



SSMU BOARD OF DIRECTORS PUBLIC MINUTES

December 2, 2019

The Board of Directors meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held in the SSMU Boardroom on Monday, December 2, 2019, at 8:00 p.m.

Present: Sam Haward (Officer, non-voting, Acting Chair), Bryan Buraga (Officer), Sanchi Bhalla (Officer), Billy Kawasaki (Officer) [arrived 20:17], Adam Gwiazda-Amsel (Officer), Jonah Levitt (Member-at-Large), Madeline Wilson (Officer, non-voting), Rohan Bhutkar (Legislative Councillor), Jack Kline (Member-at-Large), Paige Collins (Member-at-Large), Ana Paula Sanchez (Member-at-Large), Mustafa Fakhri (Legislative Councillor), Adin Chan (Legislative Councillor)

Absent: Husayn Jamal (Chair, non-voting), Jordyn Wright (Legislative Councillor)

1. Call to Order: **20:15**

VP Finance, the Acting Chair of this Board of Directors meeting, calls the meeting to order at 20:15.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The SSMU acknowledges that McGill University is situated on the traditional territory of the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe nations, a place which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst Indigenous peoples. The SSMU recognizes and respects these nations as the traditional custodians of the land and water on which it is located.

3. Adoption of the Agenda

Director Gwiazda-Amsel inquires about moving an item from Confidential session to Public session. The Chair replies that the motion to move this item would have to be done during confidential session and then return to public session, if the motion is approved.

The agenda is adopted.

4. Report of the Executive Committee

The President presents the report. The President explains that there has only been one (1) Executive Committee meeting since the last BoD meeting.



[Director Kawasaki calls into the meeting by teleconference at 20:17.]

5. Legislative Council Motions for Ratification

- a. Motion Regarding Adoption of the Climate Justice Policy 2019-11-14 --**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Moved by Director Bhalla, seconded by Director Bhutkar.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel inquires whether there is a motion to divide the question. The Chair replies that this motion is not well-taken, as Legislative Council motions are typically ratified in mass.

This motion is unanimously approved and ratified.

- b. Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of the Society's Finances 2019-11-14 --**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Moved by Director Bhalla, seconded by Director Gwiazda-Amsel.

This motion is unanimously approved and ratified.

- c. Motion Regarding Acceptable Communications Practices 2019-11-28 --**UNANIMOUS APPROVAL**

Moved by Director Bhalla, seconded by Director Bhutkar.

Debate:

Director Gwiazda-Amsel explains that this motion will be putting additional legal constraints and he will be voting against this motion.

VP University Affairs also expresses her opposition to this motion. She would encourage the Board not to ratify this motion as she believes that this motion is a personal censure against her, regarding the Facebook post that she wrote.

Member of the Gallery, Jo Roy, Social Work Representative to Council, supports VP University Affairs' opposition to this motion. Roy states that swearing at Legislative Council does not require so much nitpicking, as the post supported Indigenous students and SSMU staff, who received many hatred and racist comments in the past few weeks.

Member of the Gallery, Beatrice Mackie, Law Faculty Representative to Council, explains that she brought this motion forward to Council. She explains that the point of this motion is not tone-policing,



but rather uphold a level of professionalism. Mackie also reiterates that this debate has already happened during Legislative Council, so she does not believe the debate should continue here, as Council has already voted to approve this motion.

Member of the Gallery, Calvin Mansfre, explains that he understands that professionalism at McGill is important and may come naturally to some, but there are also students whose manner of speech might not be the same as others. He believes this motion is infringing upon class and gender.

[Director Sanchez arrives at 20:22.]

Director Bhalla would like to explain that discussion and debate conducted by members of the Gallery and by Directors has already been conducted during Council at a lengthy debate.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel inquires whether the Chair can interrupt those who are wishing to speak on debate, as we are here to talk about legal, internal and fiduciary duties, and he does not want this debate to turn into a six (6)-hour Legislative Council meeting again. The Chair replies that as per the Constitution, the Board of Directors may overturn any Legislative Council motions based on the factors that we have just described. However, BoD may have a debate on this topic.

VP University Affairs explains that although there was a lengthy debate during Council, the fact that the debate is continuing at this meeting, means that there is something more to debate and discuss, as there are different opinions on the matter.

