice. He said that campaigning when a motion is submitted could happen but the concern is not a huge one.

Vice-President Fraser said that contentious motions bring people out and healthy debate is a healthy thing. Allowing motions to be submitted this close to the assembly will strengthen the purpose of a general assembly.

Councillor Paterson said that these motions, even if they are submitted within three hours, are being strictly checked for constitutionality and equity. She asked whether they are still directed by the signature requirements of motions not from the floor.

President Knight said that currently worded, they are not required to have the same signature requirements. It is easier to submit motions from the floor without great support for the motion.

Councillor Bi said that having this option available as a resource for time-sensitive issues passed the deadline makes sense, but people do not have to obey spirit of that allowance.

President Knight said this was discussed, and ability to respond to recent issues was not the only benefit of having motions from the floor. The idea that only time-sensitive issues should be allowed would result in a lot of debates about what time-sensitive issues are.

Councillor Burnett said that it's difficult to mobilize people to come to a general assembly. There is no way to have a secret process and the possibility for abuse is not outweighed by substantial value of allowing motions from the floor.

Councillor Clarke would like to add on to Councillor Bi's and said that his worry is that this is a way that motions be brought to the floor. Debate will be reduced because two-week period will not be there. Motions will have to be approved two weeks in advance on campus and with more debate will have a greater understanding of the issues. A two-week process will become a three-hour process.

The unfriendly amendment by Councillor Bi failed by a vote of 5-17-1.

Councillor Paterson made a motion to amend to add 4.2.2 and renumber accordingly to say that "all motions from the floor may adhere to the same signature rules as other motions as stipulated in 4.2.1. President Knight recommended that 4.1.1 become 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 its own sub-clause group with its parent clauses, not those regarding motions from the floor. That was a friendly amendment

Vice-President Fraser said that she is confused by the spirit of this amendment because needing signatures for motions means that signatures would become part of the agenda and most motions should be ratified. When having motions submitted, there should either be no signatures two weeks in advance, or a separate motion from the floor (that does not require signatures).

President Knight said the issue is that they would have two streams for two different values of the and is really important to allow substantial changes to have a specific deadline to allow that to happen. It is the speakers who have to continually do that work. The benefit of requiring a 2/3 vote requirement for the introduction of a new motion is that last minute motions would not be debated if the changes made to them would take too long. That is the rationale for having systems in advance. There are things she would want to have publicized well in advance but it makes sense to have things put forward on the floor.

Vice-President Patel made a motion to amend 5.4.1 to strike that and its sub clauses. He said that given concerns presented by faculty associations in the steering committee document, it is

appropriate to strike, and not all members are at the GA because they are members of faculty associations but this clause specifically alienates people and takes away the space of people being there as an individual.

President Knight said that to clarify, she is open to suggestions for wording improvements. The goal of this is not to require everyone to align themselves to their faculty but to have a litmus test for faculties to deal with the issue that the GA is dominated from a certain constituency. It would not require any faculty association to do so. President Knight would not like to take up AUS' time with creating a stance GAs but there was some support from smaller faculties with the feeling that it would help inform the student body in general if there is a varied approach to an issue by faculty. Faculty associations do not necessarily have to deal with the concerns of their constituents. It might also allow the speakers to bring to light certain strong objections and make sure that there is forewarning that all opinions would be heard. This would get rid of the binary for or against.

Councillor Chaini said she agrees with this because everyone in the GA has a right to speak but people who are certain students may align themselves with their faculty rather than thinking about the issue. All faculty associations will have the floor and no one should be divided before any debate has been done. They can identify themselves as a member of a society anyway if they wish.

Councillor Kunev said the idea behind this point was to involve the faculties in the process of the GA. It is not possible to mandate them to be involved. This idea would get faculties more interested in the SSMU in general.

Councillor Clarke said that if the end goal is to get more people out to the GA, keeping this provision would do so and would be interested to make sure that their association states what is in line with their beliefs.

Vice-President Pedneault said that general assemblies are based on the claim that everyone should represent themselves as equal members, things must be different if SSMU was a federation but it is not. There are good reasons why SSMU is unitary.

