



# SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MINUTES

October 10, 2019

The regular bi-weekly Legislative Council Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held in Room 603, McConnell Engineering Building, Montreal, on October 10, 2019, at 6:00 p.m.

*Note: Due to technical difficulties with the audio recording during this meeting, certain gaps may occur within the minutes.*

1. Call to Order: **18:11**

The Speaker calls the meeting to order at 18:11.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker reads the Land Acknowledgement.

3. Attendance

Absent - Councillor Kaye, Councillor Patzer.

There is no Education Representative

The Speaker announces that Michael Rhamey is the new Environment Representative.

The Speaker announces Ashley Lau here as proxy for First Year Representative Das

The Speaker announces that Jeremy Platt is the new Music Representative.

The Speaker announces that Dylan Wong is proxy for Science Representative Bhuktar

The Speaker announces Sydney Meritt is proxy for Science Representative Wright

The Speaker announces that Sebastien Duckett is Proxy for Senator Lametti.

The Speaker announces the new Social Work Representative, Jo Roy.

4. Approval of Minutes - **APPROVED**



The minutes from September 26, 2019. Councillor Fakih has noted an amendment on page 12, changing the word to “national” to “annual”.

The minutes are unanimously approved.

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

Councillor Fakih motions to add Motion 12.g to 12.d, seconded by Councillor Franceschini.

Councillor Kersch motions to move Motion 12.c to 12.a, seconded by VP External.

The agenda is adopted as amended.

6. Report of the Steering Committee

The Speaker presents the Report of the Steering Committee.

7. Guest Speakers

a. Catharina (Kat) O'Donnell, Researcher (University Tenure Process)

Catharina O'Donnell presents the presentation regarding the Academic Tenure Practices at McGill. Catharina O'Donnell worked with VP Wilson doing a report on tenure at McGill, looking at how it can be improved for key stakeholders. Catharina explains that tenure is a job status for professors and librarians that guarantees substantial job security. It used to protect academic research in terms of conducting controversial research that the government may not look favourably on. Catharina explains that an individual with tenure cannot be released under normal means.

Catharina explains that tenure is evaluated at McGill through a series, beginning their career at McGill as an assistant professor, beginning a ten-year track. Catharina explains that by the sixth year of working at McGill, you must ask to be considered for tenure. This request first goes to the Departmental Tenure Committee for consideration, and then following, moves forward to the University Tenure Committee. Catharina notes that the University Tenure Committee name is misleading, as it is in actuality, a faculty committee made up of individuals that are not the peers of the professor. Within the process, there is also an external dossier constructed. In this dossier, Catharina explains that it would provide information and reasoning if the professor would be offered tenure at other universities. Lastly, the Provost provides the final recommendation.

Catharina speaks on equity in tenure, explaining that women, racialized, indigenous, professors with disabilities are underrepresented among tenure.



Catharina notes candidates are evaluated on a process evaluating research, teaching, and service. In order to be considered for tenure, candidates must be ranked superior in at least two categories, and adequate performance in the third.

Catharina explains that the dossier is produced by the candidate themselves, and contains examples of their work.

Catharina notes that the goal in creating the report is to demystify tenure and explain how it works, provides what issues are and how it can be improved.

For recommendations, Catharina recommends a further emphasis on teaching. In the evaluative process, Catharina notes that it is the second most important evaluation criteria. Catharina suggests that it could be emphasized more, especially when it relates to undergraduate services.

Catharina notes the absence of teaching materials in the dossier, explains that people only look at service and research. Catharina however notes that course evaluations are not the best way to evaluate a candidate's tenure possibility, as there is often bias.

Catharina brings attention to the fact that there is no student representation in tenure process, which is odd, as it has to do with hiring professors for the students. Catharina notes that students are on hiring committees, yet not on any tenure committee. As such, Catharina believes that SSMU should push for this. Catharina stresses that this role needs to be meaningful however. Furthermore, Catharina believes that the committee should also allow the departmental organization to submit a letter into the tenure dossier, as well as allowing the faculty representative to serve in an advising role.

Catharina speaks on disciplinary records, noting that they are not included in the tenure dossier. Catharina further elaborates, stating that the professor does not need to include it, and as well, others do not have access to it. Catharina suggests lobbying McGill to include disciplinary records, especially ones pertaining to teacher-student relationships.

Lastly, Catharina suggests the lobbying chairs of Deans, faculty, and Provost.

#### Question Period:

Councillor Fasih asks Catharina to go over the advantages of a professor having tenure. Catharina explains that the goal of the report is not to attack tenure, but to figure out how to adapt it to make it better. Catharina notes that it is an extremely important institution, as it protects academic freedom. Similarly, it allows students to pursue more interesting research if they are supervised by a professor with tenure. Lastly, Catharina notes that it allows for more honest and forceful mentorship between professors and students.



Councillor Dandamudi asks if any contact has been made with Student Life and Learning Services. Catharina explains that they are working to contact Teaching and Learning services, but she did not have the time to, given the hours allotted for her position.

The President asks regarding disciplinary records, he asks Catharina if she has examples of them being included in the tenure process. Catharina notes that they are typically not included in tenure processes, due to the idea that discipline does not affect teaching, and that they are separate. Catharina notes that the closest model is Ryerson, where the Chair can include it. However, this is not possible, given that the Chair at McGill in tenure committees does not have access to these records.

Councillor Flaherty asks that in the parameters of the research, if Catharina has any recommendations besides informal lobbying.

