



# Legislative Council

January 24th, 2019

## 1. Call to Order:

The Speaker calls the Council to order at 6:12 PM.

## 2. Land Acknowledgement:

The Speaker presents the land acknowledgement.

## 3. Attendance:

Councillors Yang (Education), Jayme (Music) and Milchberg (Science) are absent.

Councillors Sanchez (Arts) arrives at 6:30 PM. Senator Lametti (Senate Caucus) arrives at 6:40 PM. President Mansdoerfer arrives at 7:15 PM. Councillor Scarra (Arts) arrives at 8:58 PM.

Councillors Figuerido (Arts), Scarra (Arts), Karia (Arts), and Speaker Dolmat are excused at 7:05 PM. Councillor Kleiner is excused at 7:58 PM. Councillor Flaherty is excused at 8:32 PM. Councillor Price is excused at 9:08 PM.

Claire McPhee (she/her) is attending as proxy for Councillor Briand (Environment).

**Quorum is obtained at 6:15 PM.**

## 4. Approval of Minutes - APPROVED :

There are no objections to the minutes, therefore they are approved as read.

Councillor Frenette **motions for a two-minute recess to set up the tables**, this is seconded by Councillor Karia, and passes. A two-minute recess follows.



## 5. Adoption of the Agenda - ADOPTED :

Vice President Shapiro asks if a motion to amend the speaking time would be in order, Speaker Dolmat replies that it would be. Vice President Shapiro then **motions to amend the time allotted for the guest speaker to 30 min**, this is seconded by Councillor Frenette. The Speaker rules this motion in order, it passes and the agenda is thus amended.

Senator Buraga **motions to move item 11 h to be immediately after question period**, this is seconded by Councillor Figuerido. The Speaker rules this motion in order, it passes unanimously and the agenda is thus amended.

Vice President Shapiro asks the Speaker if this would be the appropriate time to add late motions to agenda. The Speaker replies that it would be, therefore the Vice President **motions to add the late motion "Donate to Kitabi on behalf of Moroccan's Student Association" at the end of New Business**, and is seconded by Vice President McLaughlin. This motion passes unanimously and the agenda is thus amended.

Councillor Karia **motions to adopt the agenda as read**, this is seconded by Councillor Figuerido. The Speaker rules this motion in order, it passes unanimously and the agenda is therefore adopted as amended.

## 6. Report of the Steering Committee :

The Speaker presents the report of the Steering Committee. There are no questions on this report.

## 7. Guest Speakers

### a. UTILE :

Laurent Levesque, representative from UTILE, and Nancy Neamtan, the former CEO and strategic advisor at le Chantier de l'Économie Sociale, present the UTILE report to the council.



The Speaker notes that the current time is that which was agreed upon prior to the start of Council when those members volunteering at McMUN would be leaving. The Speaker would therefore look favourably upon a short recess to allow for those leaving to do so without disrupting any Questions.

Senator Buraga **motions for a two-minute recess**, this is seconded by Senator Lametti. This motion passes and there is a two-minute recess.

### **Questions:**

Senator Buraga thanks the guests for their presentation and wonders how long the estimated budget that UTILE has allocated would last if the SSMU decided not to pull the trigger right at this moment.

Mr Levesque clarifies that the Senator is asking about how long the price estimates would stand for, which the Senator confirms. Mr Levesque notes that there are two parts to that answer. One, the construction market is pretty volatile right now, and so he would hesitate to commit to a number, especially given that they saw a 30% construction price bump last year. The second part of the answer is that the idea of a fixed investment covers this risk. When UTILE started working on the Concordia Student Union (CSU) project, it was a \$14 million project, and when the construction contract was closed last summer, it had gone up to an \$18 million project, with the CSU adding exactly \$0 to the mix. Levesque notes that this is part of the advantage of giving an outside shell with other financial partners, in that each actor bears the risk collectively, noting that in this case it did not even impact the CSU. He finishes by noting that this part of the work done by UTILE in order to isolate the SSMU from risk.

Vice President McLaughlin asks if the SSMU data is separated from the PGSS data, whether this would impact the trends of where students are living, noting that this will be important especially if the SSMU and the PGSS do not partner on this project in the future.

Mr Levesque replies that he does not have the exact numbers in mind in terms of neighborhoods. PGSS members live in larger apartments, there are more families, and they do have slightly lower rents per person, likely because they are more accustomed to the market and live farther off campus. Generally, they fit more of a standard renter profile, and less the vulnerable students profile.



Mr Levesque also notes that the PGSS seems to feel less of a pressure to act on the housing. They are more concerned about housing student families specifically, rather than the general student population because their students are typically in a less constrained position.

Councillor Callahan inquires about the debt required to finance this project, specifically, what the servicing of that debt would look like in terms of the mortgage, how long it would last and what the long-term impact on the SSMU's overall debt ratio would be.

Mr Levesque replies that the goal of having distinct ownership is also for the building to not be on SSMU's balance sheet. The whole idea is the project would be a distinct legal entity, with governance and board TBD. Levesque notes that this is also a very hypothetical model, but that on the CSU's project the average cost of capital was at around 5%. This was also very aggressively optimized as this included not only the traditional mortgage, but all the other mezzanine loans. These are also much lower interest than standard real estate and housing market loans as they are from solidarity and social investors that have a mission to support non-profits and co-ops.

