



SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

1. Call to Order 18:16

Meeting called to order at 6:16 PM.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker presents the land acknowledgement to the Councillors.

3. Attendance

The Speaker takes attendance.

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

Councillor Campbell asks where the minutes can be found on the google drive. Councillor Savage responds that they are found in the "Shared with Me" folder.

President Tojiboeva states that they should also be available on the SSMU website.

Motion to approve minutes passes.

5. Adoption of the Agenda - APPROVED

VP Earle motions to add a main motion regarding the standing rules at the General Assembly. Seconded by VP Koparkar. Motion passes.

VP Spencer motions to strike out Our Turn from presenting because they are not present. Seconded by Councillor Savage. Motion passes.

VP Spencer motions to add UEQ for a 10-minute time slot after the first presentations. Seconded by Councillor Mansdoerfer. Motion passes.

VP Spencer motions to add AVEQ for 5 minutes as recommended by the steering committee. Seconded by Councillor Bulger. Motion passes.



Motion to adopt the agenda passes.

6. Guest Speakers

a. UTILE, Laurent Levesque

UTILE has been working closely with PGSS to come up with solutions for affordable housing in Montreal, after having identified key issues using a wide survey of Montrealers.

Levesque is the general coordinator for UTILE. He explains that UTILE is a nonprofit based in Quebec that promotes, studies, and develops affordable housing throughout the province. They are attempting to empower student groups to find solutions to their housing problems. They work with CMHC, the city of Montreal, and numerous groups across North America, including nonprofit organizations to promote best practices in student housing. The majority of national student unions are members of UTILE. SSMU is always welcome to become a member of UTILE, which would allow access to Board and Governance structure. Concretely, they work in advocacy, and have developed a trilingual website with information to help students settle in Montreal. The site gets over 100,000 visits per year. They are working with CSU to build a 4 story affordable housing structure in the Plateau.

UTILE has been working with SSMU since 2014. Their first project was PHARE, which was a study on how many affordable housing units were needed in Montreal. They later expanded this study from 4 to a dozen participating universities throughout Quebec. This is now the main data set on student living in Montreal, with over 17,000 responses, with results that have been communicated to the student union. UTILE already presented some findings to the SSMU executive. They discovered that McGill students have the highest average rents of all universities in all of Quebec. This data makes it possible to move forward and work with the city of Montreal with real data to back it up. McGill has the most international students, and thus the least percentage of students living at home, and also the highest number of students living outside of residences. 7/10 SSMU members are living outside of residences. McGill also has the most highly concentrated student population, also concentrated in the most expensive neighbourhoods. There is an interactive map on the website which can be used to show students areas with more affordable housing.

UTILE is here to document information, but also to help student groups who want to act on this and improve student living situations. They have real estate communications. What UTILE has been discussing with SSMU is to do further research



on the issue and consider possible solutions, although the process is still at the very preliminary research stages. The study they have proposed to the executive team serves to first identify the McGill specific needs and topics, and then discover ways to fulfill general and niche needs, and assess the feasibility of these options. Some things they are looking into include what constitutes an affordable rent for McGill students, are there gender issues, do different identities have different preferences. UTILE has been looking into the themes that the executive brought up, including sustainability, how to best support foster students, and also how to work with the Milton-Parc neighbourhood. They are also working on how SSMU can move forward after the study and which avenues and structures should be pursued.

Councillor Wali asks for more information about the Concordia project, since they are McGill's closest neighbours. Levesque responds that they created a feasibility study in 2014, and the avenue that they took was creating a nonprofit revolving fund for the development of affordable housing with CSU, UTILE, and a nonprofit funding partner group. CSU invested 1.8 million dollars and UTILE leveraged that money toward a 14-million-dollar project.

Councillor Mansdoerfer commends the presentation, and asks what SSMU's monetary contribution would be for the study. Levesque responds that discussion over the scope of the study is not finished, but the total scope of the study is around \$8,000, which would be shared between three groups that are working on the project. He reiterates that they are a non-profit so everything would be done at cost.

b. Library Improvement Fund, Malcolm McClintock

Malcolm McClintock is the Library Improvement Fund Commissioner, here to give a semester report as he is mandated to do so. His role is to sit on the Senate Committee on Libraries, and help administer the funds itself. On the Library Improvement side, they deal with outreach, trying to understand what students need, and they allocate the fund of \$700,000. Half of the \$700,000 is paid for by students, while the other half is funded by alumni. McClintock presents an overview of the timeline for the year, including gathering inquiries and recruiting members for the Committee. They allocate money on a semesterly basis. Whiteboard consultation and touch-tables are the main avenues to get in contact with the student population. A campus-wide survey is something they will try to pursue this year, hopefully in collaboration with SSMU, which was done in 2014 and was really valuable.

The Library Improvement Fund funds extended hours, student employment, charging stations, tech rentals, etc. McClintock presents an overview of what was improved last



year, which can be found in a report presented to Council last year. They use four criteria when evaluating proposals: student experience, longevity, accessibility, and feasibility and logistics. Committee members are given the proposals and asked to score them. This year they are really making an increased push to focus on accessibility. To submit an idea before the website is up, Councillors are invited to send ideas to McClintock.

Fiat Lux is a project proposed by large stakeholder of the library, including the Dean of Libraries, and the Friends of Libraries committee. Fiat Lux is a dream right now, and hasn't been approved by McGill, meaning there is no money behind it yet. It is ideally planned in 10 years. The goals are to be accessible, spacious, transformative, and focused on learning. Over 50% of the space in the current library is devoted to collection, so the project will add 1.8 times the space. The project is for students, but they need to get funding behind it to some degree. They may need to put a motion forward in the future for SSMU to support the project. The master plan for Fiat Lux can be found on the website.

Councillor Fodor asks what the requested or proposed budget allocation for the Fiat Lux project is. McClintock responds that he believes it is around 180 million dollars. This will require stakeholders and investments from students.

Councillor Bazylykut asks if there is a proposed site for the Fiat Lux. McClintock responds that it will be replacing the McLennan-Redpath complex in stages, leaving the library accessible to students. Councillor Bazylykut asks how long it will take. McClintock responds it will take around 3 years, in 3 stages.

Councillor Wali asks whether student money going towards extended hours is re-proposed every year. McClintock responds that it is re-proposed every year, and has been wholeheartedly passed each time. He says that they agree in sentiment that students shouldn't necessarily pay for something that is operational, but at this point they do not have that kind of leverage.

Councillor Jenejo asks who puts the charging stations in place. McClintock responds that it is done in partnership with each library.

Councillor Fodor asks how much of a substantial gain will come from the infrastructure adjustment and whether thought has been put into if this fund could be better used elsewhere, and McClintock responds that he doesn't have an answer right now.



Councillor Bulger motions to recess for four minutes. Seconded by Councillor Mansdoerfer. Motion passes.

c. UEQ

Guillaume Lecorps is the Vice President of the Quebec Student Union. Their role and mission is to defend the interests and rights of students around the province. This revolves around financial issues, mental health, sexual violence, and international students. They improve the student condition by developing research and arguments around issues brought up by Student unions, and then develop advocacy techniques. If the political representation does not work, then they mobilize their members to put political pressure on the government. They currently have 8 member associations around the province. They have 77,000 members represented from both undergraduate and graduate students, anglophone and francophone schools, and small and large universities. They have ten observers.