Catharina notes that it is obvious that there is room for improvement. Catharina has included a list of recommendations, including various long-term improvements that could be made. As to what can be done currently, Catharina notes that informal activism can work incredibly well, providing the example of emailing the Provost in large numbers. Looking at longer term, Catharina suggests that policies would be changed, making the amendment so that disciplinary records would be included. Catharina notes that the first step, besides informal activism, is that McGill would create its own ad-hoc committee.

Robert Hendrichson, AUS, asks once tenure is granted, is there in any way it can be rescinded, and what is the process for rescinding. Catharina explains that once a professor receives tenure, they must maintain the same standard they have under tenure as they had when they first received it. Catharina notes that in actuality, this process is not actually followed. This is partly due to the fact that they are not expected to keep up with the same volume of research as they were before tenure. As well, there is no regulations on how to remove tenured professors with cause. Catharina notes lastly that there is often background negotiation deals for resignation, and as well, there is no clear process.

b. Fabrice Labeau / Phil Quintal, Office of Student Life and Learning

Fabrice Labeau and Phil Quintal present on the creation of the Athletics Referendum fee. They explain that such a fee has been in place previously.

Fabrice Labeau notes that the idea of having a facility improvement fee is to make improvements to the facilities, with the fees being matched dollar for dollar by the Provost.

Phil Quintal explains that fees are put to usage in a number of different projects.

Fabrice Labeau states that they ensure there is consultation with student stakeholders, through consultation with McGill Recreational Advisory Board, where they are in a constant feedback loop.



Question period:

Councillor Chan asks if there are any examples of large infrastructure plans they have on the docket that they would currently use this fund for.

Phil Quintal explains that on the docket, the first priority is resurfacing the field house, as it is a high use facility. As well, they would use the funds for renovations for men's and women's locker rooms, as they are dated and need refreshing. Furthermore, the funds would be used to create a Wellness and Nutrition Kitchen which will become a communal kitchen where work with students regarding nutrition and healthy students will commence. Phil Quintal notes that with the fund, they will introduce air conditioning into the field house and the gyms, and lastly, they will resurface the pool.

Proxy for Senator Lametti asks that since the fee was blocked last semester, what has been the impact on the lack of funding.

Phil Quintal states that it has put a hold on the development of future projects. Furthermore, Quintal notes that without further funding, current projects have been put at a stand still, such as the resurfacing of the field house.

Fabrice Labeau notes that there has been no consequence on operation, only on the facilities themselves.

Councillor Fakh motions to extend by seven minutes, seconded by VP External. This motion is unanimously approved.

VP External asks that when the student contribution was blocked, if the university continued to match what the students would have donated. Fabrice Labeau notes that there was no additional matching, as there was no money allocated for the fee. There is a lot of requests of funding from various places, and as such, they are typically unable to receive funding. However, Labeau notes that students placing their money is a sign for prioritization of funds.

Phil Quintal explains that a portion comes from student fees, with additional income coming from Athletics, such as merchandise, and it is a mixed model.

VP External inquires about funding coming from the university. Labeau explains that some comes from operating funds, relies on donor money, especially large works such as the Wellness and Nutrition Kitchen

Councillor Nixon inquires about the representation of SSMU on the committee, and whether they are merely consultative or voting members.



Fabrice Labeau states that quite a few students are representing as voting members, including numerous SSMU representatives.

Senator Lametti notes that the \$10.00 fee is higher than it was before, and as such, asks why it has increased. Phil Quintal remarks that the fee has actually always been \$10.00.

The President asks why they have chosen to continue to use \$10.00 and not increase the fee. Fabrice Labeau notes that many things go into picking the number for the fee. Furthermore, Labeau also explains that the idea is to replenish the needs of the program in a way that is sustainable.

VP Internal inquires what the prioritization for projects is, and if any consultation has been done considering the order of prioritization. Phil Quintal notes that various consultations were conducted before the Winter Referendum, and as a result, collected many ideas that the students wanted. This includes re-fielding the field house, the renovation of the locker rooms, creating new meeting spaces in the facility. Quintal notes that the upper mezzanine and Tomlinson Hall are always busy, as well as the cafeteria.

VP External asks that in the case that the fee doesn't pass, if there has been indication from the Provost that there will be continued money from the university. Fabrice Labeau notes that they have not received any indication from the university but they are hoping that passing this will help. Labeau notes also that it will start to impact the timeline majorly if it is not passed tonight. Furthermore, if it is not passed, they will have to completely change the way items are funded. In regards to the replacement fund, they hope that the replacement fund is from other sources, and not the Operating Grants, such as stemming from donors. Lastly, Labeau laments, stating that although it is not easy to get, it may be necessary.

#### 8. Announcements

VP Finance announces to Councillors to inform all clubs executives to pick up tokens for bank account access.

VP External announces that CJAM is looking at another strike mobilization.

VP University Affairs notes that on Tuesday, they will be meeting with the Principal of McGill University along with SSMU President. As such, the VP University Affairs asks anyone who would like something to bring up for discussion or a question to let them know.

VP Internal announces that tickets for the Halloween event are now on sale, and encourages everyone to publicize the event.

VP Student Life announces that the 2nd and 3rd Mental Illness Awareness events will occur on the 17th and 21st of October.



Councillor Wu announces that Science After-Hours held their first bar at Majesthe, and will occur for the next three Wednesdays in the month.

