

SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PUBLIC MINUTES

November 28, 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 Thursday, November 28, 2019, at 6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order: **18:13**

The Speaker calls the Legislative Council meeting to order at 18:13.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker reads out the land acknowledgement.

3. Attendance

Absent: Councillor Flaherty and Councillor Roy

Evelyn Silverson-Tokatlidis, VP Varsity Affairs of Athletics, is Proxy for Councillor Kersch (Athletics).

Sebastien Duckett is proxy for Councillor Platt (Music).

Jonah Fried is the IRC Representative.

4. Approval of Minutes

- a. Legislative Council Minutes 2019-11-14 --**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

The minutes are unanimously approved.

5. Adoption of the Agenda

Senator Lametti motions to move the report of the Comprehensive Governance Review Committee (CGRC) to immediately before new business, seconded by Councillor Chase - PASSES.

VP External motions to add a late presentation by President of the History Students' Association, seconded by Proxy for Councillor Platt - PASSES.

Senator Garneau motions to move 13.c to follow the Report of the Board of Directors, seconded by Councillor Merali – FAILS.

SSMU President motions to move 11.c to after announcements, seconded by Councillor Fakhri - PASSES.

The agenda is adopted as amended.

6. Report of the Steering Committee

The Speaker presents the report of the Steering Committee.

The Speaker notes that the Speaker, Parliamentarian, and the Recording Secretary are paid staff, and as such, are legally entitled to paid breaks. As such, moving forward, every two hours of Legislative Council will be followed by 10 minutes of break.

The Speaker notes that further rationale is in the report.

The Speaker notes that WalkSafe, DriveSafe, and McGill Nightline are all available to Councillors. Similarly, the Speaker notes that in accordance with proper fire safety protocol, McGill Security Services are also present, in order to ensure the room does not exceed the room's capacity.

Question Period:

VP External inquires on who suggested the presence of security. The Speaker notes that it was on the recommendation of the Office of Student Life and Learning, on the basis of room capacity.

Senator Lametti inquires on why the report of the CGRC has only been granted five minutes to present and discuss. The Speaker notes that in accordance to the standing rules, every committee presentation is granted five minutes to present, further noting that CGRC is a committee. However, the Speaker notes that Council can prolong discussion if they choose to do so, and notes that the five minutes does not include questions.

VP University Affairs asks if there were there any other alternatives that were sought to encourage a harmonious room and environment outside of McGill Security.

The Speaker states that there were no feasible alternatives.

7. Guest Speakers

- a. Professor Fabrice Labeau, Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning)

Professor Fabrice Labeau, Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) presents.

Professor Labeau discusses the building up of the atmosphere in the McGill community, including the story of the Daily of the Letter from Readers and the ongoing saga of the free trips to Israel. He notes that he is seeing more students coming to his office, saying that they do not feel safe on campus. He reminds Councillors to remember the concept of respect and inclusion, as he is hearing from students that they feel threatened on campus because their identities. Similarly, he notes that regardless of their identity, it is important that it is recognized.

Question Period:

VP External inquires about SEDE. VP External notes that it was an office students enjoy interacting with, and has had a positive effect on Student Life and Learning. Furthermore, the VP External notes that the office has not been relocated, though Professor Labeau previously stated that popular SEDE events would remain. As such, VP External asks about the progress of SEDE, and what community engagement at McGill will look like.

Professor Labeau notes that events such as spaghetti night, are part of the Homework Zone. Similarly, he also notes that ASB now lives in Campus Life & Engagement (CL&E).

VP External notes that more generally, the concern is for the funding for these programs. VP External notes that CL&E does not have the budget to run large scale community engagement efforts, and wonders where the budget would come from.

Professor Labeau notes that the initiatives being referred to have no budget attached to it, noting instead that they are drawn from endowments, which continue to be available and used. Similarly, Professor Labeau notes that Branches, which funds spaghetti night and homework zone, is getting more funding than it used to. Professor Labeau notes that budgeting should not be the concern, but rather, coordination.

The Speaker presents a number of questions for Professor Labeau on the Wellness Hub.

Firstly, if wait times have decreased. Secondly, if McGill still offers long-term psychotherapy and counselling services. Thirdly, what is the difficulty of procuring more physicians and doctors for the drop-in clinic. Fourthly, what is being done to make it easier to make appointments. Five, how far along is the request for proposals process to replace the EmpowerMe telecounselling service. Six – is the DPSLL office willing to advocate for SSMU and PGSS to take over the international health insurance, instead of it being led by International Student Services, as is currently mandated by Senate.

Professor Labeau remarks that wait times have decreased in some areas, but not in other areas. In psychiatry, he notes that the wait time is currently two weeks, which has decreased. For local wellness

advisors, in some faculties, the wait time is seven days. He remarks that this are new instalments. For nursing appointments, it is weekly. For counselling, there are daily drop-ins, but scheduled appointments have been booked into January.

On psychotherapy, McGill continues to offer it to a very limited extent. Professor Labeau explains that the Wellness Hub is supposed to provide front line services, and they are currently trying to get away from long-term care because they do not have the capacity to do it.

That being said, he explains that long-term care creates fewer possibilities for new patients, and as such, creates further waitlists.

Professor Labeau explains that they are currently working to create links with the outside healthcare system to make it easier for people to be referred there, in order to find the right care for everyone.

On procuring more doctors, Professor Labeau explains that in Quebec, doctors are government paid, and have a certain number of hours they must fulfill as part of their position. Furthermore, he explains that McGill is not considered part of the healthcare system. Any hours that doctors complete with McGill are on top of their work-load, and as such, it is difficult to get doctors to work with them. That being said, Professor Labeau remarks that they have recruited six new General Practitioners since September. He explains that the aforementioned situation is one of the reasons they cannot do long-term treatments.

On making appointments, Professor Labeau explains that the online booking system was supposed to come online in Sept, but IT issues delayed it. They are hoping to introduce it in the next few weeks. Similarly, he notes that a request for future proposals is out, and is currently public.

On the question of if the office is willing to advocate for international health insurance, Professor Labeau explains that it is a more complicated discussion than everyone thought it was going to be. Professor Labeau explains that the Office of Student Life and Learning first thought that it was reasonable, but more discussion revealed how complicated it was going to be. As such, Professor Labeau is unsure what the future will be.

On why notetakers with OSD are no longer paid, Professor Fabeau states that the FAQ on the OSD website that explains it. Professor Labeau explains that notetakers were originally proposed in a different temporal context, where the MyCourses was not as developed as it is today. Today, Professor Labeau explains that as our world becomes more modern, there are more notetaking groups appearing online. As such, they wish to move funding towards things that affect more students.

VP Internal inquires if there is a way to get the Wellness Hub accredited by the government in order for doctors to be able to claim hours at the Wellness Hub as part of their working hours.

Professor Labeau explains that if that were the case, the Wellness Hub would become a clinic or a hospital, which is not what they have in mind. Instead, Professor Labeau explains that they are looking to get the hours recognized without changing the status of the Wellness Hub.

VP University Affairs asks why there was a need to strike a committee for the Men's Varsity Team name, and not just name it the Martlets.

Professor Labeau explains that the name change has been subject to much heated debate. Furthermore, there is a need for a name that will unite the whole community. As such, simply dropping a name would make many upset. They are trying to build consensus, as well as being transparent.

Member of the Gallery, Hamza, Muslim Students Association, asks if anything is in the process of being done in regards to meditation and prayer space.

Professor Labeau explains that it is an ongoing dossier with on-campus space planning groups, with development currently in the works.

VP Finance and Internal arrives at 18:25.

b. CHASM Incubator

Andrew Dixon presents on behalf of CHASM. Councillor Dixon notes that he is a Director of CHASM, the Community of Health and Social Medicine incubator.

Councillor Dixon introduces CHASM, noting that CHASM was founded on the idea that global issues are local issues, and require local solutions.

Dixon explains that the catalyzing question behind CHASM was how to catalyze sustainable service. Furthermore, he notes that one of CHASM's goals is to work with community engagements.

He explains that CHASM is a blend of student-start up and a community health service. CHASM works with communities, and supports student-led initiatives.

Dixon explains that the goal is to connect students with funding, mentorship, and a social innovation curriculum, to work with the community on an idea they are inspired by.

Dixon explains that thirty people are involved in the incubator, and over fifty mentors, hosting over twenty workshops. Over the past year, topics have included the impact in public health and working in teams.

Dixon explains that there are two streams for project application. The first one is the impact stream. Dixon explains that this stream is for someone who is working with a community organization and who already has an idea. For this stream, the participant requires a letter of support from the organization and has a rough budget in mind. As well, they must be able to answer questions regarding the population and their goals.

The second stream is the needs assessment stream. Dixon explains that this stream begins from ground zero. The participant would work with CHASM to find a community to focus on, and furthermore, CHASM will partner the participant with an organization.

Dixon stresses the importance that every initiative must have in addressing health inequality, and that it spurs social innovation.

Dixon encourages everyone to reach out to their constituents and pass the information on CHASM on.

