



## Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

# Legislative Council

March 14<sup>th</sup>, 2019

1. Call to Order: 6:11 pm;
2. Land Acknowledgement:

Speaker Dolmat reads the land acknowledgment.

3. Attendance:

There are Regrets from Councillors Hobbs (Arts and Science), Briand (Environment), Callahan (Management), Abdelhamid (Medicine), Bazylykut (Nursing), Milchberg (Science), Kleiner (Social Work), and VP Esterle (Student Life).

Mustafa Fakh (he/him) is attending as proxy for Councillor Price (Engineering).

VP Shapiro (University Affairs) and VP McLaughlin (Internal) arrive at 6:36 PM, Councillor Jayme arrives at 8:01 PM.

Councillor Scarra is excused at 9:05 PM, Councillors Kara and Sanchez are excused at 10:27 PM, Councillors Yang, Hersch, and Constantin are excused at 10:54 PM, and Councillor Pilote is excused at 11:26 PM.

4. Approval of Minutes – NONE:

There are no minutes for approval this week.

5. Adoption of the Agenda – ADOPTED:

President Mansdoerfer notes that there is one change sent by VP Shapiro, and one by VP McLaughlin to add to the agenda. The first is regarding the RVC kiosk, and this amendment is seconded by Councillor Yang. The second is to add the Utile question at the end of new business, this is seconded by VP Wang.

The Speaker asks if there is unanimous consent to the first amendment. Senator Lametti is in opposition so this will be a placard vote. Councillor Pilote asks if there can be debate on this, and the Speaker confirms that there cannot. The vote results in 18 for, and 4 against, so this amendment is passed, and the agenda is thus amended.

The Speaker asks if there is unanimous consent to the second amendment. Senator Lametti is in opposition so this will be a placard vote. The vote results in 18 for, and 4 against, so this amendment is passed, and the agenda is thus amended.

There is no opposition to the amended agenda and therefore the Agenda is adopted as amended.



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

**6. Report of the Steering Committee:**

The Speaker reads the report of the steering committee.

There are no questions.

**a. Motion Regarding Changes to the Legislative Council Standing Rules 2019-03-14 – APPROVED:**

President Mansdoerfer reads the motion proposed by the Steering Committee.

**Questions:**

Senator Lametti asks if length of Council is more important than making important decisions and having good debate on these topics.

President Mansdoerfer responds that no, this is not the goal of this motion. The President notes that the goal is to make Council more efficient and discussion more generative in the later stages of Council.

Senator Buraga inquires how this change is different from using a motion to table the question if Council feels debate has become repetitive. The Senator wonders what the purpose of having this as a standing rule would be.

President Mansdoerfer replies that this motion aims to set an arbitrary end time for discussions which is the value of it, noting that councillors do have the ability to table the question, but the time limit would encourage them to use their speaking time more efficiently.

Senator Lametti asks the President what he believes the main reason why Councils have gone over time this year is.

President Mansdoerfer answers that the repetition of ideas and thoughts by those speaking, and debate where people are not actually changing their ideas on a topic are what drag out the length. The President would like to round up discussions when they are going in circles.

**Debate:**

Councillor Pilote remarks that there are important topics to debate today that need to be adequately addressed, and notes that this proposal sounds like censure from the Executive and therefore will be voting against it.

Councillor Karia says that something to consider about this motion is that its spirit is one to do with accessibility, as it is difficult for people to get home late when they are travelling far alone. The Councillor also thinks this would encourage councillors to read the motions beforehand, thereby enhancing debate and allowing individuals who want to speak on a motion to do so.



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

Senator Lametti agrees with Councillor Pilote on this, and believes this is the wrong way to approach making Councils shorter. The Senator affirms that this will only take more time when debate is needed as the Council will need to jump through hoops to get to that point. Senator Lametti also notes that this will not encourage more members to read motions ahead of time, and will instead bias towards Executives and others that read the motions.

President Mansdoerfer remarks that the goal is to make the Council more efficient, as there is no value to debating something only to waste more time. The President notes that he is willing to scrap item 5.7 and below to keep the agenda consensus part of the motion. President Mansdoerfer emphasizes that the goal is not to censure debate but to increase the Council's efficiency, noting that there are a few other things he wants to try in the last few meetings.

VP Wang sees the spirit of this motion, as it also allows for a diversity of opinions to be heard in debate and prevents the monopolization of it by one person. The VP believes this would be an overall more democratic process.

Senator Buraga moves to amend the motion to strike out sections 4.54 to 4.56, seconded by Senator Lametti.

**Debate on this amendment:**

President Mansdoerfer agrees with this, and notes that these are the sections he meant before when he said he was ok with them being removed from the motion. The parts he would like to retain are clauses 5.7 through 5.7.3.

Voting on this amendment results in 18 for, 3 against, and 1 abstention, therefore this passes and the motion is thus amended.

Voting on the main motion then results in 17 for, 1 opposed, and 4 abstentions, therefore this motion passes.

7. Guest Speakers:

- a. Martine Gauthier, Executive Director: McGill Student Services:

Martine Gauthier (she/her) presents the report from McGill Student Services.

Councillor Frenette proposes to suspend the standing rules to allow laptops during this presentation only to be able to view the slides. This is seconded by Senator Buraga, and is passed unanimously.

Gauthier's presentation continues.

Questions:



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

Senator Lametti commends Gauthier for her presentation and wonders, out of the increases she mentioned, what percentage would come from student contributions.

Gauthier replies that for the 2019-2020 school year, if the referendum passes, it would be about \$314,000. This would cover the costs of 3 counsellor salaries, and the salary for half of the trauma counsellor.

Councillor Sanchez asks about the line in the whereas clauses which refers to “the matching fund of \$337,000”, which is also repeated in the next slide. The Councillor asks to clarify that the one listed in the next slide is the same fund. Gauthier confirms they are the same.

Senator Lametti follows up by asking what the contribution of the university and other sources is, and what proportion of the increase will come from student contribution.

Gauthier replies that students are asking for increased mental health services; therefore, the majority of the increase is going to go to that.

Senator Lametti tries to clarify his question, noting that there is going to be a budget increase, and students will contribute about \$300,000 more per semester, asking how much will the University be contributing.

Gauthier replies that if the fee referendum goes through, McGill will give \$337,000 to cover the building costs for this year, and they will also contribute another \$500,000 because they will not be charging Student Services an overhead fee. There is also \$8,000,000 earmarked over the next 6 years for the wellness hub, so this will be a shared financial commitment between McGill and the external donor.

Councillor Smit notes that between financial years 19 and 20, there is a reduction by about half in terms of contribution from each entity, and asks if this is correct.

Gauthier replies that the first-year cost is higher because of their contribution to the construction costs and the training for all the new hires.

Councillor Smit asks for confirmation that financial year 19 is therefore not reflective of a yearly operating cost. Gauthier confirms that it is not.

Councillor Karia asks, if the fee referendum does not pass, does Student Services have a plan to discern how in terms of process and actual action certain subsidiaries of services will be looked at.

Gauthier answers that they do have a plan, as they have been working with the Provost and his deputy's offices on a 3-year plan and have plans a, b, c, and d prepared. There are in fact 4 referendums: SSMU's, PGSS's and the two Mac campus student unions. There are multiple backup plans. However, if referendums are not successful, these plans will involve reductions.

Senator Buraga remarks that he noticed the number of counsellors is increasing but that of psychiatrists is not, and wonders if this is because psychiatrists will no longer have to triage students and the demand on them will decrease.



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

Gauthier replies that the plan to keep the number of psychiatrists at 5 FTEs, they have had up to 7 in the past, but are lower than that right now due to unforeseen circumstances. The goal is that as they increase the number of GPs, students that require medication management can be seen by GPs rather than by specialist psychiatrists who could be dealing with students with more complex cases as they are doing a lot of med management at the moment.

