



SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

OCTOBER 12th, 2017

1. Call to Order: 18:08;

Meeting called to order at 18:08.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker reads the land acknowledgement to the Councillors.

3. Attendance

Attendance is done by the Speaker.

4. Update on/Approval of last Council's minutes - APPROVED

The Speaker moves a vote to approve the Council Minutes from 2017-09-28. The Minutes are approved.

5. Adoption of the Agenda - APPROVED

Councillor Mansdoerfer asks if it is possible to change the way that placards are raised when speaking. The Speaker explains that this would have to take place through a main motion. The Speaker asks if there are any points or motions on the floor relating to the adoption of the agenda. There are no points or motions.

The speaker passes to motion the adoption of the agenda. All are in favour. This motion passes.

6. Guest Speakers

a) Legal Information Clinic, Amanda Arella

The Speaker welcomes the guest presenter.

Amanda Arella and Marc-Antoine are from the legal information clinic. Amanda explains that they are here to explain the services that they offer to students so that Councillors can relay this information to



their constituents. Amanda explains that the legal information clinic is an independent not-for-profit, and that their costs are covered by student fees. She explains that they have two main services: The student advocacy service run by Marc-Antoine, and the legal clinic which aids students in navigating federal and provincial law. Amanda invites Marc-Antoine to explain the student advocacy portion of the legal information clinic.

Marc-Antoine explains that the student advocacy segment deals primarily with issues internal to McGill. They can help students understand how policies work. They can inform students about their rights, using the Code of Student Conduct and the Charter of Student Rights. The centre can help students resolve problems more informally, which is actually more common than situations which require a trial. They can also help students formally and informally with negotiations, and can represent them at the negotiation table. Marc-Antoine provides the example of helping students navigate charges of plagiarism and cheating. They can also help if a student is accused or wants to accuse someone of a disciplinary issue. They can help students figure out what kind of behaviour McGill will sanction, including assault. He explains how they can help students with grievances, which is kind of like going to the Supreme Court of McGill. He describes how it is a complicated process and it can be useful to have someone who understand and can explain the documents, and can help with writing. He further explains that they can also occasionally help with SSMU J-Board or Election issues, although not completely part of their mandate.

Amanda explains that they have legal information services, including the Commissioner for Oaths Service where they can witness and attest to documents for free, as opposed to the five-dollar fee required elsewhere. Amanda provides examples of attestation of full-time studies and Visas as processes where this service can be useful. She explains that they offer a service called Just Info, where they can create presentations on specific portions of law, for instance, on tenant rights for students signing their first lease. She further explains that they have a legal information clinic where students can drop by and receive information from volunteer law students. She stresses that while the clinic can provide legal information, it cannot provide legal advice, which is reserved for lawyers under Quebec law. She explains that this means that they cannot recommend a course of action or assess a student's chances of specific outcomes, but they can refer them to lawyers who can. She explains that they cannot help with matters of criminal law either, because they do not have lawyer-client relationship, which means they are subject to subpoena.

There are no questions.

The Speaker thanks Amanda and Marc-Antoine for their presentation.

7. Question Period (5)

The Speaker reminds the Council of the rules for Question Period, and Question Period is opened.



Councillor Lametti asks why the membership of the J-Board is not available on the SSMU website. President Tojiboeva explains that she was unaware of the issue and that the website was just launched on Monday. She says that she will have them posted as soon as possible.

VP Oke asks whether the Councillors would be interested in a half hour informal meet and greet with various administrators before legislative council on November 16th. The speaker motions for an informal vote using placards. There is interest.

Marina from the Daily asks whether there are updates on the constitutionality of the board which she says was questioned some SSMU Board meetings ago. President Tojiboeva replies that this is currently being discussed in Board meetings. She explains that they are still deciding on how to structure the reform itself of the constitution and how to deal with issues where it contradicts itself. She suggests that there will probably be a committee to work on the constitution and ensure the wording is sound.

Marina from the Daily asks if there is a timeline for this work on the constitution. President Tojiboeva replies that there is not yet a timeline, and that they will probably look into it at their next Board meeting.

