



SSMU Legislative Council – October 23, 2014

1) Call to Order

The meeting of the Legislative Council was called to order at 6:11pm.

2) Attendance

President Ayukawa
VP Stewart Kanigan
VP Moustaquim-Barrette
VP Chaim
VP Fong
VP Bradley
Councillor Baraldi
Councillor Dunbar Lavoie
Councillor Lin
Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy
Councillor Shah
Councillor Kuprowski
Councillor Weaver
Councillor Subhani
Councillor Sachal
Councillor Klitovchenko
Councillor Boutin
Councillor Rioux
Councillor Conrad
Councillor Michaud
Councillor Fullerton
Councillor Chin
Councillor Zhang
Councillor Medvedev
Councillor Nadifi
Councillor Pelletier
Councillor Houston
Councillor El-Sharawy
Councillor Li
Councillor Ibrahim
Councillor Benrimoh
Councillor Rourke
Recording Secretary Lydia Jones
General Manager Pauline Gervais
Parliamentarian Eileen Siow

3) Adoption of the Agenda

Councillor Ibrahim: Motion to add the Motion Supporting #ConsentMcGill and Action Against Sexual Violence.



Motion passed with 2/3 majority.

President Ayukawa: **Motion to add the Motion Regarding Plebiscite Question on Preferential Ballot.**

Motion passed with 2/3 majority.

President Ayukawa: **Motion to add the report of the Nominating Committee.**

VP Fong: **Motion to move the Motion Regarding Black Student's Network Fee to the bottom of New Business.**

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: **Motion to add an informal discussion about the GA to New Business.**

Motion passed with 2/3 majority.

President Ayukawa: We will move the guest speakers until later because they are not here yet.

Speaker: We will skip them if they are not here.

Councillor Rioux: **Motion to add Motion to Hold Plebiscite Question on Rent of the University Centre.**

Motion passes with 2/3 majority.

Motion to adopt by Councillor Benrimoh.

Seconded by Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette.

Motion passes.

4) Report of the Steering Committee

Councillor Chin: I don't think the committee was convened on October 23rd. Also I wanted to ask why the Motion Concerning Francophonie, how come it is not presented in New Business today and why austerity was presented yesterday at the GA?

Speaker: Because the first was removed and the second was brought from the floor by mover at GA.

Motion to approve by Councillor Rioux.

Seconded by Councillor Ibrahim.

Motion passed.

Report approved.

5) Guest Speakers

a. Residences Anti-Oppression Programming Coordinator



Emily Clare: I was granted a grant from sustainability fund to work with residences for a year to develop anti-oppression in residences. [Reads goal of anti-oppression project.] One of the great things about this program is it creates a forum where we can be very concrete about what we will do to move forward with this project. Training is the first aspect, at the student level, the floor fellow level, and the staff level. For students, we are piloting a race project (racism in residences' context) and mental health. I don't know if people know that there's a Mental Health Awareness Week coming up, but we're doing an optional workshop on mental health in residences. Beyond the everyday training, we also focus on student councils. There is a lot of different training for students. For floor fellows there's been first aid, or what to do when someone from a minority group is making awkward comments about minority groups. It's an ebb and flow though, so it's about providing a safe space for floor fellows to talk about their experiences. In terms of staff, our floor fellows are very well trained, so we're trying to train our staff so that there is a continuation on this language and training so that it is holistic. Accessibility: on website (visual alarms, wheelchair accessible rooms, etc info available online), building, and events. Infrastructure: HR! One of the things we're doing is to figure out what sort of support staff needs, who are we hiring how are we hiring? Food and marketing too is involved in infrastructure. Res project resources are a good website where videos and articles are posted. That's it basically. We've been partnering with lots of groups too for mental health awareness week. One last point is that we're bringing OSD and myAccess to make it universal and at your fingertips.

Councillor Ibrahim: Thanks for coming! In terms of SSMU's role, is there any more that we can do to help you do what you do?

Emily: having a good relationship with the equity commissioners, the thing about anti-depression work is to be very personal so it's always a work in progress. I'm lucky to have been a SSMU exec so I know people prior to starting.

Councillor Pelletier: Thank you for coming, on behalf of all residences students, we all had a good outlook on res project, I got the training for the events, I'm glad it's a thing now. How do you plan on expanding your project over the next few years?

Emily: I like to have things step by step lined out so no one has to be there to train. They need to be very comfortable with the material to do that too. Sam and Kyle are going to be very instrumental in expanding our project too. Just consulting and having conversations about it helps. By ensuring that we have good feedback in one way that we are trying to expand and make sure it has a long lifespan.

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: Thanks for all your work. Any plans to apply for this position again, are you confident in the next person?



Emily: I have funding for a year and I want to extend it for two months, but it is really contingent on whether there's funding. The idea is to make sure that everyone in the office has a good enough grasp on info.

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: anything that we could do to help transition?

Emily: combine Claire's point and your point, I should maybe talk to equity committee because perhaps this training could be used in SSMU.

Councillor Baraldi: just to clarify, IRC got equity training this year?

Emily: they got 2 hour training to go through some of the vocabulary about Halloween costumes and not having alcohol at events. These kinds of conversations.

Councillor Baraldi: have residences councils been trained too?

Emily: yes it is mostly a training to prevent bad things happening at Halloween. Hopefully by the time Halloween comes around we'll have enough support.

Councillor Rourke: thank you for the workshops. Just because res students take up 50% of first years, is there any possible future in which it could be offered to off campus students as well?

Emily: I get kind of maternal when I see those not supported so we're trying to incorporate them too. There's only so much I can commit. They're offered access to mental health training. For consent week, we did a res project run through, you can look at expanding this kind of programming outside the student population in res.

President Ayukawa: as you know I have a lot ties in residences. I was wondering what your thoughts are on the IRC Halloween theme party is pandemic/Ebola?

Emily: I haven't necessarily been allowed to talk about this. The IRC is as separate to student housing as SSMU to McGill. They aren't accredited student association. We provide training but it's up to them. They changed it more to "zombie pandemic"

Councillor Pelletier: our haunted house is based off the McPlague; we got feedback about it being tied to Ebola so we went more towards zombie pandemic, all our posters have zombie pandemic on it now to deter this association.

Emily: I think students have been incredibly on responding to this. One of the res lifers Ryan was so on top of his stuff. IRC is lucky to have people like this to understand the context and also bringing more formalized training to these events.

Councillor Baraldi: I would personally advise against adding this to orientation of council it would put more value on its training if it was separate.

Emily: those were the things we were considering, thanks you for your feedback.

b. Environment Commissioners Kristen Perry and Keelin Elwood



Kristen: you probably just got sent a 20 page sustainability assessment. We're going to go over the outline. If you have questions, we'll take questions at the end. The assessment was written by environment commissioners, contributed by many sources, aims to reflect on Sustainability at McGill, it provides direction for the year, definitions can be flexible, meet the needs of present and future contingents of students. Keelin: the first section is about exec reviews. The reviews were used to show how different execs integrate sustainability at McGill. It's the reviews from 2013-2014 and not 2014-2015. The next section is on legislative council and how sustainability is integrated in that. Kristen was the expert in the environment committee part. The next section was about equity committee.

Kristen: After that we had a section on internal practices i.e. Gert's and their sourcing. A lot of things to look at too. The building was written by building coordinator, we had composting but it stopped, so we'd like to get that back up and working. Human Resources: we had Marie Elaine as to what kind of equity training has been given to people. For Finances we also had information on fiscal ways to integrate sustainability.

