



# Legislative Council

**February 21, 2019**

1. Call to Order – **18:02.**

The Speaker calls the Council to order at 6:02 PM.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker presents the land acknowledgement.

3. Attendance

Proxies: Gaurav Karna for Councillor Hobbs (ArtsSci), Michael Ogundeji for Councillor Qiu (Science), Reem Mandil for Councillor Milchberg (Science).

Absent: VP Wang, VP Esterle, Councillor Constantin, Councillor Callaghan, Councillor Smit, Councillor Sanchez, Councillor Briand.

4. Approval of Minutes - **APPROVED**

February 7, 2019 Legislative Council – **APPROVED**

Senator Buraga notes that two names are misspelled within the minutes: Madeline Wilson and Asa Kohn.

No further corrections. The minutes stand approved as corrected.

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

SSMU President **Motions to amend the agenda to add to the end of New Business: Motion Regarding Statement on McGill Food Services Contract 2019-02-21 – PASSES**



**SSMU President Motions to amend the agenda to add to the end of New Business: Motion Regarding Letter for DPSLL Advisory/Selection Committee 2019-02-21 – PASSES**

**Councillor Flaherty Motions to add to the beginning of New Business: Notice of Motion Regarding Provisions to the Internal Regulations of Student Groups 2019-02-21 – PASSES**

6. Report of the Steering Committee (3)

The Speaker reads out the steering committee report.

No questions are asked for this.

7. Guest Speakers

a. Martine Gauthier, Executive Director of Student Services (10)

Martine Gauthier introduces herself, stating that she has been with Student Services for about two years. She states that when she joined, Student Services did an extensive review of what was happening across campus, particularly around student mental health. At that time, there were huge concerns coming from student voices. Since then, Student Services has found funding. The main student concern was access to services, particularly mental health services. Student Services has secured \$14 million, not to replace existing services, but to extend existing services. Right now, there are 24 FTEs of counsellors, which is highest across Canada. There are 5 FTEs of psychiatrists, which is also the highest across Canada. \$2 million of the funding is being used to renovate the space, as Student Services found that students had to choose whether to see a doctor, counsellor or psychiatrist, and they wanted to facilitate access. As of May this year, the renovations will be complete and Student Services is in the process of developing a whole new model for access. Whether students are struggling physical and/or mentally, they can walk into the hub and they will be triaged.

In addition, the funding is being used to do away with the twenty Student Services websites around health and wellness, and create one website. This will be the Virtual Hub, the one place that students need to access. Student Services is running focus groups to determine how students want this information to be accessible. The website will also be informed by work that Student Services is doing with the Department of Geography. They are developing a resource map, which is a mapping of all of the resources on/off both campuses. It is a



Google map with different parameters, determined through student input. Some of these parameters will be insurance requirements, language of service and type of service. In addition, Student Services is connecting with these resources across Montreal and Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue. They will be developing formal MoUs with these resources so there is constant and consistent feedback from these resources. Student Services wants to be able to negotiate with these places so that students can get lower costs.

The third step of the project is the embedded Local Wellness Advisors. By September 2019, there will be twelve Local Wellness Advisors embedded within the faculties, athletics, international services and within the residence. Their main role is awareness, prevention and early intervention. The latter refers to the idea that these individuals are clinicians (some counsellors, some social workers) and they report to a head clinician. The Local Wellness Advisors will be doing “single-session interventions”. This is often what students need. Most students access the Counselling Service once or maybe twice, and some more, but many students want support for a specific problem they’re experiencing. For the most part, the Local Wellness Advisors will be working with students in groups and developing specific groups to deal with local issues. Part of their mandate is to work with faculty and staff. Many of the issues that Counselling Services see are academic-related. They will be doing training and workshops with the faculty members, so that they can learn to better deal with what’s going on in the classroom. The Local Wellness Advisor will be working to support a culture within the Faculty.

The last piece is developing community partnerships. They will be developing formal community partnerships. This will be done by McGill as a whole with the Director of Community Partnerships to develop formal partnerships with the MUHC clinics and so on. This is a project that is funded for the next seven years. Only a small piece of it is going toward renovations. The rest of it is going toward expanded access and information for students, and support.