Councillor Bulger says that a constituent attended the Building Closure Information Session and learned that a new VP Operations will not be elected. She asks for clarification on why the decision was made not to elect a new VP. VP Khan explains that executives have the right to decide if they want a by-election or not, and that they decided to delegate the tasks amongst themselves. She explains that in the long term the role is more suited to a full-time staff member, and that in the next two weeks they will be bringing forward a constitutional amendment to strike the VP Operations role.

Councillor Bulger asks if there is any additional support in place for the executives who have to take on extra work of the VP Operations position in addition to fulfilling their own portfolios. VP Khan responds that there is not.

Marina from the Daily states that the building closure was seemingly announced for the first time by a Facebook event, which caused a lot of controversy. She asks if anyone can explain why this happened and if the Councillors have a response to the anger of students. VP Earle replies that the SSMU and the executive apologize for confusion that may have arisen. He explains that the event page was meant for building tenants who had been notified via email already, and that friends were added to the event, making it more public than initially intended.

Councillor Mansdoerfer motions to extend Question Period by five minutes. This is seconded by VP Earle.



Marina from the Daily asks why there was not more information disseminated to students on how to submit motions for the Fall GA, and whether there will be information on how students can submit motions from the floor. President Tojiboeva replies that the information was available on the old SSMU website and should be available on the current website, but to please let her know if this is not the case.

Marina from the Daily asks to clarify that there was no effort to distribute or publicize the information beyond placing it on the website. President Tojiboeva confirms this and explains that the information is on the website, including information on accessibility and how to submit motions from the floor.

Councillor Lametti motions to recess while technological issues are resolved. Councillor Bulger seconds the motion. The motion passes.

VP Khan asks the President to clarify whether regulations need to be suspended in order to allow students to submit motions late. The President responds that according to Article 5.3 of the Internal Regulations of Governance, students can submit late motions to the student speaker up to 24 hours before the GA, and thus would have an option besides motions from the floor.

Councillor Anderson asks if the executives decide to bring the removal of the VP Operations position to a referendum, if it will be done in the fall referendum to ensure it occurs before Winter elections. President Tojiboeva responds that this can be done, and that it simply needs to be brought to the next Council meeting. She explains that there is already a motion being worked on for a change of names as well as removing the VP Operations position. VP Earle adds that the amendment to the constitution would be a large and complex one, and that the current timeline of 14 days may not be long enough. He says that his initial inkling was that they would maybe need to hold off until the winter referendum. He reiterates that it is not just a simple change to amend the constitution, so it will probably take a while.

Conclusion of Question Period.

8. Announcements (5)

VP Spencer announces that there will be an open forum for the continuing consultations on the SSMU gendered violence policy on Monday, October 16 at 18:00. She asks Councillors to please share this with their constituents, and says that VP Externals will be receiving an email with more information.

Councillor Chan introduces the new AUS VP External.

The Speaker Announces Councillors who have resigned, and explains that the positions will be filled soon.

President Tojiboeva introduces a new Recording Secretary.



VP Spencer announces that there will be a 15km walk for the 15 and Fair campaign on October 15 and invites Councillors to email the VP External for more information.

9. New Business

a) Motion to Approve Audit – APPROVED

President Tojiboeva presents the motion.

Councillor Mansdoerfer expresses that he cannot find the audit in question. President Tojiboeva states that it was the audit presented last meeting and asks General Manager Ryan to speak to where it can now be found.

Councillor Campbell motions to include the financial audit statement in the appendix. This is seconded by Councillor Anderson. The motion passes.

The speaker announces that the audit is now on the google drive.

Default voting by clicker. The motion passes with 77% in favour, 23% abstaining, and 0% opposed.

b) Councillor Committee Allocations – APPROVED

Councillor Anderson asks why there are no minutes available from the session in which committee allocations were decided. President Tojiboeva answers that they do not have a way to produce the minutes, but that the information can be found in the steering committee report.

Councillor Anderson asks if they will have to vote on the motion before they hear about the Steering Committee report. President Tojiboeva answers that Councillors were allocated committees based on their first choice and their qualifications. There wasn't much delegation. The speaker adds that any questions can be directed to him as chair of the steering committee.

