General Assembly of the Students' Society of McGill University

[Quorum was not reached when the General Assembly was scheduled to begin, so the speakers recommended that the presentations of the executive reports should begin.]

1) Report of the Executive Committee

Vice-President Internal Michael Szpejda outlined his positions roles and responsibilities of communication, events, and campus life. Communication is going well, is now using MailChimp, a new listserv service which gives good data (how many reads, click-throughs, etc. for each listserv), and will work on continuing to improve the format. He is also working with clubs and services to develop a McGill-wide event calendar, and will be bringing this presentation to Thursday's council meeting. Events are also successful. Orientation had 3003 participants and 1003 staff and volunteers. There was no separate SSMU frosh last year, but the new integrated format went well and he hopes to keep it this way. The First Year Office is gathering information regarding orientation, and SSMU should have the results by November. The principal said the integrated orientation has been in the best in her time at McGill, and SSMU plans to continue developing orientation in this way. Upcoming events include: 4 Floors on Thursday, October 25th, tickets will be on sale on Monday, the theme is Goosebumps and the SSMU exec will be dressing as smurfs; there will be a bus trip to Queen's University (Kingston, ON) on Friday, October 26th to watch Redmen hockey; and finally he is hoping to expand exam-time puppies to more animals (possibly kittens). In terms of campus life, the Athletics Committee will have their first meeting in November. Francophone Affairs will be having monthly meetings, which will be announced later. It has been decided that this year the Old McGill yearbook will be in a digital version which will allow more people to access it without the high costs of last year ($12 000 deficit for selling 150-200 copies a year). Lastly, the beer contracts have been finalized, SSM and the faculties have reached a decision and will now be serving Sleeman.

Question: Ellie (Arts student) wanted to know what SSMU had done to uphold last year's mandate of making orientation more accessible and inclusive.
Response: Szpejda said that since the main issue had been identified as changing the culture within the leaders, SSMU revamped leader training and invited individuals from services (such as SACOMSS) to be present in the process.

Vice-President University Affairs Haley Dinel gave an overview of her portfolio, including liaising with university, acting as the go-between between undergrads and the McGill Administration. She then outlines her work with the senate, research, Library Improvement Fund, and equity. The senate is composed of 13 undergrad senators (from a mix of faculties) which Dinel organizes and meets with every month. She is the head person from SSMU to McGill and tries to represent the student voice as much as possible. Research has given us things like McGill 101 (teaches the history of McGill) and an inquiry into U1 first-year problems. Currently, there are about 8 research projects going on, including SSMU Explains and Mapping McGill. Students donate $250 000 to the Library Improvement Fund (which is then matched by alumni), and Dinel helps decide where it goes whether it is fixing McLennan, getting student guides, or providing extra power cords. She works with two Equity Officers to ensure that anything that goes on in the SSMU building and all slubs and services is subject to this policy. Dinel also helps coordinate people and committees. The transition over the summer was great, enjoyed working with her predecessor (Emily Clare). Dinel

prepared by readings lots of documents and attending many meetings. In September she worked with the senators, teaching them how to go through the many documents they need, and made the point that everyone is accountable to senate and senate is accountable to everyone as well. The Consultation Fair about advising and problems is tomorrow, Tuesday, October 16th from 4-6om in Redpath Hall. New committees include one on policy which researches any policies (i.e. McGill policies, how should SSMU react) and creates new ones, as well as a student advocacy resource which helps students navigate through the bureaucracy. Dinel's goals are to get money back from libraries and bursaries, get the lease signed, look at the equity statement and how trickles down from McGill and can be interpreted, and the student code of conduct (Green Book) revisions. She is also going to look into learning environments – how people teach and learn and how effective it is, as well as undergraduate outcomes – what does a McGill education give you that somewhere else doesn't give you, and what does that mean for you?

Question: Pedro asked how it is decided that a motion goes to the SSMU Council instead of the Senate?
Response: Dinel said the speaker would cover that once we move to the agenda.