Mz Neamtan continues, adding that there are all kinds of possibilities that could be explored and inventive ideas to consider. She notes the recent trend around buildings going up have included selling community bonds. Neamtan notes that the first decision is whether the SSMU wants to do the project, after which UTILE would help to leverage the private capital that allows to get it done.

Councillor Hersch, notes that in the presentation, a fee levy was suggested as a way to finance this project, but wonders whether McGill students are going to want to pay for something that they will not be around to see.

Mr Levesque notes that this is definitely something to consider. A long term systemic solution to student housing takes time and is a few years away in any scenario, so this is a question for the council to think about. UTILE's role is to determine whether it is possible, and if so, what some ways to do it would be. But this is a choice impacting future McGill students, as this is not a short-term plan. According to Mr Levesque, the best way to change the face of student housing is to build not for profit, affordable student housing for future generations. He acknowledges that this implies a certain solidarity with future students.



Vice President Shapiro asks if UTILE would be able to share with us any information about whether this question came up at CSU and, if so, how heavily was this considered.

Mr Levesque specifies that the CSU ran not one but two referendums before they decided to go forward with their project, as they were very concerned about the support of the student base. One major difference is that they had already raised 9 or 10 million in fee levies that was just standing by, but the fact remains that the students that voted for those two referendums are not going to live in the building. Even if the money was already raised, it still took about five years before the project was completed.

This was a big part of the CSU's communication material and the discussion material about the first referendum was about the concept of acting on housing at all. The second was then about the actual launch of the project, with both showing historical approval ratings.

Councillor Frenette asks if the presenter can go over the potential partners that could finance this project and what their motivation for financing it would be.

Mr Levesque replies that this scenario is based on a pretty conservative estimate about what the SSMU can expect from those partners. UTILE has only included partners they know that want to finance affordable student housing. There are other huge opportunities like the CMHC's, as federal government, not only has a social finance, but also has a \$40 billion national housing strategy, of which not a single dollar is included in here.

Mr Levesque continues to say the biggest part of the financial scenario is a standard first rank mortgage loan, which UTILE suggests being a trust. Then there is the CSU is contribution, as well as the estimated city of Montreal subsidy that can be expect. UTILE believe this is a very realistic expectation as they have been talking with those responsible for housing within the city government and they are looking for more student housing projects. This is not overly optimistic, as they would be looking at the same amount of money for apartments that the city has already given to the CSU project.

The last two investors that are here are the Chantier de l'Economie Sociale trust fund, which offer patient capital, specifically for non-profits, at very good conditions. Their interest is that they want to support the word done by non-profit projects, for example investing \$5 million



into the CSU's project. Mr Levesque notes that if the SSMU wants letters of interest from an of these actors, they would all be happy to provide them, they were not included today because this is just a suggestion scenario. Once the SSMU has decided they are interested in moving forward with this, perhaps with a specific approach, then UTILE will be happy to actually begin talks with these people. The final actor is the affiliates, the student housing investment funding for affordable student housing. Mr Levesque remarks that he believes they exist only to finance projects like this one, and therefore they are used to financing projects with student unions.

Mz Neamtan continues by remarking on the new trend of impact investing in today's financial world. Investors are looking to do something else besides investing in petrol and arms as they are just not very socially responsible investments in terms of impact. Instead, they look to invest in enterprises that are respecting or are cleaning up the environment. Part of this is also because there is now proof that this is good business sense. There is a huge return on investment and their projects are typically less risky. She notes that the Quebec government has been investing in these kinds of projects for the past 20 years and their portfolio in the social economy has far less losses than most private companies.

This bring an end to Questions for the Guest Speakers

Councillor Sanchez makes a point of order to request that the correct terminology "Milton Parc Community" be used in the minutes as opposed to "McGill Ghetto". This is approved by Speaker Jamal and there are no objections therefore it is implemented.

## **8. Announcements :**

President Mansdoerfer announces that the winter GA is coming up on February 25th in the Frank Dawson Adams auditorium. The President asks Councillors to please advertise it and invite everyone from their councils.

Vice President Esterle announces that from February 1st to February 7th the SSMU will be holding events for national eating disorder awareness week. There is a SSMU eating disorder Facebook page and the VP would appreciate if Councillors could share posts made there with their constituents.



VP Shapiro notes that there will be consultations happening on McGill's sexual violence policy, to be held on February 6th, 7th, 11th, 12th and 13th. They will all be in different locations, the details of which the VP will post in the Facebook group. The reason why there are so many consultations is so as to try and get input from as wide a range as possible. These consultations will happen only after the policy is made available online so that people can review, read and then discuss it. The VP urges Councillors to share it with their constituents and to try and get as many people there as possible.

VP McLaughlin announces that next Tuesday there will be a town hall with the SSMU Executives at 680 Sherbrooke, going from six to eight PM. It will be drop-in style, very casual, with light refreshments and snacks. The VP notes that this will be a good chance to hear what the executives are up to you and to ask any questions they may have a, so it'd be great to see many Councillors there and asks them to share the event with their constituencies as well.

## **9. Question Period :**

### **a. Submission of Questions for the President :**

The previous legislative council passed a motion regarding the joint Board of Directors and Legislative Council special committee on anti-Semitism. One of the motions' key resolutions were to renew the special committee for this academic year. Yet this has not been done. Is there any reason why this has occurred and what are the plans to rectify this? This question was submitted by a Senator Buraga and it was submitted in accordance with the internal regulations before the submission question deadline. Therefore, the SSMU president may not defer answering this question.