Keelin: interviews from Amina and Claire to do the significant events part of the report. It was about sexual assault and harm reduction position at McGill. Sustainability coordinator was taken out of McGill in SSMU, PGSS, and moos. There is also mental health and lease negotiations and building fee. Charter of values, provincial elections.

Kristen: initiatives coming up soon like vision 20/20, it is an overarching strategy for sustainability at McGill. For all students here, there's been progress, like last night the mandate was given to us by the motions at the GA. ECOLE project just opened and they're building programming for sustainability education and reach out in the community. Ad-hoc committee on sustainability will be continuing last year's work consulting with students and continuing their work.

Students' sustainability ambassador board, restructuring and overcoming challenges like institutionalization. Hopefully will be relaunched in winter 2015.

Spokes sustainability conference will also be happening November 2nd (next week); it's a Sunday, in SSMU ballroom, bringing together students to connect on sustainability.

Keelin: In the 2014-2015 year there's a lot more support for sustainability. The exciting new initiatives are going to ensure that McGill doesn't lose traction; administration is more supportive even though we lost a sustainability coordinator. Its crucial SSMU recognizes and supports these initiatives. Especially the student led ones.

Councillor Ibrahim: Thank you for coming here! Wondering if you know if the positions were permanent or contracted?

Keelin: they will be filled again; the application just came up right now. Currently Moos has two temporary people that are looking into it right now.



Councillor Baraldi: I had a meeting with ECOLE last week, they need new long term sources of funding to preserve their space, what plans do you have for this?

Kristen: conversations have been renewed this year, it's something they were talking about last year like fee levy we're going to be looking at all the alternatives.

Keelin: also not as recently met with ECOLE and they were talking about using videos to apply for grants and such.

President Ayukawa: thank you for writing this. It's something that SSMU is mandated to do. It's supposed to be drafted by coordinator. It's a project for two students to take on is really impressive.

6) Announcements

Councillor Rioux: One of my constituents contacted me about the use of e-cigarettes in class and in the buildings. She had told me that the senator had told her that there is policy against this. He sent me the link to this policy. Her question was whether there was a way to enforce this or make people aware of this. If you could talk to your faculties because they do count.

Councillor Baraldi: last day of consent campaign is tomorrow, photobooth campaign at y intersection. First GA of ECOLE is Wednesday Nov 5th in ECOLE house. I encourage everyone to attend.

Councillor Sachal: tomorrow there is a cat cafe from 11-4pm in room 108 in SSMU, instead of dogs this time. If you want to come you can!

President Ayukawa: SSMU is doing a Reddit AMA, if any of you as student representatives and councillor would like to participate you can.

VP Bradley: vacancy at funding committee! Contact me if you'd like to join.

VP Fong: vacancy on clubs and services committee too. Second announcement is McTavish construction: main points of email are that the construction will not be done until end of November.

Councillor Benrimoh: wanted to say a few thank yous, thank you senator Greenspoen while I was away. If I ever can't come he will be back. Secondly thank you to Rachel and her parliamentarians and Eileen and Lydia. Good job! Congratulate President Ayukawa and execs for historic GAs. One of the most successful events in a very long time. We did a good deal of good!

Councillor Ibrahim: just want to invite everyone to be a part of awesome projects. Theme of inclusivity and safer spaces even if it not something that interests you I encourage you to find someone who is interested that would be a big help to us and what's happening.

Councillor Zhang: SPOKES sustainability conference on Sunday Nov 2nd form 10-3:3 ball room RSVP on Facebook.

Councillor Li: SUS social sustainability week tomorrow we have a mental health market in Burnside basement and beer pong tournament from 8-10 and Saturday soccer tournament on lower field.



Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette: welcome Benrimoh back thank you for all wonderful comments.

President Ayukawa: welcome the first representative! Elected Michaud.

7) Question Period

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: speak to the effectiveness of Reddit as a medium for communication I don't use Reddit so I only know about trolling on it I wanted to make sure it was a useful and effective way of communication.

Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette: really good point, but I do see the use in using an online forum like Reddit, I know we've been getting a lot of comment since GA I think it's fair to have an online forum because sometimes when you have meetings or office ours, I think it's a good place to voice concerns.

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: we seem to having animal events, people with allergies, how effective the cleanup following these events is? Considerations for these people?

Councillor Sachal: I don't know the exact method, but I was told we had to stay behind and Lysol everything and keep door shut at all times to keep cat fumes inside. I am allergic to cats but I have to be there tomorrow.

Councillor Conrad: constituents: why it was approved to fund divest McGill for climate march in NY? He argues that climate march is not academic and wondering why funds were allocated to them.

VP Bradley: funding committee like other committees not sit over summer The particular exec who approve, she was not present at all for discussion so we avoided conflict of interest. Also advice of funding coordinator who has done it for 3 years. Her recommendation and then debate takes place. The ambassador fund funds mostly travel expenses, and that is very much related to social justice and climate issues. Very informative in nature. We have similarly funded equally "non academic" endeavours in the past.

Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette: the march had over 400k people, on the Saturday they attended a workshop about justice and organizing and such. Very much academic in nature.

Councillor Rioux: I'm confused because I talked to funding coordinator and she thought it was a mistake and I also talked to VP clubs and services. Is that not a fact?

VP Bradley: I signed the cheque if you want the records, undoubtedly was ambassador fund. We also helped pay for rent for Naomi Klein on same day from green fund.

Councillor Ibrahim: curiosity, given that GA lasted about 8 hours, which councillors were there?

Councillor Ibrahim rescinds his question.

President Ayukawa: anyone can speak to how often or if the ambassador or green funds are ever drained completely.

VP Bradley: no they are not. The ambassadors fund had about 750\$ and green fund had about 3000\$ at the end of last year.



8) New Business

a. Funding of Library Extended Hours

VP Stewart Kanigan: The entirety of the extended hours (after midnight) is funded by library improvement fund been the case for several years now. We've been raising questions about the fairness of students paying for this service when it is arguably an operating expense. We wanted to have a discussion about what's going on with the fund. Speaking rights to Erin from Library Fund.

Aaron: Library fund is funded by students and alumni. It's allocated by library fund. In terms of extended hours funding, it's actually been contributing to this since its creation. In terms of actual cost, it's about 250k\$ a year, it's primarily security costs. That has come from LIF over past few years. Since around 2010. In terms of library overall budget, they are getting a cut in the last few years, now restored 250k for just day security. We do see it as operational, but they do not. McGill is different from other universities in that we don't have enough study spaces for students on campus.

VP Stewart Kanigan: biggest things hoping to have addressed, students aren't widely aware that its student funding that does extended hours. 24h access is not a basic operational aspect to them. While we acknowledge that this is very important, we have concerns that the 250k is going to be taken out of library fund every year, which means that it is taken out of student's project funding. If we don't fund it, no one else will. If we just say okay fine we'll just fund it, nothing will change and we won't have library improvement fund for other projects. How should we proceed?

Councillor Rioux: if we are funding extended hours, it should be clear that it is coming from SSMU. I think a lot of the improvements that are done through LIF they don't know that it comes from students. I know a lot of people from other universities are envious of our hours. I know it's expensive but it's important

Councillor Shah: I don't know if it's impossible, but we can't do anything except tell students directly?

VP Stewart Kanigan: security is non-negotiable.

