



# LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

FEBRUARY 23, 2017

## 1. Call to Order

Speaker calls the meeting to order at 6:17pm.

Speaker: Before we get started, I just want to make an announcement, in relation to anything we might be discussing today. Thinking about experiences of gendered violence and sexualized violence can be really difficult for people in this room and know that's a normal response, and anytime anyone in the gallery or any councilor here, feel free to leave the room and take some time for yourself, there is a volunteer outside that is training in active listening outside for you, and the peer support network on the fourth floor will be open until nine today. In your email, there is a list of resources you can reach out to later.

## 2. Land Acknowledgement

Speaker gives land acknowledgement: "SSMU would like to acknowledge that McGill is located on the traditional territory of the Kanien'keha:ka, a place which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange among nations. SSMU recognizes the Kanien'keha:ka as the traditional custodians of the lands and waters on which we meet today."

## 3. Attendance

## 4. Approval of the Minutes

Minutes are approved.

## 5. Guest Speakers

### McGill Peer Support Centre

Quinn Ashkenazi, McGill Peer Support Centre: Thank you so much for having the Peer Support Center here today. I want to do is give you a bit of an overview of our service, I think



most people are familiar, but just to give a bit more background and then talk a bit about who uses our service, and what students actually want from the peer support service, and then how you and the students that you represent can get involved.

The peer support center is a student-run service that offers free, confidential, one on one, and non-judgmental listening-based support for all. Basically, what this means is that we have trained volunteers who are there to really listen to students going through absolutely anything, students can come to us to share their experiences, to brainstorm options, to make plans moving forward. We're really there to listen and help them in whatever way that we can. We're a SSMU service as of this year, which is really exciting, and we also have a close working relationship with Counseling and Mental Health services, which gives us a really great balance of student-run autonomy while at the same time having professional supervision and consultation available.

We started in Winter 2014, we were pretty small, we were run by an independent group of students, and we operated about 4 to 6 hours out of MORSL per week. Since then, we've had a lot of growth and development. Basically, if you want to go to the Peer Support center, we're open Monday to Friday, 11am to 7pm in room 411 of SSMU. You can drop in or make an appointment online. We really value open evaluation and taking an evidence-based approach to what we do, we have lots of avenues for us to collect data and I'll use that to tell you a bit more about who is actually using the Peer Support network on campus, what people think of it, and what people want to see from this network.

So we were pretty small when we started, we weren't seeing a lot of students, and we're still growing but this year, we're excited to say that compared to our last two years, we've had 348% increase in the number of students using Peer Support. We definitely anticipate that will continue to grow, which is really exciting. Here's who is actually using our service: we see that, throughout the course of the semester, there is basically an upside down U-shape in students accessing peer support. So we start off kind of slowly, which follows the student semester cycle, at the beginning of the semester you're feeling okay, then midterms and as midterms hit, we see that spike in students using our service, and then by the end of the semester, finals have begun. We see a drop here, and I think that part of the drop is that students reach a point where they're much more stressed and stop seeing peer support as being a sufficient level of support for them, or they're just not having the time to go out and access resources.

We do see students from all faculties and programs, but we're much lower in management, education and law, and much higher in arts and sciences. If you are a representative from any of the faculties where there are lower students using our services, we'd love to talk to you afterwards about how we could reach those who you represent. Also a pretty even breakdown between grad and undergrad students, based on the McGill population. Also students from all over the world. Interestingly, we see that half of our students are international students, and this makes a lot of sense to us because there are people coming to a completely



new place without their usual support network here, so instead they're seeking out other supports and that's where we come in. We have much more females than males coming, so if you have any ideas for how we can better reach out to everyone, please let us know, we'd love to talk about that. With respect to sexual orientation, we are mostly seeing heterosexual students, so we are again underrepresented on that point and would love to reach out to other students more.

This is based on self-reported data, we get this from the end of every peer support session when people fill out an info survey, and so we see that students use the service when they have a self-reported low mood and self-reported high anxiety, so this shows that peer support is really necessary because we're helping students that really need it. We're also very complimentary to Counsel and Mental Health services, so a lot of the students that access Peer Support are not seeing a professional, but about 40% of them are. So we can be used as a stand-alone source of support, but also a compliment to other forms of care, which fits in really nicely with the new step-care model. Although only a certain percent are using mental health services, a lot more are on waitlists, so this points to larger systemic issues.

Interestingly, we're building a population of returners, so about a quarter of people who use PSC come back multiple times. As you'll see later, this actually points to students actually wanting the peer support network to be more of a follow-up basis, but for various ethical boundaries, that's really hard for us to do but we have some ideas for how we can meet that need.

So why do students come to the Peer support center? A lot of it is probably the reasons that you would expect as a student. People are coming because of academic stress, general stress, depression, anxiety, panic, relationship problem, friendship and social problems, or just wanted to talk when feeling down. Our volunteers are really equipped to support people going through anything. We also see that the reasons that students come can be relatively severe. We can support students potentially experiencing self harm, suicidal ideation, and we do have the training to support these students, we have a crisis management protocol in place, and a close relationship with Counselling and Mental Health services that ensures that these students get the support they need as quickly as possible.

What do people think of the peer support center, are they happy when they leave? What we find is very much so, yes. What I'll show you in the next few slides are our quality indicators and we see that for the most part we get fours and fives out of five. Peer support center helps people realize their resilience and their coping skills. It's also really good at pointing people towards other resources or services. It's helping people feel really reassured, helping them feel equipped to face their circumstances and people who come say that overall, they feel like they're getting the peer support that they needed. Overall satisfaction. People are overall really appreciative of the support, they feel that peer support is very welcoming, helpful, etc.



So in summary, we see a very big diversity of students, with respect to faculty and background, but we do have some outreach we need to do to specific faculties and minority groups. We are also seeing a lot of students that really identify as not being well in terms of anxiety. And our satisfaction rates are high and getting higher, probably as our volunteers become better trained at supporting.

We did a needs assessment in the fall that would give us a sense of what students actually want and need from the peer support service, and the hope is that it could kind of help us to get there. We see that when we ask people, “have you or someone that you know been in a situation where peer support would have been useful?” We see that the majority of the students, 60%, say yes. About 30% are unsure and 8% are no. Similarly, we see that when asked people if they would like to access a peer support service, 48% say yes, 50% say no, but 48% are unsure. So we take that as, even given the amount of uncertainty, is that there is a huge amount of potential for peer support to play an even greater role on campus, and that really, based on that needs assessment, there’s a lot of uncertainty about what peer support actually and people don’t actually know when it would be helpful for them. Again, with you guys as students representatives, we were hoping that we could talk about how we can help students to better understand what this is and how it can help them.