Councillor Flaherty asks when the hiring of counsellors will begin if it has not already.

Gauthier replies that the trauma counsellor hiring has already started, in fact that person will be on board in a few weeks. The other three hires are contingent on referendum, as soon as they know the referendum response they will move forward with hiring. The other issue is space, as they may need to negotiate with faculties to use offices within their buildings, and they are currently working with the SSMU President and the General Manager for some of their space concerns. In short, Gauthier confirms that as soon as Student Services knows if they have the funds they will start hiring.

Councillor Lyons notes that McGill has pledged \$337,000 if the referendum goes through, therefore McGill ostensibly has this money, and it is more than what is being recruited from students by the fee increase. The Councillor wonders then why McGill is not just giving this money directly to Student Services.

Gauthier replies that she wishes she knew, every university has a different agreement with student unions as to how they fund student services. McGill's Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with SSMU is that services will be covered by students, but other universities and their student unions have different arrangements. If student organizations feel strongly about this, the MOA should be taken up with the Deputy Provost, but this is above her purview.

Senator Lametti remarks that the report has numbers comparing McGill to universities outside of Quebec, and asks if there are figures to compare it to other universities in the province, like Concordia or UdeM.

Gauthier replies that she is not sure what the comparison would be, but McGill is considered the "Cadillac" of Quebec universities. Gauthier thinks Concordia has 10 counsellors and maybe 2 psychiatrists, and notes that she meets with other Quebec student services executives every quarter and thinks McGill is way above them in terms of services offered and higher numbers of GPs, counsellors and nurses, than other Quebec universities.

Senator Buraga asks if the Legislative Council fails to send this question to referendum, is either McGill or Student Services going to send it to referendum anyways.

Gauthier replies that this is not her decision, it would be up to the Deputy Provost. She would hope that with the revised question that there is a better understanding from students of what it would entail and that students are not alone in this, but it is the Deputy Provost's decision whether it goes to referendum without council approval.

Senator Buraga asks to extend question period. The Speaker says they are limited by the IRs but invites Gauthier to stay and partake in the debate on this motion. Senator Buraga accepts this proposal.



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

**b. Motion Regarding the Student Services Fee Question for Winter 2019 Referendum 2019-03-14 – Tabled to item d.**

The SSMU President reads the motion.

**Question:**

Senator Buraga mentions that on one slide, there is a commitment with the Rossy Foundation until 2025, and asks Gauthier if there is a clause to extend it upon agreement from both parties.

Gauthier replies that there is a clause cementing it until then, and another which says it can continue upon agreement and emphasizes that student services will be negotiating for that.

Councillor Flaherty asks that if Gauthier can obtain the statistics comparing McGill to other Quebec universities, if she could please share them with councillors.

Gauthier replies affirmatively but notes that there is no comparison between McGill and other universities in Quebec with regards to international students, appropriate comparisons would be U of T and UBC in that regard.

Senator Buraga asks about if the referendum doesn't pass, and wonders whether the Council can we get tangible numbers on how many services resources would be lost.

Gauthier replies that she doesn't want to get into it as she needs to consider her staff and does not think it ethical to discuss what positions would be going. Gauthier's position is that they would first reduce staff in non-front-facing student services, so mainly support staff.

Councillor Flaherty asks President Mansdoerfer what mechanisms can be used to ask the deputy provost to give services the money anyways or if there is a protest or motion that can be done to support that.

The President replies that they could add a separate be it resolved clause, to mandate the SSMU executives to advocate for this. He asks for Councillor Flaherty to bring it to the next Council.

**Debate:**

VP Shapiro notes that Councillor Flaherty's idea should be considered, and remarks that no matter the result of the vote on this motion, they have the power to go to the Provost with this.

Senator Lametti says that he has made it abundantly clear that he opposes the fee increase, as it creates a false dichotomy for the administration to say that students need to pay more to have more services. The Senator insists that allowing this to go forward would signal that the SSMU believe in this sort of messed up logic and there is lots of evidence that the money is there – like McGill offering to match the student contribution – and it is absurd that students should have to raise their contribution for this to be given.





## Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

For the Senator, accepting this motion is an insult to what the SSMU believes in and this sort of question should not even be accepted for referendum.

Senator Buraga notes that he has reflected on this question and how Student Services would be impacted by a negative result. Echoing Senator Lametti, it leaves a bad taste in the Senator's mouth for McGill to dangle the increase over the head of students only if they also contribute. McGill has ability to increase funding if they have the priority, which means they don't find this to be a priority. Senator Buraga will be voting against this, noting that Students Services does great work but the SSMU needs to take a stand on this and ensure students get the most value for their contribution.

VP Shapiro thinks that there is a lack of creativity in the ways being proposed for the SSMU to take a stance on this issue. The VP thinks saying that the only way is to vote this down is a little facile and he would welcome Councillor Flaherty's proposal being considered more seriously. He adds that the University has been worried a lot recently about mission drift, with their taskforce on inclusion focusing heavily on it in their recent report. What this amounts to is a concern from the university and some of the professors that they are doing too much in terms of Student Services, which he finds alarming. The VP affirms that the SSMU needs to be very careful with how they proceed with this, as they have a pretty good plan in place to make this viable. At the same time, they can also pursue options such as Councillor Flaherty's to make their voices heard on this issue. The VP would encourage other members to be both more charitable and more open with their proposals.

President Mansdoerfer echoes VP Shapiro, noting that the Council should recognize that there is a chance to take on advocacy after this question is passed. The President thinks it would be very foolish of the administration to put this question to referendum if the student union had said no twice and so would not expect to see it. President Mansdoerfer wants to emphasize to Council that if this motion were not passed, the question would likely not appear on the referendum ballot.

Senator Buraga moves to amend this motion to add a be it resolved clause stating "the SSMU legislative Council does not endorse this referendum question".

The Speaker clarifies that this would mean that the question would go to referendum but would not be endorsed by the SSMU.

There is no seconder so this amendment is not entertained.

VP Shapiro says, from a similar perspective to the amendment that just failed to be moved, the Council should recognize this is a serious enough question that the SSMU owes it to its members to allow them to debate it. He recognizes that the Senator tried to add a position that the SSMU would take but fundamentally it was about the value of bringing this to students and so he commends the effort. Quoting an unnamed person in this room who often says that when bringing questions to the members, we should consider if they are the right questions. Fundamentally, the VP thinks there is a consensus that this is the right question and so the SSMU should allow their members to have a voice on it. Additionally, VP Shapiro says that this conversation is about people who need services, and even with the value of talking about the politics around it, the councillors also need to remember that there are people who need access to and support from these services.



## Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

Senator Lametti agrees with the previous speaker, and moves an amendment to add the exact dollar amount of the increase to the referendum question. Simply putting 4% is not tangible, especially since we do not know what the indexation factor is and so says the wording should be something in the spirit of “Be it resolved that the exact dollar figure of this increase would be included in the question without need for further approval from Legislative Council.”

The Speaker asks the President if, for legality reasons, it would be possible to get these numbers for the referendum. The SSMU President replies that whatever you put in a referendum question becomes legally binding, and so if you say the increase is \$6, then the increase must be \$6 and not 4%, so it would not allow for annual inflation. President Mansdoerfer would suggest putting the projected costs in appendix, but stresses that putting the cost itself in the question would be inappropriate.

Senator Lametti moves to instead include the current dollar amount of the Student Services fee amount in the question, which he believes is \$153.19 per term for full time students. This is seconded by VP Shapiro. Specific text of amendment is “, currently of \$153.19 per semester for full time students.”