Councillor Shah: I meant, so at the table that they're sitting, we'd have a sign saying that SSMU pays for the security.

Aaron: pending results of discussion tonight, looking through how it's communicated to students that it is funded through students. When they make announcement at closing maybe: brought to you by SSMU.

Councillor Rourke: I do agree with Rioux that it should be clear where the money is coming from. It points to a broader issue of transferring financial expenses on to students. This is the first thing they would cut would be extended hours. It's part of the reality of the situation. We have to pick our battles.

Councillor Benrimoh: It's a toughie. A) McGill should be paying for this, it's their building, absolutely, and the issue is that McGill has serious financial



problems right now. McGill isn't going to pay for this any time soon, it's a reality that I don't like, and I don't think we should be accepting this. I think we should mandate that we're not going to be stuck in this situation forever. When they are out of the quagmire, we should stop taking funding off student's backs. Need the university to understand that this is not permanent. While it does last, we should make it very very clear that SSMU is providing this valuable service. We can profit off of it until then, we can't accept it forever.

VP Stewart Kanigan: respond to points made, Rourke about the fact that university that there's a bad budget situation. They have never been funding this. It's not necessarily a symptom of bad financial times; it's just been the expectation since the beginning. We've continued to bring up the line that this isn't a permanent solution. We decided to give the library funding for one semester instead to two.

Councillor Nadifi: I think it would be a great idea to let students know. We should also decide that its' not a fund for hours but actual improvement. Maybe they could also decide what it can be used on.

Councillor Zhang: I'm wondering which libraries SSMU is funding, because I know music library the students are paying for them.

Councillor Chin: Thank you I would like to ask if it would be more useful to rename fund library extended hour's fund

VP Stewart Kanigan: comments about promoting that SSMU is funding these, is the angle we should be taking that it's ridiculous or should we be saying that its great toward SSMU funding it, there's been animosity towards SSMU funding things university should be funding.

Councillor Shah: getting the student body to mobilize and the only way to do that, I know LIF does fund capital expenditure, with this money, we could do x, if we didn't include it for extended hours. If students have issues between making libraries better and extended hours, I think it would help make clear the fact that SSMU shouldn't be paying for extended hours.

Aaron: There is a list of libraries, if you need more info let us know. They talk about how detrimental it would be if students lot this. What do we consider operating, what we consider not. Half of this fund is already coming from alumni.

President Ayukawa: huge issue with lack of student consultation in how they spend the money, it really seems like if it is not funded by us it will end. I would hate for students to figure out that how it's funded. There's nothing on library sites about how we fund that. Yale, Harvard, and other universities also have 24h access libraries. If anyone knew why the only other 24h access places on campus funded by other student societies, they should be operational too?

VP Bradley: I certainly echo thoughts of councillors that it is operational expense, my question for Kanigan or LIC what other types of projects do you see this money going towards?



Aaron: library has three areas: elections, services, spaces. We don't want it funding salaries or extended hours. It would be space really. Additional seating and such. There is a question from library if we don't fund extended hours, what? And that's something we want to ask students.

VP Fong: I really do want to echo statements. Liken situation to own capital expenditure reserve fund. It would be silly for SSMU to be paying for extended hours form own capital expenditure fund. Funding it form LIF is short term solution. Longer term solutions of improvement of spaces, would be a better sue of this fund. It reflects well on McGill itself. I'd advocate this being taken on as operational expense.

Councillor Rourke: would be interested in other projects. I appreciate that origin isn't due to financial difficulties; I just think that in this point in time it might be very very difficult to change it. I agree it's under their obligation, they're not necessarily under obligation to provide them, it's important, but they CAN just not offer them. While ideally I agree, it might be really hard to change.

Aaron: part of problem is that if students demanded that we don't pay for this, it's easy for McGill to blame us for not funding it after doing it for a long time. Libraries are sceptical on what we can use this one, but when you look at the Schulich, its old so we might want to invest there. Looking forward to talking with students about new projects.

Councillor Rioux: would the VP UA and LIF coordinator want us to ask our faculties to get broader perspective?

VP Stewart Kanigan: happy to send you info.

Councillor Benrimoh: I have an idea. This is our money and we should decide what to do with it. We should budget intelligently and deviously. We should create a plan, and say this is the plan for the new money, we're going to be phasing out x amount of money, and that money is going to be phased into new projects. What should we fund and in big letter, we'd like to see this kind of project funding and by year 2 this much.

VP Fong: quickly point out that Benrimoh's point is exactly what McGill is doing to us for our utilities.

VP Bradley: exact same thing, we use exact scale they first proposed. Additionally though seriously, a long term plan is a good thing and I'd be happy to work with you on that.

Councillor Chin: whether this would work or not? In this case McGill holds the strings, so how effective would that be?

Councillor Benrimoh: the way I see is that if we were to cut it next year, then McGill would win because they could say were not paying anymore. If we taper, McGill will have an interest in keeping students happy by paying only a little at a time. If we give them the incentive to keep kids happy. It's easier for them to stay in the pot.

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: my concern for that kind of thing I think the most important factor in all of that, first of all we need to not have that evil laugh thing. The substance and ideas that we would phase in would have



to be very substantial and important. Given there's a massive overhaul plan what's the point of phasing

VP Stewart Kanigan: Would phasing out be effective? The library had their budget cut extremely. Voluntary retirement projects too. It would mean reducing their budget more. If students feel its 100% operating expense it would help.

Councillor Rourke: what are the other expenses for this fund? Student consultation?

Councillor Fullerton: unfortunately McGill isn't a frog; they would probably just take action immediately so it's dangerous. So if it's taken it needs to be taken in consultation with McGill. Also bear in mind that originally McGill was not offering these extended hours. We decided to pay for it. I understand that it's important. We've taken decision o extend hours. What we're doing now is asking McGill to extend hours. This is fine and important but we have to ask them.

Councillor Chin: just to add to discussion with Benrimoh, the university doesn't have to follow rules. I agree with councillor Fullerton, you have to talk about it. You can have consultation or you can have it funded by SSMU and have it reiterated to students. Important to choose which route to go.

Aaron: in response to Rourke's question about what it be used for. Some of the projects (reads report) (washroom renovations, etc.). Not running out of capital projects, but less of a desire. Also less desire due to library ambassador plan. This is available on the website.

President Ayukawa: just wanted to say that it would be great to talk to constituents about this and raise awareness, and when there are students who care enough and loud enough. Administration makes changes like in milting ate sad sustainability fund. I would hate for the students to be loud enough for administration to care once 24h access is lost.

VP Fong: in response to Fullerton about things that students want the university to pay for. Examples of things taken on by McGill, origins of SEDE and MOOS were student led initiatives also harm reduction coordinator. I don't think it's unreasonable to thin they could assume these costs.

Councillor Rourke: I don't know the differences in terms of expenses in operational and non-operational. Anything in domain of libraries might be all university related. I don't know the specific project or details of it.

VP Stewart Kanigan: quick note on constituents, given that library has to communicate to security for next year and SSMU to decide whether fund extended hours. Middle of beginning of November. Decision before then.

Aaron: totally agree that almost all student funds at university should be a cost to university. The reality is that we do have them and it was renewed by students by ref last year.

Councillor Nadifi: bring back the point that as students we asked for extended hours and we have to pay for it because yes we have to benefit



from this, and on their website they claim that they are providing this service and I think they can attract a lot of students with this. I think McGill should pay for it.