President Mansdoerfer thanks the Senator for these good questions but thinks it would be more appropriate for VP Shapiro to answer. Vice President Shapiro notes that there were 10 "be it resolved" clauses including seven action items in the motion. One of those action items was the formation of this committee, and the committee was not formed. The VP acknowledges this was a mistake. The VP would like to reflect on some of the things that we have done in accordance with that resolution. The SSMU have made sure that there is the antisemitism training for all Executives. This was done in consultation with the members of that committee and the person who ran the training was again approved by members of the committee.



The VP also notes that he and the VP Student Life have tried to ensure that the Jewish holidays as well other major religious holidays are input into the calendar. And beyond this, the VP Student Life also worked with Jewish groups to ensure this kind of scheduling error does not reoccur. The SSMU has also adopted the working definition of anti-Semitism outlined by the special committee. The VP notes that he is out of time but will continue answering in the second submission of Question as it is on the same topic.

#### **b. Submission of Questions for the Vice-President (University Affairs) :**

Could the VP please update legislative council on the progress of your responsibilities as applied by the motion regarding the joint Board of Directors and Legislative Council Special Committee on anti-Semitism. This question was submitted by a Senator Buraga and it was submitted in accordance with the internal regulations before the submission question deadline. Therefore, the VP University Affairs may not defer answering this question.

The VP first speaks to the actions that are clearly within the University Affairs Portfolio. There are basically three actions including hiring a researcher, organizing speaking events and getting educational events. All these events are present in the VP's mind and very well may happened. The VP repeats his commitment to forming the committee, noting that it took time to get consultation from the various groups involved. This is still an important initiative, as anti-Semitism has not gone anywhere, therefore this is something that the VP will be continuing to work on.

The VP notes that they did understand from those committee members that the oppressiveness of this issue is no longer as high as it was last year for a variety reasons. And so, they don't plan on meeting as frequently, but that will be working to specify those mandates that we haven't yet built. They are entertaining the possibility of whether it still makes sense to hire that researcher, which seems likely at this time. The VP thanks the Senator for his question and notes that he appreciates him flagging this as this is something that actually has not been taken on yet.

#### **c. General Questions :**

Councillor Frenette asks, given the presentation that the council just had, what steps could be taken this year to prevent this initiative dying off with the change of councils next year.



The SSMU President relies that something that the council could do is bring this to a referendum if they feel that this something they would want to partake. If they make a financial commitment to this, the SSMU will have money is bounded to the project, not necessarily with UTILE though. The SSMU could commit to creating some sort of housing projects and have the money bookmarked for that. Executives would then be kind of forced to use it for this sort of housing project. Another option would be to develop policies or an actual mandate for the Executives for next year to have a few years' timeline in which to do this.

Councillor Hu notes that a few months ago, um, this council had committed itself to translating all documents or at the very least administrative documents into French, and would like an update on this.

The VP Internal replies that the first priority was the Constitution and there is presently a translator working on it. They are presently at section 10 and it is slated to be finished between the middle of February and the beginning of March. After that, they will be tackling the internal regulations and other policies. The Francophone affairs committee is also finally up and running, the first meeting of which is actually tomorrow. Part of this committee's mandate is to improve the SSMU's accessibility to Francophone student, and they will be looking at all the different ways this is successful done now, and how it may be expanded in terms of what needs to be translated or other measures.

The Speaker notes that this exhausts the question period. Councillor Sanchez **motions for a one minute extension to question period**, this is seconded by Senator Lametti and carried. Therefore, there is a one minute extension to question period.

Councillor Sanchez notes that she is unsure who of the executive oversees this, but that a constituent approached them with a concern about the menstrual products hygiene coordinator. There was a motion passed in council in 2016 so that there would be a campaign to ask students where the best place to have these items on campus would be. There was also just a general concern that there were not any of these products available during exam season. The Councillor acknowledges that there was a switch in the person who had the position, so they would just like an update on that.



The SSMU President replies that there was a switch in the role that created issues in December. He also notes that he can get more clarification on this role after talking to the GM tomorrow. The President remarks that he is not super involved in this, in fact none of the Executive are, it's much more administrative. In terms of having the dispensers in different buildings, it is really not in the SSMU's control as much as they would like. A lot of it must go through McGill Facilities as they have to install any dispensers themselves, the SSMU can only install them with buildings that they own. The President notes that he would love to talk to the Councillor more about this after council and can also bring this up to council next time with any updates as well.

This brings an end to Question Period.

**10. Motion Regarding SSMU's Position on Solidarity with the Unis'tot'en Camp and Wet'suwet'en 2019-01-24 - APPROVED:**

Senator Buraga introduces the motion.

**Questions:**

There are no questions for this motion.

Senator Buraga asks to incorporate the amendment submitted to the Dais into the motion. The Speaker asks if it would be a friendly amendment to all those who moved the motion. Councillors Scarra and Karia are not present and therefore the Speaker cannot in good faith accept this amendment as friendly. Senator Buraga will need to move this amendment during voting procedure.

Councillor Sanchez asks if a screenshot of the Councillors accepting the amendment over Facebook Messenger would suffice to accept it as friendly. The Speaker replies that as this could not be transcribed as part of the minutes, this will not be accepted at this time.