The caucus is the main political institution. This is where action plans for the year are adopted, research is followed up on, and they adopt or decide not to support certain causes. The General Assembly is every April, and is similar to a caucus. This is where the executive is elected, and students tell them which issues should be prioritized for the year ahead. Both members and observers are allowed around the table and at committees, and the only difference is that members have voting privilege. About 95% of the time, decisions are taken by consensus. Otherwise they use a double majority. The first vote must be one organization one vote, and then the second round is by proportional representation, where each organization has from 1 to 4 votes, depending on their size. This ensures that a majority of organizations and a majority of students are always in favour.

They have 27 issues they are focusing on this year. The first main point is sexual violence on campuses, which has been an issue for a long time. This is the biggest priority for this year. There is a bill coming forward to ensure victims are supported. Last year, they brought 17 recommendations forward during the consultations. Sources have told them that all of these will be included in the bill that will be put forth by the Minister of Education, and if they are not included then UEQ will keep lobbying until they are. These involve the need for steady funding, and sanctions for universities that don't implement what is mandated in the bill. He does not yet know much about Our Turn but is happy to learn. In terms of mental health, a broad study is lacking, so they are working this year on getting specific measures and data. They are developing a Quebec-wide investigation this year. This will get all associations in Quebec involved, to ensure that groups and experts beyond UEQ are involved, making



sure that every region and group is represented in the investigation. Thirdly, they are focusing on Indigenous accessibility. Funding is not the issue here, the problem is lacking measures of advertisement for accessibility for Indigenous students. They are focusing on creating a guide of best practices which can then be used to lobby the government to make certain practices mandatory across universities. They will also use this to advocate to specific university campuses to use specific measures that will work in that context. They maintain a regular dialogue with Indigenous students.

UEQ is a young organization, and has already achieved an 80 million dollar reinvestment in the Loans and Grants Program. They wanted to ensure that single parents are targeted, getting them 1500 dollars more each year. In terms of federal representation, they talk with different provinces and meet in Ottawa. They have met with the federal government four times in two weeks to discuss sections where they have jurisdiction. Additionally, when the Minister wants to know what students think, she calls them.

They have an easy-in, easy-out type of affiliation system. The organization can join on their own terms, using a referendum or whatever they choose, and the same occurs when they want to leave. They also try to sell transparency. All of their minutes are available to their members, and non-member observers can also receive these. Students have to talk to their respective student association to access these minutes. They also advocate for a opt-outable fee.

Councillor Bazyllykut asks how much the membership fee costs. He responds that it is currently \$4.56 per student per semester, indexed with inflation.

Councillor Dinh asks where this money goes. He responds that it often goes to the hiring of expert researchers, to pay for fees that come with advocacy efforts, to pay four employees, and to pay financial compensation to the executives which is essentially minimum wage.

Councillor Herpin says that AVEQ would like them to affiliate with them for a minimum of five years, and asks whether it is normal to request for five years. He says this is not normal, and that he is just learning about this now. This is not something he has heard of before in Quebec or the rest of Canada. VP Spencer adds a point of information that AVEQ does not require a five year commitment.

Councillor Anderson asks whether there is a clear-cut budget of UEQ, and says that it is not found on the website and that the UEQ VP Finance was still looking for the information when asked. He responds that there is a pie-chart on the website, but in



terms of specific lines they are not yet fixed on the matter, and they want to avoid having specific amounts for specific employees made publicly available, but they are working on improvements.

Councillor Campbell asks why minutes are only available to members and not to groups interested in joining if transparency is so important. He clarifies that it is also available to observers, but that they are not public due to confidentiality, to ensure that strategy in facing the government does not get disclosed. For instance, strategy in adopting action plans makes it easy for the government to look up what they are doing. The compromise they found was to make it available directly at student associations.

Councillor Chan motions to extend Question period by 7 minutes. Seconded by VP Spencer. Motion passes.

President Tojiboeva asks for more information about advocacy with the federal government and the strategy there. He responds that they noticed that more work was needed in terms of advocacy with the federal government, so they increased partnership and federal government advocacy efforts. The meetings with the federal government involve discussions over transferring money from the Canadian Student Loan Program to Quebec, since that is where the \$80 million came from in the first place. They also discussed immigration law. A few years ago, the Conservative government put a law together that ultimately meant a reduction in university advisors for international students. For example, the University of Montreal had to go from 9 advisors to 1. Because this is federal jurisdiction, they advocated for the government to exclude educational organizations from this law. They also work on copyright, and there is a new law coming out soon from the federal government. As it stands now, teachers and students can use copyrighted materials if used for academic purposes, and UEQ wants to make sure this exception stays in during the revision of the law.

Councillor Chan asks why the policy exists that UEQ doesn't approach student organizations. He replies that they do approach organizations, but they don't decide how they have to affiliate. The most popular way is through referendum, but it can be done through general assembly or other ways. Councillor Chan asks if UEQ has ever approached McGill, and if not, why. He replies that PGSS is on board, and SSMU was involved in the process that created AVEQ and UEQ, but they haven't seen them since. The line they do not cross is when organizations don't want to talk, but they are very open to relationships.



Councillor Fodor asks to confirm whether the fee for students is opt-outable. He responds that typically this is the case. He says that usually it is included in what students pay to the student organization, so if that is not opt-outable then it can be difficult, but they try to find ways to make it happen. Councillor Fodor then asks for expansion on the international student advocacy segment. He replies that the first thing they are looking for is a tax credit for international students after their study, to help the government understand the value of international students. This would refund the surplus amount that international students pay above Quebec students. They also work on international health insurance, since international students currently pay so much. Currently it costs so much because only one company offers these services, so they want to get more companies involved to increase competition and reduce costs. These are examples of the concrete efforts for international students.

Councillor Campbell motions to extend Question period by two minutes. Councillor Fodor seconds. Motion passes.

Councillor Yue asks which Indigenous groups they are working with. He responds that it is his colleague who actively works with these groups, but they have met with four or five groups already. They are working with research that has already been done on the matter as well, and they want to make sure that the conclusions made by research centers the needs of Indigenous students.

Councillor Campbell asks how bilingual the association is, whether the meetings and minutes and legal documents are in both languages. UEQ responds that everything they do is happening in both languages. Their biggest weakness is translation on Facebook but they are working on it. There is simultaneous translation in the general assembly, and all documents are bilingual for federal government and general accessibility purposes.

d. AVEQ

The AVEQ presenters introduce themselves. They are here to talk more practically about the concrete projects they have worked on over the last few months. Beginning with unpaid internships and fifteen-dollar minimum wage, they had a march last weekend to show solidarity that students need a living wage. They have also been working with a campaign against unpaid internships. This has some movement in Montreal, and they are working on making it a more provincial issue, including a day of action planned for November 10th. They have also been working on specific



demands to change the labour code, and they work in solidarity with groups across the province.