The President thanks Midnight Kitchen for providing food for the Legislative Council, and thanks the Plate Club for providing reusable cutlery and plates.

9. Question Period

10. Recess, Consent Items

No items have passed through unanimous consent.

11. Business Arising

- a. Motion Regarding Policy on Moratorium on McGill Fees Until Fossil Fuel Divestment 2019-09-26 - **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Question Period:

Councillor Chan asks the SSMU President if the moratorium will antagonize relations with the McGill administration, and what the effects of it will be.

President passes the question to VP University Affairs.

VP University Affairs states that it absolutely will, but it is perfectly fine to partly ruin the relationship. VP University notes that they have pushed off divestment for years. As to effects, she states that it will not impede SSMU from doing their job, and they will continue to meet regularly.

Councillor Mackie asks about politicizing student services and using them to put pressure is wise. VP University Affairs notes that student services have always been politicized. VP University Affairs that services have always been politicized, but services have continued to be funded by McGill. Lastly, VP University Affairs states that students will not be influenced in a meaningful way.

Debate:

Proxy for Senator Lametti presents the prepared short statement from Senator Lametti.

In the statement from Senator Lametti, he states that during the Senate Caucus meeting, a response was discussed in detail, with the overwhelming opinion being not favourable.



Senator Lametti states that the Implementation of a moratorium will remove student voice on the current process. Senator Lametti explains that if the university is forced to circumvent SSMU on running fees, they can do so, and this will become the norm.

VP Internal motions for two (2) minute extension, seconded by Councillor Chan. This is unanimously approved.

Senator Lametti explains that the SSMU moratorium will disproportionately affect international students. Furthermore, if the school cannot afford something, they will adjust the international student fees and tuition, considering that it is a deregulated form of funding. Lastly, Senator Lametti states that it will have no impact on the ability of the university to finance its projects.

Member of the gallery, Robert Henrichson, states that he is not too sure how effective divestment is. Henrichson believes that such an action would be shooting SSMU in the foot. Instead, Hendrichson suggests that they should push the administration to use shareholder rights to show up to the companies' AGM to voice legitimate concerns, becoming activist shareholders.

Member of the Gallery, Laura Mackie, Divest McGill states that McGill has divested from different industries in the, such as tobacco or companies that did business in South Africa during Apartheid, and as such, there is established precedence.

VP External states that as addressed at AUS Council, McGill divesting from fossil fuels does not cause a crash to the economy, it simply makes a statement about what the money of public institutions should go to.

Councillor Mackie has personal concerns at the fact that there was no referendum question in the motion. Similarly, the words used are big and may become confusing to students. As well, there has been no reports made on the effects of students. Lastly, Councillor Mackie states that voters have the right to be concerned and informed.

Member of the Gallery, Andres Pereztkanos, MacDonald campus, asks what will happen if SSMU approves this, and if it should be done in conjunction with MacDonald Campus Students' Society (MCSS). The President replies that he had the opportunity to meet with the MCSS President today. In the case that the motion is approved, the MCSS President is willing to collaborate on it. As well, they expressed an interest in possibly presenting it in their own council.

Councillor Roy motions to move amendment regarding SRI, seconded by Councillor Morgan.

Debate on the amendment:





VP External hesitates to support the motion given that McGill has financial reasoning for divestment, stating that In this case, SRIs don't necessarily increase financial yield. Similarly, they ask if this is a better tactic for another time.

Councillor Chan states that this sets a very bar for what it is asking for McGill, and as such, it is not feasible.

Member of the Gallery, Laura Mackie, Divest McGill, states that the campaign has been active for seven years, and that the campaign has been limited to divestment, not on alternatives as well. They recognize they are already asking for a lot, and as such, they do not wish to add one more thing for them to reach the decision to divest.

Voting on the amendment - FAILS

In favour: 3

Opposed: 22

Abstaining: 4

Debate on the main motion:

The President motions to move footnote 8 to appendix A - PASSES

In favour: 24

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 2

Debate on the main motion:

VP University Affairs states the biggest amount of power SSMU has, is money, and that they are intellectual workers. Similarly, when the moratorium passes, SSMU shows that their money is where their mouth is. As well, it would show McGill that the student body cares about climate justice and divestment. Breaking it down, the VP University Affairs that tuition and healthcare will continue to be paid, but ancillary fees will not be paid. Lastly, VP University Affairs states that it would be a shame for it to fail.

Councillor Morgan asks the Proxy for Senator Lametti to further explain why the Senate Caucus was strongly against the motion.

The proxy explains that the unfavourable opinion was not about the merits of the divest movement, but about the tactic, stating that the tactic is not effective.



The President explains that SSMU is meant to uplift the voices of those members, and acknowledges that climate change disproportionately affects those that did the least to contribute to climate change. He reaffirms that McGill cares about finances and their reputation.

Councillor Dandamudi states that she has received countless emails pushing for this motion, and it is clear that the motion should be passed.

Councillor Flaherty asks if there has been any consideration on the SSMU or Divest McGill on specifying the divestment question within the ancillary context.

Member of the Gallery, Laura Mackie, Divest McGill, states that the Divest McGill campaign follows the campaign for all divestment of top 200 oil and gas companies. Furthermore, she states that many other campaigns have put forward this platform, and have passed.

Member of the Gallery, Robert Henrichson, AUS, asks what the point of divestment is. He asks if it is to see change in the world, or to merely cleanse consciences.