Director Buraga would like echo the sentiments of the members of the gallery, regarding the racist and classist undertone which are prevalent to this motion. In his belief, this motion is not appropriate on the basis of marginalization, and he will be voting against this motion.

Voting procedure:

In favour: Director Bhalla, Director Chan, Director Collins, Director Kline, Director Kawasaki

Opposed: Director Gwiazda-Amsel, Director Buraga

Abstain: Director Bhutkar, Director Sanchez, Director Fakhri, Director Levitt

This motion is approved and ratified.

- d. Motion Regarding Free Trip Offers to Student Leaders 2019-11-28 --**NOT APPROVED;**
Did not vote: Levitt.

As per the Conflict of Interest recommendation from BoD, the Chair asks Director Levitt to recuse himself from the room for the time of the discussion and debate of this motion.



[Departure of Director Levitt at 20:26.]

Debate:

Director Chan inquires if any member of the Executive Committee can comment on the email sent by the Deputy Provost. Director Gwiazda-Amsel informs the Board that a statement will be released tomorrow morning.

Director Chan inquires as to what the sentiment of the statement will be. Director Gwiazda-Amsel replies that the statement will include the Council discussions.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel would like to move the motion to overturn the Motion Regarding Free Trip Offers to Student Leaders and to reconsider the Conflict of Interest Policy. Gwiazda-Amsel explains that Council does not have prerogative over the Conflict of Interest Policy and is solely administered by the Board of Directors, but Council does have a right to disapprove of how the Conflict of Interest Policy has been applied. There is a point made that a free trip offer does constitute a conflict of interest as it is over \$50.00, and under no circumstances can a Concerned Individual accept a gift of over that amount. Director Gwiazda-Amsel would like to motion to reconsider the question.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel clarifies that he would like to motion to reconsider all the Conflict of Interest determinations from the previous Board of Directors meeting.

Director Chan inquires about the course of action for this reconsideration.

The Chair clarifies that Conflict of Interest determinations occur during Confidential session of the Board of Directors, and it would not be appropriate to discuss them at this time, as we are in public session. The Chair encourages debate on the current motion.

Director Bhutkar inquires about the motion moved by Director Gwiazda-Amsel to be moved to Confidential session in order to discuss it. The Chair explains that it is the Board's decision to enter into confidential session, however, there is a significant number of gallery members present during this public session, and suggests that the Board takes that into consideration.

Director Fakhri states that the fact that there are gallery members should not affect the Board's decision whether to enter into confidential session.

Director Chan explains to the Board that as there are members in the Gallery who wrote an open letter to the Board of Directors regarding this motion, he would like to yield his time to one of the representatives who wrote the letter.

Director Fakhri asks Director Chan if he would like to speak to the open letter, as he is one of the signatories.



Director Chan explains what he believes is the Society's reputation is at the moment. At this time, petitions of hundreds of individuals asking the Board to overturn this motion, the McGill Administration is writing statements regarding this to be prudent in the choices SSMU makes. Director Chan continues by explaining that we have recently looked at the different media pieces about SSMU's PR and media. He explains that new media articles have been released which have a negative light on the SSMU. Director Chan explains that the Board needs to take a look at the risks that the Society's reputation would have, in addition to various complaints it would receive.

Member of the Gallery, [name inaudible], states that it was previously mentioned that the Legislative Council is the most democratic body of the SSMU, and overturning a decision shouldn't be taken lightly and hopes the Board will stay consistent on this. When taking a decision, the Member of the Gallery hopes that the Board will make a decision on the facts as to why Legislative Council approved this motion, rather than represent what campus and off-campus media is writing about SSMU.

Director Fakih claims that although we should care about campus and off-campus media and the various articles, he believes that Legislative Council did make a decision on this motion for many reasons. He further claims that most of the petitions and articles are based on false assumptions and accusations, so as the Board, we should uphold Council's decision but also address the misconceptions and false claims on this matter. Director Fakih believes that better dialogue and communication between the two parties would have improved the situation.

Director Collins echoes Director Chan's point about maintaining SSMU's reputation. Director Collins further explains that SSMU's long term sustainability is partly based on SSMU's reputation, and for it [SSMU's reputation] to be tarnished in such a way in which it has, in the past few years, she is wondering how this will impact student engagement at the SSMU as well as better serve our constituency.