Councillor Benrimoh: three options. 1. Status quo. 2. Cut off right away. 3. Long term is the only reasonable alternative. It's what's expected of high class university. We can either keep paying for this forever and never have improvement or make a plan to reduce involvement in things that university should be paying for and instead of working on making our libraries better. 3 is the preferred.

Stewart: quick action point: we can meet up and circulate info plan for you and clear question and feedback. Thank you for input.

Aaron: thank you for feedback and if you have ideas for LNF projects I will be reaching out to you.

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: thank you for coming out and seriously he does a great job.

b. Motion Regarding the Amendment of the Funding By-Laws Book II

VP Bradley: nothing new, we hope this will create more financial transparency and accountability for groups that we fund. Trial period the funding coordinator will report with success failure and problems with this model. If found not feasible it will be removed from funding bylaws.

Move into voting.

Motion passes.

c. Motion Regarding the Amendment of the Discretionary Funding By-Laws (Clubs and Services Portfolio By-Law Book)

VP Bradley: at advice of steering we just clarified some things that were not 100% clear.

President Ayukawa: few things changed in this motion is 1.11, this before was a bit unclear where it may have conflicted with another article 2.1.8. Another part clarified about how 50% had to be spent in the first semester, but that was changed. And the other change clarified role of exec committee.

VP Stewart Kanigan: my concern is the discretionary funding not directly benefitting students. Limitation of degree to which services can fund campaigns happening outside McGill campus for example supporting indigenous struggles against pipelines or such. We don't want to block them from supporting these initiatives.

Councillor Rourke: second Claire saying and then other parts say they can use their discretionary funds when it fits their mandates, doesn't that contradict?

VP Bradley: to give you some background. This money is student's money, students pay to be members of services, but they don't do so that the money does not come back to McGill, like Midnight Kitchen they do a



lot of their work with other organizations. My concern is about when students have no consent or comment they will be unhappy.

VP Fong: to add to Bradley, draw parallel with clubs, they cannot apply for funds then donate it directly to charity. If service would like to donate to something not benefitting McGill directly, they can fundraise that of their own efforts. The concern here is the money raised by students going back to those students.

Councillor Conrad: fundraising event, could they use discretionary fund to fund and host fundraising event

Councillor Ibrahim: I agree that there is a bit of a conflict of interest if there are restrictions on discretionary funding. It's a case of transparency. For example the AUS has a mandate to allow funding. What everyone thoughts are on notion that there are many groups on campus that use student funds to external things, so what people think of the idea as long as there's full transparency, why is it our purview to limit that?

VP Stewart Kanigan: Are you going to go through each person discretionary funding?

VP Fong: To answer Conrad: it wouldn't really be discretionary funding, but if they want to have a fundraiser, they can apply to one of our funds to hold fundraiser; it is a legit avenue and acts as a good marketing method. It would be very appropriate to use operating expenses to fund that.

Councillor Rioux: amendment to add to the bylaws the amendment put online. Really open to discussion about this, I think it would be a good thing because it would be at the discretion of the clubs and services I do strongly think it is good to allocate funds but for people to know about it I would continue to not opt out if this was the way we did it.

Councillor Weaver: this sort of ties in on feedback that I got on the motion itself, I think transparency and accountability to SSMU is really important. Some of the feedback I got is that services don't feel like it goes both ways on SSMU. A lot of confusion in people who don't know about services and those who do pushing things on each other. I completely understand where this amendment is coming from, but services might not be very open to it.

Councillor Kpeglo-Henney: speak in favour of amendment to motion I believe that having this info should have already existed in the past I do

Councillor Rourke: speak in favour of the amendment. I don't think it's too much time after running the event to say what they used the money for.

Necessary accountability measure. Not significant problem.

VP Bradley: also like to speak in favour of amendment. Very much in line with funding procedures now. I believe it is not undue stress on services given that it is student's money. Responsibility to students. As far as policing them, I don't care. It's not their money they're responsible. I don't think this is an unreasonable step at all.

VP Fong: speak in favour as well. When the original draft of our all the funding commissioners equity and environment. The original time it was



going to be similar, but restrictive. Speak in favour but caution that there is no method to appeal decisions from students.

Councillor Rioux: in favour of amendment. Greta time to get a breakdown semester by semester maybe at same time get a bit of insight as to how services are dealing with it.

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: Not speaking in favour, or against. I just think it's problematic I was hoping maybe services representatives. Wondering if you could speak to it more. We have little to no expertise in the area. Something good in practice could be unproductive accountability is only good when effective.

Councillor Ibrahim: want to ask mover if amenable to taking clause out directly benefitting student unless we were to consult students. 1.1.1 wondering if there are more students consulted in this process.

Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette: I don't think the idea of adding step having something approved or consulted with students to be approved is not necessary this amendment is unnecessary. We need to use our best judgment and leave it at that. Speak against this amendment.

VP Stewart Kanigan: also like to speak against the amendment. The assertion that SSMU doesn't care about services, we should just have SSMU funds. It supports that all discretionary funding decision will be approved by services putting massive amount of work on clubs and services. FI providing report creating grounds for tight running of VP fops and clubs and services.

President Ayukawa: I'm not against this amendment I'd like to emphasize importance of services rep opinions. This feedback is especially important because many of us not experts in this.

Councillor Weaver: Essentially I think there's a general feeling that discretionary funding is a privilege they are given. So many roadblocks and barriers to accessing the discretionary funding that it's almost unreasonable and unfeasible obviously always some bureaucracy but important to keep in check and reasonable.

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: **motion to extend Weaver speaking time to 3 minutes.**

Motion passed.

Councillor Weaver: In my opinion this amendment is an overstep on behalf of SSMU council onto services. I don't think SSMU council should be reviewing intimate details of services budget for discretionary. I want the reviewing to be meaningful and not sure it is.

VP Bradley: to address points, VP Kanigan we do already approve every application part of my job also read every cheque request, that's my job. I don't mind doing it at all, I catch the mistakes, it's okay, and it's not a burden. Services have no communicated that they find that burden,

Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette I don't see this as being an approval process just a recording process. Which monetary amount allocated when to who. Not a comeback and disagree, it's a description.



Councillor Rourke: I don't think this would be the biggest bureaucratic problem restriction just a public way to show what they're showing their money on just an accountability measure to increase transparency. They should provide it. They should publically report it.

Councillor Rioux: point of clarification from VP fops, they already have to be approved so wouldn't this report just be more of a burden on your two positions isn't that the only different with the amendment?

Councillor Weaver: fully support transparency and accountability but believe that VP fops and CNS are empowered in their position to oversee as they said they go over all of them so bringing this again to council. I think that this is beyond maybe what's necessary. I think its discretionary funding so it's discretionary. It's being limited and reduced in significant way.

Councillor Kpeglo-Henney: while I see that we don't have expertise, I represent the largest faculty on campus, students interested in what being spent on. If they are fulfilling their mandates they should be willing to publicize. The VPs are empowered which furthers their ability to act in their position.

Councillor Ibrahim: As services rep do the different bylaws in this motion this amendment would perhaps make them more aligned with what services want, providing services for external things. Transparency might allow for external, transparency = more.... Do you think this amendment has potential to give services the ability they need to fulfil their mandates, whereas without it, the services couldn't fulfil what they want to do?

Councillor Baraldi: a lot of good points made. Thank services rep to bring this to our attention. We don't want to create bureaucratic measures. The services wouldn't have to do anything more. Not a scrutiny or review, it's just an accountability and transparency measure from direction of services to council. Issue in dialogue between accountability and SSMU.

