



Legislative Council

October 11, 2018

1. Call to Order - 18:06:

The Speaker calls the Council to order at 6:06 PM.

2. Land Acknowledgement:

The Speaker presents the land acknowledgement.

3. Attendance:

The Speaker conducts attendance:

- Councillor Bazylykut (Nursing), Councillor Briand (Environment) and VP Shapiro (University Affairs) are absent.
- Maeve Botham is attending as proxy for Councillor Sanchez (Arts);
- Graham is attending as proxy for Councillor Jayne (Music).
- VP McLaughlin leaves at 10:12 pm.

4. Approval of Minutes:

The Speaker asks if there are any changes or corrections to be made to the minutes. Senator Buraga notes that the minutes refer to \$820,000 being allocated to the Menstrual Products Fund, which is incorrect. The correct amount should be \$20,000. The Speaker asks if there are any other changes or objections to the minutes. None are brought forward, thus the minutes are approved as amended by Senator Buraga.

5. Adoption of the Agenda - ADOPTED:

The Speaker would look favourably on a motion to adopt the agenda. Senator Buraga **motions to adopt the agenda as read** and is seconded by Councillor Karia. The Agenda is **adopted unanimously**.



6. Report of the Steering Committee:

The Speaker reads the report from the Steering Committee and asks if there are any questions from the Council. There are none.

7. Guest Speakers:

a. Lester Asset Management:

Jordan Steiner (he/him), Portfolio Manager at Lester Asset Management, and Ken Lester (he/him), also of Lester Asset Management and Professor at Desautels faculty of Management, report each year to the Council on the history and status of the SSMU's account with their firm.

In late 2006, McGill bought the half of the bookstore owned by the SSMU in order to renovate it into the Armstrong building. This suddenly gave the SSMU an amount of \$1.8 million which was highly unusual, as normally the SSMU made just enough to operate in a self-sustaining manner.

After a search for a company to invest the money with, Lester's firm was chosen, and they have been managing it ever since, with the investment's value now about double of what it was originally. At the time, the SSMU was looking to buy a second hand bookstore at the time, but remained undecided. A few years ago, the firm was finally told it would not happen anytime soon and asked to invest the money instead.

They mention that they are actually very proud of their performance with the SSMU's account, having doubled the amount invested over the last 10 years, which has followed the rule of 72, meaning there has been a 7.2 return each year. Lester notes that while this may not sounds great, the SSMU's account has always been about ⅓ fixed income and current interest rates are quite low so they have been quite "creative" with the bonds and assets selected for the SSMU.

Steiner gives a few details about the firm itself. They are a Montreal-based company founded in 1988 by Lester's father, with Steiner joining after his graduation from McGill in 2011. The firm manages about \$325 million in accounts, which in the asset management world is actually considered a small amount, and they consider themselves a "boutique" firm. They



believe their small size gives them an edge, and they aim to beat the market index with undervalued businesses, that may be overlooked by others and look to invest in them.

While the breakdown of their firm as a whole is about $\frac{2}{3}$ stocks and $\frac{1}{3}$ bonds, Steiner notes that the SSMU's account actually tends to be the opposite. This is due to the conservative mandate they were given by the SSMU originally, which has not changed much since. The goal is still to grow the account slowly over time and therefore they believe this is the strategy they will continue with going forward. Lester notes that part of the original SSMU mandate also included a provision that no investments be made in "sin stocks", i.e. companies or firms that deal in alcohol, drugs, gambling or the oil industry, which has also caused them to be creative in their investments.

Lester then mentions that he is at this meeting partly to say goodbye as he will be retiring at the end of this academic year and will be leaving Steiner in charge of the SSMU's account. He thanks the SSMU for the confidence they have placed in his firm over the years.

Steiner goes on to summarize the numbers referenced in the presentation slides. Lester notes for the council's interest that the SSMU's account was created right before the subprime crisis of 2008. This was a time when they were facing criticism from practically all of their investors and he wants to point out how much the firm appreciated the positive response from the SSMU at that time.

Steiner gives a brief overview of the high-level individual holdings in the account, specifying that the difference this year is the 10% cash stake. Normally the firm would not recommend to run a cash stake that high, but this is being done due to this year's deficit, which will mark the first time in 11 years that the SSMU has needed to dip into this account, which they are quite impressed with.

Steiner returns to the earlier mention of the ethical constraints placed on the SSMU's investment account. They do not have formal guidelines for these normally, but they speak to the new VP Finance every year to check this, but this generally consists of no oil and gas, mining, pipeline, gambling, cigarettes, weapons etc. for any of the SSMU's investments. Then if new options come up, they have a rough understanding of what the SSMU is looking for to be able to assess whether to invest in it or not. Normally, they do not recommend restrictions at all on accounts, but have been surprised how well the SSMU's account has done with the restrictions imposed by the SSMU.



Senator Buraga asks if the SSMU had invested fully into growth what more would have been made in the last ten years. Steiner replies that he would have to run the numbers to be sure, but his best guess is maybe it would have been 2-3% better per year, for a compounded 30% over the 10 years. However, there is a lot of risk doing that, especially at the beginning and with a majority in bonds. Now, 10 years into recovery from 2008, they are conscious of an possible upcoming correction to the market, so now would not be the time to be more aggressive on investments.

Lester then asks if the SSMU has any other capital expenses coming up, ideas in the pipeline for new building, large expenses or the like. Steiner notes that he does speak to Ryan Hughes, the General Manager for the SSMU, so they are informed of new developments. The President replies that the SSMU will reach out to them if ever there is anything like that being considered.

Counsellor Milchberg asks what the exact restrictions are on energy stocks in terms of the range of energy types affected. Steiner replies that the restriction is only on oil or gas stocks, and that utilities are considered to be within the bounds of the ethical restraints.

b. Skills 21:

Alexander Liepins (he/him) is the Skills Development Officer, Teaching and Learning Services for Skills21, and presents the group's report orally. Liepins has been working for Skills 21 in this capacity since November of last year. He begins by asking if any councillors have heard of Skills21 and, if so, to let him know what they have heard or what they know about it so far.

The President says he has heard it concerns entrepreneurial ideas and other related initiatives. Liepins replies that their work does focus on development and creativity, and goes on to emphasize that there are no wrong answers to this general enquiry. Councillor Yang remarks that she has heard it is a learning environment which uses primarily smaller groups.

Liepins says that is really good answer and continues that the key to their model is student learning and development, noting that this why they spend a lot of time on instructor development. They also run the Skillsets graduate development program and have been running Skills21 since September of 2017 to offer workshops for soft skills development for undergraduate students.



Liepins emphasizes that the sessions are free and are organized into five key areas: leadership, citizenship, discovery (risk taking, curiosity, etc), wellbeing and collaboration. What they have done is take a broad range of workshops already being offered on campus, as well as a few new ones, and organized them into these areas. Essentially, they wanted to recognize that learning outside of class is important and they aimed to make that more accessible and available to students, who can choose focus on one skill in particular or work generally on one of the five streams. Liepins notes that participation in these workshops is reflected on a student's co-curricular involvement record.

If students take five courses in one of the streams, Skills21 will recognize that you have achieved various learning goals and will give a special recognition in that stream to reflect it. Like in many student curriculums, there are a variety of courses on offer other than the "mandatory" ones which makes for a more personalized learning experience for each student.

Going forward, they want to integrate reflection more into their training, as learning is more than just showing up somewhere thinking about a principle for an hour and a half and then never again afterwards. Part of Liepins' job is to determine what medium works best for skill retention of this kind and he looks forward to seeing what results this line of research will bring.

Liepins affirms that the councillors know the students they represent far better than he does, having never studied at McGill himself and so encourages them to contact him with any ideas or questions they may have about Skills21 at skills21@mcgill.ca. He also notes that more information about the program can be found at mcgill.ca/skills21, which he claims it a relatively good website by McGill standards.

Councillor Hobbs asks what the typical attendance rate at Skills21 workshops is. Liepins replies that as of September, he has assumed responsibility for two workshops, time management and study skills, about 18 and 12 students have registered for these respectively. The cap is around 30, with the decision of attending or not up to the students, as there is no penalty for not showing up. Liepins notes that some workshops are better attended than others, noting that the Dobson center for entrepreneurship workshops they run have huge numbers, but concedes that this is in part due to the kind of work they do. Rez Project is a major component of student development programming is also very well attended thanks to the scope of the problem. At the program level, they have had over 1000 individual students register since last year for updates and information about the program.



c. Arab Students Network:

Karim Atassi (he/him), the President of the Arab Students Network (ASN), is here to present the ASN's operations and mission to the council in order to argue for their positive response to the motion for a fee levy to support the ASN.

Atassi first clarifies that the name of the ASN may be misleading, but that they regard the Arab world as a resource pool and they pick and choose the things that will be relevant to integrate any student into a group from a secular and non-political perspective. He then reads out the key values and aims of the ASN from the presentation details.

They have teamed up with AIESEC to provide internships in the Arab world for graduating students or others who wish to be involved in this area. Through their website, which is still under development, students will eventually be able to select internship opportunities to apply for, but in the meantime, any interested students can reach out to them on Facebook.

Atassi then states that food is an integral part to the Network and they provide discounts with local businesses for meal prep such as Yuma, to deliver meals on specific dates. This service is aimed at catering to students' needs and the ASN offers a \$20 discount for their members for 5 meals.

Another aspect of the ASN is their program for teaching refugees english, which can be done from the comfort of one's home. This falls under the umbrella of Enactus and participating students will get hours for recognition on MyInvolvement.

Atassi wants to note that the ASN has teamed up with McGill's International Student Services, and helped diversify language options for buddies by coordinating recruitment for the program among their network. Atassi claims this was very successful in helping incoming students integrate into the McGill community.

He then highlights Arablog, which allows students to communicate with the ASN on Facebook in a more interactive and exciting manner than on the ASN official page, which mostly serves as a notification of upcoming events. For example, Arablog shared a story recently about the longest party in the world happening in Beirut, Lebanon, partly to try and combat the traditional stereotypes associated with the Arab world. ASN TV is another initiative of theirs,



Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

Tel: (514) 398-6800 | Fax: (514) 398-7490 | recsec@ssmu.ca

3600 McTavish St., Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories

similar to Arablog but with more interaction with the student body on campus, trying to neutralize the impression students have of the ASN and create a more comfortable ambience around it.

Atassi also points out that in their listerv, they include an emblem that allows for discounts from restaurants and other businesses in the McGill area, and which is not limited to Arab Students.

They also try and bridge the gap between Arab students at McGill and local Arab professionals. For example, Antoine Atallah, the current President of the Liberal party of Quebec, was one of the first contacts they added to their referral portal system. The point of this is to launch career opportunities for students to make connections and communicate with local professionals through a portal on linkedin or the upcoming website.

Atassi then moves on to their Ancestry and Alumni network, noting that the Arab Student Association is their predecessor, a SSMU club founded in 1962, and the club has kept a record of every executive from then on, which allows for easy intergenerational communication between executives.

On the matter of education, the ASN has been working with the SSMU to provide a less formal dialect of arabic as a Mini Course for the Levantine Colloquial more commonly used in casual and business conversation rather than the more formal dialect taught in classes at McGill. The start date for this has been pushed to the Fall 2019 semester.