Councillor Paterson said he heard the concerns that some associations would have something and representative of EdUS she is more interested in representing this and would like to have the opportunity to say something. She said that this is an option for faculties. It's just a happy option.

Councillor Burnett said that this is not really adding new power for faculties because they are already allowed to speak on their behalf. He would like to make a request to Vice-President Patel to strike the second whereas clause to the whole motion to remove 5.4.1 and remove the clause that gets rid of faculty quorum requirements. He said that he does share the concern that part should be struck, but not that all of it should be struck.

Vice-President Fraser said that there is a lot of emphasis on people's faculties and there are a lot of stereotypes. We all come from the same university but we find that this emphasis on faculties concerns are always relevant. The way someone votes is always irrelevant to their faculty. She said that she is for this amendment.

Councillor Bi made a motion to previous question.

The Chair allowed a few more members to speak before entertaining the motion to previous question.

Councillor Kunev said that the interests of the SSMU are not always the interests of all the students. Students feel that they are not represented by faculty associations and would want to feel a part of their organizations represented in SSMU events. He is not saying that associations would have to take a position, but that all have the option to be present at that debate.

President Knight said that faculty associations can't vote on behalf of all of their constituents so this could be a good test about whether they agree with leadership and should not blindly vote with associations. This could provide additional scrutiny for student leaders. Sometimes GAs are dominated by "SSMUshies" that may not hold the relevant concerns of their faculties. Faculty associations do sometimes consider that the SSMU GA is relevant to their association. It would be very brief time for them to express this. Before taking decision before or against there would be some consultation with students from each faculty. The language of these clauses could be amended for clarity.

Councillor Bi asked whether this directly affects representatives of the faculty on SSMU. President Knight said there is no procedure whereby requiring certain things of faculty representatives would be legitimate.

**This amendment to strike 5.4.1 passed with a vote of 10-4-9.**

A motion to recess passed.

Councillor Burnett made a motion to strike the second resolved clause.

President Knight said that if this was going to an online vote anyway it wouldn't be as relevant and this stops it from being the bylaw review committee to bring it forward. Vice-President Patel's first motion was struck.

Vice-President Patel made a motion to amend 5.8 to be 5.9 with subclauses as stated on the screen. The Chairs re-numbered the amendment.

Councillor Burnett made an amendment to add article 10 with regards to language.

Councillor Paterson asked who would be responsible for the financials of said interpreter or translator.

President Knight said that this would probably be under the President's budget.

President Knight asked if the word interpreter requires simultaneous translator or translator. Councillor Burnett said that it might or might not be worth clarifying the technicalities of this. 10.3 allows whisper translation but in 10.2 anyone requiring translation could ask for something to be repeated. She suggested that 10.2 be changed to "designated translator" which was a friendly amendment.

President Knight said that 10.1 may be redundant with the constitution, but that's fine. Councillor Burnett saw no harm in the redundancy.

Vice-President Clare asked whether a procedure ensuring that they were a week ahead to ensure that there is a translator.

Vice-President Fraser asked if the exact clause 10.1 is in the constitution. President Knight said that it basically says that all SSMU members should be entitled to access to both French and English. Councillor Burnett said yes.

Vice-President Fraser would like it to be the exact same language or not the same language at all. The amendment with the exact same language as the constitution was added as friendly.

Vice-President Pedneault asked that they pull up 5.8. He would like to strike “to defeat” in favor of “in order to carry”

This amendment was friendly.

Councillor Bi made a motion to amend to add the original clauses 5.5. and 5.6 as the sub-clauses of 4.2 so that the votes online would be put online and start at 4.2.4 to read that all resolutions passed by submitted for ratification.

President Knight proposed that all motions on the floor pass from a general assembly. President Knight said that this is worthy of debate and she will therefore describe it as unfriendly.

Vice-President Fraser asked if we had already discussed that this is unconstitutional.

President Knight said that the constitution says if there is quorum then the GA can make certain decisions. Because this is a new way of introducing motions but this is in advance, then adding an additional motion is not unconstitutional.