We also asked students what they would want from a peer support service, and we see that about a third of people are very content with our current model, which is the one on one, no follow up. But a lot of students really want one on one follow up with the same supporter, but that isn’t something that we are able to do right now and probably not for the immediate future and the reason for that is that there are lots of ethical boundaries that could easily get crossed. We talked to our volunteers about it and for the most part, they do not feel comfortable with that model. So as kind of a compromise that we’re really excited about that we’re really excited about is moving towards group support and based on talking to students, based on the needs assessment, this seems to be a niche at McGill that needs to be filled, and students seem really excited about group support because of its potential to build community, they want to talk to other students about their shared experiences, so we think that we have the potential to provide that forum. In particular, the idea of an academic stress group really resonated with students.

So that you have a sense of where we’re going, what we so far are doing really well is that we have really motivated and well trained student volunteers, a lovely and welcoming space (check us out, upstairs), collaboration with lot of student groups across campus and a really dedicated promotions team. We also, as you saw, have really high satisfaction rating from people who actually use our service and a support model that, for the most part, matches on to what students are saying is their self-reported need. What we do have to work on is reaching students in every faculty and helping to clear up who we are and what it is we actually do. We also have to fill that gap for more and different types of support that students are asking for. We’re going to be focusing on support groups in the coming year, we’re also going to be working



on better expanding our promotions and outreach, especially to those really underrepresented faculties and populations, and continuing to build those cross-campus partnerships.

So it would be great if you, as the representatives of the different faculties could help us to figure how we could better reach the students that you represent, so we'd really like, in the coming year, foster cross-campus collaborations and outreach. We also would appreciate if you could let the students in your faculties know that we're currently recruiting volunteers. We want to have a diversity of volunteers that can really speak to and represent all the different student experiences. Also, we're going to be hopefully running in the fall a referendum to have a fee levy, and again we would appreciate your support in that, and we'll talk about that in a couple months, but hopefully this presentation has shown you that peer support is providing a much needed service for students on campus and we have a lot of potential to continue to grow and develop!

Councilor Cleveland: My question was, on one of your slides, it showed the different ways in which people would like to be supported, one of them was a chat-based system, with 50% of the people say that, but I noticed that was not said in your presentation as a support system that you use. Is that a support system that you use? And if it was questioned, "why would you access peer support", did you also ask them the inverse of "why would you not access peer support", and what were the results of that?

Quinn: I can pull up the exact results right now, but most of it would just be different access to professional services, and for some people that is really the type of support that they need and want, but there is also certain people who want the normalizing and de-stigmatizing that comes with peer support. There's also things like concerns about confidentiality that you would get from professionals, so again I think that leads to those 40% who are uncertain about whether they would access peer support, and we can try to target those.

Councilor Cleveland: So do you use a text-based system or a chat based system as well.

Quinn: We don't, and we thought about looking into that, but the thing is, our friends at Nightline are looking into that.

Councilor Douglas: Nightline is rolling out a chat-based support for reading week.

Councilor Cleveland: This might be a dumb question, but is Nightline available for questions during the day, or will that just be a night thing?



Councilor Douglas: That's a good question, and I can chat to you about it, but right now our hours extend from 6pm to 3am.

Councilor Chin: Thank you for the clear and informative presentation. You mentioned waitlists during high activity periods during the year, is there a bottleneck somewhere with recruitment or spaces? And my second question is that, since you mentioned a future fee levy, where would this money go? Is there any area in particular you are planning to fund?

Quinn: In respects to the first question, I think I was being unclear, because we don't have a waitlist. What I'm saying is that 18% of people come to PSC because they are on a waitlist elsewhere. So with Counseling and Mental Health services right now, they're going through a lot of changes, so we're helping compliment that transition. In regards to the second question, really the money would go towards helping the Peer Support Center be sustainable in the long run because right now we operate by relying on fundraising and crowd funding, which has worked for us so far, but it's not going to be sustainable in the long term, so for the Peer Support Center to continue to exist, we need a more stable source of income. It would go towards our general expenses, so like training, promotion, and basic space maintenance.

Councilor Sur: So you mentioned that Law is one of the faculties that doesn't use this service very often, so we have a peer support program in our faculty, but I think our program would probably be open to collaborating with some of the stuff that you do. I can forward it to them.

Quinn: That would be great! We've actually supported in Law a few times, so we're definitely happy to work closer with your program.

Councilor Jiao: Thank you for coming to council. My question is regarding the group support that the peer support center would like to implement, so there is a group-support program in mental health services right now, and I was wondering if you guys were looking to have a parallel version?

Quinn: For sure. We're still working on developing our model of group support, but what would make it different from the one that Mental Health services has, is that Mental Health has something called WRAP, Wellness Recovery Action Plan, and that's a psycho-education based group. So it's kind of more of an educational element, while really helping students develop the help that they need to be well, which is wonderful. What we would do would really be more of an environment for sharing experiences, and that seems to be something that students are asking for and that doesn't actually exist. So we would try out different models and we're still figuring out exactly how that would look, but they might just be general open groups or groups with a



particular theme. Like we would probably start with academic stress, this isn't as relevant to SSMU but we've heard from PGSS that they would really like a support group for dealing with difficult supervisors. So there's a lot of potential avenues there, and if you have ideas for potential topics, please let us know!

Councilor Thomas: I was just wondering, in terms of how you want to do outreach to certain faculties, is there any ideas for us as councilors that you would like us?

Quinn: I think that yes, we have some general ideas, but also specifically you as councilors know best how to reach your students and so we'd like to talk to you about that. At the most general level, advertising us on your Facebook page, having bookmarks available, having our posters up around your building so that we don't have to put them back up every two weeks, things like that. Also we're really open to running different outreach events in each faculty, that's something we've done in a few that has worked very well, so we'd like to continue on that track.

VP Sobat: One question is that, you mentioned reaching out to different demographics and minority groups in particular, I was wondering if there was any attempt to diversify your volunteer base, considering that's something I heard from other folks, as something that they consider important when using peer support networks, to see themselves represented in the volunteers.

Quinn: Yeah, absolutely. And that is something that we're aware of, and I took it out of this particular presentation but we have a whole volunteer demographics survey, so we actually know where the demographic gaps are in our volunteer base and as we do recruitment this year, we're going to try very hard to get as wide of a demographic as possible. So part of that, to allow us to be representative, we need to ensure that we're getting enough volunteers from different backgrounds applying. So again, spread the word!