Default clicker vote: 69% in favour, 4% against, 27% abstaining. Motion passes.

c) Electoral and Referenda Timeline Presentation – APPROVED

The speaker welcomes the presenters. The presenters discuss the timeline for FYC elections, the Fall referendum, the winter referendum, and the winter election. Councillor Bazylykut asks if the powerpoint presentation with dates can be made available, and the Presenter states that it will be sent to the Parliamentarian.

Motion to approve moved by President Tojiboeva. Seconded by Councillor Savage.

Councillor Lametti votes to remove the Gerts announcement of election results from the timeline. Seconded by Councillor Mansdoerfer. Motion passes.



Councillor Lametti says that it appears Senate elections might not have to happen under SSMU and moves to add the two words “if necessary”. Seconded by Councillor Mansdoerfer. Motion passes.

Speaker moves to voting procedure.

Default clicker vote: 88% in favour, 12% abstaining. Motion passes.

Speaker reminds those who are not familiar with Robert’s Rules to still participate, as the Speaker will help when they do not know the rules.

d) Motion Regarding Council Nominations to the SSMU Board of Directors – APPROVED

VP Koparkar presents the motion.

Bulger nominates Councillor Zhou. Seconded by VP Khan. Zhou accepts.

VP Earle nominates Councillor Campbell. Seconded by Anderson. Campbell accepts.

VP Earle nominates Councillor Mansdoerfer. Mansdoerfer answers that he cannot be a voting member on the BoD because he is not a Canadian citizen. This is confirmed by the General Manager.

President nominates Councillor O’Manique. Seconded by Councillor Tarrabain. Nomination accepted.

Councillor Ghazi nominates councillor Moshkforoush-. Nomination accepted.

Mansdoerfer nominates Councillor Bulger. Seconded by Councillor Zhou. Accepted.

Councillor Anderson motions for 2 minute recess. Seconded by Councillor Lametti. Motion passes.

The nominated Councillors present short speeches on why they should be nominated to the Board of Directors. Councillor Bulger rescinds her acceptance of the nomination due to other commitments.

Councillor Anderson motions to amend original motion to include current names. Councillor Syed seconds. Motion passes.

Councillor Anderson motions to divide the question. Seconded by VP Koparkar. Motion carries.

Vote for Kevin Zhou: Motion carries.

Vote for Vivian Campbell: Motion carries.

Vote for Councillor O’Manique: Motion carries



Vote for Councillor Moshkforoush: Motion carries.

VP Oke motions to vote by placard. Seconded by President Tojiboeva. Motion carries.

Vote: Motion carries.

e) Motion to Endorse the Popular Demonstration against Racism and the Far-Right on November 12th – APPROVED

VP Spencer reads motion.

Councillor Savage asks if it is possible to put together a list of groups considered alt-right to help eliminate confusion. VP Spencer answers that this is possible, and reminds the Council that none of the groups who have posted have been student groups. They have all been external to McGill.

Councillor Zhou asks if there is any way we can prevent outside group from posting hate speech on campus and if there is a way we can enforce disciplinary action if it comes from students. VP Spencer replies that there is no way to prevent the public from coming on campus. The best way is to take down the posters as they come up. Right now we are limited to reporting systems. It's students' reporting that we rely on. VP Oke adds that the University is responsive to these kinds of issues and what we need to do is make sure that on our end we are continuously communicating with Security and other groups that have been responsive.

VP Oke motions to strike out first two clauses and replace it with text from the current SSMU Equity policy rather than the policy from 2015. Seconded by Councillor Anderson.

Motion carries.

Councillor Savage motions to add a "be it resolved" clause that the VP External has to create a list of alt-right groups in Montreal and alt-right sentiments on campus and their threats. Seconded by VP Koparkar. Motion to amend carries.

Default vote by Clicker: Motion carries.

f) Motion to Acknowledge Rape Culture on McGill Campus and at SSMU – APPROVED

Voting by Clicker: 100% in favour, motion carries.

g) Motion Regarding the Appointment of Two Executives to the Steering Committee – APPROVED

Voting by Clicker: 92% in favour, 8% abstaining, motion carries



h) Motion Regarding First Year Council Fee – APPROVED

Voting by Clicker: 96% in favour and 4% abstaining, motion carries

i) Motion Regarding Peer Support Center Fee – APPROVED

VP Khan states that there is a member from PSC in the gallery here to answer questions if there are any. There are no questions.

