



SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PUBLIC MINUTES

April 2, 2020

The regular bi-weekly Legislative Council Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held by teleconference on Thursday, April 2, 2020, at 6:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order: **18:06**

The Speaker calls the Legislative Council to order at 18:06.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker presents the land acknowledgement.

3. Attendance

Councillors Kersh, Flaherty, Bulhoes, Eisner, Gurvey, Duckett, Watson are absent.

4. Approval of Minutes

- a. Legislative Council Public Minutes 2020-03-26 – **APPROVED**

Councillor Fried motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Councillor Chase - APPROVED.

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

Councillor Mackie motions to approve the agenda, seconded by Councillor Lametti - APPROVED.

6. Report of the Steering Committee

The Speaker presents the report of the Steering Committee.

Question Period:

Senator Garneau asks if separating the meeting into two has been considered, given the number of motions for discussion tonight.



The Speaker replies, indicating that it is not something that is practiced, given that the next meeting date of Legislative Council would then be during exam season. Regardless of the altered schedule due to classes moving online, she notes that they weren't wishing to put individuals in that situation. She notes that it has been historical precedent that regardless of the amount of items on the agenda, all agenda items are conducted and fulfilled as to not move anything forward. That being said, she notes the presence of a consent vote, highlighting that if any motions are deemed uncontentious to any individual, they can feel free to indicate so on the consent vote.

7. Guest Speakers

a. Anti-Violence Coordinators

Denisha Brennan, the SSMU Anti-Violence Coordinator, presents.

In terms of disclosures this year, Denisha states that they have received a total of 18 disclosures. Out of those, 11 were third-party disclosures, thus not investigated as per the GSVP. As well, she notes that they had 6 other disclosures, which resulted in bans, as well as one disclosure that was not followed up on due to a lack of response from the survivor.

Brennan notes that one investigation went to the GSVP Committee and the other investigations resulted in an informal resolution or unknown resolution.

In terms of initiatives, programs, and efforts, she states that training has been implemented for all SSMU employees, as well as training for 50% club membership regarding the process of the GSVP as well as information regarding gender-based and sexual violence. She notes that they also took part in a partnership with OSVRSE for events such as Our Bodies, Our Minds, which included tabling.

Regarding implementation and effectiveness of the policy, she states that the GSVP has been effective in finding a resolution, so that survivors are able to feel safe utilizing some new services and spaces. She also states that the GSVP is currently being revised by lawyers.

Question Period:

VP External states that in the Policy, it specifies an attempted process of trying to get people from SACCOMMS and other sexual violence experts to come and give regular trainings, and asks if it has been difficult to coordinate. Furthermore, he asks if most of the trainings are being done by the AVCs, or if there some success in getting other sexual violence groups on campus to administer GSVP training.

Denisha Brennan indicates that she had been doing all of the training in the past few months.



The President asks Denisha to explain what a full ban entails and the different types of measures that could be taken by or imposed by the AVCs in regards to complaints.

Denisha states that in terms of bans, it can either be a partial space ban or a full space ban. A partial space ban would ban people from SSMU services or certain clubs. If it is a full ban, the individual may not be allowed to participate in any SSMU events. In collaboration with the IRP, the full bands can potentially expand to faculty events as well.

Councillor Daryanani asks what would happen if the individual in question is part of a club or a service where the individual in charge and what would happen if a full ban was instated.

Denisha indicates that a full ban would remove them from their role. She highlights the bans can be applied to anybody in SSMU, and a ban would strip them of their position if they decide that a ban is necessary in that setting.

8. Question Period

Councillor Mackie asks if students are not currently eligible for the Canada Emergency Response Benefit and that most students are financially independent, yet jobless this summer because of COVID-19, if the SSMU is currently pressuring or planning on advocating to the provincial and federal governments for student financial aid?

VP External states that they received communication from the provincial government today on what individuals can expect. For the federal government, he states they have been partnering with their federal advocacy group to present these demands and to explore alternative solutions, but notes nothing concrete has come out of those discussions yet. He states that McGill recently announced that there will be a sizable pool of financial aid available for undergraduates, professionals, and graduate students. He states that students are encouraged to apply there first, and notes that they will try to keep Legislative Council and the membership updated as to the results of advocacy efforts.

Senator Lametti inquires about the future of francisation at McGill, given that the SSMU Francisation Plan was rejected through the referendum.