Councillor Stewart Kanigan: against this amendment. A lot of fixation on words of transparency and accountability. Assuming that they are being irresponsible by insisting on transparency. Perhaps you can have them report their discretionary funding in their yearly report.

Councillor Weaver: I would like time to consult with my constituents. Not only this amendment but the way the motion has changed since notice.

Motion to postpone until next council by Councillor Ibrahim.

Speaker: amendment needs to be dealt with first.

VP Bradley: maybe discretionary funding is a misnomer. It is donations. It is a donation account. Donation funding or project funding. Additionally regarding transparency. Would you not want to see the report of all the funds that funding committee would use. Without that report they would not have been aware of where funds are going. And yes it would be a burden on the FOPS but that's okay.

VP Fong: echo that Bradley just said. Also want to address Weaver's desire to consult with constituents. Since original motion was prepared, we



haven't received a single response from services. Perhaps that wasn't made clear to them but in our initial attempt to get feedback none was provided for us. We are very proud of what services are doing, services should be proud too and not ashamed of what spending on.

Councillor Houston: speak in favour of amendment. In spirit of motion. No real additional burden to services. I don't think it makes a negative assumption about them that they cannot manage; expecting transparency does not assume they cannot make their own decision. There's a difference between clubs and services.

Councillor Weaver: make a note of the fact that I did distribute this notice of motion.

Councillor Conrad: **motion to call to previous question.**

Motion passed.

Voting procedure.

Amendment passes.

Motion to table until next council by Stewart Kanigan

Seconded by Councillor Ibrahim

Motion passed.

d. Motion Regarding the Creation of the University Building Fund

Move to previous question by Councillor Rioux

Seconded by Councillor Ibrahim

Motion passed.

Motion passed.

e. Motion Regarding the Plebiscite Question: SSMU's Prioritization of Sustainability

President Ayukawa: This motion online referendum. Plebiscite question is non binding opinion question or poll student body. This is one of the main ways that we consult student body. Whereas clauses are repeated, some are for your info as councillors. I didn't include them on the bottom because maybe redundant.

VP Stewart Kanigan: this doesn't open on a vibe. Can it be re uploaded?

Chin: Ask the validity of asking a question to rate something between 1 and 5 when it's very poorly defined in relation to other priorities. And whether this question is biased because who is against sustainability?

VP Stewart Kanigan: I do support this I think it's important in including; the question as it stands isn't going to give us much useful data. A lot of people are just going to say medium priority. Stronger question with stronger outcomes. Getting options and seeing what students prioritise.

Councillor Baraldi: still can't open it

President Ayukawa: speak on behalf of all movers very amenable to receiving feedback and amending question. We think it's important to consult entire student body.



Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy: I don't think plebiscite question, approach to sustainability should be much more open. Maybe a town hall?

President Ayukawa: already planning to do that.

Councillor Ibrahim: prioritize is very important here

Councillor Chin: if then we would look at the question then it would best define what we are prioritizing it over.

Motion to lay on the table by Councillor Dunbar Lavoie

Seconded by Councillor Ibrahim.

Motion passed.

f. Motion supporting #consentMcGill

Councillor Ibrahim: highly speak in favour of motion also want to bring to light that there are amendments coming. Good time to discuss ideas related to that. VP Kanigan mentioned that there is no position on sexual violence currently in SSMU.

President Ayukawa: is this on vibe?

Eileen: it should be.

VP Stewart Kanigan: speak in favour of this motion. Motion to amend to second resolved clause to read that SSMU encourage McGill to ensure that consent campaigns remain.

Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette: As much as I support this motion in its nature I am wondering whether you think maybe that SSMU should be taking a different approach to this problem instead of endorsing McGill events, maybe own events>

Councillor Baraldi: SSMU has been actively involved so it makes sense to support that.

VP internal: we already do promote it within our list serv. In past 2 listservs has been done. Have been helping them past two weeks.

Councillor Ibrahim: motion to amend to continue to endorse.

Councillor Rourke: McGill doesn't just mean administration; it's everyone who was involved in it. SSMU already supports it, just making it official.

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy: speak in favour of motion no matter what currently is happening, this institutionalizes it.

Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette: thank you for clarification, correct first resolved clause (to word missing).

Councillor Baraldi: basically the position of liaison office for harm reduction we would like SSMU to lobby McGill administration to renew position. I am strongly in favour of this motion; I don't think it's even enough, we should continue to find new measures to institutionalize consent.

Friendly.

VP Stewart Kanigan: replace position liaison office for harm reduction with sexual assault response coordinator.

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy: continue to support should be in first be it resolved clause.



VP Stewart Kanigan: another motion to amend in the last be it resolved I'd like to add [reads amendment].

Shah: question some of these things should be made into a policy or made into a policy but this is actually great in favour of passing now with intent to somehow incorporate this for further years.

VP Stewart Kanigan: happy for you all to mandate me to put this into a policy. Thinking I there is a way for me to put it into the motion. Amend to adding this to the motion.

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennessy motion to previous question.

Motion passed

Motion passed.

g. Motion regarding plebiscite question

President Ayukawa: last night at GA mentioned so we're going to do it.

Councillor Shah: In the motion or sustainability there was included a group of whereas clauses included in the questions, I don't know if the movers think it's important to explain what simple plurality or preferential are.

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: speak in favour of this. Ben stayed until 12:30 and he actually fielded questions and went into detail last night so I'm sure those who stayed you're already well versed in validity and pertinence of this motion.

President Ayukawa: all whereas clauses that are in this would go into the ballot. Yet to be updated because too busy.

Motion to move to previous question by Councillor Rioux

Passed.

Motion passed.

h. Motion Regarding Black Students' Network Fee – Second Fall Referendum 2014

Elie Lubendo: the actual structure is reworded, but the pricing is completely the same.

Chin: is this new fee on top of SSMU subsidy?

Lubendo: currently under club services, if we get a fee, we have to refund subsidy

VP Bradley: speak to some of the activities and projects planned with this fee?

Lubendo: Children's aid, students from middle school and younger, education as a black student, we help with tutoring and things like that.

Discussions about issue that we think are important to raise. There was a special about Ferguson and everything that has been happening. We do a lot more education on black issues. What we believe to be important to the black community.

Councillor El-Sharawy: is the BSN only limited to black students?

Lubendo: not closed off to only black students, wouldn't want to promote that. To non black students, we couldn't progress without input from them. BSN is open to all races.



Councillor Rourke: even though its Black's student's network, it is open to other racial minorities as well.

Lubendo: one of our execs recognizes as white, we have social Fridays as well. We want everyone to know about our culture.

Councillor Shah: I notice in budget you have revenues for sponsors, but blank for sponsorship. BSN doesn't do sponsorships?

Lubendo: donations and sponsorships were put together, so you can have either, In terms of getting sponsorship because we are a services, there is a lot of technicalities with that.

Councillor Ibrahim: open letter to MUS recently really awesome but the link didn't work anymore, so what happened

Lubendo: we had a meeting about this and drafted a letter but the letter through being distributed, not all of us had seen it by the time it had been sent out. Because we had agreed that we all had to look at it, we retracted it. We met with MUS president today and we had a good discussion about it. They can't really change the circuits name but opened discussion on it.

VP Stewart Kanigan: I support this motion I am listed as a mover but no one ever approached me. I'm okay to move it, and my name is very misspelled.