Member of the Gallery, Hanin, attended the last Legislative Council for about 7 hours, is asking the Board why they think that maintaining a reputation is more important than advocating for marginalized students on campus, and this was also reiterated by the Deputy Provost, with the exception of the mention of Palestinian students.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel clarifies a few points. First, he believes that Board reputation is being weaponized at this time, which is concerning. Second, the Deputy Provost statement was political, as they got direction from the McGill Principal.

Member of the Gallery, Beatrice Mackie, Law Representative to Council, points out that she does not think it was an appropriate parliamentary procedure to ask Councillor Chase and Councillor Wright to excuse themselves from the room during the discussion of this motion at Legislative Council, as it was mentioned on multiple occasions by Senator Garneau, that this motion is not relevant to the regions of the trip offers. Mackie further explains that as the trip hasn't happened yet, she does not understand why this occurred.



Director Gwiazda-Amsel inquires as to where this discussion is moving forward.

Beatrice Mackie explains that as the two above mentioned Councillors did not get a chance to vote on this motion, she does not think it was a fair Council, seeing as the vote was 10-9 in favour.

Director Bhutkar reminds members of the gallery and the Board that the Conflict of Interest Policy was passed at the Board of Directors level, which is the highest governing body at the SSMU. Director Bhutkar explains that different factors are taken into account when discussing conflicts of interest, which is why the Councillors and Directors were asked to leave the room for the period of discussion of this motion. He does not believe that Council should oppose Board decisions.

Director Fakih addresses Director Chan's claim about SSMU's reputation, and believes that it is far more damaging to overturn a democratically approved motion of Council, rather than addressing claims from external media articles about SSMU. Director Fakih explains that if we were to address these articles, we should do so in a proper manner, without being afraid of backlash.

Member of the Gallery, Jo Roy, Social Work Representative to Council, makes a point that integrity is a big component of reputation. The integrity of the SSMU is at stake at this time, as the comments made by the President are portrayed in a slanderous and lying manner against him. This is resulting in a mischaracterization. Roy reminds the Board that we should talk about defending the President about this type of backlash and slander in regards to this motion, which he spoke about in a non-malicious way.

Member of the Gallery, Ben Lawson, Arts Faculty, states that characterizing Hillel Montreal as a lobbyist group intent on indoctrinating student leaders with alleged Israeli propaganda arises from anti-semitism. In addition, Lawson claims that if it is truly believed that this trip offer is from a subsidized organization, he inquires whether or not individuals [present in the room] would accept a paid internship at a politicized group offered under the Arts Faculty Internship program, and questions if would be considered a conflict of interest as well. Lawson further questions about internships with political parties. Lawson claims that this has been made a conflict of interest because it deals with the interest to the existence of a Jewish State.

VP University Affairs returns to the conversation about the reputation of the SSMU. VP University Affairs explains that we should also be considering that SSMU's reputation is not only as a corporation or a student union, but also the reputation of SSMU as advocating against the McGill Administration at times. She further explains that the sentence regarding McGill holding SSMU accountable presents a dangerous precedent. VP University Affairs also addresses that this motion did not single out Director Wright as a Jewish student, and understands anti-semitism from a personal perspective. However, she stresses that allegations of anti-semitism against any individual in this room will not be taken lightly.

Director Kline discusses the precedence of overturning a topic which was already discussed at the previous Board meeting and would set a bad governance precedent.



Director Chan echoes the sentiment of the member of the gallery, regarding the seriousness of overturning a Council decision. Director Chan also explains that our reputation within McGill is important and is fundamental to our existence. Director Chan also points out that he doesn't believe it's the Council's role to rule on any conflicts of interest, as it is under the Board's administration, as they are privy to confidential information to make decisions on matters. Director Chan continues by stating that it is unacceptable to accuse the President of anti-semitism as it is a strong mischaracterization, as it speaks to the toxic culture that we have on campus. However, because the perception of the mischaracterization is in the media and in the news, we do need to take that into consideration as well.

Member of the Gallery, Sebastien, Music Faculty, would like the Board to consider the legal implications of this motion. He also suggests that we take into account what is best for the students at large, not to allow such a divisive motion to pass.

