



SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PUBLIC MINUTES

February 13, 2020

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, February 13, 2020, at 6:00 p.m.

Due to technical difficulties, the minutes have been transcribed to the best of our ability.

1. Call to Order: **18:12**

The Speaker calls the meeting to order at 18:12.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker reads out the land acknowledgment.

3. Attendance

Noah Gundermann is Proxy for Management Councillor Eisner.

Absent: Councillors Platt, Daryanani, Patzer, Fried, SSMU President

4. Approval of Minutes

a. Legislative Council Public Minutes 2020-01-30 -- **APPROVED**

b. Legislative Council Confidential Minutes 2020-01-30 -- **APPROVED**

Councillor Mackie moves to approve the minutes, seconded by Councillor Chase.

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

Councillor Dandamudi moves to suspend the rules for the addition of a late motion, seconded by VP External - **APPROVED**

Opposed: 2



VP University Affairs motions to move the report of the Equity Committee to follow item 11, seconded by VP Finance - APPROVED

Senator Lametti motions to switch the order of items 7 and 8, seconded by Councillor Fakhri - APPROVED

Councillor Kaye motions to adopt the agenda as amended, seconded by Councillor Bhutkar - APPROVED.

6. Report of the Steering Committee

Parliamentarian Wong reads the report.

The Parliamentarian notes that there will be security present for the duration of the meeting.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

7. Guest Speakers

a. Report - Comprehensive Governance Review Committee 2020-02-13 --**APPROVED**

VP External asks if it would be possible for the right side of the room to use their laptops for the presentation, given that the projector does not work. The Speaker rules it in order.

Councillor Fakhri asks if it is acceptable for all individuals to keep their laptops open to follow along with the report. The Speaker indicates that it is.

Vp external point of personal privilege - would like to keep the laptops open for the duration of the presentation, this is very much in order.

Governing Documents Researcher, Husayn Jamal begins, the presentation on the report.

Governing Documents Researcher Jamal congratulates Lauren Hill on her new appointment to Speaker of the Legislative Council.

Governing Documents Researcher Jamal states that the Comprehensive Governance Review Committee is proposing the addition of five new seats to the Board of Directors, to alumni and professional directors. As well, Jamal notes that the General Manager would have full voting rights. Jamal also states that they have proposed staggering the start and end terms of Director seats, to ensure that there is a continuation of institutional knowledge maintained on the Board of Directors.



As well, he notes that the CGRC is also proposing the addition of a joint Legislative Council and Board of Directors session once per semester. He explains that it would be a way to increase communication and accountability and transparency. Similarly, it would be a way for members of Legislative Council to ask questions to the Board of Directors, as well as for the Board of Directors to better understand the work of Legislative Council. Jamal notes that since his departure, the Speaker of Council position has now been formally amalgamated into one position, the Speaker of Legislative Council and Chair of the Board of Directors. As well, Jamal notes the recommendation that SSMU move away from Robert's Rules, given its long page count, and inaccessibility to students, instead adopting Code Veronneau, which he notes was developed by students at UQAM. Furthermore, he notes that it is short, and available in both French and English.

Question Period:

VP Finance inquires about the position of the General Manager as a voting member, and asks if there was a concern that putting the General Manager creates a position with no direct oversight at any point.

Jamal notes that the concern was raised in the committee's deliberations. He notes that they drew a parallel to the fact that officers are also afforded for seats on Board of Directors, and yet they also report to the Board and yet also have four voting seats on the Board. Additionally, he notes that in instances where the Board of Directors has to consider some kind of action concerning the General Manager, it is always the Board's prerogative to ask the General Manager to leave for the duration of that discussion and then to come back later or to leave for the duration of that meeting.

Senator Lametti notes that there are certain dispositions in the Code Veronneau relating to the recording of meetings and the right of members to object to recording. He asks if in the current framework of SSMU, there is a way to make sure that those rules are superseded.

Governing Documents Researcher Jamal notes that SSMU has a policy on capital transparency which mandates for the recording and live streaming of meetings. Jamal states that they will continue, given that Plans and Policies supersede the Council Standing Rules and Code Veronneau in practice. Additionally, he notes that it can be written into the standing rules.

Councillor Bhutkar about the rationale behind adding 8.1.f, as discussions at Board don't concern Council.

Jamal states that there was an interest generated in consultations to bring the business of the Board of Directors into a more public forum, given that currently Board of Directors meetings happen in the SSMU boardroom that is mostly inaccessible after-hours, making meetings inaccessible for students to attend. As such, the best way to resolve the current situation is to regularize the process of Board reports to Council. Jamal explains that he acknowledges that Board business is often confidential and will not be discussed publicly.



Councillor Flaherty inquires about the rationale behind the alumni directors having voting seats. Jamal explains that the guiding goal of the CGRC was to ensure that the Board of Directors always had an ongoing presence of institutional knowledge. More so, he stated that a voting seat allowed for incentivization for their continued attendance and participation. Jamal states that there has been a historical trend where non-voting members of the Board of Directors have a lesser incentive to attend or participate in meetings. He notes that the voting balance on the Board is still eight to five in favour of students.

VP Internal inquires on if there is an obligation for former student Directors to fill the alumni director seats.

Senator Lametti motions to extend by discussion by five minutes, seconded by Councillor Bhutkar - PASSES.

Jamal states that there would be no obligation. More so, he notes that the Nominating Committee would sort the application to the most appropriate stream and ensure that there is an effort of balance of diverse experiences and backgrounds on the Board.

Senator Lametti notes that in a past version of the report, there was the idea that the alumni directors would not be eligible in their first or second year immediately after their term as Directors to apply. However, he notes that this has changed in the current report, and inquires what the rationale was for that change.

Jamal states that his original proposal as his position of Governing Documents Researcher was that alumni directors would have the same time stipulation as professional directors, where there must be a one year gap since their last term on the Board. However, the committee felt that the change was most appropriate in the interest of retaining institutional knowledge.

VP Finance inquires about the position of professional directors on the Board. While he notes that this sort of inclusion is common on other Boards, and clarifies that other Boards often do not meet as often as the SSMU Board of Directors, which meets every two weeks. VP Finance states that it is a much more significant time commitment, especially if they are professionals in a field like law, finance, or management. Further, he asks if that was a consideration of the committee.

Governing Documents Researcher Jamal states that it was a consideration. However, he notes that in past application opportunities, non-SSMU members or members not connected to the McGill community have applied to the Member at Large stream on the Board. He notes that those individuals were aware at the time of application of the time commitment of the Board of Directors, given that it is part of the job posting. Jamal however states that CGRC is not oblivious to the fact that it will be quite difficult to recruit and retain professional directors seats. Jamal states that the hope is to provide compensation, to not only Directors, but also to members of Legislative Council.



VP External states that on the last page of the report, the desire of the CGRC is to send to referendum the outcomes of the report as a Constitutional amendment. VP External asks if this is to say that the CGRC is formally ending its work on the Constitution and moving to other governing documents.

Jamal states that there is still a plan to have at least two more meetings of CGRC before the referendum period starts, as well as the fact that there's still one more Legislative Council meeting. He states that the plan is to set a time to meet for the next CGRC meeting. At that meeting, committee members will be handling varia. Furthermore, he notes that the goal is to get those addressed and then have one single document with the comprehensive changes from report number two, report number three, and then forthcoming report number four.

Councillor Fakih motions to extend by seven minutes, seconded by Councillor Lametti - PASSES

Councillor Fakih asks about the ratification process, furthermore, about the staggering process, and the potentiality of individual ratification for each director during the General Assembly. Jamal replies that there is a plan to have two sets of ratifications. He states that the Members-at-Large and professional directors will both be ratified on November 15th of each year. He notes that the alumni director would be ratified on June 1 of each year, along with the Officers.

Senator Lametti inquires about the rationale of the balance of four members at large and four members of the executive committee members.

Governing Documents Researcher Jamal explains that this was discussed in consultations, and notes that it was important to have those individuals that deal most with the day to day operations of the SSMU retain their votes on the Board of Directors. As well, he states that there was a goal to have an odd number of Directors, which is most satisfactory in the event of a tied vote.

[Arrival of the President at 18:41.]

Councilor Fakih states that there are four seats for officers in the Board of Directors, with three of them already being specified for individual positions. He inquires on the rationale behind having three chosen ones and one voted on.