Question Period:

Councillor Scarra asks about the student consultation done to determine the programming and training for faculty that will be conducted by the Local Wellness Advisors. Councillor Scarra mentions that many students are concerned about faculty members’ understanding of academic accommodations. Councillor Scarra asks if the Local Wellness Advisors will be providing training on this.



Gauthier responds absolutely and that this is in the proposal. The first piece is in mental health literacy and the second piece is tailoring the workshops to meet the needs of those faculties. One thing that has been heard again and again is that the accommodation piece is lacking, so this is on their list. In addition, part of the funding has been spent on a curriculum developer to develop these workshops.

Councillor Bazylykut asks if there are plans to revitalize or make a new plan for eating disorders.

Gauthier responds that the original program was a full treatment program. She states that universities do not normally have treatment programs and McGill's program cost about \$600,000 annually and there were 70 students who went through that program. More students were assessed. Student Services is 75% funded by student fees and their mandate is to develop programming and services that serve all students. The expertise for eating disorders lies within the psychiatric services. Student Services has a relationship with an external hospital that has the expertise in eating disorders. Student Services has retained every aspect of that program and the plan is to partner with the external resources, so that these 70 students can get the services they need, but be support by McGill (through workshops, support groups, two psychiatrists who specialize in eating disorders, the nutritionist). The best way to go about that at a fraction of the cost is to partner with external services, to provide the same services, but in partnership.

Councillor Karia asks for clarification on the funding for Student Services.

Gauthier clarifies that 75% of student fees (25% of funding is provided by the Ministry) are used to fund all of the units within Student Services, and mental health takes up about a quarter.

Councillor Karia continues, stating that much of student advocacy has surrounded lowering waitlists for mental health services. Councillor Karia asks about the rationale to put the new-found funds into something else and not just hiring more health professionals to lower that waitlist.

Gauthier responds that this is what Student Services are doing. The twelve Local Wellness Advisors are additional counsellors. They will also be doubling the number of general practitioners because a number of students end up in psychiatric services for medication management, when in most cases a general practitioner can be overseeing their medication management. They will also be adding on three additional counsellors. Part of the money is also going toward training the nurses. There are six nurses who have primarily focused on physical health, but at other institutions, the nurses are trained extensively in student mental health. Starting in the fall, students will be able to also share concerns around mental health



because nurses will be trained for this. All physicians are being trained surrounding mental health. Student Services is expanding the access points for students. The goal of this model is to engage with students before they get to the point where they are in crisis. This is why the Local Wellness Advisors are embedded, to get to students earlier.

Councillor Kleiner states that he has worked and volunteered at SACOMSS. The main consensus from those who access SACOMSS services is that many of the individuals who work at Counseling Services are not trauma-informed. Councillor Kleiner asks if there are plans to change that.

Gauthier responds that they are hiring a full-time counsellor (in place in six weeks) who specializes in trauma. What Student Services has been finding is that there are students experiencing trauma and the counsellors are more generalists. This is the start of Student Services hiring counsellors with expertise in different areas to meet the needs of students.

The SSMU President asks how the increase of the ancillary fee will impact Student Services. He states that his second question has to do with Student Services referring students to external services if they can't be seen at McGill. He asks whether there will be collaboration with the network established through the student health insurance provided by SSMU. Regarding the second question, Gauthier states that they plan to partner with SSMU and PGSS regarding student health care coverage. One of the struggles that student executives have is that there is constant turnover, which makes it hard to be consistent in informing health care coverage. Student Services has the expertise to be involved and can help negotiate. Student Services has been doing this already with EmpowerMe, which hasn't been working, but Student Services wants to get a provider that works for them.

Regarding the first question, Gauthier states that the \$14 million funding is only for mental health. Student Services needs funding for all other units. For example, career planning is a big stressor for students and Student Services need to be better able to support students in this way. This is a big future focus for Student Services. The other focus is on International Student Services. The university may not recognize that when they expand the number of international services, this is wonderful, but it has a huge impact on Student Services because the students need support. Most universities have international student centers, which McGill doesn't have. Student Services needs to be thinking about how to better support international students. The two big concerns are career planning services and international student services.