Councillor Rhamey asks how would one suggest becoming an active stakeholder as suggested, and seems antithetical to the approach. VP Finance states that divestment creates a statement where McGill does not support it.

Proxy for Senator Lametti states that in shareholder activism, everyone has to have an annual shareholder meeting, where one can appear to show up and address executives directly.

Councillor Wu states that passing the motion would be making a difference within our own institution, and other schools may see that and follow our lead.

Member of the Gallery, Chanel Perreux, Arts and Science, asks what the likelihood of being an active shareholder is, given that it is a substantial process.

Councillor Rhamey notes that divestment is getting rid of all involvement in petroleum and that fossil fuel companies will never be sustainable.

Councillor Franceschini states that it is clear that overwhelming amount of students support this, and reminds Councillors that they are there to represent their constituents.

Councillor Mackie motions to postpone until SSMU's General Assembly, seconded by Councillor Dixon.

Debate on motion to postpone:

The President moves to suspend the standing rules, seconded by Councillor Mackie.



VP External asks if the motion will be used to include the aforementioned amendment in discussion.

Motion to suspend the standing rules - there is a clear  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority and two (2) opposed. This passes.

The President motivates the amendment. The motion is seconded. This passes.

Voting procedure:

In favour: 26

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 3

Motion to postpone until General Assembly:

Debate:

Councillor Fakhri states that SSMU General Assembly has not gotten quorum in a while. Hence, if quorum isn't met during this upcoming GA, this will be further postponed until the next Legislative Council, and by then, the Board of Governors meeting would have already passed.

Councillor Chan states his appreciation for the desire for more student input, but reminds Council that they are currently the representatives for students at SSMU, and as such, this vote is equally as legitimate.

VP External motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Roy - this passes with a two-thirds majority.

Motion to postpone the motion until the SSMU GA:

In favour: 4

Opposed: 22

This is unanimously rejected.

Debate on the main motion:

Proxy to Senator Lametti states that they do not believe that this will squeeze McGill financially. He reminds the Council that they still have power to run fees, and it is more effective to go after current discussions.

VP External states that it is possible to do both.



Member of the Gallery, Noah Fisher, Divest McGill, notes that in 2017, the Energy East pipeline was cancelled, due largely to the success of a divest campaign.

Councillor Chan moves to the previous question, seconded by Councillor Dandamudi.

Vote to move to the previous question - PASSES.

In favour: 22

Opposed: 9

The President motions to divide the question, seconded by Councillor Rhamey - PASSES

Voting Procedure:

In favour: 16

Opposed: 13

Motion to appeal the decision of the Chair, seconded by Proxy of Senator Lametti - PASSES.

The decision of the Chair is overturned. (*inaudible*)

VP Finance motions to suspend the rules, seconded - PASSES.

Councillor Kersch asks how the moratorium is affecting the Athletics referendum.

Councillor Chase asks when the moratorium will take effect. The Speaker replies, stating that it would occur immediately.

VP Finance explains that it is a new FIO, and as such, any new ancillary fees should not be considered. However, VP Finance states that this can be violated by Council. He reminds Council that there is nothing to stop Council from debating and voting on this motion.

Councillor Fakih asks if historical precedent is a rule within the context of SSMU.

The Speaker explains that they follow a book of open ruling. The Speaker explains that it is not binding, but helpful to keep with precedent from previous years, as it allows for continuity.

The President explains that no ruling comes into effect until after ratification by the Board of Directors.



Councillor Fakih asks how the agenda at the Board meeting is decided, and if it is possible to approve the Athletics fee before the Moratorium. The Speaker states that motions appear on the agenda as they do on Legislative Council agenda.

Councillor Chase asks if the Board of Directors can change the agenda so that the Athletics Fee appears before the Moratorium. The Speaker replies that similar to Legislative Council, the Board can amend the agenda as necessary.

Councillor Fakih asks if the Board of Directors could amend the agenda to put the Athletics fee referendum before the Moratorium on the agenda of the BoD.

Motion to object to the consideration of the Athletics Fee question - FAILS.

Voting Procedure:

Motion Motion Regarding Policy on Moratorium on McGill Fees Until Fossil Fuel Divestment (Part 1) - PASSES.

In favour: 22

Opposed: 4

Abstaining: 5

Motion Regarding Policy on Moratorium on McGill Fees Until Fossil Fuel Divestment (Part 2) - PASSES.

In favour: 27

Opposed: 1

Abstaining: 3

- b. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Internal Regulations of Elections and Referenda 2019-09-26 -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Deputy Electoral Officer, Ben Howard, motivates the motion. The motion is a clarification on what election materials count as spam. Similarly, the motion would amend the IR to give elections SSMU over constituting what is spam regarding sending unsolicited messaging.

The President explains that individuals may email individually each email of each individual club and/or service, and that there is no clear wording to prohibit this.

Deputy Electoral Officer Howard states that it is something they could consider if they had a say in what this would constitute. In the limited times this does arise, it is clear when it can be considered spam.



## Debate:

Councillor Chase is concerned with the first Be it resolved clause, and cautions giving that much discretion to Chief Electoral Officer.

Councillor Rhamey asks if the wording “electronic mail or messages” on social media platforms includes email. VP Finance replies, stating that it does.

The President moves to postpone the motion until the next Legislative Council, seconded by Councillor Bhuktar - PASSES.

Proxy of Senator Lametti motions to suspend the rules to modify the agenda, seconded by VP External - PASSES.