### Debate on this amendment:

There are no speakers for debate so proceed to voting on amendment.

There are 23 in favour, and 1 abstention, so this amendment passes, and the motion is thus amended.

The SSMU President motions to add another be it resolved clause saying: “the student society approves the question...” The President says to use the wording from the other motions thought it might need to be changed for legal purposes. The Speaker remarks that as the specific language for this is not prepared yet, they will set this aside for a bit, and will return to debate for now.

Senator Buraga want to explain the rationale for his failed amendment. The Senator notes that the Council voted against this going forward at last Council and so to ensure membership fully understands what is going on, including that their elected representatives took a stand on this for a specific reason, was why he proposed this. Senator Buraga says he is still opposed to this as written but if a similar amendment was moved with similar wording he would feel more comfortable letting this go to referendum.

Councillor Flaherty agrees with Senator Buraga’s points and VP Shapiro’s discussion on how this could hurt the SSMU’s students. The Councillor would suggest there be a whereas clause that discusses the SSMU’s recognition of the ethical component of this question, as well as the reason for this referendum. Councillor Flaherty thinks it is better for this to exist as a whereas, as it is more of a contextual situation.

Senator Lametti proposes an amendment to strike out everything after the “that” in the last line of the question and replace it with “an increase in services is contingent upon a ‘Yes’ vote?” This is seconded by Councillor Hersch.





### Debate on this amendment:

Senator Lametti remarks that they have heard from the Director of Student Services that the money from this increase will go to hire more Councillors. Furthermore, whether services increase or decrease are not just up to students but also the University. This amendment reduces the possibility that McGill will come out and say that, by failing to approve this question, students are asking for a decrease in services. The Senator believes this better reflects both reality what students want and will prevent the creation of a false dichotomy by this un-amended question.

Councillor Flaherty thinks this would definitely be better than previous question. However, her understanding from the presentation is that this would be more of a restructuring rather than an increase, and therefore wonders if this question should discuss restructuring rather than an increase.

The SSMU President yields his time to Gauthier.

Gauthier wants to clarify that there would be a decrease in services, if this question is not approved, as they have not had an increase in fees in six years. In this time, cost of salaries have risen faster than the index and the funds have not so their resources have been reduced.

VP Wang says that Gauthier's point resonates with him, as SSMU is currently suffering from similar problems. There are certain restrictions related to funds they collect that mean they have had to cut services and have still been at a deficit for a while. In fact, the VP reveals that the biggest expense for SSMU is salaries so he very much understands where Gauthier is coming from. That being said, the VP thinks this change is a bit asymmetric, as research shows students are very risk averse and don't want to lose services rather than gain services. VP Wang also does not believe this is an accurate depiction of what is actually going on. Currently Student Services has been at a deficit for that much and it makes no sense that if a fee does not increase to cover that deficit, that there will be just a change of services rather than a reduction.

Councillor Flaherty expresses her confusion about the last slide of the presentation about what services they will want to cut. The Councillor asks if there will be consultation with students about what services will be reduced if Student Services does want to move forward with the three additional councillors.

Gauthier replies that they would not be able to move forward with the three counsellors if there is no increase, as they are currently maxed out at the salary level. As salaries increase again, which they are going through right now, they would need to reduce services to accommodate this.

Councillor Sanchez moves to lay this motion on the table to go to the report of the funding commissioner to allow them to leave when they need to. This is seconded by Councillor Karia.



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

This motion passes, and the Speaker explains that four individuals who are elected representatives can leave the room at this time to discuss the amendment to this motion and come to an agreement on it.

**c. Funding Commissioners, report of the Funding Committee – RECOMMENDATIONS  
ADOPTED:**

VP Wang motions to suspend the standing rules to allow the use of laptops in this presentation, seconded by proxy Fakhri, and this motion passes.

Eva Ren (she/her), one of the SSMU Funding Commissioners, reads out the report of the Funding Committee.

The SSMU President motions for a 2-minute extension to the report, Senator Buraga seconds this, and it is approved.

**Questions:**

Senator Buraga says he noticed an appendix at the end regarding a club application, and asks if Ren can elaborate on this.

Ren replies that this appendix came to be when she was analyzing the funding she realized that the maximum amount given was quite high and was close to \$14,000 for one student group and so she wanted to have a clarification for this in case any Councillors wanted justification on this. Ren summarizes that this club is under the EUS and asked for a lot of money, SSMU awarded them a partial amount and justified that to them.

There are no more questions but the Speaker remarks that there are recommendations in the report and therefore the Council would need to raise a motion to approve these.

VP Wang raises a motion to approve of all funding distributions by the Funding Committee for the Fall 2018 and Winter 2019 Semesters. This is seconded by Councillors Karia.

**Questions on this motion:**

Robyn Lee (she/her), one of the SSMU Equity Commissioners, and member of the Gallery, says that she wanted to raise a concern regarding an experience they had with the Funding Committee and to flag for Council when the committee terms and reference are looked at next meeting. Lee asks to yield to VP Shapiro, but her time has elapsed.

Councillor Sanchez yields her time to VP Shapiro. The VP wants to bring up a concern about something they have already raised as a concern with the VP Finance and the Funding Commission but wanted to bring to the attention of Council as well. VP Shapiro says that the current committee terms of reference suggest that the Equity Commissioners should be consulted when allocating funding from the equity



## Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

fund, they were not and therefore they believe amendments should be considered to frame this consultation more directly in the terms of reference.

Councillor Karia, on the topic of consultation, wonders if there is any way for this to happen with this round of funding allocations or have they already been done, and if so, proposes that this be tabled until next Council so that this consultation can happen if it has not already and they can vote when this has been consulted.

VP Wang, regarding committee terms of reference, believes he was a bit vague when he re-wrote them; they do say “should be consulted”, but the VP thinks this should be revised to say: “if necessary”. These terms of reference have been the only efficient terms of reference in the last five years in regards to allocating and dispersing these funds. The reason for this is that the most efficient number of committee members is seven, which is the current number. The VP understands that the Equity Commissioners should be considered if the delegated representatives feel that they do not have the scope of equity in that circumstance. VP Wang points out that there is an acute conflict of interest in this proposal, as every fund that has a consultant member has their own allocated budget from that fund. In other words, every dollar allocated by the Funding Committee is a dollar less for the actual committee itself. The VP proposes that the Finance and Funding Committees sit down together to discuss how to best approach this to prevent conflicts of interest.

Equity Commissioner Lee from the Gallery would be in favour of tabling this to get more consultation on the motion, and mentions that they wanted to flag as an example a funding request that was approved even though it fell under the wrong fund. A revision the Equity Commissioners would like to see is that not if the Funding Committee and Commissioner feel that they consultation, but that for every application for funding to the equity fund, the equity commissioners must be consulted as it is “their fund”.

Councillor Karia **motions to table this motion until the next meeting and for the correct consultations to be done in the meantime.** Senator Buraga seconds. The Speaker clarifies that these funds have already been dispersed, and that this is a question of the Legislative Council approving the already allocated funds.

Senator Buraga makes a point of inquiry, asking what would happen if Legislative Council does not approve the already dispersed funds.

Ren answers that this has not happened in the past, but thinks that what could be done, if there is an application the Council does not approve, they could sanction this club so they could not apply for more funding this year, or to revoke this funding, so the club would have to pay the SSMU back. She points out that the latter is what would happen if they do not fill out their post-funding report.

### **Debate on the motion to table:**

Councillor Karia says the fact that this consultation did not happen is not right, and says that hopefully postponing it will allow for a discussion on the actual ‘disbursement’ of the funds as well as actions going forward. The Councillor would also like an option to put the funds back into the equity fund and use the appropriate funds from correct place, she is not sure if this is a third



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

option but thinks it could be useful once the consultation with the Equity Commissioners happens.