Voting by Clicker: 92% in favour and 8% abstaining, motion carries

j) Motion regarding Renewal of the SSMU Ambassador Fee – APPROVED

Councillor Bulger reads motion.

Voting by Clicker: 92% in favour and 8% abstaining, motion carries

k) Motion Regarding Sustainability Projects Fund Fee – APPROVED

Councillor Bazylykut reads motion.

Voting by Clicker: Motion carries.

l) Motion to Bring the Question of AVEQ Affiliation to Referendum

Arts and Science representative Councillor Fodor signs on as third mover of motion.

Councillor Chan reads motion.

Councillor O'Manique presents a statement from the Education faculty, asking how we can expect AVEQ to successfully lobby the provincial government when they have only three or maybe four schools on board, when there are other groups that have lobbied support from many more groups.

Councillor Lametti says that there is an argument on campus that those who voted in the referendum 18 months ago were somehow uninformed and that there was an unusually high abstention rate. This is not true because it was comparable to other questions, but even if it were the case, students abstaining does not mean they were uninformed. It is undemocratic to have a new referendum when members have already expressed opinion on this just 18 months ago.

Councillor Demir asks the SSMU executive why they decided not to include other student organizations, and if it would be possible for other student organizations to come and pitch their organizations. Councillor Spencer responds: I have answered this before but because it is constantly re-asked, I think it is useful to go back historically. In 2015, the organization most schools were with



collapsed, and so two groups were made out of this and SSMU was in both groups. The VP external observed at both groups, that were to become AVEQ and UEQ, with the understanding that council would later hear reports from her at each council and then each group would make presentations in January so that Council could decide who was on the ballot. It was decided ultimately that AVEQ should be the only one on the ballot. As Councillor Lametti pointed out, there was a small voter turnout, and there were more abstentions than no votes or yes votes. Then Council mandated Emily Boytinck and the following VP External to just keep observing AVEQ, which continued last year, and then last year it was passed again to continue remaining observers and then to have a referendum. So, it's being brought forward because two previous years of Council have wanted to keep this dialogue open.

Councillor Mansdoerfer prefaces that his vote will not reflect his personal beliefs, but those of his faculty. He says that he doesn't think it's fair to bring up the abstention rate here because that's simply a trend with SSMU. Last year he spoke to Councillors who felt that AVEQ was given significant favour when it came to presentations. He says that AVEQ hasn't posted minutes in over 20 months and lacks transparency, and that while he was mandated to vote in favour, he believes that the referendum is a bad idea.

Marina from the Daily says that from an outsider's perspective, if we care about democracy then shouldn't the question be asked to the students?

VP Earle says that he would like to echo the sentiment to bring the question to referendum, so that all students have a right to bring their own opinions forth.

Councillor Anderson says that VP Earle's argument is super valid, but it just seems disingenuous to not also give UEQ another chance to present to Council when the last time this was moved, both organizations got a chance. Students should be presented all options and it seems biased to only present students with one route as a possibility.

President Tojiboeva says to echo the argument made by Councillor Anderson, there is an interesting argument published in 2016 about how the SUS discussed whether to join AVEQ or UEQ, and discussed how putting only one organization on the ballot stops another organization from having a chance. So, before we put AVEQ on the ballot, it might be wise to give UEQ the proper chance to make a claim for itself.

VP Spencer says that VP Externals for the past years have simply been following their mandates, rather than their personal opinions. We also have not had UEQ reach out to us. We could see if they are interested, but at one point they maybe messaged Muna at the beginning of the term but then never followed up. Also, UEQ does not have double the members of AVEQ, that is not true. There were more referendums for UEQ than AVEQ because UEQ decided to have more referendums while AVEQ decided to talk to those more at the table.



Councillor Mackinnon says that the revenue generated for AVEQ by McGill would be three times as much as for some smaller organizations, and they have run a 66,000 deficit and are planning to again. Mackinnon asks if this a responsible use of our funds. VP Spencer explains that the one-association-one-vote system is for solidarity because one of the reasons why the previous group broke up is that the larger francophone associations were bullying out the others. So yes, McGill would be paying more money, but it's to the benefit of the greater good.