Councilor Cleveland: As a floor fellow, I've seen your work at roundtable during training, are there plans to work more closely with Floor Fellows or possible to trade knowledge on how best to support students throughout the year?

Quinn: That would be great, I don't think we have that currently in the works, but we'd love to have that conversation, so if you're able to help us get that going, that would be helpful!

## 6. Adoption of the Agenda



VP Sobat: I would like propose to postpone Motion Regarding Revisions to the Equity Policy to the next council, because we need to add provisions, based on consultation.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: I would like to add a notion of motion. This has recently been talked about at AUS council and I think it's only fair that it be talked about at SSMU council; it's notice of motion regarding impeachment of Igor Sadikov. I've had many engineering students come up to me and talk to me about the situation. I sat down with an engineering student who just cried talking about their experiences, and this has happened a couple times. It's a very emotional subject. Regardless of the political motivation behind it, I just think that the threat of violence is something that shouldn't be tolerated. I hope everyone here really thinks about this regardless of what that outcome is, because it should be considered at SSMU council, just like AUS did yesterday. If anyone else wants to speak, that would be great. Thanks.

President Ger: If I may ask a question to the mover, so the way the constitution lays out the procedure, a notice has to be given to the councilor if they are to be removed, it doesn't necessarily have to be a notice of motion on the agenda, it just has to be 48 hours notice. I'm not sure if the councilors who are moving this would potentially open to submit to steering instead of having it go through a notice process, which would mean that it would be debated today as well as the next council when it comes as a full motion, just for the sake of minimizing the amount of energy that people have to put into this discussion, especially considering what happened last council, I think it's in the interest of those people effected. That's just a suggestion to the mover.

Councilor Mansdoerfer: Yeah that's a great point. I think it's hard to have this discussion today, so I'll send it to steering.

Councilor Sur: So the law faculty was asked to sign on to this motion, and we brought it to the LSA council, so our council voted on this motion, so are we supposed to take this back now to our respective councils or no?

President Ger: So this wouldn't be coming to be voted on right now, it would be coming for notice to be voted on the following council, we can either have a debate now and at the following council, followed by a vote, or this will just go through steering and then come to the following council.

Decided not to add this notice of motion.

Agenda is adopted.



## 7. Question Period (5)

Councilor Templer: My first question is regarding the recent resignation of the VP External, my question, and depending on the answer I may have a follow up to this, my question was when was the first instance in which the alleged sexual assaulted were raised as a concern with any member of the executive committee?

President Ger: Thank you for asking. So I want to clear up some of the information regarding that, because understandably recent articles and publications that were made can seem to tell how the process went. The Executive Committee was not made aware of any incidents regarding sexual assault. There was communications that happened earlier in the year, I believe it was sometime in the fall, regarding a very different incident, which is what the responses were that the so-called “check-ins”, which were an educational session, equity training, training regarding power dynamics, but other than that no incidents were brought up.

Councilor Mehrotra: My question is unrelated to that, but I'm scheduled to give my report to council today for the third or fourth time and there are over 25 councilors on this council, and I am wondering why I have had to give my report so many times, when there have been nine councils, so really everyone should have given it once by now.

Parliamentarian: My bad.

Councilor Thomas: Is it a result of other councilor's not sending in their reports and you having to choose from only the ones that are sent in? Or is it just an accident?

Parliamentarian: No, just an accident.

Councilor Chin: My question is in regards to a recent meeting between the SSMU executives with Dr. Suzanne Fortier, I caught news of this from various media sources, I wanted the SSMU executives to clarify what happened exactly in those exchanges with Dr. Fortier, and why did the SSMU execs provide a reply or compliance to her demands in such short notice? What exactly were the legal opinions with regards to this case? And given all the changes in the meantime, will the Board of Directors revisit an impeachment vote on the matter? Lastly, myself, along with all students, received an email with regards to SSMU execs and the executive committee's position; will that be available on the website or any other media? Is that something that you should consider?



VP Magder: With regards to that meeting between McGill and the executives, I will be very blunt, they told us that the fact that we were not calling out a student leader who is inciting violence was wrong. And this was basically followed by a very long discussion, both at that meeting and following for pretty much the rest of the day at executive committee, at which point the majority of the executive decided to endorse the statement asking for the resignation of Igor. And although there are members of the executive who disagree with that action, the majority of the executive signed off on the statement and numerous, especially myself, I'll be very vocal about that, have all been saying that we do not condone violence and that's exactly what the university was asking for.

President: I'll add an addition to some of the follow up questions, in regards to the resources not particularly available on the website, they were shared as well on Facebook, but we can add them on the website, that's not something that was done intentionally and if people want that put, it can be done.

Councilor Okome: So I just have a couple questions about the executive who resigned, and I was just wondering that when the first case of harassment came up to the exec team, why was this information kept secretive, in the sense that this executive was in this room with women who have potentially experienced sexual violence and to me, what that creates is this sense of white entitlement, where people are getting together to protect one another and condoning behavior that is not okay, and to make sure that everyone understands that this is already such an unsafe space for women and for people of color, and even discussions that we have in this room – I guess I'm frustrated because I thought that the executives were supposed to be equity trained, and this is embarrassing, but especially as a woman, even more so as a black woman, it's so upsetting that this happened.

VP Sobat: Thank you for that question, I think it's an important one. I also want to thank those people who have come forward to the executive with information on this matter. I know that's very difficult to do. I do want to note, in terms of the information given, for example, to the press in that Daily article, that information was not available to the executive before now. If information of that nature had been made available to the executive, I want to assure everyone that there would have been much more severe steps much sooner. The nature of the information that was disclosed to some of the executives was of behavior that made some people feel uncomfortable, so steps were taken internally to address that, some of the issues that the president mentioned through the office of the President, who is responsible for dealing with relationships with the executives. However, I think that this does point to a clear failure in terms of our existing reporting procedures, recognizing how this information, particularly those that others had, did not reach the executive. That is a significant issue that needs to be



addressed, training for the information and advocating on the behalf of survivors. The burden of this should not fall on those individuals, so there is a commitment from the executive to take steps based on the statement made yesterday and in regards to this issue. So I want to apologize on behalf of the executive that more action wasn't taken sooner, and I appreciate any feedback from councilors and others in the community on how we could improve on this moving forward.

Question period is extended.

Kiana, ArtsSci: My question is also regarding the recent events that happened with the resignation; my question is what was the threshold for you to decide that something was severe enough for you to have weekly-check ins, where you talk about consent and equity, but not believing that the fact that women and people were feeling uncomfortable was enough to pursue things further, and are you considering resigning? Specifically to the exec.