VP Finance states that in the process of creating next year's budget, he's been working with the Communications team to set aside a plan that will work given the resources that we have. He states that what isn't going to be feasible, is live whisper translation during Council. In terms of what is feasible, he states that it includes additional professional fees for translation, such as for governing documents.

Councillor Kaye motions for a seven minute extension, seconded by Councillor Fried – PASSES.



Councillor Kaye inquired towards the Speaker, Governance Manager, and the President regarding the event of the last Council, during which an anti-semetic trolling occurred. She notes that it was very concerning, and asks if they have any updates in regards to the investigation of the issue or how they can move forward to ensure a safe space for all of Council.

The Speaker notes that she has filed a report with Zoom directly in order to be granted access on participant information, in order to see if it is possible to find out their email address and their IP address, which she notes would help limit the number of possible individuals it could be.

The President notes that they had a discussion this week about it, but notes that their efforts have proven fruitless in terms of figuring out who exactly perpetuated the unfortunate incident. Instead, he states that they are now putting into place measures to ensure that it won't happen again, including making the Zoom sessions password protected, as well as creating a form for members desiring to take part in Legislative Council can put their McGill specific information down, indicating that if an event were to occur, they could be tracked down, as well as to limit the pool of people within the SSMU specific membership.

The Governance Manager states that together, in consultation with the Building Director, they are putting different steps together to ensure the safety of the members and Councillors, and apologizes for the event once again, and notes that they have worked hard this week to ensure nothing similar ever happens today or in the future.

Senator Lametti inquires what the place of the French language is at the SSMU.

VP Finance states that for next year, the SSMU will continue to work on making governing documents available in French, as he notes that they have to be translated in French, regardless of how the fee referendum went. VP Finance also states that money from the base fee for the upcoming budget has been used to provide Francophone Affairs Commissioner and the relevant committee.

VP External states that the translation of governing documents should be done regardless of Bill 101, in order to increase accessibility. He states that Francophone students have sought support from SSMU in two major areas, in the accessibility of SSMU itself, as well as advocating for French students at the university level, largely with regards to the submission of work in French.

Councillor Chase asks the VP External to explain anarchists that were brought up at a previous meeting.

VP External states that the SSMU has various mandates as part of the Policy and Plan Book, which requires SSMU to advocate for generally sociopolitical change.



In regards to external advocacy, VP External states that you generally have to work with the groups that are available in Montreal. VP External states that in Montreal, there is a huge, huge, huge number of people who espouse anti-racist and anticapitalistic critical theory, and notes that there is often huge overlap between the two groups. VP External states that the , work done with anarchist groups is always within the realm of partnership, working on third party issues and generally in coalition building. He notes that this is not to say that SSMU has a mandate to promote anarchy, because they do not.

Councillor Chase asks if working with anti-capitalist groups was included in the Book of Policies.

VP External states it is not. He states that coalition building is a really large tool at their disposal for furthering advocacy goals.

9. Recess, Consent Items

The Speaker announces no item was passed by consent vote, and as such, will be scrutinized under question period and debate at tonight's Legislative Council.

[Arrival of Councillor Kersh by teleconference at 18:48.]

10. Announcements

Councillor Dixon congratulates the new MSS Representative.

The President states that the SSMU office and associated spaces will be closed at least until May 1st in compliance with Quebec declarations regarding COVID-19. He states that the situation is still fluid, and that they will do their best to give updates to the student body. He notes that this also includes that construction is halted for both the University Centre and 3501 Peel at this point.

VP External reminds Councillors that SSMU is continuing to hire for next year and encourages applying by emphasizing the important work.

Councillor Fried notes for the record that this is the last meeting where the Inter-Residence Council will have a representative on SSMU Legislative Council. He encourages future generations of SSMU to continue to interact with its residents on Council.

Councillor Fakih thanks the executives for all their work throughout the year, as well as the staff, the Speaker, the Parliamentarian, the Governance Manager, the General Manager, and Communications.



The President states that the Dean of Students advisory committee is welcoming any comments or recommendations from members of the McGill community regarding the appointment of the new Dean of Students. He states that students can reach out by email or to the The President.

11. Business Arising

- a. Motion Regarding Amendment to Indigenous Solidarity Policy 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

In favour: 23

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 3

This motion is approved.

- b. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Internal Regulations of Committee Terms of Reference 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

In favour: 25

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 1



This motion is approved.

c. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Equity Policy 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

In favour: 24

Opposed: 2

Abstaining: 0

This motion is approved.

d. Motion Regarding a Student Engagement Plan 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

VP External motions to amend, with the amendment mandating the VP Internal and VP External to work on implementing the plan over the summer, and coming to the Fall 2020 Legislative Council with a completed plan for approval, seconded by Councillor Lametti.