Senator Crawford said the language of section 28.1 intends to ensure that the general assembly has freedom within the confines of what it wants to pass. He said this is against the spirit of that part of the constitution.

Councillor Burnett said that aside from some of Senator Crawford’s concerns are concerns regarding the logistics of this recommended for re-insertion by Councillor Bi. He said with no campaigning within the context of regular referendum periods it is very difficult to get that quorum and does not know if this is treatable.

Councillor Chaini said that all of these should state motions from the floor and agrees with Councillor Burnett. Councillor Chaini’s addition that all of this would say “motions from the floor” is friendly.

President Knight would like to say that all motions from the floor must be submitted to an online vote in section 5.8. It would ensure that everybody has the opportunity to vote. At some level if they choose not to take that opportunity that is their own issue. That would not be unfeasible logistically.

Councillor Bi said that in general, there needs to be more checks for motions on the floor and sees how this might limit the spirit but cannot house every single person. Online voting offers the ability for every member to participate.

Vice-President Clare spoke in support of this amendment because it allows for students to come more aware of things even as an after the fact. She said this would allow for newspapers to engage with this dialogue as well.



Vice-President Fraser said that 5.6 is weird that there is no campaigning and doesn't see the point of putting these online in that case. She would suggest an amendment to strike 5.6 and its subclauses. This would be allowed to replace part of this than to strike it completely. At the discretion of the chair, that will be proposed later.

Senator Clarke said that his fear is that by eliminating the window this would limit discussion on campus. The distinction of before the constitutional and now is not valid because before it was unconstitutional because this satisfies any quorum requirements. He would rather let the J-Board decide whether this is constitutional than vote on it.

Vice-President Pedneault said that his concern is with submissions days in advance versus a few hours in advance. He said that this motion in practice would not allow regular SSMU members to create their own motions and they would have to be put to an online vote.

Councillor Chaini asked whether, for an unfriendly amendment, the vote can be made clause-by-clause.

Chair Nizam said the motion can be divided after a motion is made to previous question.

Vice-President Patel said that he would discourage voting in favor of this motion. Though participation is greatly appreciated online voting takes away from the dialogue at the A. He feels that the GA is a place that individuals can express their feelings and the online vote would take away from that.

Senator Crawford agreed with that and said if the last month has taught us anything it is the ability to dialogue with your fears is important.

Councillor Chaini agrees with Vice-President Pedneault and would suggest dividing the question or striking the amendment and adding the same clause with other motions.

President Knight said that one thing she heard during the feedback is that people were alarmed by the idea that people could bring motions forward without hearing political opinions beforehand. Additionally, she does not necessarily agree with the idea that it's marginalizing people to allow online voting and said that motions on the floor might be better understood in context. She said that there is a valid argument but the flip argument could be just as valid. If this were passed she would like to further amend this.

Councillor Bi said that substantive and time-sensitive issues are respected but asked why there are no explicit conditions for motions on the floor. She said that someone will not put it on the agenda if they think it will be voted down. Someone could put through a motion that only a small few put forward beforehand.

Vice-President Clare asked to have a straw poll to see how many Councillors are unsure how to vote on this because they are unsure about the constitutionality.

President Knight said that their conclusion about constitutionality could be verified by the J-Board.

Councillor Crawford made a motion for a straw poll.

Councillor Paterson asked if it is possible to commit clauses to the J-Board  
President Knight said no because there is a formal procedure which involves submitting something to the J-Board but she could approach them about their opinion to see if they would answer without the formal procedure.

Chair Tong said that we will take Senator Crawford's straw poll to ask whether or not it should be part of the amendment.

Councillor Paterson made a motion to mandate that this be brought to the J-Board. If there is a motion to informally request from the J-Board she asked if that would entertain just debating the motion. She asked if we would be debating adding this to the constitution.

President Knight said that significant concerns about motions on the floor could be debated here, then at the appropriate point in voting procedure the Council could divide that out and table that section.