VP Sobat: So I think that the decisions that were made were in line with the recourse procedures available. One issue I guess is that the disciplinary actions available to take against an executive are different than other staff. For example, an executive can only be removed from their position by a general assembly, certainly when people come forward to us with information, we want to respect their wishes in terms of to what extent their willing to engage with the process. So to take steps in that regard, it needs to be clear that we can share that kind of information to initiate the following process, if we just want to speak in terms of definitions, there were no cases of sexual assault that were made known to the executive. If there had been, absolutely different actions would have been taken, so in terms of the steps that were made in regards to recognizing that there was problematic actions, training for the executive was done through equity to ensure that this did not continue in the future.

Malaya, Arts: I have two questions. My first question would be, is there no formal procedure for dealing with sexual harassment claims, and are these not considered serious enough? I'm still a bit unclear on where the threshold is for it to be serious enough to be given serious consideration to have disciplinary measures taken, and then my second question is just a point of clarification because, we're getting very conflicting information coming out. The Community Disclosure Network has said that many women came forward last fall and previously even before that with complaints of actual sexual assault against this man, so now I'm hearing that there were actually no complaints made of sexual assault. So I would just ask you to clarify, if the executive is really saying that no complaints of sexual assault were brought to SSMU's attention, because what this is implying then is that those survivors are lying, so is that what you are implying?



VP Sobat: So I can confirm that no such cases were disclosed to the executive, I think that this may refer to instances in regards to other student representatives to McGill, like McGill Against Austerity, the information available to those groups and the steps that they had taken were not things that the SSMU executives were aware of until this week. So again, that points to a concern about the procedures and the circulation of information. We are in contact with the Disclosures Network about the information that they had collected. They noted in their statement and their information question that their intention was to present this to the Board of Directors exactly so that a formal procedure could play out. In terms of the threshold for taking action, the nature of what was made available did not warrant, or it would have been difficult to proceed with a motion for removal over something of that nature without more information from the community. I think what we've recognized is that more needed to be done to assess the risk to members posed by the individual at that time and to try to collect more information, however unfortunately to some extent we were reliant on the degree to which people wanted to engage with reporting procedures and were not able necessarily to expect more from those individuals who came forward, if that makes sense. We were, to a certain extent, taking direction from them in what they wanted to see. So they more recently, those who came forward have asked very clearly for removal and that is what happened.

Ariane, Sci: Based on the fact that weekly check-ins were established with the member that has now resigned, I think that the SSMU executive would have probably had a solid understanding that there was danger, because he was having to receive further consent education on a one-on-one basis. Considering the fact that you had kind of identified him as a threat, I was wondering, considering the recent events that have come to light, I'm going to reiterate the past question that was asked, is anyone considering resigning?

President Ger: Thank you for the question. I do want to disclose anything for the rest of the executive other than to reiterate the information that was said by Councilor Sobat, which is that the information that was provided at that time, after consultation with our attorney, thought that it did warrant, or at least wanted to take the most action that we could at the time, to put a training program in place, that the executive do that education and the executive in question, the former VP External, was provided information. I do not believe that members of the executive at this time are considering resignation.

Kiana, Arts&Sci: So my question is, given the fact that we now know that David was willing to resign when placed with the threat of being exposed, both by the network that actually exposed him but also by the Young New Democrats of Quebec, did anyone on the executive express to him that he ought not be in a position of power, given the way that he treats and makes women



uncomfortable, at any time, even regardless of knowledge of sexual assault, given that he made women uncomfortable and that women viewed him as someone who harassed them.

VP Sobat: So I can't speak to the context of the discussions that were had in the weekly sessions, but I think it was absolutely communicated to that executive that their position and actions of making people uncomfortable and that needed to be rectified. Knowing what we know now, I wish that, on a personal level, that I had communicated that better because I absolutely agree. I think that the feeling was that the scope of what was understood was that there needed to be changes in his behavior and steps were taken in order to address those behaviors. Understanding again now, that the systematic nature of these issues, that clearly was not sufficient.

Councilor Douglas: My question is in relation to the weekly check ins, when were those established and how long had they been going on?

President Ger: I can't speak to the exact date, I would need to look that up, but it was in Fall Semester, about half way through, but I can follow up with times and specific dates if you would like. They went on for about two months in terms of educational resources and then there was also outreach to staff members, just to remind them that there was communication channels that were not through that member, if they would like to communicate to myself, as well as reminders of the different pathways to report.

Councilor Sur: This issue around sexual harassment was brought forward to the executive as quite a few members in this council had received messages from survivors, saying that they had consulted and then let the executive know about the harassment. Also back in our last council just before the December break, this issue of sexual harassment was also brought up in council. Executives weren't there, but it was just glossed over, and so I think that's important to address, that this is not something new, people were aware of this issue and now survivors have brought it forward very explicitly, which is why it's being focused on. I'm just asking why this wasn't taken seriously back in December, when the councilors also knew that this was going on?

President Ger: I'll also reiterate Councilor Sobat's sentiment. In terms of information that was passed on to the executives, in situations where we were not present, the last session of legislative council was time where executives would leave the room and feedback was able to be given to the speaker and the parliamentarian to be passed on to the executive. The sheet that was given to the executive did not include that specific information, the information that was given did lead to internal conversations, as well as the inclusion of a report for the next committee,



people did know that he was going through equity training. I want to reiterate again what VP Sobat said, that this information, had it been shared, would have resulted in faster action.

VP Sobat: I want to make everyone aware that we have been in contact with the disclosures network and were in contact in advance of these events and the events that the actions of this week were based, which is that people were organizing to collect disclosures and information. Again, recognizing that it is difficult to remove an executive forcibly and that requires a certain type of general assembly, which is a public setting, as well as needing to bring more information to the Board of Directors, which is responsible for the human resources of the society, in order to request a resignation. So just to be clear, that as soon as we had questions about these channels, that information was provided and then we were anticipating that we would be moving forward with those procedures. It was not quite providing in that way, and so not all of that information was made available to the executive through that process; I think the issue that has been identified is that there were fragmented amounts of information available to different people, rumors and other information and that this did, unfortunately because of the nature of these procedures, did not reach us. So we have absolutely made a commitment to changing that by working with the groups such as SACOMSS and the Disclosure Network to better improve those channels and their accessibility, because we understand the numerous barriers that exist and the breakdown of these systems that did lead to a situation like this.