**Debate:**



Senator Buraga **moves the amendment he submitted**, this is seconded by VP McLaughlin. There is no debate on this amendment and it is passed unanimously. The motion therefore now reads as amended.

Councillor Flaherty is confused about the fourth “be it resolved” clause, which reads that the SSMU stands in Solidarity with those peoples and in opposition to the pipeline. The councillor is unsure why the opposition to the pipeline needs to be stated, and feels it would be enough to be in opposition to the violation of the UN convention on the treatment of Indigenous Peoples. The Councillor agrees that the RCMP’s actions were immoral and illegal from a UN standpoint, but is unsure how necessary it is to be opposed to the pipeline and the private sector.

Councillor Sanchez think this is a fair point but that another consideration to take into account is the fact that a company that has been trying to create this pipeline engaged in very unethical business practices by only consulting with one group of indigenous leaders rather than both.

VP McLaughlin thinks that if here were to wager a guess and I think most people here would not be opposed to the pipeline. In fact, the VP does not think this motion is really about that. This is a policy on the specific situation with regards to the human rights violations or the UN treaty violations and therefore does not think having the piece on the pipeline is relevant to the motion.

Councillor Frenette remarks that about five to 10% of his constituency is trained and might work in the oil industry. So unfortunately, this puts him in a very tough position as the Engineering representative and will not allow the Councillor to vote in favor of this motion if the pipeline section stays in.

Senator Buraga elaborates on the details about the SSMU’s consent or opposition to the national gas pipeline. The indigenous people in the area oppose the pipeline and the reason it has been approved thus far was because they have gone through the Canadian legal system in the sense of continuing to use the settler colonial law, as in having elected members of that indigenous group. However, in the past, these indigenous group has relied on hereditary leaders who have stated their opposition. This is definitely an ethical and moral conflict of whether we should impose Canadian law and perpetuate this colonial practice or



rather respect the way of life that this indigenous group and their hereditary leaders are putting forward right now. Senator Buraga believes it is really important that their own governance practice be recognized and that the SSMU follows their prerogative to be in opposition to this pipeline.

Councillor Flaherty **moves to amend this motion to strike out the words referring to the SSMU's opposition to the pipeline.** This is seconded by Councillor Frenette.

The Council now enters debate on this amendment:

Councillor Price would like to echo the point made by Councillor Frenette with regards to their constituency. He himself is trained as a chemical engineer and many of their peers are trained in oil and gas. The Councillor understand that it's important to maintain a certain level of ethical and moral standards, but does not think this opportunity should be taken to attack a different problem, when what is specifically occurring are the RCMP violations. Councillor Price is fully in favor of this motion to address that issue, the focus should be on how the council addresses this issue instead of just tackling all of the issues everywhere because that would be interminable. The Councillor points out that the SSMU is in Canada, and there are a lot of indigenous issues to face here.

Senator Buraga remarks that the solidarity with the Unis'tot'en camp and the opposition to the pipeline itself are inextricably linked. The Unis'tot'en camp is directly asking for solidarity and opposition to the pipeline. This motion was specifically worded in this way in order to be more transparent and clear as to what the SSMU is standing in solidarity with. If this part is removed and the SSMU still says that we are standing in solidarity with the Unis'tot'en camp, that does not negate the opposition to the pipeline. Because if the SSMU stands in solidarity with the Unis'tot'en camp, they are going to be standing in opposition to the pipeline. That's just how the SSMU would be showing solidarity with them. If people still wish to vote against this, the Senator wants them to note that it is impossible to hold both of these conflicting positions at the same time. Either the SSMU stands in solidarity with them and opposes the pipeline or it does not stand in solidarity at all.



Councillor Kara completely agrees with Senator Braga and would like to point out that this is not an opposition to all pipelines ever. This is an opposition to this particular pipeline. And based on the information at hand, it seems like the issues are inextricably linked. Therefore, the Councillor does not think it is logically consistent to oppose one side, and not oppose the other.

Councillor Flaherty completely understands the points made but thinks it is a bit simplistic to say that if the SSMU stands in solidarity against the human rights violations, then they also have to oppose this specific pipeline. The Councillor believes that this is overextending the issue, given this became a problem because of the RCMP's treatment, which is obviously very moral. Councillor Flaherty does agree with the points made about the unethical practices, but the truth is that a lot of McGill students will be employed here, especially in the engineering sector. The Councillor thinks that if the SSMU approves this amendment, it would be much more representative of the McGill population, which the SSMU is supposed to do. Given the Councillor does not know that the SSMU can say they are against the pipeline, if that line was taken out, the SSMU would still be saying they are in solidarity with the camp.

Councillor Sanchez wants to clarify that this did not become an issue just because the RCMP became involved. That was just when the media began to pay particular attention to the demands of the indigenous people in that area.

Counselor Callahan can certainly appreciate all of Senator Buraga's points in opposition to the amendment but also thinks the council can all agree that the points that Councillor Frenette and Councillor Price have brought up are very critical. The point of university is employment and if standing in opposition to this is going to affect the employment of their constituencies, the Councillor can certainly appreciate why they would be opposed to the wording of this policy. If this targeted jobs that management students were to seek, Councillor Callahan would be opposed to the policy as it would not represent the opinions of her constituency. The Councillor also notes that this motion is supposed to be related specifically to the events undertaken by the RCMP. While these two events may be linked, the Councillor thinks they should be treated as two separate events.