VP McLaughlin supports postponing this, to have the consultation, but notes that if we do disapprove this, it would not be the club's fault and the SSMU should not sanction the clubs as a result.

VP Wang agrees with the discussion about this dilemma, as there are several financial nuances with regards to this and with improving the process in the future. That being said, the VP hopes that each Council member holds their fellow Councillors accountable for the Committees they sit on as this is something that should be done. This is not the club's faults and they should not be sanctioned but a healthy discussion is needed.

Equity Commissioner Lee from the Gallery was unclear about what the Council was voting on exactly, but reiterates the position of Equity Coms is that what is done is done. The Commissioners want to change this for future processes, specifically with regards to the Funding Committee terms of reference.

VP Shapiro echoes what the Equity Commissioner said, and thanks Councillor Karia for the creative suggestion, but thinks consultation and discussion can happen without this motion being postponed. Therefore, the VP believes there is value in this conversation happening tonight and hopes for it to go through anyways.

Councillor Karia asks to retract her motion to postpone. The Speaker says that this is impossible as it is now the property of the floor.

In voting on this motion, there are 2 votes for, 23 against, and therefore this motion fails.

In voting on the main motion: there are 24 votes for, 0 against, and 1 abstention, therefore this motion passes.

The Speaker would look favourably on someone taking from the table the motion about Student Services:

Motioned by the SSMU President, seconded by Councillor Karia and unanimously passed.

- d. Return to debate on the Motion Regarding the Student Services Fee Question for Winter 2019 Referendum 2019-03-14 – APPROVED:

Return to Debate on Senator Lametti's amendment.

The SSMU President motions to call the question on this amendment, and is seconded by Councillor Sanchez. The Speaker notes that this requires a 2/3 majority to pass. There are 19 votes for, and 3 opposed, so this passes and we move to voting on the amendment.



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

In voting on this amendment: there are 9 votes for, 10 against, and 4 abstentions. Therefore, this amendment is not added.

President Mansdoerfer moves to amend the motion to add a be it resolved clause at the end of motion. Seconded by Senator Buraga.

**Debate on this amendment:**

There is no debate on this amendment so they move to voting procedure.

In voting on amendment: there are 24 votes for, 1 against, and no abstentions. Therefore, this passes and the motion is amended.

Senator Lametti moves to amend the referendum question by striking out the last line of the question, this is seconded by Councillor Kara.

**Debate on this amendment:**

Senator Lametti is adamant that asking leading questions in a referendum question is not OK, if people want to see what this is about they can read the extensive preamble. The Senator also notes that whether a failure to pass this might result in reduction of Student Services is quite speculative, but a no vote on this specific language could impact the University's decision to fund Student Services as well. The Senator emphasizes that this question should be about increasing the fee only.

VP McLaughlin says that Students typically do not read the preamble of questions and so it is only fair to include this language in the question as well. The VP adds that they could amend the question to include something along lines of "barring any intervention from the University."

Councillor Kara says that in the interest of fairness, there should be no leading statements in the question. In particular, this line is a large metaphorical stick the University if holding over the heads of students voting.

In voting on this amendment: there are 19 votes for, 3 against, and 3 abstentions, therefore this passes and the motion is thus amended.

Councillor Scarra motions to call the question on this motion, which is seconded by President Mansdoerfer.

Senator Buraga motions to amend the motion to say: "whereas the SSMU Legislative Council rejected a similar referendum question at its February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting." There is no seconder so this is not entertained.

Councillor Flaherty motions to amend the motion to add the following whereas clause: "despite Legislative Council's recognition of the problematic nature of equating an increase in fees with the



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

services available to students. We believe that students should have opportunity to vote in the referendum for themselves.” This is seconded by Senator Buraga.

Senator Lametti makes a **point of order** to disagree with the Speaker entertaining amendments when there is a motion to call the question on the floor, as it has privilege over all others. The Speaker returns that it does not have privilege as it is a subsidiary motion so it is allowed.

Councillor Sanchez makes a **point of order** that the amendment is not completed and seems to be in process. The Speaker asks for Councillor Flaherty to complete her amendment, and she does.

Councillor Pilote makes a point of inquiry about whether the motion regarding the amendment can be discussed. The Speaker clarifies that the motion to call the question takes precedence and if it fails, then we will move to debate on the amendment.

In voting on the **motion to call the question**, which requires a 2/3 majority, and proceeds by placard vote: **there are 18 votes for, 7 against, therefore this passes and we move to voting on the motion as a whole.**

In voting procedure on the main motion, voting is done electronically. **This passes with 19 votes for, 5 against, and 1 abstention.**

At the speaker’s discretion, the equity commissioner report will take place before, as the commissioners need to leave after.

**e. Equity Commissioners, Report of the Equity Committee:**

Senator Buraga **motions to extend the previous suspension of the standing rules regarding laptops to include all guest presentations today.** This is seconded by Senator Lametti and **approved unanimously.**

The Equity Commissioners, Andreann Asibey (she/her) and Robyn Lee (she/her) present the report of the Equity Committee.

**Questions:**

VP Wang asks if the proper event budget was ever submitted for the events the commissioners are hosting.

Lee replies that it has not, but this was discussed with the VP Finance yesterday and the process was discussed, they will submit it by tomorrow.

Councillor Sanchez raises a point of inquiry about confidentiality during a confidential session of Legislative Council, as she does not recall who was privy to that. The Councillor asks to what extent the Council is able to allude to previous confidential sessions.





**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

President Mansdoerfer replies that confidential sessions should be discussed in confidential session only.

- f. Indigenous Affairs Commissioner, report of the Indigenous Affairs Committee –  
POSTPONED to 2019-03-28:

The SSMU President motions to postpone this to next session as the Commissioner is not present. This is seconded by Senator Lametti. There is no debate so they move to voting on this motion.

This motion passes and the report is postponed to the next Council session.

- g. Senator Bryan Buraga and Bryan Jay, report of the Fall Reading Break Committee:

Bryan Jay, (he/him), and Senator Buraga present the report of the Ad/Hoc Reading Week Committee.

The time elapses, so the SSMU President motions to extend the report by 1 minute. This is seconded by Proxy Fakih, and passes unanimously, so the report is extended.

**Questions:**

Councillor Flaherty asks if the Committee considered the cost of holding Saturday exams and if they explored options regarding a 3-day break, which several schools do, as it could be a halfway point.

Senator Buraga answers that several options were examined. They concluded that starting a week early would allow the flexibility to have a full week of break for Canadian Thanksgiving, and would allow an increase in educational time and in the length of exam period. The Senator emphasizes that Saturday exams were considered but this is not the preferred option.

Councillor Smit asks who the Committee plan to share the conclusions of the report with.

Senator Buraga replies that this report will be put into referendum question next month as well as the consultation document that McGill itself has prepared. The Senator confirms that this report is public, and it will be on the SSMU website.

**CONTENT WARNING: MENTION OF SUICIDE AND SUICIDAL IDEATION. PLEASE SKIP TO ITEM 'H' TO AVOID SUCH MENTIONS.**

Councillor Hu says that suicide is mentioned a lot in the report and he finds this to be very concerning. The Councillor asks if the absence of a fall reading break was the main cause of suicides or was this rather a last straw.

Jay affirms that they do mention suicide a lot, and this is more specific to some cases rather than every case. Jay confirms that this is a last resort, and is not prevalent in every situation they see. Senator Buraga continues that it is a combination of factors, but the fact that it has been mentioned in comments to them as one of contributors to these feelings was very concerning.



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

**h. President Tre Mansdoerfer, Policy and Plan Book:**

Present Mansdoerfer presents the policy and plan book.