Malaya, Arts: I have a three part question. My first question is regarding these check ins, do we have any record of these check-ins even happening, is there minutes from them, who was in attendance? Do we have any record of them even, because right now I see it as a bit of bros clubs, two friends who are checking in with each other. My second question would be, I still feel unsatisfied as to understanding what the SSMU exec, how they would respond to those large members of the Community Disclosure Network who are saying that they came forward to SSMU with these claims of sexual assault; are they lying? How do you respond to those who are saying that this did happen, and then my third question would just be, in regards to SSMU exec's decision to call for the impeachment of Councilor Sadikov because of his incitement of violence, does the SSMU exec not think that knowing about, and my understand is just sexual comments or harassment, is promoting the incitement of violence towards a targeted population on campus, does that not consist of targeted incitement of violence?

Speaker: Before we continue, I know this is a sensitive issue and I do sympathize with every person in this room, but in the future, I really hope people could be respectful by just getting to the question. I know we're really passionate, but this happened two weeks ago and I do want to make everyone feel comfortable in this room. So before you ask a question, understand what



you're saying before you speak. Just when we're asking questions, just ask the question without giving your opinion about it before. I know I'm asking a lot because it's a very sensitive topic.

Councilor Sadikov: Is the speaker suggesting that people ask one question at a time?

Speaker: That would be helpful, but I understand that the question could be two-fold or three-fold, so just asking the question without really giving context or your input about it, would be appreciated.

VP Sobat: The President will have to respond about the weekly meetings. We are absolutely aware that people have since reported accusations of assault, again that information was not available before this week to the executive committee as a whole, and I think that speaking of reporting to SSMU, the issue that I see is what that means, in some capacity this information did not reach the executive, and that's why I'm addressing policy and process to ensure that this information does reach councilors, the executive, the committee as a whole, we've committed to more training in that regard. The executive committee was not aware of any instances of assault; that is not to say that they did happen or that they were not disclosed at different times, but that is the information that we are acting on.

Jennifer, Bull & Bear: My question, given that the response to the initial claim portrays a deep misunderstanding of the nature of sexual assault and violence in general, are you prepared to say that there is an institutional failure on the SSMU's part of dealing with these sexual violence claims.

President Ger: Yeah, I will respond to that, as well as the previous questions that were not given responses to. Yes, I think the SSMU as well as the entire executive committee does recognize that there was a failure, as was also highlighted in the Community Disclosure Network statement, there was a history of missteps that we are now following in order to hopefully improve some of the failures and eliminating some of the barriers in order to create more pathways for those to take action that do not involve disclosure necessarily. As was also mentioned, we also are in touch with and collaborating with folks who have been involved in order to make sure that the steps taken in the upcoming days are adequate. In regards to check ins, that's super fair. There are no recordings of these check ins, however I can provide – I recognize the insufficient nature of the record, we have record of these check ins happening, I guess potentially people in other offices nearby might be able to potentially say that they happened, but here was no formal reporting.

Question period is extended.



Alexander, Arts: My question is just that if you knew that comments of sexual violence were being cited repeatedly, so much so that you had to have weekly check ins with this individual, why was this not made available to the greater public? And why, as a survivor of sexual assault, should I believe that you will do anything in the future to ensure that a member who is in charge, in power over me, is not going to continue with that power?

President Ger: I will respond to that, as well as another question that I have yet to answer. I would like to reiterate that the information that was provided to the executive was not specifically of that nature, and in addition to another question, I would like to say that I do not believe it was the intent of Councilor Sobat to say that there were any lies by the Disclosure Network, I think what was being alluded to was the fact that there were these sorts of reports being collected, however those were given to the executive and this wasn't happening. Regarding any specific incidents, we recognize the failure and want to do what we can to regain that trust, we will be working closely with people who are part of that network, as well as SACOMMS and other individuals who would like to get involved in the consultative process in order to rectify some of the systemic problems that exist within the institution and alleviate some of those barriers. On behalf of the executive, we are truly sorry; but we know that those words are hollow without action.

Councilor Wu: My question is that so far, the executives have quoted a lack of information on the matter as the main reason why more serious measures were not taken; however why did the executives, upon receiving this information, proactively not seek out the history of the VP External's sexual harassment allegations in order to take action, given that the individual had already been identified as a person with a history of sexual violence?

VP Sobat: Yeah, so I think they had been identified as someone who some members of our community feel uncomfortable with, and that's what we were operating under. I recognize that, absolutely in hindsight, we should have search out that information. On a personal level, I believe that when information like this is shared, it is of a sensitive nature, we should respect the wishes of whoever is disclosing that and to take some direction from them of what they would like to see, and that includes making available information on what the formal reporting channels are as they exist, as well what kind of information needs to be shared or formally reported on in order to be received, and that there are times when people do not want to go through those channels, given that they will possibly have to disclose or come forward with personal testimony, and so that information regarding the concerns of an executive's behavior, the question that was asked was what would you like to see from us, and depending on the answer, providing information on what the policies should be in regards to that process. What's



been pointed out absolutely is that, that information needs to be made clearly available on the website, and that is something that we will do, as well as to make anonymous channels available where possible. I want to note that is something that we will absolutely do, as long as it's possible for us to take the full scope of action. There are definitely issues with this process, however I recognize that with the concerns that were raised, the whole executive should have been more aware and taken steps to sensitively reach out to other to ask for more information.

Kiana, ArtsSci: Sorry for taking up so much of your time, but this is important and I feel like we need more answers. Two-tiered question; the first tier is do you think somebody who regularly makes women uncomfortable, whether or not they sexually assault women, ought be in the position of power over those women? And, if so, will you, in solidarity with all of the survivors, not only of this person but throughout McGill, resign, recognizing that you did not do enough to make sure that he no longer held a position of power over women, whether or not he sexually assaulted them?

VP Sobat: Thank you. I recognize the trust that has been broken here, and that many of you have concerns, not being comfortable about who is holding these positions, I've also been personally asked to do more to improve these policies and procedures to ensure that future people who come into these positions are better placed to address these kinds of concerns. That is a request that was made by those who have disclosed, so I do want to do what I can to respond to that, but I recognize that there might not be a lot of trust in that process right now, however I will say if one or two more executives would like to address the feasibility is of making those changes requested, purely on a practical level.

Councilor Cleveland: Was it your intent to allow David to step down quietly, as per the stipulation he suggested to the CDN? Why is it that most of the community received the first knowledge of these acts and of David's resignation through the Daily and not through a SSMU statement? And finally, were any of these concerns brought to the HR department of SSMU, as per what I would assume are the guidelines of a disclosure of this nature?

Speaker: Also just to remind everyone, according to the internal regulations, all questions that are asked three days prior to legislative council can be answered right away, but councilors can have the opportunity to defer their answers to the next legislative council, just want to remind people that because there are a lot of questions to unpack here and I know that everyone would like answers, but to give a more detailed response, I do want to give people space in this room to have that time to come up with a response or answer.