The SSMU President **motions to move the previous question on the amendment**, seconded by VP McLaughlin. With a  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority, this passes and the amendment will now be voted on directly. The Council votes and this amendment is approved by a single majority, and the motion is therefore amended as proposed.

The council then returns to debate on the main body of the motion.

VP Shapiro would like to state his dissatisfaction with the result of this vote and then would like to actually take the time to reflect on a question he decided not to ask in questions period on this, which was: in principle solidarity should go beyond words. Therefore, what actions or monetary value was the SSMU planning to give and support to this cause. The VP stopped from asking that question as he thought it was framed very clearly within the motion. VP Shapiro appreciates that this motion was drafted in consultation with the SSMU's indigenous affairs commissioner and how it clearly explained again how the SSMU was standing in solidarity in the way the people that they were standing in solidarity with had requested. Therefore, he did not ask the question that he would have asked. The VP would now like members to keep that question in their mind going forward. VP Shapiro adds that he is quite dismayed that the idea of engineers, though he respects them and anyone else in any job field, but that the SSMU decided to put up indigenous peoples against the rights of - The VP is informed by the Speaker that his time has elapsed.

Councillor Bazylykut notes that it has historically been a problem that the SSMU has had very little indigenous involvement in all faculties, especially in nursing. There is an indigenous representative position that has been unfilled for the Councillor's entire time at McGill which is kind of ridiculous. The Councillor argues that the SSMU should not be telling indigenous people what they need. If they feel this is what the SSMU needs to say to stand in solidarity with them, then that's what the SSMU should do. And if the SSMU wants more indigenous involvement in all forms of student government and at McGill in general, then the Councillor feels it's necessary to show that the SSMU will support them and what they need.

Councillor Hobbs echoes the previous sentiments, nothing that it is kind of ridiculous that we ended up passing the amendment as you can't really halfway stand in solidarity with someone. It's either all or nothing. Again, by standing in solidarity with the Unis'tot'en camp and what they want, having worked out the best option with the indigenous affairs



commission, that would be what is best for the camp itself. The Councillor therefore feel like the motion itself is now rather empty and has no meaning or power whatsoever.

The Speaker notes that he is obligated to informed counselors that the recommended period of 10 minutes of debate on this motion has been reached. It is the prerogative of council to continue to debate should they wish to do so, but the Speaker is duty bound to encourage the Council to move to a vote.

Senator Braga would like to bring attention to footnote number five, which is the specific pledge that we would fill as per the second “be it further resolved” clause. As specifically mentioned in clause three “we denounce any attempt by coastal gasoline pipeline, federal government, provincial government or RCMP to interfere in the rights of the Unis’tot’en to occupy, manage or maintain their lands”. If the SSMU is going to show solidarity with this and keep the second “be it further resolved” clause, the SSMU will still be standing in opposition to the pipeline regardless of if the precious amendment had passed or not. Based on the previous comments made by some Councillors who still wish to specifically oppose the pipeline, the Senator suggests they vote this down because if you don't stand in solidarity, it doesn't really mean anything to again, not stand in full solidarity. Senator Buraga asks that Councillors please vote in favour of this motion.

Councillor Price would like to say from the beginning of that he and nearly all the council stand in solidarity with these groups. This isn't to say that the Councillor does not agree with what they want and this isn't to say that he does not think that they have the right to do what they would like with their territory, but rather they don't stand in opposition to the pipeline. There is a distinction between the two. If the pipeline can work in an amicable way between these groups, they're welcome to do what they'd like. If that pipeline does not violate their right to feel as though they are autonomous. But the Councillor reaffirms that there is a distinction from disagree with the pipeline and agreeing with these groups and what they want.

VP McLaughlin notes that the council did not change the motion to say that the SSMU supports the pipeline or not, it was changed to get rid of the mention of the pipeline. The VP affirms that it does not take away from his own stance in solidarity with the camp because it doesn't say that the SSMU actively does not approve of the pipeline, it just makes no mention of it.



Councillor Sanchez begins to speak but yields their time back to the Speaker.

Councillor Flaherty wants to speak to something said prior. The Councillor does not think she would have proposed this amendment if it weren't for the third, “whereas” clause because that does talk about the non-consent of the pipeline and how the SSMU is standing in solidarity with them on that. The Councillor therefore does not think that removing that language completely negates the point of it or it makes it useless to the camp. Councillor Flaherty believes they will still appreciate it because few members of council approve of the actions that have been taking against them. The Councillor notes that the motion still does mention the pipeline and that it was amoral, but that the SSMU would not be representing the McGill population otherwise. Councillor Flaherty will be voting in support as she believes it is really important to get this out quickly to their community while they have a kind of some fire and some media attention.

VP Shapiro notes that as much as they may be disappointed, he is sympathetic to some of the comments made. One thing that still irks him is that this removal of languages lacks the transparency to take away an action that we're clearly doing. Senator Buraga explained again as did Councillor Flaherty, that the SSMU will still be in opposition to the pipeline, just without saying that they are in opposition to the pipeline. The VP does not commend that action, and therefore encourages any counselor who voted in favor of the earlier amendment to recognize that, as Senator Buraga pointed out, either they stand opposed to the whole motion or in fact they were in favor of the original formulation of the motion. VP Shapiro therefore encourages someone to actually try to reword this motion to retain transparency.

Councillor Bazylykut **motions to move the previous question**, and is seconded by Councillor Hersch. The Council votes on whether to move the previous question, and this passes the  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority handily. The Council then votes on this motion as a whole. With 22 for, 2 against and 2 abstentions, this motion is approved.