Debate on the amendment:

Councillor Dixon asks if it is permissible to mandate future Executives or members of Council.

The Speaker states that on Executives, it is a common precedent.

The President also states that typically, at the end of the academic year, the Legislative Council can mandate future years' Executives, and notes that it is common practice.



Voting on the amendment:

VP External motions to vote by unanimous consent, seconded by VP Internal.

The amendment is unanimously approved.

Debate on the main motion:

Councillor Chase motions to amend, seconded by Councillor Kaye.

Councillor Chase motions to strike sections of 3.1, as he believes that if they are to hold public assemblies, they are going to quickly get into affirming biases.

Debate on the amendment:

VP External opposes the amendment and nature of the amendment, as it comes down to personal interpretation of the role of a student union.

VP University Affairs indicates that this is something desired by students. She notes that this year, they held a public assembly updating students on the work that was being done around mental health advocacy, and notes that it was well received. She understands Councillor Chase's note about confirmation bias and lack of new ideas but notes that it would be better to state within the motion 'introduce a variety of viewpoints to these panels'.

Councillor Chase states that his amendment would not prohibit the SSMU from engaging in these things, but rather, so it is not formally mandated in a special plan.

VP External states that this is a plan which is supposed to capture the goals and best practices for engaging with the student body. VP External states that public assemblies are generally well attended, especially if there is food, an interesting topic, and engaging speakers, more people will be brought in. Furthermore, he states that it encourages a more participative democracy where people feel as though they're part of the decision making process.

Voting on the amendment – FAILS.

In favour: 2

Opposed: 21

Abstaining: 4

Debate on the main motion:



VP External motions to amend, seconded by Councillor Dixon.

VP External motivates.

VP External states that the amendment comes in line with the suggestion by Councillor Chase, stating that a SSMU organized public endeavour should attempt to present a diversity of sources and opinions.

Debate on the amendment:

There is no debate.

Voting on the amendment:

VP External motions to vote by unanimous consent, seconded by the President.

The amendment is unanimously approved.

Debate on the main motion:

Senator Lametti notes that in the consultation, consultation was done with various student unions. He asks if that has anything to do with a previous motion which involves creating a multi-university association or working group, or if it is unrelated.

Councillor Chase highlights that in section 6 with “McGill doesn’t do anything for student spaces, we create the student community” is opposed to the phrase, and believes it should be removed next year, as he believes it is quite arrogant.

VP External states that in regards to Senator Lametti’s question, it has no relation to the working group, it just happened out of increased interaction.

For Councillor Chase’s point, he states that the point is well-taken, but notes that they are responsible for providing insurance and bank accounts for upwards of 230 student groups.

Voting Period:

In favour: 24

Opposed: 2

Abstaining: 1

This motion is approved.



e. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Committee Terms of Reference 2020-04-02

APPROVED

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

In favour: 22

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 2

This motion is approved.

f. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Committee Terms of Reference 2020-04-02

APPROVED

Question Period:

Senator Lametti inquires why the VP Finance is not on the Housing Committee, given that a sizable amount of money is going towards student housing.

VP External states that it is an oversight. He states that the VP Finance was not involved on the committee this year, and was just being advised when necessary on financial matters. He notes, however, that there are a large number of weeks where they just spoke about design, location, et cetera, without anything having to do with finance. Furthermore, he notes that the VP Finance sits on 14 committees already.

Senator Lametti states that while he understands that there are a lot of committees, he recognizes that there is significant money going into the project. He asks the VP Finance or the VP External if he believes that the VP Finance should be on the committee.

VP Finance states that he believes the role of the VP Finance on this committee should look like the role of the VP Student Life with regards to the Funding Committee, who sits on the committee as a purely consultative body.



Debate:

VP External motions to add the Vice President Finance to the membership section of the Affordable Student Housing Committee, seconded by Senator Lametti.

Debate on the amendment:

There is no debate.

Voting on the amendment:

VP External motions to vote by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Fried.

The amendment is approved unanimously.

Voting Period on the Motion:

In favour: 24

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 2

This motion is approved.

g. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Internal Regulations of Governance 2020-04-02

APPROVED

Question Period:

Councillor Chase asks about the Positions book, and who wrote it.

VP External notes that the content is not original, and is transposed from the Policies and Plan book. He states rather than just having a one year mandate, these serve as standing positions of the SSMU.

