



Legislative Council

February 28, 2019

1. Call to Order - **18:40 (6:40PM)**

The speaker calls the Council to order at 6:40 PM.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The speaker presents the land acknowledgement.

3. Attendance

The speaker conducts attendance.

Proxies: Maeve Botham for Councillor Scarra (Arts), Alex Miller for Councillor Hobbs (ArtSci), Dylan Wong for Councillor Milchberg.

Absent: Councillor Fletcher, Councillor Frenette, Councillor Smit, Councillor Bazylykut, Councillor Cosette, Councillor Kleiner, VP McLaughlin, VP Esterle.

Other: Councillor Smit leaves at 8:29PM. Councillor Kara arrives at 8:09PM.

4. Approval of Minutes - **APPROVED**

Fall 2018 General Assembly Minutes - **APPROVED**

There are no changes or corrections. The minutes stand approved as distributed.

January 24, 2019 Legislative Council – **APPROVED**

Senator Buraga notes that pages 12 and 14 misspell his last name.

SSMU President notes that “um” should be removed from page 8 and that page 12 includes “ab” where it should be “an”.



No further corrections. The minutes stand approved as corrected.

Senator Buraga **Moves to amend the January 24th Minutes to include the voting for responsible representation motion.** The Speaker notifies the Council that the minutes will be amended to reflect this change.

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

Proxy for Scarra **Motions to amend the agenda to add: Motion in Support of Revisions to McGill's Policy Against Sexual Violence and Student Advocacy 2019-02-28 to the start of new business – PASSES – 20 - 0**

VP Wang **Motions to move the Finance Committee Report and VP Finance Report to after Old Business – PASSES – 20 – 0**

SSMU President **Motions to move both presentations to after all business and to move the Health and Dental Fee motion after Health and Dental Fee presentation – PASSES – 20 – 0**

Senator Buraga **Motions to move Motion in Support of Revisions to McGill's Policy Against Sexual Violence and Student Advocacy to after the Question Period – PASSES – 20 – 0**

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

The Speaker reads out the steering committee report.

There are no questions for this report.

7. Guest Speakers

a. SSMU President, Health and Dental Plan **(10)**

The President yields time to Andrew Dixon (he/him) as member of the Health and Dental Committee.



Students' Society of McGill University

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

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

Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories

Dixon states that he will talk about the Health and Dental Plan as it currently stands. He explains that SSMU dental benefits are provided to all international and non-international students, but health insurance is only provided to non-international students. The university provides health insurance to students through Blue Cross, but that will not be the focus of discussion today. The insurance broker is StudentCare and the underwriter is Desjardins.

Two pieces of data will be reviewed, including the survey data from 2019 and the claims data. There were 179 responses received to the dental question posed during the survey. The dental coverage used to be \$750, but was lowered to \$500. The question was posed within the context of a willingness to pay. 49% of survey respondents preferred raising coverage back to \$750.

He explains that the current provision for mental health is \$500, which includes coverage for individual providers and the question was posed in a similar style, regarding willingness to pay for an increase. 37.4% of respondents were in favour of an increase to \$1000 and 33% were in favour of no increase in benefits.

EmpowerMe is a service offered by StudentCare, which provides telephone and video counselling to students. It is offered as part of the dental plan, since it covers all undergraduate students. An overwhelming majority of students had not heard of EmpowerMe. 26% of respondents voted in favour of removing it and 26% voted in favour of keeping it. The SSMU President states that 62 people used it over the course of a year, but \$100,000 was paid to EmpowerMe for the service.

Dixon explains that a loss ratio is the number of claims paid out versus the number of premiums paid to them. Insurance companies tolerate a loss ratio of 80-90%, which allows them to keep their margins and SSMU to maintain a decent plan cost. The SSMU's loss ratios have been consistently over 90% for the health plan and over 100% for three out of five months of the dental plan. Until now, there has been a 97% loss ratio for health plan overall and a 101% loss ratio for dental plan overall.

Dixon states that the insurance company essentially paid SSMU to have insurance this year. The current breakdown shows a usage increase and a cost associated with the current number of benefits. The current breakdown includes health insurance at \$145, dental insurance at \$100 and it is opt-outable.