The President clarifies that the Executive will be bringing up policies that are expiring to Council next week, with the clubs and committees as the highest priority. There will also be a motion sent to the last Council asking the future executives to reformat the policy and plan book, as currently the structure for a policy and a plan is not in sync, making it hard to understand the objectives for each executive, and for SSMU. The recommendation going forward is for more delineation to be made.

**Questions:**

There are no questions on this presentation.

**i. President Tre Mansdoerfer, SSMU Master Plan:**

President Mansdoerfer presents the master plan.

**j. Motion Regarding Increase of the SSMU Membership Fee 2019-03-14 – APPROVED:**

**Questions:**

Senator Lametti says it is important to get time to discuss this plan correctly and it would be a shame to feel limited by time. The Senator **moves to suspend the rules to have the five-minute recess to approve the items of the consent agenda now to see if we can pass any of the remaining motions unanimously.** This is seconded by Senator Buraga.

The Speaker clarifies that any motions where there is not unanimous approval will have debate tonight. **This motion passes unanimously.**

Councillors then vote on their consent items form in the electronic voting.

Senator Buraga makes a point of inquiry, asking about the items added to the agenda earlier and whether they are also on the consensus agenda. The Speaker replies that these will appear as they do on the agenda, the Parliamentarian adds that these are not on the consent agenda as Council has not read them.

The Speaker announces that the Motion Regarding Amendments to the Judicial Board Procedures has been approved by consensus. The Speaker announces that every other motion will be debated.

**Questions continue:**

Councillor Pilote remarks that the President mentioned other universities in Canada but not those in Quebec, which all have lower base fees than SSMU, and asks if this omission was voluntary.



## Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

President Mansdoerfer replies that McGill is more comparable to other Canada Universities, such as the U15 schools, as we are not exactly doing same things as other Quebec Universities in terms of clubs and services, so they are trying to compare with universities more similar to ours. The President emphasizes that he would be happy to compare it to other groups' fees as well.

Proxy Fakih notes that many Engineering students are not interested in the SSMU. The Proxy says this could be because the Student Center is far from many of the Engineering buildings, and 3501 Peel is even further still. Proxy Fakih asks if there is any chance of buying property on the east side of campus.

President Mansdoerfer replies that this building was bought in March last year and its location is comparable to Gerts. The President notes that the Engineering council was excited when this was presented to them a few weeks ago. Regarding properties on the east of campus, President Mansdoerfer says he knows McGill is selling some but these are not good prospects for the SSMU and not good idea to split up the SSMU's building that much.

Senator Lametti says there are many aspects of this plan, but the main idea is regarding the purchasing of buildings from McGill. A lot of deferred maintenance is required on these buildings and it is expensive to own and maintain them. The Senator remarks that there is a reason McGill is selling them, as the University is starving for space and yet it still willing to get rid of them. Senator Lametti asks if there is a concern that these will become a liability, eventually forcing us to sell them at below market price, leading to financial ruin.

The SSMU President answers that he cannot say much about his experience on the Building and Properties committee of McGill as it is on the Board of Governors level, but being privy to information there, and understanding that they're doing a lot of equity for the Royal Victoria Hospital and it is not reflecting in the properties, and more that the RVH project is very expensive. The President concludes that he feels confident in this proposal.

Senator Buraga says that one concern from other senators was the financial accessibility of this, as \$30 is quite steep and represents a 40% increase of the current base fee and there were concerns about it being not opt-outable. The Senator asks how the President would respond to these concerns.

President Mansdoerfer replies that the base fee is currently not opt-outable, it is an expectation of being a member, and a lot of this fee goes to staffing the Society. The President thinks it would not be fair for individuals to be able to withdraw from a fee that impacts their experience on almost every level. In addition, interior renovations associated with this raise should also not be opt-outable, as this is a facility that will be available to all students and should be contributed to evenly. President Mansdoerfer agrees that this is a hike to the base fee, but this has not been increased significantly since 2007 and this adjustment represents the increases that should have been happening in the time since to improve student experience at McGill.

Councillor Pilote says that the President mentioned that if the base fee increase were to take place then the SSMU would be level with other U15 schools, and asks if this include the SSMU's additional fees.



## Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

President Mansdoerfer replies that it does not, but neither does their base fee he is comparing it to, as he is comparing base fees to base fees. Other schools also have additional fees to support student groups and he would be happy to send links with documentation of this to councillors.

Senator Lametti understands that there is a lot of info specific to buildings that McGill owns that is confidential, however, members who will be voting on this do not have this information. The Senator knows that there are a lot of zoning restrictions on these building, as you can't change much in Montreal, and many are old buildings, which he finds worrisome. The Senator asks if the President can reassure them how the SSMU would avoid such issues.

President Mansdoerfer replies that a lot of these properties are heritage zoned, and there is a limit for the skyline. The heritage refers to the roof facades that must be maintained, which is why we don't have the Schulich Library torn down and rebuilt. The President says that internal renovations would be significant, but would be much less than those put into effect for our own property this past year. President Mansdoerfer says these are not worrisome changes, nor are they debilitating and the SSMU could renovate these properties and have them ready to go in a reasonable time frame.

### Debate:

Councillor Pilote says the project is a great and interesting project and thanks the Executive for their effort, but remarks that this is an enormous hike in the base fee, which is already the highest in Quebec. The Councillor believes such an increase should be over multiple years, even more when considering insurance fees will most likely increase in the same years, and this could cause financial stress if they are raised at the same time. Councillor Pilote also believes it is dishonest not to include the specific amount of the increase in the question, considering the substantial amount being referred to. The Councillor makes a point of inquiry as to whether it is possible to amend the question to include specific amount of the fee raise.

President Mansdoerfer answers that the Provost's office said no to having the \$30 amount in the question, but notes that it will be possible to include it in the appendix attached to the question to reflect diversity of fee increases depending on status and department of students.

Councillor Pilote **moves to add a be it resolved clause to include the option proposed by the SSMU President.**

Councillor Karia offers a wording option for the amendment: **"be it resolved that the SSMU President investigate a way to include specificities pertaining to the fee amount increase in the question."** Councillor Pilote is amenable to this wording, and it is seconded by Councillor Frenette.

### Debate on the amendment:

Senator Buraga makes a point of inquiry if this language will be included in the referendum question. The Speaker does not believe so as there are other be it resolved clauses not within referendum question.



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

In voting on this motion: **there are 21 votes for, 1 against, and 2 abstentions, therefore, this passes, and the motion is thus amended.**

Senator Buraga completely agrees with the goals of this, as he has seen the presentation 3-4 times now. The Senator is fully committed to this and thinks it is a great idea that gives the SSMU direction it has been lacking for many years. This will give students services they are expecting from SSMU and will allow future student execs to have a more defined long term goal. The Senator emphasizes that he is completely in support, and encourages other councillors to vote for it.

Senator Lametti has also heard this presentation many times and commends the President for speaking on this in so many places. In terms of the Medical Student's Society, many students there would not be in support of this as would not bring a whole lot to them. Personally, the Senator is in favour of some things within it such as additional staffing and support for clubs, but does not think buying buildings with significant risk is a good idea. The Council has a responsibility to make the society viable for years to come and risky investments are not the way to go on this. Senator Lametti says he is ok for this question going to referendum, but for a smaller amount and a smaller project.

The SSMU President says if this fee passes, the SSMU will not go buy these buildings immediately, there will be appraisal process to evaluate and risk evaluate them, and there will be other locations in Downtown Montreal that could become useful for other kinds of usable space. The goal of the fee increase would be for space acquisition in general, i.e. maybe the daycare that McGill is selling.