Additionally, the network acts as a medium for recruitment for arab speaking students, when needed by other mcgill services or clubs, for example tutor roles or buddy pairing for the International Student Services. They also work with faculties and event to input “arab-esque” elements to their programming, like the tea this past Fall at OAP, as a non-alcoholic option for a more diversified option.

As part of their support branch, since they have been upgraded to a service, they want to still acknowledge their institutional heritage, which is the point of awards. Committees and volunteer opportunities also to help promote student involvement as well as more specialized events such as Arab Fest help promote their activities on campus.

In order to finance all these activities and raise their profile among the student body, the ASN is looking to introduce levy fee of \$0.50 to help them provide all these services, which would be voted on by a Referendum Question.



The proxy for Councillor Sanchez is curious about the name of the organization, it is inherently similar to that of the Black Students' Network (BSN), but it appears as though the ASN has a very different mandate and would like Atassi's thoughts on that. He replies that they are aware of this, and remarks that they had difficulty with finding a name for the service so that people would understand it is not limited to Arab students, but felt for the professional aspect they hope to cultivate, the ASN was a better title and had a better ring to it.

Councillor Smit asks what the Network's major revenue streams have been until now in order to make income to sustain the club. Atassi replies that the main revenue so far has been through events, as they wanted to make an impact with their secular mandate, they tried to do so with their events. For example the Levantine Deep House Party hosted last year, with a club scene and volunteer Arab DJs provided them with a huge revenue stream. Other events such as Nas Daily, who is coming soon, is a free event, which means no revenue stream, but mainly events and bake sales have been their way of raising funds, but also notes that a lot of their initiatives do not require funds.

Councillor Milchberg inquires as to whether the levy fee would be opt-outable. Atassi confirms that it would be.

Senator Lametti asks how the \$0.50 fee was calculated. Atassi replies that there is a large excel file dedicated to this, but knew he would not have time for it in this presentation. Essentially, their yearly budgeting costs came out to \$26,000, so \$13,000 per semester, which comes out to \$0.50 per student.

Councillor Figuerido questions whether the apolitical nature of the service is enshrined in its constitution. Atassi promptly replies that it is and that the lack of political bias is very important to them, even the maps they use are those internationally recognized.

Senator Lametti asks whether they have accounted for students opting out of the fee in their budgeting and levy amounts. Atassi clarifies that the actual amount they require is 0.487 per student, which is flexible enough to allow for those people opting out. He also notes that many of their events and initiatives are more networking or volunteer based and therefore would not incur as much cost. Their events and speaker invitations are usually costlier, and therefore they could always decide to charge just enough for these to act as a counterbalance and regulate any disparity in fees



d. Plate Club:

Dezso Lovicsek (he/him/they), the General Coordinator of the Plate Club, is here to inform the council of what the service does and give some details about their Fee Levy Questions, how they plan to use the money and why it is required.

The Plate Club is the SSMU's free dishware rental service, which anyone, either individual or group, can rent plates, cups, bowls, etc. from for free. They do ask for them to pay a deposit at pickup, but it is always returned when items are returned clean and intact. This is a direct approach to waste diversion, it allows for students to run sustainable events, and has saved 10 thousand items from being thrown out last year alone, which is a point of pride for them.

The service also provides a lunch service to complement Midnight Kitchen when the SSMU building is open. Midnight Kitchen does not provide containers for their food and therefore the Plate Club offers students to rent containers in order to be able to eat their lunch. They also have two office hours every week day to allow for people and groups to book and pick-up/drop-off items and every office hour is staffed by at least one volunteer.

Place Club was founded in 2008, but has faced consistent challenges faced as a service since then: office hours have been schedule and groups show up but there is no one there, or emails sit in their inbox unanswered in a timely manner. They aim to use the funds to improve the service to benefit the students, and they would also like to expand and improve too, but given they are struggling to provide at the moment, they will focus on fixing that.

The solution they have arrived at is to have a paid General Coordinator position - and Lovicsek notes that they have tried other approaches before but they haven't really worked. There was an attempt to distribute the work among a larger groups of volunteers, but this was difficult to maintain as you cannot hold a whole group accountable. Another attempt included a list of responsibilities that volunteers could sign up for but this fell victim to much the same issue.

They currently have a smaller number of coordinating positions which works fairly well, but this setup puts a lot of strain and responsibility on those involved. This is also not a sustainable model from year to year, as they want to aim to make service more institutionally sustainable with this position.



This paid coordinator would be responsible for making sure everything in the service runs smoothly, promoting the service and providing a contact for bookings etc, leaving coordinators room to work on initiatives for growth. There would also be a few Volunteer Project Coordinators to complement this General Coordinator, and this hierarchy would be built in to the service's structure. Some examples of the Volunteer coordinator's projects would be organizing an information campaign about municipal composting at home to help expand the mandate and reach of the service.

Lovicsek affirms they have budgeted for a possibility of hiring three of these coordinators per semester, which they believe would help to ensure recognition for each person's work as well as encourage high quality output from each coordinator.

The plate club is therefore looking for a \$0.14 opt-outable fee levy for undergraduate students. This would cover an incremental inventory expansion, including buying new plates and other dishware to meet the demand of the students. Previously, they have been sold out at times during the semester, which is detrimental to other club's sustainability efforts. This fee will complement any losses of material as well, and help them meet the increased demand for the service.

In addition, part of the fund will go to volunteer support, helping to ensure volunteers are recognized for the work they do. It is a fairly thankless job and the club wants to ensure they all feel welcome and appreciated. In addition, they have a fairly high rate of turnover at the moment and Lovicsek says by showing their gratitude more, they hope to decrease this significantly. Lastly, the fee will help cover material and supplies, such as dishwasher detergent and sponges for them to use to maintain their stock.

Councillor Abdelhamid wonders why the Plate Club is looking for this kind of funding instead of applying for the SSMU's club funding. Lovicsek replies that they cannot use club funding for a paid position, and they also would prefer to have a sustainable source of funding every semester, that would not change based on availabilities. The President also clarifies that the Plate Club is actually a SSMU Service, despite the misnomer.

Councillor Hu asks how this position would be filled and how interested persons would apply. Lovicsek answers that the job description creation is finished and is currently being reviewed by the SSMU's HR. The current restrictions are that the person hired has to be a McGill student and have been a Plate Club volunteer for at least 2 semesters, and if there are no



candidates with those credentials, they will need some experience with another environmental service at least.

Councillor Constantin notes that as they have tried outlining different responsibilities in past, have they tried re-structuring leadership team to have a position dedicated to holding people accountable. Lovicsek answers that yes, there has been a position specifically to hold people accountable, but a lot of work ended up falling to that individual, resulting in a lot of coordinating work being done by one person.

Senator Buraga asks what has been the source of revenue for plate club in the past, and have they looked at the Sustainability Projects Fund. Lovicsek replies that in the recent past, they have not spent money but also have not made any either. They have a stock of plates, their service is free, but there is a fee for any late items as well as any items that are missing or broken, which has typically come out to \$75 per semester max. The Club started with the Sustainability Projects fund and has been expanded once or twice using it, but the fund can only be used for projects following the outlined SMART plan, and as the position is not time-balanced therefore would they would not be able to apply for the fund.

The President **motions for a three minute recess**, Councillor Scarra seconds this, and it is **PASSED unanimously**.

e. Gendered and Sexual Violence Policy Implementation Coordinator:

Bee Khaleeli (they/them), the SSMU mental health commissioner, is here today to talk about the GSVP and the procedures it seeks to implement.

In Winter 2017, multiple elected officials in the the SSMU stepped down from their positions after being outed as perpetrators of gendered and sexual violence, highlighting the fact that there was nothing in place within the SSMU to adequately deal instances of gendered and sexual violence in a meaningful, pro-survivor way. There were also limited avenues for recourse and limited procedures in place to deal with such issues.

While there was some talk within Community Disclosure Network (CDN) of creating a policy for the SSMU, originally the Executive team last year took this on but faced some criticism for their work due to their overall lack of critical experience. Many also felt it was inappropriate for executives to be working on this policy given this was being drafted as a response to executives perpetuating violence.



Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

Tel: (514) 398-6800 | Fax: (514) 398-7490 | recsec@ssmu.ca

3600 McTavish St., Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories

Consequently, Khaleeli, Caitlin Salvino and Priya Dube were hired to form the SVP project team, an initiative originally funded through SACOMSS, who extended a grant to the SSMU. This team did extensive consultations through January and February, including extensive consultations with members of marginalized communities such as the Indigenous Students' Alliance, BSN, QueerMcGill etc. This team wrote a policy and a report, both of which are available on the SSMU's website.

Broadly, Khaleeli explains, this Policy aims to be as holistic as possible, it aims to establish avenues for prevention, advocacy, response, all in an intersectional pro-survivor way. The procedures are fairly straightforward, there are both informal and formal complaint processes as well as the possibility of accommodations upon making a disclosure, including, most notably, if they were a SSMU employee and they needed some sort of a workplace accommodation.

There are also clear timelines in the policy for both types of complaints. A formal complaint is meant to be investigated and resolved within one month, maximum two months if an external investigator needs to be brought in. For informal, there are interim measures available and these procedures will be administered by two paid coordinators, similarly to the Equity or Mental Health commissioners, and they will be called the Anti-Violence coordinators.

These individuals will be in charge of coordinating training, referring people to relevant support structures, and with conducting investigations, although, if instances where conflicts of interest arise, an external investigator - who has already been identified - will be brought in to resolve the situation. The sanctions for complaints made will be deliberated by a GSVP committee which will be made up of two Board members, two members-at-large and two members of community support organizations.

Khaleeli will now address the Fee Levy, which is part of a separate question that will come up. The policy as it stands requires paid positions to be created, therefore there needs to be a sustainable source of income. The groups has proposed a fee levy of \$0.45 per semester to allow for payment of the coordinators, for honorariums for training and any relevant admin costs. It will also create an Anti-Violence fund which all SSMU members can apply to.

There were some concerns that came with the idea of doing a fee levy as opposed to taking the money out of the SSMU budget. The main arguments for it are that the levy would be a



sustainable source of income and it would circumvent the SSMU's current financial limitations. The concern is that if the fee were not voted on, it is crucial that the SSMU find another way to allocate funds to this internally as the policy cannot be implemented without them.

Khaleeli asks the council to keep this in mind as they reiterate the two questions at hand: first the policy itself and then the matter of the fee levy for the upcoming referendum period. They note that the fee levy is a kind of "in the hands of God," as it could be approved in council and be voted down by the student body at which point the council would have to find another solution, so they emphasize that the main question is the policy itself.

Khaleeli then reads out the procedure for Gendered or Sexual Violence complaints being made from the implementation guide for the policy.

Councillor Pilote asks how much involvement Our Turn has in this policy. Khaleeli responds that yes, actually the former project coordinator for the GSVP, Caitlin Salvino, is also the former chair of the Our Turn national committee so there is definitely a lot of influence from their broader mandate in the development of this policy. The criteria of their scorecard and such has impacted how this has come into being.

Councillor Pilote remarks that Our Turn is mentioned by name multiple times in the report, and so wonders how much involvement they actually have in the implementation of this policy. Khaleeli answers that one of the mandates of the Anti-Violence coordinators is the creation of an Our Turn committee, which more generally would be an advocacy committee that would act as a nexus connecting several groups that are addressing sexual violence on campus. This is the sense in which Our Turn is implicated in the policy's implementation but yes they are referenced within the policy.