Dixon explains that there are three different options and the numbers do not add up because they are taking into account inflation, which is noted in the question asked to students.

Option 1 includes a \$18.94 increase to the health plan due to usage and removal of the naturopath benefit to save \$1.35. This represents a total increase of \$27.54. The dental plan would increase to \$23.24 and EmpowerMe removal would save \$4.50.

Option 2 includes the addition of a massage therapy benefit for \$2.10 and the removal of the naturopath benefit to save \$1.35.

Option 3 is currently proposed within the question. Option 3 includes the addition of a massage therapy benefit for \$2.10 and the removal of the naturopath benefit to save \$1.35. It also includes an increase of the psychology benefit to \$1000 for \$13.34. The total increase would be \$41.70. To include an increase to \$750 for dental coverage would result in a total increase of \$48.00.

The question being posed today surrounds the different options suggested for increases. Dixon asks councillors for their feedback on which option should be selected.

Question Period:

Councillor Lyons asks how many people filled out the survey and the SSMU President responds that there were approximately 225-250 students.

Senator Buraga asks if the usage changes are to ensure that the loss ratio is between 80-90%. The SSMU President says yes.

The SSMU President asks for additional information on the psychology benefits usage rates. Dixon responds that mental health plan was added in 2016 and it is very actively used. Current usage rates are eight percent coverage per visit of the total plan (\$80,000-90,000 this year) per year. This is approximately 12% of the total plan and will likely amount to about \$120,000 this year. The SSMU President states that the psychology benefits usage rates are significant.

Proxy Botham asks for the percentage or number of people that use the entirety of their psychology coverage. The SSMU President responds that they do not have this number, but



they do know that the current plan allows for about six appointments per year before the cap is reached. Increasing the benefit to \$1000 would allow for 12 appointments per year.

Senator Buraga asks if the two-year surplus planned will be enough to cover the projected increase in psychology usage. The SSMU President states that the plan bills higher in the first two years to run a surplus and then runs a deficit in the following two years to ensure that benefits remain consistent without annual referenda. The calculations show that the two-year surplus will be enough.

b. Motion Regarding SSMU's Health and Dental Fee Question for Winter 2019
2019-02-28 **[20] - APPROVED 20-0-0**

The President explains that this motion concerns the health and dental fee question, and presumes that Council wishes to pursue the greatest increase in benefits under the plan which includes prescription massage therapy, removal of EmpowerMe, removing naturopathy, and increasing dental coverage to \$750. This was the plan the committee initially thought to go with, but they are open to adjustment if need be. The increase to psychology is very badly needed. Fees are going to increase significantly regardless, as the plan fees have not increased in three or four years.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

The SSMU President states that the total plan would increase by \$50, but the President encourages all Councillors to consider these changes.

Senator Lametti states that they trust the work of the committee and that this is a good plan that matches the needs of students.

Senator Buraga echoes his colleague, but wonders if the survey results are representative of the student body since there were only 200 responses. His second concern is how many students are maxing out their psychology coverage. He states that if people are still needing more support, it would perhaps be worth determining if it should be increased further.



The President states that this is a fair question, but the current focus has been on how many claims are paid out for psychology practitioners. The new proposed plan allows for about 12 psychology appointments per year. The President states that they do not have information about the discrepancy. Senator Buraga asks if it would be possible to get that discrepancy information. The SSMU President is unsure if this could happen. It would depend on what the plan provider or underwriter makes available.

Senator Buraga asks if the President would be amenable to postponing this until the next Legislative Council. The SSMU President will reach out to other members of the committee regarding this discussion.

Andrew Dixon, Member of the Gallery, states that councillors should understand the urgency of this motion, as there is a tight timeframe of getting this referendum question to students. He appreciates the need for this information, but urges Councillors to not put this question on the line by postponing it unless the information is urgently needed.

Councillor Sanchez recommends that this plan not be postponed and states that there is significant information that members of the committee can share if there are questions.

Proxy Botham echoes what Councillor Sanchez has said about not postponing, but also asks what happens if the referendum fails. The President states that if the referendum fails, then the current plan remains, but that would be seen as a cut in benefits. Dental would face significant decreases in benefits.