Councillor Savage says that as someone involved in the red square protests back in 2012, there are a lot of things that we need to consider. SSMU would benefit from being part of a larger organization, AVEQ or otherwise. There has been a lot of turnover in the student body population since the last referendum. The student voice needs to be unified, whether it's through AVEQ or another organization, because the reality is that there are organizations in our government that want to privatize our education more and more, and we need to have a strong organization here. If it's true that they haven't posted an agenda in 20 months, then I don't want to give money to that and we need to put our money elsewhere.

Councillor Chan says that we should remember that there was a Notice to Motion last week, and a presentation as well. These are genuine concerns, but if Councillors were motivated enough to voice these concerns now, then these concerns could have been enacted last week. Now this motion is in front of us to let students have the chance to make a decision for themselves. We need to give students the full transparency including information about the agendas not posted for 20 months, but we shouldn't shoot down the opportunity for students to make a decision.

Councillor Lametti says that there seems to be a consensus that students should be allowed to decide what they want, and he agrees, but that is what was done 18 months ago. It is undemocratic to keep having referendums. Last week he was told that agendas would be posted imminently by AVEQ, but as of today at 5 PM, this still has not been done. The overwhelming consensus of the faculty of medicine is that this is a bad idea, and he has the mandate to oppose this motion.

VP Spencer says that a benefit and drawback of student politics is that it changes every year, based on the issues that run concurrent with elections. This is why we always bring referendums back, to allow students to have changing opinions. The mindsets of executives at the SSMU and faculty levels change every year, and a lot has changed at McGill and on AVEQ over two years. To address the Minutes thing, AVEQ is putting their minutes up shortly, but UEQ has none, and even we are still looking for our Board Minutes here at SSMU.

Councillor Urban is in favour of reopening the debate between AVEQ and UEQ. Not much has changed within AVEQ since students decisively voiced their opposition to AVEQ, so why are we reopening this debate?



Gallery Member Joshua Chin from the faculty of Medicine sat on the Legislative Council for the last three years, and knows about AVEQ, UEQ, and what happened. He would like to state information that Council does not know yet. First of all, there has been an inappropriate hiring of AVEQ employee under SSMU payroll. The University of Sherbrooke decided to distance themselves from AVEQ due to a lack of transparency, specifically quoting a lack of structure in hiring of a coordinator. On September 26, 2016, AVEQ voted to appoint the sitting VP External of SSMU to the future AVEQ board of directors.

VP Earle wants to reiterate that the Speaker said at the first meeting to be mindful of the amount of space you are taking up. He feels that a lot of people with similar identities are repeating the same things. Going forward, please be mindful of the space you are taking up.

Councillor Fodor asks the AVEQ representative in the gallery to speak to changes made in AVEQ over time, and the concerns of students over the lack of these changes. The AVEQ Representative replies that she wasn't around during the first referendum, but was excited to get involved with a group that would make sure organization like SSMU, who has historically been excluded, would be supported. This is her understanding of why a referendum was held so early. A lot of students wanted to contribute even though it didn't have concrete structures. She adds that the first year there were two or three executives at AVEQ, but there are now six. She adds that the meeting minutes are available on request, and will be posted publicly once they are up to a professional standard. She adds that AVEQ and UEQ have very different goals. AVEQ has demonstrated their work with sexual violence by pushing the government to look at these concerns at a very serious level. They are also doing mobilization work with climate justice, 15 and fair, and internships.

VP Koparkar says that there is a lot of discussion about how this has brought to a referendum recently and shouldn't be done again, but our population has changed a lot and it's fair to give the students the change to decide between both organizations again. The people advocating for more transparency on minutes and things should do the same when it comes to our own processes.

VP Oke points to the danger in emphasizing numbers such as abstentions when it comes to conversations about voting and making decisions. This might say something about the overall mindset some of us have here, and it is this kind of majority thinking that means the vote of equity always loses, because it is the minority.

President Tojiboeva asks that the member in the gallery confirm that Emily Boytinck indeed became affiliated with AVEQ while a student at McGill. The gallery member, Joshua Chin, confirms that on Sept 26, 2015, in Chicoutimi, AVEQ voted to appoint Emily Boytinck to the future Board of Directors. When you line this up with her mandate in office, you will come to a conclusion.