Question Period:

The President asks if you need a team already to participate in CHASM, or if you can come forward individually. Dixon states that it is both. Dixon explains traditionally, a team has come together. However, now that CHASM is working at the earlier stages of projects, there are often groups of individuals or pairs in the mixture that wish to grow their community.

The President asks Councillor Dixon to explain what resources are provided.

Councillor Dixon replies, stating \$1000 in funding, social innovation curriculum, and mentorship. Furthermore, Councillor Dixon explains that mentorship works through matching interests between a mentee and not-for-profit and faculty mentors.

c. Presentation Regarding Room Renaming

Charlotte Scott-Frater, President of History Students' Association presents on room renaming.

When the SSMU Building re-opens, Scott-Frater encourages SSMU to rename a room within the building after Marlene Dickson, a McGill professor, who in 1974, was removed from her teaching position for being a political radical.

Scott-Frater explains Dickson came to McGill at a time where students were advocating for the introduction of a vital curriculum, which included the introduction of African Studies and Gender studies. Dickson was deeply involved in this group, teaching organization tactics, and overall, was very involved on campus.

In 1971, her contract came up for renewal, and her department said that her teaching and academic work was not up to standard, as a tactic to make her resign.

That being said, Dickson did not resign, instead drawing upon the support of students and external academics.

Scott-Frater explains that the next three years for Dickson were a pattern of sustained harassment. Following her work at McGill, she never held another job in academia, and eventually travelled back to California, forming a small leftist group while there.

Scott-Frater explains that she matters because this professor is not a person that will be honoured by the McGill bicentennial celebrations, which Scott-Frater believes is a shame. Furthermore, Scott-Frater believes that it is a good intervention SSMU can make into the bicentennial conversation.

Question Period:

VP University Affairs asks if Scott-Frater has a specific room in mind.

Scott-Frater states that she does not have a specific room in mind, but states that ideally it would not be a “tiny practice room on the 4th floor”. Furthermore, she thinks it would be appropriate to be a room of gathering.

VP University Affairs asks if Scott-Frater would like the entire building re-named.

Scott-Frater indicates yes in theory, but believes that it would create a lot of resistance for the Shatner building to be renamed.

SSMU President asks Scott-Frater the title of the book that Scott-Frater referred to.

Scott-Frater states that it is called Things Which Are Done in Secret.

Senator Lametti inquires if the professor has any living descendants, and if you Scott-Frater has spoken to them.

Scott-Frater explains that Dickson was not married, and does not know if she has children. Furthermore, Scott-Frater explains that the individual is too recent to search genealogical records.

Enter into Confidential Session.

Return from confidential session at 19:33.

8. Announcements

VP University Affairs reminds everyone to complete It Takes All of Us is due tomorrow, or a hold will be placed on the individual student's record.

Councillor Fakih states that on December 6, 1989, fourteen women were killed at Ecole Polytechnique. He explains that they were killed because they were women, and more so, were in the engineering program. Councillor Fakih explains that this event is called the Montreal Massacre. Furthermore, he reminds Council that violence against women continues to occur. Fakih invites everyone to the 30th anniversary commemoration of the 14 young women, occurring on December 6 from 10:30 to 11:30am in front of the Brown Building, directly by the plaque and tree dedicated to the women.

Councillor Fakih calls for a minute of silence.

A minute of silence is observed.

VP Finance announces that individuals should Call DriveSafe if necessary, and that information is in the Report of the Steering Committee.

VP Student Life notes that registration for Activities Nights Winter 2020 has begun, and 200 of 300 tables are taken up. Similarly, VP Student Life notes that registration is due by December 13.

VP External announces that they are holding an end of month gala to commemorate Movember, being held tomorrow from 1:00pm-3:00pm in Leacock 132.

Councillor Daryanani announces that Mental Health for AUS is holding drop-in hours for colouring and snacks, and notes that it will be in room M3-17B tomorrow from 10:00-17:00.

The President announces that the Winter 2020 General Assembly has been rescheduled due to midterms, and that it will now occur on Monday, February 24, at New Residence Ballroom.

VP University Affairs asks if the people inside this room will be guaranteed a spot following the recess. The Speaker states no, as they were not tracking who had entered the room.

VP External states that on December 5, the Board of Governors will decide on the decision of divestment. VP External notes that it will be held in open session, and encourages everyone to come out. Similarly, VP External also encourages individuals to bring people to Winter 2020 General Assembly.

Councillor Chan asks for clarification, asking if it is CAMSR or Board of Governors.

VP External notes that it is a general Board of Governors session, and the CAMSR report will be taking place in open session in James 301.

VP Finance notes that there is no report of the Funding Committee, and that their one last meeting will be after Council has stopped sitting in the semester.

The President motions for a five-minute extension, seconded by VP External – PASSES.

The President reads the announcement prepared.

“Hello Council,

As you may or may not know, the Board of Directors, at their meeting last Thursday, voted to overturn the motion we passed at Legislative Council suspending the Management Councillors for their failure to attend a Gendered and Sexual Violence Policy training by the allotted deadline. This was done at the recommendation of the Anti-Violence Coordinator, the Administrator of the GSVP, to make an exception for the Management Councillors in so far as they attend the winter training session in January.

To explain the circumstances further, Councillors Eisner and Gurvey were unable to make any of the scheduled GSVP trainings over this semester due to legitimate timing conflicts that were academically related or directly affected their constituents. It was communicated to these Councillors that there would be a final GSVP training make-up session in early November, however, this was not the case, and the Councillors were suspended with this misunderstanding in play.

To make up for their absences, Councillors Eisner and Gurvey offered to have an alternative remedy on their own time instead of taking the GSVP training, including studying the GSVP training slide deck and writing a reflection piece or summary of it. Although this option was not deemed acceptable by the Anti-Violence Coordinator, their actions showed their initiative in making sure that they were trained on this very important issue.

As such, in my capacity and President and Chief Spokesperson of the Students' Society of McGill University, I would like to apologize to Councillors Eisner and Gurvey for this miscommunication and their suspension. To be clear, Councillors Eisner and Gurvey did not do anything wrong and did everything in their power to ensure that they were able to complete the GSVP training as mandated by the Policy.

At this point in time, the Board of Directors recommends that the Legislative Council postpone the Motion Regarding Suspension of the Management Representatives to our January 30th, 2020 meeting per the recommendation of the Anti-Violence Coordinator.”

9. Motion Regarding Suspension of the Management Representatives 2019-11-14

The Speaker motivates the report.

The Speaker explains that it was overturned by the Board of Directors.

Question Period:

Senator Lametti asks if there is any reason this crucial information did not come to Legislative Council last meeting.

The Speaker states that he learned the information following Legislative Council. To detail, the Speaker and the President had a meeting with both of the Management Representatives following Legislative Council on November 14, which is why the information was not communicated in time.

Debate:

VP External motions to put forward a motion brought forward by the Anti-Violence Coordinator to postpone suspension until January 31, 2020, seconded by Councillor Mackie – UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Recess begins at 19:51.

Recess ends at 20:01.

10. Report of the Board of Directors

The President reads the report of the Board of Directors.

Question Period:

VP External asks if all individuals referred to gave their permission for this information to be released, as deemed necessary by policy.

The Speaker states that the policy requires that but notes that the Board can make a unilateral decision to interpret the policy in different ways. In this specific case, the Board made a resolution mandating the information be shared.

Senator Lametti asks if the different directors were evaluated individually or as a group. The Speaker replies, stating individually.

The President notes that the discussion for the recommendation was discussed as a group, and all individuals were asked to remove the room during that point in time.

VP University Affairs invites the President to share his personal opinion at this time.

The President states that he prefers to differentiate his opinions at this time, and that it will be made later.

Councillor Morgan asks the Speaker to further explain how it does not follow the COI policy, given that Hillel Montreal is outside the purview of SSMU.

The Speaker explains that the COI provides a narrow frame of interest, and only applies vis-à-vis a body that interacts with SSMU.

Senator Lametti asks if Director Chan or Collins were involved in any discussions.

The President indicates that they were involved, as at that point, they no longer had a conflict of interest.

Senator Lametti inquires if there was any other evidence used in these deliberations outside what was provided in the individual conflict of interest forms.

The Speaker states that the Board was presented with all the information, including the coverage from the student press. Furthermore, the Speaker notes that the Recommendations are based solely on the information disclosure form.

The President states that the PowerPoint presentation/letter sent to the individuals going to the trip was also included for consideration.

Councillor Fakih asks if the Board received any information from internal or external groups.

The President states that communication was received from CJA one day prior to Board meeting, and that it was sent to each Director.

Member of the Gallery, Andreas Koch, AUS, states that understanding that the trip is fairly expensive, most of funding is coming from Mackabee Task Force, an interest group which pushes pro-Israel and anti-BDS view points, funded by a known Trump supporter. Koch asks if this information was brought up during deliberations.

The Speaker notes that what was shared with the Board was the article of the McGill Daily, which included that information.

Member of the Gallery, Ghita Mawlawi, AUS, asks how it was determined that it wasn't a conflict of interest, given that the trip is politically motivated, and they were approached as student leaders, yet they claim to be going as individuals.