Senator Lametti says that he trusts this year's executive but this is a multi-year project and you cannot be sure what comes next. The capital expenses fund would be acquired anyways and would place pressure on the Executive to do something with it. The Senator is not sure if SSMU in five years' time will be as dedicated as this year's Executive. Senator Lametti is more in favour of other parts of the proposal like remodeling the cafeteria, adding staff, etc.

Councillor Karia touches on a few other aspects of the plan that stood out to her as an Arts representative. The average student does care about their common space such as a student bar, where students enjoy spending time and knows that those aspects of plan are ones of more concern. The Councillor states that McGill is a world class university but their infrastructure does not reflect that right now. UBC for example is miles ahead and so these aspects of the project are what speak to students' want. The fact that this increase does not even put the SSMU in the high end of costs but in the middle also says a lot.

Councillor Flaherty understands the concerns with this but some things the President spoke about regarding increased continuity has to involve a bit of trust that McGill can handle it and that Executives in later years will be up to the job. Personally, the Councillor does have to reflect on Councillor Karia's points that it is pretty poor compared to other institutions of this quality, and the SSMU should not be letting theoretical, very conservative concerns from holding them back from the possibilities. The report is very detailed, focused on logistics and appears well thought out.

VP McLaughlin says that, with regards to capital expenditure, and building purchases, the SSMU will need more building or expansions in the future based on their expansion. If in 5 years the SSMU decides they





**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

want to do this, but have no capital, then they will not be able to do this. The VP stresses that the time is now to allow Executives in the future to increase our space.

Senator Buraga ask President Mansdoerfer to allay some of Senator Lametti's fears about the fund and asks if this fee could this be used for something like the Utile project if this motion passes. The Senator asks for clarification that this is a capital expenditure fund tied to space increases in general but does not need to be married to the Peel properties.

The SSMU President replies that based off this fee, there will be a large capital expenditure fund, so his answer would be yes, not explicit in the proposal, more aimed at things such as that will be able to be purchased.

Senator Lametti is sympathetic to remarks about the need for future flexibility is understandable, but believes that they do not get a shot very often to increase the SSMU fee, noting that the last time was in 2007. The Senator stresses that when they do try, they must be sure to get it right, and thinks a different structure may have a better chance of succeeding, perhaps with a third option may have a better chance of passing. Senator Lametti asks if the President thinks this is the best strategy to get students to approve the fee.

President Mansdoerfer replies that it is very recognizable that some increase is needed, and knows that Senator Lametti values that. The President agrees that a lower one would be more achievable, and could cover the basic staffing costs, but is adamant that a fee of this magnitude hits what SSMU needs to be doing. The President thinks it would be a shame to overshoot this and still not get the minimum increase needed, but the SSMU needs this opportunity to improve our spaces, if the fee increase was dropped from \$30 to \$15 then a Gerts renovation would be in 5 years and a cafeteria renovation in 10, which would be a disservice to not recognize that this is a bigger issue.

VP Shapiro would suggest that this project requires a fee increase and a vision, and it would be negligent to approve it in a piece meal way to require a renewal every couple of years. To continue from Senator Buraga's point, the VP notes that Concordia's capital expenditure was originally earmarked for a building but ended up going to a UTILE project.

Senator Buraga remarks that President Mansdoerfer will be the campaign chair for this question, and points out that base fee increase will require a lot campaigning, giving the example of a smaller base fee increase earlier this year that failed by 17 votes. The Senator asks how the President plans to prepare for this and show all the good things that can ensue from this, ensuring the fee does pass and renews the faith of students in the society. President Mansdoerfer is called outside the room in the middle of this statement.

VP Shapiro replies that the Executive at large feel confident that this referendum is on both the Executive and the President's terms and feel comfortable having the increase lumped in with that. Their goal is to make sure future Executives can do more in the future. This is part of a broader effort to have people more involved in the long-term future of the society.

Senator Buraga motions to lay this motion on the table. The Senator then revokes his motion.





## Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

Senator Lametti motions to suspend the standing rules and hear reports from members until the SSMU President returns. This is seconded by Councillor Karia, but is discarded by the Speaker when the President returns to the room.

The SSMU President returns and answers the question from Senator Buraga. The President has applied to every Council to ask to speak to the directly about the plan and the work being done, trying to engage first years across community as well. The goal is to engage as many people as they can across the student body, with a campaign team of about 50-100 people being prepared right no. The President is fine with people voting yes or no to the fee so long as they understand the intent behind it and what it could create.

The SSMU President then notes that McGill Security is shutting down this building at 10:30, potentially later, but if that is the case, will ask Councillor Frenette to open the EUS common room, as there are three more fees to get through tonight and this Council has already gone on way too long. President Mansdoerfer asks for member to be ready to help shut the space down and move to McConnell if given the notice.

In voting on the main motion by electronic means: there are **19 votes for, 3 against, and 3 abstentions, therefore, this passes.** The Parliamentarian reviews this as it is more votes than there are members present. The corrected record is **18 for, 3 against, and 3 abstentions, as there was a vote submitted twice by accident.**

### 8. Announcements:

President Mansdoerfer says that we will be evicted shortly, so encourages Council to try and speed up.

### 9. Question Period:

There are no questions this evening.

### 10. Recess, Consent Items:

This was taken earlier as per Senator Lametti's earlier motion.

### 11. Old Business Part 1:

President Mansdoerfer motions to move items d, e and f in Old Business to this spot on the agenda, which is a suspension of the rules, and is seconded by Councillor Sanchez.

Councillor Sanchez motions to move the LICM existence referendum to voting online, seconded by President Mansdoerfer.

Councillor Hu motions to move the LICM existence referendum right after these, and is seconded by Councillor Pilote.



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

Voting on the President's motion, which requires a 2/3 majority: it is approved by 23 for to 1 against.

Councillor Sanchez's motion, which also requires a 2/3 majority, is then approved by 21 vote for to 3 votes against, deprecating Councillor Hu's motion.

Senator Buraga makes a point of inquiry as it is now past 10 PM and the Council would appear to be violating the elections timeline, asking what happens now.

The President suggest adding in one of these motions a 'be it resolved' clause amending the elections timeline to 12 AM instead. The Speaker says that this can be added in at a later item.

**12. New Business Part 1:**

**a. Motion Regarding Space Fee Question for Winter 2019 Referendum 2019-03-14 – APPROVED:**

VP Wang reads out the motion.

**Questions:**

Senator Lametti says he did vote to approve this in the consent agenda, but asks why we would have a referendum question for \$1 on a space fee when we also have a referendum question on what is essentially a \$30 space fee.

VP Wang replies that the President's plan is a base fee increase. This is discretionary depending on how the next SSMU Executive decides to allocate it. This \$1 fee is for those events and requests that the SSMU cannot accommodate on its own premises. For example, there have been many applications for space such as the SSMU ballroom, which the SSMU cannot currently provide, so they will instead rent out things like New Residence or Blue Dog.

**Debate:**

Senator Buraga says that now that this fee is becoming opt-outable, what do they expect the opt-out rate to be and have they planned for that.

VP Wang says that the opt-out rate is 9.9% in the Winter semester and 11% in the Fall, and averages 10% annually. The Executive did consider this and it is in tangent to the President's grand plan, and so \$0.90 per student should be enough to handle this with the opt-out rate.

In voting on the motion by electronic means: with 19 votes in favour, 2 opposed and 1 abstention, therefore this is approved.

**b. Motion Regarding SSMU Safety Service Fee Question for Winter 2019 Referendum 2019-03-14 – APPROVED:**



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

VP Wang reads out the motion.

**Questions:**

Senator Buraga asks if the VP consulted with SACOMSS regarding this fee decrease.