Senator Buraga asks for Khaleeli's opinion on whether it would be better for the GSVP funding to come from the SSMU budget or rather through Fee Levy. Khaleeli answers that ethically, they do not think it should be the case that students need to be paying more for their own safety, but they also understand other similar funds are done through levies. They would prefer the SSMU find a way to allocate budget for this internally, however their conversations with the SSMU General Manager and VP Finance have strongly implied that this is not feasible at the moment, but if there was a way for the SSMU to manage to fund this internally, they would be very amenable to that.



Councillor Karia is curious about the timeline and involvement, assuming this policy is passed in some way, the Councillor wonder whether Khaleeli's team prefer to hire coordinators for this year or rather the next. Councillor Karia also asks how can students get involved in implementation of this policy.

Khaleeli answers that if this ends up funded by fee levy, the money would only become available in the Winter Semester, and therefore would only be able to hire the coordinators for around December. If the SSMU was able to find money elsewhere then these coordinators can come in much sooner. As for student involvement, the members at large on the GSVP committee can be a way to get involved, and clubs and services can always ask to receive training in implementing this policy. One of the longer term goals of the policy is to mandate that all clubs, services and ISGs receive training in this matter.

Councillor Frenette mentions that there are talks of similar policies among faculty student societies, and wonder if the GSVP folks have been in touch with any faculty undergraduate societies for joint efforts. Khaleeli wants to note that faculty and departmental associations are housed under McGill policies, but the SSMU is not. Therefore they have been in contact with stakeholders in different faculty associations, but while the contexts are super connected they are not the same.

f. Gender Neutral Language Researcher:

The Speaker notes that the Gender Neutral Language Researcher has prepared their report, but is not able to be here this evening, therefore, at their request, the Social Work counsellor will present it to the council.

Councillor Kleiner reads the report. The Speaker then informs the council that due to there being recommendations in this document, it is required for the council to vote on whether to accept the final recommendation of the GNLR.

Councillor Milchberg asks for clarification on the section of the report regarding picking up cheques. The Councillor would like to know what the current procedure is, how this would change this, and how this change would maintain confidentiality while ensuring legality.

VP Wang answers that the current procedure is to provide the person's legal name listed on their bank account. When a cheque request is processed by the accounting department, it is then filed and given to the VP Finance and GM to sign, given back to accounting for them to



verify and then finally passed to the front desk receptionist who then contacts the person on the cheque to come and pick it up. If they did not request for pickup then it will be mailed directly to the address provided. There is currently no procedure in place for maintaining confidentiality of a person's legal name.

Speaker Jamal remarks that he worked with the GNLR on this in some capacity, and that the proposal being advance is that individuals filling in a cheque request form would be able to request for a different name than their legal name to be on the outside of the envelope. This would allow for confidentiality to be maintained when picking up the cheque or having it mailed.

Councillor Milchberg follows up by asking how do we then confirm that the correct person would be picking up the cheque. VP Wang replies that they would need to provide government Identification.

Councillor Frenette understands that some of the proposed changes have already been implemented but wonders whether any of the recommendations for legislative council have not been implemented yet. The Speaker replies that they have all been implemented so far, apart from the ones for SSMU Staff, so Accounting and HR.

Senator Buraga asks how the Executives plan to implement the recommendations from this report. The President replies that the fee waiver for students who are changing their name was implemented this past summer to allow for students to do so and get a new ID card free of charge. They have communicated this directly to ResLife and other services related to this and are continuing to do so with any groups they think may require this information. The last part of the recommendation regards the Legislative Council which President Mansdoerfer notes they can approve right now for the Steering Committee to review bi-weekly. As for the position of VP Equity, the President believes this is part of a much larger discussion and as such does not want to get into it right now.

Councillor Milchberg asks if government issued ID needs to be provided to pick up the cheque, if a person's preferred name does not match the legal name on their ID, how do we confirm them for the cheque pickup. VP Wang replies believes McGill ID is sufficient for pick up of a cheque, but is not sure as this sort of procedure does not fall to the VP Finance's jurisdiction.



The Council votes of whether to **accept the “Be it Resolved” clause at the end of the report.** 29 members vote for, none against, and there are 2 abstentions, therefore this recommendation is **ADOPTED.**

8. Announcements:

President Mansdoerfer reminds the council that the SSMU General Assembly is to be held on October 29th. There was a motion writing workshop held today that was not well attended, but they will have one tomorrow as well. The President asks for every councillor to invite at least 100 people on Facebook to the General Assembly in order to try and increase turnout.

President Mansdoerfer reminds the council of the resignation of the VP External, Marina Cupido. The President notes that the statement released yesterday was written with the entire executive including VP Cupido, will be working more on how to proceed later this month and will bring a proposal to the next session outlining what they will have decided to do.

Councillor Scarra informs the council that the Arts Undergraduate Society is having a graduate and professional schools fair on November 7th in New Residence Hall Ballroom and asks for councillors to share the event with their constituents.

Senator Buraga announces that the Ad Hoc Fall Reading Week Committee is looking for representatives from all faculties and schools. The Councillor requests that all councillors report back to their faculty or school council for them to send a representative there.

Councillor Qiu notes that the Science Undergraduate Society is also having a graduate studies fair on November 6th at the New Residence Hall ballroom, and that not only science schools will be attending and so encourages others to attend.

The Speaker also reminds the Council that the General Assembly will be held on Monday, October 29th in the New Residence Hall Ballroom. The Speaker will also be hosting an Intro to SSMU Governance 101 session with the McGill Daily on Oct 16th and encourages the Councillors to have any constituents with questions about the SSMU to attend.

9. Question Period:



The Speaker reads a question Submitted to the SSMU President by Senator Buraga: For the benefit of all councillors, could you give a brief overview of the SSMU's conflict of interest policy and how a councillor would declare a conflict of interest?

The President replies that currently, there is no formal conflict of interest policy in the rules of governance, however he hopes that this will be something prioritized by the council and himself this year. At the moment, and the procedure that was used last year, a councillor would recuse themselves from a discussion based on the topic being discussed, but the President stresses this was not a formal policy.

Senator Lametti asks about the Facebook post made on Oct 2nd on the SSMU External Affairs page. About 3 hours before this meeting, this was deleted, and another post was made on the same page, the Senator would like to know in what way did the phrasing of the previous post not reflect the sentiments of the Executive team.

The President replies that the phrasing that they did not agree with were a few of the introductory words regarding the CAQ, a sentence or two of the original post were therefore removed.

Councillor Hu asks why the French version of the SSMU Constitution or the FYC Constitution are not available on the SSMU website. The President replies that both of those currently do not exist in French, but that is something the Executive are working on this year. Traditionally, FYC documents can be added to website if the FYC wants.

Senator Buraga asks if there is a timeline for when the Executive intends to release a French version of all the governance documents. The President replies that there is currently no timeline but that he is open to setting a deadline of the end of the year if a Councillor wishes to make a proposal for this.

Senator Lametti clarifies that the language of the Facebook post was “the CAQ is a racist, xenophobic, and far-right party.” In light of the SSMU President's previous answer, the Senator asks if this means that the current Executive does not consider the CAQ to be a racist, xenophobic, and far-right party. The President replies that they not a far-right party. While there are issues with some of their policies, but the language is stronger than the Executive deemed appropriate.



Councillor Hu asks how will the SSMU Executive try and mend their relationship with the incoming provincial government in light of this post. The President clarifies that while the SSMU work with provincial associations, they do not work directly with the provincial government. The provincial association the SSMU works with will then advocate at the provincial level. Groups like UEQ and AVEQ, who represent larger groups of schools will work with them more closely. The only interaction the President has had with the provincial government was when sitting at an UEQ table with the Minister for Education in August.

Gallery member Charles Lepage (he/him) - Faculty of Arts - remarks that the role of the SSMU External Facebook page, as listed online, is to inform McGill student of what is happening outside of McGill. Given that an elected body of McGill posted this, he asks if the SSMU is ready to apologize for the language of this statement or retract it, as it constitutes disinformation and does not represent the feelings of the entirety of the student population.

The President acknowledges that this is very fair question. He confirms that the original post was not correct, and the final one reflects the Executive's current stance. It was not correct for the original post to have been made, which is why it was retracted.

Conseillère Pilote remarque que si dès le départ l'exécutif n'était pas en accord avec les propos, et d'ailleurs le Délit a aussi mentionné que les propos n'étaient pas endossés par le Président, pourquoi alors est-ce que il a pris une semaine pour que l'exécutif réfute cette proposition. The President replies that the post was made last Tuesday, and the Executive had planned a meeting for the next day to address it, which was when the VP External announced their intention to resign, further complicating the situation. It therefore took the Executive a week to respond, which the President acknowledges should have been done much more quickly.

Senator Lametti **motions to extend Question Period by 10 minutes**, seconded by Senator Buraga - this **PASSES**.

Gallery member Bee Khaleeli (they/them) - U3 Faculty of Arts - asks that given that the SSMU supposedly has a commitment to the principles of equity and is supposed to work to represent the safety and interests of marginalized students, they would like to gain clarification on the SSMU's stance. Given that it has been stated that the SSMU refutes that the CAQ is a far-right party, as a Muslim student and the child of immigrants, they would like to know if the SSMU can clearly acknowledge that the CAQ is a xenophobic or racist party.



The President responds that the Executive's thoughts on the CAQ's policy regarding French-language immigration and religious freedom, they do feel that these stances are xenophobic to some extent. The Executive agreed that the use of far-right to identify the CAQ was too strong a descriptor.

Councillor Figuerido asks that, given that the SSMU is an organization funded by students and has the mandate of representing students, was there any consultation made by the VP External to take into account the political diversity of the campus before making the post. The President replies that from his understanding, the post was made without consulting with other SSMU Executives but does not know if other members of the community were consulted beforehand.

Councillor Hobbs asks if the SSMU heard anything directly from the student body about their perception of the post. The President notes that he does not want to speak for the entire student body, but that his general understanding is that a lot of people were dismayed at the CAQ's victory.

Councillor Hobbs follows-up by asking if the SSMU has received anything directly from the student body itself in the wake of the post. VP McLaughlin mentions that the mock poll taken of the student body prior to the election is probably the best representation of the student body's general feelings regarding this election.

Senator Buraga mentions the delay between the VP External's post and the statement from the Executive. The Senator wonders if the Executive could have mandated the VP External to remove the post at the meeting they held the day after. If there was a discrepancy as to when the VP was to resign, would the rest of the Executives not have the prerogative to take down the post anyways. The President answers that the Executive could have done so but he feels that it was fairer for the person who made the post to be there for that discussion.

Senator Lametti notes that there are 4 new fees being brought to council this session to be approved for referendum questions. The Senator notes that this is a recurring theme every year, that the SSMU continues to increase the accessory fees while the question to increase the base fee failed in referendum in 2016. The Senator gives the example that his own base fee this semester was \$32.49 but had to pay about \$80 for the SSMU-associated accessory fees. This has created many problems for example unused funds being restricted to certain purposes and also core parts of the SSMU mission such as anti-violence and equity are



accessory fees. The Senator asks when will the SSMU end this terrible policy of adding accessory fees and commit to increasing the base fee.