- c. Motion Regarding Changes to the Health and Dental Review Committee Terms of Reference 2019-09-26 --**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

## Voting procedure:

In favour: 19

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 2

## 12. New Business

- a. Notice of Motion Regarding the Creation of an Affordable Student Housing Committee 2019-10-10

VP External motivates the motion. VP External explains that on the committee, two spots would be reserved for Councillors, and that currently, housing is extremely expensive, and that through the committee, they would work to combat this.

- b. Notice of Motion Regarding Adoption of an Event Management Policy 2019-10-03

VP Internal motivates the motion. The VP Internal explains that the only policy that currently exists is the intoxication at events, does deal with how execs should behave themselves, does not exist in concerns of capacity, or in regards to who should be there for first aid. The VP Internal also states that there was consultation with the General Manager before the resignation.

- c. Motion Regarding Creation of an Athletics Facility Improvement Fee Referendum Question 2019-10-10 --**NOT APPROVED**



Councillor Kersch presents the report. Councillor Kersch explains that the motion goes towards everyone. He explains that the equipment is extremely outdated. He recognizes that the fee would be used to bring the building to current status, not state of the art status.

Question Period:

VP External reminds the Council that the moratorium was just passed, and as such, fees should not be paid by the students.

Councillor Chan asks if there is any mechanism to change the wording of a fee so that it is not a new fee. The Speaker notes that changing the wording does not change the fact that it is a new fee being added to the e-bill.

Councillor Bhutkar asks for Councillor Kersch to explain why this is not a new fee. Councillor Kersch states that it is a new fee, but has been voted on for the last 36 years to contribute to the fee.

Member of the Gallery, Robert Henrichson, AUS, asks why this fee is non-opt-outable. Councillor Kersch states that he cannot elaborate more on it, but the reason is that it goes to the whole student body, and affects the whole student body.

Councillor Wu asks if the moratorium has been established until May 1, 2024, and as such, does that mean that no student fees will be passed.

VP External states that there is no consideration for a new policy until 2024.

Councillor Daryanani motions to extend conversation by 3 minutes. The motion is seconded - PASSES.

Member of the Gallery, Alex, McGill Daily, asks why the basis of this referendum to help students if it is still an auxiliary fee.

Debate:

VP University Affairs objects to the motion, stating that they had just passed the moratorium to not consider this motion, and voting for this motion would contradict the vote prior. VP University Affairs that McGill has the opportunity to make these financial improvements through overhead and donors. VP University Affairs explains that though it would benefit all students, it is not the students' responsibility to fund this.

Councillor Marcoux apologizes to Councillor Kersch, however Councillor Marcoux finds it difficult to support such a motion.



VP Finance states that McGill puts aside \$460,000, and if the referendum fails, the money allocated will not be given by McGill.

Councillor Roy claims that considering the motion they just passed, it would be contradictory to the collective bargaining that the moratorium has created.

Councillor Rhamey states that the argument that this fee has a special distinction doesn't really hold up.

Councillor Marcoux move to the previous question, seconded by Councillor Morgan - PASSES.

Vote to close debate and move to a vote:

Motion Regarding Creation of an Athletics Facility Improvement Fee Referendum Question - FAILS.

Approved: 5

Opposed: 16

Abstaining: 8

This motion is unanimously rejected.

- d. Motion Regarding Increase and Nature of SSMU Equity Fee Referendum Question  
2019-10-10 --**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

VP University Affairs motivates the motion. VP University Affairs explains that it will increase the equity fee from \$0.50 to \$1.00, citing that the equity fund is consistently low. VP University Affairs explains that the SSMU Equity Fund is consistently low, with the Equity Commissioners having no money to work with. More so, there is currently not enough money to pay the commissioners, or pay for events within the portfolio. VP University Affairs cites the hypocrisy in this, explaining that the goal of equity is to decrease barriers. Similarly, VP University Affairs explains that this fee would be non-opt-outable, given that it impacts everyone.

Question Period:

Councillor Fakh asks what will happen if only one of the two questions concerning the referendum passes.

VP University Affairs explains that only the question that is passed will come into effect. VP Internal further explains that they are two separate referendum questions.

Proxy for Senator Lametti asks if the university block these fees in retaliation for blocking the McGill ancillary fees. VP External states that McGill cannot.





Debate:

VP Finance clarifies that the Equity Commissioners will continue to be paid, simply SSMU will be at deficit spending in that department.

Councillor Fakh asks that since the fund is in deficit, does it mean that no one can apply for the Equity Fund. VP Finance replies that one can continue to apply to the Equity Fund.

Member of the Gallery, Robert Henrichson, AUS, states that there is no consistent policy on what fees should be opt-out-able and what fees should not be. Henrichson suggests a committee should be created in order to ensure consistency is maintained and established.

Debate:

There is no debate on the amendment.

Voting procedure for those in favour of the amendment of clause 12.e. - PASSES.

Councillor Chase motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Bhutkar - PASSES.

Voting Procedure:

Motion Regarding Increase and Nature of SSMU Equity Fee Referendum Question - this is unanimously approved.

- e. Motion Regarding SSMU Club Fund Fee Referendum Question 2019-10-10  
**--UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

VP Student Life motivates the motion. VP Student Life explains that the fee would be used for the club portal, called Eventus. It is \$7.75 per student, an \$5.00 increase. Lastly, VP Student Life states that it would cover all sponsorship contracts.