Proxy Botham asks what efforts will be taken to inform students about the significant increase. The President states that they are currently visiting Faculty Councils to pitch the new plan and explain the increases.

No further debate.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on Motion Regarding SSMU's Health and Dental Fee Question for Winter 2019 –
APPROVED Unanimously 20 – 0

8. Announcements (5)



The Speaker announced that the motion from the Consultative Forum is on the agenda this evening and thanks Councillors for attending.

VP UA announces that there is an Indigeneity & Solidarity event tomorrow, March 1.

Councillor Hu states that tomorrow is the second town hall hosted by FYC. There is a clubbing event on March 13th. The Councillor thanks VP McLaughlin for his help on these efforts.

9. Question Period (5)

Senator Lametti states that it has come to his attention that vote-splitting among constituencies is an expectation and the Senator asks about the historical basis for this? The President has not seen this happen at Council for the past three years and it is enforced very rarely. The last usage was on the Igor Sadikov issue during the 2016-2017 academic year.

10. Business Arising/Referred

- a. Motion in Support of Revisions to McGill's Policy on Sexual Violence and Student Advocacy 2018-02-28 - **APPROVED** 19-0-0

Proxy Botham motivates, stating McGill's Policy on Sexual Violence is currently being revised. It is going to Senate for approval on March 20th and documents will be sent in on March 16th. There are more changes that working group members would like to see happen. This motion would be in support of these changes. This motion calls for a broader prohibition on professor-student relationships, due to the inherent power imbalance. It also calls on SSMU to lobby the Quebec government to amend the privacy law to allow information to be shared with complainants.

Question Period:

Councillor Hu has a question about the "Be it resolved" clause of point four. He asks why they decided on "seven years" and under which circumstances the documents will be kept on file.

Proxy Botham states that the motivation is that when professors apply for tenure, non-research related documents, such as complaints or disciplinary processes, should also be considered as part of the tenure dossier. This is important information and it shows that it is something serious to have this information about professors trying to apply for tenure.



Senator Lametti asks for the VP UA to respond to the first question. VP Shapiro states that the tenure cycle is seven years and that is why the number was selected.

VP Wang asks if “teaching staff” includes undergraduate teaching assistants. Proxy Botham states that currently TAs and undergraduate TAs are under the same umbrella as professors in the context of the policy. Part of the advocacy they are engaged in is to distinguish between TAs and professors, as there is a wide range of power and positionality.

Councillor Hersh asks if an exception is made for pre-existing relationships. Proxy Botham states that the current policy does include an exception and this is very logical, if someone has a relationship before entering the university. These are instead handled as conflicts of interest.

Senator Lametti asks why the policy only includes reference to alcohol and cannabis. Proxy Botham states that there should be a safety net to facilitate safe reporting, but the McGill administration has levied legal reasons for why other drugs are not included.

Debate:

Senator Lametti **Motions to amend the Be it Resolved clause to append a new clause:** “Be it resolved that SSMU advocate for protections for survivors who are found to have used alcohol, cannabis, or illegal substances during an investigation, as allowed by law”. This motion is seconded by Councillor Stemper.

Proxy Botham asks if Senator Lametti would be amenable to changing the language to align it with the previous parts of the motion. This amendment is friendly.

VP Shapiro states that it makes sense to include this, as this is work that is already being engaged in. It would be great to have the Society vote in favour of this amendment to reinforce the work of the Senators.

The President makes a point of personal privilege, announcing his temporary departure to present to EUS Council. He will return shortly.

Senator Buraga **Motions to amend the amendment** to strike and replace significant parts of the motion, so that it reads “Be it resolved, that the SSMU support and advocate for



protections for survivors against disciplinary investigation or sanction, in the course of making a Disclosure or a Report, that they breached a university regulation or policy by possessing or consuming alcohol, cannabis or any illegal drug, as allowed by law.” This amendment is friendly.

Councillor Sanchez makes a point of personal privilege, requesting that size of the projection be increased.

Councillor Sanchez asks if the concern is that the person would not be in full capacity to make a decision.

Proxy Botham states that in the course of making a report or disclosure, they should not be subject to disciplinary action for consumption or use of illegal substances.