Vice-President Finance & Operations J.P. Briggs outlined his role and responsibilities. He is the Chief Financial Officer, and gets financial information from SSMU and organizations. He deals with finances, operations, and committees. He is currently working closely with the controller, the General Manager, and other heads of departments on budget revisions. The goal is to budget away as much of the deficit from last year as possible while maintaining same offerings. This budget will be available Nov. 1. The club audit had been revised to be done on semesterly basis as it is easier for clubs to manage finances, makes it easier to do audits, and has the benefit of giving clubs the opportunity to remedy bad audit scores the next semester. Briggs is also working on a club mandate and audit expense tracking and is meeting with clubs to overlook their budgets. He is also having ongoing meetings with the services department. There are some big differences this year. Every service is asked to provide its own operating budget instead of basing it on SSMU reports in the hopes that it will improve club management and financial operation for years to come. The bylaws are under revision, Briggs is trying to bring them up to speed so they can be as accurate and useful as possible. The updated bylaws will come out at the end of the semester. In terms of operations, Gert's has undergone a $450 000 renovation in the past summer which includes a student-staffed kitchen called Gertrude's Corner, which is designed and managed by students. The Operations Management Committee is undergoing feasibility reports on the student-run café which, combined with research and input from last year, will be built into the feasibility study to work on the business model. This model will focus on menu design and design of space to insure sustainability is built in from the ground up.

Vice-President Clubs and Services Allison Cooper announced that quorum had just been reaches and the assembly applauded. She introduced herself as a 5th year Anthropology student, and outlined her duties as Vice-President. Her main job is communication with the 278 student clubs, 21 services and 12 independent student groups under SSMU. She also works with a lot of committees, is the building co-manager along with General Manager Pauline Gervais, and helps organize Culture Shock, a presentation of McGill and QPIRG. The projects she has worked on so far include Fall Activities Night, which was attended by 5000 people Cooper thanked to veteran coordinator Andrea, and wants to expand into the Brown building and find more space for clubs and services. She has also been providing executive training services for clubs which include a walk-through of the complex website and would love more feedback on this training. Along with

Vice-President Finance and Operations, she has been services to work on their budgets, projects and goals. This year's office alignments are more thematic (for example, music groups are located close together), and she has conducted orientations for new offices. Cooper is also working on club master list and wants to implement a club database system next year so clubs can store documents and submit forms online. This would make the transition to new executives easier as the former executives would only need to pass on username and password to their successors. The SSMU room booking system is being reviewed, and should be working better soon. Her goals are to have an exciting new format for Winter Activities Night, possibly having a different category of clubs for each night of the week, to listen to the needs expressed by the Clubs Council, to use feedback forums and to make more improvements, to complete the bylaw review, and to look into student space and the long-term visioning for the Shatner Building.

Vice-President External Robyn Reid-Fraser displayed her job description on the screen and then proceeded to explain her job description. She sees her position as having 3 broad areas. First, external affairs, which involves communicating positions SSMU takes on issues external to the McGill campus to external bodies such as TaCEQ (an organization McGill is part of along with other Quebec students). Second, campaigns, which involves running and helping to support political and nonpolitical campaigns on campus. Finally, community relations, where Reid-Fraser acts as a liaison between SSMU and the Milton-Parc community (or student ghetto) East of campus, as well as other things that come up. Reid-Fraser works with the Milton-Parc Citizens Committee and TaCEQ. McGill is one of four member associations of TaCEQ, the others are the undergrad and post-grad student bodies at Laval University, and the University of Sherbrooke. These groups meet regularly and collaborate on policies, etc. Over the summer the student strike continued. Early in the summer there was an opportunity to sit down with the government to negotiate the situation. Representatives from TaCEQ were there and supported the legal challenge to bill 78/law 12. Involvement with TaCEQ is long-term and involves sharing research, policies, and external communication (they will send a semesterly newsletter to students to inform them of what is going on elsewhere and communicate with other students' association governments). The Education Summit is upcoming, and TaCEQ's themes include university financing, tuition fees and alternatives. Reid-Fraser also works on Anglo association collaboration, and worked to set up an election debate at the end of August, especially with Concordia as both Concordia and McGill are Anglophone and outside of Québec. She wants to know how people feel about their education and is working on getting speakers on international student issues. She also works on the accessible education campaign which is a long-time mandate of SSMU. This has been less active over the summer, but it provided information through the SSMU website and tuitiontruth.ca. In terms of community relations, frosh street-teams were very successful as a safety resources, and helped to direct and provide information to confused froshies. Community Engagement Day was on October 5th, and although Reid-Fraser was not a main organizer she tried to help recruit people to attend and thought it went very well. Next, she will be working on the Holiday Fair (which was successful a few years ago). She is trying to get students and long-term residents to talk to each other. Efforts include a video project to get to know the neighbourhood and resources for students who are moving into apartments for the first time which teach them how to be a good neighbour. She hopes to put more information in residences to assist with this initiative. Reid-Fraser is trying to make the Community Engagement Committee accessible to people all over campus. Along with this committee, she also sits on the External Affairs Committee. She will be looking for student input for the Education Summit. Reid-Fraser closed by giving her contact information.