Question Period:

VP Internal asks that when considering events that include alcohol, what the extent that it is covered by insurance is. VP Finance replies stating that there is no insurance policy that covers events based on the encouraged consumption of alcohol.

VP Finance explains that the insurance would include general liability coverage for every member of SSMU, and furthermore, would allow every member to be covered internationally as well. Similarly, it would be easier to get proof of insurance, and would cover alcohol in private venues.



VP Internal asks if the fee would cover participation of clubs in Activities Night, given that there was much backlash from clubs after they were charged \$5.00 to participate in Activities Night. VP Student Life states that it would not.

Debate:

The President hopes that everyone votes in favour to show the McGill community what SSMU does for them, and so that SSMU can help clubs thrive.

VP External explains that the only reason students pay for this is because McGill will not support it.

Member of the Gallery states that individuals hold many small scale events that do not include alcohol or travelling, but it is still required to submit constant insurance forms. They ask if this would still be necessary with the new fee. VP Finance states that the fee streamlines the insurance process.

Councillor Dixon clarifies that the given insurance will pay for high-risk events, and asks what measures have been taken to ensure the financial stability of SSMU.

VP Finance states that SSMU has not made a single claim on its insurance in the past five years.

Councillor Fakih asks what type of insurance this is referring to. VP Finance states that it is general liability insurance.

Councillor Chase motions to return to the previous question, seconded by VP Internal - PASSES.

Voting Procedure:

Motion Regarding SSMU Club Fund Fee Referendum Question - PASSES.

Approved: 16

Abstaining: 0

Opposed: 2

This motion is unanimously approved.

- f. Motion Regarding Creation of the Gerts Reopening Fund and Fee Levy 2019-10-10  
**--NOT APPROVED**

Councillor Chase motivates the motion. Councillor Chase explains that many SSMU members are excited for this fee, as they are anxious to re-open Gert's. Lastly, Councillor Chase states that the fee would be opt-out-able.



Question Period:

Councillor Dixon asks what efforts the university has taken to cover the costs, given the immense timeline of the construction of the Shatner Building.

VP Finance states that the university as a landlord has offered an exchange of spaces in 680 Sherbrooke and elsewhere. VP Finance explains that however, very few provisions have been made to off-set the financial losses that SSMU has incurred as a result of the building closure.

VP Internal asks if there is a reason why the fee is specifically for Gert's, and not for the opening of the University Centre as a whole.

Councillor Chase explains that the fee will be used to supplement some of the losses Gert's will take as a result of the purchasing of new equipment. Councillor Chase further explains that Gert's will have to operate at a loss through purchase of cups and beverages, and that the fee would help to offset some of this.

Councillor Franceschini asks that since the fee has been opt-out-able, how was the number of people who will choose to contribute estimated.

VP Finance explains that the typical opt out rate is 8-10% for small fees, with large fees often being higher. With their calculations, they estimated a 15% opt out rate, given that it is a one time large fee.

Councillor Dixon motions to extend by five minutes, seconded by VP Internal - PASSES.

VP Internal asks how they arrived at the estimation.

Councillor Chase states that in the appendix, there is an explanation of costs.

The President asks that considering the BoD is the body ultimately handling SSMU's financial and legal obligations, if Councillor has consulted the BoD.

Councillor Chase states that he has not consulted BoD, and that the idea was born out of the Finance Committee.

Councillor Dixon asks to clarify why some things such as furniture damage have occurred, and why students have to incur these costs. Councillor Dixon also asks why equipment would fail, and why it was justified at 50%.



VP Finance states that when the SSMU building was closed, all the furniture was moved off to storage or upstairs in a giant wooden box. He states that this box was intended to last six months without significant damage, and in the meantime, any number of things could have happened. Lastly, VP Finance states that no one knows what happened during construction, as no one has seen the building since 2018. He states that it is likely that the percentage of equipment failure or destruction is higher than 50%.

Councillor Fakhri inquires if due to the fact that since the building closure has been delayed because of McGill, if the university should be responsible for the incurrence of these costs, and not the students. VP Finance answers in the affirmative.

VP Internal motions to extend question period by 2 minutes, seconded by Senator Garneau - PASSED.

VP Internal states that given that the 50% estimate was given if something was closed for six months, and that the failure rate is most likely higher, the cost is more likely even higher.

Councillor Chase states that to his knowledge, if you don't fund the fee, the money will come from SSMU's bank account. Councillor Chase explains that if everything has to be replaced, with the fee, there is something to work with. Councillor Chase explains that the fee would minimize fiscal responsibility that SSMU finances would incur.

Debate:

VP Finance states that the numbers are estimates, and that they do not know what it will be like.

Councillor Dixon states that it is not fiscally responsible to do this, given the uncertainties and the inaction by the McGill administration.

Member of the Gallery, Andre Perezakos, MCSS, asks why the fee is not being affected by the moratorium.

The Speaker explains that the moratorium only affects ancillary fees being instituted by McGill, not being instituted by SSMU.

The President thanks Councillor Chase for creating this motion. However, he states that students should not be the one to pay for this. The President states that the BoD has the full financial picture, and most likely would not propose this motion unless it is a last resort. He reminds the Council that SSMU is not in a position to send this to the membership. The President states that by sending this to the membership, it creates the idea that SSMU is directly responsible for the re-opening of Gert's.

VP Finance states that they will have the complete picture for the building reopening before the e-bill is issued in January.