Director Sanchez is deeply concerned with the state of SSMU as it stands. Director Sanchez remarks that Israel is an exceptional country, but points out that the situation in Gaza and the alleged human rights violations post-1967 are disturbing to her. In addition, she discusses anti-semitism, although pointing out that she is not an expert on the topic. She questions whether Hillel Montreal accepted Director Jordyn Wright into their program due to her position on campus. Director Sanchez points out that numerous other non-Jewish, non-Israeli, nationalist groups also have these programs. Director Sanchez points out that Israel is not the only religious country in the world. However, she also points out that if a similar program were offered in Russian interest group, there might be controversy as well. The way this discourse is going is concerning to her. Director Sanchez points out that our conflict of interest policy is difficult to understand, as this program was applied to, and granted by an organization. With regards to the events of November 28, 2019, she points out that nowhere was it stated regarding Director/Councillor Wright's Jewish identity, and the preamble did not mention any other Councillor or Director who is attending the trip. In addition to that, Director Sanchez points out that the motion would call for Director Wright's resignation from the Board of Directors, but not from Legislative Council, questioning whether Council is not equally as important as the Board. Director Sanchez points out that as a female Jewish student, Director Wright was targeted, however, her male constituent, was not. Director Sanchez claims that she believes in equality of lives, and reminds directors that this motion would place SSMU in legal liability. Director Sanchez continues by stating that it has come to her attention that individuals came forward with anti-semitism claims and behaviour during the last Legislative Council meeting of November 28th. She is encouraging that an Anti-Semitism Committee be created immediately. Lastly, she would like to apologize to Director/Councillor Wright for what she is going through.

Member of the Gallery, Senator Garneau, Senate Caucus Representative, is the individual who moved this motion. He explains that this motion has been directed into the wrong direction of what he was going for. In addition, Senator Garneau explains that the reason why Director/Councillor Wright's name is included in the motion is because the other Directors/Councillors either declined the trip offer.



Member of the Gallery, Rhida, Faculty of Arts, was also at the Legislative Council of November 28th for seven hours. She reminds the Board of Directors that this discussion has gone too long and that the trip is not a scholarship or an education trip, but rather a trip that is funded by the Maccabee Task Force. Rhida mentions that the discussions on campus seem to be about Jewish individuals feeling safe on campus, with no mention of Palestinian students' safety on campus.

Director Kline reminds the Board that we should be thinking of the legal ramifications of ratifying this motion and the effects it would have.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel points out that we should consider our governance duties. In addition, Legislative Council approved this motion, demonstrating their opposition to the decision made by the Board of Directors under the Conflict of Interest policy, which states that gifts of over \$50.00 must not be accepted. However, Legislative Council does not have the right to mandate the Board of Directors to review their decisions. In regards to Director Kline's claim that this motion and decision is solely at the Board level, he respectfully disagrees, explaining that AUS and SUS both agreed with this decision. He explains that the reason why Israel was singled out in this motion, is because it is the only trip offer that has come to SSMU's attention. If there are any other groups on campus who are offering free trips to students, he finds that concerning. Director Gwiazda-Amsel points out that if there were free trip offers to Sweden or Bulgaria or any other country, he would still vote that it is a conflict of interest as the trip would be valued at more than \$50.00, which constitutes a conflict of interest. Director Gwiazda-Amsel explains that we should not be accepting this motion as it is bad governance.

Director Fakhri inquires regarding the recommendations brought by the Speaker and Governance Manager regarding this conflict of interest, and would like to know how we can be sure that things will be different next time.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel reiterates that we need to make a decision based on the motion.

Member of the Gallery, Calvin, echoes the sentiment of his constituent regarding the Palestinian students on campus and allyship meeting to be called. Calvin further explains the different issues in which McGill Administration allegedly colluding with interest groups regarding the Israeli-Arab conflict. Calvin points out that this brings his point regarding the McGill Administration having Jordyn Wright's back on this matter, as well as individuals on social media, and claims that this can be considered as 'white privilege' to have this kind of support, which he believes does not get extended to black, Arab, brown or Palestinian, Muslim students.

Director Buraga points out the personal impact that this motion had on his ability to perform his duties as SSMU President. Director Buraga explains that he has taken the time to listen through the livestream and has asked the Governance Manager to transcribe every time that he spoke regarding this motion. Director Wright's personal attack on his comments has been very difficult for him, as his personal integrity has been on the line. He is unable to see during which he singled out Director Wright



or have suggested others to attack Director Wright in any way. Director Buraga has spent time with the Principal today to talk about the issue of safety of students on campus. Director Buraga explains that Legislative Council felt that the determination made by the Board of Directors had been insufficient, and that it did not take into account that something of value has been offered to student leadership. For example, Director Buraga explains, that if he were offered a \$10,000 scholarship from ExxonMobil as a direct result of his position of SSMU President, he would have to declare it under the COI policy, and it would have to be discussed and decided. Director Buraga would suggest to follow Director Gwiazda-Amsel's decision to overturn this motion, but keeping in mind that we need to revise our Conflict of Interest Policy in order to take into account the concerns that have been brought forward.