Councillor Chase asks how the positions book will influence future decision-making, if adopted. VP External asks for clarification.

Councillor Chase clarifies his question and asks how will the Positions Book that the Society has adopted, influence decision-making in the Society, especially within Executives.



VP External states probably not more than what is currently the case, as these positions already serve as the official positions of the SSMU. Furthermore, he states that they are not mandates, just recurrent of values. VP External gives the example: a military research campus is immoral, and how it may influence the decisions of the executives when discussing such items.

VP External asks the Governance Manager if the links to the positions book and the policy manual will be updated to ensure that the documents will be copied and owned under the SSMU website, so that they are not continuing to link to his personal Gmail account.

Governance Manager indicates that the documents will be uploaded as a PDF.

Debate:

Councillor Chase believes that the motion would impose the political decisions made by Council prior. He is concerned with this, as he believes it is not democratic, given that people will be governed by certain political decisions taken by previous years' Councils composed of students who no longer study at McGill. He believes that these positions should have 'sunset clauses'.

VP External notes that current policies last for five years as it is, and it is currently the norm that political leanings, if during the timeframe in which they are active, have to be actively superseded or appealed. He states that the motion clarifies that these are the positions of the SSMU. He states it also indicates that it is easy to appeal it, through passing a motion.

Councillor Chase is concerned about the lack of information for people who might be concerned about a previous position. He states it induces a lot of labour on people. He believes that when issues come up, they should address them currently, allowing members to stay better informed.

VP External states that it is a concern he has as well, and which is why he introduced the motion. He states that currently, if someone wishes to see the positions of the SSMU, they have to go through 177 pages where internal operational procedures are mixed in with statements of principle or mixed in with a history and background, highlighting its inaccessibility.

Councillor Fried suggests to Councillor Chase that his upcoming proposal of having a SSMU Historian probably covers this issue, as the SSMU Historian could easily look into past positions and bring them to Legislative Council or research them at the request of Councillors, reducing the workload of Councillors and Executives within their mandate.

Councillor Chase states that Councillors often do not have the time to research many of the SSMU documents, and typically pay attention to what is in front of them. Furthermore, they may not know the position underpinnings of various discussions, and he believes that that is not a good way to run a



Society. Councillor Chase asks if there could be a 'sunset clause' put on the positions taken by the Society.

VP External states it is something that they can do. He states that the reason for a five-year expiry on policies is because the policies enshrine a specific way in which SSMU should advocate on a certain issue, and those may not be relevant after five years.

The President notes that for positions taken by the Society through Legislative Council, Legislative Council resolutions are valid for one year, so there is a sunset clause for positions taken by the Society with regards to Legislative Council resolutions. He also re-iterates the statement by the VP External regarding five-year expiration dates for policies. He states that the goal of the Positions Book is to encourage transparency and show to members of the Society, as well as elected officials, what exactly the SSMU has decided on the positions that SSMU takes. He states it is the responsibility of the elected officials to do their due diligence through research, and figure out what positions their constituents would like to take and use it as a starting point.

Councillor Mackie motions to call the question, seconded by VP External.

Voting Period:

In favour: 25

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 1

This motion is approved.

h. Motion Regarding SSMU Policy on Accessible Education and Academics 2020-04-02

APPROVED

Question Period:

VP External asks the Steering Committee asks if it is the case that the policy will be reformatted by the Governance Manager in order to conform with the shape of the current policies.

The Speaker indicates that it will be.

Councillor Chan asks the movers if the policy would put the SSMU in a position whereby SSMU is calling for changing the name of McGill University.

VP University Affairs indicates that it is not necessarily, but rather, recognizes the name is in fact used to glorify an individual who has a problematic history, who was a slave owner. As such, the incoming



Executives would be mandated to advocate for more physically accessible infrastructure in spaces. As well, it holds that the Society recognizes that the individual has an unsavory and colonial history.

Councillor Kersh inquires what motivated the motion, especially the part concerning intellectual workers. He also asks what their plan is for re-naming buildings such as MacDonald and Currie buildings, especially from a financial standpoint.

VP University Affairs states that it does not outline specific advocacy initiatives. VP University Affairs states that the concern came from consultation with the Black Students' Network, who noted there were a number of buildings named across the university that glorified or otherwise exalted individuals with racist, misogynist pasts.

[Recess begins at 20:01.]

[Recess ends at 20:11.]

Councillor Rhamey motions to a ten minute extension on Question Period, seconded by Councillor Merali.