The President notes that the Board of Directors took into consideration all the information they had been granted, and that under the COI policy, the Board of Directors determined that it did not constitute a real or apparent conflict of interest, but also saw that there could be a conflict of interest in the future.

VP External asks if the Legislative Council will be receiving a report from the Board of Directors, or just a statement.

The Speaker explains that historically, Legislative Council has never received a report. In Winter 2020, if there is a desire by Legislative Council to receive reports, the Steering Committee can investigate it. The Speaker explains that ever been practiced in the past two years for Legislative Council to receive a report from Board of Directors on its business.

The President elaborates that in the report of the President, he detailed what occurs in Public Session of Board of Directors. Otherwise, he notes that there is no official report.

VP University Affairs asks if the report is up for approval. The Speaker states that it is not for approval, as COI Policy is at the sole prerogative of the Board of Directors.

The President states that Councillors can comment, but the report is not amendable.

Member of the Gallery, Hussain Awan, AUS, states that the COI Policy states that certain individuals can accept gifts under \$50. Awan asks if the Board of Directors ruled that this is not a gift, or ruled that this was worth less than \$50.

The Speaker states that the Board ruled that this was not a gift. Similarly, he notes that a gift over \$50 is not automatically a COI, as long as it is disclosed.

Senator Lametti speaks on the report of the Board, which states that there is a possible future conflict of interest. Senator Lametti asks what parameters it is in regards to, and what circumstances it would arise under.

The President states that if there is a motion that pertains to the Arab-Israeli region, or a motion in the Board of Directors regarding it, the concerned individual would have to recuse themselves.

President Motion to extend ad libitum, seconded by Councillor Fakih – FAILS.

In favour: 13

Opposed: 16

Chan motions to extend by five minutes, seconded by Councillor Franceschini – PASSES.

In favour: 23

Opposed: 5

Senator Garneau asks that following the recent ruling, if there has been any talks about reviewing or reworking the COI.

The Speaker answers yes. He states that he, as Governance Document Researcher, is currently working with the Governance Manager, and they have identified several weaknesses with COI. The Speaker states to expect an amended policy to come forward in the new year.

Senator Garneau asks if the cases that were just ruled, would be reviewed again.

The Speaker states that once a decision is taken by the Board, the decision is binding. The Speaker states that the Board could vote to rescind, but that it would not happen automatically.

Member of the Gallery Haneen Elderi, AUS, states her concern about the lack of consideration for the safety for the Palestinian students on campus. Furthermore, she notes that Professor Fabrice Labeau did not mention Palestinian students being affected. Lastly, she asks if any Palestinian students or individuals were present when the Board of Directors made their decision.

The Speaker explains that the decision regarding the COI Policy was made in confidential session. As outlined in the Internal Regulations, only directors are authorized to be present during confidential session.

Senator Garneau asks if in order for COI to be raised, if it requires a vote from the Board.

The Speaker states that the disclosure is made first, then goes to the General Manager, and then to the Board of Directors. Alternatively, the Speaker states that if a breach is discovered, the General Manager conducts an investigation, and the report of the investigation is sent to the Board of Directors. The Speaker notes that all decisions of COI are made by the Board.

Councillor Fakh asks to discuss further the contents of the email sent by CJA Federation to the Board of Directors.

VP External motion to read the papers, seconded by Senator Garneau - PASSES.

The President reads out the letter sent to Board of Directors:

“Dear SSMU Board of Directors,

Students' Society of McGill University

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

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

Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories

It has come to our attention that some of your members have come under scrutiny because of their association with one of our programs. In the pursuit of transparency, we want to clarify the goals of this program, its substance, and the processes through which SSMU/AUS members became involved.

The trip in question is an educational program bringing participants to both the Israeli and Palestinian territories. The goal of this program is to help expand the participant's perspectives on the region and conflict away from binaries, and towards a better understanding of the history, culture, and grievances of both peoples.

In this pursuit, participants will spend time in both Israeli and Palestinian territory led by guides from each society respectively, meeting with speakers from many different backgrounds, creeds, ethnicities, and political orientations. We have tried to create a program where participants will be exposed to different narratives and perspectives through individuals who can speak to them through the lens of lived experience.

Participation in this program was not offered as a gift. Participants became involved through a chain referral process, meaning those already involved with the program and Hillel MTL reached out to people in their personal networks, and then those contacted went through an application process involving interviews and a written submission. This is an educational program with a thorough application process, and characterizations that it was offered as a gift are inaccurate. To clarify, this program was organized by Hillel MTL, which is a separate entity from Hillel McGill and operated by Federation CJA.

We are trying to foster a culture within the group that is willing to engage with complex ideas and deal with serious subjects. Students who were accepted into the program had to demonstrate appropriate character traits like critical thinking, open mindedness, and a desire to engage with different perspectives. These character traits often correlate with involvement on and off campus through clubs, cultural organizations, and political associations, and therefore we valued these kinds of leadership experience in applicants. However, no one was invited to apply or accepted because of their position within student government, and the majority of participants have no involvement with any of McGill's legislative bodies. Notably, there are absolutely no obligations or requirements after the trip for anyone involved.

It has been suggested that Hillel MTL would not be able to offer an unbiased experience, and that our program should be rejected as a result. It is not a secret that we support the Jewish right to self-determination: Hillel MTL's official position is that we support the continual existence of a Jewish state, and we are committed to the pursuit of peace and a two state solution. There is nothing in our stance that precludes empathy for the Palestinian people, and we hope for mutual prosperity and peace. Regardless, none of our positions will be imposed on participants in any way.

We want to offer participants the opportunity to critically engage with a diverse set of individuals and experiences, ask questions, and learn more about the region and its people for themselves. This is the program that we have created, and it is something that we are proud to offer and stand behind fully.

We believe that this program is in the intellectually curious spirit of a university, and regret that those involved have been criticized for their involvement. If there are any further questions that we have left unanswered, please reach out.

Sincerely,

Hillel MTL”

Member of the Gallery, Haneen, asks what gives the Executives the privileges to visit Israel and Palestine, and to go free of charge, when Palestinian students cannot go home, given that they have an actual claim to the land. Furthermore, they state that Israel has violated international law by not allowing Palestinians the right to return. Similarly, they note that Fabrice Labeau did not mention Palestinians nor Arabs when addressing respecting individuals' beliefs. Lastly, they note that no Arab students have been invited on the trip, and asks if accepting and going on the trip would be offensive to Palestinian students.

The President states that SSMU VP Finance and Internal were offered invitations, but declined them. However, he notes other executives of faculties have accepted.

Councillor Fakhri motion to extend, seconded by Senator Garneau - PASSES.

11. Question Period

Haneen Elderi, AUS, was inquires why Members of the Gallery were not informed that their seats would not remain saved prior to leaving for confidential session

The Speaker notes this situation before regarding capacity has never been reached before, and as such, there was no precedent for this. The Speaker extends his apologizes for this.

Senator Lametti states that at the last Council, Legislative Council passed a motion concerning cannabis, and is inquiring in regard to an update. VP External states that they have been communicating with the only provincial lobbying group, and that SSMU already in line with their positions, and as such, they stand behind them.

Councillor Fakhri asks the President if he shared with Hillel Montreal, that the decision regarding the Conflict of Interest disclosure forms would occur at the Board of Directors meeting.

The President states that he did not.

VP Finance asks that in the context of the email that was just read, if the President can also read the first paragraph that was sent to the VP Finance.

SSMU President reads out the first paragraph, starting with “Dear student leader.”

Councillor Morgan asks if it was sent to finance@ssmu.ca.

VP Finance states that it was sent to his personal email, after someone approached him during his office hours.

VP External states that AUS had a similar conversation yesterday, and asks the Arts Representatives if any tangible action came out of it.

Councillor Daryanani states that while he is not mandated to discuss it, states that AUS constituents will receive the following in the Listserv:

“Statement Regarding the Hillel Trip from AUS Legislative Council (November 27, 2019)

The AUS Legislative Council would like to express our profound disappointment with the decision of two members of the AUS executive - VP Finance Stefan Suvajac and Arts Representative Andrew Chase - to attend a trip funded by an interest group (The Maccabee Task Force) whose leaders have explicitly stated their goal to influence the decision-making processes of student leaders on campus, and call on the two executives to refrain from participating in this trip.

The AUS Legislative Council would like to re-emphasize to Palestinian students and to all other students who have been personally affected by the executives’ actions that even in spite of this decision, we stand in solidarity with their concerns and with their lived experiences of oppression. We do not believe that the ruling of any policy, in this case the SSMU Conflict of Interest Policy upon the concerned AUS Executives, should serve as a moral compass.

The AUS Legislative Council endorses the letter published by the SSMU executives in asking for increased transparency from Hillel Montreal with regards to whom was offered a position on this trip and why, as we find this lack of transparency deeply concerning.”

SSMU President motions for a ten minute extension, seconded by Senator Lametti - FAILS.

12. Business Arising

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

VP Finance motivates the motion.