Councillor Bazylykut asks if there are plans to address the wait times for follow-up, as people may access the service faster, but they may not receive fast follow-up.



Gauthier responds that follow-up is critical. Historically, Student Services has held students throughout their entire career at McGill, but this isn't feasible anymore given the increased demand increase (57%). Last year, Counselling Services saw 6,000 students. The reality is that there have to be some caps, meaning that Counselling Services may not be appropriate for students who require weekly appointments with a counsellor. They could also join support groups and see an off-campus counsellor, which is what they are talking about with regard to collaborative care. Student Services found that 10% of the students took up 70-80% of the spots. When most students need 1-5 sessions, a consideration needs to be made with regard to equity.

Councillor Flaherty asks when the primary care physicians will be able to help students get a new prescription. She also asks if any Local Wellness Advisors will have prescription-writing abilities.

Gauthier responds that the Local Wellness Advisors are counsellors, but they don't have the professional ability to do prescriptions. Nurse practitioners could be able to write prescriptions, but they are in such high demand. The new general practitioners will have mental health expertise backgrounds, which is part of the job description. Student Services will be increasing the number of general practitioners in September and training the existing general practitioners.

Senator Buraga asks for a more detailed run-down of the reduction of the wait times.

Gauthier responds that when she first came on board, wait times were as high as 4-6 months. During the last two years, wait times have been reduced to 4-6 weeks for first-time counselling. With the hub, urgent care matters will be seen on the same day by a mental health clinician (not necessarily a counsellor). Student Services is looking at providing access to a mental health clinician for students other than those who require urgent care, within 72 hours. A student who wants short-term counselling will be seen within two weeks with the hub.

b. Geoffrey Phillips, Director, Sport Programs, Athletics & Recreation **(10)**

Philip Quintal introduces himself as presenting with Geoffrey Phillips. He states that he will be sharing information about Athletics & Recreation, and facilities and the development of facilities in the future. He explains that the state of the facilities is always of prime concern for them and they want to provide as good an opportunity as possible for McGill students.

Geoffrey Phillips states that they are strong believers in the wellness issue and the role of



Athletics & Recreation in wellness. He points to collaboration done with Student Services and states that they hope that students take advantage of services provided by Athletics & Recreation. Philip Quintal states that one of the important issues is ensuring that facilities stay up to date and that they can accommodate the programs they want to offer to students. Facility expansion and major renovations are not operations or expenses that come out of the regular operating budget. They come out of the funds set aside for facility development and facility improvements. Over the last number of years, since the early 80s, a lot of the work done in these areas has been a result of student support. Students have provided this support through a facility improvement fee, matched by McGill, which has allowed Athletics & Recreation to undertake the ventures they have undertaken. Donors have also contributed to this support. Undergraduate students have supported the fee, which is \$10 per semester. This has always been matched dollar-for-dollar by the university. With student support, the university also supports. Over the years, Athletics & Recreation has been able to expand and build new facilities. The total support amounts to about \$10 million. A few years ago, Athletics & Recreation conducted consultations with students. From these came a gender-neutral washroom, creation of a gender-neutral changing room, study lounge in the hall, two fitness pods for those to work-out privately (these have been extremely popular), resurfaced Molson Stadium and Forbes Field, as well as responding to security issues.

Looking to the future, there is a list of items they would like to do. It is important to go to the users of the facilities to find out what they need and want. Through the Student Athletic Council, interaction with SSMU and PGSS, surveys and a committee established by the DPSLL, they have received a significant amount of suggestions. They have now put together a list of projects that reflect that which is important to students. Refurbishing the men's and women's locker rooms is a priority, building a teaching kitchen, creating additional gender-neutral facilities, adding more fitness pods, resurfacing the track in the Fieldhouse and the tennis courts, improving air conditioning in the Fieldhouse, retiling the entire pool and pool deck, creating additional study areas, and relocating the sports medicine clinic, which is inaccessible.

Athletics & Recreation is incredibly appreciative of the continued support. It is because of the undergraduate students getting on board that Athletics & Recreation has been allowed to move forward. This list of plans to move forward depends on that continued support. He hopes that undergraduate students will continue to support the effort to make the facilities better for the McGill community.