The President thanks the Senator for the great question, and notes that he just had a meeting with the head of accounting at McGill on that exact issue. The President notes that 2 of the fees on the table today, those for the charity and environment funds, are there as they failed to be renewed last year. The President acknowledges that the bigger question is how to group fees and increase the base fee, noting that if the base fee were to increase it would be contingent on removing some of the other fees that currently exist. The President notes that increasing the base fee is much more difficult than running separate fees targeting more specific issues.

Gallery member Robyn Lee (she/her) - U3 Faculty of Arts - going back to the Facebook post and the SSMU's stance on the CAQ, the member notes that it is at least a little bit disheartening that the conversation is mostly about the labelling of the party. The member wishes to clarify the SSMU's recognition that the CAQ has harmful policies which will ultimately have harmful effects on members of the SSMU's student body. The member asks if the SSMU will recognize that the racist aspects of this party's policies will negatively impact members of their student body and whether the SSMU plans to allocate any support resources or other material resources to acknowledge and provide material support to those most affected by these harmful policies.

VP McLaughlin refers to the first part of the question and notes that the post made today on the SSMU External facebook page explicitly calls the CAQ's policy racist and also says that the policies can have real and harmful negative effects on students.

The President answers regarding the second part of the question and says this would involve dedicating time to saying to groups like UEQ and AVEQ at the provincial level what the SSMU's stance is. The External portfolio or another SSMU member would be on that committee in order to advocate for the SSMU's members in that regard.

Gallery member Charles Lepage (he/him) - Faculty of Arts - would like to suggest to the President, considering this body has been elected to represent the students at McGill, the member asks if the President thinks it is in the mandate of the SSMU to take a position on the elections without having done consultations prior.



The President remarks that in terms of consultation, the SSMU did have a mock election poll to get an idea of the student body's views. With regards to the post, the President notes that he does not believe it was fair for it to be made without consultation from the rest of the Executive.

The President **motions to extend Question Period by 5 minutes**, seconded by Senator Lametti - this **PASSES**.

Councillor Figuerido recounts that his family immigrated to Quebec in the 1970s from the dictatorship, where they did not have running water or electricity, so the Councillor appreciates the SSMU calling out the CAQ for what are xenophobic policies. The Councillor asks if there was any apology made for the SSMU External page's "like" of a comment saying "Quebec is full of xenophobic racists," how will this be atoned for, considering McGill is a school in the province of Quebec and that many of our students are from here and this statement is insulting towards all of these students. The Councillor again asks if there has been an apology for this.

The President notes that this was a comment on the original post in question. The President remarks that they have not seen the full context of it and cannot give a formal thought on it at the moment, but invites the Councillor to share the screenshot with him and says he will address it going forward.

Senator Lametti specifies that the 4 new fees he mentioned in his previous question are the 4 new fees, not including the renewals. The Senator notes that the President's previous response stated that it is easier to pass piecemeal fee increases to accessory fees and while that may be true, these are then more difficult to administer as well as being less ethical and transparent. Instead of disguising these slow increases, which if passed today in referendum, would increase 18% of the base fee, the Senator asks when the SSMU will stop disguising these fees and pass a base fee increase to cover basic SSMU functions.

The President apologizes for the confusion earlier with the different fees and notes that he would love for a base fee increase to be on the table for the March referendum. The goal right now is to see how to consolidate those fees and sees the base fee increase as a good opportunity that needs to be worked on.

Senator Buraga asks the Executive why they decided to put up a post 3 hours ago, especially given there is a motion which was slated to discuss the previous post. The Senator notes that



it feels almost undemocratic for all the Councillors to be present here to discuss this and to have this retraction posted preemptively.

The President reiterates that the latest post was contingent on the Timeline the Executive was dealt this week, especially with the resignation this past Wednesday. They had the post ready the day after but did not want to post it until they were able to confirm and announce the resignation. The President notes that he still hopes to discuss the motion and see whether there are parts of it that can be maintained.

Sénateur Lametti demande pourquoi l'Exécutif a décidé de retirer la publication plutôt que de la rétracter. The President answers that there was no intent from the Executive to do one rather than the other. They did not put extensive thought into the difference between the two, rather they did what seemed to them to be correct.

10. Old Business:

a. Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations 2018-09-27 - APPROVED Unanimously:

The Speaker notes that this was delivered as a notice of motion at the previous meeting and as such all councillors have sufficient notice to have read the motion. This motion was in fact read at the last meeting therefore it will not be read again. There was also a Question Period on this motion at the last meeting, when there should not have been and therefore the Speaker will allow a Question Period at this meeting.

The Speaker asks if there are any questions on this motion. There are none so the Speaker moved to debate on this motion. There is no debate therefore the Councillors vote on this motion by Google Forms.

There are 24 votes for, none opposed and 4 abstentions - **APPROVED Unanimously.**

b. Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations on Strike General Assemblies 2018-09-27 - FAILED:

Question Period:

Senator Lametti asks the movers of this motion in relation to the clause that would exempt certain faculties from taking part in a Strike and whether this has anything to do with a recent



decision from students at the UQAM faculty of Education to give a strike mandate regarding unpaid internships. Senator Buraga replies that this clause exempts the faculties of of Medicine, Nursing and Dentistry due to their medical nature and the goal is not to jeopardize the safety and health of people. This motion in no way prohibits individual departments or faculties from proceeding with their own strike actions, rather it sets guidelines for the SSMU itself.

Councillor Callahan points out that some students pay their own tuition, and asks whether not allowing them to go to classes they are paying for is really fair. Senator Buraga replies that there are specific clauses in the Internal Regulations that allow for a student strike, this is just to set a formal framework and regulations to it. The goal is democratize and make more accountable the process of creating strike GAs, whereas in the past it has only taken a vote of 500 people in favour of it to put the Student Body on strike. This increases the amount of regulation and ensures that if the society does decide to go on strike, that it is a plurality of students that wish to do it.

Conseillère Pilote n'est pas certaine d'avoir compris l'ampleur de la question, elle demande une clarification sur si cette question porte seulement sur les votes de grèves de l'AÉUM ou aussi pour les grèves de facultés. Senator Buraga replies that this motion has no bearing on in-school or faculty strike votes, it is really restricted to SSMU strikes.

Senator Lametti asks the movers for clarification on article 9.11.1. Senator Buraga explains that this provides two frameworks in order for a student society strike to proceed to ratification. Either 50% of undergraduate faculties and schools that have representation on Legislative council would have to have a successful strike mandate from their own strike General Assemblies and they would need to together total more than 50% of the SSMU's membership. The second way is if $\frac{2}{3}$ of the SSMU membership votes to enter into a strike action this would also be conditions for ratification.

Senator Buraga **moves to extend the question period by 5 min**, there is no second so this **FAILS**.

Debate:

Councillor Figuerido begins by saying he has read over the motion a few times and understands the need to have a procedure for strikes, but the fact that this can be ratified by 51% of the people who go to the General Assembly of 51% of the faculties, and then ratified



by 51% of 25% of the student body is a really small minority of the student population forcing everyone else to go on strike. The Councillor therefore feels that a small, very vocal and maybe radical group could therefore take control of the entire SSMU body to force through a strike basically banning people from attending class is something he does not support and he notes he will be opposing the motion

Senator Lametti announces he is also voting against this motion. However, the Senator disagrees with Councillor Figuerido and actually thinks the procedure is extremely detailed and would actually ensure that there is broad consensus for a vote for a strike. The Senator's objection is that even with a broad consensus, this procedure and timeline make it too complicated for it to ever actually occur. While the Senator is personally not a big fan of student strikes, if 90% of the students want to strike, it should be achievable relatively quickly and this motion prevents that. The Senator also notes that this motion has many flaws that make it incoherent and therefore it should be re-drafted.

Senator Buraga does not disagree with Councillor Figuerido's point but also notes that the current structure is broken, needs some sort of framework in place as currently, less than 1% of student body voting in favour of a strike would set it upon everyone. The Senator thinks these regulations set a strong standard for the conditions in which the society can go on strike. Senator Buraga also notes that he is open to amendment but urges councillors to vote in favour of the motion in order to ensure that there is at least a stepping stone in place to ensure the SSMU's democracy.

Councillor Frenette informs the council that Engineering is an accredited program and therefore has to have a required minimum number of days of classes. However, this motion makes strikes objectively a lot harder as a whole and therefore the Councillor is in favour of the motion.

Senator Lametti would like to bring a bit of historical perspective to this debate and note that in Quebec it is often individual faculties go on strike and then join together as more and more go from each school vote for the strike. This allows for only one GA or referendum for a strike, and the Senator thinks this sort of approach should be prioritized in the regulations and therefore will be voting against this motion.

Gallery member Christelle Teonsono (she/her), Arts U3, reminds the Council that this is not a motion for whether the SSMU should have strikes but rather on how should the SSMU



navigate strikes. This is important because if this nuance is not understood it will create an environment where being politically active is limited. Strikes are a fundamental right.

Councillor Figuerido agrees that strikes are a fundamental right, but the right to go on strike does not trump the right to an education.

Senator Buraga would like to again explain the rationale on how he came to draft this motion. In his thoughts, when there is a strike, there is a social movement building behind it. If the social movement behind it fails, it is because there was a lack of information dispersion or a lack of social consciousness as to why there should be a strike. Therefore, the obstacles set out in this motion, if surpassed would each be a condition in which the society strike would be successful in order to achieve their goals. A strike is definitely a last resource option for airing any grievances but if there is enough of a social movement to create such a strike, then it is legitimate and therefore it should have a process for being dealt with.

Councillor Karia asks the movers for a short pitch on how they would make this long motion accessible to constituents.

Senator Buraga summarizes that you need to hold a strike General Assembly with 500 members. Once that is done, within two weeks, the SSMU executives and council will work with the faculties and schools to vote on a strike General Assembly within each of the faculties and schools after which they will proceed to the ratification of each of their strike motions. After this, if the $\frac{2}{3}$ threshold is met, the SSMU itself will hold a final ratification vote on whether a strike is feasible, at which point they have the option to back out if need be.

Councillor Hobbs refers to point 9.3.1 which refers to needing only 250 members, which seems like a very small number when a strike would affect the majority of the student body.

Senator Buraga explains that this is the initial motion to bring a General Assembly with a mandate to strike. In the past, if you wanted a regular GA to have a strike motion, only 100 signatures were required. Similarly if you wanted a special GA, the Senator believes it was 150 members. This motion actually increases the threshold to bring a strike motion to a GA so that a small minority of students does not have the power to compel the entire student body to strike.

The Councillors vote on this motion by Google Forms.



There are 5 votes for, 15 against and 7 abstentions - therefore this motion **FAILS**.

11. New Business:

**a. Motion Regarding Adoption of a Gendered and Sexual Violence Policy
2018-10-11 - APPROVED Unanimously:**

The President briefly summarizes the motion.

Question Period:

Gallery member Asa Kohn (he/him), Science U1, notes that the motion's appendix B does not seem to be available to the public. The Speaker notes that it has now been made public.

Senator Buraga inquires about the case in which the fee levy does not pass, what is the SSMU Executives' plan to fund this policy if this occurs.

VP Wang replies that they will re-evaluate budget to accommodate this policy if this occurs. Some other budget items may need to be reduced in size to allow for this, and a new budget will be voted on in the Winter semester.

Debate:

Conseillère Pilote **propose un amendement au point 5.1 pour que la clause soit "sexual and gendered violence coordinator"** afin de mieux refléter le but de la position. Seconded by Senator Lametti, the Speaker notes that this will amend all articles in this policy.