Jamal states that in analysis of most non-profit structures by the CGRC, it is most common to have the executive director as a voting member of the Board of Directors. In the context of the SSMU, the executive director responsibilities are split between the General Manager and the President, which is why CGRC is affording both of those a voting seat on the Board. For the VP Finance, he states that in his experience in Chairing the Board of Directors, he believes that the VP Finance has offered measurably helpful knowledge and information to share with other Directors concerning the financial state of the Society. After the list of operationally essential officers on the Board, was exhausted, they left the additional seat open to the determination of Legislative Council, to ensure that Council



continues to have some autonomy, and some say in the composition of the Board was important to retain as well.

Senator Lametti asks if there was any consideration given into considering the status of students as selected members.

Jamal states that the Board of Directors is not meant to be a representative body and it never will be, given that it is important to have a diverse composition on the Board of Directors, and that the Nominating Committee in working with the Equity Commissioner has utilized significant methods of ensuring that individuals from minorities and marginalized communities are encouraged to apply to be on the Board of Directors.

Councillor Fakih notes that in the past, there have been frequent discussions about having individual ratification for individual directors, as they are currently voted on in a bloc. Furthermore, he asks if this has been considered in the Committee.

Councillor Chase motions for a five-minute extension, seconded by Councillor Mackie – PASSES.

Jamal states that debate concerning that did arise at CGRC, but that they were guided by a previous standing decision of the Judicial Board, which says that a motion to divide the question on ratification of Directors is generally unconstitutional and inadvisable.

Debate:

VP University Affairs states her concern about the proposal to add professional representatives onto the Board of Directors. While she understands the rationale, her concern stems from the existence of the Director composition on the McGill Board of Governors, noting that the body has significant numbers of seats for professionals, and that it poses a problem when they are making decisions on behalf of a community they represent. Furthermore, she notes that they often have the best interests of an industry in mind or the best interest of their personal business in mind, and not necessarily the best interest of the Society in mind.

Senator Lametti motions to amend, stating that alumni directors will be persons that were formally on the Board of Directors, either as an officer, member of the Legislative Council or a member at large, but are no longer enrolled as an undergraduate student in the university for the duration of their term in office. This amendment is econded by VP External.

Senator Lametti motivates.

Senator Lametti states that he is wishing to revert this section to closer reflect a similar idea in the previous working document, stating that there is that a fear where outgoing members of the Board,



may have the opportunity to immediately reenter the Board of Directors. He notes that while this would help for continuity, he does not think it is in the best interest for some sort of distance.

Jamal states that in his capacity as Governing Documents Researcher, he believes that the amendment is a good idea.

Debate on the amendment:

The President states that they were discussing this specific clause in CGRC, and notes that it is a double-edged sword. One on one side, there is the possibility of a revolving door issue for executives and people currently on the board. On the other hand, he notes that it offers continuity in terms of institutional knowledge and information that these specific officers and/or Directors have had while they're on the committee.

[Social Work Representative Shaun Watson arrives at 18:56.]

Councillor Chase states his concern on if there's a director or a former director who will then be enrolled at McGill to be a Law student or a Medicine student.

Senator Lametti states that it is possible that that might be the case, as well as potentially enrolling as a graduate student. He notes that in the case of Medicine and Law, they would be members of SSMU, and would be able to apply as Members at large.

VP External is concerned on the basis of the current composition to the ability to make quorum, and inquires if the CGRC has considered techniques of ensuring attendance.

Councillor Bhutkar echoes the sentiments of the VP External, stating that last semester, it was very hard to reach quorum for the Board of Directors, given that a lot of the members had graduated and no longer were interested in being part of the Board. As such, he would caution against adding so many people who are not around campus as often.

VP Internal states that if you look at attendance records of the Board meetings over the semester, the individuals that did not show up were members who had graduated. She states that it is difficult to generate loyalty if they are not on campus all the time. Jamal states that he does not think they should conflate the ability of now graduated students to attend meetings with the Board, with those who specifically applied for an alumni seat. Furthermore, alumni acknowledge that they're no longer part of the McGill community, as well as acknowledging an obligation to attend meetings. Furthermore, he notes that the Board of Directors, has a mechanism should they deem necessary to ensure that its composition remains in such a way that can continue to meet in a regular fashion in the way that it needs to.



VP University Affairs does not think that they should be changing the governing body structure to incentivize people to attend. Furthermore, she thinks that if they apply, they should attend and they should want to attend. She does however recognize the danger of having the revolving-door effect, and agrees with Senator Lametti that there are other avenues for people who are graduate students who are in other ways eligible to become members at large to apply for those if they are still here. Furthermore, VP University Affairs believes that having people wait a year is worth the lack of one year institutional knowledge and in such, more reliability is gained, as well as a lack of the revolving door effect.

Councillor Fakih states that there are two sections in the report that clarify this change the Constitution, and asks if the amendment will also affect it. Governing Documents Researcher Jamal states that he does not believe it should, given that the composition changes that happen on pages four and five are separate and distinct from the composition changes that happen on pages eight and nine.

Voting on the amendment – PASSES.

Debate on the main motion:

VP Finance motions to strike item F, seconded by VP University Affairs.

VP Finance states that in the current Constitution, the General Manager is already an ex-officio and non-voting member of the Board. He notes that to give them a vote on the Board creates a power dynamic between the General Manager and the rest of the permanent staff. He states that it would allow the General Manager to override HR staff, and states that there is a reason that the General Manager doesn't currently have a vote on the Board. Furthermore, he states that voting rights are not required to give information and impact the decision-making of the Board to be able to provide that input and insight.

The President asks the Governing Documents Researcher that if the section was struck, would the GM remain as a non-voting member. Governing Documents Researcher Jamal states that yes, as it is in the Constitution.

Councillor Merali echoes the sentiments of the VP University Affairs, stating that as mentioned of the division of duties of the Executive Director on SSMU and its translation, if the amendment was to be struck down, the executive director would essentially have two votes on the Board of Directors.

Senator Lametti motions to amend the amendment, by increasing the number of members at large by one, seconded by VP Student Life.

Senator Lametti states that if item F passes, he would like to maintain an odd number of people on the Board.



Debate on the amendment to the amendment:

VP External questions the democratization behind the nomination of members of Directors, given the Nominating Committee structure. He states that he would look more favourably on perhaps increasing the number of professional Directors instead.

Senator Lametti states that he does not see how it would change the composition significantly to add a member at large. Furthermore, he states that he does not think it's necessary to make sure that members are all elected members of SSMU.

The President inquires if it would make more sense just to have the General Manager be the tie breaker in the case that the Board is split on their vote, considering they have the most operational knowledge of ongoing business off the Society.

Councillor Bhutkar believes that having the General Manager as a voting seat brings up a different power dynamic. Councillor Bhutkar believes that the idea of adding another member-at-large, and striking the General Manager from a voting seat makes more sense.

Councillor Mackie moves to call the question, seconded by Councillor Fakih - PASSES.

Voting on the amendment to the amendment – PASSES.

In favour: 29
Opposed: 0
Abstaining: 2

The amendment to the amendment is adopted.

Debate on the amendment:

VP Finance moves to call the question, seconded by Councillor Rhamey – PASSES.

Voting on the amendment – PASSES.

Opposed: 3
Abstaining: 1

Debate on the main motion:

VP University Affairs motions to strike articles F and G, seconded by VP External.



The Speaker clarifies that article F will not be considered, as it was voted down prior.

VP University Affairs motivates.

VP University Affairs believes that it is dangerous to have professional Directors on the Board of Directors of a student association. She notes that while it may be beneficial to have professional consultation, she does not think it's relevant to have professionals attend every single meeting, and more so, allow them to have full voting rights.

Senator Lametti disagrees with the VP University Affairs' statement. He notes that there are many other student societies who have external directors. Secondly, he notes that the balance between student members and professional members would be significantly tilted in favor of students. He states that if they were members of the Board, they would be privy to confidential business and they would be able to take part in those decisions. As well, he states that they would acquire a lot of knowledge about how the Society functions.

Councillor Dixon states that speaking on the PGSS Board of Directors, there are professional external members of the Board, and notes that their input was crucial to much of the affairs relating to the business affairs.