## Question Period:

The SSMU President ask if the Library Improvement Fund will use the funds for staffing, as has been done historically.

Philip Quintal states that the funds cannot be used for salary or travel expenses. It is solely for facility improvement. He states that the information about Athletics & Recreation costs and expenditures are available to students.

## 8. Announcements (5)

The Speaker announces that Arts Representative 3 to Legislative Council, Councillor Andrew Figueiredo, has tendered their resignation to Legislative Council. The Speaker of AUS has been informed and informed the Speaker that the vacancy will be decided by AUS Council at the next AUS Council on the 27<sup>th</sup>. The choice will be made before the next SSMU Legislative Council.

The SSMU President states that on February 25<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 PM there will be the General Assembly at the Frank Dawson Adams auditorium.

The President states that he would like to speak to each faculty's council to give a presentation. If there are other bodies that would be open to meeting, he is also interested in presenting there. He asks for councillors to send meeting dates for each council.

Senator Buraga states that the Bachelor of Arts and Science Integrative Science is running their yearly elections so the nomination are ongoing and will continue until February 25<sup>th</sup>. The polling period will take place between March 11 and 14. For any information, councillors can contact [president@mcgillbasic.com](mailto:president@mcgillbasic.com) or Senator Buraga.

The Speaker states that if there are no motions presented at this time, if an individual would like to bring one forward, it can be brought forward up to 24 hours before. If it brought forward from the floor, it requires three-fourths of the assembly to accept it.

Regarding the referendum, the polling period begins on March 26<sup>th</sup>. The deadline for the wording is fourteen days prior. The next Legislative Council is the deadline for any Legislative Council-initiated referendum questions. If you are currently working on, it must be distributed to council 72 hours prior, which is Monday.



## 9. Question Period (5)

### a. Submission of Questions: President

Senator Buraga asked: “From the point of view of the SSMU Executive Committee, could you please explain the approval process for Political Science course 339, and what steps are being taken now in response to this event.”

The President states that SSMU is required to engage in a process, for any course approval whether departmental or faculty, as stipulated in the Fee Advisory Committee Terms of Reference. When a faculty approves a fee, they send a letterhead to the President saying that the society approves this fee, agreed on this date, and signed by their president. The SSMU Executive Committee generally approve the fee, acknowledging whatever the faculties decide and send this to the Deputy Provost. With the current process, the AUS has asked to rescind their original fee. SSMU has also decided to rescind this and it has been brought to the Deputy Provost. They are unsure of what the Deputy Provost will do.

## 10. Old Business [95]

### a. Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of Governance on Freedom of Information 2018-11-15 [30] – **NOT APPROVED** 2-23-2

Senator Buraga motivates, stating that what was done in the Steering Committee subcommittee, was review the motion itself and take into consideration the concerns that were brought up during deliberations. These amendments came from recommendations of the General Manager, in terms of ensuring that this process would be quick and conducive to making the process as smooth as possible. It directs any freedom of information requests to the SSMU President or the General Manager. Business days were also specified within the timeline.

Question Period:

Senator Lametti asks about point 2.8, “Sanctions for Violations”. Senator Lametti asks for further elaboration on this point.

Senator Buraga states that the intention of this clause was to ensure that SSMU representatives would be accountable to this and not block freedom of information requests. It basically says that if you aren’t transparent or accountable, then you will be punished for it.



The SSMU President asks about the documentation that this adds for the public to see, given that Board and Legislative Council minutes are already public.

Senator Buraga states that it would open up the breadth of what students would be able to see, for example email threads between Executives and work within the legal community. It also streamlines the process, as there is a central person to ask for these documents.

VP Shapiro asks for an explanation of what similar organizations allow individuals to read email exchanges, besides those under freedom of information acts.

Senator Buraga responds that the intention of this motion was to bring the Society up to speed with regard to how anybody in Canada can request information from McGill through the freedom of information request that way. Senator Buraga states that he trusts that future SSMU Executives wouldn't engage in stonewalling, but this motion provides good checks and balances against that.