Councillor Dinh asks the AVEQ representative to clarify how McGill is paying a higher fee for lower representation on AVEQ.



AVEQ Member states that in reference to the one association one vote rule, it goes back to what VP Oke said with regards to ensuring equity over numbers. The association was made to be a voice for underrepresented schools, including anglophone schools and regional schools.

Councillor Bazylykut asks why the fee is non-opt-outable. VP Spencer answers that it is non-opt-outable because you can't opt out of advocacy, and because the money goes towards things like hiring which rely on a budget that is known in advance. She compares this to the SSMU base fee that is non-opt-outable at McGill.

VP Spencer says that the role of the VP External is to represent SSMU on external organizations, which is what she was mandated to do with AVEQ. AVEQ also offers for faculties to come and represent themselves without having to go through the VP External. Echoing what Councillor Savage said, we are working within a very specific context that we often forget. The VP External can not just go to the Minister of Education, so it doesn't make sense for us to be in this limbo of not being in a student organization, because provincial representation is so important and right now the voices of our members are not being heard.

Councillor Mansdoerfer asks if the VP External can speak to the direct conflict of interest of a former VP External being appointed to AVEQ during her mandate with SSMU. VP Spencer replies that Emily Boytinck was given a position while she was still an observing member, but she was not the only one. There were others who joined the board while being observing members. Using the payroll through SSMU was to provide not financial support, but administrative support to AVEQ while they were starting up.

The member from the gallery, Joshua Chin, asks what happens to the AVEQ conversation if this motion fails. VP Spencer answers that it would bounce back to Council to decide next steps.

Councillor Savage says that he wants to reiterate that while a lot of people are concerned about representation, he only represents 170 students and his vote counts as much as anyone's, so we need to ease our fears on that. He says that Council is having a really productive debate right now which shows that we aren't all comfortable bringing this referendum to the students. We need a unified front before we can offer this question to the general public. We need to reopen the question to all possibilities, instead of just AVEQ.

Councillor Moshkforoush explains that she has been mandated by SUS to vote yes, but does not personally support the motion. The SUS was given a presentation by AVEQ and the VP External who directly represents SSMU. She asks if it is constitutional to have the VP External, who she says is clearly biased, presenting to those who will vote on this. VP Spencer replies that she clarified this with the CEO, and because we aren't in a referendum period right now it is definitely allowed. Her mandate says that she has to inform those about AVEQ. This is not a say yes to AVEQ campaign, as would start during a referendum period. This was her hope of bringing the conversation to the faculties so that



they could discuss, hopefully do research, and ask questions. There were a lot of questions, and her role was to facilitate the process. When I checked with the CEO, that was fine. This way, they could mandate their councillors coming in.

Councillor Moshkforoush asks to what extent VP Spencer was able to present all sides, and states that the SUS executive was not aware of all sides being discussed today when they mandated her vote. VP Spencer replies that she didn't make the presentation, AVEQ did, and that it's the role of the Councillors to make sure that councils understand the arguments presented here at SSMU. It's up to the Councillors to bring the arguments presented at SSMU back to the Councils themselves.

Councillor Moshkforoush states that her question is whether Councillor Spencer could specifically represent SSMU on that topic. The Speaker will talk to CEO on the constitutionality.

VP Khan wants the Council to remember that VP Spencer was mandated by Council last year to bring this referendum up. This means she had to make sure all the faculties knew what AVEQ was. She wasn't mandated to bring UEQ up, and this is only coming up now, which means VP Spencer wasn't mandated to do this. If she had brought UEQ presentations up without a mandate, she would then really have been biased, but towards UEQ, but right now this is in no way a conflict of interest.

Councillor Urban asks whether it was appropriate for VP Spencer to use Facebook as a platform to spread messages that seem to be strongly in support of AVEQ. VP Spencer replies that she has a mandate to communicate what is happening at AVEQ, and has been using multiple platforms to do exactly her job, as outlined in the mandate from Council and the VP External job description. She is mandated to represent at provincial unions, and currently we are observing AVEQ.

Councillor Lametti reminds Council that the current motion is to bring a referendum forward now, in this period, and is not about the broader conversation. Maybe it is better to hold off and pursue this conversation over the next extended period.