Councillor Kunev said that the motion to amend and ask the President to speak to the J-Board and asking them about reintroducing 5.5 and 5.6 to issues online is important.  
President Knight said that there is substantially different certainty in the two matters. She could ask them both questions. She said that she would like that interested Councillors assist her in this because it takes some time.

Vice-President Pedneault said that there is a separation of legislative, executive, and judicial branches. If people want to discuss this it should be brought to referendum.  
Councillor Clarke said that asking questions of the judicial branch happens all the time. This can happen and is allowed.  
President Knight said that she is also part of the legislative body.

Councillor Paterson asked if President Knight would like to include Councillor Kunev's point in her question.  
President Knight will first ask for an informal discussion with the J-Board and if they say no it has to go through the normal way. This motion passed.

Councillor Kunev made a motion to mandate her to file an official J-Board case with regards to 5.5 saying that all resolutions have to be submitted online.  
President Knight spoke against this because the issue with the previous aspect that she brought to J-Board, Steering made a decision it was unclear. However, Steering did feel strongly about the constitutionality of the online vote therefore that should not be brought to the J-Board. Reversing the decision of Steering would be part of it but she does not agree.  
Councillor Kunev said that an informal discussion would be for a second opinion. President Knight said that we are not all unclear and steering was clear. As this issue is not unclear in the eyes of the steering committee this would be abuse of the system.

Chair Tong ruled Councillor Kunev's motion out of order.

Councillor Chaini made a motion to table this and discuss the rest of the motion other than what is currently being debated.

President Knight said that the motion would be to divide to see if online voting from the floor would be constitutional. This amendment has been committed to the J-Board this amendment. We will be tabling 4.3 right now.

Councillor Bi's amendment will not be voted upon right now if this motion to table passes.

President Knight said that because people might not be sure if this is constitutional there should be further discussion.

Vice-President Pedneault said that this would be fine if we didn't divide the motion. This shows that student associations trust their membership to come up with new business. He will be voting against dividing the question.

Councillor Burnett said that this is really important and if we cannot accept motions from the floor then it would be pertinent to vote against the whole resolution.

Councillor Bi said the spirit of the amendment is to fill out the idea of a motion from the floor because things can be done three hours before. If we can't let that happen then this is a rash decision.

President Knight said that there were a lot of people who expressed that their support was contingent of this going online.

We will now vote on dividing the question.

The motion to divide the question passed with a vote of 12 for and 11 opposed. 4.3 will not be voted upon in the final vote.

Chair Nizam said that this could require table to a later date and a vote of 12/11 does not.

The vote to reconsider a hasty decision passed.

**The revote on the division of the question to table 4.3 failed.**

The motion to previous question passed.

Senator Clarke asked that we see the entire motion on the screen.

**The amendment to 5.6 will be brought to the J-Board but voting on the whole motion was 9 for, 9 opposed, and six abstentions.**

#### **10d. Motion Regarding Letter Regarding Dean Jutras Investigation**

Councillor Paterson spoke against this motion because she does not have massive concerns with Dean Jutras' investigation and has seen the principal answer the question many times on the integrity of the investigation. In the interest of time because the Dean is someone that knows the university this is good. Councillor Paterson said that it gets a bit whiny on our part and she will strongly vote against this.

President Knight asked the Principal at the board of governors, in response to a professors question at Senate, whether she had consulted experts on how this investigation should be conducted but had a bias about the internal investigation. Her argument was based on the idea of a peer review and

asked if she had considered someone else who would be a peer. President Knight said for peer review you do not get peer reviewed by peers within your institution. The Principal said that she had already answered the question.

Vice-President Pedneault said that specific phrasings in the letter were discussed. This letter regarding Dean Jutras' investigation was drafted and signed by 27 professors. One of those contacted him and brought this to Council in terms of boarder political vision to this body and the executive. Vice-President Pedneault said that an impartial investigation does not necessarily rely on this. The core of the question is in point 2 about assigning blame to individuals and holding security accountable to the actions of November 10<sup>th</sup>. He said that this is well-written letter but is looking more broadly of an ad hoc committee appointed from representative decision-making. This should not come off as whiny. The reasons why an external inquiry would be preferred are outlined in problems of paragraph 2. A few years ago there was a case at York where someone was responsible for sexual abuse and the university was mandated to consult student unions and there was a demand that the investigation be run differently. This has happened before that a university has looked into getting their own processes. We could allow the McGill community to really get some answers.

