



Legislative Council

April 4th, 2019

The regular bi-weekly Legislative Council Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held in Room 603, McConnell Engineering Building, Montreal, on Thursday, April 4, 2019, at 6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order - **7:23 pm**
2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker reads out the land acknowledgment.

3. Attendance

Councillors that are absent are: Councillor Scarra, Fletcher, Price, Frenette, Pilote, Smit, Callaghan, Jayme, Qiu, Lyons, Kleiner, and VP Esterle.

4. Approval of Minutes - **APPROVED**

The Speaker explains that these are the minutes for Legislative Council sessions from March 14, 2019.

The minutes stand approved as distributed.

5. Adoption of the Agenda - **APPROVED**

The Speaker states that there are additions to the agenda including the Motion Regarding Further Action on Affordable Housing, **submitted by the VP University Affairs, seconded by Senator Buraga - PASSES.**

Councillor Flaherty Motions for an amendment to the agenda to include the Motion Regarding Adequate Notice on Mandatory Club Workshops, seconded by Senator Buraga - PASSES.



Senator Lametti Motions for an amendment to the agenda to include the Club Committee reports, seconded by Councillor Flaherty – PASSES.

Senator Buraga **Motions to move the Motion Regarding the Science Representative Seat to immediately after the Recess, Consent Items, seconded by Councillor Karia – PASSES.**

Senator Buraga **Motions to adopt the agenda, seconded by the SSMU President – PASSES.**

6. Report of the Steering Committee **(3)**

The Speaker reads out the report.

Question Period:

Senator Lametti asks if there were a recommendation made at Steering Committee to combine motions, given that some are dependent on others for approval.

The Parliamentarian states that he understands and it is what it is.

Member of the Gallery Asa Kohn (Science, he/him) states that information isn't available on the website and asks if the Speaker can display the agenda on the screen.

7. Guest Speakers **(10)**

- a. C. Colleen Cook (Trenholme Dean of Libraries) and Diane Koen (Senior Director, Planning and Resources) **(10)**

share their research in relation to this and hopefully the astronauts will come afterwards.

Question Period:

The President asks if McGill would be interested in doing a concert for the students for the 200th anniversary. Cadet thinks that this is a great idea, but this is only from a personal view. He wants to be able to create a "McGill Spirit". From a Director perspective, he wants to see how they can highlight the McGill factor in this and believes there is enough time to pull this off.



b. Marie Lemieux (Library Improvement Fund Commissioner), Library Improvement Fund Committee

Question Period:

8. Announcements (5)

The President thanks councillors for their participation. The President also states that the Arts Building was just renamed to “The McCall-MacBain Building” after John McCall-MacBain and a donation made to the University. John McCall-MacBain has written a letter discussing this donation.

Councillor Kara arrives at 7:36 PM.

9. Question Period (5)

Senator Lametti states that there are a few motions that would bring about an emergency referendum for a fee increase, knowing that a referendum for a fee increase failed about a week ago. He asks what the process was for this to be brought forward so rapidly and with no consultation.

Senator Buraga states that there was going to be a special referendum period anyways around the Fall Reading Break question. After consultation with students, and the outgoing and incoming Executives, because there is such a need for financial resources to staff the Society properly, it made sense to run the \$15 fee increase in order to have the bare minimum for this staffing. Senator Buraga states that they believed it was a reasonable compromise, given that 47.5% of students voted in favour of the \$30 increase. There is definitely a want by the student body to have a fee increase, so they believed that \$15 would pass.

Senator Lametti has two questions: first, Senator Lametti asks how 47.5% voting for a fee increase indicates that the student population would like a fee increase. Second, if they referendum had passed by 15% would they also be having a referendum to reduce the amount of the fee increase by the same logic.



The SSMU President responds to the second question, stating that no, noting that the difference between the two fee increases is that they are now drastically reducing the money given to long term projects. With the \$30 fee, \$8-9 was going to go to staffing and now \$8-9 is still going to staffing. This new increase is in recognition that the long term projects aspect isn't as pertinent as the staffing aspect. In response to the first question, the SSMU President states that the 47.5% of students voting in favour doesn't directly indicate that, but it is representative of an appetite for a discussion of a fee increase that isn't as drastic. To pretend that 2.5% of students wouldn't potentially change their opinion given a \$15 difference is incorrect. There is probably an appetite for this and a desire to improve resources that help all aspects of the Society.

Senator Buraga asks the SSMU Executives about the process for the selection of SSMU Awards and who was involved.

The VP Internal states that as is customary, once all applications are received, they go through them and it isn't based on a super objective system, such as a rubric. They look at the application and the criteria for the award. It is very qualitative, but it also based on the application exclusively.

Senator Buraga asks about who specifically participated in the discussions.

The VP Internal states that all Executives were invited, but the VP Student Life and VP University Affairs weren't able to attend the first round of reviewing applications.

Senator Buraga motions to extend the Question Period by two minutes, seconded by the SSMU President – FAILS.

10. Recess, Consent Items (5)

The Speaker explains this item and how people can vote right now to approve motions if they do not believe they are worth a debate. This will take place during a 5 minute recess period.

Senator Lametti makes a point of order, noting that councillors have not been given adequate time to review the two new motions.

The Speaker states that these two motions will not be considered.



The Speaker states that none of the items passed by consent.

11. Motion Regarding the Science Representative Seat 2019-04-04 - **APPROVED**

Senator Buraga moves to suspend the rules to allow a member of the gallery to present the motion ad libitum, seconded by Councillor Kara.

Voting on this motion – FAILS 7-10-0.

Senator Buraga motivates the motion, stating that this motion comes as a result of a member of the gallery coming to the Board of Directors meeting last Saturday regarding the decision made by Council to allow the Science Representative to have perpetual proxies until the remainder of the sessions of Council. The member of the gallery pleaded his case to the Board because at this time, the Judicial Board is not functional. The Board allowed the member of the gallery to present this motion and the member of the gallery has looked into the Constitutional implications of this motion. He has tried to use every procedural tactic to ensure that there is accountability because the SUS Constitution has been broken. By that logic, it is also breaking the SSMU Constitution. Senator Buraga states that he believes this is an oversight of the SSMU, which should be corrected. At this time, it is more a matter of principle than anything, but he thinks it is important that when someone takes the time to correct a wrong, it is important to recognize that we have committed a wrong and fix that as soon as possible. He asks that Council joins him in fixing this wrong in overturning this motion and formally recognizing the position that was formally held by Councillor Milchberg is now vacant.