President Ger: Thank you. I will admit that the SSMU executive was writing the statement at the time, or nearly completed the statement at the time that the article came out, I believe we had just sent it for legal consultation. Once we were made aware of the disclosure network demands at that time, we immediately did begin acting on them. In regards to whether or not it was the intention of the executive to let Executive Aird step down quietly, we were following, I guess what was direction at that time, for when information was being collected, through a few channels, that it would be the opinion of the committee collecting that information to not have the former Executive Aird know, and thus were going to work to have him removed, and then once he found out about that information, the process in question acted accordingly.

VP Sobat: Just to clarify on that last point, the potential avenues for recourse were made available, or that information was provided to people who reached out; in the discussion was about what that would look like, it was suggested that by people we spoke to then, that recognizing that it would have to be a request to the Board of Directors for resignation, disclosing that information would have to be shared at that stage, and it would have been preferable to have that happen and it would be better to ensure that the individual in question was not longer in their position, as opposed to bringing that information to general assembly and expecting people to disclose that view publically. However, as the President mentioned, since it didn't play out that way, it was thought that, this kind of information and concerns do need to be shared publically, so that has been included in the response.

Question period is extended by five minutes.

Jennifer, Bull & Bear: I have a question for the two other executive members who have not yet spoken on this issue, I would like to ask Councilor Carolan as well as Councilor Magder to comment on this issue, thank you,

VP Carolan: I'm happy to comment on this. I would like to acknowledge that there was a systemic failure on behalf of the SSMU. And to clarify again some of the timelines that have been mentioned: the entire SSMU executive was not made aware of these claims until this week, and I acknowledge that 100% that it was wrong of the SSMU executive to place the burden of validating those claims that were being made, that weren't aware to the entire executive, that shouldn't have placed on those affected, that should have been taken on by ourselves, and I'm personally frustrated with myself and the executive that more wasn't done to bring in the entire executive into the issue so that we could deal with this as a team, however there are a lot issues and factors that went into that in terms of what people wanted to disclose and what they didn't. Ultimately I think that the executives who were being made aware were trying to respect the wishes of those who were making the disclosures to them, but again I don't want to speak



necessarily on their behalf. We failed the membership on not acting on this sooner and taking more active steps in looking at the other claims that were being made, not just necessarily the ones that were brought directly to the President or other executives that necessarily couldn't warrant the full action of what was available. It's my knowledge that SSMU human resources wasn't made aware of this.

VP Magder: First of all, I want to say thank you everybody for coming forward and I hope that at least in my capacity as an executive I can keep an open door for anybody who wants to talk and if there is anything I can do to extend my emotional support, I would like to do that in any case and I hope everyone knows that my door is always open. I want to echo a lot of what Niall said, I'm deeply disturbed that there was a failure in the clear reporting process, and I think that's something that needs to change. Other than that, I don't have much else to add.

Councilor Templer: I have a couple questions that have come up, so I want to ask them individually to make sure that I get an answer from each. So my first one, could a member of the executive committee who is also a member of the Board of Directors, who were made aware of these the situation and the concerns surrounding the VP External that were raised in the fall and that were serious enough warrant these sessions of training, for lack of a better word, as well as recognizing that he made students feel unsafe and uncomfortable, explain their interest in allowing the VP External to join the Board of Directors and to take on an additional position of power within the Student Society?

VP Sobat: So there was a vacancy for an officer position on the Board of Directors, and that individual was the only executive eligible for that seat. In hindsight, that may not have been the best decision.

Councilor Templer: My second question, did the executives inform their colleague, the VP Student Life, about the fact that the VP External had made sexualized comments or actions which made women on campus feel uncomfortable or unsafe, and what steps were taken to ensure her safety?

VP Sobat: I'm not going to answer that one without the VP Student Life here. I haven't spoken to her.

Speaker: We can make that question clear to the VP Student Life to be answered later.

Councilor Templer: My next question was, do the executives feel that it was hypocritical to work on a sexual assault policy at McGill while having an executive accused of sexual harassment, or



at the minimum accused of making women feel uncomfortable because of sexualized action or comments, remain in his office or undisciplined?

VP Sobat: So I recognize that there have been failures in our reporting procedures, I don't want that to take away from the necessary changes at this university as a whole that need to happen on the administrative side of this institution, I would note that process by which McGill came forward with a policy against sexual violence was not something that anyone expected coming into this year, it was moved forward with a very strict timeline to have a policy by the end of the calendar year. Student voices needed to be a part of that process, and the steps that were taken to improve upon the consultation and advocacy that I can assure you, would not have come from the administration, in terms of student consultation. Again, when these initiatives were undertaken, that information was not the information that we had available, certainly it points to larger issues, whether or not people who come into these positions are equipped to handle these kinds of measures, and having that kind of training and educational resources.

Councilor Templer: I'll go quickly through my next question; I want to make sure that there is room for others to speak. So my next question is, did the executive request for the VP External's resignation on the first instance of this being reported to the executive, in the fall when this information first became available? Was any request made by the executive committee?

VP Sobat: There was not a request by the executive committee at that time. Again, action was taken through the office of the President as stated.

Councilor Templer: My final question is that, if the executives felt that the institutional forms of redress or discipline were inadequate or good enough for this situation, did they consult with SSMU's legal counsel regarding the actions for removal?

VP Sobat: Again, at the time, it wasn't thought that they were sufficient, but simply that the procedures as they exist are, there's a very high threshold to remove an executive, we have in the past consulted our legal counsel on that and they've felt very strongly that this issue of whether or not to remove an executive should be put in the hands of the general assembly. However, one immediate step we have taken now is, in the proposed referendum question regarding the amendment to the constitution, there is a proposal that the powers or role of the Board of Directors be clarified in terms of their ability to suspend an executive for an extended period of time, for example that's a clarification measure or an appendix about that situation, recognizing that there are changes to be made there.



Councilor Templer: If I could just follow up to confirm, legal counsel was not consulted in this specific instance?

VP Sobat: No.

Speaker: I'm sorry, this has allotted our time, and it's not in our Standing Rules, it's in our Internal Regulations and there cannot be suspension of the Internal Regulations.

VP Sobat: Motion to suspend the rules and add point 8 on the agenda, which is a discussion on this matter, recognizing that folks have more questions and concerns.

Rules are suspended, motion is passed. "Discussion Period Regarding the Resignation of the VP External" is added to the agenda.

Councilor Chin: Could we clarify that we are done discussion on all other matters before we move on?