Councillor Sanchez asks if there is any concern that someone might argue that they are misremembering due to use of a drug prescribed. Proxy Botham responds that this isn't a concern under this policy because it is trauma-informed.

Voting on Amendment – PASSES 17 – 0 – 1

Returning to debate on the main motion.

Councillor Pilote asks what the current model for this policy is at other schools in Canada. Proxy Botham states that what is being asked for goes beyond other policies in Canada. The current policy is in line with several other universities like UdeM, but what is being asked for is more similar to American schools.

VP Shapiro states that it is important that this motion comes before Council as PGSS and MAUT have already voted on this, so students should be heard, as well. He states that more attention should be given to undergraduate teaching relationships. He also mentions that the student does not find out the outcome of the disciplinary procedures and this is a breach of national justice.

Robin (Member of the Gallery, she/her) calls on Council to specify who should be doing this advocacy work in the motion.



Senator Lametti states that he wants to continue with what VP Shapiro was saying. Bill 151 does not allow complainants to know the outcome of an investigation and mandating SSMU to pursue this change is important.

VP Shapiro states that Senate is taking place on the 27th not the 20th. He acknowledges the value in amendment suggested by the Member of the Gallery, but also sees value in keeping it broad. He suggests that it is the Vice-President University Affairs responsibility, as well as Senate Caucus and the President.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on motion with amendment – **APPROVED 19 - 0 - 0**

11. Old Business [30]

- a. Motion Regarding Provisions to the Internal Regulations of Student Groups
2019-02-21 [15] - **POSTPONED**

Moved by: Councillor Flaherty (Clubs Representative), Councillor Kara (Clubs Representative), Councillor Hu (First Year Council Representative), Councillor Buraga (Senate Caucus Representative).

Councillor Flaherty motivates, reiterating what was mentioned at last Council.

Councillor Price asks why VP Esterle is not a mover on this motion and whether this is due to opposition or simply because they did not move it.

Councillor Flaherty responds that she does not know certainly what VP Esterle thinks.

VP Shapiro asks if it would be valuable to postpone this motion, so VP Esterle can be at the table.

Councillor Flaherty states that the motion is urgent for the Club Committee and should be passed, since it has been delayed for over a month.

Debate:

VP Shapiro asks what is pressing between now and next Council. Councillor Kara states that this motion is not to change the rubric, but instead to have the Club Committee be involved



in the process and ensure that the VP Student Life is held accountable to the committee. Councillor Flaherty agrees that the Club Committee won't be meeting until after reading week. She doesn't see a reason to postpone the motion.

Senator Lametti states that he is sympathetic to the needs of the Club Committee, but it is the job of the Legislative Council is to fully consider IR changes and that cannot be done without VP Esterle. Councillor Kara responds that the nature of this motion is not one that would cause a lot of contention. The sole purpose is to increase accountability of the process

VP Wang asks if the Club Committee is a management committee or a working committee.

VP Shapiro states that this is very valuable work, but not urgent and can be postponed.

Councillor Kara responds that VP Esterle has been absent from Club Committee meetings, so it doesn't matter whether they are a management committee or working committee.

Senator Buraga asks if VP Esterle has communicated her position on this motion to any of the SSMU Executives.

VP Shapiro states that he understands that the VP Student Life is interested in this motion, but also has some concerns on the motion. He continues that it probably makes sense to postpone in this case.

Councillor Flaherty states that she understands the concerns of the VP Student Life not being present, but the merits of the motion should be debated and not its urgency. The motion states that changes to the club rubric must be approved by the Club Committee. The current rubric is putting a damper on the Club Committee and the matter is urgent.

Senator Lametti states that he has some concerns on the substance of the motion. The motion requires more thought and he would be in favour of postponing it.

Councillor Price states that it is great to see this motion returning several times, as this process is important. He does not feel comfortable voting on this motion without the input of VP Esterle. He is in favour of temporarily tabling this discussion.

VP Wang states that his reason for asking about the nature of the Club Committee is because it is important to determine whether VP Esterle wants to delegate determining the rubric to



Club Committee or wants the Committee to carry out the decisions of VP Esterle as a working group.