Question Period:

VP Internal states that it is his understanding that the Councillor was never removed by the appointed body (i.e. the SUS), so in reference to the third whereas clause, he asks how this makes sense.

Senator Buraga states that the Councillor resigned from his position, so he was otherwise removed and no longer hold this position with the SUS.

Councillor Hu asks what happens to the votes made by proxies for the Councillor.



The Speaker states that his interpretation is that there would be no change to the votes cast by SUS Representative Milchberg's proxies. To retroactively remove those votes would be inappropriate. In accordance with Speaker Dolmat's ruling, the votes would stand.

Senator Lametti asks what sort of communication the SSMU received from the SUS to the effect that Councillor Milchberg had been removed, there were mechanisms within the SUS to replace him or there was a new election within the SUS in process.

The VP University Affairs responds that he was unaware of any communication to this effect.

The VP Internal states that the Legislative Council has already resolved not to interfere in the internal affairs of the Science Undergraduate Society or other faculty associations. Given this precedent, the VP Internal asks why they should revert this precedent and interfere in their affairs now.

Senator Buraga responds that in the absence of a Judicial Board that is functioning, it relies on the legislative body to right those wrongs whenever possible. The Senator remains convinced that this is the right thing to do as per the SSMU Constitution. This has more of a direct effect on the SUS Constitution. Based on the obligation of this body to uphold the Constitution, he believes this should be approved.

The VP Internal asks if the SUS has made the decision not to appoint a replacement or call a bi-election, and send proxies, why does this process allow them to send a representative not recognized by the association they represent, if this was the decision was taken by that same association.

The VP University Affairs responds by stating that if other associations are not governing properly, the SSMU should not govern improperly as well. Proxies are meant to represent a particular person and this isn't the case. There is a process outlined in the SSMU Constitution to ensure that that happens and this isn't being followed. The VP University Affairs believes that the SSMU Constitution should be followed.

Debate:

Asa Kohn, member of the gallery, states that he was the member who attended the Board of Directors meeting. He stated that they have more than 100 signature from constituents of the SUS on a motion he intended to bring to the SUS General Assembly. He also attempted to bring this to the SUS Referendum.



The SUS Council never made a decision on this, rather the SUS Executive Committee made a decision and reported on this decision to the Council.

Senator Lametti states that it is regrettable that the association followed this process, but as someone part of an association, it would be terrifying if the SSMU started removing people from representative bodies on its own accord. He believes that these are internal affairs of the SUS and the SSMU should limit itself to recognizing decisions made by the faculty associations. He believes this sets a terrible precedent and that few faculty associations trust the SSMU to make these decisions.

The VP Internal states that he agrees with what Senator Lametti has said. Given that the Legislative Council is not the Judicial Board, it sets a horrible precedent. The VP Internal doesn't understand how the appointing body removed Councillor Milchberg.

The VP University Affairs states that he doesn't think that SSMU should not be removing people from other constituencies. He wants to draw attention to the text of the motion which recognizes the position as vacant and does not remove anyone. The representative isn't functioning at SUS, so this isn't a matter of removing them. Rather, it about the SSMU living up to best governance practices and being fair.

Asa Kohn stated that Councillor Milchberg did unambiguously resign from the SUS, this which is mentioned in the preamble. Given that he resigned, he is no longer the Councillor appointed by the SUS. He states that he would support this even if it didn't violate the SSMU Constitution because he sees it as important for the SSMU to hold faculty associations accountable.

Senator Buraga would also like to point out that the member of the gallery has tried multiple avenues, including trying to put a referendum on this issue to the SUS, but this was denied by the temporary CRO and the President of the SUS, for reasons which are unclear. The member of the gallery has done everything right to remediate this issue and Senator Buraga thinks that when there is an opportunity to intervene, normally the Judicial Board would be able to intervene, but because they aren't a functioning body, it is up to the Legislative Council to right this wrong.

Senator Lametti states it is regrettable that this happened, but he rejects the authority of the Judicial Board over faculty association and he rejects the authority of the SSMU to remove people from Council, and respects the decision of faculty associations not to replace a



member who resigns if they so desire. There are many reasons they would do so. He thinks that this is an overstep to say that they are obliged to have representative at Council.

Concillor Karia adds that she has a structural recommendation for the SUS. The AUS has an internal judiciary functioning body that deals with these kinds of issues, so for future reference the SUS should work on implementing something like this, so this discussion doesn't need to happen again.

The VP Finance states that he agrees with Senator Lametti's point. He hopes that councillors are aware that SSMU has no legal authority over other societies, given that they are different not-for-profit organizations. The Board of Directors of SSMU can't override another corporation. He thinks that the SUS should designate resources to developing their own judicial system.

The VP University Affairs states that they aren't removing anyone, they aren't telling SUS who to send, and they aren't asking SUS to send anyone else. SSMU is not intervening in any internal affairs of the SUS, rather they are maintaining decorum in this body. If an institution wanted to send a proxy for each Council, it would be determined to be disrespectful. It is a matter of keeping SSMU's house in check and not intervening in anyone else's affairs.

Asa Kohn, member of the gallery, states that Judicial Board does not on its own have authority over the SUS, but the SUS delegates its authority to the Judicial Board to make binding (not legally) decisions on the SUS.

Senator Buraga points out that the last motion is a right given to the space by Legislative Council as a political favour. Here, Council is not taking away representation from anybody. Rather, they are saying that these are the rules, the rules have been broken and the procedure isn't broken. This is a matter of principle.

Senator Lametti states that he would like to **amend the motion to strike the second, third and fourth Whereas clauses and the second Be it Resolved clause, seconded by the VP Internal.**

Debate on the amendment:

Senator Lametti states that all of debate is centering around recognition of the seat as vacant, which seems legitimate. The rest of it the motion is invoking clauses that aren't



applicable and may set a dangerous precedent, and revisiting decision taken legitimately by this Council.

The VP University Affairs states that he would have been partial to this amendment, but would like to maintain the second Be it Resolved clause. The reason why this decision has been reconsidered is because Council is recognizing that a mistake was made, and recognizing a member has taken the time to highlight this mistake and certain processes have been exhausted, so this had to be brought back to Council.

Asa Kohn states that wouldn't have an issue with this amendment if the second Be it Resolved clause were included. It would be ambiguous otherwise.

Senator Buraga moves to unstrike the second Be it Resolved clause, seconded by the VP University Affairs.