Councillor Franceschini states that they owe it to themselves to open Gert's, and given that this fee is opt-outable, it seems reasonable to push the motion forward.

Councillor Flaherty states that she shares President's sentiments. Councillor Flaherty explains the cultural significance Gert's has to clubs on campus, with it being used for fundraisers, clubs, and student life.

Councillor Fakih asks what the feasibility is for making this fee opt-outable. VP Finance explains that they do not believe it possible, due to the fact that Minerva and Student Accounts do not operate in this regards.

VP Internal states that in regards to the Executives finding other pathways to receive other funding, VP Internal is currently working on a campaign to receive other funds.

Senator Garneau wishes to make students aware that they can opt out, and that they know how to.

Councillor Daryanani motions to postpone the motion for two meetings. No seconder - FAILS.

VP Finance states that he was not part of the writing of the motion, he is merely providing the numbers behind it. Furthermore, VP Finance states that they could sit down for hours to calculate, however the numbers that would be created would not be much better.

Councillor Daryanani states that there is not enough data for why the fee should be charged on now, concerning when the building will be open, what the state of the building will be. Councillor Chase states that it is clear that the administration will not pay to re-open Gert's if SSMU does not vote for this motion, and will not pay for the damages resulted from the building closure. If there is not a fee, SSMU will have to pay for it directly, and Councillor Chase believes it unacceptable to be borrowing against future students.

Councillor Chan states that there is no time to waste, given that the referendum deadline is tonight.

VP Student Life moves to call the previous question, seconded by Councillor Bhutkar - PASSES.

Voting Procedure:

Motion Regarding Creation of the Gerts Reopening Fund and Fee Levy - FAILS.

In favour: 9

Opposed: 10

Abstaining: 4



This motion is unanimously rejected.

Buraga Motion to postponing 11.H and 12.G to next Legislative Council, seconded by Councillor Franceschini - PASSES.

VP University Affairs motions to postpone Executive reports until next meeting, motion is seconded. - PASSES

The President moves to postpone all remaining reports besides Services Review and Funding and all reports.

VP Internal states that postponing is dangerous for precedent, and reminds Legislative Council that meetings will only get longer.

Voting to postpone - PASSES.

g. Motion Regarding Condemnation of Bill 21 2019-10-10 --**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

VP External motivates the motion. VP External explains that Loi 21 is a bill adopted by the Quebec government, forbidding individuals working in the public sector from wearing religious symbols, and those receiving public services as well. VP External explains that Bill 21 allows individuals to wear religious symbols in their current position, but not if they move up through promotion or change jobs. As such, the VP External explains that it will stunt growth and employment opportunities. VP External reminds the Council that the tyranny of the majority cannot be used to justify risking the safety of the minority. As well, the motion that is under consideration discusses the fears that the government is playing onto.

Question Period:

Councillor Chan asks how this would affect the relationship with the Quebec government.

VP External states that they do not have an individual relationship with the government.

Councillor Chan asks VP External to elaborate on if the word fascist is being diluted in any way.

VP External states that they do not believe it is being diluted, and believes that the way the government is using this law and the change of the name of the position is fascist.

Debate:

Member Hamza Lahmimi, Faculty of Science, states that the bill objectifies women in teaching positions, as if they do not have any specific talent, due to their religious identity.



Councillor Chan motions to introduce an amendment to remove the word “fascist” in the second last be-it-resolved clause, seconded by Councillor Mackie.

Debate on the amendment:

VP External states that it is overly conservative, and they cannot change it simply because they are “scared” of it.

Councillor Chase states that VP External used example of Benito Mussolini with regards to the state, while he agrees with his characterization, he believes that a better word for such a term is ‘authoritarian’.

Councillor Chan states that he is not worried about their relationship with the Quebec government, but as representatives of the student body, he is concerned that the word fascism is very strong. Therefore, Councillor Chan believes that there should be a vote to determine if individuals are comfortable with the use of such strong language.

Member of the Gallery, Hamza Lahmimi, Faculty of Science, believes the word fascist is correct.

The President moves to lay the amendment on the table, seconded by Councillor Fakih - PASSES.

The President states that they got the sense of the room that we weren't considering the full extent of the work we were considering, which goes against our equity policy when concerning minorities. The President states that he fully supports it. Lastly, he explains how it is the duty of the SSMU to support the marginalized groups and pass the motion.

VP External explains that some students do not have the luxury to step back and not use such strong language, as this Bill goes against their very existence.

Proxy for Senator Lametti motions to call the previous question, seconded by Councillor Dandamudi - PASSES.

Motion Regarding Condemnation of Bill 21 - PASSES.

In favour: 22

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 3

This motion is unanimously approved.



h. Motion Regarding Creation of SSMU Student Academic Support Services and Fee Levy  
2019-10-10 --**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

The President motivates the motion. The President introduces SSMU Student Academic Support Services. The President explains the historical precedent behind it, citing that note-takers for the Office of Students with Disabilities are not paid, and that currently, on campus, Prep 101 has created a monopoly on campus that is predatory in nature, due to their astronomically high prices. Lastly, the President states that eventually, they also hope to integrate SSMU Mini Courses into the system.

Question Period:

Councillor Bhuktar asks the President to explain why there is a \$0.93 fee specifically.