VP Shapiro asks if there are any provisions in this motion to ensure that SSMU has the same resources and capacity to go through requests and disburse information as quickly as McGill can.

Senator Buraga responds that one of the measures McGill takes is to give the Board of Directors the authority to block the request, if it is exempted as a document or not submitted in good faith. Senator Buraga would want to see how this act is accessed by students and then add a provision afterwards.

Senator Lametti asks first who would be responsible for implementing sanctions outlined in 2.8. Second, he asks if the timeline is short, given the policy applying year-round.

Senator Buraga states that sanctions would be implemented by the Legislative Council. Regarding the second question, this is an idealized timeline. He sees three-weeks as a long period of time to find the information.

Debate:

Senator Buraga makes a point of inquiry, asking if the amendments are voted on or already included because the motion has been committed. The Speaker states that they are in the debate portion of the entire motion and the amendments have already been incorporated.



Senator Lametti states **Motions to amend section 2.4 to remove the period, add a comma and append the words “or transmitting them to their successor.”** This motion is seconded by Senator Buraga.

Senator Lametti states that the reason for this amendment is that the positions covered by this policy have a term length of one year, so it is reasonable for someone leaving the position to transmit all documents to the successor. This is more efficient and saves them from answering requests after they've left McGill.

### **Voting on Amendment – PASSES**

Returning to debate on the main motion.

VP McLaughlin states that all documents of the SSMU are already made public with the exception of email correspondence. Where McGill is a public institution, SSMU is not, so there is no onus to have the same approach to freedom of information request process. VP McLaughlin states that the private email correspondence is private, so he doesn't feel comfortable with this process applying to private correspondence.

Senator Buraga responds that students pay a lot of money for this institution to exist. All of the work that individuals do are as a result of the members paying fees. He thinks that they should be able to have access to information about the work representative individuals do on their behalf. This holds representative individuals accountable.

Councillor Scarra asks if the requests process would be such that if she asks to access personal, private information, such as that contained within Equity complaints, would it be accessible via this process.

Senator Buraga responds that this information would be exempted and the person making the requests would be told the reasoning for the exemption.

VP Shapiro states that he will be voting against this motion. His first reason is that a number of the Executives conduct political affairs on behalf of the organization. The ability to do so will diminish drastically if individuals know that correspondence can be accessed. There are mechanisms to hold Executives accountable in other ways without having access to emails. The second reason is that unlike at McGill, within the SSMU, those filing requests for



information and those fulfilling these requests will likely know each other. Pretending that this dynamic won't get personal quickly is silly.

The SSMU President states that he will be voting no as well. He points to operational costs of fulfilling these requests, stating that an archival process would require an operations cost. Councillors should be critical of this cost. The President acknowledges that they are accountable to students, but they will be spending money on this process itself. The President states that he thinks they are very transparent using the mechanisms they have in place.

VP McLaughlin states that many individuals would be less prone to having things in writing and more prone to making more informal agreements. He also thinks that this is a weak policy because it is not particularly enforceable. He states that interpretation of sensitive or personal information is up to the individual who possesses it, and there are issues in this process of determination.

Senator Buraga responds that political negotiations have been considered in 2.3.1c. This point prevents against that. Regarding the sensitive information issue, a singular person is not solely responsible for vetoing the request. The requestor can appeal to the Board and the Board of Directors will make this decision. He states that he would like to pass this and then bring it to the Board of Directors.

Senator Lametti states that the exceptions are unclear currently. He would encourage postponing this motion or voting no.

Councillor Scarra asks if it would make more sense to make financial considerations before the motion is brought to Council.

VP Shapiro states that there is a shared interest in increasing transparency. One reason that Executives are most vocal is that they are in an election period and it is a concern that people may not be willing to seek out these positions with the extra pressure put on them. They want to ensure that they are creating roles that people want to be in. He is unsure what questions they are trying to solve. He states that "negotiations" reflects a limited understanding of the types of discussions Executives engage in. For example, a professor may now offer to help with a project, but may not do so in the future if this email could be publicly accessible.



Senator Buraga makes a point of parliamentary inquiry, asking if this could be referred to the Board without it being passed through Legislative Council. The SSMU President states that this could be done, but he wants to ensure that Council wants to commit to this.