[Arrival of Councillor Morgan at 19:19.]

VP University Affairs states that when you have people with expertise in these issues, it's very helpful, but that's also a position of power that they have over students and obtain knowledge over these issues that the students may not have.

Councillor Chase believes that one issue that will be generated is that many McGill students are not from Quebec and there's a good chance that when they graduate and apply as alumni Directors, they won't be living in Montreal and be able to easily access meetings. Furthermore, he supports professional seats on Board, given that due to legal liabilities, the Board obviously has to do consultation with lawyers, and this would allow the SSMU to consult without racking up legal fees, as well as doing it internally within the society.

VP Internal states that there are not enough people applying to fill the current seats of Board of Directors, and believes that having more specifications such as insisting that one, they are an alumni director. Second, she notes that they have professional experience, might further limit that pool and just make it harder for SSMU to get Directors. She agrees with Senator Lametti in the fact that there is a difference between being able to consult professionals on what we're discussing at Board and having them in confidential meetings because there is little business conducted in public session.

Jamal states that he is opposed to the amendment. He states that the rationale for having a professional Directors was because it is unreasonable to expect that students know how to handle



complex legal matters, operational matters, financial matters, building matters that the Board of Directors tend to deal with it on a regular basis. Furthermore, in building institutional capacity, it's important for those two professional Directors to be able to be there so they can share their knowledge with other Directors.

VP Finance states that he does not think the discussion should be framed in the context of how much it costs for outside counsel. He states that even with professional Directors, the Society's need for outside counsel most likely wouldn't change that much. Similarly, he notes that professionals on the Board could not provide impartial counsel, and have conflicts by definition.

Councillor Chan is opposed to the amendment. He states that even if professional Directors cannot provide formal legal counsel, someone who's familiar with the whole realm of expertise would benefit the decisions of the Board, and as such, will be voting against the amendment.

Councillor Mackie states that it would be helpful to have the presence of professionals at Board, but is not sure if they should be voting or not.

VP External states that professionals could not offer valid legal opinions if they are on the Board. As well, he notes that combining the seats of alumni and professional Directors would be valuable.

VP University Affairs motions to remove the strike-through but add non-voting to professional Directors, seconded by Councillor Kaye.

Senator Lametti states that professional Directors should be voting, as it may be difficult to recruit otherwise. He states that it would show that the Board truly values their expertise.

VP External states that although in theory it makes sense to separate the seats of alumni and professional Directors, within the Montreal and McGill context, there are alumni Directors who are professionals who have heavy involvement with SSMU and who would be desirable to have on the Board.

Jamal speaks in opposition to the amendment. He states that the concern with having non-voting professional Directors has been elaborated by Senator Lametti. Furthermore, while it's important to note that these individuals do bring a considerable amount of expertise and there is a concern that it could sway the Board of Directors, the Board of Directors is not a representative body. More so, Individuals that can help Directors ought to have the right to vote in order to help facilitate that kind of environment.

VP University Affairs thinks the idea of voting professionals is scary to her. She states that she is either open to removing all of them, making them non-voting or reducing the number to one. VP University Affairs also cites her concern with a power dynamic.



Councillor Chase disagrees on the basis that if there are two professional Directors, there could be many instances in which they have a disagreement, and that it would be able to provide the students with alternatives.

Voting period on amendment to section G – FAILS.

In favour: 4

Opposed: 10

Abstaining: 15

Debate on the main motion:

The President states that there have been numerous consultations done by both the Governing Documents Researcher, as well as several members of CGRC with specific constituencies to be able to get this report to where it is today. The President indicates his content with the report. Furthermore, he also appreciates all of the robust debate that's been going on, that he has generally been in favour of.

VP University Affairs motions to lay the report on the table, seconded by Councillor Merali – PASSES.

In favour: 29

Councillor Fakih moves the amendment that was sent. The Speaker reads out the amendment. The amendment is seconded by Councillor Morgan.

Councillor Fakih motivates. He explains that he has changed four items. He notes that he has reduced the amount of Directors for each of the two categories to one. As well, he has added criteria for the professional director, stating that they need to be McGill university undergraduate alumni. To compensate for that, they would increase the members at large from four to six individuals.

Council Bhutkar speaks in opposition to the amendment, as they do not believe that the correct answer to removing individuals with professional knowledge to contribute is just adding more members at large. Furthermore, it doesn't solve the challenge, the underlying mission of CGRC for this report of retention and maintenance of institutional professional knowledge on the Board of Directors. Additionally, to propose lowering the numbers disregards the two years of consultation and discussion that has happened around these issues.

Senator Lametti restates his opposition to the fact that professional Directors should be alumni of McGill. Furthermore, he states that they are being recruited for professional experience, not for the knowledge of McGill or this Society. He notes that there are alumni Directors who are being selected for that knowledge. As well, he states that having two members is beneficial, as if one happens to be absent, you would still be able to have the other at a meeting. As well, when there are two, there is a



possibility for dyskinetic opinions, which would just make the decision making capacity of the Board better. He fears that if there is one, too much weight may be given to that opinion. If there are two concurring opinions and means something, if there are two, descending opinions also means something.

VP External states that some of the opinions were fairly split with the number of external directors. He echoes the sentiments that having the professional as alumni doesn't necessarily add much, and according to Senator Lametti, actually remove some ability to recruit professionals.

Voting on the amendment – PASSES.

In favour: 16

Opposed: 6

Abstaining: 5

[Recess begins at 20:20.]

[Recess ends at 20:30.]

Debate on the main motion:

Councillor Chase motions to amend, to retain the extra two student members, but have two alumni Directors and two professional Directors, seconded by Councillor Fakih.

The motion is struck out of order by the Speaker.

Debate on the main motion:

VP External motivates to strike G, seconded by VP Internal.

VP Internal states that she does not think that just being a McGill university undergrad alumnus gives an individual a significant amount of info about the context more than being the alumnus of any other university would, and especially considering the fact that, say if they are from Montreal, then you have many other universities that have their own governance structures that have their own histories and have context that might add some variety to the discussion going on at Board and just provide some different insights.

Voting on the amendment:

In favour: 15

Opposed: 6

Abstaining: 10



The President motions to change clause E from six members to five, seconded by Councillor Fakhri.

Debate on the amendment:

Voting on the amendment – FAILS.

In favour: 9

Opposed: 7

Abstaining: 9

Debate on the main motion:

The President motions to amend to seven members, seconded by Councillor Daryanani.

Councillor Morgan asks to summarize how many members will be on Board.

Governing Documents Researcher Jamal states that the composition of the Board of Directors would be 11 voting Directors, the President, VP finance, VP Student Life, and one additional individual from Legislative Council and five members who are not officers or Councillors, the members at large, one alumni director and one professional director.

Debate on the main motion:

VP Internal asks if there is a reason that the International Representative seat was taken out of the Board of Directors.

Jamal states that the international representative seat is still on the Board of Directors.

Voting Period:

Vote on the Report - Comprehensive Governance Review Committee – PASSES.

In favour: 25

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 7

Senator Lametti motions to suspend the rules to go to question period, and then resume with the regular order of business, seconded by Councillor Mackie - PASSES.

In favour: 27

Opposed: 1



8. Question Period

- a. Submission of Question (1): Medicine Representative Dixon
- b. Submission of Question (2): Medicine Representative Dixon

The Speaker reads out the questions submitted by Councillor Dixon.

Question 1: What formal accountability structures exist for the Daycare, if it's not overseen by SSMU Legislative Council (like other SSMU services)?

Question 2: Are there parental positions on the Board?

VP Student Life states that the Daycare Board of Directors deals with legal, financial, and HR matters only. He notes that it's similar to the Board of Directors for the SSMU and that it's the highest governing body of the corporation. He notes that the daycare's also not considered a service, but rather, a separate corporation entirely. VP Student Life states that the Daycare Board's composition has been in the current form since its inception in 1999 and they recently renewed their permit. He states that they conduct annual audits and provide documents and proof in order to continue to receive subsidies. As well, Daycare's have regular inspections and they had their most recent inspection last week, which was passed with no issues. They are planning to consider a perinatal seat on the Daycare Board, but notes that it would consist of a change to our membership, which is currently undergraduate students and would entail a change in our Internal Regulations. He notes that this could negatively affect their subsidies, which would be a detriment to members. He states that there are a variety of ways parents can engage with the Daycare, including the parents committee. He states that the parents committee is consulted on many aspects of the Daycare, including educational programming, acquisition and use as educational materials, furniture, equipment, the location, and events and activities as well as services offered.