President Josh Redel welcomed everyone to the assembly. He then outlined his areas of responsibility. He works for student democracy and its constituents by advising the Judicial Board and helping them complete projects (for example, websites for past-decisions), overlooking the SSMU handbook which live online to cut down on printing, attending council, sitting on the President's Roundtable (for the presentation of the Deputy Provost's report), logistically assisting elections in SSMU (although he doesn't make decisions), and running the GAs . He has also worked with orientation for 3 years, as part of a communications group and on elements of 2012's integrated orientation which included 12 events offered by many different groups. In terms of McGill governance and university relations, he is 1 of 4 on the McGill Board of Governors (is 1 of 2 that have a vote), sits on the Executive Committee and Space Committee, sits on Senate with the 13 student senators, sits on the Campus Community Committee, and sits on the of Board of Directors for the McGill Alumni Association. Regarding sustainability, President Redel is the sustainability coordinator, sits on the Environment Committee, works with Vision 2020,and works on projects such as the e-waste bin in the lobby. Human resources is more integral and is a big part of his daily responsibilities. For this role, he works with supporting staff, creates work plans to help empower people to achieve goals, works the Executive Team Council, enables the Executive Team, oversees logistics and general governance of the Legislative council, is the Secretary of the SSMU Daycare and Nursery Board of Directors, and chairs the SSMU Board of Directors. President Redel then explained some of the different elements of the GA this year. There have been two important changes to the GA in person. GA guides in red (Jonathon, Rachel, Daniel, Riva, and Justin) are present to answer any questions about anything (for example, how to format a question). Raise your hand, not your placard and they will help you. They are there to help you to be successful at the GA and make your voice heard. GA Guides also count votes. Also, Emily Clare is the GA Mood Watcher who maintains the mood in the room. If the environment is unfriendly or hostile, text 514-900-0125 to let her know. This service is anonymous, Clare gets feedback from the crowd and will give suggestions to keep the room in a good mood.

2) Call to Order

At 5:48pm quorum was reached and the General Assembly was called to order.

3) Approval of the Agenda

Councillor Morawetz motioned to approve the agenda.
Chair Nizam said they would wait to see if there are any other motions first.

A member of the body motioned to see the rest of the agenda on the screen.
Chair Tong adjusted the display.

A mover from the Plan Nord motion motioned to have updated motions added to the agenda.
Chair Nizam said no because the updated version of this motion was submitted after the deadline, and that following rules and procedures is important to the functioning of the General Assembly. However, once the motion is read aloud the movers will have the opportunity to speak on its behalf before the assembly votes on whether to include it in the agenda. There will be 2 speakers for and 2 speakers against allowed and the vote requires a two-thirds majority.