Question Period:

SSMU President asks VP Finance to explain the operative clauses, and inquires why the motion has come forward to Legislative Council.

VP Finance explains that the motion is regarding the Indigenous Equity Fund. VP Finance provides a framework for how the fund will be distributed, how it will be allocated, and the IAC's role in the collection. Furthermore, the VP Finance states that a new department in the accounting system will be created in order to manage it.

Question Period:

Councillor Morgan asks VP Finance to reiterate how it was decided that 10% of the equity fee that would be allocated.

VP Finance states that SSMU's legal counsel advised that 10% was a reasonable level.

Debate:

VP Finance states that if something is being added to the Internal Regulations, it should be done in public session.

The President states that he asked for clarification for gallery members, in order for members to participate more fully in debate. Furthermore, the President indicates his optimism towards seeing the IAC work with SSMU Executives to see the fund come to fruition.

Voting Procedure:

Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of the Society's Finances - APPROVED.

In favour: 29

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 3

This motion is unanimously approved.

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

VP External motivates the motion.

Question Period:

Councillor Chan states that SSMU passed a similar policy in the 2015-16 year, and asks in what ways the policy has changed, and furthermore, if the previous policy was deficient.

VP External states that the former policy expired. VP External states that in the new policy, scientific evidence has been updated, and larger revisions have been made in regards to “climate justice” and action points. VP External also states that the policy has benefitted with input from the Sustainability Commissioner.

Debate:

The President thanks the VP External for his work done in this capacity.

Voting Procedure:

Motion Regarding Adoption of the Climate Justice Policy – APPROVED.

In favour: 29

Opposed: 1

Abstaining: 1

This motion is unanimously approved.

13. Comprehensive Governance Review Committee

Senator Lametti motions to extend discussion by fifteen minutes, seconded by VP External - PASSES.

Husayn Jamal, Chair of the Comprehensive Governance Review Committee presents the report.

The Chair states that some recommendations have remained the same, while others have been added, removed, or changed .

The Chair notes that over the period of 2019-2020, permanent staff and casual staff were consulted.

Furthermore, he notes that a part of the individuals consulted, six Legislative Councillors came forward, two Senators, and one SSMU constituent.

He states that the student body of large was invited to participate in consultations, both through email and through a Facebook event.

For recommendations, Chair Jamal states that 12.1 and 12.2 relate to the General Manager, which will be moved to the Internal Regulations. Chair Jamal explains that given that the status and duties of the General Manager is enshrined in the constitution, it is difficult to amend the duties, and in the future, it needs it to be pliable. As well, the descriptions of the Offices of the Executives will be moved into the Internal Regulations. Regarding the J-Board, Chair Jamal states that the role and functioning of the J-Board is also being moved into the Internal Regulations, but that the existence of the J-Board will continue to be in the SSMU Constitution. Regarding the reformed composition of Legislative Council, novel recommendations are being made. For starters, Chair Jamal, on behalf of the CGRC, recommends all executives lose their vote. Chair Jamal explains that this decision came about upon public consultations and furthermore, is based on the Concordia model. Chair Jamal details, stating that in public consultations, 15 out of the 20 people who came forward, proposed taking away the votes of the executives. For those 15, some made reference to the public voting, showing that executives tended to vote as a bloc. Chair Jamal states that this recommendation will help to ensure that executives remain accountable. On Senate representation on Legislative Council, Chair Jamal recommends reducing the seat count, from two to one. Chair Jamal explains that the Senate provides disputing opinions to the Executive, such as evident in the discussions concerning the moratorium. Chair Jamal also recommends removing the IRC seat. Chair Jamal proposing adding seats from IAC, Equity Committee, and Francophone Affairs, granting them one voting seat each. Chair Jamal states that the seats will not automatically be the commissioners. Instead, the groups in question will each select a representative. On the MCSS, Chair Jamal indicates that they will not be a voting member, given that they do not pay SSMU fees. Other recommendations remain the same.

In honouring student-led democracy, the CGRC is still recommending that members of the student body at large can submit motions to be read and presented at Legislative Council, after receiving the signatures of 100 students, in accordance to the Internal Regulations.

Furthermore, the CGRC recommends reducing the number of GAs from two to one. However, Chair Jamal reminds Councillors that this does not take away the special ability to call a special GA with 50 signatures if the Winter GA is too far to be practically feasible. That being said, Chair Jamal states that if the recommendation moves forward for one GA, the one GA will be unable to be cancelled under any circumstances.

Question Period:

VP University Affairs asks if the changes would come as separate motions.

Chair Jamal states that if Legislative Council is in favour, the CGRC would finish its work with Legislative Council, and then move onto Board of Directors. Following, the CGRC would then group the recommendations together to be presented to Legislative Council, and then brought to referendum to be ratified.

VP Internal notes the inclusion of Indigenous Affairs, Francophone Affairs, and Equity Committee on receiving special seats. VP Internal asks if there is a reason other under-represented groups were not included.

Chair Jamal states that within the confines of CGRC, they looked at committees that already existed under SSMU, and not services. Similarly, Chair Jamal states that Services already has a seat. Furthermore, the Committees mentioned exist as committees of Legislative Council. If anyone wishes to include groups such as Queer McGill, a committee should be struck under the Legislative Council.

Councillor Franceschini inquires about the 15 out of 20 people who were consulted voted in favour of getting rid of the Executive votes. Councillor Franceschini asks how many of those who came to discussions were in favour of the introduction of the three committee votes.

Chair Jamal states that there was no consensus among the individuals who came. Chair Jamal states that the CGRC took four options circulated and voted on those options, and that the one that came on top was a voting seat for each committee.

Councillor Chan asks Chair Jamal, in his position as Governance Document Researcher what his opinion of having voting members for those seats is.

Chair Jamal states that in September 2016, Legislative Council received a report regarding Equitable Governance. As he does not wish to delegitimize the work of the researcher, he thus supports the findings.

Councillor Morgan inquires about the possibility of the Senator seat to be non-voting.

Chair Jamal indicates that the Senate seat would be voting.

Senator Lametti states that the report is to be taken as a guiding idea. Senator Lametti inquires on the rationale for reducing the number of Senate representatives.

Chair Jamal states for faculty representation, each faculty is granted one seat, and for one additional seat after every 2000 students, to a maximum of four. With regards to club seats, they stand as a significant constituency at McGill, as clubs are SSMU's highest priority. While Chair Jamal admits that the Senate does provide considerable, incredibly important information, he notes that there is no rationale behind why they were granted two in the first place, given they are supposed to represent Senate Caucus.

VP Finance asks that in regards to removing executive votes, what other rationale other than executives voting as a bloc is, as when one looks at past voting records, most motions are passed with large majorities regardless.

Chair Jamal states that he spoke with the presiding officer of Concordia's student union, which does not permit executives to vote on their council. Their rationale is that it is an additional way for the Legislative Council, the political body of the society, to hold members of the executive accountable for their actions.

Senator Lametti motions to extend discussion by ten minutes, seconded by Councillor Franceschini - FAILS.

Councillor Kaye motions to extend by five minutes, seconded by Councillor Mackie - PASSES.

Member of the Gallery, Andres Perez, MCSS Representative, thanks the CGRC for including a member of the MCSS. Perez asks Chair Jamal if the CGRC has considered the inclusion of a SSMU representative at MCSS meetings.

Chair Jamal indicates that his mandate only concerns SSMU documents.

The President indicates that they are currently looking at closer integration, and states that they have had discussions with MCSS President to include a SSMU representative.

Member of the Gallery, Justine, asks the SSMU President why would he would be opposed to having a voting seat for Francophone Affairs. The President states that he is not opposed to it.

VP Internal states that going back to taking votes away from the executive, VP Internal asks if there was any discussion considering making an executive caucus, being granted one vote. Chair Jamal replies that it was discussed but refused by CGRC, similar to the Equity caucus.

VP External asks the Chair to discuss the equity caucus option further be able to touch on the option of the equity caucus. Chair Jamal explains that the Equity Caucus would not just be the three committees mentioned prior, and could include groups such as Queer McGill and Black Students' Network. Furthermore, he notes that these groups would come together to meet collectively.

Proxy for Councillor Platt returns at 21:35.

Senator Lametti motions for a five minute extension, seconded by the President - FAILS.

Debate:

VP University Affairs states their opposition towards the removal of officer votes, and notes that it is important to keep in mind that they are elected based on campaigns. VP University Affairs states that it is often hard to do that, unless they have a vote on council. As such, VP University Affairs believes that removing the votes damper the ability of the executives to perform their mandates.

VP External supports the non-voting nature of executives. Similarly, VP External states that they would push further to amend the number of councillors of large faculties to one or two maximum.

[Councillor Dixon leaves at 21:39.]

Senator Lametti motions to amend the report to adopt all recommendations except for the recommendations of section 2, which is referred to the CGRC for further consideration.

VP External objects to the consideration of the amendment.

Voting Procedure:

Senator Lametti's motion to amend - FAILS DUE TO $\frac{2}{3}$ MAJORITY AGAINST.