Councillor Daryanani inquires on who was responsible for the manner in which the decision was made to escort the Day Care Director out.

VP Student Life said it was the HR Manager and the Building Director.

Michael Mackenzie, Secretary of the Parents Council inquires about the events that transpired.

The Speaker suggests a motion to go into a confidential session.

Councillor Chan motions to enter confidential session, seconded by Councillor Bhutkar – PASSES.

[Enter into Confidential session, time unknown.]

[Return from Confidential session, time unknown.]



The Speaker speaks to the individual from the gallery, Michael Mackenzie.

The Speaker states that as the day in regards to the question posed, as the Daycare is a separate entity of SSMU and Legislative Council does not have the prerogative to discuss issues pertaining to the daycare, Legislative Council recommends that all subsequent follow up-questions or inquiries are directed to the Board of the Daycare.

The President moves to lay question period on the table and return back to the White Paper for CGRC, seconded by Councillor Das – PASSES.

Question Period:

Member of the Gallery Asa Kohn asks Senator Lametti what his question is.

Senator Lametti indicates he moved back to Question Period as leaving something on the table is bad practice.

9. Generative Discussion on Officers and Elections 2020-02-13

[The Speaker notes the permanent departures of Councillor Morgan at 21:17, VP Student Life, Councillor Marcoux at 21:18, Councillor Sbayte and Councillor Franceschini.]

Councillor Kersh motions to suspend the rules to move Item 14c to immediately follow. This is ruled out of order by the Speaker.

[The Speaker notes the permanent departure of Proxy for Councillor Eisner at 21:19.]

Voting Period:

Vote on to lay question period on the table period – PASSED.

Return to Generative Discussion on the White Paper.

Governing Documents Researcher Jamal presents. He states that the prevailing feeling was that members of the CGRC required consultation with the Legislative Council concerning options of the Executives. He states that within the White Paper, there are three options presented that came forward as a result of public consultations. Jamal summarizes the three options. He states that option one is to maintain the status quo, where there are six or seven individually elected officers. Option two would be to move to a model that's employed by the Concordia Student Union, the CSU, which is a full elected slate. He explains that slates of six or seven officers would run together and would then be voted on collectively as a slate. Lastly, option three is a hybrid system, more in line with what's used at the University of Western Ontario, where there is an elected President and Vice President, and then



four or five appointed associate Vice Presidents that are interviewed and then approved by Legislative Council.

Question Period:

Councillor Mackie inquires on the third system, and how the pool of appointed associate Vice Presidents are appointed.

Jamal states that the elected President and Vice President would nominate their preferred candidates to fill the AVP, the associate Vice President slots, and those people would then come before Legislative Council to be questioned and then approved. He notes that it does not bar the option of having a fully open application process.

Councillor Das believes that the last two options are problematic, as they might not grant a diverse range of backgrounds, and asks if there is any plan to control that.

Jamal states that that has been a recurring theme, and acknowledges that concern. Instead, he points to the importance of Legislative Council, to serve as a representative body to represent constituencies, noting the furthermore addition of Indigenous Affairs Commissioner, Equity Commissioner and Francophone Affairs Commissioner to Legislative Council.

Councillor Chan states that he does not see an issue with the status quo. Furthermore, he notes concern with second and third options, particularly with the second one that it would lead to increased partisanship in student government. With the third one, he notes his concern that the system could be nepotistic, with the President and Vice President just choosing they're friends, which he notes would not foster diversity of opinion.

Jamal states that those concerns are acknowledged in the report. He states that in the case of the third option, if the first option for the candidate is not approved by Council, they would have to go back and pick another person, with the Legislative Council serving as a check. Similarly, Jamal states that with option two, it would serve to create stronger group unity, potentially becoming better at implementing the vision and mandate put forward by them. Jamal agrees with both Councillor Chan and VP External. He states that both model two and three have issues in terms of limiting the capacity and the ability of individual officers to carry out mandates and to manage and implement new programs or initiatives they might be passionate about. To touch on Councillor Chan's point. Although things may not be broken, he believes they can be improved.

VP University Affairs indicates her concern for option three, as it institutes a power dynamic amongst the Executive Committee whereby the President and Vice President have selected the other members. Jamal agrees with VP University Affairs, and notes that at UWO, they can conduct cabinet shuffles at their choosing, but notes that CGRC would never endorse such a structure. That being said, he



recognizes the emotional strain that being an executive places on an individual, and recognizes that options two and three grant the opportunity of greater cohesion.

Councillor Kaye asks if the Executives are also full-time at UWO and CSU. Jamal indicates that they are.

Member of the Gallery, Alex Karasick, believes that options one and two both make sense. However, he brings up the concern of cabinet positions not being filled.

Jamal states that there is that potential. That being said, he believes the hybrid system offers an opportunity of greater flexibility in how many officer positions are offered, and makes an avenue for greater and more fair distribution of workload.

Councillor Fakhri asks that for elected slates, if people still have the option of fronting by themselves or just restricted to slates. Jamal states that it would be a slate-only policy.

Councillor Das asks if there is any way for students to get involved in a survey or consultation.

Jamal states that the student body at large is welcome to come to CGRC, and he continues to offer public consultations. He notes that when he offered a week and a half of public consultation, only three people came. He states that a survey would make it difficult. Instead, he encourages them to share these options with their constituents.

Councillor Chase believes that option three would mitigate the occurrences of uncontested positions, citing the success of the AUS and their VP Services. He states that an application process is a lot more accessible and welcoming, than running a campaign. Jamal indicates his shared sentiments.

VP Internal asks if there was consideration given in for option two on a free agent sort of situation where if there is a slate of five executives who are all filling five positions, but there is a sixth that the slate does not have someone running for is could.

Governing Document Researcher Jamal indicates that is what happens at CSU.

Councillor Mackie states that coming from the Faculty of Law, while there have been a lot of people interested in SSMU, a slate from being in Law would be very difficult. As such, she believes that it would discourage people in Law from running. She states that for the hybrid system, she does not support it as she does not actually believe it would promote high group cohesion. As well, she does not think there should be a low bar of entry because they are paid positions and they do a lot for the students. While she understands that individuals don't want to go under the scrutiny of running and being in the public eye like that, she states that that is a large part of the position.



Husayn Jamal thanks her for her participation. He states that for specific positions, such as VP Finance and VP Student Life, that they require a high degree of technical knowledge, needing to be good implementers, rather than necessarily good politicians.

[Departure of Councillor Dixon at 21:46.]

Member of the Gallery, Alex Karasick, discusses option 2. He states that if there are slates, the slates can run in addition to individual candidates as well. The individual candidates could run in competition with a slate for the same position, and they don't necessarily have to be a full slate, according to the CSU.

Senator Lametti states that many of the decisions of the Executives are political in nature. As such, it is important for them to have democratic legitimacy, and states that a slate may not offer that.

Governing Documents Researcher Jamal asks to conduct a straw poll, seconded by Councillor Merali.

Option 1: 10

Option 2: 1

Option 3: 3

VP External indicates his disagreement with changing the model. He states that it is difficult to remove or otherwise discipline officers who don't follow mandates or who commit acts of violence in cases of having an extra institutionalized popularity aspect, as well as the protection of other executives around oneself.

Councillor Fakih states their support in having slates composed of as many students as they want, which he states would be a good compromise as compared to having the entire executive body be from one group.

Member of the Gallery Alex Karasick states that there is no maximum or minimum for a slate, basing it off of his experience with the CSU.

Councillor Kersh motion to suspend the rules to move item 14c to immediately, seconded by Councillor Chan – PASSES.

VP Finance objects to the consideration of the question – FAILS.

10. Announcements

The Speaker introduces herself as Lauren Hill. She notes that she will be serving as Speaker for the rest of the year, and is excited to work with everyone.