President Mansdoerfer **proposes a 5-minute recess to allow members to partake in the food provided by Midnight Kitchen**. This is seconded by Councillor Kara. There is then a 5-minute recess.

## 11. Old Business :



There is no Old Business on the Agenda this evening.

**12. New Business :**

**a. Surveys: Athletics, Health and Dental, BOMCOM :**

The Speaker asks member if they have not had a chance to fill in a survey or send them out to your relevant constituencies, then please take the opportunity to do so after council today.

**b. Discussion on UTILE :**

President Mansdoerfer notes that this was a really good presentation. If Councillors have things they would like to discuss today on how to proceed with this he would be open to that, noting that a large block of time has been allotted to this. However, the President notes that they have already talked about this for 50 minutes this evening, remarking that the rest of the discussion on this could be saved for a later date.

Councillor Bazylykut remarks that the prices noted in the presentation were much cheaper than those charged by McGill Residences, and wonders how that is possible. Councillor Abdelhamid has the same question and thus would advise the council to tackle this next time, as there seem to be many questions and discussions to be had before a generative discussion can occur.

VP Shapiro says these prices somewhat depends on what structure is decided on, but also notes that in many ways, residency is more like a full-scale hotel service than this project would be. The VP agrees that if Councillors want to take more time to think about this project it would make sense, and recommends that there be a conversation outside of council meetings, perhaps in a session with Mr Levesque, to try and get answers to the questions Councillors have. To answer Councillor Frenette's question about the goals for now, VP Shapiro would say that Executive team is interested, and that the offer sheet provided by UTILE gives a sense of what project might look like.

Councillor Frenette thanks the VP for the answer, and mentions that a lot of other student unions are members of UTILE and cast votes on what the organization does. This costs a



symbolic \$150 per year and would allow the next VP external to take part in their discussions and thus ensure UTILE caters to the SSMU's needs outside of individual projects.

Senator Buraga wonders if there are any plans by the SSMU Executive to initiate the fee levy this year or whether this would be a question for next year's Executive. VP Shapiro says the Executives are not a monolith, and if a consensus could be obtained regarding moving forward then perhaps, but if not then they would defer to the next Executive. The current Executive's goal is to get there by working with UTILE and would like to facilitate this to make it a reality.

Senator Lametti, in the context of the SSMU possibly becoming the owner and operator of these buildings, would like to see more refined doctrine on what housing should be like and its' role in general. This is not really addressed in the thoughts brought forward in this presentation, and the Senator is not sure if this concept is even compatible with the usual process in Quebec. Senator Lametti would like to see more of an outline of this from the SSMU to say what the students' want and stand for.

Councillor Frenette wonders if it would be possible to make this a capital expense instead of a fee levy, so that it would eventually come back to the SSMU in form of rent in the long term. VP Shapiro replies that it would be possible but would be interesting to understand what the SSMU's strategy is for getting this on the ground and what the ultimate goals are. The VP echoes Senator Lametti's call to get more definition on what the SSMU wants to see from housing. VP Shapiro also believes that the SSMU could put forward a small fee levy in place to get things rolling, they could also ask for McGill to invest in the project, in similar way they ask it to divest from fossil fuels. In short, there are lots of other ways to proceed too and VP Shapiro wants them all to be considered.

Councillor Flaherty agrees this would be a good topic to delve into more completely next time, but was confused about one thing in particular. The presenter talked about the CSU having \$10 million available from previous levies, and the Councillor wonders if the SSMU has anything like that or whether a levy would start building towards that. President Mansdoerfer replies that SSMU has an investment fund of about \$3 million but it's not quite the same. The CSU's money was originally intended to go towards buying a new building, which is why they had so much set aside. They could not build a new building finally so they instead put the



money already collected towards this project. The SSMU does not have anything like this so would need to build towards it from scratch.

Senator Lametti reiterates the need for more clear thought on this, and notes that his main opposition of this is the notion of housing some vulnerable groups while excluding others. The Senator clarifies that these groups are more powerful when they have access to a larger market and building segregated housing will in a way restrict housing options more. Regarding a fee levy, Senator Lametti believes that it is only reasonable to expect current students to be a paying for something in the future if the fee is not a commitment to building a particular building but rather commitment to the SSMU's vision of what fair social housing should look like. The Senator does not really think it is appropriate to be paying for the building if it is not based on anything except just bricks and mortar.

VP Shapiro reiterates that, between now and next council, he would like everyone interested to meet in order to delve into this more seriously. This is in view of having this kind of offline counsel for a bid and then bringing it back to the next council. The VP wants to make sure Councillors understood that there will be opportunities to discuss this as a group. There will be an opportunity to discuss this with Mr Levesque or anyone else invited to have these conversations sooner rather than later.

End of generative discussion.

**c. Motion Regarding Policy Time Length Consistency 2019-01-24 -  
APPROVED:**

President Mansdoerfer reads the motion.

**Questions:**

VP Shapiro wonders if the president knows of any other recent policies that have overwritten other policies or when the last time a policy like this one was passed that changed something that was in another policy.



President Mansdoerfer replies that he is unfamiliar with any, as he has never seen that in his experience with council. This does not mean that it should not have been necessary for making legislative adjustments like this.

There is no Debate on this motion. Therefore, the Council moves to vote on it.