Against: 22

Councillor Chan disagrees with the proposal made by the VP External, proposing getting rid of popular representation of faculties. Councillor Chan states that faculty size matters.

Councillor Chase motions to call the previous question, seconded by Councillor Kaye - FAILS.

In favour: 13

Opposed: 15

Proxy for Councillor Platt motions to vote on the motion by paragraph, seconded by Councillor Chase - FAILS.

Councillor Fakh motions to strike from 7.4 (following vacancies) to 7.6 (following vacancies), seconded by Councillor Marcoux.

Councillor Fakh states that based on his understanding of the amendment, if there are vacant seats on the Board of Directors, quorum would be lowered. He further states that there have been recent occasions where there was a significant number of vacant seats on the Board, and if this amendment was in place, quorum would have been extremely low. Councillor Fakh further states that they should keep quorum the way it is, given that it is the highest governing body of SSMU.

Chair Jamal explains that the time that it takes the Nomination Committee to find a new Director is approximately two (2) months. If they cannot reach quorum for two months, they cannot ratify any motions, and no business can be conducted in SSMU.

The President states that previously, they had difficulty reaching quorum.

Councillor Marcoux states that in its current state, the Board of Directors can do whatever they want, with next to no accountability, and lowering quorum can allow the Board of Directors to decide on everything that SSMU can do.

Councillor Fakih understands the difficulties of not reaching quorum, but believes more efforts should be diverted towards focusing on finding new Directors, as opposed to simply lowering quorum.

VP External inquires what the amendment is.

The Speaker states that the amendment motions to strike from 7.4 (following vacancies) to 7.6 (following vacancies), stating that the Board of Directors would operate with a set quorum.

Councillor Daryanani leaves indefinitely at 21:56.

Voting on the amendment - PASSES.

In favour: 11

Opposed: 6

Abstaining: 9

The amendment is adopted.

Debate on the main motion as amended:

VP Finance states that this is the largest change to SSMU's Constitution in about eight years. VP Finance states that he thinks that there is time to read the report, and to submit amendments in reading.

Senator Lametti expresses disappointment that the amendment was objected to, and thinks that there has been significant changes to Section 2 since the last council.

Councillor Morgan motions to postpone until the next regular meeting of Legislative Council, seconded by Councillor Wright - PASSES.

Recess begins at 22:03.

Recess ends at 22:13.

14. Vice-President (Finance)

VP Finance presents the report.

Highlights include starting the 2021 Budget, sitting down with the Indigenous Affairs Commissioner to discuss the funding process for the fee once it is collected, general services review and a credit card project.

Question Period:

Proxy for Councillor Platt asks what the cost of the audit was.

VP Finance states that it cost \$21,000, which VP Finance remarks as pretty normal for an organization the size of SSMU.

15. New Business

- a. Notice of Motion Regarding Changes to the Internal Regulations of Committee Terms of Reference 2019-11-28

The Speaker explains the notice.

The Speaker explains that there are two ways at giving a notice, the notice of motion, and the first and second readings. He notes that policies and plans require two readings.

Notice of motion is not the same thing, which is just a notice of a motion arriving next Council.

VP Finance gives notice of a forthcoming notion of the Financial Ethics committee.

VP University Affairs motions to suspend the rules to add a late motion, seconded by Councillor Fakih - FAILS.

In favour: 8

Against: 17

- b. Motion Regarding Acceptable Communications Practices 2019-11-28 --**APPROVED**

Councillor Mackie motivates the motion.

Councillor Mackie states that SSMU communications are supposed to represent the will and views of the students, but students are often left feeling alienated, creating a divide between SSMU and the student body. Councillor Mackie explains that the motion is meant to respond to the straw poll held last council, which informally declared that the majority of Legislative Council found profanity within official SSMU communications unnecessary and unprofessional.

Question Period:

VP External asks Councillor Mackie to clarify what is meant by 'milder words' that have the same vulgar connotation as profanity.

Councillor Mackie clarifies, stating that it refers to alternatives meant to circumvent swear words. However, they decided not to list them as they felt this was unnecessary.

Councillor Morgan asks if the motion is directed towards SSMU executives only, not Councillors, given that only SSMU Executives have access to SSMU communications, but explains that Councillors may comment on social media posts and pages .

Councillor Mackie states that the goal of the motion was to reflect the straw poll. She is not against the idea if someone wishes to amend the motion.

Councillor Morgan inquires if the motion is adopted, in situations where one needs to be assertive, they ask what the recommendations on what to do.

Councillor Mackie states that personally, she has sent strong messages before without using profanity. Councillor Mackie believes it is possible to write and convey strong messages without using vulgar language.

Councillor Merali states that swearing on other posts has occurred, yet no attention has been diverted to it, and asks why it is. Councillor Merali explains that a post from this past October has been shared on the VP External Affairs' Facebook page, regarding a post from the SSMU Indigenous Affairs page. The post in question includes four (4) swear words in reference to the Liberal and Conservative parties in regards to the compensation of Indigenous children. Merali continues by explaining that he doesn't understand why this hasn't been previously brought up, but now that VP University Affairs' post has been shared regarding racism and racist comments, this motion is brought forward.

Councillor Mackie states that she didn't see that post. Councillor Mackie explains that the motivation came from the fact that it was originally brought up by Councillor Marcoux. Councillor Mackie states that it is not meant to target a specific post nor an Executive. Similarly, Councillor Mackie is not asking for the post in question to be changed or removed, indicating that the motion is just forward-looking, and lastly, not wishing for it to be seen as an attack on any individual.

VP Internal motions to extend question period by five minutes, seconded by Councillor Mackie - PASSES.

VP External asks if Councillor Mackie or Councillor Marcoux have read the radical post regarding the condemnation of Bill 21 and using the term "fascists". Councillor Mackie replies that she did not read it.

VP External asks a follow-up question inquires if Councillor Mackie and Councillor Marcoux should be informing themselves on the debate of censorship as it pertains to SSMU, knowing that the larger debate that will occur will be in regards to the nature of censorship. Councillor Mackie asks for clarification on this question.

VP External clarifies the question, asking if they believe they have informed themselves the necessary steps of censorship before entering debate today. Councillor Mackie replies in the affirmative.

Councillor Merali asks the mover and seconder if they would like to speak about the motivation for this motion.

The Speaker rules this question out of order, as questions should only pertain to the motion or clarifications regarding the motion.

VP Internal inquires if she can only direct questions to the mover and seconder of the motion. The Speaker explains that typically, this is what the practice has been.

Debate on the motion:

VP University Affairs states that she does not support the motion. VP University Affairs explains that there are two important aspects, one of tone-policing and there is the aspect of profanity. VP University Affairs states that profanity is a tool used to shock people, and that the shock is sometimes deserved and sometimes it is not. VP University Affairs' explains that the intent was to shock in the post she wrote, as the post pertained to addressing racism against an individual who is an employee of the Society, and who is part of a marginalized community. She believes that the use of profanity is meant to shock people.

VP External motions to extend by five minutes, seconded by Councillor Marcoux. – PASSES.

VP University Affairs states that profanity is part of a broader movement on decorum in politics and is used to suppress those with lived experiences about certain things.

Similarly, VP University Affairs states that she is using profanity as a tool of advocacy. She explains that it is easy for an individual to not use profanity when they have not lived these experiences. VP University Affairs explains that it may seem easy to use profanity for an individual who is sitting in a room across from someone who has lived experiences of anti-Indigenous racism and targeted racist comments. She explains that profanity can be used as a tool of advocacy, in addition to being a tool of shock in this instance. Furthermore, VP University Affairs states that to not use profanity is a disservice, and would ask the mover and seconder who this motion is helping in this case. VP University Affairs states that the motion sets a dangerous precedent for what cannot be said in SSMU communications. Next, she explains that she posted an article in the SSMU Legislative Council Facebook page earlier in the day. VP University Affairs brings attention to the fact that female SSMU

Executives are being targeted due to tone policing. Further, VP University Affairs explains that it is very difficult, as she feels that female SSMU executives' words are being watched twice more and judged more than another. She explains that it is her job to ensure that past and future Executives are not limited in what they can do or how they can do things, and explains that part of her job is also to call out McGill University on certain situations, as well as call out on racism and any issue that will pertain. VP University Affairs explains that she is glad this motion was brought forward, as now the discussion around tone policing can be debated and discussed at this Council. Again, she reiterates that she strongly disagrees with this motion.

Proxy for Councillor Kersch indicates her disagreement with the VP University Affairs. Using a sports analogy, Proxy for Councillor Kersch explains that if a player swears in a game, they are kicked out of the game, or given a red card. Speaking on a leadership position, Proxy for Councillor Kersch states that it is possible to still call out individuals, but believes there is a way to say things in a more professional manner. Proxy for Councillor Kersch states that it is unprofessional to swear, given that they are representing a governing body.

Senator Lametti states that he is very sensitive to the idea that the VP University Affairs has been suffering due to tone policing to a significant degree. That being said, Senator Lametti believes it is dangerous for the executive to claim that attempts by elected members of the Society to define effective communication practices as tone policing or censorship, when it is in reality, an essential part of the democratic discourse of SSMU.