For Our Turn and Sexual Violence, they don't work directly with the Without Yes it's a No campaign due to certain criticisms, but they are actively involved with Our Turn, especially in the creation of the action plan. It's a very thorough campaign that involves advocacy, support for survivors, and education. They are also working in consultation with the government, and submitted recommendations on legislation, and got survivors and SSMU, who wasn't in the room before, a seat at the table. This is very survivor-centric and trauma informed.

In terms of climate justice, the presenter used to work with Divest McGill, and they have been working with NGOs and community groups on a campaign to have the 16-billion dollar Montreal investment moved into different investments. They have agreed not to fully divest, but move towards carbon reduction, which shows how working in solidarity can create an impact across the province. AVEQ also tries to train students on mobilization techniques, and are hosting a workshop on this topic in January. AVEQ is very open to answering any questions that Councillors may have.

Councillor Herbin states that the proposed fee for AVEQ is non-optoutable for five years. He says that UEQ does not ask for this commitment, and asks why SSMU should give it to AVEQ. The presenter responds that all fees at McGill are done simply on a term of five years, unlike most schools which approve indefinitely. He reiterates that this is based on the student association and not with AVEQ. AVEQ has no stipulations on length of membership, and, like UEQ, it is up to student organizations.

Councillor Lametti asks what AVEQ's efforts have been in terms of federal level advocacy. The presenter responds that the majority of education has to do with provincial governments. The federal government has a youth council that is creating a youth policy, and there McGill students actually sit on this council. In terms of environmental issues, AVEQ tries to bring these more to the federal level.

Councillor Savage says that he is disappointed with the AVEQ presentation as compared to the UEQ presentation. He asks how AVEQ will represent his constituents. The presenter responds that they wanted more of an emphasis on conversation because they have already presented formally to SSMU, but all presentations should be available to Councillors.

Councillor Zhou asks both UEQ and AVEQ if there is collaboration between the two groups in terms of joint efforts of sharing funded research to eliminate redundancy.



AVEQ responds that UEQ and AVEQ met at the beginning of the summer, and they agreed that they have a lot of research in common, particularly about mental health. It's a common goal to not waste time or money, so they have a collaboration going on which is open and better for everyone. They have to put aside their political differences for the benefit of every student in Quebec. They have met informally to talk about different issues. UEQ adds that when they met, they didn't come up with specific aims to collaborate on, but they are open on that. He adds that they work on a complimentary basis and have different approaches, and the layering of this can actually increase efficiency.

7. Report of the Steering Committee (5)

VP Koparkar presents the report.

8. Announcements (5)

VP Earle presents the following announcement on behalf of the SSMU Vice Presidents: On behalf of the five vice presidents of the society, we would like to make a statement regarding the present state of the society, the President, and her role as both the spokesperson of the society and the chairperson of the executive committee. The five of us have been committed to working to fulfill our portfolio mandates, completing our tasks, and effectively communicating with one another as well as with any external sources. We feel that the work we have been able to produce demonstrates a commitment to making the society a more transparent and student-centered institution, and that we are more than capable of working towards the best interests of this institution. It is our passion for our portfolio and the work that we are able to do, as well as our ability to communicate and work as a cooperative unit that has enabled us to continue in our roles. Despite our positive vision for the society and our work in carrying out our mandates, we feel that we have not been able to do so to the best of our abilities, given the conduct of the President of the Students' Society. It is for this reason that we wish at this time to state our position of non-confidence in the President and her ability to fulfill her mandate. There has been a serious issue regarding a lack of transparency and communication on the part of the President which has been particularly troubling when decisions being made concern some or all of the executive. The most recent example are the events at and following the most recent Board of Directors meeting. The executive received several questions from the media regarding information that the rest of the executives were not privy to, and/or had understood to be confidential, with citations referring to the source of information as the President. Unfortunately this is not the first time that the President has caused concern among the executives over her ability to act as the spokesperson for the society. Internal attempts at resolution have produced limited results. The poor decisions made by the President and the subsequent media storm has taken up time, energy, and



resources that are already spread thin. As we cannot trust the President to adequately act as a spokesperson, the executive committee recommends that the President steps down from her role as spokesperson of the Society, and that the Vice President Student Life Jemark Earle takes over for an interim period of time. It has also come to our attention that there are student-led campaign revolving around the idea of constitutional reform that have been circulated across the membership. While the five of us believe that we are making a concerted effort to increase transparency, we also understand that the governance structure that we have has many flaws, and find that many of the ideas put forth in these campaigns are justified, and thus should be looked at as serious suggestions for the processes of the Students' Society. We would like the students partaking in these campaigns to remain part of the political process, and encourage them to keep pushing forward the conversation surrounding institutional reforms, in order to make the SSMU more accessible and transparent to its members. The executive committee has spoken on ways to bring this type of reform about. In the next couple of weeks, we hope to be able to bring forward proposals on how to move forward with this institutional change to the next few legislative councils. The five of us feel that, based on everything that has happened, the environment surrounding SSMU has become toxic and not conducive to our ability to serve the student body in the best way. As such, it is the recommendation of the Vice President Student Life Jemark Earle, Vice President Finance Arisha Khan, Vice President Internal Affairs Maya Koparkar, Vice President University Affairs Isabelle Oke, and Vice President External Affairs Connor Spencer that the President steps down from her role as spokesperson of the SSMU. Further, we would like to establish the executive committee's position of non-confidence in the President's ability to carry out her mandate as chief spokesperson for the Society, and that we also support the student-led campaign to make SSMU more accountable and transparent. We would like to acknowledge that it is because of situations like this that we are currently in, that the members mistrust the Students' Society, and as executives, but also as members, we are frustrated with how positions of power have been handled and the lack of transparency demonstrated. This statement is a commitment from the five vice presidents to the council and to our membership that we will continue to make the voice and proper representation of our members our priority. In solidarity, the Vice Presidents of the Students' Society of McGill University.

President Tojiboeva presents the following announcement: I would like to respond to the statement, and in my response I would like to touch on three main specific points: the constitutionality of what is being asked, workplace hostility and bullying, as well as the issue of lack of transparency. I would like to start off by saying that under the Corporations Act, Section 8, as well as the Constitution, which under Section 10.11 mandates me to be the spokesperson and the chief officer of the society, my duty is to be the spokesperson of the society. Every single time that I have communicated to the media, I was met with comments from the executives, saying that I did not represent their viewpoints. I would like to point this



out as a problem because I am not here to represent the viewpoints of the executives, I am here to represent the viewpoints of all of the members of the undergraduates at McGill. Every single time I have communicated with the media, it was always factual. I either cited the bylaws or Robert's Rules. So every single time I was not there to communicate the opinions of the executives, but to communicate actual straight facts. Recently, information has been leaked, and that information was leaked by the Vice President Finance.

Councillor Fodor motions to extend announcements by 3 minutes. Councillor Jiao seconds. Motion passes.