With 21 in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstentions, the motion is carried.

**d. Motion Regarding Changes to the Elections Extended Nomination Timeline  
2019-01-24 - APPROVED :**

President Mansdoerfer reads the motion.

There are no questions, or debate on this motion. Therefore, the Council moves to vote on it.

With 24 in favor, this motion passes unanimously

**e. Notice of Motion Regarding Policy on Effective Committees 2019-01-24 :**

President Mansdoerfer reads the notice of motion.

The Speaker notes that in accordance to the Internal Regulations, there cannot be Questions or Debate on this motion today, as it is a notice of motion. There will instead happen in the next session.

**f. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Committee Terms of Reference  
2019-01-24 (1) - APPROVED :**

Senator Buraga reads the motion.

There are no questions on this motion.

**Debate:**



Senator Buraga moves his amendment to the motion to add to item 1.3, responsibilities, “submit a report to the Legislative Council by March 14th” and to change item 1.7 to reflect this new date as well. The Speaker has had to term this amendment unfriendly as there are movers of this motion who are not present. This is seconded by Senator Lametti.

There is no debate on this amendment. The Council therefore votes on whether to include the amendment. With 23 in favour, none opposed, and one abstaining, this amendment is approved and the motion is thus amended.

There is no debate on the motion as amended. Therefore, the Council moves to vote on it.

With 19 in favor, none opposed, and three abstentions, the motion is carried.

**g. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Committee Terms of Reference  
2019-01-24 (2) - APPROVED :**

Senator Buraga presents the motion.

**Questions:**

Councillor Abdelhamid wonders how this is different from the motion that the SSMU President suggested previously regarding the end of year report for each committee. The SSMU president replies that this motion asks for more of an exit report. There is still a reporting schedule, but this is different. The President clarifies that an exit report would be something kept internally. For example, the mental health committee would make a nice report for their own work to be used by next year's committee.

There is no debate on this motion. Therefore, the Council moves to vote on it.

With 23 in favor, this motion passes unanimously,

**h. Motion to Donate to Kitabi on Behalf of the former McGill Students'  
Moroccan Association 2019-01-24 - APPROVED :**

VP Shapiro presents the motion.



## **Questions:**

Senator Lametti apologizes for being late to council, as this motion was added to the agenda late, but assumes there is some urgency to this addition and would like clarification on what exactly this urgency is.

VP Shapiro would like the record to reflect that this is why he had tagged the Senator in his post in the fb group about this motion. The reasons are threefold, first, because the Executive committee had only voted on this on January 3rd. Second, this is something that former members of the club have been dealing with SSMU with for about half a year. While the VP respects the council and the timeliness they deserve to weigh and consider motions, he stresses that it is also important to respect that such things can get bogged down within the SSMU bureaucracy and to try to make things a little easier on this club as a result. To the VP, adding one more hoop for them to jump through because of deadlines did not seem particularly fair. Finally, this was not something that really fell under any of the Executive portfolios specifically. Therefore, the VP would rather deal with this now as opposed to having it fall by the water because it does not really relate to a particular portfolio and is taking this chance to bring it up while he can.

Senator Lametti asks if the SSMU knows of any reason why this money may have been there for so long?

VP Shapiro notes that this permutation of this club had only existed for about a year. They had raised the total amount through three events and the executive could not agree on anything that made sense with the mandate that they had to donate it. Therefore, they had left for the next Executive to decide. Kitabi has had a surge of popularity recently and a relatively viral Facebook video about their literacy campaigns in Morocco. This meant that some alumni who are associated with the Moroccan Student's Association as former executives of the club had got wind of the video. Recognizing that they had money till sitting in an account, and that this was something that they felt fit their mandate, they discussed it and felt that it made more sense that it be donated to that organization than it did to have it sitting in the account.

## **Debate:**



Senator Lametti remarks that he is sympathetic to the reasons why this is a good motion, but notes that he cannot in good faith be in favor of any motion involving money without having a chance to verify it thoroughly. The Senator reiterates that he only saw this last night and needs more time than that to do his duty as a counselor. Senator Lametti clarifies that his opposition is just about the principle, but that he is sympathetic to the aims, as it is reasonable to give the money for the purpose for which it was raised

The Council moves to vote on this motion. With 21 in favor, one opposed and two abstaining, the motion is carried.

Councillor Bazylykut **motions to suspend the standing rules to move the report from the Nursing representative before the report of the Executive Committee.** This is seconded by Councillor Hobbs. The Speaker notes that this would need a  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority vote in order to pass.

With 23 for, and one opposed, this motion is approved, and the agenda is modified to this effect.

### **13. Reports by Councillors :**

#### **a. Caitlin Bazylykut (Nursing) :**

Councillor Bazylykut reads their report as the Nursing representative.

### **Questions:**

SSMU President asks if Councillor Bazylykut would be interested in moving a motion that will be presented in the next two weeks regarding the health cuts she mentioned. The Councillor emphatically agrees.

The Speaker notes that this is not an appropriate use of question period and asks members to be mindful of that in the future.

### **14. Reports by Committees :**

#### **a. Executive Committee :**

The SSMU President reads the report of the Executive Committee.



## **Questions:**

Senator Buraga has a question about the recent resignations of the campaign coordinators. The Senator understands that this is a really important part of the external portfolio and inquires if the coordinators provided any reasons for their resignation?