Debate on Motion to Commit to the Board of Directors:

The SSMU President asks to vote on the motion itself, rather than commit this to the Board.

Senator Lametti states that he disagrees with asks to hear from the Board.

### **Voting on Motion to Commit the Motion to the Board of Directors - FAILS**

Councillor Price **Motions to call the previous question.**

Senator Buraga **Motions to vote by roll-call.**

The vote is conducted by roll-call.

### **Voting Procedure:**

Voting on motion with amendment – **NOT APPROVED 2 – 23 - 2**

- b. Motion Regarding Adoption of a Conflict of Interest Policy 2019-02-07 [30] – **APPROVED – 24-0-1**

The SSMU President motivates. He states that Speaker Jamal wrote his policy. It expired a few years ago. He encourages councillors to make amendments if they see it necessary.

### **Voting Procedure:**

Voting on motion – **PASSES 24 – 0 - 1**

- c. Motion Regarding Changes to the Rubric for Full Status Clubs 2019-02-07 [30] - **POSTPONED**

Councillor Flaherty motivates. She states that she will discuss circumstances that have led movers of this motion to want to postpone this motion within the notice of motion later.



Councillor Flaherty **Motions to postpone this motion to next Legislative Council**, seconded by Councillor Hu.

Debate on postponement:

Senator Buraga asks if they will be able to meet with VP Esterle before next Council.

Councillor Flaherty responds that they are unsure.

Councillor Flaherty rescinds the previous motion and **Motions to postpone** this motion until Legislative Council on March 14 – **PASSES 25 - 0**

#### 11. New Business [40]

- a. Notice of Motion Regarding Provisions to the Internal Regulations of Student Groups 2019-02-21

Councillor Flaherty motivates, stating that within the Internal Regulations it is a principle to involve the Clubs Committee, but there are ambiguities, which means that this can be overlooked. They would like to ensure that the evaluation methods are clear and fair, and can't just be according to the will of a singular Executive. They want to be able to bring the changes and evaluations to the Legislative Council, so that they are aware.

- b. Motion Regarding an Interim Provision to the Internal Regulations of Elections and Referenda 2019-02-21 [5] - **APPROVED 24 - 0 - 1**

Senator Buraga motivates, stating that the previously-passed elections timeline violates some IRs. This motion gives an exception to this specific election period. This allows them to avoid the long and exhausting process of putting it in the Listserv, etc.

#### **Voting Procedure:**

Voting on motion – **APPROVED 24 - 0 - 1**



c. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Elections Timeline 2019-02-21 [5] –  
**APPROVED 25-0-0**

Senator Buraga motivates the motion, stating that this extends the timeline to refer questions to referenda from 6 PM to 10 PM. This will allow Legislative Council to send the question regarding the Fall Reading Week to referendum.

**Voting Procedure:**

Voting on motion – **APPROVED 25 – 0 - 0**

d. **Motion Regarding Renewal of Library Improvement Fund Fee 2019-02-21**  
**[10] - APPROVED 23-0-1**

The SSMU President motivates, explaining that this fee will expire this year. He states that this fee has existed since 1996 and is matched by the university. It helps ensure 24-hour access to the libraries during midterm and final seasons. Over \$100,000 of student staffing, furniture, phone charging stations, all have been funded by this fee.

Question period:

Councillor Scarra asks if the money could go to cleaning up the bathrooms in Redpath.

VP Shapiro states that cleaning cannot be covered by this.

Councillor Abdelhamid asks about the basis for the amount of this fee.

VP Shapiro states that the basis for the amount of this fee is based on the projects that have been funded so far. Some of the costs that are less innovative include 24-hour access and student staffing. There is no reason to ask for more money.

Councillor Abdelhamid asks if the amount could be decreased.

VP Shapiro states that this fund is used consistently every year or leftover funds are used.



Debate:

The President states that funds are accumulated over years to fund major projects, such as the Schulich bathroom renovations. He states that this motion allows them to ask this question to the student body.

Senator Lametti states that this fee is one of the most effective fees. He wants councillors to be cognizant of the ways in which some fees that go against the equity mandate of SSMU, but Senator Lametti will be voting in favour of this.