Senator Dinel said that she spoke to the principal and said that this decision was not unilateral as that letter reads. She said that there is a perceived lack of independence in the Dean's investigation. Secondly, where in the letter it says that the investigation will not hold personnel accountable, it is important to note that it will also not hold students accountable.

President Knight said that one clause is her concern because in the last paragraph before the discussion of an ad hoc committee they call for the suspense of the investigation. That would be unlikely. She said it would be interesting to see even if we don't agree with this process.

Councillor Lessard said that he is for an inquiry, and there is an inquiry from both Dean Jutras and an independent student investigation.

Vice-President Fraser said that he was saying that he would like to preserve both investigations.

A straw poll was taken as to whether this should be passed.

Councillor Paterson asked if it would be possible to specify that the undersigned be put down as specific members of SSMU Council. She would like to request that her dissenting force be put forward.

Councillor Dinel asked who would sign this letter and who it would be sent to.

Vice-President Pedneault said that it could be signed the Vice-President External on behalf of the the Legislative Council, or the Executive Council on behalf of the Legislative Council.

The Chair said there would have to be an amendment to the resolved clause if she would like to include the signatories of the letter formally.

President Knight said that it won't proceed differently depending on who is required to sign this.

Councillor Dinel made a motion to add Resolved that Vice-President External Pedneault sign the letter on behalf of SSMU Legislative Council.

Vice-President Pedneault said this is unfriendly because this is a difference between him signing this on behalf of the Legislative Council, and having the Legislative Council sign. He said that he should be mandated to do things he doesn't want to do.

Chair Nizam said that later on it could be a problem if this isn't signed by a specific person.

Senator Crawford said that while he respects the rights of Councillors to express dissenting vote, it should be signed by SSMU Council as a united front. We should do things as a whole.

Councillor Chaini said that we've also taken decisions that have not been unanimous but have been carried out. She said that typically within the executive committee it will be drafter and undersigned by the drafter on behalf of the executive. However, it would not make much sense for legislative Council to step away their responsibility to one person.

Councillor Paterson would like to add that it not be signed by SSMU Legislative Council but that it be signed with a roll-call vote.

Councillor Chaini asked if this is even possible that SSMU could sign this as an entire Council because this is not unanimous and we can put individual Councillors' names instead.

Chair Nizam said that we could have voted to do it this way. In general you vote as a group but if there is a strong enough vote of dissent that is how this would not be signed.

Councillor Chaini asked if each person would sign separately.

President Knight asked a point of parliamentary inquiry because she feels as though the whole resolution as though that changes the spirit of the resolution. If this were to fail that would not prevent Councillors to change it. The body of motion states that this is an endorsement of the letter. It is important to sign based on the way the motion is written at the moment.

The motion to previous question passed.

A motion for a roll-call vote passed.

By a vote of 10 for, 10 against, and 4 abstentions, this does not pass.

## **11) Reports by Committees**

### **11a. Interest Group Committee Report**

Vice-President Fraser stood for questions.

This report was adopted.

### **11b. Operations Management Committee Report**

Councillor Chin stood for questions regarding this report.

President Knight asked how marketplace is doing so far and if there is a strategy for broader publicity.

Vice-President Patel said that three students have used it so far. There is an issue with marketing strategy. He would like to post textbooks during the first two weeks when we're back.

### **11c. Student-Run Café Working Group Report**

Councillor Canon stood for questions.

### **11d. Funding Committee**

Councillor Winer said that at next Council, the Committee will be reporting on how much money is left in each fund. Secondly a project they have worked on this semester is getting a form online on the website for clubs to be reimbursed when there are checks.

Vice-President Pedneault asked why TVM got more than they requested.