The Speaker announces that there is one bathroom on the floor, a male-identifying bathroom. For the time they spend at McConnell 603 however, it will be a gender-neutral bathroom. She states that if anyone is more comfortable with single use stalls, to use the elevator to go down to the fourth floor. As well, she notes that the water fountain is all the way down the hallway to the left. She reminds Councillors that Legislative Council is live streamed, and as such reminds them that viewers will be able to see what is on their computer screens, and asks Councillors to refrain from interacting with the camera, and to maintain professionalism.

VP Finance announces that three positions of Vice-President (Finance), Vice-President (Internal), and President have been extended until Monday, February 17 at 5:00pm, and encourages everyone interested to reach out to the Executives if they have any questions.

VP External announces that SSMU and Milton Parc are throwing a joint community bash tomorrow for Valentine's Day. He notes that there will be food and inexpensive beverages, as well as live performances from both McGill bands and bands from the community. As well, he states that individuals can learn more about the community organizations near them so that they can get involved in the community right by their door.

VP University Affairs wishes everyone a happy Black History Month. She states that for this month, McGill has a lot of events, mostly organized by the Black Students Network. She states that more information is in her report. Secondly, she states that the Library Improvement Fund Committee proposal period for the winter semester is now open. She states that if anyone has any ideas or suggestions for things that can be funded in any of the libraries across campus, the form can be found and as a link on the University Affairs Facebook page.

The President announces that Drivesafe is now running, and that individuals can call them at (514) 398-8040. He also announces that the SSMU General Assembly is on Monday, February 24th, at 6:00 in the Ballroom. He encourages everyone to tell their constituents, and notes it is important to have democratic participation.

VP External announces that Provost Chris Manfredi, announced that Campus Life and Engagement is officially taking over Community Engagement and alternative spring break, and notes that an integration with the Montreal community is back at McGill.

VP Internal encourages everyone to staff faculty Olympics. She also wishes everyone a happy Valentine's Day.

Councillor Chase announces that AUS elections are next week, from the 17th to 19th. He notes that all Faculty of Arts students are able to vote at ssmu.simplyvoting.com.

Councillor Daryanani motions to extend by fifteen seconds, seconded by VP Finance – PASSES.



VP External discusses the ongoing situation between the RCMP and the Wet'su'we'ten. He encourages everyone to get involved in some action as part of the movement to shut down Canada, such as various economic pressures and other infrastructural disturbances.

11. Recess, Consent Items

[Recess for consent vote begins at 23:26.]

[Recess for consent vote ends at 23:31.]

The Speaker announces that both the Motion Regarding Amendments to the Internal Regulations of Elections and Referenda passed unanimously, as well as the Motion Regarding Adoption of the SSMU Francisation Plan. She announces that the remaining three did not pass unanimously.

[Departure of Councillor Kersh at 23:34.]

The Speaker notes that if any individual wishes to leave, the Council will lose quorum and forced to adjourn.

12. Business Arising

- a. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Internal Regulations of Elections and Referenda 2020-01-30 --**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**
- b. Motion Regarding Adoption of the SSMU Francisation Plan 2020-01-30
--**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**
- c. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Committee Terms of Reference 2020-01-30
--**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

VP External speaks in support of the motion, and states the Health and Dental plan pays out of its surpluses for mental infrastructure, most notably Empower Me, and as such, believes that the Mental Health Commissioner should have a say on the committee.

VP Finance motions to adopt the motion by unanimous consent, seconded by Senator Lametti – PASSES.

The motion is unanimously approved.



13. New Business

- a. Notice of Motion Regarding the Creation of a Services Committee 2020-02-13 --FOR APPROVAL

Councillor Merali motivates.

Councillor Merali states that he has consulted with VP Student Life, and has formalized a committee where all the services could meet, talk about shared issues, talk about goals, and working together on projects.

- b. Notice of Motion Regarding Affordable Student Housing Plan 2020-02-13 --FOR APPROVAL

VP External motivates.

He notes that this is a properly-defined plan involving capacity building over the next five years. He notes that they started with a committee, but notes that SSMU has been working with them since 2014. He notes that the motion formalizes the goals of the Society concerning affordable student housing. He notes that the motion features an extensive consultation process, the project, opportunities for construction of affordable housing, campaigns around affordable housing, et cetera.

- c. Motion Amending the 'Policy On McGill Fees Until Fossil Fuel Divestment' 2020-02-13 --**NOT APPROVED**

Councillor Kersh motivates.

Councillor Kersh states that the motion put forth does not position Athletics in the stance that it is against divestment, as they 100% support divestment. He yields his time to member of the gallery, Chloe Parsons.

Parsons details her involvement with McGill Athletics, as well as the Student Athletics Council, and the McGill Athletics and Recreation Advisory board.

Councillor Das motions to extend time by five minutes, seconded by Councillor Kaye – PASSES.

Chloe Parsons states that athletics is most self-funded, funds coming from student fees, money acquired through the services offered to McGill services, and the ancillary fee. She states that the fee is used to improve athletic facilities. She states that although the moratorium sends a message to McGill, it has broader consequences on entities such as McGill Athletics. She states that McGill Mental Health Services sends roughly one ambulance every day because they are engaging in self harm or



experiencing suicidal thoughts, correlating it to the proof that physical activity improves mental health. She states that it no longer benefits the McGill community, but the larger Montreal community, through programs such as the FAM programs, as well as intramurals. Similarly, she notes the significance renovations would have to people partaking in exams. She states that ventilation issues are not something donors are willing to take on, due to the high price tag.

Councillor Chan motions to extend speaking time by three minutes, seconded by Councillor Kaye – PASSES.

She states that there, there seems to be a misconception that McGill Athletics is separate from the rest of McGill, but in fact, it serves the whole McGill community and we serve all of Montreal.

VP External motions to enter recess, seconded by Councillor Daryanani – PASSES.

[Recess begins at 22:09.]

[Recess ends at 22:19.]

[Departure of Councillor Dandamudi at 22:19.]

Question Period:

Senator Lametti inquires on why the concerns were not brought up when the moratorium was first discussed at Council, and asks for what the state of the discussion was then and what has changed since then.

Councillor Kersh states that the Athletics Fee followed the moratorium, and was immediately shut down. He notes that he abstained from it due to the impact that the moratorium would have on athletics.

Member of the Gallery, Alex Karasick, states that in the resolution for approval it says that the SSMU Legislative Council amend the policy of moratorium on legal fees until fossil field divestment to exempt all McGill fees relating to McGill Athletics and Recreation. He asks if this has the risk of not only letting the Athletics fee approved, but allow for future changes or new fees.

Chloe Parsons states that this motion is only to address the ancillary fee of the facilities.

Councillor Rhamey asks that if they were to approve this motion, if SSMU would then have to submit a second motion to add the fee question to the referendum to be approved.

Councillor Kersh states that it would not be automatically implemented, and the fee would have to be brought back.



VP External asks if the mover of the second or the motion would be amenable to editing the body text to bring it in line with the amendment as proposed. Councillor Kersh indicates that he is.

Councillor Chase asks if this would require a notice as it is a change to policy, as he states that the only item that needs a notice of motion are amendments to internal regulations.

The Speaker states that policies and plans also require a notice of motion, through multiple readings.

VP Finance asks why it is on the agenda for steering for tonight.

[Recess at 22:26]

[Return from recess at 22:29]

The Speaker states that in regards to the question asked, while new policies and plans do require a notice of motion, considering that this is not a new policy in itself, it will be recognized in this Legislative Council and it will be allowed to be debated upon.

Debate:

Member of the Gallery, Chanel Perrault, Divest McGill, states that she believes that Divest McGill is not in opposition to working with other groups on campus, and furthermore, does not wish to alienate Athletics.

VP External motions to extend speaking time indefinitely, seconded by Councillor Kersh – PASSES.

Perrault believes it is essential that the integrity of this moratorium is upheld. She states that she thinks that the Board of Governors is really close and even if they are not, there is a necessity to keep up pressure in any way possible. She hopes that McGill Athletics and Recreation would be amenable to working with Divest, towards directing collective anger and collective needs against the Board of Governors and not against each other. Perrault expresses her desire to put forth an amendment, that would ask McGill Athletics and Recreation to fully support divestment and in seeking to support this initiative, undertake a plan to present to the Board of Governors, either in person or in writing, to endorse divestment before them.

The Speaker indicates that such an amendment must be submitted from a Councillor in writing.