Jacqueline Brandon, one of the movers, speaks in favour of the Plan Nord motion. She moved this motion because McGill has a lot of ties to Plan Nord and people aren't aware of this. McGill has ties to mining engineering companies that profit from it and the PQ has put a populist spin on it. it is symbolically important for McGill to oppose this, but there is also the ability to mobilize against it.

A member of the body speaks in favour of the motion, saying that there is a large resistance in Anglophone communities against the tar sands. Similarly, in the North the indigenous communities strongly oppose Plan Nord and this opposition is reaching boiling point. It is important to get together and work in solidarity to pass this motion.

Chair Nizam notes that the movers have made amendments to this motion.

The motion to allow the Plan Nord resolution to the agenda (item 5f.) passes.

The motion to approve the agenda passes and the agenda is approved.

4) Question Period
No questions were asked.

5) New Business

a) Motion Regarding Installation of a Bouldering Wall
The President of the McGill Student Center (one of the movers) reads the motion. She says they want a boulder wall to be installed in the Shatner building and be made accessible to all students.

Questions:
A member of the body asks where the wall would it go.
The movers respond by saying that they are looking into a storage room in the basement that used to be used for as storage for Gert's.

A member of the body asked where the funding would be coming from and if the movers had any quotes or plans done.
The movers responded by saying that the budget was coming from the McGill Student Outdoors budget , and that they were not asking for money from SSMU. They are looking at about $4000 in set up costs, and they will charge a fee to cover running costs.

Debate on the motion begins:
A member of the body asks the movers if any other student groups are also looking to use the room they are interested it. The movers say that no, no one else is interested in the room.

A student spoke in favour of the motion, saying she transferred from a university that had free bouldering wall in the basement that was good for getting exercise. It may seem like a big investment, but it would be worth it. She would like to see the user fee reduced to just a donation.

A member of the body spoke against the motion, saying that it needs to be elaborated on a lot more and that exact figures are needed as well as names of manufacturers, etc. The project is not ready right now. The movers say they have been working on the plan since

May and that they do have a well-fleshed out plan and have looked into a large variety of costs. Also, the user fee would be negligible compared to other boulder wall facilities. The speaker against asked if there were any way that this information could be made public or published, and the movers responded that this would be done via an amendment.

A student asked if it would be a free wall or if there would be a fee implemented through the Outdoors Club, and wanted to know if the wall would be available for students outside of the Outdoors Club. The movers answered by saying that it would not be a free wall but that it will be the same cost for everyone. The tentative budget estimates that the cost will be about $25 per student, per semester.

A motion to previous question was seconded and passed.

The motion passed with 82 in favour, 3 against, and 16 abstentions. The motion passes in the General Assembly and will go online for ratification.

b) Motion Regarding Renaming the SSMU Breakout Room
The movers want to rename the SSMU Breakout Room after Madeleine Parent and have a placard in the room honouring her life.

Questions:
The movers want to rename the SSMU Breakout Room after Madeleine Parent and have a placard in the room honouring her life.

A member of the body asks if the movers can explain who Parent was. The movers point the student to information contained in the whereas clauses and add that the ideas behind this is that it would be good to have a name for this room and for it to be named after a woman. Madeleine Parent got her bachelor's degree here at McGill and went on to work on labour unions in the 1940s when the government was hostile towards unions and helped many workers to form unions. Parent passed away this year.

A student asked how much it would cost to print the placard and put it on the wall, to which the movers responded that if McGill isn't the one to put it up, it shouldn't be too expensive.

A motion to move to the previous question is seconded and passes.-voting on the motion:

The motion passes with 83 in favour, 3 against, and 15 abstentions. The motion passes in the General Assembly as will go online for ratification.

c) Motion Regarding Ethical Investments at McGill

Questions:
A student asks what positive investment actions SSMU and/or McGill should undertake to make the tar sands obsolete, such as investing tar sand money in other types of energy like solar, wind, etc. The movers are working with the VP Finance and Operations to develop a

matrix for to figure this out, and suggest the student can propose an amendment if he would like.

Brian Farnan, Arts VP External asks what are the companies that McGill is involved with that apply to this motion. The movers say they can obtain a list and bring it back to debate.