Councilor Anderson: Quickly, it has come to my attention that a former member of this councilor, Councilor Ashby, who was the Science Rep to SSMU, who was removed, is still a member of SSPN, which he was appointed to as a councilor. Dan (VP Lawrie) is not here tonight, but I just wanted to confirm whether or not Ashby is still a member of SSPN, because I do believe he should be removed, due to the nature of the reason he's been removed as a councilor.

VP Sobat: As far as I was aware, when he was removed as a councilor, he was also removed from SSPN.

Councilor Mansdeorfer: Yeah, he's on the committee of SSPN, and also Faculty Olympics Committee.

VP Sobat: That was not our understanding, but we will follow up with the VP Internal on that.

Motion to suspend the rules to add something to the agenda. Added "Discussion Period Regarding the Resignation of the VP External" to the agenda.



## 1. Discussion Period Regarding the Resignation of the VP External

Ariane, Arts: If there are widespread calls for resignation, given the fact that SSMU created a space in which a person who at least made women feel uncomfortable was allowed to continue to work, and there are widespread calls for resignation, will the executives involved resign?

President Ger: I'm happy to have a formal conversation with the rest of the executives.

Councilor Zhou: My question is that, following the resignation of the former VP External, will the SSMU be looking to take follow up disciplinary actions against the former VP External, who is still a member of this society, perhaps in collaboration with the office of the Dean of Students and perhaps with the administration with regards to potential legal action?

VP Sobat: As far as I'm aware, there has not been a formal police report filed nor is there formal disciplinary action being taken by the university at this time. If any members would like that to happen and would like our support in that, we are absolutely open to lending that. Just to note that we are taking direction from those who have come forward and some of them may not want to engage in those procedures. SSMU does not have the ability to discipline individual students; that it not part of our representational model or within our capacity, but we would welcome any thoughts on that front.

Councilor Anderson: My question is regarding the consultation of the resignations of the execs. Rather than resign, would you be amendable to devoting the majority of your remaining time in office to developing better policies that address these kinds of issues and can set in motion a sustainable way to address them in the future and create safer spaces on campus?

VP Sobat: I'm absolutely committed to that in the context of my own portfolio, and that was a request of the Community Disclosure Network in particular, who I have been in contact with, which is absolutely my intention and the main reason why I would like to remain in this position, but again recognizing that there are others who have different feelings about that. Short answer is yes.

VP Magder: Unequivocally, yes.

Councillor Junejo: My question is for the entire executive, is it that following this situation, are they planning on putting a system in place in which the coming executives get background checks regarding what they've been up to in their previous assignments? Because in this case, if that was done prior to their assignment, this could have been avoided.



President Ger: Well we're certainly amenable to that, we will not that executives currently go through criminal background checks, however more steps can be taken and we're definitely looking to working collaborative with those who are interested in working on that process, we will ask specifically the Disclosure Network on defining more specific changes, include potentially that. I will also say that yes, to Councilor Anderson's question, and over again I will echo that the executives will have a discussion surrounding possible resigning.

Councilor Okome: I was wondering, because it seems like this situation is a question of accountability, and the fact that, it seems to me like the execs were not accountable to each other or, to me, it definitely seems like there was some protection, weird veiled protection going on, and I was wondering if there are going to be any steps taken towards maybe having a different committee created just to keep the executives accountable to one another and make sure that information is being shared, whether small or big, not just held privately but becomes public knowledge.

VP Sobat: I'm very open to something like that, I would want to do more consultation on what that would look like, I think that on the one hand, we have some obligations from an HR perspective, but that absolutely that conversation needs to be had about sharing information. One thing that we tried to do this year, was in recognition that in the past, this has not been a very mental-health friendly workplace, was to prohibit the amount of personal information that the executives did need to make available, so that we could reassess the kinds of conversations that we made at the executives committee level, for example, about what is available. So in terms of oversight for the policy and procedure changes, going forward, that will happen in consultation with the Disclosure Network and SACOMSS and anyone else who wants to be involved. Other committees could be formed to go beyond that as well.

Councilor Magder: In future years, I think, although there was an effort to protect mental health, more information needs to be shared between the executive, I think that's number one, and number two, I think it's an interesting idea to suggest, I think it could be a very good idea to suggest, to have someone to hold the executives accountable, I think it's something that should definitely be explored.

Councilor Chin: Given that the current office of the VP External is vacant, how are the responsibility of that office going to be partitioned off to the remaining executive for the remainder of the year. And, more specifically, given the level of involvement of the former VP External towards AVEQ, I want to ask how our relationship with them has changed, given that they have



an active campaign against sexual violence, and one of their foundational principles is feminism?

President Ger: I want to recognize that is a bit of an ongoing process, we are currently collecting or amassing a list of projects that were in place, as well as splitting up portfolios. By tomorrow, we should have a plan of how to split it up the executive role among the team, however in regards to relationship with AVEQ, there are other executives who do sit around that table, specifically our VP University Affairs, but I guess conversations will be had in the near future regarding that.

VP Sobat: Just a note, the VP External was not involved in the campaign at AVEQ that you mentioned, or the consultation on new government legislation around sexual violence. Most of those conversations have been to push for wider consultation, not just with student representatives but with allies, supporters and survivors themselves.

Malaya, Arts: Two quick questions, my first question is because of the unwillingness to discuss resignation at this time, because SSMU has recognized that there was a mishandling of the situation, at this time is SSMU willing to make a statement that their mishandling of this situation resulted in directly perpetuating rape culture on campus, as well directly contributing to the gendered and sexualized violence under their watch because of their mishandling, and my second question is, does SSMU plan on contacting Provost Manfredi or Principle Fortier to demand that they stand in solidarity with all of the survivors of Mr. Aird's actions? Will there be communications with Principle Fortier and Provost Manfredi about this?

President Ger: Whole heartedly yes to both, we're very willing to indicate the failure and our direct contributions to rape culture on campus. In regards to communication with both the provost and the principle, emails can be sent as well as in person follow-ups, for sure.

Councilor Cleveland: From what I understand from your answers tonight, specifically the VP UA, there was no consultation with Human Resources or legal counsel from being first informed of harassment allegations in the fall semester. So, am I correct in saying that this was just handled by some type of inner circle within the executives of SSMU, and if so, why would you not take what seems to be appropriate actions, such as contacting HR or legal counsel?

VP Sobat: So the President is responsible for overseeing SSMU human resources, they are also responsible for the relationship within the executive committee as a whole and the relationship between the executive and the rest of SSMU. I think what we've heard is that there needs to be some other players in that process, one level at the level of the Board of Directors, which does



have a human resources committee, however there are opportunities for that lower down, organizing for that, and that communication did not happen.