Councillor Winer said that this year they haven't always give a club what they apply for. It depends on what their budget is looking like and how much money they actually need. Clubs don't have acute understandings of what they need.

This report was adopted.

### **11e. Executive Report**

President Knight said that she would like to mark that today marks the halfway point of the Executives' terms in office. They might have also seen the fact that the tribune published their midterm reviews and asked that constituents send e-mails.

The report was adopted.

## **12) Reports by Executives**

### **12a. VP Clubs & Services Report**

Vice-President Fraser stood for questions.

Councillor Clarke asked about MOA changes and whether anyone said that they will not change no matter what.

Vice-President Fraser said that sometimes groups were not allowed to choose things that wanted and sometimes the name cannot change because of externally affiliated organizations

Councillor Paterson asked if she got any responses yet on the changes to activities night. She said she got a lot of really constructive feedback. A lot of groups informally sent messages about what kind of activity they can do. Some groups said that they did not want to do that but wanted tabling space.

Councillor Kunev asked about tomorrow's deadline for submitting an activity.

Vice-President Fraser said that she said she wants feedback on the new format by Monday but the deadline to submit the activity would be January 11<sup>th</sup>.

Councillor Chaini asked if there will be other workshops and whether there will be space if clubs would want a projector.

Vice-President Fraser said that there would be a master schedule about events going on at different times. They would also be willing to provide equipment and set-up.

### **12b. VP Internal**

Vice-President Plummer stood for questions.

Vice-President Fraser asked him to report orally on the dogs.

Plummer said that he has contacted Therapeutic Paws of Canada as a network of people who own dogs certified to play with people and they're very friendly. This is a service that a lot of American

universities offer to students during exams. People are coming in with their dogs on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

Councillor Paterson asked if the building code has been overturned for this event. Vice-President Plummer said that he sat down with Carol and Pauline, the building managers and it is ok to allow pets with the consent of both building managers.

The orientation debrief was the other night and sat down with Leslie, Ian, Jana, and all faculties. This week's particular debrief was about how disappointed they were with how Discover McGill ran this year and how the First Year Office Needs to do things differently next year. Councillor Doyle met with Kady Lins and was wondering if they decided on a topic. Vice-President Plummer said that is something he is going to leave to the MPCC and other specific individuals.

Councillor Kunev asked whether there is an official name for the dog event and whether you can bring your own dog.

Vice-President Plummer said there is none and you can't bring your own dog.

### **12c. VP External**

Vice-President explained that a response to the events on November 10th that the external affairs committee drafted, Simon decided to hold off on signing the letter and do more research on signing the letter. He asked about the protocol to follow when police enter campus. The letter will be sent after that.

MUNACA is voting on Monday or Tuesday about a proposed collective agreement. He does not know any details. That seems encouraging and could mean that they will be back to work at some point. They could also decide to continue the strike at some point. She said in other messages sent to students the Executive sent it out the night they mentioned the statement. They would like to wait until the strike is resolved one way or the other and stood for questions.

Councillor Clarke asked how many were arrested.

According to Montreal police four people were arrested, two of which were McGill students.

Councillor Paterson asked if any sort of celebratory activities are planned to welcome MUNACA back onto the on-campus community.

Vice-President Pedneault would be wary to sway people's votes one way or the other but when they do settle he would be open to a celebration.

Councillor Uribe-Arango asked whether the VP External could be contacted about the November 10<sup>th</sup> events.

There was a meeting of TaCEQ the Saturday after December 10<sup>th</sup> and said that the response he got was that they were not interested in discussing that issue. The demonstration looked good in the media and they didn't want to tarnish that by mentioning that there was police brutality at McGill. He asked that people respond with the facts and they said they were not interested in asking it.

Councillor Lessard asked who is sitting on TaCEQ.

Vice-President Pedneault said that executives, two from laval, one from sherbrooke, and one from SSMU

### **12d. VP University Affairs**

Vice-President Clare stood for questions.