Debate on the amendment to the amendment:

Senator Lametti states that this should remain out of the motion because it is a moot point. Second, if the seat is recognized as vacant, the effect will be the same. Third, it will set a dangerous precedent because Council doesn't want to repeal or reconsider decisions made legitimately during Council.

Senator Buraga states that he is in favour of this amendment because the person for whom this is being fixed is in favour. Second, if we do something wrong, we should have the ability to rectify it. He thinks that Council has the ability to undo a wrong.

Councillor Sanchez motions to call the question regarding the amendment to the amendment, seconded by Councillor Kara – PASSES.

Voting on the amendment to the amendment – FAILS.

Senator Buraga motions to call the question regarding the amendment, seconded by the VP Internal – PASSES.

Voting on the amendment – PASSES (15-2-1).



Councillor Hirsch motions to call the question regarding the amended motion, seconded by the VP Internal – PASSES.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on Motion 11 as amended - **APPROVED 11-3-4.**

12. Old Business [25]

- a. Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of Elections and Referenda 2019-03-28 [5] - **APPROVED**

The SSMU President makes a point of order, stating that he does not need to motivate this motion because it was motivated at the last meeting.

The Speaker notes that this point of order is well-taken and thanks the President.

Question Period:

Senator Lametti asks about 4:2.2, campaign for plebiscites. He asks what sort of rules would apply to this item.

The SSMU President states that the same rules applying to other referendum questions would apply here.

The VP University Affairs asks if this change were to go ahead, what the difference would be between a referendum question and a plebiscite question.

The President responds that in terms of its treatment, nothing would be different.

The VP University Affairs asks if SSMU is effectively going from having two avenues to one and why this is better.

The President responds that for a question that is not a fee referenda, you would still want there to be a campaign around it. This doesn't limit their ability, as people can still decide not to run a campaign. Rather than limiting, it does the opposite, in that that person/group has the choice regarding how that question is run.



Senator Lametti asks why the campaign for plebiscites was forbidden in the first place.

The President states that he assumes that they wanted plebiscites to be used as a survey tool. This hasn't applicable in this way for several years.

Debate:

Senator Buraga **moves to amend the motion to strike 4:2.2 and items within the second column, seconded by the SSMU President.**

Debate on the amendment:

Senator Buraga states that they are trying to reduce clutter and increase accessibility of the governance documents. The difference between referendum questions and plebiscites is that one is binding and one is not binding, they are still under the same category of referendum questions.

The SSMU President notes that items will need to be renumbered.

Voting on the amendment – FAILS.

Debate:

The VP Internal moves to call the question, seconded by the President.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on Motion 12a - **APPROVED 13-1-5**

- b. Motion Regarding Policy on Clubs and Services as SSMU's Highest Priority
2019-03-28 [5] - **APPROVED**

The motion has been previously moved.

Question Period:



Senator Lametti states that at the September 27th Council, the original version of this motion was presented. It stated that further consultation was pledged and he asks if this was done.

The SSMU President responds that this did take place, and he was able to speak with 13/16 services about the plan and the policy itself, which have been separated.

Senator Lametti asks why these two motions were not combined into one motion.

The SSMU President states that the plan revolves around a number of set dates and expectations of clubs and services, which is what people really wanted. These documents can't be combined because the policy can't have preset dates. Originally, this was presented as a single document, but after consultation it was determined not to make sense.

Debate:

The VP Finance states that he understands that there are good intentions, but there is no deliverable. Stating that clubs and services are the highest priority says that SSMU will put students first, but there is no value added to this. There aren't sufficient resources to put the clubs and services as the highest priority.

Councillor Sanchez says that it seems that within the Constitution, students are the highest priority and clubs and services have a direct impact on that. It seems like this is a non-motion that isn't changing anything.

Councillor Flaherty states that she understands the concerns, but agrees with explicitly stating this. Rather than providing all resources, triaging it should be the highest priority.

The SSMU President says that this policy doesn't say that they will fully help clubs and services with all financial resources to operate at the highest level possible. Rather it recognizes that they are a priority and they are working to make it better, but it takes time. As well, a number of other things that concern students could have been chosen as the highest priority, for example advocacy, operations, health and dental, etc. SSMU over the last 10-15 years has singled out clubs and services as the most important thing SSMU does. The President states that there should be recognition that these are the highest priority.

The VP Finance states that he agrees with the President that there is value added in a triage process. The SSMU shouldn't over-promise. When the VP Finance's department tries to



provide resources, one club or service will say that they aren't being prioritized (when compared with another club or service).

Councillor Kara states that he is on board with this as the Clubs Representative. He also states that there would be an option to specify either clubs or services as the highest priority.

The President would encourage someone to motion to split it with the services as the highest priority, as over \$500,000 of student fees are invested in services. As well, the Society also states that the policy comes with the corresponding plan which has actionables.

Senator Lametti states that he is uncomfortable with this motion because he wonders if clubs and services are more important than financial sustainability or supporting students. This policy is a way to mobilize clubs political energy. This only creates possible harm.

The VP University Affairs states that he doesn't mean to undermine the work of clubs and services. However, he is cautious and concerned about the suggestion that the SSMU shouldn't do things that put clubs and services in jeopardy, rather the SSMU should be able to advocate freely.

Senator Lametti **moves to amend the motion to strike point one of the Be it Resolved Clause, seconded by Council Abdelhamid.**

Councillor Sanchez makes a point of parliamentary inquiry, asking if the title of the motion should also be changed.

The Speaker asks Senator Lametti to restate the amendment.

Senator Lametti **moves to amend the motion to strike point one of the Be it Resolved Clause and ensure that the motion is consistent as delegated by the Senator to the Steering Committee, seconded by Council Abdelhamid.**

Debate on the amendment:

The President states that this isn't just words. Rather, with fee increases and the building shutting down, clubs and services are prioritized. There is value in saying that this is our highest priority. This policy has been in place for 15-20 years. It is important to focus on this



history and prioritizing operations for students groups because SSMU values the impact that clubs and services have on students.

The VP Internal states that if the first point is removed, there is no substance here.

The VP Finance states that the first point is disingenuous because the Society is there to improve the welfare of students and the Society is there to ensure that welfare is achieved through financial responsibility. This is the purpose of the Board of Directors. Financial responsibility comes first. The VP Finance states he will be voting in favour of this amendment.

Councillor Flaherty states that he doesn't agree with this amendment. As the President stated, this has been a policy for a long time. Financial sustainability should be expected and it shouldn't be stated as a priority. Clubs and Services are what make SSMU work for the students. She thinks there is value in this point.