Director Bhalla asks if Director Buraga could elaborate on the amendments he brought forward at Council.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel points out that he believes Director Buraga's amendments to the motion are fairly clear. The amendments put forward by Director Buraga were meant to actionable the opinions of Legislative Council, as a democratic body of the SSMU. Director Gwiazda-Amsel does not believe that Director Buraga was calling upon any individuals to attack or target Director/Councillor Wright or any other individuals.

VP University Affairs expresses her concerns of anti-semitism allegations against the President, as well as mentioning the fact that she has read this motion and she attended the Council meeting of November 28th and she does not see how this was an attack or target on Director/Councillor Wright, as the only reason her name was mentioned in the motion is because she is the only Director/Councillor still attending this trip in question.

Member of the Gallery, Chip Smith, Faculty of Science, was a Judicial Board justice who has recently resigned. Smith explains that when the Judicial Board gets a case, they have to look at things objectively. Smith also explains that he has stepped down from his role as Justice as he knew he could not be independent from this case. He explains that the Board of Directors should also be objective and if people have these types of opinions, he suggests that they resign.

Director Bhutkar clarifies to the Board and members of the gallery that the Judicial Board is not an independent organization, but rather a committee which reports to the Board of Directors. Director Bhutkar explains that any recommendation made by the Judicial Board is sent to the Board of Directors. Director Bhutkar further clarifies that he does not believe that Director/Councillor Wright was attacked or targeted during Legislative Council. He explains that the reason why her name is in the motion is because it pertains to the situation at hand. Director Chan's name was also on the motion, but this was amended as Director Chan declined from attending the trip. Director Bhutkar expresses his concern of the false information published in the Facebook post, and reiterates that this motion was not a personal attack on an individual.



Member of the Gallery, Hanin, expresses her acknowledgment that as an Arab student, her point of view are being taken into consideration and expresses her gratitude to the President.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel motions to call the question, seconded by Director Chan. The Chair explains that this requires a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority and debate.

Voting on the motion to call the question: seven (7) in favour, which is $\frac{2}{3}$ majority - PASSES.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel suggests to vote by secret ballot. Director Sanchez inquires if this requires a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority. The Chair will review this in the IRs.

[Recess, time unknown.]

[Return from recess, time unknown.]

Director Gwiazda-Amsel motions to vote by secret ballot, seconded by Director Fakh. This requires a simple majority, with six (6) in favour and three (3) opposed, this passes.

[Departure of Director Kawasaki at 21:32.]

Voting procedure on the Motion Regarding Free Trip Offers to Student Leaders by secret ballot:

In favour: two (2)

Opposed: seven (7)

Abstain: one (1)

This motion is unanimously overturned by the Board of Directors.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel would like to move a motion from the floor, which would include an interim provision for this motion not to return to Council, as the trip would have already happened by January 2020, and it would be an unnecessary debate.

The Chair explains that the Board of Directors can pass an exceptional interim provision, which would go to Legislative Council, as per the Internal Regulations of Governance.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel moves the motion to suspend clause 1.3 of the IRs of Governance-06 and not send the motion back to Council, seconded by Director Chan.

Debate:

Director Fakh inquires as to whether or not the Board will inform as to why this decision was made.



Director Buraga believes it is important that this motion be brought back to Council for discussion and take their opinions into consideration. Director Buraga explains that not bringing this motion back to Council, would also prevent for the Board to explain why and how this decision was made. Overturning is a very important decision that should not be taken lightly, according to Director Buraga. He believes that it would be improper to move with this interim provision.

Director Levitt asks for clarification on the motion of interim provision. The Chair clarifies.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel explains that bringing it back to Legislative Council, we have a precedent of bending the rules slightly. He explains that he would suggest to have guest speakers to discuss the topic of conflict, rather than continuing this discussion at Council.

Director Chan believes that we should talk about the report of the Board in taking this decision, rather than having another motion to vote on and debate at Council.