President Tojiboeva's announcement, continued: In an effort to increase transparency I actually motioned the Board to make the minutes and the information discussed in the confidential session public. This motion was passed by the Board of Directors, and was unanimous. So everything in the confidential session that happened on Sunday, October 15th is now public information, thus that is why it was communicated to the media. I would also like to speak about transparency. Always, the issue of my lack of transparency is brought up. However, I would like to point out that since 2015, a lot of the Board of Directors minutes were actually not published, and in July I made it my top priority to actually go through all of the minutes, and all of them were published on the website. I would also like to point out the following: that last year the Board of Directors did not publish the minutes, since February basically, around the Igor Sadikov scandal, and there was never an issue about that. Under my chairship, minutes have been approved and posted as long as technical staff were actually there to produce those minutes. I would also like to point out that it is under my representation, and because we were able to actually follow procedure, and a lot of times the issue of transparency comes up with the board of directors, the motion brought up on September 17th, ratifying the BDS decision was actually brought up by the Judicial Board. I think that's really important to clarify because the issue itself was not addressed for fifteen months. Since they mandated me, unanimously to actually put this on the ballot, this is what I did, this is strictly a procedural matter, and I think the fact that it wasn't addressed in 15 months actually shows that, as the chair of the board, I am doing a good job. I would also like to point out that the chair of the Board of Directors actually mandated me to be the spokesperson of the Board itself, because clearly they trust my ability to represent the board, as well as to communicate the information to the membership. Lastly, to touch upon the issue of workplace hostility and harrasment. I would like to point out that I was repeatedly bullied for being different and having different opinions than the executive. I was not only body shamed, but also my qualifications were put into question, only because my opinions did not match those of the executives. One of the examples would be the clear attempt to undermine my credibility in legislative council multiple times by asking pointed question that could have been prevented. Instead of airing our dirty laundry to legislative council, it could have been resolved in private, and resolved really quickly.



Councillor Fodor motions to extend announcements by 2 minutes. Councillor Abhu Youssef seconds. Motion passes.

President Tojiboeva's announcement, continued: The critiquing of my personal life continued throughout the summer, even though I said, multiple times, that I was uncomfortable with certain comments by the executive. I was multiple times called an opportunist, I was told that my friends were problematic, and every single time I tried to do my job, I was met with snide comments, or comments about my qualifications. I was elected with 53% of the vote, to actually represent the students who felt not represented by the SSMU establishment. I think it is unfortunate that now, because the executives disagree with my opinions, they choose to air our dirty laundry, and also continue this problematic relationship at work that creates workplace hostility and not a healthy environment for anyone. To finish up, I would also like to point out the comments that were made multiple times to me at the workplace, that were really unprofessional, including body shaming. At one point, one of the executives pointed out that "wow you're very skinny". That is a rather awkward comment to make, so I said "thank you", however the response of the executive in question was "that was not a compliment". That is a trend that continued for the past five months. I think it's unfortunate that the executives feel the need to air our dirty laundry only because I disagree with their political opinions, and I would also like to conclude on the note that I think it's interesting that the VP External chose to talk to me today about my posting a report made by the VP External of PGSS about legislative council, saying that I have ulterior motives in the matter. I only posted it because some Councillors asked me to post the report, so the fact that, again, I was questioned for ulterior motives is highly problematic. Thank you.

9. Question Period (5)

The Speaker reminds the Council of the rules of Question Period.

Councillor Savage reads a statement from the Social Work group regarding the literature put on campus regarding Bill 62 recently passed by the provincial government. The Social Work Students' Association condemns Bill 62. Councillor Savage asks whether Councillors will consider rejecting the notions put forth in Bill 62.

Marina from the Daily asks why meetings are consistently held when the SSMU building is locked, and why are they not announced in advance, if transparency is such a concern for SSMU. President Tojiboeva responds that meetings are announced on the website, and it has always been every Sunday at 7 pm. There is always someone at the door standing to open the



door and make sure people can get in. The members from the press have always been present so clearly they are able to get in.

Marina from the Daily asks why the Speaker is not chairing the Board of Directors. President Tojiboeva replies that a constitutional amendment in March 2017 states that the speaker can chair meetings if there is a need, but there was no need, especially due to the lack of resources at SSMU. Since all issues discussed were rather straight forward, there was no request from the board to do that.

Grace in the Gallery asks given Muna's involvement in over a dozen SSMU committees and in every facet of student life, what gives the Executives the right to question her credibility and why the members of the society should see this as anything other than a political witch hunt. VP Spencer responds that the executives are frustrated that they can't have these discussions internally, and we would like to have these issues back in the office but they haven't been allowed to.

Councillor Lametti asks what the internal remedies mentioned by VP Earle were and what has been attempted before bringing this to Legislative Council. VP Earle responds that various meetings have been held both during and outside of business hours, including round tables about the entire situation, where everyone gets to speak. They have done that multiple times, which has been the main source of these internal remedies.

Councillor Zhou motions to extend Question Period by five minutes. Seconded by VP Koparkar. Motion passes.

Mikayla from Arts in the Gallery says that last year members of the SSMU council and several executives here were accused of gendered violence. Mikayla asks why the executive is repeating the same kind of toxicity and creating a hostile environment for a woman of colour. VP Spencer responds that the claims made deserve a response in a space different from council, and these concerns can be brought up with the Equity Commission since they are not to be taken lightly.

Andrew Figueiredo in the Gallery is a concerned member of the student body who votes in every student election. He says that the president was democratically elected by the students, and now the executive body is trying to unilaterally override and undermine the student body and student voice. He asks what gives the VPs the prerogative to undermine our student democracy. VP Spencer clarifies that they are not trying to remove Muna from her position, and they are simply trying to make their concerns clear. Decision are not transparent to the executives, and are thus certainly not transparent to the members.



Councillor Fodor asks at what point the President failed to represent the SSMU. VP Spencer responds that the concerns are that there were several decisions made that they weren't aware of, and they still haven't received formal notification from the September 17th decision, nor that from a few days ago.

Councillor Lametti motions to extend QP by 5 minutes. Seconded by Councillor Campbell. Motion passes.

Councillor Fodor asks whether it is the President's direct responsibility to inform the exec of Board decisions. VP Koparkar says it is likely somewhere in the Constitution, but in terms of best practices it is really important.

Marina from the Daily asks why VP Khan was not made aware her standing as director would be up for debate prior to Sunday's vote. President Tojiboeva says that she would like to know where Marina heard this information. On the October 1st meeting, the GM was mandated to investigate this in the next two weeks, so the board of directors knew of this. Director Khan was interviewed and admitted to the breach of confidentiality which was presented during the meeting. Everyone was expecting this because the GM was mandated to do this. In a follow-up question, Marina says that VP Khan was surprised by this, and her understanding was that the GM would be presenting updates, and she was not aware that her standing would be up for debate. President Tojiboeva says it was announced the final presentation that would be brought up for discussion, and everyone knew this would happen.