Councillor Karia states that this amendment would make multiple stakeholders more comfortable with passing this policy overall, waiving fears surrounding the precedent set, which is perhaps deterministic. What Council should be actually focusing on is the policy attached to this motion, understanding that actual constructive work can still get done if this policy is passed.

Senator Lametti states that history shows that it is not the case that financial sustainability is expected. He thinks that point two and three are more substantive, which is what clubs and services care most about.

Councillor Kara states that in response to the VP Finance's statement regarding student wellbeing, he would like to call attention to various SSMU services which are essential for the wellbeing of students (e.g. MSERT, Walksafe, DriveSafe, and Nightline). In his opinion, services should be the highest priority.

Councillor Sanchez motions to call the question regarding the amendment to the motion, seconded by the SSMU President – PASSES.

Voting on the amendment – FAILS 9-9-2

Debate:



Senator Buraga motions to call the question.

Voting Procedure:

Councillor Flahery departs at 8:54 PM.

Voting on Motion 12b - **APPROVED 13-5-1**

- c. Motion Regarding Plan on Clubs and Services as SSMU's Highest Priority 2019-03-28 [5] - **POSTPONED**

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

The VP Finance agrees with this plan, but he isn't sure where the money will come for this.

The SSMU President states that the plan requires two readings, if the fee passes and the fee doesn't pass. He suggests postponing some items if necessary.

Senator Buraga states that if the fee increase is passed, that would be financially contingent. He thinks it makes sense to vote in favour aspirationally.

Senator Lametti moves to postpone this motion until the next meeting, seconded by the VP Finance.

Debate:

The VP Finance states that he agrees with this motion because SSMU should not over promise things that SSMU doesn't have. In HR, staff cannot be hired until there are funds.

Senator Buraga states that this makes financial sense.

Voting on the motion to postpone – PASSES 16-0-2.



13. New Business [30]

a. Motion Regarding Interim Provisions for Internal Regulations of Elections and Referenda 2019-04-04 [10] - **APPROVED**

The SSMU President motivates this motion, stating that the goal is to have a special referenda this upcoming week or two. There will be two questions.

Question Period:

Senator Lametti asks what the President thinks about modify rules designed to protect students for the purpose of reintroducing referendums that happened one week ago.

The SSMU President thinks that they have the ability to debate this when the question comes in the next motion. This motion isn't dependent on that, as the fall reading break question is a new question.

Senator Lametti asks why the fee referendum is included in the Whereas clauses, if this is true. He asks why this is being done for both when the fall reading break has been coming for a year.

Senator Buraga states that through the fall reading break lens, they required more time to move this motion due to the consultations done with students. Students expect them to use any means necessary to be able to facilitate a fall reading week. The plebiscite question is extremely importance for fall reading break advocacy. If this particularly piece doesn't happen the current timeline will be significantly delayed. The SSMU President came to Senator Buraga to talk about the membership fee increase and this is a fundamental fee increase to serve students at the bare minimum level and not overwhelm the SSMU Executives next year.

Senator Lametti states that this modification would allow referendum periods to occur before the first or after the last weeks of class. Senator Lametti asks what precedent this sets for student democracy at McGill.

The President doesn't think this sets a precedent. Rather it reflects that they recognize the timeline of the fall reading break. They also recognize the conversation surrounding the fee



increase, given that 47.5% of students are engaged in the original conversation, and there is a need for staffing. That is the reason behind it.

Debate:

Senator Lametti states that there are rules to ensure that students have a voice and they will be heard. He thinks this is a slap in the face to students. Waiving requirements means that students' referendum decisions are not respected.

Councillor Hu states that the timing of the motion is suspect because it comes one week after the general referendum. It seems like it is in response to this referendum. He thinks it sets a dangerous precedent with regard to the legitimacy of referendums.

The VP University Affairs states that the intention to bring the fall reading break question forward was noted throughout the term. To the second point, minorities should be respected and there was a strong minority that indicated an interest in a fee increase. The incoming and outgoing Executives felt it was important to bring a new question to referendum.

Senator Lametti states that he finds it dishonest that the fee increase is piggybacking off of the fall reading break question to try to get through. He also agrees with respecting minorities, but there is a difference between things that trample on people's rights and voting yes or no on a fee. He thinks it is dishonest to reduce the fee until it passes.

The VP Internal states that \$30 was a fair place to start and they have adjusted. It is bad to insinuate that SSMU could have picked a lower fee that they thought would pass.

Senator Buraga states that he wants to encourage all to vote for this because the fall reading break question is crucial to the fall reading break advocacy.

Councillor Karia motions to call the question.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on Motion 13a - **APPROVED 13-4-1**

b. Motion Regarding a Special Referendum Period 2019-04-04 **[10] - APPROVED**



Senator Buraga states that this is the timeline set for the Special Referendum Period about the fall reading break plebiscite. This was done in consultation with the sub-committee in order to set the proper student representation. This question will be proposed to members. If there is a positive result, it will be possible to close the deal and get a fall reading break. This is necessary to keep the timeline. 96.6% of students voted in favour of a fall reading break and he sees no reason why this wouldn't pass.

There are no questions and there is no debate.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on Motion 13b - **APPROVED 14-1-3**

- c. Motion Regarding Policy and Plan Standardization 2019-04-04 [5] - **APPROVED**

The SSMU President explains that this motion asks the incoming Executives to determine a better formatting system for the Policy and Plan Book. This year, the SSMU President made the Committee Terms of Reference more accessible. The Policy and Plan Book suffers the same issue as the Committee Terms of Reference did, which became more evident as the year progressed. The new Executives should make these documents were comprehensible.

There are no questions and no debate.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on Motion 13c - **APPROVED 17-1-0**

- d. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Committee Terms of Reference 2019-04-04 [10] - **APPROVED** (unanimously)

The SSMU President explains that this motion asks committees to revise them each semester, so that they are updated to reflect practice. The President would much rather have those who are actively involved in these groups be involved in modifying their terms of reference.

Question Period:



Senator Lametti states that the number of councillors was lowered in one of these committees. The Senator asks if this is because quorum wasn't being met.

The President states that the previous number wasn't reflective of practice and the actual numbers. There is not necessarily the need to have 2-3 councillors on each committee.

Senator Lametti asks about the Mental Health Committee and why councillors on this committee will be chosen by the commissioners. If the purpose is accountability to Council, why would the councillors be chosen by the commissioners, as opposed to elected by Council, as it is with other committees.