Councilor Cleveland: As a follow-up, there is someone listed on SSMU's full-time staff page whose job is listed as human resources manager, who provides human resource advice and expertise, this seems like someone you would consult with in situations like these.

VP Sobat: I will note that our previous HR manager did leave the society in January, and we've recently had someone new step into that role, however you're right that part of their role is to be able to provide advice on HR matters and issues, for example to executives to their capacity as supervisors. In the past, they have not provided advice necessarily on the role of the executives as employees, but I think that we can better use their expertise when those issues do arise.

Kiana: ArtsSci: My question is for Ben specifically, what is your personal relationship with David and do you think it influenced your willingness to talk to other about what he told you?

President Ger: I'm happy to answer that. I did not know David prior to this position, we did not hang out outside of work, it is a purely formal relationship.

Councilor Templer: So I understand the point made by Councilor Cleveland and the request that some councilors are making for a body to hold the executive committee accountable, but my question is, I understand that this might be perceived as being outside of its role, but as the Board of Directors is the highest governing body and is responsible for legal matters concerning the Society, why were the initial concerns raised with the executive not then shared with the Board of Directors? Especially considering that David was working with the Board of Directors, which includes women.

VP Sobat: So currently information that isn't in the form of a formal complaint, through those channels, I think that is something that we could better establish around the table right now, as that transition to restructuring the Board of Directors and having it take on more responsibility this year has been a work in progress. The HR committee of the Board has not yet met; we need more administrative and institutional support in order for that governing body to be effective in being able to address these issues. It was imagined that it might be able to adjudicate on human resource matters that might not be able to be dealt with by the executive committee, however the human resources are dealt with internally.

Jennifer, Bull & Bear: I have two questions. Firstly, is anyone able to speak to the whereabouts of Councilor Patterson tonight? And the second question is, the process or the lack of adequate



actions that happened seems to come from an inability to take women's words seriously when they report sexual harassment. Do you feel like, if the SSMU exec was not so male dominated, this would have been taken more seriously?

President Ger: In regards to the whereabouts of Councilor Patterson, she is on vacation that was booked previous to this council, a few weeks ago. In addition, I would like to formally recognize that the SSMU executive does recognize it's inaction and how it contributed to rape culture on campus, especially in how that affects women. I do also want to reiterate that if there was more information that was provided, we would have taken immediate action and it was not our intent to not take anyone's word or situation seriously, we truly apologize for the effect that has had.

Councilor Magder: I think if the full executive had spoken from the beginning on this, a different decision might have been taken.

Councilor Cleveland: This may have been previously addressed, but was there a rationale behind excluding certain members of the executive from knowledge of this harassment?

VP Sobat: So again, we may be using different words to describe the information that was available, but the procedures that were in place were that, in terms of regarding executives, in terms of personal information, were dealt with by the office of the President and the discussion that we're having now is what kind of information or at what level of threshold should those be considered at more than personal information, and at which point should that be shared with the executive committee as a whole. In regards to the previous question, I absolutely want to recognize the lack of diversity of the executive team and our positionality with regards to taking very seriously the people who have reached out to me on an individual level, and recognizing that it precludes those who don't feel comfortable doing that. That includes being in active contact with the Community Disclosure's Network. We met today and we'll be meeting tomorrow to discuss the next steps.

Councilor Cleveland: Perhaps as a final clarification, which members of the SSMU executive were aware of this harassment and which members were not?

Ben: I want to answer that question, but do you mind if I get in touch with those people who were contact to see if that information is okay to share?

This question is deferred until next meeting.



Kiana, ArtsSci: I guess I wasn't disclosing this before, because I was only asking questions, but I'm the co-president of the Young New Democrats of Quebec. So immediately, after hearing that there were complaints, not of sexual assault but harassment, we got David to resign from our executive. He didn't spend a single day actively acting as his position as VP Politics. This is not to pat myself on the back, I think and wish that we could have done more, I understand wanting to keep anonymity and doing the wishes of individuals, which is exactly how we acted. I just don't believe you when you tell me there's not way that he would have resigned, barring you going to the Board of Directors or taking that action. I think there has been proof, both with my executive but also with the Community Action Network, that when you threaten him with exposure, he is willing to resign. I think the fact that he never felt unsafe enough, or never felt enough pressure from the executive to resign, even before you know about his assault, is an indicator that he didn't feel like you were ever going to do anything that was going to expunge him or reprimand him for what he was doing. I think that is extremely problematic. If you want to talk to me about how to get him to resign, I'm happy to talk to you after, because it was honestly one of the simplest processes of my life and took very little effort, surprisingly, and I think this demonstrates that, one, the fact that he was very scared of being exposed but two, the fact that you didn't do enough to get him to resign and get him away from a position of power and I'm really disappointed in this executive.

Councilor Templer: As some of you personally know the one of the survivors, I asked them if they wanted to convey any message regarding this situation and the handling of this information as it has come out. Obviously it was difficult for them as they were at a loss for words, but they did ask me to read the following: the SSMU executives say about the early complaints that the information provided did not allow for immediate disciplinary action and then later say that they support the students that are coming forward. Really? Their internal measure were weekly meetings with David that apparently served to do nothing. If SSMU can condemn David's actions, they need to condemn the actions of the execs that found out about this and what? Hoped that it would resolve itself?

Malaya, Arts: I just want to make it clear to all the survivors, because I'm seeing happening tonight, what is absolutely disgusting to me, is the fact that these survivors have said that they told SSMU that David had sexually assaulted them. So what I am hearing tonight, frankly I think is a lie, that SSMU did not know that he was sexually harassing people on campus, so I want to say tonight to every survivor on campus and off campus that I believe you, and a whole group of us believe you, we believe you when you say that you told SSMU that he had been sexually assaulting women. We believe you, I'm not sure if SSMU does, frankly I believe that SSMU is covering this up, but I just want to reiterate to those survivors that I believe you, and we believe you.



**Students' Society of McGill University**

Tel: (514) 398-6800 Fax: (514) 398-7490 | [ssmu.ca](http://ssmu.ca)  
3000 McTavish St., Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3  
L'Association Étudiante, Rue Jean-Jacques St., Université McGill

VP Sobat: I was going to mention that I am personally available if anyone would like to speak, I recognize that may not be the case, in which case I would urge you to reach out directly to the Disclosure's Network, they do have an email account, with your thoughts and points. Other than that, I wanted to motion for a 10-minute recess.

Recess, turns into adjournment of council.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Muna Tojiboeva". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Muna Tojiboeva, President

2017-08-09