Chris, a political campaign manager working with VP External Robyn Reid-Fraser, says that BP, Exxon, and Chevron are the major companies McGill is involved with, and that there are at least 14 companies on campus involved in the tar sands. He wants to know what McGill would be investing in otherwise to make up for this investment, or if SSMU would just be lobbying them. VP University Affairs Haley Dinel says the movers are open to suggestions and will be looking into further energy alternatives.

A member of the body asks who decides where the money from the endowment fund goes, and which particular body of the university would lobbying be directed at? The movers respond by saying first the Minister of Finance, and then Michael diGrappa.

Debate on the motion begins:
A speaker in favour of the motion says there is no shortage of jobs and things to invest in; there is a lot that can be done. If people believe in making a better world without the tar sands, there are other things that could be invested in.

Mark, a U5 Arts student speaks in favour of the motion, saying that McGill's underfunding is done on purpose, and issues with McGill's finances shouldn't stop people from voting to stop investing in the tar sands.

A councillor speaks against the motion and offers a new perspective. McGill is investing money here because they are getting good returns on this investment. The real issue that should be discussed is if the students should have more information on this topic. It is unreasonable to just take away the tar sands immediately.

A speaker in favour of the motion says that socially conscious investing has always had at least equally good returns as other investments, so the motion should be considered.

Lily, a student in favour of the motion, says she understand that Canada is based on the tar sands economy but that there is something to be said for pushing for something just for the sake of pushing for something. SSMU is a good way to take responsibility and to be a catalyst for cultural change.

A speaker in favour of the motions says it is unrealistic in the short-term that we will be able to get McGill to stop investing the tar sands, but that the strength of this motion lies in raising awareness.

A member of the body suggests approaching this issue positively: instead of lobbying for what they don't want, students should lobby for positive things that they do want (for example, green energy).

One of the movers, VP External Robyn Reid-Fraser, says it is important to be proactive about this issue.

There is a motion to amend. Two resolve clauses are added and read:

"*Resolved,* that the SSMU lobby McGill University to divest form all financial institutions that invest in or dive loans to companies engaged in the tar sands.

Resolved, that the SSMU lobby McGill to cut all ties with companies engaged in the tar sands and financial institutions investing that fund the tar sands."

Motion to move to the previous question is seconded and passes.

Chair Nizam announces that quorum has been lost and that the general assembly now exists as a consultative forum. It cannot make decisions, but decisions made in this period will be considered in the Legislative Council. Because it is unknown how long it will be until quorum is reached, the consultative forum will move on to the vote, trusting that this vote will be taken into consideration at the Legislative Council meeting this upcoming Thursday.

The motion passes in the consultative forum with 61 in favour, 14 against, and 10 abstentions, and will move on to the Legislative Assembly.

A member of the forum asks what the voting period for online ratification is. The answer is that it will begin tomorrow at noon and last for the next 7 days.

d) Motion Regarding Renewing Support for Accessible Education

Questions:

Harmon Moon, a student in U3 History, mentions that the previous VP External spent thousands of dollars on a cause that they later voted down and wonder if similar things could happen with this motion. The movers respond by saying that the current context is much different from last year: the student government is much different than last year, tuition hikes have been cancelled, etc. The situation won't be the same as last year, and one of the advantages of bringing this motion to the Legislative Council is to talk about last year and what should be different. This motion is continuing a policy that SSMU has had for a long time: advocating to keep education accessible and affordable to any student who wants it. The role of the VP External is to provide information on the state of post-secondary education such as why there was a strike, etc. One way or another students will want to know what's going on, and the consequences will affect everyone.

A member of the body asks what some alternatives to tuition are. The movers respond that instead of having a user-pay model they will look for other ways that education can be financed, such as additional government funding. They would also look at ways to change the structures of universities to make sure that the funds are being used to benefit the students.

A student asks if international students would be taking money away from Quebec if government money is used to fund tuition and universities. The movers state that studies show that Quebec students can actually create a lot of money for the university.