Lubendo: it was the wrong name put on this, I'm sorry.

VP Bradley: motion to amend: winter 2018 inclusive.

Friendly.

Councillor Weaver: general support of motion I believe that BSN provides necessary service to student body and id like them to extend scope of their services.

Motion passes.

i. Motion regarding fee levy

Lubendo: This motion is being brought up because general feedback about no conversation about building fee, it won't be changed until 2021, at least SSMU moving forward they can re-negotiate down the road.

Councillor El-Sharawy: based on past 2 years, SSMU's been getting a lot of stick because not asked students. The likelihood of students fees being 1\$ is very low. It doesn't take much; it doesn't guarantee a promise just asking opinion. It is good media right now, we need that.

Councillor Conrad: I'm really afraid of this motion only because reading it the first time considering there was the recent vote on student levy, the fact that I'm confused and I sit on council. I feel like the reaction is going to be you just asked us to pay why are you asking again?

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennessy: one of the movers itself said that it was incredibly not possible. Backlash problematic issue on campus where people think this is something that could happen. Poor idea.

Lubendo: the reason this is being brought up is because it should have been asked in the beginning. People don't know that people use dot pay 1\$. The very least we can do is ask people what they think about it.



Councillor Baraldi: echo thoughts, I think this would be confusing, a lot of student voices have been vocal for 1\$ fee. I fear this might give that movement momentum. Misinformation, believe this would be possible. In terms of SSMU and administration negotiations and MOA. We can discuss this and I believe this process can be approach under a different light maybe with a different council

Councillor Subhani: I don't understand purpose behind motion except creating confusion. We will never get to that 1\$ fee no point in passing this.

VP Bradley: this is a really bad decision. To clarify, the option of a 1\$ lease was on the table for as long as that executive sat in term. It was a very real possibility and it was evaporate. They have a huge power dynamic. Concerns about bad perception. I think everyone would love a 1\$ lease. I don't think it's whether they want it or whether it's feasible. Putting this out there confuses people again.

Councillor Ibrahim: purpose is either education or artillery to sue against administration. Which one is it?

Councillor Shah: certainly are merits for this but be it resolved clause has whereas clause in it. A leading question almost. No one's going to say not to that. It needs to be clearer.

VP Stewart Kanigan: good press = misguided. Perpetuating false info that not asked for 1\$ lease. SSMU execs pushed for 1\$ lease though. Not possible. Create impression that it's possible. Cannot break lease McGill will sue us. We don't have the option. It will cause nothing but poor press for SSMU.

President Ayukawa: love a citation for second clause, also think if included on ballot not enough background info on whereas clauses. Really concerned with lack of exec consultation. Plebiscite questions are supposed to be not binding for society. Either a going to confuse people or false impression to campus that we can do something about this when we can't. Pressure undue on execs and councillors to do something we can't do until next few years. Not until lease negotiations open again in few years.

Councillor Fullerton: motion to previous question.
Retracted.

Councillor Rourke: fully support spirit of this motion. Recognize transfer of funds from students to funds for McGill. Having some sort of statistic to back us up gives us a bit more leverage. As it does stand, it is not clear enough. We need to find another way to do this.

Councillor Chaim: the reason this motion was brought forward. Apple analogy of buying iPhone, saying they change their prices afterwards. Not good publicity, no other answer than yes. Not going to help our situation.

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy: Very quick note. First citation directly quotes Redel, why would you cite something in the regard that it is impossible.



Councillor Nadifi: want to ask I think it would add confusion but considering the faculty that we already asked the question about building fee, people were already angry to be asked twice, going back on issue will already make people angry I think there's a better way to do this and just talk about that the execs really did negotiate that but it wasn't possible. Ask students about something that is more feasible and that can actually happen.

Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette: I would like to clarify that I was consulted, I would not move because more clarifications on whereas clauses. I don't think this should go out to student body. I agree in spirit, students should push for 1\$ lease and stop at nothing, but I don't think this motion is going to do it.

Councillor Chin: I agree Shah that this question is poorly worded and given that this motion was very late and since I cannot ask constituents I want to motion o table until next council.

Speaker: due to deadlines, it is the last day before the nomination period comes to a close. It would be today or nothing at all. Unless online vote, in which case we don't get quorum.

VP Fong: I fully support the intent to consult students but doing so in untimely manner is not only detrimental but potentially dangerous, afraid of false hope for non backable actions. Usually we have actions to back it up; there are plans to amend bylaws to reflect consultations with students. The consultation is not time sensitive. No valuable info right now. Tabling until 2021.

Lubendo: important to note that all feel that students would say yes. No problem to putting this to next semester or 5 years down the road. It's just to have them ask. 7 years down the road, the university will have so much leverage. Straw poll: Is main problem timing? Yes or no.

Fullerton motion to call to previous question

Seconded by Councillor Chaim

Passed.

Motion fails.

Councillor Michaud: if there is an amendment made during meeting does the mover have to vote yes?

Speaker: no.

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennessy: we also have the ability due to the constitution to bend the rules, right?

Speaker: yes.

9) Informal discussion about GA

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: would like an informal discussion about GA, some said success, some said it was an example of how ineffective the GA is. I think the content of how the GA proceeded, and the indefinite postponing.

Councillor Shah: One of my constituents directly contacted me with respects to the GA. One specific point was that there's a lack of understanding or distrust



Roberts rules applied to a group of 800 people no longer serves purpose its aiming for. People didn't understand how entering was a logistical and procedural thing. People fundamentally disagree with ability to postpone.

Speaker: I can speak to the Robert's rules. They are used in parliaments and governments. 200-300 people normally. Rules don't lost any of their efficiency or democracy, they work the same way. It's slower the more people you have and the more uneducated you are about the rules. I did receive emails about how it was advantageous to those who knew Robert's Rules. That's true but that's what happens when picking a system. If council feels that a different system of rules should be used. These are not off topic discussions. Come see me if there's any questions about that.

Councillor Nadifi: people were really concerned about Robert's rules because they didn't know how it worked. Maybe if there was someone to refer to during GA so people know. Someone asked if we could move straight to voting procedure, and maybe someone could have been there to guide them.

Councillor Rioux: I'd like to say that there's nothing wrong with using Robert's rules. On campus most recognized way of proceeding. AUS and SUS EUS use it. Everyone uses this. I heard a lot of people complain about capacity. Half the time we have a hard time getting a hundred people, I think if we consider that we were okay. When we don't have capacity that size for any room.

Councillor Rourke: In general it went well. I do think there's one thing you have to look at from perspective of average student. 10h. Not okay to keep people in a room without going to bathroom or eat is not super convenient or feasible. Committing that much time is not feasible. Huge commitment, this is midterm season.

Councillor Boutin: spending a little part of the evening outside the door with those not let in, they were really upset that their voices were not being heard is the only reason they couldn't vote is because they couldn't get into the room. I wanted to recognize that VP Fong and Ayukawa did a good job at giving them opportunity to vote even outside room.

Councillor Ibrahim: apologize for awkward question earlier, echo Councillor Dunbar Lavoie did take opportunity away from people. Speak to Roberts rules: 50% plus 1 policy for tabling, everything should be 2/3 majority, better express to constituents how GA works, most democratic way, consultative forum if they don't agree.

Councillor Baraldi: echo Rioux, ask speaker if possibility of adopting standing rules at GA like at council. 2/3 majority will be adopted for tabling. Also wanted to say maybe next time issuing statement beforehand explaining procedure overall well run also another topic is how much of a political vehicle SSMU should be.