The Speaker states that the Mental Health Commissioners provided a comment: "We ultimately didn't have particularly strong participation from the councillors which were allocated by council, and as such we would benefit from choosing our own Council reps. Furthermore, we didn't feel as though Council took our request for prioritizing marginalized candidates seriously. This should be left in the hands of the commissioners as such."

Senator Lametti asks about the Steering Committee being able to create subcommittees on its own. He wonders what the basis of this is and he doesn't understand the rationale for this.

The Speaker states that the reason for this is when there are items of business that are referred back that might want to have the involvement of all councillors, they wanted to have which should have the involvement of councillors, they wanted to build in the flexibility to allow additional councillors to participate beyond the base membership of Steering Committee.

Debate on the main motion:

Senator Buraga **moves to amend the motion to strike the Francophone Affairs from the Community Affairs Committee, seconded by the VP Internal.**

Voting on the amendment – PASSES.

Debate on the main motion:



The VP Finance states that the Funding Committee's terms of reference state that the Funding Commissioner should be consulted, but the VP Finance would like to amend this to state "should or can" be consulted. The Commissioners don't necessarily exercise this right.

The VP Internal **moves to amend the motion to strike a portion of 10.4c**, which discusses the selection of councillors by the Mental Health Commissioners, **seconded by Senator Lametti**.

Debate on the amendment:

The VP Internal states in reference to the first point made by the Commissioners, he wonders what insight the Commissioners would have that the councillors would have in terms of involvement of councillors. Regarding the second point, there is not an unlimited pool of councillors and all councillors have to sit on committees. We want marginalized voices on all committees, so it doesn't make sense that this committee would seek marginalized voices that others don't.

The VP University Affairs will be voting in favour, but for different reasons. He trusts the judgment of commissioners. He thinks there is value in having marginalized voices on this committee in particular. He will be voting in favour because Council should have the right to appoint its members to its subcommittees.

Senator Buraga states that he is uncomfortable amending a recommendation from the Commissioners without giving them the ability to argue against the changes. He states that Council has the prerogative to do this, but he is uncomfortable with overruling the people deemed experts.

The VP Internal states that Council shouldn't serve as a rubber stamp. They don't have any insight into the people or have the right to pick people for committees.

Senator Lametti states he thinks that the Commissioners should have some say informally. He thinks that Council should be held accountable for its own decisions.

The VP University Affairs states that if they do vote in favour, Council should consider other mechanisms such as the new Executives ensuring that members meet with the Commissioners before they put their names forward for committees.



Councillor Sanchez states that it is within the purview of the Commissioners to contact the Equity Committee if they have an issue with the councillors on their committee.

Voting on the amendment – PASSES.

Debate on the main motion:

Senator Buraga states that the reason they are striking the Ad Hoc Fall Reading Break Committee is because the work has been done.

The VP Finance motions to amend the Funding Committee's terms of reference under 7.8, seconded by Councillor Karia.

Debate on the amendment:

Senator Buraga is concerned with the way in which the Equity Commissioners weren't consulted in the past and they had to proactively give input.

The VP Finance states that there is a lack of proactivity and a lack of accountability from the commissioners.

The VP Internal states that it would be interesting if there were an amendment regarding unsuccessful attempts to contact the commissioners first.

The VP University Affairs moves to amend the amendment such that the members must be consulted, if having received notice, they do not respond and indicate no intention to attend, the committee may finalize decisions without them, seconded by Senator Buraga.

Debate on the amendment to the amendment:

Senator Lametti thinks it is a bad idea to write a policy based on past instances. He thinks they should leave it at "consulted" – if someone is contacted, they have been consulted.

The VP University Affairs states that he will be voting against his own amendment. He thinks it would be valuable to develop mechanisms in a separate document.



Councillor Sanchez motions to call the question – APPROVED.

Voting on the amendment to the amendment – FAILS.

Debate on the amendment:

There is no debate.

Voting on the amendment – FAILS.

Debate on the main motion:

The VP Finance motions to strike 1.3 d seconded by the President.

Debate on the amendment:

The VP Finance states that he wants to strike this because if there are prejudicial actions being taken, these should be reported to HR.

The SSMU President states that the Clubs Committee's responsibility shouldn't be to manage those who sit on the committee. It isn't an HR body.

Voting on the amendment – PASSES.

Debate on the main motion:

Senator Lametti makes a point of order stating that the highlight of c wasn't distributed.

The Speaker states that the text was still there and councillors could have cross-referenced.

Senator Lametti moves to add 1.4 h and include “up to two (2) additional councillors”, seconded by the VP Internal.

Debate on the amendment:

He states that there are three councillors, but due to the structure, Council will not be able to name councillors to the committee.



Voting on the amendment:

The Speaker states that one individual hasn't voted so he will ask councillors to vote again.

Senator Lametti makes a point of order, stating that abstentions should count as non-voting.

The Speaker states that because not everyone voted and the decision was within a margin of one, he will ask councillors to vote again.

Senator Buraga appeals the Speaker's decision on his point of order, seconded by Senator Lametti.

Debate on appealing the decision of the Speaker:

Senator Lametti states that in the Speaker's ruling in the report of the Steering Committee, there is not a substantive difference between abstaining and being present, but not voting. If Council takes that to be the case, then they are the same.

Voting on upholding the decision of the Speaker- FAILS.

The Speaker's decision is overturned and the original vote, in which the voting on the amendment passed, is maintained.

Voting on the amendment – PASSES.

Debate on the main motion.

There is no further debate.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on Motion 13d - **APPROVED** (unanimously) **15-0-2**

- e. Motion Regarding the Increase of the SSMU Membership Fee 2019-04-04 **[20]** - **APPROVED**



Senator Lametti makes an objection to the consideration of the question.

Voting on the objection to the consideration of the question – FAILS 8-8-2.

Senator Buraga motivates this motion. He understands that this motion is brought forward in a way that bypasses many procedural safeguards that councillors have brought up. As an incoming Executive he understands the immense pressure that the current Executives have had during the last year with insufficient staffing and resources to be able to uphold the level and quality of services that SSMU's members are asking of them. With regard to the failure of the \$30 question, that was a failure of the \$30 question itself. This doesn't have an impact on the idea of an increase, rather it's the idea that a \$30 increase is unacceptable to the student body. In his sincerest opinion, he thinks that the \$15 increase will be able to give SSMU the resources it needs next year to be able to do the work necessary to give clubs and services the necessary resources to do their good work and make sure they don't need to be lacking. Sending this to referendum, if it passes, will allow the Executives to have less strain on their mental health. It is so important to have these resources at the Executives' disposal, so not having allowing this question go to the student body for them to consider it does the student body a disservice. He recognizes the procedural skips that have been done to facilitate this, but the resources are needed to have a SSMU that works.