Director Buraga believes there are important sentiments from the Legislative Council, which they would like to be heard. He explains that we should explain to Council if they have overstepped, and why this motion was overturned. This is to ensure that Legislative Council may still express their opinion on decisions taken by Board.

Director Sanchez explains that the Judicial Board is also a resource of violations of governance or practices at the SSMU.

Director Fakih does not understand why we should send this motion back to Council, as the trip will already be passed by this time.

Member of the Gallery, Calvin, explains that the issues that Palestinian students face will not simply go away because the trip would have passed. Calvin explains that just like with POL1339, another issue has occurred with Israeli region.

Member of the Gallery, Rhida, claims that the student leaders are accepting money from a right-wing billionaire and would like to understand the reasoning.

Director Buraga motions to call the question on the motion for an interim provision, seconded by Director Chan.

Nine (9) in favour, one (1) opposed - this PASSES.

Voting procedure on Motion of suspending the clause from the IRs of Governance so that this motion does not return to Council:

In favour: Director Bhalla, Director Chan, Director Collins, Director Gwiazda-Amsel, Director Kline



Opposed: Director Bhutkar, Director Buraga

Abstain: Director Sanchez, Director Fakih, Director Levitt

This motion is unanimously approved.

Director Fakih motions to mandate the President to write a statement to Legislative Council regarding the overturning of this motion.

Director Chan inquires if the President is to provide a report regarding the Board of Directors to Council. Director Buraga explains that he typically includes Board activities in his report.

Director Buraga inquires with the Chair as to whether the motions adopted from the floor require $\frac{3}{4}$ majority, as this is in the Standing Rules of Council, as the Board of Directors does not have any Standing Rules at this time.

6. Minutes for Approval

There are no minutes for approval.

7. Email Approvals

There are no email approvals.

8. Motions for Approval

- a. Motion to Mandate the President as spokesperson of the Society to send a communication to explain the non-ratification of the Motion Regarding Free Trip Offers to Student Leaders 2019-11-28 -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Director Fakih moves this motion, seconded by Director Gwiazda-Amsel.

Debate:

Director Chan inquires with Director Buraga whether this will put an additional burden on him to write this statement. Director Buraga explains that he was previously mandated to write a statement and was able to do so in conjunction with the Governance Manager, and will write this statement if he is mandated to do so.

Member of the Gallery, Hanin, would like to understand the reasoning of the Directors' choices to overturn the decision of Legislative Council (Motion Regarding Free Trip Offers to Student Leaders),



(the Directors who voted in opposition to ratifying). The Chair replies that debate is currently on the Motion to mandate the President to make a statement to Council.

Director Kline voted in opposition of the Motion Regarding Free Trip Offers to Student Leaders as he believes it is bad practice.

Hanin inquires if Director Kline could explain what he means by 'bad practice'. Director Kline explains that this is in terms of legal liability and in terms of the interests of safeguarding our internal practices as Directors of the Board. Hanin asks if he voted in opposition as a governance procedure from legal liability. Director Kline replies in the affirmative.

Director Sanchez asks Hanin if she would like this reasoning to be included in the statement to Council. Hanin replies that she would prefer to hear the reasoning during this meeting.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel explains that unlike other Directors who voted in opposition, he did not vote based on legal ramifications. He voted 'no' because he believes it is an improper governance practice, as Council does not have jurisdiction to rule over Board of Directors decisions regarding Conflict of Interest Policy, as it is administered by the Board of Directors.

Director Chan explains that as a Board member, he only votes in favour of motions that he believes are not damaging and do not violate any financial, legal or human rights duties of the Board of Directors.

Member of the Gallery, Hanin, would like to clarify with Director Chan if his reasoning for voting in opposition of ratification is that he does not believe he had enough information to vote in favour. Director Chan replies that by voting in favour of that motion, he did not believe it would be in the best interests of the SSMU.

Member of the Gallery, Calvin, inquires as to the interests of the corporation as mentioned by Director Chan, and finds it concerning that this is what his decision was based on. Calvin further discusses that marginalized and racialized students should also feel safe on campus and does not understand why some human rights are more important than Palestinian human rights.

The Chair intervenes to explain that we are debating the motion regarding mandating the President to prepare a statement for Council.

Director Chan apologizes for the misunderstanding as he meant human resources, rather than human rights.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel explains that he votes differently at Legislative Council than he does on the Board of Directors, as the duties of a Director are much different, as to ensuring that SSMU does not get sued or get into legal troubles and cease to exist.