Debate on the Amendment:

Gallery member Robyn Lee (she/her), U3 Arts, the SSMU Equity commissioner, does not see a need to change name as the title reflects the terms of the policy.

Gallery member Bee Khaleeli (they/them), U3 Arts, the SSMU Mental Health commissioner, is amenable to a name change, but this is not it. The GSVP group spent a lot of time worrying about the name and making sure it was simple enough to have people recognize easily. They would be open to changing it to something like GSVP coordinators. They don't think a title of this length is a good move in terms of creating a legible policy, but would also be ok with keeping the name as Anti-Violence coordinator.



Senator Buraga **motions to call the Question on this amendment**, seconded by the SSMU President with 26 for and 1 opposed this **PASSES** and the Question is called.

Voting on the amendment results in 0 votes for, 20 opposed, and 7 abstentions - therefore it **FAILS**.

Senator Lametti **motions to amend the name to GSVP coordinator** to make it more descriptive, this is seconded by Councillor Pilote and would apply to all sections of the policy.

There is no debate on this amendment.

Voting on the amendment results in 9 votes for, 10 against, and 10 abstentions - therefore it **FAILS**.

Senator Buraga thanks those involved in this policy for their hard work, **motion to amend the motion to add a clause directing the VP Finance to find appropriate funding for this policy without resorting to a fee levy**. This is seconded by Councillor Hobbs.

Debate on the Amendment:

VP McLaughlin notes his agreement with the spirit of trying to avoid a fee levy, but it is unsure that liquidating assets to accommodate their budget is a feasible or sustainable solution.

Councillor Scarra wonders if this change would negate the fee levy or rather be a fallback option if the fee levy is not passed by a referendum.

VP Wang agrees with VP McLaughlin. The reason why it is proposed as a fee levy follows the precedent of previous similar policies which are all financed by fee levy to promote financial transparency and allow students to select their fee endorsements more critically rather than lumping them into one large sum.

Councillor Karia remarks that the most important thing for this policy is funding, and agrees that the fee levy is most viable but not most preferable option. The Councillor wants to ensure this policy is funded and asks for the amendment to be reworded for this to be the long term solution for the policy.



Gallery member Khaleeli notes that they would look favourably on the possibility that the SSMU locate money for these positions earlier on in the school year to allow for these coordinators to start working as soon as possible.

Senator Lametti asks about the stance of the dais on the wording of the motion as it seems to be in part worded in the negative and the Senator is unsure whether this follows the rules of procedure properly. The Speaker confers with the Parliamentarian and replies that to the best of their knowledge, there is nothing in the standing rules or Internal Regulations that precludes a motion including wording such as this.

Senator Buraga remarks that if the SSMU finds this to be a priority, they will find the necessary funding for it. The Senator argues that telling students they have to pay more for certain services shows that the SSMU does not prioritize these services. Senator Buraga claims that the SSMU could take \$20,000 from their Capital Expenditure Fund to fund this.

VP Wang notes that the SSMU's HR does not recommend hiring these coordinators earlier as it would not be responsible to hire people they do not have the funds to pay. For Senator Buraga's point, the VP replies that the SSMU would have to cut part of the current budget to accommodate this, and they cannot prioritize this over other portions like Indigenous affairs or sustainability.

Councillor Karia notes that financial viability is an important but longer conversation and this policy is an imminent issue that deserves to pass regardless of the financial discussion. The Councillor would love to know what those responsible for the report think of the amendment and whether they see it as something that helps or hinder the implementation of it.

Gallery member Khaleeli responds that when speaking of fee levy for any service, they have been clear that these should not be extra fees and should be a permanent part of the SSMU's budget. The member also would like to push back on the argument that the SSMU would have to cut other portfolios, noting that the SSMU has money in other pools and that it is disingenuous for members to insinuate otherwise.

The President replies that he is on board with the amendment for the SSMU to make it happen but wants to remind the council of what Lester Asset Management mentioned earlier, that the SSMU has had to take \$300,000 from their Capital Expenditure Fund to cover the deficit alone. The current financial situation does not really allow for this to be executed, but would love for this to be made part of the operational budget going forward and it would



be a poor decision to strike it down now and force the SSMU to find the money. It would be possible, if need be so it is up to the council.

Senator Lametti **motions to Call the Question on this amendment**, seconded by Councillor Figuerido. With 27 for, and 1 against, this is approved and the question is called.

Voting on the amendment results in 4 votes for, 15 against, and 9 abstentions - therefore it **FAILS**.

VP Wang clarifies what seems to be a general concern about funding. The funding cannot come out of operating budget, which has already been approved and voted on by this council. If the purpose for the use of the fund doesn't fall into a previously agreed upon category, then it cannot be used for this.

Conseillère Pilote a une question pour le VP Finance: le budget a-t-il été adopté par le conseil, mais si le budget n'est pas approuvé par l'AG, est-ce qu'il pourrait avoir une révision à ce point-là.

The President replies that the budget is not approved at the GA, which only approves the auditor and the Board of Director nominations, there is no talk of the budget there, as it has been approved by the Legislative Council.

Senator Buraga remarks that he is wholeheartedly in support of this motion, but disagrees with the statements made by the President and VP Finance that the SSMU will not be able to find the money for this nor that the budget has already been approved. If it was a priority for the executive to make sure there was funding for this, then it would be appropriate for them to bring to council an amendment to the budget for the council to approve. Additionally, in order to find an alternate funding source, increasing the base fee at this point in time would be preferable to having a separate one. The Senator believes the onus is on the SSMU executives to find our priorities and ensure this is funded in a way the council wants. Senator Buraga would like the councillors to keep this in mind when discussing how to fund this policy.

The President emphasizes that if this fails by referendum, the SSMU will make this a priority and find a way to fund this policy and also that a \$6,000 investment was made to bring in a Treasurer to do a presentation on the financial portfolio and how it can be improved, but that this is part of a longer, later discussion about restructuring the SSMU's finances.



Councillor Karia agrees that a long term commitment to funding this policy is essential, and while this discussion will take time, the integrity and spirit of this policy in the short term will not be affected, and that there can be a short term solution to act on this policy immediately.

Senator Buraga **moves to adopt this motion by unanimous consent.** The Speaker would look favourably on a 2 minutes recess to consider that motion.

Senator Buraga **motions to recess for 2 minutes**, seconded by the SSMU President and passes - there is a 2 minute recess

Snetor Lametti **moves to suspend the standing rules for the remainder of the session, and for all subsequent votes to be unanimously approved unless motioned by a councillor.**

The Speaker explains that the suspension of the standing rules is not actually necessary and the concern of the Speaker was not whether this is allowable but rather how it would appear on the public vote record which is published after each meeting. After conferring with the Parliamentarian, the Speaker, at their discretion, will make all further votes by unanimous consent. **Senator Lametti withdraws his previous motion.**

The Speaker explains that they will ask if there is any opposition to the motion and if there is no opposition, the motion will be automatically adopted.

The Speaker asks if there is any opposition to this motion. Seeing none, **this motion is APPROVED by Unanimous Consent.**

b. Motion Regarding the Creation of an Anti-Violence Fee Levy 2018-10-11 - APPROVED:

The SSMU President reads the Motion.

Question Period:

Senator Buraga asks why this fee is opt-outable as opposed to not-opt-outable. VP Wang replies that this follows the precedent of other fees levied in the past.

Debate:



Senator Lametti **moves to amend the motion to strike last two be it resolved clauses.**

Seconded by Senator Buraga.

Debate on the Amendment:

VP Wang **motions to amend Appendix A with the breakdown.** The Speaker notes that there cannot be motions to amend the original motion during debate on a different amendment and therefore **this motion is out of order.** The Speaker invites the VP to reintroduce this amendment when the council is back in debate on the main motion.

Councillor Karia agrees with the spirit of amendment, but is concerned in the event that there is no way to find funding, and is concerned that this would mean that this policy and associated positions would not have any finances associated with them at all.

Senator Lametti mentions that this motion will compel the Executive to find the funds for this, either through additional deficit or cuts, and will generate both political pressure and precedent to stop adding additional fees and reconsider a base fee hike.

Senator Buraga agrees with the amendment and brings up the possibility of funding the deficit by using the Capital Expenditure Fund, of which $\frac{2}{3}$ of 1% would be required to fund this policy, without making members pay an extra fee. The Senator would like to see this amendment approve and urges the Executive to look into a base fee increase in order to cover the future expenses of this policy.

Gallery member Christelle Teosono (she/her), U3 Arts, wants clarification from the Speaker on whether this motion needs to be passed tonight or if it can be instead pushed to the next legislative council. The Speaker clarifies that per the timeline set out by Elections SSMU and the deadline from McGill's administration, all fee questions need to be submitted to the Deputy Student Provost by October 15th in order to be on the ballot for the fall referendum. Therefore the motion would need to be passed this evening in order to stand any chance of being on the ballot this fall.

The SSMU President would like to be able to inform councillors more in detail of the deficit that will be incurred this year - which would need to be done in confidential session - so that they may have a more complete understanding of it prior to voting.



VP Wang says it is financially unadvisable to finance an Operating cost this way, as in the current cost suggestion, with an unsustainable source of revenue. The VP clarifies that he says this because the Capital Expenditure Fund is only added to if there is a surplus from the Operating budget. It is not a reliant source of revenue and is only used by Finance as per the Capital Expenditure Fund mandate for Capital Expenditures and therefore covers a deficit in extreme situations only.

Councillor Karia asks if it would be advisable if, given this clear divide, as on one hand the SSMU can't fund this but the other side is that the SSMU is obliged to fund this sustainably, would the council look favourably on a compromise using a fee levy in the short term in the view of transitioning to sustainable support later on, given the constraints mentioned before.

Senator Buraga makes a **point of parliamentary inquiry** as to whether it would be possible to table this motion to move it to the confidential session in order to get actual numbers regarding the deficit. The Speaker answers that as Councillor Scarra has already been recognized for debate, this motion will have to wait until the floor is open again.

Councillor Scarra agrees with Councillor Karia's proposal, given that realistically with timeline for this referendum, the Council does not want to see this motion not passed at all, and therefore, they should choose the solution Councillor Karia proposed. Regarding the confidential session for more financial information, the Councillor states that the council will not be able to determine the financial solution in the course of one confidential session, as this is more complicated than one evening's work. Councillor Scarra ends by asking if there can there be a stipulation for the SSMU Executive to look into an alternative mode to fund this other than a fee levy.

Senator Lametti first declares that the points from the last two councillors are well taken, and that ideally the council would mandate this as a future plan and use a fee levy to fund it in the meantime. Unfortunately, this has been the policy and practice for years now and this policy is something that the SSMU cares about sufficiently to not allow be dropped by the wayside if the council were to mandate for them to find the funds immediately. The Senator believes this is a chance to set a precedent for fees to be included in the budget rather than passed separately. This would be a great rider for the Winter 2019 fee referendum for the Executives to run a great campaign regarding an overall base fee increase.

VP McLaughlin agrees with Councillor Karia, and understands the pressure and change that could be applied with this brought up by Senator Lametti, but worries about the possibility of



it not being implemented at all as a result. The VP would hate to have the policy fall to the wayside as a consequence for attempting to change part of the SSMU structure.