Councillor Campbell asks the General Manager what options have been provided to SSMU clubs during the building closure, and also asks when the webpage about the closure would be added since he said in an email it would be updated along with the SSMU website. GM responds that the website was launched but has one week left of bug fixes including several major issues and some minor issues. He instructed the new communications manager to create the backbone of the page, and he has been creating the content in consultation with McGill. The page will be a reiteration of what was sent to occupants, with more information on the project itself and who will be affected. They have biweekly meetings with McGill, and what they have done is talk to several sister associations to see if any space is available for specific groups that have niche activities. Some groups have office activities, while others, like the flat bike collective, do not, so finding space is more difficult. For the vast majority of groups, they are finalizing negotiations for space with McGill, with the aim of keeping them as close as possible to the campus core and on campus. Some groups are specific in requests for accessibility and confidentiality, so they want to make sure that those needs are met. The GM is also in negotiations with third party realtors, which will be brought up at the next meeting. The closer buildings are to the downtown core, the more expensive it gets. The clubs will not have an exact replacement of the University Centre, but they will do their best. The



jurisdiction for security might change, for instance. It is an ongoing situation. 50% of the noncommercial occupants have spaces, but some details need to be finalized with McGill. 30% of the GM's daily tasks are associated with the building closure, which is expected to increase.

Councillor Lametti extends Question Period by 5 minutes. Seconded by Councillor Fodor. Motion passes.

Audrey from the Tribune asks why the board of directors felt that a two week suspension was the best mode of action as opposed to a censure, for instance, and why this was considered to be in the best interest of the society. Councillor Anderson responds that she is not sure whether meeting minutes from the confidential session are completely public, but it was basically seen as the least strange decision being thrown around at the meeting. Anderson suggested the suspension only because other suggestions made her uncomfortable. She made it clear that she was uncomfortable suggesting a suspension, which is by she abstained from the vote. She felt like a minority voice and felt uncomfortable, and regrets not speaking up. She made it clear that the vote for a suspension was the lesser of several evils that were being passed around. She did ask for input when she presented this to the executives when they came back into the room, and no one spoke, which she found unsettling too.

Olivia is in Engineering and is the President's Secretary General. She can attest to her commitment to SSMU and the entire student body. She is dedicated to following through on campaign promises, and works incredibly long hours. Olivia states that the President has shown commitment despite her competence constantly being called into question, and asks why President Tojiboeva is being held to a different standard than the other executives. VP Earle says that it's not a motion, just a recommendation. It's nothing official. Olivia reiterates the question. VP Earle echoes what was said by VP Spencer in regards to things not being made transparent. The VPs make a constant effort to be transparent in what is said in the committees they are chairs of, so they are holding the President to the same standard.

Councillor Syed motions to extend Question Period by 5 minutes. Councillor Mansdoerfer seconds. Motion passes.

President Tojiboeva cedes question time to Director Buhnstein in gallery. He furthers Anderson's response to the Tribune question by stating that ideas were thrown around that Khan be suspended from confidential sessions for a determinate period of time. Another option was brought by Director Anderson, because it was about emails, to have an email monitoring system or person put on the VP Finance's account for a determinate amount of time to prevent leaks. The final option was talked about briefly, which was to make a public statement from the board telling the public, but this was decided against. He doesn't



remember the exact reason why, but thinks it was because of the amount of damage that had already been done to the board in recent weeks, and to ensure her reputation wasn't damaged. Obviously this didn't happen due to leaks to the media and that it was made public by the President.

Claire in the Gallery is from the Arts faculty. Claire says that during today's Council, VP Spencer denied the President's lived experience in body shaming, and that the VP External said that people felt misrepresented because the executive felt misrepresented, even though all info was released publicly. How does the executive justify their statement? VP Earle responds that the letter is about the President's role as spokesperson. The information given to the media was not transparent. He says that the President disseminates information to the media and the media then asks the executive questions that they don't have the answers to.

Councillor Fodor motions to extend Question Period by 3 minutes. President Tojiboeva seconds. Motion passes.

David in the Gallery states that there is a great degree of hostility to a President who students voted in to put an end to hostility. He asks how the executives can justify their statement when they seem to be the cause of the hostility. VP Spencer says that they are all elected representatives, and the student body put a lot of trust in the executive. It's difficult to address hostility or perceived hostilities. VP Spencer wants to make a point of how people should be aware of lived experiences in the room when they are asking questions, she hopes people feel like their concerns are being heard. The VP is happy that the student body has come out to participate, and says that the executives are trying to represent the views of the membership.

Councillor Abhu Youssef says he understood from VP Earle and VP Spencer that they intend to remove the President as spokesperson and not as President, but the President said that these cannot be discerned. VP Spencer says that they simply read the statement and are responding to questions and didn't mean for question period to go on for over an hour.

Councillor Demir asks why the executive is openly disregarding the roles mandated to executives. VP Spencer responds that one of the few things that the membership can not just wander into is the executive committee. They did not mean to completely sideline the legislative council, and VP Spencer hopes everyone, especially the media, takes up issues brought up by Councillor Savage and Councillor Campbell as well. This was not a motion, but just a statement to make it clear to everyone what is happening behind closed doors because there is no other way to do that.



Councillor Lametti motions to extend Question Period by 5 minutes. Seconded by Councillor Dinh. Motion passes.

Andrew in the Gallery is an officer of IRC. He was happy to find that minutes from this year are online but minutes from last year are not online, and SSMU and IRC were intertwined. His advisors were also surprised, given the scandals from last year. He asks why this is a breach of transparency for the President. Councillor Mansdoerfer says that they came to IRC directly, so it would be in those minutes accessible through the old IRC executive.

Dominic with McGill Tribune says that there were allegations of confidential matters from the Board of Directors being leaked to the CIJA, a Jewish advocacy group. He asks why this was not taken as seriously as VP Finance's leak. President Tojiboeva clarifies that there is a difference between the confidential session, public session, and access to confidential information. Approval was done in public session so there was no confidentiality issue. Here the VP Finance leaked info from a confidential session, so the contexts were different. Leaking information to outside parties who wouldn't normally have access is why the board was so concerned.

Joshua Chin from Medicine in the gallery sat on Council for three years. On multiple occasions, he recalls questioning of the transparency of the board of directors. At one point, he even asked who sat on the board, because even he on council was not privy to that information. He asks why this is such a big deal now and what the political differences in question are. There is no response.

Councillor Fodor asks if the executive is attempting any internal reconciliation that does not involve a restructuring of the internal structure. VP Spencer replies that attempts were made for formal side of informal mediation. They reached out to COCO which does grassroots workplace mediation, but she was told to stop pursuing this because something else was in place. They have tried to do many types of mediation from this grassroots side. As proposed in the statement, something they wanted to do was look at the constitutional reforms that have been suggested by the membership. It is clear that this is a recurring problem from year to year, and it is naïve to sit here and decide that this year is over and SSMU will have to try again next year. They are proposing as an executive to look into how this reform could be. They are frustrated not only as executives, but as members of the Society.

Marina from the Daily says that when a director is censured or impeached, they must have the opportunity to defend themselves. Regardless of whether VP Khan was notified, why was she not given a chance to defend herself? President Tojiboeva responds that she wasn't impeached, and the decision in itself has no consequences in terms of her role or her responsibilities. It was a mere suspension from the board. Marina follows up that she was



suspended and that she is now in the middle of a publicity storm, and asks why she was not given the chance to defend herself since her duties were impacted. President Tojiboeva reiterates that she had two weeks advance notice, and any reasonable person should know that if at the next board meeting the final presentation would occur, then this would be the discussion that would occur. She could have been there through electronic means, and this is a non-issue that keeps on coming back.