Debate on the motion begins:
A speaker in favour of the motion says that if accessibility is not good for international students and bad for Quebecers, it would actually benefit all.

A speaker against says that this motion is taking a broad goal that we all support and putting idealistic limits on it. This is the problem with this motion.

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

The motion passes in the consultative forum with 52 in favour, 14 against, and 11 abstentions, and will move forward to the Legislative Council.

e) Motion Regarding Opposition to Canadian Military Involvement in Iran

Questions:
A member of the forum asks what should happen this motion passes and what SSMU should ask Canada to do. The student also wants to know the long-term goals, and if specific amendments should be made. The movers respond by saying that if the motion is adopted there could be suggestions of other action that could be taken aside from military intervention. They can't call on government to do something very specific because they do not know what will come up. SSMU should be advocating for more peaceful society and should think carefully about using sanctions, which have been dangerous to the lives of people in the countries being sanctioned.

Brian Farnan asks if the movers could indicate what kind of agencies were meant in last point of the 2nd resolve clause. The movers say that some labs on McGill's campus are doing research into various weapons, and some have contracts with defensive companies. They pointed him to a website about a previous campaign against weapons research on campus.

A student asks what would the movers would say to students who are afraid their families would be hurt by Iran's actions. The movers say that in general, this motion is very much opposing war because it can affect many innocent people's lives, not just on Iranian side of things but also everyone else. They would be open to an amendment that would support everyone whose countries are involved in this conflict.

A member of the consultative forum asks that if SSMU opposes all connections to war, would SSMU lobbying to remove alumni plaques for alumni who have served in the military be included in its opposition. The movers say this was not taken into consideration in the drafting of this motion. They are opposed to the work being done at McGill and the investments being made that promote war and are involved in hurting and killing people and destroying their countries.

Chair Nizam points out that this motion is in reference to current and future military endeavors and research, not past involvement.

Brian Farnan says the movers might want to include a resolve clause that would state that past and present people (not just alumni) would not be hurt by this motion if their lives are connected to the military. The movers say they would be open to amendments.

A student asks why it was not in the resolve clauses to oppose the President of Iran and to oppose Iran's use of nuclear weapons. The movers say that SSMU is part of a Canadian university and therefore is more able to take positions in relation to the Canadian government.

VP Internal Michael Szpejda asks if the movers would take into consideration the fact that many innovations in other fields (i.e. medicine) often come through military research and efforts to make the lives of soldiers better. The movers say that the direction of this motion is around Iran specifically.

A U3 arts student asks if this motion would involve stopping the combination of Canadian humanitarian efforts, considering that Iran has vowed to wipe Israel off the face off the Earth. The movers say this is getting into the specifics of the situation, and that it is hard to know what exactly is going to happen with the situation. The point is opposing Canadian military aggression towards Iran.

Debate on the motion begins:

A speaker in favour of the motion speaks of his affinity with people everywhere who are about to bombed. He says he is concerned more with them than with any government. SSMU should support the people, not the use of bombing.

A motion to amend is made: that the overthrow of regime must be led and conducted by the Iranian people

A speaker against the motion says that SSMU should be concerned with Iran's nuclear weapons instead of being worried about a military intervention that hasn't even happened yet.

Another speaker against says that any particular action SSMU could take would not fundamentally change the situation in Iran. The issue is happening above the level of where SSMU's opinion matters.

Another speaker against says that, generally speaking, Canada doesn't have a huge history of bombing people. If they have, it was usually because Canada is about to be bombed itself. The issue with the Canadian military tends to be that it is over-regulated instead of under-regulated

Brian Farnan speaks against the motion, saying it is problematic because the vast majority of students would probably support the disassociation of McGill with military research, however, plugging it into a political situation which ultimately has two sides causes problems for the motion.

Vincent, a U3 Arts student, speaks against the motion. He says the facts about the situation are that Israel is more likely to attack Iran than the other way around. Israel has a history of making pre-emptive military attacks, and Israel has nuclear weapons while Iran does not.