Councillor Das inquires regarding the article, and asks for clarification regarding the article.

VP University Affairs appreciates the comments, but thinks that the flaw in the logic is that SSMU is not a sports game. VP University Affairs states that a student government is supposed to be an advocate, and through that, calling out racism and sexism and other issues should be allowed. Similarly, while she understands the need for Council to have an opinion on SSMU communications, she does not believe that this motion is the correct way to do it.

VP University Affairs states that she will not comply with the motion, if it passes. She further states that she is inviting Council to hold her accountable if she does not comply with the motion, which she intends to do.

VP Internal states that as a visible minority, and a female member of the Executive Committee, and states that she believes there are strong enough alternatives in contrast to swearing or other vulgar language. VP Internal states that there are many different words in the English language which can be used in the same manner. VP Internal also explains that many of her constituents have come forward to her in support of this motion because they believe that profane words can be seen as triggers to certain individuals, as certain individuals come from homes where these words are used in an abusive manner.

Councillor Franceschini motions to extend by two minutes, seconded by Councillor Mackie – PASSES.

VP Internal would also be interested to expand this motion to any other SSMU staff who have access to the accounts or official SSMU pages.

VP External states that they do not think the straw poll made it clear that there was a general consensus among Council. On the terms of profanity being provocative, he explains that that is the point. There are times when using words doesn't necessarily get the message across. As such, VP External explains that when he works with various groups, such as anarchist groups, it is important to move towards the right element. VP External also states that when we are faced with divisive issues, such as racism, it is important to address that.

VP University Affairs motions to extend speaking time by five minutes, seconded by the President – PASSES.

VP External states that SSMU Executives are not the same as athletes. VP External also explains that we often have to use our platform to speak on behalf of the ones who are not privileged to have their voices heard. That being said, in terms of better ways to say things in a more professional manner, defining the communications policy is not censorship, but states that a comprehensive communications policy is not what is being put forward. There are strategic uses of profanity, according to him. Lastly, VP External states that a blanket ban on censorship is not a step forward.

VP Finance states that the motion clearly reads as a censure of the VP University Affairs, and should not be proceeded with. VP Finance states that those who look at the motion in the future will not look at the minutes, but look at the motion 'in a vacuum'. He states that the difference between SSMU communications and SSMU advocacy are very different. He states that the work of the Executives can be very emotional, and limit their ability to express themselves is frustrating.

Member of the Gallery, Alex Karasick, McGill Daily, indicates that he is worried that the motion is needlessly trying to sanitize things. Karasick explains that individuals tend to swear in real life, but is unsure of what is being achieved by censoring, and does not understand the point of this motion.

Member of the Gallery, Andres Perez, MCSS, states his personal opinion, explaining that people vote for Executives, it is because voters believe in them. However, the candidates do not put swearing in their mandates. Perez states that there are other ways to advocate. Furthermore, if they are using official pages of the SSMU, profanity should not be used, and states that there are many ways to get a message across. Furthermore, Perez states that some of the biggest messages in the world, such as the messages of MLK Jr., did not contain profanity.

Councillor Das motions to extend by three minutes, seconded by Councillor Franceschini – PASSES.

Similarly, Andres Perez states that the accounts should be maintained professionally. More so, Perez reiterates VP Internal's comments in regards to the English language, which is already rich enough to use different words and still get the message across successfully. He explains that the real problem of the post was racism, and Perez states that the SSMU can work on other avenues to address racism in a more professional manner and work towards a way of ending it.

Councillor Chan would like some clarification regards VP University Affairs' comments made earlier regarding groups, specifically inquiring if she is speaking on behalf of SSMU or personally. The Speaker interjects that he is not obligated to return to VP University Affairs for a follow-up and proceeds by taking debate from other Councillors.

Proxy for Councillor Platt takes issue with the argument that swearing is a tool used to escalate and does not believe that swearing is ever an effective tool, and the example he brings forward, is that members are here tonight to discuss this issue. Furthermore, Proxy for Councillor Platt believes that swearing took away value from the message of the post in this case. Proxy for Councillor Platt states his support for this motion.

[Departure of VP Finance at 22:56.]

Councillor Gurvey is worried about the credibility of SSMU, given the issue of swearing. Councillor Gurvey states that the people in the room are students who are currently involved in SSMU. People who see the Facebook page may not be as involved and may have their opinions reflected in the way they view SSMU. As such, Councillor Gurvey states that the Facebook page can impact how people view SSMU, and less favourable opinions are generated through the use of swearing. Similarly, he is concerned that it will draw more attention on the profanity, and less on the act itself.

VP University Affairs addresses one of the original things that brought up when Councillor Marcoux discussed the post in question, which states that it may turn people away from SSMU. VP University Affairs meanwhile believes she would be more turned away if SSMU took a glossy, sterile front. VP University Affairs states that she would personally turn towards SSMU when they took harsh stances against objectively bad things. VP University Affairs states that it is clear which side the supporters and opponents of the motion are on the political spectrum.

Councillor Franceschini states that he doesn't believe VP External's example regarding anarchists overthrowing the government is a good example to use in student politics. Councillor Franceschini explains that we are representing students and there are certain standards that come with that responsibility.

[Departure of VP Internal at 22:59.]

Councillor Wu speaks as a woman from a marginalized community, stating that shocking language can overshock. Councillor Wu further explains that the original message of the Facebook post has now

been overshadowed by tone policing. She believes that it is possible to get a message across without profanity.

Member of the Gallery, Andres Koch, states their personal opinion, that there are more proper ways to conduct themselves than swearing. That being said, Koch states that it is completely inappropriate to enforce personal views and preferences onto the views of Council.

Councillor Marcoux states that a mandate of Legislative Council is to mandate the Executives and let them know what to do and which direction to go.

Councillor Rhamey states that if a conversation is being held on what a portfolio of SSMU said, it would be a better idea to present feasible alternatives and present what other methods, other than profanity, are available, rather than just condemn this with this motion.

[Return of VP Internal at 23:02.]

VP External suggests creating a communications policy. VP External points out that there is no profanity spewing left and right on the SSMU pages. VP External explains that in terms of making social media more professional, our Facebook page reaches a lot of people, but less people are showing up to events and this does not correlate to increased engagement. VP External also states that for those who browse on Reddit “our McGill”, are the individuals that he believes dislike SSMU, and the swearing did not come up on Reddit. However, he continues, what did come up is that people believe that SSMU “doesn't do anything”. VP External reminds Council that we shouldn't be focused on appearing on a postcard as professional student leaders, but rather we should be working on being great student leaders and representing our student body.

Councillor Chan motions to extend by three minutes, seconded by Proxy for Councillor Platt – PASSES.

VP External explains that in his capacity as VP External, he has been working with anarchists, as have the previous VP External prior to him. This is due to the fact that he believes that anarchist work on getting things done in a different manner. He clarifies that is not an anarchist, and the SSMU office does not have an anarchist policy, however, Leftism often uses provocative methods to get their message across. VP External continues by explaining that there are strategies, such as swearing in a post on social media, to show that SSMU stands up against racism. Further, he states that if he ever received a mandate not to work with anarchists, he is unsure how this would work in his portfolio, and there would be a lot less representation at the provincial level.

Councillor Eisner states that SSMU and student leaders can stand up to racism and sexism without the use of profanity. Councillor Eisner states that one can use the strongest terms and condemn in the strongest terms without using profanity. Furthermore, Councillor Eisner would like to ensure that the official Society's pages remains professional, and through that, is capable of representing the largest amount of students.

Member of the gallery, Haneen, points out what she finds ironic is that the use of a swear word has distracted individuals from standing up to racism against marginalized people. Haneen explains that there are approximately 15 gallery members present in the room who are trying to discuss a topic which is important to their identities, and believes that the conversation on this motion has been dragged out to distract, while they have been sitting in the room for hours.

[Departure of Councillor Wright at 23:07.]

Councillor Fakih moves to call the question, seconded by Proxy for Councillor Platt – PASSES.

In favour: 21

Opposed: 6

[Arrival of Councillor Dixon by teleconference at 23:09.]

Voting procedure on the Motion Regarding Acceptable Communications Practices 2019-11-28:
APPROVED

In favour: 18

Opposed: 5

Abstaining: 5

This motion is approved.

c. Motion Regarding Free Trip Offers to Student Leaders 2019-11-28 --**APPROVED**

Motion to suspend the rules by Councillor Fakih to add a late motion 'Motion to request the Board of Directors to reevaluate the recent Conflicts of Interest Recommendations', seconded by Senator Garneau.

Voting on suspending the rules to add a late motion:

In favour: 4

Opposed: 18

The $\frac{3}{4}$ majority was not reached. This fails.

Moving onto the next agenda item, Motion Regarding Free Trips to Student Leaders 2019-11-18 moved by Senator Garneau, seconded by Councillor Merali.

Councillor Wright asks the Speaker if she is allowed to stay for question period, as she is explicitly mentioned in the motion.