Councillor Flaherty disagrees that it would create operational inefficiencies if the Club Committee became a management committee instead of a working group, as it could allow for the VP Student Life to act unilaterally.

Senator Lametti **Motions to postpone this motion until the next meeting of the March 14th Legislative Council, seconded by Councillor Sanchez.**

Councillor Flaherty asks if VP Esterle's attendance would this be impacted by VP Esterle's recent stepping back from some responsibilities.

Senator Lametti makes a point of order.

Councillor Hersh asks if VP Esterle will be present at the next Legislative Council. Councillor Sanchez responds that she cannot speak to VP Esterle's availabilities, but they could write a short response to be read out if they cannot attend.

Councillor Kara does not believe this needs to be postponed since this change only brings the Legislative Council into the process for making the decision.

VP Wang states that the reason that this should be postponed is that there is a delegation between Officers and Legislative Council is the body to voice the opinion of constituents to the Executives. This is how decision-making bodies should work.

Councillor Stemper states that he is hesitant on this motion, as the last time VP Esterle attended, they were not aware of this motion and there still has been no communication.

Councillor Hersh makes a point of order to keep the debate to postponement only.

Senator Lametti states that he supports the point of order, as this is not just the extension of democracy. It is not a simple decision and not all decisions should come through Council or referendum.



Councillor Kara states that clubs are an important part of the student body, and there should be a joining of Executive decisions with expertise and broad representation through Legislative Council.

Councillor Price **Motions to call the previous question, seconded by Councillor Pilote – PASSES 14 - 4**

Debate has now closed on the postponement.

Voting Procedure:

Vote on postponement – **PASSES 12 - 7**

b. Report of the VP Finance

VP Wang reads the report.

Question period:

Senator Buraga asks what a moratorium on clubs and services means.

VP Wang responds that the details have not been finalized, but it might mean a pause on all banking services and approvals of new interim clubs, as well as a compliance review of services.

Councillor Hu asks why it takes so long to approve new funds.

VP Wang responds that there is a lack of compliance and respect for making budgets, so the release of funding has been slowed.

Senator Buraga states that according to the Internal Regulations of Finance, the VP Finance has the right to impose sanctions, but these must be approved by the Executive Committee and then brought to the Legislative Council. Senator Buraga states that clubs have the right to due process on this and asks when they will come to Council. VP Wang states that these are not sanctions that could be waived or discussed, as these are sanctions required per provincial law and bringing these to the Legislative Council would be a rubber stamp that would waste Council's time. Additionally, interim sanctions do not need to be brought to Council.



c. **Report of the Finance Committee (5)**

VP Wang reads the report. VP Wang mentions that the Finance Committee has been ordered to restructure SSMU funds and details this restructuring.

Question period:

Councillor Flaherty asks about the need for more administrative staff and whether this could be met with more top-down delegation.

VP Wang responds there would be officers in place of the Club Administrator. This is a ground-level approach to allow all clubs to have a dedicated and continuous point of contact. This allows for efficient management.

Councillor Kara asks if there are the resources for that amount of staff and where the funding would come from.

VP Wang states that this will be discussed during the President's presentation.

Councillor Flaherty asks about the role of these new staff.

VP Wang responds that these would act as logistical assistants to ensure that contracts are signed, permits are filed, cash controls are followed, and no decision-making powers delegated.

12. New Business [40]

a. **Motion Regarding Renewal of Campus Life Fund Fee 2019-02-28 [5] - APPROVED 18-0-0**

VP Wang motivates, mentioning that this year they have seen the greatest depletion of the fund, which is great.

There are no questions.

Debate:

The President states that it is crazy that these funds are depleting now, which means the surplus is being exhausted, so shout out to VP Wang for implementing the procedures necessary to simplify the funding process.



b. Motion Regarding the Athletics Facility Improvement Fee Question for Winter 2019 Referendum 2019-02-28 [10] - APPROVED 15-3-2

The President motivates, stating that this fee will generate around \$500,000, which is matched by Athletics. The President states that this is an important fee, and would be used to create gender neutral bathrooms and renovate the Fieldhouse.

Question period:

Councillor Sanchez asks if this wouldn't go to overhead operational costs. The President responds that this is correct, and it only goes to operational and capital improvement costs.