The SSMU President defers to VP Shapiro to answer this as he works directly with them. VP Shapiro replies that one of the campaign coordinators was working while on exchange and everyone recognized that this didn't really make sense for them. For the second, this was their last semester and other opportunities arose for them. It also did not make sense for them to be doing this job while not at McGill anymore. There will be some transition in terms of the way things are managed in the external portfolio. The VP notes that this will be visible in the report of the external affairs portfolio, and notes that at least one of the former coordinators is still in the loop in terms of the transition planning, especially regarding rehiring for those positions.

Senator Buraga sees that anti-violence coordinators have been hired, and is wondering when students will be able to avail of the services they provide and whether there will be more effort to advertise that this is now something that the SSMU offers.

President Mansdoerfer replies that they have been officially hired, and that they work directly with the HR manager, Khatera Noor. They are not under any executive but rather with HR. In terms of advertising, that could definitely be something that the Executive discusses with Khatera. The President stresses that these services are available right now and that the SSMU could start advertising it a lot more effectively.

### **15. Reports by Councillors (2) :**

#### **a. Victoria Flaherty (Clubs) :**

Councillor Kara reads the report from their fellow Clubs representative. There are no questions.

#### **b. Imogen Hobbs (Arts/Science) :**

Councillor Hobbs reads their report as Arts and Science representative. There are no



questions.

**c. Bryan Buraga (Senate) :**

Senator Buraga reads their report as Senate Caucus representative. There are no questions.

**d. Kenzy Abdelhamid (Medicine) :**

Councillor Abdelhamid reads their report as Medicine representative.

**Questions:**

VP Esterle remarks that she is only getting space for booking through McGill so if a group isn't a SSMU group, they should not go through as all she is doing is going directly to McGill building directors. If groups want to book space, the VP can provide the emails for them to do so, but by going through her, they are actually just making the process more complicated rather than just sending an email directly. The VP asks if this would that be okay for the Councillor to communicate to the MSS. Abdelhamid responds that it would be.

VP Esterle **moves to suspend the standing rules to add the Club Committee report that was submitted to Steering Committee on time to the Agenda as it does not appear there.** VP Shapiro seconds this motion. The Speaker notes that this will take  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority to pass. The Council moves to vote on this. With 20 for, and one opposed, this does carry. The Speaker asks VP Esterle if they want to have the report added immediately. The VP confirms.

**16. Report by Committee (2) :**

**a. Clubs Committee :**

VP Esterle presents the Clubs Committee report. There are no questions.

The Speaker notes that the report contains a resolution for council. VP Esterle **moves for council to approve these recommendations**, and is seconded by Councillor Kara. There is no Debate.

Therefore, the Council moves to vote on it. With 22 for, 0 opposed, and 1 abstaining, the motion is carried and the recommendations are adopted.

**17. Executive Reports :**

**a. President :**

Pres Mansdoerfer presents his report. There are no questions.



## **b. VP University Affairs :**

VP Shapiro presents his report. There are no questions.

## **c. VP Internal :**

VP McLaughlin presents his report.

### **Questions:**

Senator Buraga is curious about the drug testing kits and inquires whether would it be a good idea to proactively buy these and supply them for events such as Faculty Olympics or other, campus wide, drinking or partying events.

VP McLaughlin replies that this could absolutely be possible, but that there is just no money allocated to it. The VP thinks the ideal thing would be to have a fee levy to be able to fund this, but is unsure if that would actually be a feasible thing. The Executive have not finished their research on this yet and are also on a short timeline because it is coming up so soon. The VP admits that they are not sure exactly what the best way of doing this would be, but is adamant this is what it needs to get done, whether it be just for large events or whether it be any student can come pick up one for, either for free or for a reduced cost. VP McLaughlin thinks the SSMU need to be accessible.

## **d. VP Student Life :**

VP Esterle presents her report.

### **Questions:**

Senator Buraga understands that club sanctions have to also then be approved by executive committee and then legislative council and would like to know more about the timeline for that.

VP Esterle is unsure what the Senator means. Club sanctions are as a result of clubs not fulfilling their requirements, and these are applied within SSMU. If the Executive or Committee notice that a club have not done something, then the sanctions are imposed by either the General Manager, VP finance, or VP Student Life and then they communicate it to the rest of the club's staff. VP Esterle continues that there is no approval for sanctions as they are mostly procedural. If a club does not attend a club workshop, then there's a sanction, if they don't submit an audit or submit it late, there are also consequences. The VP concludes



that there is not really an approval required, because it is a procedural situation based on facts.

**e. VP Finance :**

VP Wang presents his report.

**Questions:**

Senator Buraga wonders, based on the internal regulations mentioned by the vice president at point 10.1, when these sanctions will come to the Executive Committee and then to Legislative Council for approval.

VP Wang replies that they could come up at the next council session if the Senator so desires.

**f. VP External Portfolio :**

VP Shapiro begins the report for the External Portfolio. VP McLaughlin continues the report. President Mansdoerfer concludes the report.

There are no questions for this report.

**18. Confidential Session**

**a. ~~There is confidential business this evening~~**

The Speaker informs councillors that there is documentation missing for this evening's confidential session and therefore it will be removed from the Agenda.

**19. Adjournment at 10:16 PM.**

Senator Lametti **motions to postpone the confidential session to next council and adjourn this meeting.** Councillor Kara seconds. This passes unanimously.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Bryan Buraga, President