VP External inquires with the Speaker on how the recusal of Councillors was recommended in the recommendation.

The Speaker explains that it was adopted as a remedy by the Board of Directors.

The Speaker invites Senator Garneau to motivate the motion, with two minutes. Senator Garneau asks to have an extension.

Councillor Das motions to extend by four minutes, seconded by Councillor Sabayte - PASSES.

Senator Garneau motivates the motion. He explains that he did not foresee his first motion at Legislative Council to be this, but believes that it's important to discuss this at Legislative Council in light of recent question period at the previous Legislative Council. Senator Garneau further explains that this motion is not about the purpose of the trip or its content, but rather about gifts and accepting gifts as a student leader.

Question Period:

Councillor Mackie acknowledges that this motion is coming from Senate Caucus and asks Senator Garneau if he could explain the vote breakdown at Senate Caucus in moving this forward.

Senator Garneau replies that he is not obligated to share this information.

Councillor Wright asks the movers of the motion to define what is their definition of "student leader" as this has been the headlines the past few days, and do the movers believe that the only student leaders are SSMU members or from faculty associations.

VP External explains that he is unsure of how the mover's personal interpretation of this motion's definition of student leaders is pertinent to the operative clauses of the motion.

The Speaker replies that throughout several sections of the motion, it does make reference to 'student leader'. However, notes that Council is always welcome to appeal the Chair's rulings.

VP External motions to appeal the decision of the Chair on the grounds that everyone knows what a student leader is, seconded by VP University Affairs.

Debate:

Councillor Chan agrees with Councillor Wright regarding defining specifically what a student leader is. Councillor Chan also mentions the Hillel Montreal letter and their selection process of student leaders for the trip.

Member from the Gallery, Andres Koch, explains that he disagrees with Councillor Wright, in the fact that this motion does fall within the student leaders and student politicians and a much broader category.

Senator Lametti supports in sustaining the decision of the Chair and agrees that members should ask questions related to the motion to appeal the decision of the Chair at this time.

VP External doesn't want to get caught in the semantics and thinks it would be pertinent to move forward, as they have already received the Board of Directors report.

Councillor Merali explains that based on the conversation he had with Senator Garneau, it is specifically to focus on the gift aspect of this motion. Councillor Merali states that the topic of Israel/Palestine is not related to this motion.

Councillor Chan respectfully disagrees and thinks this motion is all about semantics and the definition of student leader and thinks that they should sustain the decision of the Chair.

Voting on upholding the decision of the Chair: PASSES

In favour: 18

Question Period is resumed:

The Speaker asks the Recording Secretary to restate the question asked by Councillor Wright.

The Recording Secretary restates the question.

Senator Garneau replies that he does not believe that the definition of student leader only applies within the framework of SSMU or McGill.

Councillor Franceschini inquires about the fact that the Board of Directors has already determined that it is not a conflict of interest, then why is Legislative Council discussing the Board's decision.

Senator Garneau replies that he believes this reaches further than just a conflict of interest, and touches upon the judgment of student leaders accepting gifts of large amounts.

Councillor Rhamey inquires about the specific wording of monetary benefit in the motion. In other words, if the individual was never intending on going on the trip, if they are not profiting from a monetary benefit.

Councillor Merali explains that simply because you never 'intended' on attending the trip, it is not fully justified here. Councillor Merali explains the example of giving someone a car. Although the individual had never intended on buying a car, it is still something that has a specific monetary value, when given to an individual.

VP University Affairs motions to extend question period by two minutes, seconded by Councillor Fakhri - PASSES.

Member from the Gallery, Andres Koch, has an issue with a 'Whereas' clause and would like to amend it. The Speaker informs that only Councillors may amend clauses, members of the gallery cannot.

With the end of Question Period, the Speaker asks Councillor Chase and Councillor Wright to recuse themselves from the room for the duration of debate period, as per the Board of Directors' Conflict of Interest recommendations.

Debate on the motion:

Councillor Mackie strongly encourages Councillors to not abstain on this motion.

SSMU President moves to add the amendments in red, which were submitted to the Speaker and the Parliamentarian, seconded by Councillor Chan.

The President explains that there are no longer two Councillor-Directors who will be attending the trip, there is only one at this time, and there is an additional whereas clause pertaining to the AUS and SUS stances regarding this.

Debate on the amendment:

Senator Garneau strongly indicates his support of the amendment.

Councillor Wu claims that as the only individual from SUS currently in the room, she encourages this amendment.

Member from the Gallery, Asa Kohn, SUS, asks if the Science Undergraduate Society declared its opposition or was that simply from the Executive Committee, as Kohn was at the last General Council meeting and he does not remember this being said.

Councillor Wu replies that the SUS Executives had a very long conversation about this and although they haven't declared it publicly, it is available as meeting notes should he wish to request it. Councillor Wu also mentions that SUS will be releasing a statement soon.

Voting on the amendment:

In favour: 22

Opposed: 1

Abstain: 0

The amendment is approved.

Debate on the main motion as amended:

Proxy for Councillor Platt inquires if the voting on Senate Caucus is confidential.

VP University Affairs replies that usually Senate Caucus does take minutes, but because the voting on this happened online in a Facebook group, as a result, this is unclear.

Councillor Chan shares the concern about gifts. However, Councillor Chan would like to clarify with the movers of the motion whether or not they want to go into specific details of the Be It Resolved clause, as it is currently very broad.

Senator Lametti moves an amendment to the motion, seconded by Councillor Mackie. The amendment would add two Whereas clauses.

Debate on the amendment:

Senator Lametti explains that this motion takes a position on what consists of accepting gifts as a conflict of interest, and Council would be doing this despite the fact that the Board of Directors has already decided otherwise.

Councillor Eisner asks in terms of the Board of Directors taking a decision on this already, if it does not have weight.

The Speaker clarifies, and states that there is nothing in the motion that will remove Directors from the Board, as Legislative Council does not have that power.

Member of the Gallery, Haneen, clarifies that herself and other members of the gallery have been waiting for hours to voice their opinion on the matter at hand.

Councillor Fakih asks Senator Lametti to clarify his motivation for the amendment.

Senator Lametti replies that these are facts and this is something that has happened and this may make the decision of Council stronger.

VP External claims that while the motion won't necessarily change how the Board of Directors operates or the decision taken, as they must comply with the Conflict of Interest Policy, VP External points out that as two faculties have already taken their stance on this, and as such, it might urge the amendments to the Conflict of Interest Policy to be changed.

Voting on the amendment:

In favour: 23

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 1

This amendment is adopted.

Debate on the main motion as amended:

Councillor Mackie asks the Speaker if Councillor Wright should be invited back to the room as this motion pertains to judgment, so it would make sense to inquire what Councillor Wright's judgment was when accepting this trip.

[Departure of Councillor Sbayte at 23:51.]

MCSS Representative, Andres Perez-Tiniakos explains that he understands the struggle and the fear of someone going into your house, or living with fear that you might get killed by police or authorities. Andres explains that the issue is where the trip is going, Israel and Palestine, and if this trip was going to Sweden, this wouldn't be such a problem, in his opinion.

VP External motions to extend by three minutes, seconded by Councillor Franceschini - PASSES.

Senator Garneau interjects, claiming that the statement is not directly related to the motion and does not wish to further discuss it.

The Speaker replies that we have previously set a precedent of allowing members of the gallery to speak and comment in regards to motions. As members of the gallery have been sitting here for a few hours, the Speaker will allow the member from the gallery to continue speaking.

VP External motion to appeal the decision of the chair, seconded by Councilor Merali.

VP External points out that Legislative Council is not the place to have Israel-Palestine discussions or debate and says that the Executive Committee will be ensuring that they have a budget to further discuss this with professionals on the matter, and wishes to move forward with Senator Garneau's motion.

Voting on upholding the decision of the Chair - PASSES

In favour: 24

Member of the Gallery, MCSS Representative, Andres, continues with his statement. Andres states that the Israel-Palestine debate is long existing.

Recess at 00:00 am.

Legislative Council resumes at 00:10.

Member from the Gallery, Justine, asks Councillor Chan why he accepted the trip in the first place and why he later changed his mind about the trip.

Councillor Chan replies that after listening to his various constituents, he had a change of heart regarding attending the trip, as such, he decided not to attend the trip anymore. Furthermore, he states that the issue has also been a distraction to his academics and friendships.

Member from the Gallery, Ghida, states that she does not understand how anyone thinks this is an educational trip when it is founded by an outside organization. Ghida claims that this organization is funded by a known Donald Trump supporter.

Member from the Gallery, Jordana Schiff, AUS, states her deep concern on how SSMU is addressing the issue.

Senator Garneau makes a point of order that this does not relate to the motion specifically.

The Speaker will allow the member from the gallery to continue speaking and participate in debate.

Senator Garneau intervenes and makes a point of order once again.

The Speaker claims it is once again out of order.

Senator Garneau appeals the decision of the Chair, seconded by Councillor Fakih.

Member from the Gallery, Alex Karasick, McGill Daily, opposes the point of order and wishes that Council would allow the Member of the Gallery to finish her statement without interruptions.