Councillor Sanchez asks if there is a concern around posing a question that would allow an increase in fees towards Athletics directly, given that Athletics has not been particularly helpful in the Change the Redmen Name campaign.

VP Shapiro responds that there is certainly a concern, but we should allow our members to raise that concern to Athletics, as the decision is now with the Principal. Council should let this go through.

Councillor Sanchez asks if there is any direct conflict of interest.

VP Shapiro states that at this point, the answer is clearly no, since the funding goes to Athletics improvements, which did not make the decision on the Redmen name.

Senator Buraga asks if this fee has increased from last time or if it is still the same \$10.00 fee. The President responds that it is his understanding that the fee has existed since 1996 at the same amount, but the \$10 number is the same from last time.

Senator Lametti asks if it should not be students that pay for the Athletics services that benefit society at large.

Councillor Kara asks if this fee is non-opt-outable. The President responds yes.

Councillor Sanchez asks if it is appropriate for students to pay this fee. Councillor Pilote states that she wants to echo the sentiments of her colleague on the fees charged by universities.



Councillor Hersh states that the fund is matched dollar for dollar and the Athletics services are used primarily by students.

VP Wang states that it seems odd that students would pay this fee when Athletics services may not be accessible without a membership.

Councillor Sanchez states that McGill can always increase membership costs for outside members as opposed to on students.

The President states that the number of outside members is quite small. Additionally, it is a very powerful message when fees fail at referendum because it sends an indication to the university. SSMU can also choose to not endorse the question later, but it should be put to the students.

VP Wang asks if it is possible for the university to change the fee to implement it into the gym membership. It does not seem right that many students would pay the fee without ever using the gym. The President is unsure. While there is some usage of the fee for things that students have to pay more for, it also contributes to the pool and other facilities open to all students. The President states that it is a small fraction that will only benefit students with memberships.

Councillor Sanchez asks if it would be possible to remove the private aspects of the fee, so that all students paying it have access to the services. The President states that there are marginal differences between those that pay for individual workout pods and the rest of the fund. SSMU's funding should not pay for MacDonal campus Athletics facilities or services for graduate students and that is where the line should be drawn.

Senator Buraga asks if it is possible to amend the referendum question. The President states that the wording of the question was sent by McGill and was sent to the Legislative Council first even though the administration could unilaterally put a referendum question.

Senator Buraga **Motions to amend** to strike “non” from “non-optoutable”. This is not seconded.

Councillor Pilote **Motions to move the previous question, seconded by VP Wang – PASSES**



**c. Motion Regarding the Student Services Fee Question for Winter 2019
Referendum 2019-02-28 [10] - NOT APPROVED 5-10-4**

President motivates the motion, reminding councillors of the presentation at last Council.

There are no questions.

Debate:

Senator Lametti asks if this is another masked increase for students. He states that it is ludicrous that students pay for health care in Canada and this fee should not increase beyond the inflation indexation. Senator Lametti states that this should not be accepted and the question was submitted in bad faith.

VP Wang asks if McGill can still bring this to referendum, even if Council votes no. The President thinks so, but doesn't really know. This wasn't brought to Council last year, but SSMU can opt not to endorse them.

Councillor Lyons notes that the question states that a no vote would result in a reduction of services and asks if the services would just stay the same. VP Shapiro states that the basic answer is that the current level of service has factored in the current funding level.

Senator Buraga states that something in this question doesn't sit right with him. Students seem to be being coerced to vote yes or services will be reduced. He states that this is another way of offloading expenses to students. Theoretically, McGill can go around us and pose this to the students, but the dis-endorsement would be to vote no and we don't think this is right. We think the government and McGill should cover the cost of healthcare for students.

Councillor Kara states that he is swayed by Senators Lametti and Buraga.

The President **Motions to amend** to add the text in red and remove the strikethrough.

No debate on amendment.



Voting Procedure:

Voting on the amendment – **APPROVED 20 – 0 - 0**

Returning to debate on main motion.

VP Shapiro states that in light of the fact that there is one more Council after Reading Week, he would encourage councillors to consider bringing this to Senate.

