Question RE: Environment Fee

Whereas the SSMU Environment Fee, also known as the SSMU Green Fund, was created in 2007 to empower campus members to engage in sustainable initiatives on campus and in their personal lives as well as build a culture of sustainability on campus; and

Whereas Green Fund monies have supported projects such as the McGill Farmers Market, The Plate Club, Campus Crops, the McGill Food Systems Project, Tapthirst, the Sustainable McGill Project, the McGill Business Conference on Sustainability, Gorilla Composting, the Rethink Your Curriculum Challenge, ECOuture Fashion Show, SUS Green Week, the Uncharted Waters Conference, McGill's industrial composter, SSMU Environment Commissioners and Green Events Coordinator; and

Whereas the recently-created Sustainability Projects Fund targets large-scale projects which must benefit the entire campus community and therefore cannot prioritize students, and does not fund projects which try to "green" normal operations (e.g. recycled paper for event posters) or projects which are the direct responsibility of another group (e.g. SSMU Environment Commissioners); and

Whereas the Green Fund has made it possible for McGill students to be involved in the sustainability movement beyond McGill through Power Shift USA, Power Shift Canada, Sustainable Campuses Conferences, and the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education; and

Whereas the Green Fund has made it possible for many non-environmental groups to run more environmentally-friendly events where the changes required would have otherwise been financially untenable; and

Whereas the Green Fund is the only student-regulated environmental fund on campus; and

Whereas any SSMU member is eligible to apply for Green Fund funding; and Whereas students will continue to be able to opt-out of the Environment Fee,

Do you agree to renew the SSMU Environment Fee of \$1.25 (opt-outable) per semester for three years, to start in Fall 2010, and to be charged until Winter 2013(inclusive), with the understanding that a "no" vote will eliminate many environmental events, staff positions, and services supported by it?