VP Finance discusses self-funded units and how McGill uses them to defer its responsibilities and pass the cost onto the students. He states that McGill could offer funds if they wanted to.

VP University Affairs alerts Council to how much the Principal makes, and criticizes self-funded units.

VP University Affairs states it is McGill's job to realize that they have the ability to change the situation.



Councillor Daryanani echoes the sentiment of VP University Affairs. He states that the idea behind the moratorium was that it will stay until McGill makes a difference. He notes that McGill did not make a difference. He notes that his opposition is not indicating the Athletics don't need the motion, but rather, that they should continue the moratorium because it had the purpose of divestment. He notes that many people on campus are demanding it, and as such, that they should listen to their constituents and fight for divestment.

Councillor Rhamey states that coming from the School of Environment, their perspective states that they cannot stand by the motion, because of the spirit of the motion, which they see as actively working against divestment. Councillor Rhamey states that the moratorium should stand and then a separate motion should be drafted with potentially better consultations with various stakeholders on campus, notably Divest McGill or CJAM.

Councillor Kersh apologizes for not having consultations. He notes that once he realized it was wrong, he reached out to Campaigns SSMU and Divest McGill to apologize. He also notes that he met with Chantel prior to the meeting. He notes that Athletics believe that special treatment, because of the role Athletics facilities play for the greater Montreal community. He understands that McGill has the money, but they need students' help. He references children with special needs, improving mental health, for reasons to support the motion.

Councillor Chase motions to amend, seconded by Councillor Kersh.

Councillor Chase presents the amendments.

Debate:

VP External states that the amendments do not respond to what was asked of the Councillors. He states that there are still statements about the moratorium strategy failing to provide enough pressure. He reminds Council that the moratorium is part of a longer-term strategy and that like a single fee blocked won't force McGill to divest, and as such, believes the changes should be more ambitious.

VP Finance reminds Council that self-funded units are not separate from McGill, providing the example of SSMU and Midnight Kitchen to detail.

VP Internal states that there is a large fee coming next Council, regarding the McGill Library Fiat Lux fee. VP Internal states that the Fiat Lux plan is central to their master plan, and notes that a failure to pass such a motion would be significant for McGill.

Councillor Chase cautions Councillors from always repeating the mantra of "McGill should do this, this isn't our problem". He states that in reality, it is in front of us. He states that McGill has said that they would only grant funding if approved through a student fee. Furthermore, Councillor Chase states that



he isn't sure if they will be able to get public pressure, noting the lack of it for this fee originally. He notes that the fee has not been in place for almost a year now, and if they don't act by next meeting to get the fee through, they will have to wait another semester until next semester in order to get the fee done.

Senator Lametti states that he has been on the Council since 2017. He notes that he has consistently held the view that the way McGill treats ancillary fees is wrong. Furthermore, he also states that he believes that the moratorium and this sort of discussion is also wrong because it's establishing a sort of quid pro quo in which if McGill does what SSMU wants, SSMU will then support an increase in ancillary fees. Senator Lametti repeats his opposition to the idea of using acceptance of ancillary fees as a negotiation tactic. He states that he does not see the point of the motion. He notes that he feels the frustrations of the VP Finance. Similarly, he also thinks that it is unacceptable that there are safety issues in the McGill athletics facilities, and they would decide not to palliate them if the students were not to pay. He states that it is McGill's legal responsibility to do so, and as such, they should pressure them as much as possible to do that, including using legal measures if necessary.

The President motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Fakhri – PASSES.

Voting on the amendment – PASSES.

In favour: 14

Opposed: 4

Abstaining: 3

VP External motions to amend by striking, seconded by Councillor Chase.

[Departure of Councillor Watson at 22:56.]

VP External notes that the amendment was based on two factors. Firstly, he believes that the motion provides a shortsighted view that a single fee voted down would not allow SSMU to continue using pressure tactics. Secondly, no consultation was conducted with Divest. McGill. VP External states that it is almost an insult to even be voting on something that has the clauses in them, when it's being put forward by people who weren't in the campaign who were making statements about the strategy of divestment without ever talking about it.

Debate:

Councillor Chase states that there's nothing wrong with these amendments, and that they're not actionable.

VP External reiterates the fact that the motion was done entirely without consultation of constituencies that are affected. He is aware that Councillor Kersch has apologized, and he



appreciates it, but notes that there is a more general pattern of not consulting, and reminds Councillors to do so. Councillor Kersh really apologized about it, and again, that's very appreciated. He notes that it was reminded at Council Retreat.

Councillor Kersh states that he could not attend retreat as he had a mandatory away trip for McGill Baseball. He states that at the meeting where the moratorium was put into place, that the SSMU President seconded the motion for the Athletics fee and did not conduct a single consultation. He notes that nobody reached out to him personally, and he was upset and frustrated.

Voting on the amendment – PASSES.

VP External yields his time to the member of the gallery.

Chanel asks Councillor Kersh if there is any way that they could get him to commit and that he is willing to at the very least, write a letter indicating his support of divestment and that he demands better from the University.

Councillor Kersh states that he does not have the power to do that, and cannot make the promise currently.

Councillor Kersh yields his time to member of the gallery, Chloe Parsons.

Chloe Parsons states that neither Councillor Kersh nor herself would have the carte blanche to do that. She states that there are higher bodies that would govern those decisions that would need to be brought to the SEC, and more probably to MERAB. She notes that it is something they can petition for, can ask for and that they can apply pressure for and can actually work with other students who sit on MERAB to apply that pressure. She concludes by indicating that they do not have the authority to be definitive at this time.

VP University Affairs states that they are entering into a debate where every fee that comes up, they will have to enter into a debate of deciding whether or not the unit is special. She states that she would make a similar argument for the library. Secondly, she states that the motion is mandating the VP University Affairs to inform members of the McGill University's administration of the disappointment of SSMU with the lack of divestment, and notes that she does that every day. She states that if someone had had a conversation with her, this unnecessary statement would not have been in the motion.

The President discusses the impact that the moratorium has had in negotiations with the University and role on CAMSR. He states that the moratorium has allowed the President to advocate more strongly for divestment. He states that while decarbonization is not exactly what the students wanted, he notes that seven years of campaigning for divestment have brought them here, and that they have never been so close to getting it, and that the moratorium has helped them get there. He states that



making an exception for one unit would open the flood gate to do that for others. He promises Councillor Kersh that when he and VP University Affairs meet with the Principal, they will bring up the fact that Athletic constituencies' facilities are not up to par. Furthermore, he states that they will attempt to get a commitment from her to make sure that the funding is committed. He states that the moratorium is so important, and to have even a tiny slip of pressure would diminish credibility, making it more difficult for them to get divestment. As such, he asks the Council to vote the motion down and they will work with Athletics and the other units that are adversely affected by the moratorium to get them the funding that they need, that this university refuses to.

Councillor Rhamey states that the school of Environment does not think the motion would be a good piece of good governance. He states that the motion is just too complex as it currently stands with a variety of interests, and that those interests have not properly come to terms with the other interests.

The Speaker notes the permanent departures of Councillor Rhamey and Councillor Wu at 23:10.

Councillor Das motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Chan – PASSES.

Voting Period:

Councillor Daryanani motions for a one minute recess, seconded by Councillor Fried – PASSES.

Voting on Motion Amending the 'Policy On McGill Fees Until Fossil Fuel Divestment' 2020-02-13 – FAILS

In favour: 4

Opposed: 15

Abstain: 3

Councillor Chan motions to postpone Motion Regarding Greater Integration Between Athletics and SSMU until the next meeting, seconded by Councillor Daryanani.

Councillor Chan motivates.

Councillor Chan indicates that he has a midterm tomorrow, and that this is his motion, and that it is not time sensitive, seconded by Councillor Das.

Debate:

Councillor Fakhri states that according to VP Finance, there are numerous fees going up for referendum, and does not wish to cram everything into the next Council.

Councillor Kersh states that he cannot make the next meeting, and as such, would ask Councillor Kersh to brief him or his proxy.



Senator Lametti states that it would be a better idea to move to consent items, see what passes, what doesn't, and then states that the SSMU would be in a better position to make decisions on how we want to structure our emotions.

Councillor Chan withdraws the motion.