VP Fong: echo confusion that students had in terms of logistically how Robert's rules functioned. Not an intuitive form of leading discourse. Last year I helped Larson host many workshops to educate students of Robert's rules. I think for a motion that would've brought a lot of students maybe an idea for following GA.

VP Bradley: respond to Nadifi, about guides, I answered about 70 students' questions. It was exhausting, people thought I had authority, but I thought that



was helpful, if we had volunteers, it was not easy to find them, and it would be something worth looking into. Roaming Robert's rules people. Simple for us who knew and they left satisfied.

Benrimoh: the way I see it the GA ran relatively well considering # of people all the irritating things were part of demo process what I think would have been helpful is to have encouraged the chair to take a bit more executive action in terms of limiting discussion. The chair should be exercising a bit more authority, with the caveat that you can overrule me with 2/3 majority. That should have been said more often.

President Ayukawa: if anyone has any extremely difficult or concerning feedback, give them my number or email me. In the weeks and days after the GA I received a lot of emails and I'm in the process of getting back to them. I have like 200 to go through, trying not to copy paste. Please forward me any especially concerning things.

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy: did hear feedback that they were happy that people came and they came. 700 people left after one motion. In response to Benrimoh, they attempted to get rid of the chair like 3 times.

Speaker: the one time I used my judgment, it was appealed.

Councillor Chaim: last night was a lot different the real conflict was not the way it was done, it was the majority that showed up only cared about whether it would be debated or not. Half wanted to keep going and half wanted to end it there. We only get people out because of controversy. I think what our course of action could be is release from our perspective what happened tonight, what SSMU wanted to do was what it was mandated it to do.

Councillor Rioux: suggestion is to help students know Roberts rules a bit better. First: posting online tutorial, as simple as a taping of part of council, also having councillors identified by a specific colour so they would know they could ask us.

Councillor Shah: I agree a lot with what councillor Rioux said, I don't like doing this, engaging people on Facebook before GA. Hosting session on Roberts rules no one will come. They'll always have an excuse for why they can't participate. The easiest way is to involve people on social media.

Councillor Michaud: being at my first GA and not knowing about Robert's rules, people were really passionate and being on my own around them but it would almost be really productive to have someone like Suzanne Fortier there to introduce the GA, to direct less anger toward SSMU so McGill is accountable for these kinds of decisions too.

Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette: everyone should give President Ayukawa so much kudos and I applaud her and she was working night and day and it was hard to watch and I think she did an amazing job.

Councillor Houston: thank speaker parliamentary president, story: when I was at front of overflow room there were so many people who asked questions about Roberts rules, they were super thankful to have help with that. If we could find some way to help people. Lastly to remind everyone that speaker tries to cut off debate when everyone has spoken, not feasible for speaker to limit debate after everyone has spoken.



Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: Thanks for feedback. Totally understand if we're ill or whatever, I think it was really important for all of us to be there. We need to be identified as councillor for next GA. We were all ready to go. If we are councillors we should be given bathroom privileges. I was not necessarily aware that were mandated to stay until the end. Ahead of time we make this awareness. Point being, we probably should have all been there early.

Councillor Rourke: minor frustrations was that no one was differentiating who SSMU was and what SSMU they were talking about. I think there were a lot of questions people had that would have been nice to know before GA. We should be answering questions, I would introduce myself as a councillor, and I don't know how to approve that. Second point the point about everyone left after one motion; very normal for us to stay it's not normal for every single student.

Councillor Nadifi: before entering the SSMU ballroom I was with constituents it was not clear how the line up was made I was waiting in line, when we entered the SSMU ballroom he just left, and when we got in, we had to move to the cafeteria. I find it sad that he left.

President Ayukawa: We usually have GA guides, we didn't have them this time because they were counting votes and mood watchers and crisis councillors. Thanks to everyone who did volunteer. Using you guys is a great idea!

VP Moustaquim-Barrette: so much respect for councillors staying until end I respect time you devote. I brought you all apples.

Councillor Houston: Is it problematic for us to be voting And GA guides? The problem thinking SSMU confusion, indicative of larger problem. Not sure if ever pointed out to students that they could make a point of parliamentary inquiry.

Speaker: technically nothing wrong with Robert's rules. I think in your responsibilities its outlines that you're there to help concerns.

Motion to take from table by Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy.

Seconded by Councillor Rourke.

Passed.

10) Motion Regarding Plebiscite

President Ayukawa: I hear the concerns and I and mothers are coming up with some way to come up with new ways to ask the community for opinions. Love to hear for new ideas, otherwise I may ask to table this motion until winter referendum.

Motion to table until winter referendum period by Councillor Chaim.

Seconded by Councillor Rioux.

Motion passed.

11) Reports by Councillors

a. Councillor Zhang

Reads report.

VP Stewart Kanigan: thank you for bringing this to council and I commend your efforts.



b. Councillor Kuprowski

Reads report.

VP Stewart Kanigan: thanks for your report glad more outreach happening. They were making references about review wanted to be done, any input on that?

Councillor Kuprowski: We have two more weeks but forward we want to finish season as strongly as possible, they will be putting a lot more thought into what needs to be done moving forward. IN their investigation they will be opening up peer open conversations.

Councillor Ibrahim: commend efforts, clarify what best buddies are.

Administration often post varsity guide, but how many people actually read it?

Councillor Kuprowski: every year beginning of season orientation meeting where we meet with varsity manager and she goes over eligibility and anti doping policies and services. Go through the student athletics code of conduct. Through varsity council, I've been trying to tell people what code of conduct stand for. Will be working on what we can do to make sure it's reiterated. Following events of last year, I chaired committee that discussed a full review of code of conduct that was submitted to McGill and McGill athletics. That is at the office right now well making sure that that's asked. And then quickly best buddies McGill is a group in which tries to provide opportunity for individual with mental disabilities get them out and more engaged in community one of the things they approached was enjoying selves at varsity events so they're hosted by different teams, as close to sidelines as possible . meet players after game and such.

President Ayukawa: not sure if you welcomed to council so welcome!

Councillor Baraldi: in the consent campaign planning meetings up to this week, rep on athletics has been so, so helpful.

c. Councillor Klitovchenko

Reads report.

VP Bradley: as someone who values exceptionally clean teeth, amazing service.

Councillor Ibrahim: I heard talk of the dentistry moving to Sherbrooke?

Councillor Klitovchenko: Facility issue. The building for dentistry was divided with medicine. So students would spend second half of second year in pre clinical lab. Then moved to general hospital. Given new super hospital, contract between general and dentistry ended. We're at new location already. Idea was to get all 4 years of dentistry in place so we wouldn't have to move again. Strathcona lab less used now.

12) Reports by Committees

a. Interest Group Committee

Motion to adopt by Benrimoh



**Seconded by Councillor Ibrahim
Adopted.**

b. Nominating Committee

President Ayukawa: met at 9am, we reviewed the applicants for speaker and this is something we had to do for bylaws. There are people who already started working and this is something that bylaw committee is already working on. Ratify hiring that was done earlier.

Motion to approve by Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy

Seconded by Councillor Ibrahim

Approved.

c. Executive Committee

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy: students position for bylaw review?

President Ayukawa: something that's come up a lot. We need a lot more help than committee made up of councillor, massive tasks; I wish I could do that myself. I wanted to talk to executive committee about hiring part time staff member to draft new bylaws to fit current situation of what SSMU does. Bring SSMU proposals to bylaw review committee and discuss these ideas to council.