Vice-President Fraser asked what is going on with Macy's

Vice-President Clare said that the McGill Association for Continuing Education Students she has sent multiple e-mails in terms of senate representation and liaising for the different unions at McGill. She has not gotten a response. There has also been a few rumors floating around. She decided to go to their office and there was a mini conspiracy-theory. There is currently an election going on.

Councillor Paterson asked the VPUA to elaborate on her comment in the report that senate very much destroyed her.

It was really exhausting and not the most productive meeting. She is disappointed that more professors didn't speak out about the events of November 10<sup>th</sup>.

Councillor Kunev asked her to elaborate on the meeting with provost and deputy provost, This meeting was a good meeting which is a typical one and talked about November 10<sup>th</sup> and subsequent senate meeting over concepts of leadership,. If you want to hear more specifics ask her after council.

Fraser said that as a follow-up, there will be another consultation fair in January on security and safety at McGill from everything about walking through Milton Parc Community and the idea of having safe places to learn and academic freedom.

### **12e. VP Finance & Operations**

Vice-President Patel said that it has been a pleasure working with Councillors so far. He wants to thank his fellow executives. That being said he stood for questions.

### **12f. President**

President Knight said that BOG was occupied earlier this week. She attended the Montreal alumni association board meeting. She has been doing a bunch of outreach in the next two weeks including the bachelor of arts and science integrative council and the arts and science meeting. She will be meeting with the president's roundtable tomorrow and would like to congratulate EUS. Lots of HR stuff is coming up for her and evaluations are being done for all the permanent staff. This has been a semester full of crisis management.

Councillor Hernandez asked what BOG is.

President Knight said that two main governing bodies of McGill are senate and BOG. The Board of Governors is 25 members with 13 external members and 12 internal members. They meet six times a year.

Councillor Winer asked if she has had occasion to discuss QPIRG and CKUT's passing in the referendum and when their refund system will be returned to their own control.

President Knight said that given they are their own groups she would not interfere unless requested to do so unless they will be in touch with CKUT and QPIRG. There is a J-Board case in proceedings regarding the QPIRG question requesting that it be declared invalid.



Vice-President Fraser said that CKUT Board of Directors CKUT is in contact with Medelson and they're working on stuff.

Councillor Kunev asked what's going on with the lease.

President Knight said she is hesitant to comment definitely. They will be signing a memo tomorrow regarding Council's concerns. They have not yet received information that they are going to understand their concerns.

Councillor Crawford asked whether there were intentions to speak about the occupiers and whether that would be addressed officially,

President Knight said that she has not had the opportunity to sit down with a lot of them. She did intervene a little at BOG and did get confirmation that she would be willing to have a town hall. She was not involved in the process in advance.

Vice-President Fraser said that administrators who stayed behind they are going to be attending the open forum on governance reform tomorrow at 2pm at Thompson house.

Councillor Clarke asked whether she found the occupation productive.

President Knight said that some people feel that the Principal should be open to asking awkward questions. It was productive in some senses but made clear to members of the BOG that students have serious concerns though some of the actions did not have good collective impact. Others saw that students are very upset.

### **13) Question Period**

Vice-President Fraser asked why there were only four Councillor reports. She asked if it would be possible if all Councillors did submit Councillor reports and would like all Executives to submit reports on time.

Councillor Kunev said that every week different Councillors will submit reports but said he thinks it's fair that not all everyone will submit reports every week.

President Knight said that though things are not always achieved within 2 weeks you are mandated to report every Council. If she didn't do something mandated to do she would be reprimanded.

Councillor Paterson said that she understands the intention Council would do some good to note something to have more reports on who has submitted and who is late but introducing optional project update, whereas nobody is mandated to. Right now nothing really happens when she does not submit a report. She does not feel very accountable.

Councillor Lessard asked what they mean by the updates.

Chair Tong suggested that Councillors could read their reports at Council.

President Knight said that Councillor photos will be going up as soon as possible and some Councillors have not been proactive in getting photos put up. There will be a tally of reports and attendance.

Councillor Uribe-Arango asked what reporting should include.

President Knight said that Councillors could state which committees which you have attended

### **14) Adjournment 11:53**