Director Sanchez echoes Director Gwiazda-Amsel's opinion. Director Sanchez also explains that in the previous Board of Directors meeting, an extensive training on duties and obligations of Board members was conducted, explaining the Quebec Corporations Act and personal liability.

Director Buraga explains that it was quite difficult for him to vote against the ratification of this motion. Director Buraga still disagrees with the Board of Directors' Conflict of Interest recommendation. However, in order to follow proper governance practices, it's important to understand after multiple meetings with the Principal and the Deputy Provost, the statement which was released by McGill Administration constitutes as a threat to SSMU. In this case, McGill holds complete leverage over our financials, so if they feel that SSMU is overstepping their ground, it's important to ensure that this does not occur, as we want to be able to continue offering services to students. Director Buraga stands behind his opinions raised during Legislative Council.

Member of the Gallery, Calvin, claims that he feels this is the same way that the situation occurred last year, with POLI339, during which the Deputy Provost was able to explain the technicalities, according to him. He further claims that he does not feel that this Board operates objectively.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel explains that a press release will be released tomorrow.

Director Bhutkar claims that there will be questions to Director Buraga once he delivers his report to Council regarding this motion.

Director Fakhri reiterates that he would like to present a report to Council.

Director Buraga explains that he will write the report, which will provide a chance for Councillors to ask questions. He is in favor of the statement.

Director Sanchez inquires whether the press release will be used as additional information for the statement to Council. Director Gwiazda-Amsel replies that Director Buraga will decide how he wishes to write the statement if he is mandated.

Director Bhutkar motions to call the question, seconded by Director Chan. This requires $\frac{2}{3}$ majority - PASSES.

Voting procedure:

In favour: Director Bhalla, Director Bhutkar, Director Chan, Director Collins, Director Sanchez, Director Gwiazda-Amsel, Director Buraga, Director Fakhri, Director Kline, Director Levitt

Opposed:

Abstain:



This motion is unanimously approved.

Director Kline would like to move a motion from the floor, pertaining to release a statement the following day from the Director Buraga regarding the non-ratification of this motion should only be signed by Director Buraga, seconded by Director Bhalla.

The Chair clarifies that Officers of the Society are not mandated to sign off on any releases if they do not wish to do so.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel calls the opposition to consideration of the question. This requires $\frac{2}{3}$ majority.

Voting in opposition of the motion: four (4) - this FAILS.

Director Kline explains that he believes that Director Buraga should release this statement.

VP University Affairs explains that the statement is almost entirely written. The statement address what happened during Council, Board meeting, Director Wright's Facebook post and the Deputy Provost's statements. The reason why the statement should be signed by all Executives is to show support and solidarity, and VP University Affairs does not believe it is the appropriate time for Director Buraga to release statements on his own, as he has already been singled out. She strongly encourages Directors to vote against Director Kline's motion.

Director Bhalla inquires as to whether the Board wishes to read over the statement prepared by the Executive Committee in case they wish to make any amendments.

Director Gwiazda-Amsel believes that this is a divisive question and feels that this may be somewhat as a personal attack on an individual. He does not feel that Director Buraga should release the statement with only his signature, as this will demonstrate that the allegations against him are somewhat true, which is not the case.

Director Chan would like to understand why Director Kline's motion can be considered as a personal attack. Director Buraga replies that if Director Kline's motion passes, and the statement gets released with only his name, it will look like he is standing on his own, in response to the situation at hand.

VP University Affairs expresses her concern of setting a precedent for Board of Directors having to review each press release written by the Executive Committee. However, the Board of Directors does have the prerogative to do so if they wish, but this will be a bad precedent, according to her.

Director Sanchez explains that it appears that the Executives appear to be unified on this matter.



Motion to call the question by Director Kline, seconded by Director Bhutkar - PASSES.

Voting procedure on mandating the President to release a statement tomorrow morning:

In favour:

Opposed: Director Bhalla, Director Bhutkar, Director Chan, Director Collins, Director Sanchez, Director Gwiazda-Amsel, Director Buraga, Director Levitt

Abstain: Director Kline

This motion fails.

9. For Discussion

There are no items for discussion.

10. Confidential Session: **22:26**

The Board of Directors enters into Confidential session at 22:26

11. Adjournment: **23:26**

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

Bryan Buraga, President