VP Earle motions to extend Question Period by 5 minutes. Seconded by Councillor Dinh. Motion passes.

VP Earle asks all Board members present to clarify if it was stated that there would be a final decision at the next board meeting. Director Gluschtein from Gallery clarifies that he is only one member of the board, but his understanding was that the final results were going to be presented at the next board meeting.

Perry Weintraft from Arts and Science asks if there is assurance that if a motion comes out of the executives' concerns that the executives take into account the overwhelming support for the President. VP Earle replies that she has the assurance of all executives present that these views will be taken into account.

Councillor Lametti says that he was alarmed that there was no answer to the question about political differences given the talk about transparency, and asks again what the political differences are. VP Koparkar replies that there was no mention of political differences put forth in statement by the executives. It was more procedural about transparency and the like, so the executives are also concerned with how that came up.

Julia from Arts says that only a small group of voices have been heard tonight, so they are hearing from a loud minority against the President. She asks if the executives feel that they are undermining SSMU by failing to represent the majority and by getting in the way of functioning of SSMU and of an institution that is otherwise working fine. VP Spencer replies that the point about a silent majority is important, and the people in this room are not most likely the silent majority by the fact that they are speaking. There is still a huge amount of work that needs to be done in making these spaces available. They just wanted to make a statement and move on.

Councillor Fodor continues the question from the faculty of medicine. He says that twice the question has been posed about political differences, and twice they have been rejected. If there is no difference and the President did follow everything listed in Constitution, then what is the problem? VP Spencer replies that they did not mobilize that there are political differences. This was read in the President's statement. They will make the text of their



statement available if people want to look at it. Their problem is the lack of transparency, and a comment really stuck with her that it isn't about the constitutionality of actions, but the ethics of actions, which is why this is being brought forward. It's concern about the transparency of the work that is being done in the office in its completion or non-completion.

Councillor Zhou motions to recess for 10 minutes. Seconded by Councillor Lametti. Motion passes.

10. New Business

a. Motion Regarding the Proposed Bike Centre Facility – APPROVED

Councillor Bulger presents the motion.

Councillor Campbell asks why the amendment to propose the budget breakdown with percentage amounts that they presented last Council is not in this version. Councillor Bulger delegates time to Paul. Paul added the number but not the percentages because he was unaware of this request, but would be happy to add it.

The Speaker explains that legally it has to be added because it passed as an amendment last council.

Councillor Zhou speaks in favour of the motion because it is a good step forward and would look great for an institution like McGill to be among the first to have a facility like this, and believes that the funds in the IREF would be best used in this project.

Councillor Bazylykut says that after talking to Nursing Constituents, they disagree because there could be better use of the fund and the NUS feels that showers don't pose a barrier to cycling to school, and it is misleading to call it a bike center when the majority of funds are not going to that. They also want to be presented with cheaper models, as used at MUSC, where there is underground parking. It also seems like it is more for faculty than students, and students already have a financial burden.

Councillor Anderson reminds everyone that this is a motion to send this to referendum so that students can make their voices heard, which is a better step than just passing it as a council. Students will make a decision for themselves if they can read the long motion. She would also like to see it going more toward student use since it is in a student union building. The center representatives were saying that use would be flexible depending on need and interest, so this could be shifted toward students.

VP Koparkar is in favour of increasing sustainability and increasing space for those who use bikes. The copy of the 2015/2016 transportation survey at McGill says that



only 8% of those who use a private car are students, so in terms of sustainability and carbon reduction, she wonders why the proposed facility is in a student building. There are also other more important factors for bikers, including the quality of bike paths and signage and lighting, which could produce greater payoff at lower costs. The plebiscite question was answered by 2 or 3 thousand students, whereas the survey VP Koparkar is referencing was to five thousand students and faculty. She suggests that increasing the membership fee for staff, improving conditions of bike paths, lobbying for public transport discounts, or making membership more financially accessible should be considered before going to referendum.

Councillor Bazylykut says that while all students should be able to vote, it's a lengthy motion and most students wouldn't be able to access it, and doesn't think it will be clear to students how this money is being used.

Councillor Zhou says in response that the notion that the project will be too expensive is unfair because the fund can only be used for projects like this and has been untouched in past years, and this is one of the first projects to come by that wants to utilize this fund. The actual cost of the project doesn't reflect the cost to students, and the maintenance will be paid by subscription which is a voluntary fee, so there are no extraneous costs to those who don't want to use the facility.

Councillor Campbell states that a constituent brought up a concern about personal safety and comfort in the shower area since there isn't a lot of privacy or implementations to make it safe for everybody using the facility. The constituents also had concerns about the restrictions of the IREF in the whereas clause to only using annual interest, when SSMU would clearly be using the whole thing so it doesn't appear to actually be restricted.

Paul responds that the terms of the IREF are that it is restricted to only the annual interest, but last year council lobbied the deputy provost, and they allowed it for this project. So, in theory they could lobby again, but in terms of everyday use, it is restricted.

Councillor Dekunna asks what kinds of measures will be in place for safety in the bathrooms.

Paul says that in terms of bathroom safety, they are bringing in SSMU and McGill security for consultation, and keycard access and security cameras have been recommended.



Councillor Jiao asks whether cameras will be set up in the area of lockers, to prevent theft. Paul responds that there will be.

Councillor De Moulin asks Paul to clarify whether security measures are already included in the budget. Paul responds yes.

Councillor Lametti brings up complexity of the question and says that the situation of the IREF fund is not immediately clear, so in a way, any decision made on this project will be done with incomplete information, but supports a referendum so the whole student body can be collectively responsible on whether to move forward.

Councillor Bulger adds that the motion is for it to go for referendum, so the reason for the length is because at last council there seemed to be a need for more info to be added, which is why numbers, percentages, and restrictions on the IREF were added.

VP Earle echoes the concerns related to the shower facilities, and adds that a lot of students won't feel comfortable showering in same floor space as staff and faculty.

Councillor Campbell brings up other constituent concerns, including that there has not been a call for any other proposal for the space or the funding. This is concerning considering the large amount of space in the student centre building, and the large amount of student funds that the general student body doesn't seem to have been consulted on in terms of other project ideas. Councillor Campbell asks why a competing proposal hasn't been asked for.

Amelia from the office of sustainability says that the way that the idea evolved was organically, rather than as an answer to the question of how to use the space or fund. From their perspective it was about the idea itself, and not how to use the space or fund. Paul adds that the space in the parking garage is not leased to the students for the most part, but to the University, so the majority of space is being given up by the university and not the society. In 2015, the SSMU made the proposal to convert it into a bike space, so they were consulted. In 2015, the SSMU partnered with them to make this study, and bringing it to a referendum will allow the students to decide.

Councillor De Moulin reiterates that the referendum will allow students to make the decision, and also cites concerns that perhaps the facility will not get significant use in the Winter.

Councillor Yue says that it is unfair to assume that students won't understand or read the motion. A lot of these questions about what students want can be asked by the referendum to let them decide themselves. Also, if there was another pressing need



for this facility, it would have been brought up already, and this is what is needed now. In terms of lower Winter participation, many clubs and services face lower use in the Winter when people stay home more, so it's kind of just what happens.