Councillor Figuerido echoes the VPs point, as he does not think that we should hold this policy hostage in order to make a point about the base fee. The council can deal with the base fee when we get to discussing its increase, but this policy is too important. The Councillor believes the amendment should be retracted and that language should be added in line with Councillor Karia's suggestion mandating the SSMU to find a long term solution to this funding issue. Councillor Figuerido also does not want this to go to confidential session as those persons who worked so hard on this policy are members of the gallery and they would not be able to stay for the confidential session.

Senator Buraga makes a **point of parliamentary inquiry** and asks for the Speaker to review the rules on whether a member of the gallery may attend confidential session. The Speaker replies that according to the Internal Regulations, the Council can mandate a member of the gallery or a guest to remain for the confidential session by a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority vote, and after they sign a confidentiality agreement.

The President remarks that a potential solution is to add a new "be it resolved" clause to the motion mandating the Finance Committee to present a proposal to the Council in either February or March on how to restructure this funding and the base fee in the long term. The President also think this would be a good project of a rather underused committee.

Senator Lametti steps in to say that if what the President just said is possible then he would like to retract his amendment. The Speaker declares that is not possible as the amendment has already been moved and seconded and therefore is the property of the floor.

Senator Lametti then **motions to call the Question if there are no further speakers**, but some members indicate they wish to speak and so the **motion is dismissed**.

Senator Buraga argues that with a fee levy, the actual implementation policy will not receive funds until next January, with the proposed amendment, the VP Finance would be mandated to find a funding solution to this policy right away and would cut the amount of time before implementation from 4 months to possibly 1-2. The Senator asks for councillors to keep this in mind and requests them to vote in favour of the amendment. The Senator believes that by voting this in, the Council are not taking money away but rather giving the funding to this policy more quickly.



VP McLaughlin notes that if a fee levy does not pass and the SSMU cannot find the finances this academic year then there will be no means to implement this policy so he will be voting against.

Senator Lametti disagrees with the previous statement from the VP that there would be no funding as the Executive have the power to fund this in the event the fee levy does not pass.

The President concurs that comparable to what is currently being done with other groups, the Executive could figure out how to fund this group for a few months. He would defer to VP Wang on this, but they could reorganize funding priorities in order to do so. The President would still look to scrap this amendment though and instead add language to say that these positions will be paid as soon as is possible and also asking the Finance Committee to restructure the base fee.

VP Wang wonders what part of budget the Councillors expect the Executive to take this funding from, the Operating budget or the Restricted funds.

Councillor Scarra remarks that the question of where to take funds from should not be decided in the span of a council meeting. If it is possible to fund the policy in interim then great, but the fee levy is essential given the financial situation of the SSMU at the moment. The Councillor notes that there also would need to be further consultation regarding the funding.

Senator Lametti **motions to call the Question**. This is seconded by Councillor Scarra.

Gallery member Asa Kohn (he/him), Science U1, makes a **point of order** that was not distinguishable in the room or on the recording. The response from the Speaker is that no that is not required for Procedural matters and that this is a vote on whether to call the vote, not a vote on the amendment and therefore it is procedural.

The Council votes unanimously for the call to the question, which therefore **passes and the question is called**.

The Council then **votes on the amendment**, seeing that there is opposition it goes to a placard vote. There are 3 votes in favour, 16 against, and 7 abstentions, therefore this amendment **FAILS** and is not added to the motion.



The President makes a **point of parliamentary inquiry** as to whether it would make sense to amend this motion to add a “be it resolved” clause calling for the SSMU Finance Committee to present a report on the funding for this policy. The Speaker believes it would not as this motion is specifically for a fee levy rather than for the policy as a whole.

The President makes a second **point of parliamentary inquiry** as to where **would** be more appropriate place for this to be included. The Speaker notes the previously approved policy itself would have been a better option for the inclusion of such a clause.

Sen Buraga **motions to vacate the decision of the chair.**

Councillor Scarra makes a **point of parliamentary inquiry** for clarification on what that entails. The Speaker clarifies that this means the Senator disagrees with the Speaker’s assertion that it would be inappropriate to add this clause to this motion, even though the SSMU President agreed with the Speaker. The basis is that because this motion deals directly with the fee question, adding an additional mandate for the Finance committee would not be appropriate, especially as the full terms of the motion do appear on the ballot.

Sen Lametti makes a **point of order** that no amendment has been submitted and the chair has not made a decision on a submitted amendment and therefore **Senator Buraga’s motion is out of order.**

The President makes a **point of parliamentary inquiry** to ask if a “be it resolved” clause can be added to the VP Finance report to expand the job of the VP Finance to include this or by extension that of the Finance Committee. The Speaker replies that in accordance with point 5.4 of the Internal Regulations of governance, as done with the Gender Neutral Language Researcher’s report, it is possible to add a binding recommendation to a report. The President notes that he will wait till then to add that then.

Councillor Figueroa **moves to call the question**, and this is seconded by Councillor Scarra. The speaker notes we would need a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority to be approved.

VP Wang makes a **point of parliamentary inquiry** and asks if the debate portion was on an amendment that was brought forward previously. The Speaker replies that it was, but the amendment then failed and we are now back in debate on the main motion. VP Wang asks if he would then be able to motion for an amendment to the motion now. The Speaker replies



that according to Internal Regulations, a motion to amend yields to a motion to call the question and therefore it would not be in order.

Councillor Figuerido asks if he can retract his previous motion. The Speaker notes that it was seconded and therefore is now the property of the floor.

Senator Buraga **motions to vacate the decision of the chair**, which the Speaker notes was not the chair's decision but rather an application of the standing rules and therefore needs a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority vote to pass.

Councillor Scarra asks if someone motions to vacate the chair does this remove the previously motion to call the question. The Speaker replies that this motion overturns the decision stated by the chair, so the chair saying that the motion by VP Wang to amend is out of order is what Sen Buraga has asked to overturn and is what councillors would vote on.

VP Wang seconds this motion, and the council votes on it. There are 2 votes for.

Senator Buraga interrupts the vote to **make a point of personal privilege** to ask if the Speaker can again explain what this motion means. The Speaker once more explains that a motion to vacate the decision of the chair requests that a ruling made by the chair be overturned as the person moving the motion believes that the chair erred in the application of the standing rules, Internal Regulations or Robert's rules. Essentially, the Senator believes that the Speaker has made a mistake and he would like it to be overturned.

Voting continues on this motion with 2 votes for, and 25 against, therefore this motion to vacate the decision of the chair **FAILS**.

The Council then votes on the earlier motion moved by Councillor Figuerido to call the Question. There are 25 votes for, and 2 against, therefore this passes and the question is called.

The Council then votes on the motion itself. There is opposition therefore a google forms vote is used. There are 22 votes for, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions and therefore the motion is **APPROVED**.



Senator Buraga notes that he believes there are 27 members in attendance. The Speaker replies that this is true, but that the members were given a 30 second warning before the end of the voting period as was done in the clicker system.

c. Motion Regarding Responsible Representation 2018-10-11 - POSTPONED to 2018-10-18:

Senator Buraga summarizes the motion, noting that it was created in response to the Facebook post by the former VP External and that certain substantive clauses are therefore irrelevant now. The Senator affirms that the meat of the motion is a good step to prevent such situations from occurring in the future. It would allow student representatives the freedom to fulfill their mandate while preventing personal opinions not authorized by executive committee, the leg council or the student body to be posted. This motion was created not to put unnecessary restrictions on people's jobs but to prevent actions of the society that are not commonly approved from being publicly posted.

Senator Lametti makes a **point of order** that given this motion contains a policy as it stands and that according to the Internal Regulations, policies require two readings, this motion should therefore be considered a notice of motion and not a motion.

The Speaker notes that plans require a notice of motion before the motion is brought forward, but policies do not, so this is ok.

Question period:

The SSMU President asks that in the interest of time (it is past 9:30 pm) and given that there is another council scheduled for a week from today's would the movers look favourably on postponing the motion until then.

Debate:

Senator Buraga **moves to postpone this motion to the October 18th council session.** This is seconded by President Mansdoerfer.

Voting on the motion to postpone results in 24 votes for, and 3 opposed. Therefore **this motion is POSTPONED to the October 18th Legislative Council Session.**



**d. Motion Regarding Arab Student Network Fee Referendum Question
2018-10-11 - (APPROVED):**

The VP Finance summarizes the motion and clarifies that the ASN is already an approved SSMU service after having been approved by the legislative council in the Winter 2018 semester, however the corresponding fee levy was not passed in time to finance this service, which is why it is before the council today.

Question period:

Senator Lametti has a question for the President of ASN who is in the gallery, and asks, given there was no time to pass this fee last year, why is there not a detailed estimate of the fee breakdown included in the presentation or referendum question, as the Senator is worried about random round numbers being used rather than giving a detailed budget table.

Gallery member Karim Atassi (he/him), ASN President, replies that the \$0.50 fee is not an estimated number. The Network worked with the previous VP Student Life, Jemark Earle, to get the exact number that would return a surplus of \$0 for the Service, as they cannot be for-profit. This came out to \$0.47 but to account for students who opt-out this was brought up to \$0.50.

Senator Lametti continues to ask if there was a reason why this breakdown was not presented without the council having to ask.

Atassi answers that he assumed that given the 10 minutes he was allocated to present, he thought the council would want to focus more on the breakdown of the service and the initiatives they offer rather than a breakdown of the fee.

Councillor Constantin asks if there will be any new costs this year that this money will be used to cover, or will it simply be a continuation of previous services offered by the ASN.

Atassi replies that the SSMU has approved a \$5,000 deficit for the service for the Fall semester, as there was not enough time to get a fee approved last semester. As such, the number of events has been reduced for this year only to allow the Winter 2019 levy fee to cover the events and activities of both semesters.

There is no debate on this motion.



In voting on this motion, there is no opposition and therefore **this motion is ADOPTED Unanimously.**

e. Motion Regarding Plate Club Fee Referendum Question 2018-10-11 - APPROVED:

VP Wang summarizes the clauses of the motion and also notes that this is a one-year fee rather than the typical five-year fee as the club understands that sometimes services tend to be over-budgeted and this one-year period will allow for a pilot to be run to see if fee is enough to cover expenses and whether the idea proposed is viable.

Question period:

Councillor Figuerido asks if any measures or restructuring efforts have been taken to resolve the problems mentioned in the presentation, whether these have been successful and, if not, whether the club believes this funding will allow them to solve them going forward.

Gallery member Dezso Lovicsek (he/him/they), the General Coordinator of the Plate Club, answers that some of those problems have been dealt with, through this representative and others putting in an inordinate amount of time and effort, but the executive of the service feel that this is not a long-term sustainable solution, and that this paid position will work better to offer the level of service expected of the Plate Club. It is still a little early to say regarding turnover, but they have been enjoying many more volunteers this semester thanks to aggressive fall recruitment.

Senator Lametti notes that this motion was made available to the council on Tuesday late in the evening, with edits coming as late as this morning. The Senator is concerned about the late entry of this motion especially given it is a fee based question. The Speaker notes that the Senator is correct and that the motion was received after the Steering Committee had met.

VP Wang counters that it took a lot of time to create this fee referendum and acknowledges it was submitted late. The VP explains it was an issue of timing with working with the Plate Club while balancing the VP's own work with the Bank Transition.

The President agrees it should have been done earlier this weekend along with the rest of the motions but that is unfortunately how it ended up.