The President explains that in the past, previous SSMU executives have been criticized for using round numbers. As well, the President states that the operations department has done a forecast for how much this would cost given other revenues. The President explains that they anticipate a first year deficit around \$13,000. Lastly, the President states that it would be an opt-out-able fee.

Councillor Chan asks if the President foresees a part of this fee being a physical space within the Shatner building, or rather, an ad-hoc position.

President states that it will be a mixed model, depending on which service you are consulting.

For course preparations, this will occur in the University Centre, with the same being said for tutoring.

VP Internal asks that in terms of classes and mid-term and final review sessions and study packages, would the President plan on making them for only classes that Prep 101 offers, or would they expand it to include any class students demanded for.

President explains that they will primarily focus on large first year courses, such as POLI 244, Math 140. The pamphlets will be written by students and professors themselves. The President states that the ultimate goal is to displace every single course that Prep 101 does.

Motion to extend by Councillor Flaherty for five minutes, seconded by Councillor Rhamey - PASSES.

Councillor Daryanani asks what will happen to the note-takers on OSD, and how students with disabilities will continue to receive notes.

The President explains that notes would be accessible to all students on the online platform.

Council Dixon asks regarding the legality of these services, what procedures will be put in place so as to not ensure a breach of copyright.





The President states that similar to other educational resources, they would work collaboratively with Professors to create these and get consent to use copyrighted materials. In the case they do not consent, the President states that they would instead use open source material.

VP Internal asks if there was any consultation with MUS, given that they have a long-term sponsorship with SOS101, another test-preparation organization.

President states that SSMU does not want to infringe on faculty associations, and they are there to fill the gaps where SOS101 does not cover, especially concerning arts and science courses. Similarly, the President states that they will work with departmental and faculty associations to find out where the greatest needs for courses lies.

Councillor Flaherty states her appreciation for the nature of motion, but wonders why this was chosen over paying a fee each student would have to pay for access to each package, citing it as a concern of equity versus equality.

The President explains that in his opinion, it was better to find long-term sustainable model that students could fund, where as buying packages would be less financially stable. Similarly, it guarantees access for all students, and for them to share the reservoir of all available academic resources.

Debate:

Councillor Mackie explains that it falsely equalizes the aim of the motion with the issues of the OSD, making it appear that it is up to SSMU to fix the issues of the OSD, which it is not.

Councillor Mackie has concerns about the second whereas clause related to OSD, seconded by Councillor Roy.

Councillor Dixon appreciates the effort that has gone to the motion. Councillor Dixon states that passing this signals another movement to provide services from SSMU already provided by McGill. Councillor Dixon reminds Councillors that they must not lose sight of advocating for the university to provide adequate services.

Vote on exclusion of second Whereas clause - PASSES.

Debate on the main motion:

Councillor Wu notes that in the Science Faculty, many departments make much of their money through selling Note Taking Courses, and this is how they make the majority of their funds.



VP Internal asks if re-naming would be possible, given to the comedic nature of the acronym.

VP External clarifies, stating that it still spells SSMU SASS, but he does not wish to amend the name.

Councillor Daryanani motions to move to the previous question, seconded by Councillor Bhuktar - PASSES.

Voting Procedure:

Motion Regarding Creation of SSMU Student Academic Support Services and Fee Levy - APPROVED

In Favour: 14

Abstaining: 1

Opposed: 5

- i. Motion Regarding Committee Allocations 2019-10-10 --**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**
- j. Motion Regarding Condemnation of Judicial Challenge of Human Rights Tribunal Ruling Regarding First Nations Children --**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Tomas Jirousek motivates the motion.

Question Period:

President Buraga asks if this motion will complement the demonstration that is being planned for the future.

Tomas Jirousek explains that this demonstration is being planned on the fly, to help demonstrate the grievances regarding the appeal.

President asks Tomas about the second be-it-resolved clause and the timeline of the statement to be published.

Tomas replies, hoping for tomorrow night.

Voting procedure:

Approved: 24

Opposed: 1

Abstaining: 0

This motion is unanimously approved.



### 13. Reports by Committees

- a. Executive Committee - **POSTPONED**
- b. Service Review Committee

VP Finance presents the report. VP Finance explains that the report was not submitted to last Legislative Council meeting of 2018-2019. VP Finance notes that all services have passed, with one constitutional change made by Queer McGill.

VP Student Life motions to approve recommendations, seconded by Councillor Bhuktar - PASSES.

- c. Finance Committee
- d. Funding Committee - UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

VP Finance reads the report of the Funding Committee.

Question Period:

VP Internal asks that given the Black Students Network runs a fee, why did they not use their funds to pay for their couches as opposed to applying for the space fee.

VP Finance explains that the services fee they charge is for operations only.

VP internal - motion to extend question period by one minute, the motion is seconded. - FAILS.

Debate:

The President asks if there is anything the VP Finance is wishing to flag.

VP Finance states that everything has been approved by the Funding Committee.

VP Finance motions to approve the funding allocation as presented by the Committee, seconded by Senator Lametti - UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

### 14. Executive Reports - **POSTPONED**

- a. President
- b. Vice-President (University Affairs)
- c. Vice-President (Internal)



- d. Vice-President (Finance)
- e. Vice-President (Student Life)
- f. Vice-President (External)

15. Confidential Session

- a. There is no confidential business this evening.

16. Adjournment: **00:14**

VP Student Life motion to adjourns, seconded by Councillor Bhuktar. The meeting is adjourned at 00:14.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Buraga".

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bryan Buraga, President

APPROVED