Councillor Bazylykut says that this initiative would result in an increase of need for bike spaces, and suggests turning the whole facility into a bike space since showers were last on the list of needs for bikers presented by VP Koparkar.

Voting by clicker to pass motion: 73 in favour, 19 against, 8 abstaining. Motion passes

Motion to recess for three minutes by Zhou. Seconded by VP Koparkar.

Councillor Mansdoerfer motions for 2-minute recess. Councillor Bulger seconds. Motion passes

b. Motion to Bring the Question of AVEQ Affiliation to Referendum – POSTPONED

Councillor Chan reads the motion.

There are no questions for the movers. Move to debate.

President Tojiboeva asks what people would think about tabling this to bring to faculties for consultation considering the presentations have just occurred. The President thinks it would be useful to bring to faculty level.

Councillor Campbell commends AVEQ for showing up to every meeting, always answering questions, and generally being super available.

Councillor Lametti would like to start off by echoing Campbell's comment, but is also concerned that their presence in great number may have coloured the conversation. Secondly, he would like to know why this motion is being presented now, since AVEQ has ran a deficit for two years, and their current organization is not sustainable without McGill's inclusion.

VP Koparkar says that AVEQ showed up because they were requested to, and they were not colouring opinions, but rather were simply requested to.

Councillor Lametti asks about idea of tabling motion. Speaker explains that tabling would essentially be deleting the motion because it would go past the referendum period. Lametti asks if there are opinions on pushing it to next semester.



Councillor Chan found it interesting when asking UEQ why they didn't interact earlier that their response made an assumption that McGill's student body wouldn't be compatible with UEQ. This made Councillor Chan reconsider other things that had been said during the presentation. It's clear that AVEQ has been reaching out toward SSMU continuously, and when an organization is willing to go out of their way to support your organization, that is super important and that is where UEQ fails, despite their positive aspects with federal advocacy and the like. The Councillor felt a more genuine connection with AVEQ.

Councillor Anderson reiterates that the VP External of SSMU has had a mandate to maintain information on what SSMU is doing and they have presented multiple times and they've shown up to every meeting where they needed to speak, and SSMU had not reached out to UEQ to start that process either. UEQ's answer was more that they want the student body to reach out to them, and SSMU had never done that because it never had a mandate to do that, which explains maybe why it took so long. Councillor Anderson is appreciative of AVEQ constantly showing up and providing information, but is also happy that the conversation has been opened up again.

Councillor Mansdoerfer paraphrases PGSS's experiences in both AVEQ and UEQ. This is found on the legislative council facebook group but can be made available to the media if necessary. The 80 million dollars of federal transfer to education shows that UEQ worked on this for a long period of time and talked to all member and observers. AVEQ did not talk to observers which upset the PGSS VP External. A temporary University Council Group was created and UEQ went to all member associations with 29 pages and 30 recommendations. AVEQ brought this up three weeks before the deadline and seemed disorganized. They pushed 8 recommendations that did not seem to be based on any collaboration. UEQ also had a 38-page document on sexual assault with 17 recommendations, while AVEQ lacked any real effort. Mobilization had a net neutral with different methods but no distinction made by the PGSS External. There is no specification on how UEQ handled international health insurance, but the PGSS VP External seemed to be pleased with a 52 person survey. In terms of transparency, UEQ involved a lot of members throughout the process, while AVEQ didn't consult with nonmembers. Consultations with members can't be talked about because PGSS was an observer. The recommendation ultimately was to stay on UEQ as an observer and not stay on AVEQ at all. His personal opinion is to wait and not to push AVEQ down students' throat. He would recommend waiting to make the decision in March. Senate Caucus switched their vote from two yes to a split yes and no.



VP Spencer says that it is very important to take this report seriously, and asks if Councillor would like to hear from AVEQ on this. VP Spencer's understanding is that the VP External of PGSS only attended two conferences. The VP also points out that no one has asked how the VP External of SSMU's experiences has been.

Councillor Campbell asks VP Spencer what their experience with AVEQ has been.

VP Spencer responds that the relationship began right around the elections, because the consultation for the sexual violence policy at the provincial level was happening and through AVEQ the VP University Affairs asked if Spencer would take that ticket. Spencer was the only student and was really upset by everything that was going down. It was a room of old white people saying what was going down which was really disconcerting, and AVEQ made it possible for survivors to be in the room. The first congress was where Spencer was just observing because the mandate had not yet officially began, and what was really explicit was solidarity, so associations were making commitments to one another which was very exciting as someone who has always worked in grassroots communities. There was also a congress over the winter and there is one this weekend that the VP External will be attending. This conference is where she really felt she wanted to vote on something, which was the Our Turn project. This hadn't yet been translated into French so the regional groups were obviously weary of signing onto something they couldn't fully read, so she first really saw the regional experience as opposed to the anglophone large city experience. Those are the rundowns of the association. Since the beginning of her mandate, she has worked closely with AVEQ because they are constantly checking in, and Divest McGill has really benefited from Kristen's work with them. They've done a great job with checking in with projects. The regional association has so far been positive.

Councillor Bazylykut said that her constituents believe they shouldn't keep having this referendum back to back in a semester and is kind of insulting to students. There should be at least another year rather than a semester turn around. There should also be more presentations from UEQ.

Councillor Demir echoes sentiments, saying that some law students are worried about AVEQ's ability to mobilize students considering the health survey recently brought up. The whole point of joining a student association is to have a voice in front of the government, so AVEQ's history of not hearing student organizations might be problematic. Councillor Demir's constituents would have liked to have more time to discuss alternatives, and so the Councillor is hesitant to vote in favour because of the lack of discussing alternatives.



President Tojiboeva motions to postpone motion to allow for various faculties to engage in a consultation process, because otherwise they are doing a disservice by moving hastily, and then vote at a late date. The Speaker reiterates this as a motion to postpone resolution until further consultation with specific constituents takes place. Seconded by Councillor Fodor. Debate period entertained

Councillor Herpin speaks in favour of this motion because Council just heard from UEQ today, and it is best to get the faculty association opinion before bringing this back for debate. This is important because to represent constituents, with this new UEQ aspect to the debate, faculty associations should have time to discuss, and then this can be rediscussed in the Winter.

Councillor Jiao is in favour of waiting on the question to bring it up in winter 2018. The fact that Councillors care so much and want more information is a good thing. Thank you to the AVEQ execs who are here, and Councillors are more than happy to hear from them as the discussion continues.

VP Spencer wonders if the movers of this motion have ideas for what kinds of specific consultations are needed, because otherwise this might be repeating the same thing. She agrees that student consultation should always be done, but are there idea of specific things that should be mandated by the VP External with the understanding that she would have to give up other projects to do that.

Councillor Lametti responds that the VP External went to speak with several faculties about AVEQ, so it would be great if they could also speak to the faculties about UEQ. It would also be appropriate to be an observer to UEQ, bring in narratives, be a contact person, which would be a fantastic source of information. We want more information and observing both organizations will help make a more informed decision later.

VP Spencer wants to make sure that Council is incredibly specific about what needs to be done by the VP External as this process moves forward.