Councillor Campbell motions to postpone the resolution until effort has been made to reach out to UEQ to present to Council, specifically to postpone to next week. Seconded by Councillor Dinh.

Councillor Anderson suggests that perhaps other student organizations besides only AVEQ and UEQ should be invited to present. VP Spencer says that she can call the associations tomorrow and have an update by the end of the day tomorrow and keep the council updated on that. Gallery Member Rep from AVEQ states that UEQ is the only other organization that SSMU would be compatible with due to its structure.

Speaker extends deadline for motions for next meeting to Friday at 3pm.

Motion to postpone the current motion to next week passes.



m) Notice of Motion Regarding the Proposed Bike Centre Facility

Councillor Anderson reads notion of motion.

Councillor Lametti asks where the money in the IREF comes from. Jonathan from the gallery who works for the Deputy Provost of Student Life and Learning explains that funds were set up by administration in the 1990s to cover ongoing maintenance costs in the University Centre that would not normally be covered by the maintenance that the University is responsible for. There aren't many projects that can use this fund. The fund was created by the university, and not by students. It was a way of creating an endowment that the SSMU could match. It has grown due to investment that has been matched as SSMU hasn't been using the fund.

VP Koparkar states that the creation of a new bike facility will encourage even more students to bike to school in addition to the 5000 who already do, and asks how the gap between student cyclists and bike parking spaces will be reconciled. Paul from the gallery (who works for the Deputy Provost Student Life and Learning) explains that not all 5000 students are biking every day, and the actual number of cyclists on a daily basis is unknown. There are 2000 spaces right now, but standards recommend about 2500, so we are almost there. Adding 350 won't address the entire gap, but it isn't the only initiative the university is making either. The university regularly purchases exterior bike racks and will continue to do so.

Sebastien from Le Delit asks if the construction of the bike facility will happen at the same time as the university closure, and if so, if that is feasible. Paul answers that they will not occur at the same time. HVAC renovation is occurring during Summer 2018, while this would occur during Summer 2019, so it would not create major disruption to the SSMU.

Marina from the Daily asks if it is true that half of the bike spaces are reserved for faculty. Amelia from the office of sustainability answers that there were never supposed to be rigid lines, but they want to honour that it is a cooperative effort between the faculty and the students' union. The lines will be flexible, but it's about 1/3 to faculty, 1/3 to students, and 1/3 flexible.

The proxy for Councillor Mutoko says that 2 million dollars for 350 bikes seems like a lot, and asks if other measures have been considered at a lower cost. Paul replies that the money is not all going to the bikes. Some is going to maintenance, to the creation of the showers, etc. Only about 230,000 is going to the actual bike parking area. Over the 25-year life cycle, that evens out to 26 dollars per space per year. Councillor Bulger adds that there is a lot more going into this than just bike spaces, and that the washrooms and other aspects of the facility will benefit the entire student population.

President Tojiboeva points out that on slide 7, the price allocation shows how there is no difference between what students and faculty are paying. She asks if this is something that can be negotiated.



Paul says that they recognize that faculty have more financial means and this can certainly be negotiated.

VP Koparkar asks if all students will have access to the space since the money is going directly to the improvement of SSMU spaces. Paul answers that spaces need to be improved even if not all of SSMU uses them.

Councillor Campbell asks how much money isn't going towards the actual bike parking lot. Paul replies that about 1.65 million is not going toward the actual bike parking area. But the bike center includes the showers, locker facilities, the flat bike collective, the parking area, and the SSMU functional space.

Councillor Campbell says that the SSMU space doesn't have to do with bikes, and asks how much money is not going towards bikes. Paul replies about 481,000.

Councillor Mackinnon asks whether it has been considered that this go to referendum so that students can have the option of deciding for themselves where the large sum of money in a relatively untouched fund will go. Jonathan answers that a referendum should be considered. Amelia adds that an issue with a referendum is that they are working on a tight time frame.

VP Khan suggests that if we wanted to bring it to a referendum, it could work with our timeline with the vote next week. Perhaps it would be more consistent to bring this to a referendum.

VP Khan motions for a friendly amendment to have Council approve this as a referendum question. Seconded by Councillor Campbell.