VP Wang answers that he did meet with their Finance Coordinator in both August and February. In fact, he sent out an email on October 18<sup>th</sup> saying that “we can discuss a motion to change SACOMSS’ fee structure at our next meeting.” That being said, every meeting the VP has had with them he has brought it up, but at the end of the day, it is their responsibility to financially budget and there is initiative from service VP Finances who are not paid to conduct analysis and report to him in a diligent manner.

Senator Lametti asks what steps are being taken to prevent such over-budgeting in the future

VP Wang replies that it is responsibility of the VP Finance to be diligent about these fees. He understands that it can sometimes be difficult for a VP Finance to come in a gauge the financial forecast, especially when they do not have experience in the field. And so, if a fee is over-budgeted, the VP believes the right thing to do is to reduce it in the next referendum. However, this was not done for the Safety Service fee which is why he is doing this now.

Senator Buraga asks Councillor Constantin, the Services representative, if SACOMSS has been properly consulted and is generally in support of this change or whether they would hold such a surplus for a big project or something. The Speaker notes that Councillor Constantin is one of the motion’s movers and can therefore answer.

Councillor Constantin says that she did not have a chance to contact them directly about this, but VP Wang did notify them of this surplus repeatedly throughout the year. The Councillor does feel it is an appropriate action given the accumulation of money they have had over the years. That is not to say that if they need funding, they cannot access it, as next motion is for an overhead fee to mitigate exactly that possibility. Councillor Constantin believes this does allow for a better redistribution of the Service Fee.

**Debate:**

There is no debate on this motion.

Voting on this by electronic means: with **20 votes in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, this motion passes.**

- c. **Motion Regarding SSMU Service Fees Question for Winter 2019 Referendum 2019-03-14 – APPROVED:**

VP Wang presents the motion.

**Questions:**



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

There are no questions.

**Debate:**

VP Wang wants everyone to understand that though this is dry and a lot of material, if anyone has any questions to please let him know.

Voting on this by electronic means: **with 18 votes for, and 3 abstentions, it passes.**

President Mansdoerfer **motions to move the motion on the plebiscite to immediately after this, then to read through the notices, then the rest of old business and then everything else.** Seconded by Proxy Fakh.

Senator Buraga **motions to postpone the motion regarding the IR's of student groups to next week,** which is seconded by Councillor Smit. The Speaker reminds the Council that this motion has been postponed multiple times now.

Speaker allows Councillor Flaherty to speak on this as she is the primary mover of the motion regarding the IRs of student groups. Councillor Flaherty says she is disappointed this is being brought up for postponement again but says it is ok.

In voting on the motion proposed by the SSMU President, **this results in 16 votes for, and 2 against and this motion passes.**

The President says that if people have it in their hearts to stick around a bit longer to help Councillor Flaherty's motion go through he would really appreciate it, but also it is really late so he would understand if people don't want to.

VP Shapiro explains that he will be voting to oppose this as last Council he had urged to postpone this to this week.

Senator Buraga knows the original rationale was to allow the VP Student Life to be present or have the chance to state their opinion on this. The Senator asks if there is any update.

VP Shapiro replies that this was why he will be voting against this, as he was committed to ensuring that, regardless of whether VP Esterle was here, he would be able to represent her views on this topic if it were to be addressed tonight.

President Mansdoerfer points out for Councillor's knowledge that VP Esterle is not here tonight and will likely not be here at the next session either due to concussions.

In voting on the motion to postpone, **there are 9 for, and 9 against, therefore this motion fails.**

**d. Motion Regarding Affordable Student Housing Plebiscite 2019-03-14 – TABLED:**



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

Senator Buraga motions to lay this on the table, this is seconded by VP McLaughlin. With 17 votes for and 1 against, this passes and the motion is tabled.

- e. Notice of Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of Governance 2019-03-14:

President Mansdoerfer introduces this notice of motion.

- f. Notice of Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of Representation and Advocacy 2019-03-14:

President Mansdoerfer introduces this notice of motion.

- g. Notice of Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of Finance 2019-03-14:

VP Wang introduces this notice of motion.

Senator Buraga motions to take the motion on the Plebiscite from the table, this is seconded by Councillor Briand. This motion passes, and they return to the motion.

- h. Return to Motion Regarding Affordable Student Housing Plebiscite – APPROVED:

VP Shapiro presents this motion.

**Questions:**

There are no questions on this motion.

**Debate:**

Senator Lametti says for the record that he does not see why this was presented late, and feels it is not necessary to have a plebiscite, saying that it is within the SSMU responsibility to just develop this and present the results to Council and students later.

VP Shapiro responds that there is no good reason why it was added late, we all know that, but would encourage members to read the recent Tribune article on Executive overwork. More seriously, there is value in a plebiscite, as though the Executive are within their rights to just develop this unilaterally, the VP feels they are at a junction with this and need to see if affordable housing is something students want to support and if so, in what capacity.

In voting on this motion by placard: with 17 votes for, 1 against, and 1 abstention, this motion passes.

**13. Old Business Part 2**



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

a. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Judicial Board Procedures 2019-02-28 – APPROVED Earlier by Consensus:

b. Motion Regarding Provisions to the Internal Regulations of Student Groups 2019-02-2 – APPROVED:

Councillor Flaherty introduces the motion.

**Questions:**

VP Shapiro is curious about whether Councillor Flaherty can provide Council with any reasons beyond transparency for these suggestions.

Councillor Flaherty replies that the rubric right now could be changed by the new VP Student Life every year if they so desire to whatever they want, and that this can ignore many policies that have been put in place in the past, such as equity and environment policies. The Councillor gives the example of a closet misogynist being elected as VP Student Life and how this could allow them impact things without anyone knowing as they could act unilaterally. The Councillor claims that many VPs just use the rubric from years past so any previous biases and mistakes get carried down as well. Councillor Flaherty emphasizes that these are worst case scenarios but that the changes the motion proposes are practical and designed to keep personal ideals out of the rubric as much as possible.

Senator Lametti asks if someone could tell the Council what the thoughts of the VP Student Life are on this motion.

The Speaker says that as the VP University Affairs is not a mover, he unfortunately cannot speak for the VP Student Life at this time but can do so during debate.

**Debate:**

VP Shapiro says that VP Esterle is largely concerned about the ways in which this motion is somewhat redundant as Council can choose to pass whatever they want in terms of club rubrics, and this could slow down matters as this is a mostly administrative matter, where the VP Student Life works internally with permanent SSMU staff who have better institutional knowledge. The VP says there is also concern that this will be a cumbersome process that students used to being part of a collaborative and consultative process now have a clearly defined check that throws something not only through a 2/3 majority in committee, where there are only 5-6 people, and then automatically to Council, the thought is that these are hoops that already exist in terms of Council authority to change things.

Councillor Flaherty says that she appreciates hearing VP Esterle's thoughts on this, but says she has problems with those concerns, and some answers for them too. In terms of Council's authority, the Councillor thinks this is not applicable as Council is not involved in this process right now, and bringing it from one executive to Council would be a lot more indicative of what all students want. With regards to the 2/3 majority, this was an issue the committee considered, and they would be ok with amendments for a simple majority. So far, they have found it to be fine, as 2/3 is more than enough for voting procedure as,





## Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

if consultation is done properly, all will likely be on board with the changes. The Councillor does not think this will slow down the process from a bureaucracy standpoint, as they could have presented this 2 months ago and were not able to because of this loophole, being told they did not have the authority to consult.

VP Shapiro thinks there is value in an amendment keeping this in the responsibility of the VP Student Life as it is rather administrative, but having it be required to consult with Clubs Committee to approve this, and if a majority of the committee has cause for concern, then it could be brought to Council. But not allowing the VP Student Life to work on something that clearly is an administrative thing within their term would just impede the process. The VP says the wording here suggests that the process stops until Clubs Committee reviews and does not want to create a responsibility for them to tinker with this every year. VP Shapiro thinks there is more value in leaving the matter to the VP Student Life, and requiring a consult with the Clubs Committee would allow them to create a final product more quickly.