Councillor Fakih indicates that he wishes for Council to focus on the motion in question.

VP External says that Council shouldn't be having this type of debate during Council.

[Departure of Senator Lametti at 00:20.]

Proxy for Councillor Platt is now the Proxy for Senator Lametti.

[Councillor Bhutkar arrives by teleconference at 00:27.]

Councillor Fakih moves to suspend the rules to add a generative discussion to the agenda. Councillor Fakih moves to lay the motion on the table, seconded by Senator Garneau - FAILS.

In favour: 9

Opposed: 12

VP External motions to call the question on the ruling of the Speaker, seconded by Councillor Wu – PASSES.

In favour: 17

Opposed: 2

Motion regarding sustaining the ruling of the Speaker to allow the member of the gallery to continue her statement:

In favour: 19

Opposed: 1

Member of the Gallery, Jordana Schiff, resumes. Schiff states that the underlying motion goes against academic freedom at McGill. As such, Schiff explains that voting in favour of the motion would set a dangerous precedent.

Member of the Gallery, Benjamin Stis, Faculty of Arts, would contest the academic value of a trip whose primary purpose is propaganda, according to him.

Member from the Gallery, Haneen, states that she considers herself a very intellectually inspired individual. She explains that if she wanted to go on this trip, she would not be able to, as she would be questioned at the border and not be allowed to go back to her home country of Lebanon. Furthermore, she encourages Council to listen to Palestinian voices.

Member from the Gallery, Gilli Cohen, AUS, wishes to address the fact that the organization leading the trip is Hillel Montreal. Cohen explains that Hillel Montreal is not a club of the SSMU. As a member

of Hillel McGill, he suggested to some of his friends to apply to the trip, but had no say in the decision-making. Gilli explains that simply because this trip is run by a Jewish organization does not mean it is necessarily a propaganda trip.

Councillor Eisner motions to extend by one minute, seconded by Chan – PASSES.

Member from the Gallery, Murad Khrais, Faculty of Science, claims that this trip is not only organized as a Jewish organization, but Hillel previously stated that its main purpose is to fight BDS.

Member from the Gallery, Andres Koch, states that there has been a lot of headlines and a lot has been said and written about the trip. He is wondering what Council thinks about the fact that pro-Israeli billionaire, Sheldon Andelson, is funding this trip. He notes that the format of the trip is similar to over 40 trips offered by Hillel chapters across universities in North America available since 2014. Koch asks Council what they would think if a trip to China was offered to student leaders, funded by a pro-China billionaire, or by the Chinese state, and clarifies that he doesn't believe that individuals wouldn't inquire that the trip is academic nor 'innocent.'

The President motions to make the default speaking time by three minutes, seconded by VP External.

[Departure of VP Internal at 00:31.]

The President motions to suspend the standing rules to set default speaking time to three minutes for members of the gallery, seconded by VP External - FAILS.

The President moves to amend the motion, seconded by Councillor Fakih.

Debate on the amendment:

Proxy for Councillor Kersch motions to extend discussion by four minutes, seconded by VP University Affairs - PASSES.

The President notes that it's important for Legislative Council to realize the true power that it has in recommending to the Board of Directors certain means regarding incorrect decisions made. Furthermore, SSMU President explains that Legislative Council is the highest political body of the Society. Generally, the Board is obliged not to intervene with any motions passed by Legislative Council unless they are in conflict with any HR, financial or legal matters. The President would like for Council to fix the situation. In his opinion, the President thinks there has been a great debate on the content of the trip and the location of the trip as well. The President reminds Council that VP Finance and VP Internal were offered this trip as student leaders. In his opinion, the President argues that the individuals who were offered this trip, are taking advantage of their position. The President wishes for Council to understand that the circumstances under which the Executives were invited to this trip, it's possible that this discussion wouldn't necessarily be happening. Even if the location of the trip was

different, it still stands. The President believes that this trip is improper, it shows a lack of integrity in student leaders and strongly urges them to take the time to deeply consider.

Member from the Gallery, Ashley Schulman states that in terms of altercations of the motion, the discussion is going beyond the jurisdiction of this Council and seems to be motivated by personal opinions. She would also like to remind everyone that SSMU is an a-political organization and this Council should not be solving conflicts around this topic.

VP External moves to extend by one minute, seconded by Councillor Wu - PASSES

Schulman continues by explaining that it is obvious that Zionist students continue to be targeted by the changes in this motion.

Councillor Chan explains that this decision was not a simple decision made by the Board of Directors. The Board did find that there would be a potential conflict of interest regarding discussions about Israel or BDS or Palestine, so these individuals would need to recuse themselves from the room.

Councillor Eisner Motion to extend by two minutes, seconded by Councillor Wu - PASSES.

Councillor Chan further explains that the Board of Directors is a governing body which is capable of making apolitical decisions of an objective nature, while the Legislative Council cannot do the same. Councillor Chan states that we need to respect the Board's decisions, as this sets a dangerous precedent, in terms of Council politically disagreeing with the Board's rulings.

Councillor Bhutkar echoes the sentiments of the President. He believes that this decision should not be political, and should be made by Legislative Council and upheld by Board of Directors. Furthermore, he explains that the debate isn't about the country of the trip, but how these individuals were approached to go on the trip. He reminds Legislative Council that this should not be a political decision, but it should be a decision concerning the conflict of interest as it is pretty clear that there is one, and it should be up to Legislative Council to uphold this.

Councillor Fakhri points out that given the recent Board ruling, the Board has also violated the Conflict of Interest Policy which was democratically and unanimously approved by this Council in September as it is an Apparent Conflict of Interest according to section 2.2.a) of the policy. Councillor Fakhri reminds Council that it is the democratic and representative body of the student body and it has the authority to make its own decisions. He also mentions that Council and the Board do not have the same motivations when voting.

VP University Affairs responds to the claim that SSMU is apolitical, and states that this couldn't be further from the truth regarding Legislative Council, as it is the most political body of the SSMU. She also claims that a dangerous precedent would be allowing people to attend a trip that has a specific motive, given to them in their position as student leaders. She echoes Councillor Fakhri's point,

explaining that this is not an overreach of Council's power, but rather this is how Council should operate, as Council is a political body, and this motion is a political decision. VP University Affairs explains that one cannot remove the location of the trip from the conflict of interest as these are intertwined, according to her.

Councillor Marcoux moves to call the question, seconded by VP External - PASSES.

In favour: 20

Opposed: 1

Voting on the amendment:

In favour: 11

Against: 10

Abstain: 1

The amendment is adopted.

Debate on the main motion:

VP University Affairs would like to discuss academic freedom. VP University Affairs states that in her opinion, this trip seems to be a way people use academic freedom to justify hateful or hurtful things. Lastly, she stresses that academic freedom is something to value.

Member from the Gallery, Jordana Schiff states that in terms of academic freedom, the notion is flawed and she would like to argue that she wouldn't disagree on something that anyone else would say. She also addresses the fact that a lot of terms used in regards to Zionism and Israel are considered hateful terms and debatable and she hopes that Council will not simply rely on these. She states that everyone has the right to academic freedom.

Councillor Chan disagrees with the point made by VP External. He is disturbed by the second point of the motion, which would mandate SSMU to send an email to all undergraduate students, naming Councillor Wright. While he understands that transparency is important, he states that sending over 20,000 emails to single out one individual's actions is troubling.

The President confirms with the Speaker that as per the Be It Resolved clause, the Speaker would be mandated to ask with Councillor Wright if she did attend the trip or not.

The Speaker replies that he will do as he is mandated, as a SSMU staff.

Councillor Mackie makes a point that while Councillor Wright was approached as a student leader on campus, it is important to note that she is also a Jewish leader and a greek life leader on campus.

Councillor Mackie would like to motion to suspend the rules to allow her to come back into the room.

Proxy for Senator Lametti claims that in regards to the Senate vote that took place, the vote count was 4-1. He states that two of those votes were not from Senators.

Similarly, Proxy for Senator Lametti states that Fabrice Labeau came to talk about how students do not feel safe on campus, and as such, believes that this motion will not be helping the situation.

Councillor Kaye has a concern with the motion understanding that Council will be preemptively overruling a decision of the Board.

VP External moves to strike the Be It Resolved clause pertaining to the Speaker asking Councillor Wright if she did attend the trip, as they find it particularly invasive, seconded by Councillor Chan.

Voting on the amendment:

In favour: 22

Opposed: 1

Abstaining: 0

The amendment is adopted.

Motion to call the question by Proxy for Senator Lametti, seconded by Councillor Franceschini – PASSES.

In favour: 22

Opposed: 0

Voting Procedure on the Motion Regarding Free Trips to Student Leaders – APPROVED.

In favour: 10

Opposed: 9

The motion is approved.

16. Confidential Session

17. Adjournment: **1:16am.**

Councillor Chan motions to adjourn, seconded by Councillor Franceschini – PASSES.

Students' Society of McGill University

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

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

Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories

Legislative Council adjourns at 1:16am.



Bryan Buraga, President

APPROVED