Question period:

Senator Lametti asks why when students vote no, their decision is illegitimate, but when students vote yes, their decision is legitimate.

The President responds that they are critical of both. He doesn't think this is a fair question as there is criticalness of the current fees as well.

Member of the gallery, Adam Gwiazda-Amsel (incoming SSMU VP External, he/him), asks if they are listening to student voices, which said that it was too much too fast, why should Council think there is not a good reason to put a lower amount to students.

Senator Buraga responds that he has heard that the main impetus from students was that it was too high too fast. It was an ambitious master plan, which will need to be revisited. What they are trying to do now is give the basic, baseline resources to do the good work that they do. This is a signal of the student body being willing to give money for the SSMU to do what is expected of them.



Senator Lametti asks what extent do students have to go to be heard as they have spoken during the referendum.

Senator Buraga responds that students made their voices heard. This specific fee question is used for another purpose. This is the baseline resources that SSMU needs.

Councillor Kara asks if SSMU will keep asking for lower fee increases until students say yes.

Senator Buraga responds that if the fee increase fails, it sends a message that students aren't willing to give SSMU the resources they need. This might result in a cut in staffing and resources and no further questions. He would like to think that the student body understands the strain that the SSMU is under.

Councillor Hu asks Senator Buraga if students already voiced this message by voting no to the first referendum.

Senator Buraga states that he thinks the message was too high too fast. This question is different because it focuses on staffing.

Councillor Hersh motions to extend the question period by three minutes, seconded by the President – FAILS.

Debate:

Councillor Hersh states in response to the point of this being too much too fast, the students voted for a \$100 increase to the health and dental plan and Council is treating this differently.

The President states that that fee is opt-outable and the SSMU base fee isn't. He isn't sure if the same logic applies to both. As is, SSMU can't function without the \$15 fee.

Senator Lametti wants councillors to think about who they are accountable – to SSMU or who elected them. He asks whose voice is louder. He states that it is true that 47.5% voting in favour is close. However, if the fee passed by such a slim margin, they wouldn't have respected the voices of those who voted no.



The VP Finance states that he is sympathetic, but that everyone will need to be accountable to the clubs and services who are not given what they need.

The VP University Affairs states that the rhetoric is difficult to process. He states that this question is fundamentally different. Democracy works such that the new Executive team was elected by the student body and advising them is the outgoing Executive team that was elected by the student body. He cautions against taking this huge democracy point, while all those who have been democratically elected are using their best judgement. To address the slippery slope point, that will be dealt with when it comes to Council.

Councillor Hu states that he would like to remind everyone that students voted for the new Executives at the same time. He thinks it is fundamentally wrong to remake referendums until SSMU has the decision it wants.

Councillor Hersh states that he was elected to represent students and the vast majority of students voted no, so he will be voting no. He questions why they decided to go with too much too fast when there were concerns before the referendum.

Senator Lametti states that when students elect Executives, they expect them to abide by the rules and not change the rules that are made to protect students. The only thing that students can do is to vote in a referendum and you are saying they have to vote again.

Member of the gallery, Sanchi Bhalla (Management, she/her), states that students don't see the effect that the fee will have internally. She states that the \$8 staffing component would benefit the students. Students need to know how they're being affected by it.

The President states that in consultation with faculty councils, many councils were very positive and didn't say anything about it being too much too quickly. There is this recognition that SSMU needs to provide services for the student body. People want SSMU to do thing. He thinks that an increase in staffing would be beneficial.

Councillor Kara would like to draw attention to the fact that students voted no to an increase of \$30. It is logistical to assume that a larger group of students would say yes to a lower amount. He thinks this is a fair question – it is a different question and a different amount.

Senator Lametti states that most of those people who are defending this question are current or incoming Executives. He also thinks that students didn't just say no to \$30 and they voted



no to the fee increase. He thinks that the Executives will keep asking questions until they get what they want.

At 10:25 Councillor Sanchez has left the room, but is attending via teleconference.

Councillor Stemper states that she is not a current or incoming Executive, she thinks it is a fair question. She doesn't see an issue with it.

The VP University Affairs states that a new question is being put forward given consultation that only happened after the vote. While he appreciates those keeping Executives accountable, but there is no reason why outgoing Executives need this fee. There is no reason for incoming Executives to support this if they didn't think it benefited students. To suggest otherwise is disheartening.

Senator Buraga states that he also wants to hold Executives accountable and understands the hesitance. He sees the big picture (talking with Executives, sitting on the Board) and it is that the SSMU doesn't have the resources students are asking for. Students are asking for SSMU to be able to offer a certain quality of service that SSMU can't currently provide. He thinks that they need to meet this need.

The VP Finance states that he would like to amend a part of the Whereas clause to strike out and replace phrasing regarding the large capital projects, seconded by Senator Buraga.

Debate on the amendment:

The VP Finance states that this is purely administrative because the VP Finance role has to properly budget the capital budget for these types of projects. It is literally their role and internal fund restrictions shouldn't be put on this.

The VP University Affairs states that he will be voting in favour of this amendment.

Senator Buraga states that there are different staffing needs that the Executives would like to see and if this referendum is passed, it doesn't make sense to artificially limit that now. They should have the flexibility to be able to provide staffing and meet baseline financial needs. He will be voting in favour of this motion.



Councillor Karia motions to call the question, seconded by the VP Finance – PASSES.

Voting on the amendment – PASSES.

Debate on the main motion:

The VP Finance motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Kara – FAILS.

Adam Gwiazda-Amsel states that there is a difference between reacting to the minute changes in perspectives to the study body and consultation more generally. Constituents don't know what happens behind closed doors. The incoming and outgoing executives have this knowledge and arte concerned with the Society doing its job properly.

Councillor Karia states that what she likes about this question is that students want consultation. While there was consultation before the first question, being asked again about the projects and asked period is something important. If they dislike this question, they'll just vote no. She states that she think it's worth just asking.

Senator Lametti wants to express his displeasure at the insinuation that Executives know best. He also thinks it's important to represent students. Students were asked in the most direct way and they said no.

Senator Buraga states that this question is fundamental: the resources that they could give to the Society to make it grow and to give the Executives the ability to do what is asked of them. The current Executives are overworked and exhausted due to the lack of resources available. Being able to cross the threshold, makes Senator Buraga emotional because he wants to see the society succeed.