Councillor Jayme asks to be excused, and the Speaker notes that this would be the last person to leave as we are now at quorum. Councillor Pilote interjects to say that their last train is in 5 minutes and therefore asks for priority to leave. The Speaker grants this and therefore Councillor Jayme is not excused.

VP Wang agrees with the VP University Affairs as the rubric is not something that should be changed every year, it should be static. The VP gives for example the funding committee, who he asks for consultation every year, but they do not revise the rules every year, as this would make it less transparent for student groups and would require the VP to consult more with SSMU permanent and support staff to understand the consequences of their decisions and changes.

Councillor Flaherty says first that she does not believe this says anywhere that it would be a yearly thing, although she understands how this might give people more incentive to revisit this every year. However, the Councillor is unsure why this would be a negative outcome for it to be re-examined by a new Clubs Committee and legislative council every year, as the new policy says it can't be changed from last year's unless more than just the VP Student Life has a look at it. Councillor Flaherty also does not think this is not an administrative issue, as this is more about the values they are judging clubs based on, stressing that while it is not an ideological issue exactly, the Clubs Committee does need to objectively abide by it all year at meetings. If we treat this as administrative and leave the VP Student Life to deal with it on their own then they can do whatever they want whenever they want. The Councillor is not trying to make this a bureaucratic hassle, and believes this is a fairly simple way to proceed as the committee usually does not have any disagreement about what to judge clubs based on.

Councillor Pilote **motions to call the question**. This is seconded by Councillor Frenette.

VP McLaughlin asks if can make an amendment right now. The Speaker says technically yes, but it would be voted on after the motion to call the question.

In voting on the motion to call the question, which requires a 2/3 majority, with 11 for, and 8 against, this does not reach a 2/3 majority and so fails.



## Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

VP McLaughlin motions to add amendment emailed to the Parliamentarian. The Speaker says they are working on adding it in and will let the VP know when it is ready to be presented.

Senator Lametti says that, amendments aside, he cannot support this motion as it creates an equivalency in responsibility between elected positions like the VP Student Life or Legislative Council and unelected officials such as the Clubs Committee. The Senator believes this is not acceptable from accountability purposes and while he understands where Councillor Flaherty is coming from, in the interest of student democracy we cannot allow this to occur.

VP Shapiro thanks Senator Lametti for his point, and expands on the idea, saying that the Council recognizes with the wide range of executive committees they work with that there is value in having students with a range of experiences pertaining to the portfolio especially with regards to perspective. The VP thinks it is important to note that on things like the Equity Committee, while there are students there that do a lot of good work, at the end of the day, the ones who are held accountable are the VP himself as well as the Equity Commissioners. The VP says that this would create a weird dynamic where the three unelected students and student staff would oversee holding this person accountable.

Senator Buraga says he is generally in support of this motion as he believes those whose constituency is directly affected by this should have a bigger say. The Senator thinks it is important to empower the Clubs Councillors to take a bigger part in process. Senator Buraga stresses that this does not come from a place of malice but rather from a place where they hope to secure proper checks and balances in place and ensure best possible option always achieved. The Senator is confident that this will also increase the amount of thought and process that goes into creating clubs' rubric which will only benefit the process and streamline it further. Senator Buraga says that whether it is amended on a yearly or longer basis, he thinks that at its core this will improve clubs rubric process.

Councillor Flaherty says that she would be amenable to VP McLaughlin's amendment depending on the specific text of it. The Councillor would like to point out that VP Shapiro says that the Committee could bring their concerns to Council, but there is no mechanism right now to check them and it doesn't really matter what the Committee's concerns are. Councillor Flaherty remarks that this has made it obvious that in a few years someone in this position could change it unilaterally, and at the end of the day, they are the representatives of club voices on campus and so would make sense to listen to the clubs that are abiding by the rubric.

VP Shapiro thinks it is important to recognize that while clubs have a voice and stake at this body, which can hold every executive accountable, even if committees cannot. The VP would also like to mention that while everyone has a constituency that voted, the club constituency while very valid, operates differently, and finally asks if they would be open an amendment to have a 50% vote instead of a 2/3 majority due to small size of committee.

VP McLaughlin moves his amendment and modifies it to be a simple majority instead of 2/3 majority for both the committee and the council, this is seconded by Councillor Karia.

**Debate on amendment:**



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

Senator Buraga wonders if this amendment could be added on to the full status accreditation portion of the motion below as it is the exact same process.

VP McLaughlin says this is a friendly amendment to his amendment.

There are no objections to this amendment on the amendment, and it is friendly according to Councillor Flaherty, so this amendment to the amendment is adopted.

Back in debate on amendment proper.

Councillor Frenette says that he may have missed the boat on speaking on the sub amendment, but regarding having a simple majority for full status accreditation, is worried that this mean that anytime full status accreditation fails, it would come to Council, as this would not be a very efficient process and could involve clubs appealing to Legislative Council. The Councillor is not sure this is the best way to approach this.

Councillor Flaherty says that this is just in terms of the rubric for evaluation, and not the approval of clubs themselves, simply the rubric they get approved based on.

In voting on the amendment there are 16 votes for, 0 against and 2 abstentions, therefore it passes.

Back in debate on motion proper.

In voting on the main motion by electronic means, there are 11 votes for, 2 against, and 5 abstentions and so it passes.

Councillor Frenette motions to adjourn and postpone all remaining items to next Council, and is seconded by VP Wang. This passes unanimously.

14. New Business:

- a. Notice of Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of Governance 2019-03-14 – MOVED TO 12.e:
- b. Notice of Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of Representation and Advocacy 2019-03-14 – MOVED to 12.f:
- c. Notice of Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of Finance 2019-03-14 MOVED to 12.g:
- d. Motion Regarding Space Fee Question for Winter 2019 Referendum 2019-03-14 – MOVED TO 12.a



**Recording Secretary | Secrétaire de séance**

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

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

*Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories*

- e. Motion Regarding SSMU Safety Service Fee Question for Winter 2019 Referendum 2019-03-14 – MOVED TO 12.b:
- f. Motion Regarding SSMU Service Fees Question for Winter 2019 Referendum 2019-03-14 – MOVED TO 12.c:
- g. Motion Regarding Support of the SPF for the Bike Centre Project Operations 2019-03-14 – POSTPONED to 2019-03-28:
- h. Motion Regarding Affordable Student Housing Plebiscite 2019-03-14 MOVED TO 12.d:
- i. Motion to Endorse a Yes Vote on the Legal Information Clinic McGill (LICM) Existence Referendum 2019-03-14 – MOVED TO ONLINE VOTING.

**15. Reports by Committees:**

There are no reports from Committees this evening.

**16. Reports by Councillors – POSTPONED to 2019-03-28:**

- a. Benjam Smit (Management):
- b. Julian Jayme (Music):
- c. Garima Karia (Arts):
- d. Maxence Frenette (Engineering):
- e. Philippe Cossette (PT/OT):
- f. Haoyi Qiu (Science):
- g. Robert Hu (FYC):

**17. Executive Reports – POSTPONED to 2019-03-28:**

- a. President:
- b. VP University Affairs:
- c. VP Internal:
- d. VP Finance:
- e. VP Student Life:
- f. VP External Portfolio:

**18. Confidential Session – POSTPONED to 2019-03-28.**

**19. Adjournment – 11:41 PM.**

*Tre Mansdoerfer*

---

Tre Mansdoerfer, President

**APPROVED**