Senator Buraga asks about the contribution of this fund to Fiat Lux.

The President states that that is a separate fund.

Senator Buraga asks about the student staff positions that are funded by this fee.

VP Shapiro asks that the Library Improvement Commissioner be allowed to answer these questions at the next Council.

Voting on motion – **APPROVED 23 – 0 – 1**

e. **Motion Regarding the Creation of Security Services Collective Promotion Committee 2019-02-21 [10] - COMMITTED**

The SSMU President motivates, stating that this committee involves collaboration between Security Services (Walksafe, DriveSafe, MSERT and Nightline). The desire is to generally promote their services better and more effectively. It will be a committee under Legislative Council. These services should be more accessible to students.

Question Period:

Senator Lametti asks why this would be under Legislative Council, if there are no spots for members-at-large from Legislative Council.



The SSMU President responds that this is a fair question. He states that the thought is that under Legislative Council, there would be more institutional memory, when compared with those under Executive portfolios.

Senator Lametti asks if would be appropriate to be under the Board of Directors.

The SSMU President would be in favour of amending this in that way.

The SSMU President **Motions to amend the motion**, changing all mentions of “Legislative Council” to “Board of Directors”.

Debate on Amendment:

Senator Lametti states that he thinks this amendment should be rejected and the motion should be postponed until VP Esterle is present.

SSMU President states that there is nothing time-sensitive about this motion.

**Voting Procedure:**

Voting on amendment – **PASSES**

Return to question period.

There are no further questions.

Debate on main motion:

Senator Lametti **Motions to commit this motion to the Executive Committee**, seconded by VP Shapiro.

**Voting Procedure:**

Voting on commitment - **PASSES**



f. Motion Regarding Adoption of General Assembly Standing Rules 2019-02-21 [5]  
**- APPROVED 24-0-0**

The SSMU President motivates the motion, stating that these will take effect on February 25<sup>th</sup>. They are the same rules as last semester.

Question Period:

Senator Lametti **Motion to amend the motion** by adding “,or be exempted of this requirement by the Speaker” and “or to the Speaker’s discretion” seconded by the President.

**Voting Procedure:**

Voting on amendment – **PASSES**

There is no debate.

**Voting Procedure:**

Voting on motion with amendments – **APPROVED 24-0-0**

g. Motion Regarding Statement on McGill Food Services Contract 2019-02-21 -  
**APPROVED 21-0-2**

VP Shapiro motivates this motion, stating that McGill is now looking into a food service provider for locations across campus. The Executives feel it is important to be involved in this process because food services affect students heavily. The thought is that amendments to the letter would be welcome during debate. SSMU Senators thought that this would be a good step to ensure that student voices are heard.

Question period:

The SSMU President asks how VP Shapiro has so much knowledge about Tim Hortons.



VP Shapiro states that the SSMU President is also passionate about Tim Hortons. VP Shapiro states that there is an emphasis on Tim Hortons because other campuses have this and McGill has previously had a Tim Hortons.

Senator Lametti states that they had previously met with the DPSLL and asks VP Shapiro to elaborate on the way in which services are offered are related to the contract and what will happen moving forward with the contract.

VP Shapiro responds that there may be a slim probability of having a Tim Hortons in the library. From a contract perspective, it may be difficult to get a new group in right before renovations.

Senator Buraga asks about the timeline for this letter to be sent to the committee. He also asks if it were intentional to not include a signature.

VP Shapiro states that if this passes at Legislative Council, it will be set up as a petition which people can add their names to. It can also be signed by Council if necessary.

Debate:

Senator Buraga **Motion to amend the letter** to include “Signed, the Students’ Society of McGill University” seconded by VP Shapiro.

### **Voting Procedure:**

Voting on the amendment – **PASSES**

Return to debate period.

Senator Lametti wants to stress that this letter does emphasize the importance of affordable options. He also states that councillors have the ability to send a message that if these locations are too expensive then they won’t buy items from them.

The President states that once this letter is passed by Council, it will be copied onto another motion that has the active petition. It will then be dropped into the Council drive. The SSMU President asks all councillors to share this with their constituents.