Motion to approve by Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy

Seconded by Councillor Ibrahim

Approved.

13) Reports by Executives

a. VP University Affairs

Councillor Benrimoh: question about mental health. No issue with the screening stuff, what happened with working with website people on adding in wellness stuff talked about in policy?

VP Stewart Kanigan: working really hard that these priorities are listed in website. Pushed aside recently because website steering committee with no student rep on it something we brought up so we only actually attended one meeting so far. Trying for a long time to try and be on board. Trying to get a clearer answer on that. They have yet to demonstrate our concerns about our wellness approach. As of right now I don't think were being consulted in partnership.

b. VP Internal

Councillor Conrad: are you selling a set amount both Wednesday and Thursday? Pizzadimondo is awesome!

Councillor Chaim: half tickets each day. Huge problem was last year that we sold out. Fair opportunity this year. If you can't make it, ask someone to go for you.



Councillor Ibrahim: thanks for report. Feel uncomfortable knowing that not everyone is aware of this fact, what efforts have been made about gender line abolishments?

Councillor Chaim: defer to Lola

Councillor Baraldi: Wallace was receptive but argument was that it might interfere the way that security usually goes about their job. The main concern on choosing their security guard. Male security guard might not feel comfortable and that opens up to liability (inebriation). Conscious choice, but still interferes with the way that they're used to doing their jobs.

Councillor Chaim: unfortunately don't want to put security guards in a tough position.

VP Stewart Kanigan: I didn't know this was the conclusion, very disappointed in this outcome. It is not upholding equity policy to force binary gender. Not a common practice. Airport either. Standard that we have and comfort level that we have, it's not acceptable. Unacceptable.

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy: Transgender would have to experience dysphoria, problematic staring at safe space, if security is not amenable what alternative are you going to use?

Councillor Baraldi: I brought this up during meeting we're asking people when they come to 4floors to respect safe space. Met by same reservations. If this is a concern, I highly encourage support from councillor; we could try to arrange another meeting with security. I don't know how to arrange this again.

Councillor Chaim: I'm uncomfortable going over Wallace's head to not do his job. It's not to say we didn't try, but this is a safety concern.

Motion to add a discussion about 4floor security guard.

Speaker: amenable after president's report.

c. VP External Affairs

Councillor Baraldi: now that the motion has passed, what are the next steps with eco?

Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette: really excited about this, we will be having an action on November 13th that I will start advertising. A number of other student associations will be voting on it, November 9th = roundtable. We will be discussing action plans in Montreal.

Councillor Chin: AGSEM you drive, if it is no longer an avenue communication what's the plan?

Councillor Moustaquim-Barrette: cannot distribute info about unionization at work is policy, McGill says we can't email. Loose interpretation of the laws. Not sure what to do about this yet, looking into labour laws and whether this upholds. Concerning that McGill is trying to limit our communication. Keep you up to date.

d. VP Clubs and Services

[reads report]



e. VP Finance and Operations

Councillor Weaver: point out en masse opt-outable fee levy would affect services because many are fee levied. People should have a choice to support which they want to

Councillor Conrad: keeping track of where student fees are growing. Over multiple years it's really useful for students to see the new fees, whereas if you changed to one big fee, they wouldn't be able to endorse it much. I like the fact that the students can see where the fees are being added.

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy: **motion to add discussion to next council**

Speaker: in order.

f. President

Councillor Rioux: repeat which committee is looking for someone?

President Ayukawa: ad hoc sustainability committee.

Councillor Conrad: What is AMSERT?

President Ayukawa: social responsibility committee of board of governors like when McGill divested from tobacco it was AMSERT? That did that.

14) Security issues at 4floors.

VP internal: we're going to talk to Wallace this coming Tuesday, I understand that this is a huge problem for you and I cannot guarantee that he is going to change his mind, Les Hotes is outside company and they have a lot of guidelines, I can't guarantee a change of mind.

Councillor Benrimoh: two questions for feasibility: cannot force security farads to do things, if there were security guards that were willing to do it would be able to cover liability? Can we train SSMU people to do pat downs? If not is there anything else that can be done?

Councillor Kpeglo-Hennesy: how would you react to any other employee under your purview that violate bylaws? How apply different standard to different groups? How would you feel if you were not able to enter because you didn't feel safe? Violates equity policy. I don't understand.

VP Stewart Kanigan: division of the lines into gender segregated lines provides another sight of violence against trans people same kind of discussions of comfort and security around trans communities, like trans people in women's locker. If one's security guard's comfort is not worth it. Last thing I want SSMU to be is another sight of violence against trans people.

Councillor Baraldi: remind everyone that we're all on the same side here I'm glad that this conversation is coming up, we'll have a meeting next week, were really going to try to change things. We're all on same side here.

President Ayukawa: we can't train other staff to do work of security agents because certification and insurance. Cannot financially cover liability. I also want to say as exec tasked with HR I'm pretty uncomfortable with discussing work of permanent SSMU employee, lines themselves okay but if this discussion turns into a space where we are in any way questioning permanent staff I'm going to ask to end discussion.



Councillor Ibrahim: if we can't uphold these values as uncomfortable idea is we should maybe outsource to another security. I think if we are paying for service essential to our event, we should branch out. I don't think this is something we can compromise. I really hope if you need support just ask.

Houston: is the issue that we are still separating lines into genders or if we're letting someone determine our gender?

President Ayukawa: I stood at the door helping with costume checking ID I'd notice this, it is something I talked about with VP internal, when I was watching the lines, the people were able to go up and identify themselves, they were told to go to a pat down and it was gendered I did notice people that were dressed in drag for their costume would go up to a security agent that they would not be expected to. The security not pat anyone down. Or tell anyone to go to a different agent.

VP Stewart Kanigan: Regardless of whether we are explicitly telling someone to define their gender, we're still asking them to define either a or b. That's not even to get into all the problems. Even the fact that we're not acknowledging trans. Still imposing. One additional point, this is something that should be covered by equity policy. I don't think it should be an extra point that says we can't have gendered lines. It strikes me as strange that we need to go to that point.

Councillor Dunbar Lavoie: I appreciate everything expressed here. Like to emphasize how important this is. Worked hard to improve SSMU so many good initiatives I would hate for something like this just seems just really unfortunate to damage the good we've done. It seems really bad. I've never had to choose this kind of thing before I don't know why it's a thing.

Councillor Rourke: clarify what is the best solution? Is it to have two separate lines, is it to not have two separate lines at all. What are people proposing?

Councillor Baraldi: we as a council cannot come to a decision.

Councillor Chaim: summary I'm getting is what the best case scenario would be to have two agents one male one female and people choose where to go. From my understanding we can do that if the agents are okay with it. Wallace doesn't think it will work, try to remain constructive.

Councillor Ibrahim: I think there is a better alternative, we should find alternative security if they're not willing to promote SSMU values. Clarify, dividing line, completely out of question or think, all options are bad, what's worse is to allow the security agents to choose.

15) Confidential Session

16) Adjournment

Motion to adjourn by Councillor Ibrahim

Seconded by Councillor El-Sharawy

Meeting adjourned at 12:42am



Students' Society of McGill University

3600 McTavish Street, Suite 1200, Montreal, Quebec H3A 0G3

Rachel Simmons, Chairperson

Lydia Jones, Recording Secretary

APPROVED