Chair Nizam says it should be noted that this is an unfriendly amendment.

The amendment is withdrawn. Debate on the original motion continues.

A student speaks against the motion by pointing out that Canada is not about to be bombed by Iran; Israel has nuclear weapons, not Iran. He says that Every military situation Canada has been involved with has been fairly external, and questions Canada's support of Israel.

Another speaker against says that the underlying contradiction lies in the motion condemning McGill for engaging in research into weapons, but not condemning Iran for the same research.

A member of the consultative body speaking against says that any benefit of having SSMU take a stand would be out-weighed by the cost of having a divided student body over a contentious issue.

A speaker in favour of the motion says it is frustrating to say that decisions made in the GA are irrelevant. They can in fact create change by causing people to engage. Taking political stances is important, it is not a pointless or negative experience to be having this discussion and taking stances.

Josh, a U3 Arts student, says the motion understates the positive impact the Canadian military has had on the lifestyles people enjoy today. He propose an amendment that SSMU supports and is grateful towards Canadian soldiers and their sacrifices.

There is a motion to extend debate by 5 minutes. The motion does not pass.

Chair Nizam says the debate has to continue while the amendment is discussed, but will be stopped after 3 speakers.

A member of the forum says this is an interesting consultative body to make decisions in. A fundamental tension in this resolution is that the theoretical resolution is supported by most students, but may not be represented by the reality of the people in the room.

Chair Nizam says that the previous amendment was recommended to be put forward to be included in the Safe Space policy.

Nicole, an Arts student, speaks against the motion, saying that it doesn't have to do with usefulness, it has to do with whether or not SSMU should be taking a position on a foreign policy issue of which is does not have control.

A student makes the historical point that Canada did not fight for its independence, it was granted by the British.

A mover says that SSMU taking a stand does have a significance, for example, the one day strike in opposition of military action in Iraq. SSMU can help influence decisions when done in conjunction with other bodies.

A motion to postpone the issue until the next General Assembly or until an actual conflict occurs with Iran is proposed and seconded.

A motion to call the question is proposed and seconded.

Voting on the two motions begins. The first motion clearly does not pass. The second motion, on the opposition of Canadian military involvement in Iran, passes with 32 in favour, 14 against, and 8 abstentions, and will move on to the Legislative Council.

f) Motion Regarding Plan Nord
There are no questions, so the consultative forum moves into debate on the motion.

Debate on the motion begins:
The movers read the additional whereas clauses.

A member of the forum asks for clarification on the resolve clauses, and wants to know what resources would be put towards this motion and if resources would be allocated specifically to things within the motion or to things outside of the motion. The movers say that this is specified in resolve clauses and would not be very costly things.

VP Internal Michael Szpejda points to the clause that asks McGill to divert from mining programs, and asks if, since McGill has engineering and mining programs, this would be opposing things that could offer opportunities to students. The movers say they believe that funding for mining should come privately and not from the university where the job is to educate people, not to make money.

A member of the consultative forum makes the comment that even people in the mining sector could oppose Plan Nord, just opposing something that has to do with mining doesn't mean one has to oppose everything that has to do with mining.

A speaker in favour of the motion mentions that one the members of McGill's Board of Governors is the CEO of Hydro Quebec, a big partner in Plan Nord. McGill should oppose this because it is clear that the indigenous people do not want mining on their land.

Another speaker in favour of the motion says the level of resistance coming from the indigenous people has not been seen since the Oka Crisis. SSMU can do a little something to promote solidarity and support.

A member of the forum speaks in favour of the motion, pointing out that there were massive protests against hydroelectric companies by indigenous people in Panama. Workers went on strike and engaged in direct action, and as a result it is now written into their constitution that no one can mine on their land.

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

The motion passes in the consultative forum with 44 in favour, 0 against, and 2 abstentions, and will move on to the Legislative Council.

6) Adjournment

Motion to adjourn, motion passes.
General Assembly adjourned at 7:54pm.