President Tojiboeva responds that faculties should hear from both UEQ and AVEQ, and they should have more information about all the organizations out there, since the Councillors were all interested by both presentations. A lot of people would appreciate hearing from UEQ.

Councillor De Moulin says that as representative for IRC it would be beneficial to postpone this to talk to the presidents of all residences so that first years can know what is happening.



VP Spencer would love if this could be a commitment from the Council to help in this process, because this is one of the first times she is hearing from all Councillors that they are interested in this. While only observing one association, the workload is already huge so she would appreciate the support from the Council in widening this debate.

Councillor Jiao asks if it would be efficient for Council to form an ad hoc committee so that not all the work is put specifically on VP External.

The Speaker explains that it would be possible through a main motion at the next committee.

Voting by placard on motion to postpone: Motion passes with 25 in favour and 1 against.

Main motion effectively tabled for this referendum period.

c. Motion to Approve the Creation of a Stand-Alone Francophone Affairs Committee – APPROVED

Councillor Anderson reads the motion

Councillor Dinh asks who would be sitting on this Council and who would be chairing. President Tojiboeva responds that this can be found in the appendix if the Councillors would like the information in front of them.

Councillor De Moulin asks whether this committee is only open to francophone students or to international students too. President Tojiboeva responds that it would be open to anyone who wants to advance francophone affairs on campus.

Councillor De Moulin asks if there is a specific example of how French students would be helped. President responds that as a francophone, it is important to separate them because it would expose international students to Quebec and the French language and also promote activities that would promote francophone students on campus, like helping students transition from french education ot McGill life, and also it would encourage various initiatives that would promote international exposure and resources for francophone students. The President is working with the VP University Affairs on a proposal about the retention of francophone and international students and the administration is supportive of this, so this is kind of a starting point.



Councillor Anderson asks VP Spencer if they had anything to speak to it since they would have to take on a bulk of the work. VP Spencer responds that at the end of 2015/2016, it was decided that francophone and community affairs should be put into the external portfolio, so last year was a trial year. Her opinion is that they shouldn't be together, as made clear in platform, because they work on very different things. To give this group the attention it deserves, the VP felt a separate committee was useful. As a bilingual person but not a francophone, she asked the President if she would co-chair as a francophone. This is to work on resources for francophone students, and resources for anglophones about francophone issues.

Councillor Campbell asks if there was purposely a distinction made between international students and students outside of Quebec, because a lot of anglophone students outside of Quebec could benefit from the same exposure for international student that President Tojiboeva was speaking about. The President responds she meant to refer also to Canadians from outside of Quebec when using the term 'international students'.

Voting by clicker: 96% in favour, 4% abstaining and 0% against. Motion passes.

d. Motion to Endorse and Distribute Science & Policy Exchange's Open Letter to the Prime Minister of Canada - APPROVED

Councillor Lametti presents the motion.

Councillor Campbell asks why this is the first time they are seeing this motion. The motion is not online. The Speaker explains that it was received by the Steering Committee and they apologize for it not being online.

Councillor Campbell motions to amend this to be a notice of motion, so that Councillors can discuss this with constituents. Councillor Demir seconds.

VP Spencer says that this is unfortunately a timely thing. They are asking SSMU to sign onto a letter planned to send out next week to the PM, however she supports going back to constituents. Perhaps it could be signed onto later, but the letter is going out next week.

Councillor Chan asks if signing onto this letter late would influence anything in terms of the weight of McGill's endorsement and what it would mean for McGill. VP Spencer states that her understanding would be that it just means the name wouldn't be



attached to the larger student movement, and it would be 24,000 students less that they could say is backing this when they present to the Prime Minister, but it isn't the worst thing. Especially because a McGill group started it, they were hoping to have their home university support them.

Councillor Chan says that perhaps Council should discuss the merits of voting on this as student representatives. This comes after years of censorship from Harper and part of Trudeau's mandate was to bolster innovation and it would look really good that McGill is supporting a group from McGill, and Councillors should consider the weight that McGill has in signing this letter.

Voting on amending the motion to make it a notice of motion: Motion fails.

Return to main motion debate.

Councillor Mansdoerfer motions to add a two-minute reading period. Councillor Abhu Youssef is in favour. Motion passes.

Councillor Fodor motions to move to previous question (ending debate and moving to vote). Councillor Bazylykut seconds. Motion passes.

Voting by default clicker: 88% in favour, 4% against, 8% abstaining. Motion passes

e) Motion for the Adoption of General Assembly Standing Rules – APPROVED

Councillor Bulger adds on as mover. Councillor Jiao adds on as mover.

VP Earle presents motion.

Councillor Campbell mentions that this is less than a week before the GA, and the Speaker clarifies that since it says "may", it doesn't create a problem.

Councillor Dinh asks about point number 3, asking what it means. Councillor Anderson clarifies that this is standard procedure under Robert's Rules.

Councillor Kopkar asks for clarification on point number 5. Councillor Zhou responds that it's a convention that once five speakers have gone through, the speaker can entertain motions to amend or call to previous questions. Councillor Anderson adds that it's also just so if members speaking have raised a point that someone wants to make a motion on, it gives them that chance.



Councillor DeKunna moves to friendly amend Clause 1 of the appendix to read the most recent version of Robert's Rules of Order. Friendly and adopted.

Councillor Campbell motions to amend default speaking time to two minutes. Seconded by VP Spencer. Friendly and adopted.

Voting by clicker on main motion: 96% in favour and 4% abstaining. Motion passes.

11. Reports by Committees

a. Executive Committee (5)

President Tojiboeva presents the report.

Councillor Campbell asks what the role of the Menstrual Products hygiene coordinator would be. Tojiboeva responds that their role would be filling the dispensers.

Councillor Chan presents report from constituents that the role description said it was explicitly for women's washrooms. She asks if it was changed so that this is also brought into gender neutral washrooms. VP Earle responds that the job description was not changed. Chan follows up asking if it changes the nature of the position, because the motion last year included that menstrual products would be dispensed in all washrooms, and asks if this promise will be maintained. VP Earle responds that the products are available in all bathrooms in the University Centre except the main floor men's washroom.

12. Councillor Report

a. Councillor Fodor, Arts & Science Representative

Councillor Fodor presents the report.

b. Councillor Demir, Law Representative

Councillor Demir presents the report.

c. Councillor Jiao, Athletics Representative

Councillor Jiao presents the report.



13. Executive Reports

a. VP (Internal) (3)

Koparkar presents the report.

b. VP (Finance) (3)

VP Finance is absent.

c. President (3)

The President presents the report.

VP Earle asks if the McGill logo is included with the McGill name in the MOA. President responds that this is indeed the case.

d. VP (University Affairs) (3)

The VP University Affairs is absent.

e. VP (Student Life) (3)

The VP Student Life presents the report.

f. VP (External) (3)

The VP External presents the report.

14. Confidential Session

15. Adjournment

Motioned by Councillor Zhou. Seconded by Lametti. Motion passes.

Meeting adjourned at 00:00.



Muna Tojiboeva, SSMU President

2017-11-30

Catharina O'Donnell, Recording Secretary

APPROVED