Senator Lametti motions to suspend the rules to go to consent items immediately. The Speaker indicates that a suspension of the rules is not needed, and the Senator withdraws the motion.

- d. Motion Regarding Greater Integration Between Athletics and SSMU 2020-02-13
--**POSTPONED UNTIL MARCH 12 MEETING**

Senator Lametti moves to take Question Period from the table, seconded by VP External – PASSES.

The President motions to postpone until the March 12, 2020 meeting, seconded by Councillor Mackie

Debate on the motion to postpone:

VP External states that it is a straight-forward motion, and thinks that passing it would be beneficial for Athletics.

Senator Lametti thinks it is in the SSMU's best interest not to postpone, as it is a fairly straight forward motion and thinks that it can be disposed of in an quick manner.

SSMU President states that prior to the recess Councillor Chan indicated that he wanted to speak on the motion as he was one of the people who drafted it. In addition, the SSMU President feels that it's also important to have the Athletics Representative present to be able to voice their thoughts on this particular motion.

VP External states that he does not believe Athletics Representative will say anything other than the fact that they're supportive of the motion. VP External states that they should vote yes on this motion and not have to deal with it later when they will have new questions.

VP Finance moves the previous question, seconded by Councillor Fried – PASSES.

Motion to postpone until March 12 meeting – PASSES.

- e. Motion Regarding the Creation of an Affordable Student Housing Fee 2020-02-13
--**APPROVED**

VP External motivates.



VP External states that the plan for the first construction of an affordable student housing unit is laid out in the motion. VP External states that it involves financing from the city, from private partners, some social-economy groups, and a large loan from the Canadian Mortgage Housing Company. He notes that these groups only want to start funding a social economy project if there is a demonstration of social economy solidarity. He states that the group in question has to demonstrate their own financial commitment, with a first step of risk, so procuring land. VP External notes that they have estimated with UTILE that it would be about \$1.5 million, and so there is a \$6.53 fee, payable from the entire student body, times two semesters time five years. VP External states that the rents from the building will be upcycled into a fund that can be used to pay for the next housing units. He states that SSMU has had a longstanding relationship with UTILE since 2014, with them collecting data on SSMU membership in order to better understand the housing needs.

Question Period:

Councillor Das asks if it is possible that the fee can be opt-outable. VP External replies that there are a few problems with the opt-outable model. Firstly, he notes that it becomes more expensive or takes an indefinitely longer period of time because it is difficult to estimate how many individuals will opt out.

Debate:

Senator Lametti expresses disagreement with the strategy. Senator Lametti does not think SSMU should get involved, even though the landlord part will be taken care of by another company. Senator Lametti states that he does not believe in segregated housing. He also notes that he does not believe in housing this is tied to one status either. He states that he will be opposing the motion and voting no in the referendum if it does pass, but recognizes that there has been extensive working consultation done around it.

VP University Affairs states that she will be voting for this, as she believes the motion is a good idea, and that affordable student housing is a necessity. While the VP University Affairs agrees in principle that housing tied to a status can be precarious, she states that in this particular circumstance, it's been shown to be a demand of students. Furthermore, she thinks that this is a necessity for a lot of students on campus, and believes that the non-opt-outable nature is also integral. As such, she will be voting in favour.

The President expresses his support for this. He notes that in the last plebiscite, 77% of the student body voted in favour of moving forward with the possibility of affordable housing. He states that he is in full support of it and will be actively campaigning for it in the case that it passes.



Senator Lametti does not believe that it will put pressure on the McGill administration, and believes it will do the opposite, as it is another example of students taking on fees to undertake things that the University should be doing, like offering affordable housing to students.

Councillor Das asks how it will be decided who will be living in the apartments.

VP External states that it is outlined in the term sheet, which is not currently attached, but notes he will send it to everyone on email. He states that this is the framework, which will be reviewed by lawyers and then signed into a binding contract. He states that a large priority is on a socioeconomic status because housing is tied to precarity.

Councillor Das extends by three minutes, seconded by Councillor Fried – PASSES.

VP External continues. He states that the other consideration is a rent decrease for those who want to take part in the living learning community aspect. He explains that in the same way that residents have floor fellows, there would be people who would be leading the floor that is managing the physical spaces. He notes that those individuals would sit on the administrative committee.

Councillor Fried joins the President and the VP University Affairs in expressing support for the motion. He points out that this policy is very much in line with policies currently in place at Concordia University and Western University, and thinks that this initiative is needed.

VP External thanks Councillors Fried, Merali, and former Councillor Roy, as well as the members-at-large for their work.

Voting Period:

Voting on Motion Regarding the Creation of an Affordable Student Housing Fee -- PASSES

In favour: 10

Opposed: 4

Abstaining: 4

- f. Motion Regarding Condemning the Presence of Homophobic and Transphobic Blood Donation Policies on McGill Campus --**REFERRED TO AD HOC COMMITTEE**

The Speaker announces that someone will need to motivate in the absence of the Mover and Seconder.

Councillor Kaye motion for a two minute recess, seconded by VP Finance – PASSES

[Recess at 00:13]



[Recess ends at 0:15]

Councillor Daryanani motivates.

Councillor Daryanani states that the motion comes in reference to the blood drive that was held specifically yesterday. He explains that motion is for the Legislative Council to request the Executive Committee to release a statement condemning the homophobic and transphobic practices of Héma-Québec, as well as provide resources such as Queer McGill and SSMU Equity Commissioners for students negatively affected by discrimination on campus. He states that at AUS Legislative Council, sentiments were expressed condemning Héma-Québec as well as Health Canada's prohibition for homophobic and queer students who give blood.

Question Period:

Senator Lametti asks why the motion specifically targets Héma-Québec and Blood Services Canada when it is in fact Health Canada who makes the decisions on eligibility. Furthermore, he states that Héma-Québec and the Canadian Blood Services have been campaigning for about fifteen years to Health Canada to progressively decrease the periods for homosexual men especially.

Councillor Chase states that they had extensive debate. He states that part of the condemnation is that Héma-Québec misgenders, which was something frustrating to Councillors.

Debate:

Senator Lametti states that he does believe that there's a lot that's wrong with regulations concerning blood donations and much of the regulation does not follow current evidence. However, he thinks that this motion does not express that correctly. More so, he states that it is important that when someone is criticizing health decisions, to do it on an evidence-based approach, which he does not believe the motion does. However, he states that it is possible to extend this sort of criticism based on evidence, which is what should be done to make the argument stronger. Furthermore, he states that the motion should be postponed or committed, to find a better way of phrasing it and making sure it will stand the test of time. SSMU President provides a background on the history of SSMU with regards to its own Legislative Council regarding blood bans. He states that in the early 2000s, SSMU adopted a very similar motion, but made it more actionable in that it prohibited any blood donation activities from taking place in the University Centre as well as actively campaigning against it. He states that this could be another potential avenue.

Councillor Merali believes that the statement could be better worded to make it more actionable. As well, he notes that he would ask the mover and seconder to draft a statement together in tandem with various groups on campus.

Councillor Chase states that the past actions of SSMU were discussed, and it was indicated that they did not SSMU to pursue that path, to the extent that they desired within the statement, the message



for individuals to continue to donate blood, because of its vitality within the health system. Regarding consultations with Queer McGill and Union for Gender Empowerment, he states that there has been discussions of it.

Senator Lametti motions to refer it to the Steering Committee, seconded by Councillor Bhutkar.

Senator Lametti states that there are more groups that can be consulted, more evidence to provide, in order to adopt sensible policies.

VP External moves to amend the motion to instead refer it to an ad hoc working group, which would be composed of the VP External, VP Internal, and VP University Affairs. VP External states that consultation will occur within the group. This is seconded by VP Internal.

Debate on the amendment:

Councillor Chase states that the main goal of this motion is to get an email statement put out. He states that in theory, the Council can mandate the executives to put out a statement, and they can write it after doing consultations.

VP University Affairs indicates that's what would be done.

Senator Lametti states that passing the motion is not necessary. Instead, Council can refer to the ad hoc committee and the decision of the ad hoc committee can be to not bring the motion back and instead to release the statement that is revised that accomplishes the purpose of the motion..