VP Wang comes back to Senator Lametti's question, apologizes for the delay and states that there is really no excuse for the lateness of the motion.

Debate:

Senator Buraga **moves to amend to add a “be it resolved” clause to ensure that appendix A is included on the Referendum Ballot** to ensure accountability and transparency for all clubs and services. This is seconded by the SSMU President.

Debate on the amendment:

Gallery member Asa Kohn (he/him), Science U1, makes a **point of order** noting that the numbers on the website and in the document in front of the council do not match, and asks for a clarification as to whether the fee is \$0.20 or \$0.14. Gallery member Lovicsek clarifies that the actual fee being decided is \$0.14. The budgeting process can be found in the spreadsheet in Appendix A but the amount being levied for is \$0.14.

Gallery member Kohn asks whether the motion on the SSMU website has any other disparities from that being displayed apart from the fee amount.

Councillor Constantin disagrees with the proposal to pay executives in order to improve the accountability of the service's members. There are several other services who currently operate with office hours and who do not pay their executives. While the Councillor understands that the Plate Club does not currently have a stable source of funding, she does not believe a \$0.14 opt-outable fee is the right solution, especially given the various surpluses that exist among other services. Councillor Constantin also believes that a redistribution fee would be more appropriate but that this is a discussion that would need to happen with appropriate parties before going forward.

Senator Lametti asks for clarification as to whether we are currently debating the amendment or the motion itself. The Speaker answers that the amendment is what is currently being discussed.

VP Wang asks if there can be an amendment made to the Appendix that will be amended. The Speaker clarifies that the current discussion is whether to amend the motion so as to include



the appendix and not the appendix itself, and therefore this would be out of order at this time.

Gallery member Lovicsek wants to emphasize that Appendix A has very valuable information and should therefore be distributed to all the voters.

In voting on this amendment, there is no opposition and it therefore **passes unanimously and the amendment is included in the motion.**

VP Wang **motions to amend appendix A to say “Estimated breakdown of Fee Revenue”**. This is Seconded by Senator Buraga.

There is no Debate on this amendment. In voting on this amendment, there is no opposition and it therefore **passes unanimously and this amendment will be included in the motion.**

Senator Lametti is very sympathetic to the motion however will be opposing it due to the late timeline of submission. This delay is unacceptable and does not allow councillors the appropriate time to research the proposed changes.

In voting on the motion itself, there is opposition, and therefore voting is done using Google forms. There are 14 votes for, 5 opposed, and 7 abstentions, therefore this motion is **APPROVED.**

f. Motion Regarding Charity Fee Referendum Question 2018-10-11 - APPROVED Unanimously:

The motion is summarized by VP Wang.

Question period:

Councillor Lyons notes that there is a small typo in the referendum question, in accordance with the Internal Regulations, this is corrected by the Parliamentarian without further ado.

There is no debate on this motion.

In voting on this motion, there is no opposition, and therefore the motion is **APPROVED unanimously.**



**g. Motion Regarding Environment Fee Referendum Question 2018-10-11 -
APPROVED Unanimously:**

VP Wang summarizes the motion.

There are no questions or debate on this motion.

In voting on this motion, there is no opposition, so the motion is **ADOPTED Unanimously.**

**h. Motion Regarding Renaming of McGill's Men's Varsity Teams 2018-10-11 -
APPROVED:**

The SSMU President notes that this motion is not contingent on the October 15th deadline for fee referendum questions and therefore **motions to postpone this motion to next week's Legislative Council Session (October 18th).**

Conseillère Pilote demande s'il y aura une session de débat sur la motion de remettre la motion principale au prochain conseil. The Speaker replies that yes there can be debate on this motion once it has been seconded.

Debate on the motion to postpone:

Conseillère Pilote pense que ça serait important d'assurer que la conseillère représentante des équipes sportives puisse être présente pour discuter de cette motion étant donné l'aspect clairement sportif de celle-ci.

The Speaker notes that currently, we are debating whether to postpone the motion to the following council session (October 18th), where the Varsity Representative, Councillor Fletcher, will not be present, the session two weeks after that (November 1st) or to continue to debate it tonight. The Speaker wants to highlight the Parliamentarian's concern that if the motion is postponed to the November 1st Council session, that will be the same day as Elections SSMU's deadline for referendum questions and therefore if the Council ends after 8pm, it is likely this question will not be submitted in time to be on the Fall referendum ballot.



Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

Tel: (514) 398-6800 | Fax: (514) 398-7490 | recsec@ssmu.ca

3600 McTavish St., Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories

Councillor Kleiner asks why this motion is being postponed. The SSMU President replies that as this motion was not contingent on the October 15th deadline for fee referendum questions, he thought it might be better to move it to the next week's session.

Councillor Hersh wants to reiterate the point that it is very important for the Athletics Representative to be present for this motion's debate as it directly impacts her constituency.

Councillor Kleiner believes this is an urgent matter as there are indigenous students being affected and harmed by this name and therefore it needs to be voted on today.

The SSMU President **motions to withdraw his motion to postpone**. As it was never seconded, the Speaker notes that the President can rescind it at any time, and so the SSMU President **rescinds the motion to postpone**.

The SSMU President reads out the main motion.

Question period:

Councillor Fletcher asks if the movers can elaborate on the specifics of how the SSMU would work towards renaming the varsity teams.

The President replies that the VP UA could probably answer better but that to his knowledge, there is a committee or subcommittee at the McGill administration level whose purpose is to discuss the renaming of the teams, and it is that level at which the SSMU would be acting. The other possibility is for the SSMU to take this matter to the McGill Senate level and to advocate for it there.

Debate:

Senator Buraga **motions to amend the motion to add a "be it resolved" clause so that the whereas clause is included on the ballot**. This is seconded by President Mansdoerfer, although he expresses a concern about how this will be laid out on the ballot.

Councillor Kleiner points out a typo in the whereas clause which is immediately fixed by the Parliamentarian.

Debate on the Amendment:



Senator Buraga point out that in the interest of explaining to the membership why this referendum is being proposed, as well as the Historical significance behind it, it is important to put this information on the ballot.

In voting on this amendment, there is opposition, therefore the council proceeds by placard vote. With 20 votes for, 2 opposed, and 3 abstaining, this **motion is passed and the amendment is included in the motion.**

Councillor Hu notes that he personally dislikes the name of the Men's Varsity teams, that being said, il s'oppose à cette motion car il est en profond désaccord avec les raisons données et inférées dans le texte. The Historical roots of the team, according to McGill athletics, has "No association to native people." Furthermore, the motion itself mentions that it is the misrepresented history of the name and not the name itself that creates confusion and offense. Le Conseiller déclare que nous avons pas besoin de plus de désinformation. Au contraire, il croit que l'AÉUM devrait mieux informer le public afin d'assurer que le nom de l'équipe n'ait plus de connotation dérogatoire envers les peuples autochtones. Conseiller Hu invite donc les membres du conseil de voter contre cette motion.

Councillor Kleiner remarks that it is not up to the SSMU to say whether Indigenous students are offended by an outright racial slur. The Councillor notes that many of the members of the council are white and many other are not indigenous and therefore the council has a duty to vote to protect the indigenous students at our school.

VP Esterle echoes the sentiments expressed by Councillor Kleiner.

Councillor Scarra completely agrees and also mentions that intention does not equal effect, just because something is not intended a certain way does not mean that it will not offend people.

Councillor Figuerido remarks that he has been torn on this issue in the past and has tried to speak to people of Indigenous origin on why it should or should not be changed, and understands the concerns brought up by Councillor Hu. However, this is really the least we can do to make students feel comfortable and welcome on campus and notes that the name change would not really have a noticeable effect on the teams themselves.



Councillor Fletcher notes that athletes have expressed various opinions on this subject, and that the referendum will allow for these student athletes and all other students at McGill to voice their opinions on it.

VP Esterle believes it is wrong to even consider the SSMU going against a campaign driven by their Indigenous Affairs Commissioner, especially given the SSMU's historical issues with oppressive behaviour. The VP does not believe it is the SSMU's place to be doing that or to go against indigenous voices advocating for this campaign.

Senator Buraga asks the Athletics Representative to explain the feelings of the men's varsity teams with regards to this.

Councillor Fletcher was not able to measure the general feelings of the men's teams and does not want to speak for all when they have not been canvassed, but does know some feel attached and others do not.

In voting on this motion, there is opposition, so the vote proceeds by Google Form. With 22 votes for, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions, this **motion is APPROVED**

**i. Motion Regarding the Creation of a Legal Defence Fund and Fee Levy
2018-10-11 - FAILED:**

The motion is summarized by Senator Buraga.

Question Period:

Councillor Frenette asks if the movers could provide an example of what kind of cases this fund could be used in.

Senator Buraga answers that the student currently facing a lawsuit from their professor would be able to work with a SSMU executive, which was intended to be the VP External, but with the position vacant, this would probably fall to the VP University Affairs. They would go through an application process which would be reviewed by the steering committee to ensure everything is up to speed. From there, the Legislative council would then review the application in either public or closed session depending on the preference of the applicant and decide how to disburse the fee.



Councillor Figuerido asks why this fee is not opt-outable, given there are already so many non opt-outable fees.

Senator Buraga replies that this fee is intended to act as a resource for students facing an injustice where they either have had this injustice brought upon them as a result of their conduct in service to protecting the students or the university. It is intended to work for the society as a whole.

Senator Lametti notes that as this is a fee that will be renewed year after year, he assumes that there must be an ongoing need for legal defense from McGill Students. The Senator asks if the movers can give examples from the past of students who could have benefitted from this funded.

Senator Buraga replies that case he had in mind when drafting this is the ongoing one mentioned prior and, as the Senator has only been at McGill for a little over a year, he cannot go into any prior history. Nevertheless, the Senator is sure that the eligibility criteria set out in this proposal define it in enough terms that it would be protecting McGill students and ensuring that injustices faced by our members are fought back against, with the goal to avoid the financial ruin of the SSMU's members.

Councillor Abdelhamid wonders how it will be determined that something is unjust, especially given that this is the whole point of a legal procedure: that it will determine what is right and wrong.

Senator Buraga answers that it would a decision made by this council, with the criteria and eligibility set out in the motion, which would be added to the Internal Regulations, so it will be a definite policy. At the end of the day, it will be up to legislative council to decide if and application merits fees from this fund.

Conseillère Pilote a des questions concernant l'application de la motion. À quel moment l'application pour les fonds est-elle faite, est-ce que c'est quand un étudiant a l'idée de prendre un recours légal, quand le processus est enclenché, quand l'étudiant reçoit la facture ou bien à la fin complète du recours légal. Également, concernant les détails des dépenses légales, comment cela peut être implémentée étant donné la difficulté d'estimation des dépenses légales, surtout avec les différent niveaux d'appels qui peuvent être en question.



Senator Buraga answers the Councillor's first question and says that if they are currently in a legal proceeding, they can choose to apply then; if a SSMU member is wrongly accused of plagiarism, and want to move it up through the channels before initiating legal action, they can also apply for it at that point. Many people chose not to pursue a legal course of justice at all due to the considerable financial factor. This motion is written in such a way that if students wish to do this, they have the opportunity to apply for funds beforehand to ensure they don't get into financial ruin.

Senator Buraga answers Councillor Pilote's second question by saying that he hopes they would work with the McGill legal information clinic to determine this and to get an estimate of their fees. The Senator is not one hundred percent as to the process of determining them previously. Senator Buraga continues that this motion has been written in such a way as to allow for students to get more money with subsequent applications for the fund if necessary.