VP Shapiro states that this committee chose not to go through the typical process of having a student representative.

### **Voting Procedure:**

Voting on motion with amendments – **APPROVED 21 – 0 - 2**

- h. Motion Regarding Letter for DPSLL Advisory/Selection Committee 2019-02-21 -  
**APPROVED 21 – 0 – 1**

The SSMU President motivates this motion, stating that this role provides direction to a number of units. This letter references what undergraduate students want to see in the next Deputy Provost.

### **Voting Procedure:**

Voting on motion – **APPROVED 21 – 0 - 1**

- 12. Reports by Committees
  - a. Executive Committee (5)

The President presents the report.

Question period:

Senator Buraga asks whether the sanctions imposed by the VP Finance on clubs has been brought to the Executive Committee for approval.

The President responds that the VP Finance has the ability to impose these sanctions.

Senator Buraga points to the Internal Regulations of Finances which stipulate approval by Executive Committee and then Legislative Council. Senator Buraga asks when Legislative Council will be asked to approve these sanctions.

The President responds that he will bring it to the next Executive Committee and to the Legislative Council after that.



b. Mental Health Committee

The President presents the report.

There are no questions.

13. Reports by Councillors

a. Andre Lametti (Senate Caucus) (3)

Senator Lametti presents the report.

There are no questions.

b. Shannon Stemper (IRC) (3)

Councillor Stemper presents the report.

There are no questions.

c. Fairhurst Lyons (Science) (3)

Councillor Lyons presents the report.

There are no questions.

d. Brandon Hersh (Dentistry) (3)

Councillor Hersh presents the report.

Question Period:

SSMU President asks when the free cleaning event is.

Councillor Hersh responds that this event does not exist.

14. Executive Reports (18)

a. President (3)



The President presents the report.

Question Period:

Councillor Kara asks when Council can expect a donation from the current SSMU President, given the donation by a past SSMU president.

The SSMU President responds that this will be 30 years.

Councillor Scarra asks if the SSMU President can settle for 10 minutes at AUS Council.

The President states that this will be difficult and he would appreciate as much time as possible.

b. VP University Affairs (3)

VP Shapiro presents the report.

Question Period:

Senator Buraga notes the January 29<sup>th</sup> McGill Tribune editorial, detailing the impact of the OSAP cuts on students, and asks VP Shapiro if he can do anything in his position to ensure that they get the funding that they need.

VP Shapiro welcomes suggestions, but states that this may be an external, Ontario issue.

Senator Buraga asks if the VP UA would be amenable to meeting with the SSAO about providing support to Ontario students.

VP Shapiro states that he can look into this.

c. VP Internal (3)

VP McLaughlin presents the report.



Question Period:

Councillor Scarra asks whether FYC were planning to clean the Arts Lounge.

VP McLaughlin states that the plan is to do so.

d. VP Finance (3)

The President presents the report.

There are no questions.

e. VP Student Life (3)

The President presents the report.

There are no questions.

f. VP External Portfolio (3)

VP Shapiro and VP McLaughlin present the report.

Question Period:

Senator Buraga asks about AVEQ's dissolution and what the current status of this work is.

VP Shapiro states that there was a push to engage with the question of this, but now only one of the paths are viable. There was no commitment to join the one that is left. Right now, SSMU is in the same position – if there are individuals interested, they will pursue provincial representation.

Senator Lametti asks for VP Shapiro's take on the pushback to the discussion of internships.

VP Shapiro states that he doesn't want to say anything conclusive.

Senator Buraga asks about the Winter 2018 GA Motion about the fight for free education. He was told that there would be work done this semester, but would like on update on this.



VP Shapiro states that the action committed to since that motion was to support those organizations who rallied around the motion. The President and VP Shapiro sat down with those organizations to discuss how SSMU can support them.

#### 15. Confidential Session

- a. There will be a confidential session this evening.

#### 16. Adjournment - **22:36 (10:36PM)**

Councillor Hersh Motions to adjourn, seconded by the President – **PASSES Unanimously**

*Tre Mansdoerfer*

---

President, Tre Mansdoerfer

**APPROVED**