Voting to refer the motion to an ad hoc committee of VP External, VP Internal, and VP University Affairs
- PASSES

[Recess begins at 00:30]

[Recess ends at 00:40]

14. Reports by Committees

a. Executive Committee

The President presents the report of the Executive Committee.

b. Equity Committee

The Equity Commissioner presents the report of the Equity Committee.

The Equity Commissioner states that the purpose of the new Equity Committee is to confront



historical and current inequities of McGill through active engagement and public education. She states that they work with the Equity Policy, as well as consult other policies as well, including the Accessibility Policy, with regards to membership. For recruitment of membership at large, she detailed that it began in September. She states that eight members at large joined the committee. She also notes that they did not receive a Councillor to sit on the committee but are still open to receiving one. She states that the previous other Equity Commissioner was unable to continue in her role in the Winter semester, and a new individual has been selected to take her place. She states that meetings occur weekly, and that the focus for the committee has been on popular education to increase awareness of equity concepts and increase awareness of inequity on campus too, with a focus on evaluating the Equity Policy. She states that due to the change in leadership, this latter aspect will be unable to be considered. She notes however, that the more thorough review should be done in the future, especially concerning the complaint process. For instance, the complaint process needs a lot more precision. She states that in the fall, they ran a fee campaign. to encourage students to vote yes to the proposal to increase the equity fee to a dollar as well as to change the status to make it non-opt outable. She states that while the increase did pass, the change of status did not.

VP University Affairs motions to extend by five minutes, seconded by VP Student Life – PASSES.

With regards to winter 2020, she states that the main project that they're going to work on is a photo campaign. She states that this will be done in collaboration with Community Narratives. She states that it will be to highlight voices and experiences of marginalized groups on campus as it means a popular education through storytelling. Lastly, they are working to plan an art show.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

SSMU President moves to take the CGRC report from the table, seconded by Councillor Fakhri – PASSES.

c. Funding Committee --**APPROVED**

VP Finance presents the report of the Funding Committee.

Question Period:

SSMU President asks if the consideration of voluntourism was considered when making decisions concerning funding. VP Finance indicates no.

Voting on the decisions of the funding committee, seconded by VP External – APPROVED.

d. Clubs Committee --**APPROVED**

Councillor Kaye presents the report of the Clubs Committee.

Question Period:



VP External asks for clarification on the constitution rejections, as to what it meant for changes were not tracked.

Councillor Kaye indicates that it means a new version was submitted without explaining what had been changed.

Voting on the approval of the report of the Clubs Committee, seconded by Councillor Merali – APPROVED.

15. Reports by Councillors

a. Councillor Bulhoes (Education)

Councillor Bulhoes presents the report.

Councillor Bulhoes discusses the actions of Education concerning Bill 21. She states that Education just had their elections, and has a new executive board.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

b. Councillor Marcoux (Engineering)

Councillor Fakih presents the report in Councillor Marcoux's absence.

Councillor Fakih states that EUS is looking to restructure its council format, possibly introducing more votes from executives and lowering the number of students from each department that sit on Council. Councillor Fakih also states that they had a tech fair, and held their General Assembly yesterday, which only lasted a few minutes.

Question Period:

VP External asks why their GA was so brief. Councillor Fakih states that it was due to high attendance, and there was no business on the agenda besides announcements.

c. Councillor Daryanani (Arts)

Councillor Daryanani presents the report. He states that he organized the AUS Graduate Professional Schools Fair in November and the Work Your BA series. As well, he notes the successful occurrence of a non-profit community services fair. He notes that he chairs three committees: community support, engagement committee, and AUS mental health.



Question Period:

There are no questions.

d. Councillor Merali (Services)

Councillor Merali presents the report.

Councillor Merali states that they have been in contact with various services about moving back into the building following the building opening. He notes that he has also been sitting on the Affordable Student Housing Committee, and it has been going well. He states that his main project is working on the set-up of the Services Committee.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

e. Councillor Mackie (Law)

Councillor Mackie presents the report.

Councillor Mackie announces the designation for degrees have changed to a JD. She states that Coffeehouse, the Law bar, continues to occur. She states that she also sits on FEDEC, in which she attended their conference a few weeks ago. She notes that they are reconsidering and reevaluating our relationship with the organization.

Question Period:

VP External asks if the re-consideration is to do with their conservative nature, or their lack of advocacy.

Councillor Mackie states that McGill pays a high fee to be a part of it, but does not really benefit of it. She notes that there is no constitution, no website, and is quite disorganized.

16. Executive Reports

a. President

The President presents the report.

Question Period:



VP Internal asks what is the top running name on the Varsity Men's Team Naming Committee. The President states that he cannot officially comment, but states that one would think that a name that would be so evident would be the front runner, but one might think otherwise.

VP Internal asks if there has been a recommendation to reduce the amount of times this committee meets, since it appears to meet biweekly?

The President indicates that the committee meets twice a week, due to their participation in the consultation process.

b. Vice-President (University Affairs)

VP University Affairs presents the report.

VP University Affairs announces that the term for the Dean of Libraries has been extended for two (2) years. As well, they are looking to establish a food insecurity committee project, and have hired a new Equity Commissioner.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

c. Vice-President (Internal)

VP Internal presents the report.

VP Internal announces that the venues for Fac-O are confirmed. She states that Fac-O is exciting as it is the first event of this kind to have the all-faculty IRP. Following Fac-O, is Grad Frosh. She states that they are seeing if Beach Club is still a viable option, but notes that it probably isn't. She also notes that they are looking on how to bring SNOap back. She states that they were finally able to convince key McGill individuals, but the meeting happened far too late in the year for various reasons to actually allow SNOap to occur.

VP External motions to extend by three minute extension, seconded by Councillor Mackie – PASSES.

VP Internal states that the First Year Council town-hall/free food event is coming soon. She states that they are looking at holding a First Year Prom. She states that she brought First Year Council executives to various meetings, to get them ingrained and allow them to learn how McGill governance works. She announces that CL&E has given them a seat on the Orientation Planning Group Committee.

For Sustainability, the Catalyst awards are coming up, which are self-nominated for student or faculty nominated awards, which touch upon various facets of sustainability and they can be given to



students, to faculty, to administration, or to anyone that works any at any level in SSMU. any of that's coming out in April.

VP Internal states that Sustainability Commissioners are currently working on an e-waste drive and education campaign, including a juul-pod recycling project, and the final step in the mug reuse projects.

VP Internal also states that she down with HR and worked at the pay scale. For McGill 24, she states that they are interested in ambassadors for the renovating Gert's project, and invites individuals interested to message her. She states that there was a bicentennial committee meeting yesterday.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

d. Vice-President (Finance)

VP Finance presents the report.

VP Finance states that there will be a first draft of the budget this month. He details that it will come to Council at the end of March. Similarly, in early April there will be a bank transition. For the Finance Committee, he states that they will be discussing the investment portfolio. He states that the new Finance Committee is running well, and that member-at-large applications are due tomorrow. As well, he notes that a new Clubs and Services Coordinator started this week. For funding, he notes that a couple of funds are still not getting utilized, including the Green Fund, Community Engagement Fund, and the First-Year fund. He states that this year fund utilization is really high, which is really cool. Food definition is not specific in the Internal Regulations, which means a lot of food-related expenses have to be denied, which is unfortunate.

Question Period:

VP External asks if the under-utilization of the Green Fund took into account the dispersal that was just approved for \$14,000.

VP Finance indicates that it does. He states that they are going to be looking at the Environment Committee spending more, taking on more employees and expanding their role, and as such, less in the funding department and more in the actual operational department.

e. Vice-President (Student Life)

VP University Affairs presents the report in the absence of VP Student Life.



Question Period:

There are no questions.

f. Vice-President (External)

VP External presents the report.

He states that they are working on reworking the representation blurb in the Constitution's preamble as part of governance reform. He also states that Divest held a rally today. There will be a series of events called Social Justice days. As well, the IRP is in full effect. He notes that the Quebec government has passed Loi 40, which is marketed to abolish school boards.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

17. Confidential Session

The Speaker announces that there are no further items for confidential session.

Councillor Chase congratulates the Speaker on a successful first Legislative Council.

18. Adjournment: **1:19am**

Councillor Wright motions to adjourn, seconded by Councillor Dandamudi - PASSES.

Legislative Council comes to adjournment at 1:19.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Buraga". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. Below the signature is a horizontal line.

Bryan Buraga, President