Senator Lametti **motions to extend Question Period by 7 minutes**, seconded by Senator Buraga. Voting on this motion to extend yields 18 votes for, and 7 against, therefore this **motion passes and the Question period is extended by 7 minutes.**

Gallery member Asa Kohn (he/him), Science U1, asks if this would be applied to VP UA as opposed to VP External only in certain cases, such as this year. What would happen in other cases.

Senator Buraga answers that he will amend this to clarify in the debate portion.

Councillor Scarra asks for confirmation that the discretion for the usage of this fund would be up to the legislative council.

Senator Buraga replies that the application must first pass a few checkpoints, the main one being the Steering Committee first to check it meets criteria and eligibility portions of the proposed Internal Regulation changes. If it does not meet these, then the application will not be considered.

Councillor Hersh notes that \$3 per student, per semester is a lot of money. The Councillor asks how the movers arrived at this number, and how any potential surplus be attributed.

Senator Buraga answers that, in previous consultation, he was working with the former VP External on this motion and they suggested \$3 was a good starting point. The Senator



notes that he is open to amendments to this fee if members feel this is too high. The reason why this number is on the upper end, representing around \$60,000-70,000 per semester, is that the movers were not exactly aware of what legal expenses for students may go up to, but that in cases like the one being used as an example, if it is successful, these may be quite high. In the future, if it is deemed by this or a future legislative council to have accumulated too much money, by referendum it could always be appropriated somewhere else.

Senator Lametti does not think insurance funds are a matter of opinion, they are a complex assessment of risk and planned disbursement. Therefore, how did the Senator assess the risk of future judicial intimidation by the University and how did the Senator assess the future costs of legal costs of future cases based on that. Senator Lametti finds it highly unlikely that either of these were done at all, let alone correctly, and believes it irresponsible to pull figures like \$3 out of thin air.

Senator Buraga replies that in consultation with the persons previously mentioned, this number was chosen as a starting point to be able to afford legal challenges that would come up in the future. The Senator is not sure how many cases would be disbursed as a result of the fund, noting that it would be a good thing to figure out in the first year of the fee and adjust it accordingly. The current mandate is for 5 years at this price, and if this is too high for members, then he is open to amending it. The Senator concludes by saying that just because he does not have the information, given that it may not be findable at all at this time, that is how the number was chosen.

Councillor Kara wants to return to the non-opt-outable nature of this fee. The Councillor believes the answer given previously as to the historical precedent that would warrant this fee levy to be modelled this way was insufficient. Councillor Kara does not see why there would be sudden rise in the legal battles against McGill students in the near future. Given that there are no previous cases given as examples as to why this should not be opt-outable, this seems to be a value judgement based on the current case and he does not see why the council should be imposing this on students. In the case of future legal battles, the Councillor does not see why the council should be imposing a value judgement on them before they occur.

The Speaker notes that the Councillor did not ask a question. Councillor Kara asks whether the movers agree with his statement.



Senator Buraga agrees that this is a fair point to make. This motion was made with the idea in mind that those who would be applying for it would be incurring these fees in service to the society, therefore the Senator thought it would make sense for it not to be opt-outable. However, if members of the council do want to make it opt-outable, that is something he would be open to in amendments.

Debate:

The SSMU President remarks that he thinks there is a very good intention and thought behind this, but there a lot of reasons why he does not believe it is a good idea to implement right now. First, for the benefit of Council members' knowledge, the group known as StudentCare, which provides Health and Dental insurance for the SSMU, is also looking at providing legal insurance for the membership which could be explored by the council at a later date. This would allow for students to get legal coverage if they need legal aid with issues from landlords or other external issues. This motion currently restricts the use of the collected fees to lawsuits from the McGill admin against students and from students against students. President Mansdoerfer continues to note that Michigan State has an interesting approach whereby they have three full-time lawyers in their Student Centre Building who are usable by student members of the Centre. The President notes that if the approach outline in the motion is the one the council wants to take, that is fine, but expresses concern that this will prevent other options from being considered, especially the insurance option from StudentCare. With regards to the most recent case, the President believes organizing a GoFundMe page or something similar for the individual would make a lot more sense, which was something the former VP External wanted to do.

VP Wang says that while he sympathizes with the spirit of the motion, it is in direct violation of the SSMU's tax obligations given that the society, as a not-for-profit, cannot use its funds to directly benefit an individual or individuals as per the SSMU's auditors. In addition, this is in direct violation of the Internal Regulations of Finance because all funds must be distributed by the Funding Commissioner unless an exception is made.

Councillor Callahan echoes VP Wang by remarking that this motion violates auditing standards, and based on the assumption that there are 26,000 SSMU members, this would amount to \$156,000 a year which is the cost of a downpayment on a home in Vancouver. This would also amount to 7% of each semester's fees which is ridiculous for one single fee. In addition, the Councillor believes it was mentioned earlier that this fund could be used for students facing wrongful accusations of cheating, but the McGill Law Clinic presented at the



last council session and discussed that they represent students in such cases, therefore this motion is not necessary.

Councillor Abdelhamid finds it a little inappropriate that one of the movers of this motion, the VP External, was clearly a huge part of this motion and the fact they are not present to speak for it is not great for the motion they proposed. The Speaker notes that at the time of submission to the Steering Committee, the VP External was still in office and was entitled to all the rights and privilege associated with that office, but also understands the Councillor's concerns. The Speaker also notes that even without the former VP External, there are enough movers for the motion to come to the floor.

Senator Buraga does not necessarily find it was inappropriate at the time of submission, as the VP External was in office at the time. Regarding calls of unconstitutionality, the Senator was not aware that this is against accounting standards or that it was unconstitutional, believed it to be the job of the Steering Committee to determine this. The Senator notes that he sits on the Steering Committee and was under the impression that it was constitutional and that may have been why it was allowed to pass. Senator Buraga would like to see a further legal opinion on it and would ask the VP Finance where those opinions he stated came from. The Senator is aware of a few other non-profits that have a similar setup and therefore thought the model could be transferred to the SSMU.

Councillor Figuerido remarks that the intent of this motion is in the right place, but the issue is that it looking at a problem that is not systemic. This has occurred once, and while it is regrettable that it has, when legislative council or the student body is approached with a legal case, a natural part of how these cases work is that both bodies will be unable to know all the facts. If the council does not know all the facts, then they cannot be trusted to make decisions on where to put the SSMU's money. The Councillor therefore believes this would be best left to the legal system of a GoFundMe if someone feels passionately about a certain case. The majority of the council are not lawyers and do not know all the facts in these cases, therefore they should not be putting a non-opt-outable student fee to this, especially given there are already too many non opt-outable student fees as it stands. The Student body needs to be given flexibility and the proper knowledge going into something that their money will be spent on.

VP Wang notes that, regarding Senator Buraga's previous question, he was informed of this by consultation with the General Manager, however if the Council wants the full breadth of consultation, will need to speak to the SSMU's legal counsel.



Senator Buraga **motions to calls the Question.**

Senator Lametti makes a **point of order** to note that if there is no one else wishing to speak, there is no need to call the question as the vote will be triggered automatically. The Speaker replies that the Senator has the prerogative to make this motion if he so desires and continues to say that the Speaker is not willing to overrule this motion only to have his decision vacated.

The motion is seconded by Councillor Hobbs. In voting on the motion to call the question, there are 26 votes for, and none against so **the motion passes and the question is called.**

In voting on the motion itself, there is opposition, therefore the council will be voting by Google forms. This results in 2 votes for, 22 opposed, and 2 abstentions, therefore **this motion FAILS**

**j. Motion Regarding Approval of Judicial Board Proposed Procedure Changes
2018-10-11 - POSTPONED to 2018-10-18:**

The President **motions to postpone this until the October 18th legislative council meeting.** This is seconded by Councillor Figuerido.

Question Period:

Senator Lametti finds the motion to postpone surprising given that the Judicial Board's new rules of procedure were passed on March 14th and the Board has deferred on approving these for no apparent reason. The Senator would like an answer as to why there has been a six month wait on this and why it is being postponed again.

The Speaker gives a brief explanation arising from the Steering Committee. These changes have already been approved by the Board of Directors, and Legislative Council is just the final formality step. However, the Speaker will defer to the SSMU President for a full answer on this question.

President Mansdoerfer notes that this is a good point. The President was under the impression that the Board of Directors had approved these in April but they in fact had not and this only came to attention in September. These were then brought to the next Board



meeting where they were approved and the desire was to have it go back to council to be formally approved. To postpone the motion therefore makes sense in light of these circumstances.

Debate:

Senator Lametti says that, in all fairness, he does not think this makes any sense, as if this is a mere formality then there should be almost no debate. The Senator accepts to postpone it as he does have questions as to why it took so long and does not believe it is acceptable that, by a simple mistake, one of the constituent bodies of the SSMU had its rules of procedure not immediately approved

Voting on motion to postpone results in 26 votes for, and none against, therefore **this motion is postponed to Oct 18th.**

**k. Motion Regarding the Rights of Canada's Most Vulnerable Children
2018-10-11 - POSTPONED to 2018-10-18:**

President Mansdoerfer **moves to postpone this motion to the October 18th Legislative Council session**, as he has been working directly with the President of this society. If members want to pass around this petition sooner, this conversation can be had now, but it is quite late and so would the President would like to postpone it. This is seconded by Senator Buraga.

Voting on motion to postpone to the October 18th Legislative Council Session results in 26 votes for, and none against, therefore the **motion is postponed to the October 18th Legislative Council Session.**

12. Reports by Committees:

Senator Lametti **moves to adjourn this meeting in accordance with the constitution** and have any remaining matter discussed at the next session instead. The Speaker confirms that the Senator wishes to adjourn while recognizing that there are 3 Committee reports, 6 Councillor reports and 6 Executive reports still remaining. The Senator indicates that this is correct.



VP Wang makes a **point of parliamentary inquiry** asking if the council were to adjourn according to this motion, would all the reports need to be revised in order to be accurate for the new time period which they would represent.

The Speaker answers that yes, all Councillors who had been expected to report this week would have to re-write their reports again. For the Executives, that would mean re-writing their reports and re-submitting them to encapsulate everything that happened in the intervening week between this council and the next. All committees would also be expected to update their reports and all additional councillors and committees expected to report next week would still need to do so.

The Speaker recognizes the Parliamentarian to give clarification on the Executive reports. The Parliamentarian recognizes that the campus media do refer to the Executive reports the day after Council meetings, and therefore the Parliamentarian believes those should still be posted in their current states tomorrow morning.

Councillor Scarra makes a point of parliamentary inquiry regarding the Councillor reports, essentially, would those councillors who were expected to report next week be presenting on top of those postponed from this week's session.

The Speaker clarifies that at the October 18th meeting, the Councillors reporting would be all those currently on the agenda in addition to Councillor Figuerido (Arts), Councillor Fletcher (Athletics), Councillor Hu (FYC), Councillor Cossette (PT/OT), and Councillor Hersch (Dentistry), which would bring the total number of reports to 19.

The SSMU President wants to clarify that there should not be that many motions next week and that it could instead be a mostly report-based council session.

Voting on the motion to adjourn, this **motion is passed unanimously.**

13. Adjournment at 11:11 pm.