The VP University Affairs states that the member of the gallery was advocating that the question be brought to members and it is not that Executives know best. This decision will rest in the hands of the members. A vote no now means not allowing students to reconsider this idea being discussed all year about Executives needing more support. A vote no means not allowing the Executives as a collective and team to say here's the plan and here's what we need to respond to your needs. A vote no means not allowing members to think about the concerns that they have brought up at the last Council regarding what Executives should be doing to support students.



Councillor Hu states that the referendum question asked Executives to find solutions without increasing the fee. He sympathizes with the difficulty of the task, but this is what students want. He trusts that the students understood the original question and the consequences.

Senator Lametti states that the reality is that students voted no and speculation surrounding misinformation about the fee or students wanting a lower fee increase is incorrect. The reality is that students voted no. He listens to students and respects their voices.

Councillor Karia states that she thinks what's important is understanding that constituents are informed, intelligent individuals. We assumed that they will understand the nuances and complexities of the question. What she has heard is that they want what the fee increase is proposing, but the initial increase was too much. She thinks that what would be dishonest, unconstitutional and undemocratic would be to go forward without consulting them. By doing this and allowing a lesser option, SSMU is giving students what they have asked for all year long, which is Executives that listen to them and better facilities, with a lower fee increase.

Member of the gallery, Jacqueline Yao (McGill Tribune, she/her) states that she has heard people mention the Tribune Editorial Board said that there was too great an increase too quickly. She wants to say that this is based on the opinion of a select few people and the Tribune Editorial Board does not reflect the entire student body. She thinks that it would be important to ask students why they rejected the fee and going from there.

The VP University Affairs wants to reject the notion that people are saying students don't know what they voted for. No one is suggesting this about students. Rather, students knew what they voted for and SSMU is going back to them with a new question. Council will be responsible for having allowed a year to go by without Executives able to receive necessary support.

Councillor Kara states that what is not speculative is that students voted not to a \$30 increase, they don't vote no entirely. If they were given a spectrum, this may have been more helpful, but this was not the case.

Senator Lametti states that it would have been possible to have \$0, \$15 or \$30 options on the original question. Students knew it was all or nothing. It is important to listen to students, knowing that they had a choice between \$0 and \$30.



Councillor Hu asks if it would be legitimate to have a second referendum during the exam period at the end of the year.

Senator Buraga states that the question of legitimacy comes from hitting quorum. If it doesn't reach quorum, it won't be considered legitimate. He states that there is a false dichotomy being painted. This is a brand new question with a brand new campaign and a brand new plan.

The VP University Affairs states that he wants get back to the idea that there is still a minimum threshold that must be passed. To pretend that you are now giving a carte blanche to the Executives to continue putting questions to referendum if this were to fail, is false. He wants to encourage members to think about, saying this cautiously, the courage that the incoming team is putting forward by supporting this motion, and the care and selflessness that the outgoing team is putting forward by supporting this motion.

Senator Lametti doesn't think that councillors should be voting in recognition of the Executives. When he consulted students, they said "what" to the idea of another referendum. Students will feel like they're not being respected or recognized. He urges councillors to take this question seriously.

Senator Buraga states that if it is the will of council not to accept this, he will work with the incoming Executives to see it through. However, he thinks that they have the opportunity to finally give SSMU the resources that it needs and student have been asking for for years. He sees a vision of SSMU where SSMU gives to students the resources, services, advocacy and representation they want. He is optimistic and hopes others will join him in voting in favour for this.

Senator Lametti motions to divide the question into three parts as follows, seconded by Senator Buraga.

- a) Approval of the referendum question.**
- b) Start a yes campaign committee (i.e. endorse).**
- c) Tre Mansdoerfer would chair said committee.**

Voting on the motion to divide the question – PASSES 17-0-1.

Senator Lametti moves to vote by roll call, seconded by Senator Buraga – PASSES.



Voting Procedure:

Voting on the first division of Motion 13e - **APPROVED 11-6-1**

In favour: Councillor Karia, Councillor Kara, Councillor Briand, Councillor Stemper, Councillor Bazylykut, Senator Buraga, Councillor Constantin, SSMU President, VP University Affairs, VP Internal, VP Finance.

Opposed: Councillor Hersh, Councillor Yang, Councillor Abdelhamid, Councillor Hu, Councillor Cosette, Senator Lametti.

Abstaining: Councillor Sanchez.

Voting on the second division of Motion 13e - **APPROVED 10-6-2**

In favour: Councillor Karia, Councillor Kara, Councillor Briand, Councillor Stemper, Councillor Bazylykut, Senator Buraga, Councillor Constantin, SSMU President, VP Internal, VP Finance.

Opposed: Councillor Hersh, Councillor Yang, Councillor Abdelhamid, Councillor Hu, Councillor Cosette, Senator Lametti.

Abstaining: Councillor Sanchez, VP University Affairs.

Voting on the third division of Motion 13e - **NOT APPROVED 5-7-6**

In favour: Councillor Kara, Councillor Hersh, Councillor Yang, Councillor Stemper, Councillor Bazylykut.

Opposed: Councillor Abdelhamid, Councillor Hu, Councillor Cosette, Senator Lametti, Senator Buraga, SSMU President, VP Internal.

Abstaining: Councillor Sanchez, Councillor Karia, Councillor Briand, VP University Affairs, Councillor Constantin, VP Finance.

- f. Motion Regarding Fall Reading Break for Winter 2019 Referendum 2019-04-04
[10] – APPROVED (unanimously)

Senator Buraga states that they need this and he encourages councillors to vote yes.

There are no questions and no debate.

Voting Procedure:



Voting on Motion 13f - **APPROVED** (unanimously) **17-0-0**

- g. Motion Regarding Further Action on Affordable Housing 2019-04-04 **[20]** -
APPROVED

The VP University Affairs states that following the plebiscite they would like to bring to Council concrete actions that are appropriate. One of them is formally joining UTILE. The second is a consultation plan.

There are no questions.

Debate:

Senator Buraga wonders if the future VP External has any opinion on this.

Adam Gwiazda-Amsel states that he believes that this is in the interest of students and he is open to meeting with UTILE regarding this. He thinks it is unfortunate there wasn't a campaign surrounding this. If the students go ahead with this, he will listen to the suggestions from UTILE.