Senator Buraga states that with the Health and Dental Fee, postponement would have endangered it. He asks if postponement would endanger this.

VP Shapiro **Motions to postpone** until the next meeting of Legislative Council on March 14th, seconded by Councillor Lyons - **FAILS**

Debate on postponement:

Councillor Sanchez makes a point of parliamentary inquiry, asking if the recommended time for this motion ended. Speaker Dolmat states yes, by about four minutes.

Senator Lametti rejects VP Shapiro's notion to postpone, since this centres on how students pay for healthcare.

Councillor Sanchez makes a point of parliamentary inquiry, asking if the motion to call the question would override a motion to postpone. Speaker Dolmat states yes, if it had been done earlier.

VP Shapiro states that he is aware of who pays for healthcare. In the context of McGill and Student Services, he thinks councillors should pause, bring this back to constituents and bring it to Senate thoughtfully and forcefully after Reading Week.

Senator Buraga states that he is voting against postponement, since debate was going quite well on swaying Councillors a certain way.

Vote on motion to postpone – **FAILS 8 - 10 - 0**

Returning to debate on the motion:



The President states that he is convinced that approving the fee, making a no endorsement committee, and advocating for that through a no vote at referendum would be a stronger message to McGill. He sees greater value in several thousand no votes, especially on ancillary fees.

Senator Lametti asks if in the past years the university has not brought these questions to Council, why have they started now. The President answers that they want to see if Council support it as an indication of student opinions.

Senator Buraga asks if there are any Councillors on the fence that want information from their constituents.

Voting Procedure:

Voting on motion with amendment – **FAILS 5 – 10 – 4**

- d. **Motion to Endorse the Student Walkout for Climate Justice 2019-02-25 [10]**
- APPROVED 16-0-4

The Speaker explains that this motion arose from the Consultative Forum and has no movers. The Speaker reads the motion.

Question period:

Allison (Member of the Gallery, she/they) introduces herself as the Sustainability Commissioner. Questions will be directed to her.

Councillor Price asks for clarification of the rationale for a delegation of the Executive to be sent to the walk-out. Allison states that she did not originally include this in the motion, but Senator Buraga can speak more to this. Senator Buraga states that he included this statement in the motion because the SSMU Executives should organize a larger group to attend the walk-out.

Councillor Hu asks if all faculties are required to participate.



Senator Buraga states that since there is no VP External, this would be led under the VP External portfolio and the Campaign Coordinators. There is no requirement of certain faculties to attend.

There is no debate.

Voting on motion – **APPROVED 16 – 0 – 4**

e. Notice of Motion Regarding Amendments to the Judicial Board Procedures 2019-02-28 [5]

The President motivates the notice of motion.

Senator Buraga makes a point of parliamentary inquiry, asking why this is a notice of motion and not a regular motion. The Recording Secretary states that this amends the annexes of the judicial board procedures and thus requires a notice of motion per the IRs.

f. Motion Regarding Endorsing the Statement on Tuition Deregulation 2019-02-28 [15] - APPROVED 16-3-1

Senator Lametti motivates the motion.

There are no questions or debate.

g. Motion Regarding McGill Tribune Fee Renewal Endorsement 2019-02-28 [15] - APPROVED 10-6-4

President defers time to Member of the Gallery, Marie Labrosse (she).

Labrosse motivates the motion, mentioning that the Tribune has a journalism and education mandate exercised through workshops and conferences.

Question period:

Councillor Lyons asks if this fee is opt-outable. Labrosse responds no.



Students' Society of McGill University

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

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

Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories

VP Wang asks if there is a current budget that details how that one dollar will be allocated and if the one-dollar increase applies per semester or per year. Labrosse answers that it will be per semester and the resolution will come with an appendix that includes finances from previous year that shows the deficit.

Councillor Flaherty asks if the fee is not opt-outable, why the appendix wasn't included with this motion. Labrosse answers that it would not make sense to allow students to opt-out, as they can't control who access the paper.

Councillor Hersh asks why student newspapers are funded through non-opt-outable fees when radio and television might be. Labrosse states that the DPS, which offers similar services, is also non-opt-outable and this is necessary to maintain journalistic independence.