Debate on Amendment:

Councillor Bulger says that there was already a referendum on student interest, with the result of 83.1% yes on interest. VP Khan replies that that was a plebiscite question, and this would be about the cost question rather than the interest in the bike facility itself.

Councillor Savage asks for confirmation that this is not coming out of current student fees. Jonathan answers that the IREF never came out of student fees. It was the administration creating an endowment. These weren't fees collected by SSMU.

Councillor Lametski states that given the timeline of this project, it would be irresponsible to extend time when it has already been demonstrated that the funds are available. Marina at the Daily says that it isn't clear that council has determined that it is all financially feasible.

Councillor Bazylykut says that it should be made clear that only a portion of the funds are going to the actual bike center.



VP Spencer asks VP Khan what other kinds of projects the fund could be used for. VP Khan answers that in terms of the long term financial plan outlined in 2014, it has a rather broad scope but must be approved by the Deputy Provost. It has many restrictions that could result in it being rejected. In 2013 or somewhere around there it was actually used to help provide ameliorations to the room that we are in. The nature of this fund is broader than we are making it out to be.

VP Koparkar says that in terms of a referendum question, it would have to be really clear what this fund is going towards. It should also be made clear that they would have to pay membership fees to use the space in the future.

Councillor Campbell motions to amend the motion to add a referendum question, to add information ratios of where the money is coming from and what it is going towards. Seconded by Councillor Bazylykut.

Councillor Lametski asks if someone can clarify what the feasibility of the timeline on the project would be if the motion for a referendum passes. Paul answers that if on November 9th they had clarity of either support or not, it wouldn't be a problem to meet the timeline. Regarding other amendments, it wouldn't be a major issue to include percentages of money in the motion.

Vote for the amendment of the amendment. Motion carries

Jonathan in the gallery asks a Councillor to clarify what information is given to students in the referendum question. Councillor Anderson answers that any additional background information needed to understand the question would be provided prior to the question.

Motion to postpone amendment until the end of new business by Councillor Anderson. Supported by Councillor Lametski.

n) Notice of Motion to Approve the Creation of a Stand-Alone Francophone Affairs Committee

President Tojiboeva reads motion.

No questions.

10. Reports by Committees

a) Executive Committee (5)

President Tojiboeva presents the Executive Committee Report.



Councillor Anderson asks when the Executive and Steering Committee reports will be uploaded. The Speaker replies that they are typically put up before Council and that more of an effort will be made to ensure this happens.

b) Steering Committee (5)

President Tojiboeva presents the Steering Committee Report.

11. Councillor Report

a) Councillor Mansdoerfer, Senate Caucus Representative

Councillor Mansdoerfer presents the report.

b) Councillor Lametti, Medicine Representative

Councillor Lametti presents the report.

c) Councillor Fodor, Arts and Science Representative

Councillor Fodor is absent. The proxy does not have a report to read on Councillor Fodor's behalf.

12. Executive Reports

a) President (3)

President Tojiboeva presents the report.

Councillor Mackinnon asks what was discussed in terms of McGill's international ranking. President Tojiboeva answers that the principal discussed that most of the ranking systems changed how they rank the Universities. For instance, one university went down twenty rankings because one faculty member left. She also said how the French and Chinese universities went up significantly due to higher funding.

b) VP (University Affairs) (3)

VP Oke presents the report.

c) VP (External) (3)

VP Spencer presents the report.

Councillor Campbell asks where the Our Turn policy can be found. VP Spencer answers that it is in the News section of the SSMU website.



d) VP (Finance) (3)

VP Khan presents the report.

Councillor Moshkforoush asks what VP Khan meant by the audit reports being horrific. VP Khan answers that a lot of people didn't participate, or didn't fill out the whole form, or didn't have the right receipts, so instead of putting clubs on probation automatically, we are giving them the chance to redo them.

e) VP (Student Life) (3)

VP Earle presents the report.

Councillor Mansdoerfer asks if progress has been made on selecting a Service representative. VP Earle responds that this is underway.

f) VP (Internal) (3)

VP Koparkar presents the report.

13. Confidential Session

14. Adjournment: 23:34.

VP Oke motions to adjourn. Councillor Chan seconds.


Muna Tojiboeva, President

2017-10-30


Catharina O'Donnell, Recording Secretary