The VP University Affairs states that in the presentation that they received from UTILE at a prior Council, the thought is to encourage members to be engaging with students and looking outside of the bubble that students are currently in.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on Motion 13g - **APPROVED 15-1-1**

- h. Motion Regarding Adequate Notice on Mandatory Club Workshops 2019-04-04
[5] – POSTPONED

Councillor Kara states that this is something made in response to Executives airing grievances regarding the notice given for club workshops. They are given a week's notice or less, and this is not adequate. Given the threat of sanctions, there should be adequate notice of three weeks, or sanctions can't be applied.



Question:

The VP Finance asks if the movers believe that club executives should be as accountable, in the sense of adhering to their constitutions, as SSMU Executives.

Councillor Kara responds yes.

Debate:

Senator Buraga states that during his election, one of the questions he received was whether he was in favour of a club calendar. He pledged to have two weeks' notice for clubs. He will work with the VP Finance and VP Student Life to ensure this schedule is provided way in advance to ensure they aren't sanctioned.

The SSMU President states that for clarification, the VP Student Life and VP Finance are already proposing a calendar.

The VP Finance states that this has been frustrating for permanent staff, the VP Finance and the VP Student Life for a number of reasons. They have given late notice because it is difficult to find space and there are a number of external deadlines to be met. Given the strain on resources, this was the best that could be done.

Councillor Kara states that he appreciates this and he still fears workshops being sprung on clubs. He is afraid that clubs will be sanctioned for not attending last minute workshops.

Senator Buraga asks the VP Finance about the necessity of sanctions to protect the financial sustainability of the SSMU. He asks the VP Finance if in exceptional situations, where the workshop falls outside of the timeline, would the club be sanctioned for failure to attend.

The VP Finance responds that they shouldn't receive a sanction; however, it may be subject to sanctions because there are reasons for the workshops.

Senator Buraga states that one of his concerns is that he doesn't want to inhibit the future Executives from being compliance officers. He asks for the VP Finance to propose an amendment.



The VP Finance states that he agrees with the workshop being scheduled in advance, but given the resources, this isn't possible. This seems to just be an issue for this past year and it likely won't come up again in the future.

Councillor Kara states that he agrees with the VP Finance, but the point of these unexpected workshops is that they are unexpected and they may come up. It wouldn't be fair to sanction.

Senator Buraga motions to postpone until the next Legislative Council, seconded by Councillor Cosette.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on Motion 13 h – **POSTPONED.**

14. Reports by Committees **(25)**

Councillor Hersh moves to accept the reports of the Executive Committee, Health and Dental Review Committee, BOMCOM and Comprehensive Governance Review Committee, as written, seconded by Councillor Briand – PASSES.

Senator Buraga motions to suspend the rules to add the Services Review Committee report to the agenda, seconded by the SSMU President – FAILS.

- a. Executive Committee **(5) - POSTPONED**
- b. Health and Dental Review Committee **(5) - POSTPONED**
- c. BOMCOM **(5)- POSTPONED**
- d. Comprehensive Governance Review Committee **(5) - POSTPONED**
- e. Club Committee **(5)**
 - i. Report 2019-03-19 – **APPROVED 13-3-2**

The Speaker reads out the report.

There are no questions and there is no debate.



ii. Report 2019-03-29 - **APPROVED 15-2-1**

The Speaker reads the report.

Question period:

Senator Buraga asks why the Eating Disorder Resource and Support Centre was rejected for interim status.

The President states that this will be put as a committee under the VP Student Life.

iii. Report 2019-04-01 - **APPROVED 14-2-2**

The Speaker introduces the report.

There are no questions and there is no debate.

f. Accountability Committee **(5)**

The Speaker presents the report. Councillors will recall that this report was mandated to be delivered. The accountability surveys were conducted in November. There was a recommendation put by Council and ratified by Board that the comment included in confidential session be included in public session. Concerns surrounding the Accountability Committee survey process were raised that the VP Finance assumes that those that interact with him have limited or no understanding of finances to the point that it comes across as condescending especially with reference to individuals who identify as female. These concerns were further elaborated to include statements that the VP Finance has acted flippantly or frustrated when dealing with women to the point that it comes across as misogynistic. The VP Finance has an opportunity to respond to these concerns.

The VP Finance states that he doesn't agree with this statement. He states that his role as the VP Finance is to ensure financial responsibility and to hold all his constituents accountable to these rules regardless of who they are. He will concede that this role is a lot more difficult than he originally anticipated. There are definitely times that he gets overwhelmed due to the extremely high workload and responsibilities. He apologizes to anyone at any point who felt



that he came off as condescending or misogynistic. He wants to make it very clear that he had no intention to mistreat anyone, especially given his previous background.

The Speaker continues, stating that since the Fall 2018 semester, Council amended the Accountability Committee's terms of reference so that there is no longer a quantitative and qualitative assessment of officers, senators, director and councillors. The Accountability Committee is now required for attendance at all meetings of Council and committees. Next year, there will be a centralized tracking system for all SSMU committees. This will be included in the public report given to Council each semester. Accountability will now mean attendance of Council and committees. Councillor Jayme was suspended and reinstated. They suggest no further amendments of the terms of reference.

Question period:

Councillor Hersh hopes that future iterations of the committee will be harsher when it comes to attendance. Councillor Hersh has only missed 1/1.5 Councils this year. This is a personal question surrounding the report.

The Speaker responds that the reasons they are required to accept without further question are: physical or mental health, family/friend emergency and academic conflict. When councillors submit the absence form, about 95% of the reasons are one of these three. This is specified in the standing rules of Council.

Senator Buraga states that regarding the previous semester's report, the Senators would be analyzed by the Accountability Committee, but this didn't happen.

The Speaker states that this was planned to happen in February, but due to the change in committee terms of reference, they weren't empowered to do this.

15. Reports by Councillors (21) – POSTPONED;

- a. Benjamin Smit (Management) **(3)**
- b. Brooke Callaghan (Management) **(3)**
- c. Julian Jayme (Music) **(3)**
- d. Ana Paula Sanchez (Arts) **(3)**
- e. Philippe Cossette (PTOT) **(3)**
- f. Marie Pilote (Law) **(3)**



- g. Zach Kleiner (Social Work) (3)
- h. Rowan Fletcher (Athletics) (3)

16. Executive Reports (18) - POSTPONED

17. Confidential Session [60]

- a. There will be confidential business this evening.

18. Adjournment - 12:15 AM

VP Internal Motions to adjourn, seconded by Councillor Kara - PASSES

A handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to read 'Buraga', is written over a horizontal line.

Bryan Buraga, President

APPROVED