Councillor Pilote asks if it would be possible to postpone this to the next Legislative Council, as there is insufficient details about the specific increase. Labrosse responds that the referendum has to align with PGSS and their deadline is sooner than SSMU's, so likely not.

Councillor Flaherty asks if Labrosse can provide a verbal breakdown of how the additional funds will be spent. Labrosse responds that they are currently running a significant deficit due to printing and accounting fees, which have gone up significantly. The size of staff and stipends have also grown. They would also like to not take as much funding from SSMU to maintain their journalistic independence.

Senator Buraga asks if the deficit was funded by external sources, where the funding came from and if advertisements could fill the gap. Labrosse responds that advertising is a significant problem, as that revenue slowly decreased. Provincial and federal advertising agencies continue to decrease year-over-year.

Councillor Sanchez makes a point of parliamentary inquiry, asking if it is possible to end question period. Speaker Dolmat responds that question period has been exhausted.

Debate:

Councillor Kara asks if the Tribune has considered other ways to reduce printing costs.



Senate Lametti states that he believes in the Tribune's good faith and he sees the need, but SSMU keeps jumping from round number fee to round number fee, which shows little thought going into it.

Councillor Sanchez states that she is supportive of this motion and the campus press to ensure that the editors continue to be able to pay their editors.

Labrosse states that they do not control the number of copies printed, as their MoA with McGill requires a print run of 5,000 copies per week.

Councillor Hersh asks if it might be disingenuous to say that a fee allows students to control the content, but it is actually controlled by the editorial board. Labrosse states that the editors do shape the editorial line, but they are all students. She states that any current student or member of the McGill community can still contribute, and student fees mean that they have the input.

Councillor Lyons states that this has no impact on the referendum question happening and asks what a yes endorsement from the SSMU look like.

The President states that SSMU would just endorse whether the fee increase makes sense. Historically, SSMU has done so for the Daily. The President states that he will abstain as an Executive.

Councillor Flaherty asks how much thought was put into the increase and why it is a round number. VP Wang states that there are current pressures on advertisers. A one-dollar increase is not as significant as it may seem, as this would barely cover one additional accountant. There are certain service minima that have to be met.

Councillor Sanchez **Motions to call the question** seconded by the President –
PASSED 14 - 6 - 0

Senator Buraga makes a point of parliamentary inquiry.

Councillor Price **Motions to suspend the rules and move the Club Committee Report to now**, seconded by VP Wang - **PASSES 18-1**

h. Club Committee (5) - RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED 18-0-0



Councillor Kara presents the report of the Club Committee.

Question Period:

Senator Buraga asks what constitutes a club going from full status to interim status. VP Wang responds that there are several reasons for these sanctions that can be found in previous Council meetings, such as misuse of booking privileges, failure of audit, not providing insurance policies.

The President **Motions to accept the recommendations of the report**, seconded by Senator Buraga – **APPROVED 18-0-0**

Senator Lametti **Motions to suspend the rules to remove the master plan from the agenda, remove all Executive reports, remove Executive committee reports, and the Councillor reports for those not present and suspend these until next Council - PASSES**

The President **Motions to suspend the rules such that the Environment Committee Report comes after Francophone Affairs - PASSES**

13. Reports by Committees
 - a. Francophone Affairs Committee report

The Francophone Affairs Commissioner presents the report.

Question period:

Councillor Hu states that he is concerned about the translation of the documents and whether the FAC is participating in this process. The Francophone Affairs Commissioner states yes.

- b. Environment Committee report

Allison (Sustainability Commissioner) presents the report.

Quorum is lost at 22:12 with VP Wang departing.



There are no questions.

14. Reports by Councillors

- a. Zaheed Kara (Clubs) (3)

Councillor Kara presents the report.

There are no questions.

- b. Julia Briand (Environment) (3)

Julia Briand presents the report.

There are no questions.

The President makes a point of order, requesting a change of vote. Speaker Dolmat states that the matter will come to Steering Committee and Steering Committee will communicate a recommendation to Council next week.

15. Confidential Session

- a. There is no confidential business this evening.

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

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tre Mansdoerfer', is written over a horizontal line.

President, Tre Mansdoerfer