Councillor Kaye thanks the VP University Affairs for her response, as it was very clarifying. She asks if it would be better to rephrase that section in a way to shed light on the injustices these various people have committed. She highlights that work has already been done in this regard with a certain Art History seminar titled 'James McGill as a Slave-Owner', and believes more work could be done to bring light to those things.

Councillor Chase is aware of the groups that were consulted and wonders if any other groups in the wider student body who perhaps might not be as involved with it activism were consulted.

VP University Affairs indicates that they were not, but also clarifies that the groups are all necessarily activist groups, as a number of them are also service-based groups. She states that they were consulted based on the barriers that these groups have traditionally faced towards the sizable education and academics. She states that if he has other suggestions on groups who should be consulted, she would be happy to entertain them. She states her consultation was not done to be a self-confirming endeavour.

Councillor Chase if they can go into the rationale of why each of the names his motion is calling for to be changed.

VP University Affairs states that some of them are really well known, while others were originally brought to her attention through a Why Intersection article. She notes that all of the people have documented histories of racism and misogyny. She states that upon further research, these people do have well-documented unsavory histories.



Debate:

Councillor Dixon motions to amend and motivates his amendment. Councillor Dixon thanks the movers of the motion. He believes that a more successful strategy of advocacy would be to help McGill look forward and celebrate diversity of McGillians from diverse backgrounds, and he believes that an amendment of this nature would ensure effective strong advocacy going forward, as potentially changing names would not be realistic.

Debate on the amendment:

VP University Affairs appreciates the spirit of the amendment, but contests the idea that policies have to be purely realistic. She believes that there is a certain degree of policies that should be aspirational. She states that she would welcome the amendment as an addition to the clause, but believes it is incredibly important to publicly state and recognize the names of buildings that are referencing individual people who themselves are problematic. She states that she is against striking out the pre-existing clause as it would prevent the names from being in public record. To conclude, she welcomes the amendment, but thinks it should be complemented by the names of problematic individuals.

Senator Lametti believes it is a good idea to remove the list of names from the policy. He states that while it is not a problem in itself to have them, he simply believes that this policy is not the right space. He indicates that he would prefer if individual faculties had their own grassroots movements to condemn the names of buildings they use the most, which could be signed onto by SSMU in a motion of its own, much like the actions of the SSMU in regards to the former name of the McGill team.

Councillor Merali highlights that changing the names of pre-existing buildings isn't quite as unrealistic and as impossible as it may seem. He highlights the fact that last year in Montreal, Amherst Street was renamed, because General Amherst was accused of bringing smallpox. He states that changing the name is definitely possible and definitely something that the SSMU can do.

Councillor Mackie supports Councillor Dixon's amendment, stating that there is more to be done than just recognizing that the names are problematic and advocating, and notes that Councillor Dixon's amendment is very much forward looking and is very realistic. While she does agree that problematic names should be changed, she believes that most people's discomfort with the name was more so having to do with the name McGill. Lastly, she believes Councillor Dixon's amendment is an attainable advocacy goal.

Councillor Dixon thanks the Councillors for further input. He states that they could spend significant time debating about what the best way to approach the past is. He believes that the policy is very strong, and an important one. However, he believes this clause, especially due to the fact it includes



the name of the University itself is perceived as very detrimental and would cause Councillors to think twice about voting in favour of it. As such, he believes that his amendment is a more aspirational kind of clause, and has put forward to ensure that the policy can carry forward with its direction as intended.

Councillor Chase highlights the high volume of people that have reached out to him because they were upset about the motion. Furthermore, they were angry as due to the school closure, they are unable to participate in student democracy, and furthermore, debating advocating for a change the name campaign of the university during a global pandemic. He indicates that such an action would be terrible to do in times such as now, and more so believes that this issue is very controversial and believes it something that most students will oppose.

VP University Affairs indicates that this is not a motion to McGill, but rather, a motion to make education and academics more accessible for all students on this campus. She notes that she consulted with students for whom the name McGill is harmful to them because it glorifies someone who was a slave owner. However, she notes that that was only one component of the much broader motion. She also states that bringing this motion at this time was not an intention of hers, but she finds it disturbing that they're having a conversation about whether or not they should be tailoring their emotions to people who think that being a slave owner is acceptable. She notes that part of her interpretation on what a student union should be doing is advocacy and notes that that advocacy isn't always going to be universally celebrated, such as in the case of the Change the Name campaign. However, she agrees with Senator Lametti's point that a lot of advocacy would work best at the faculty level with the faculty bringing up the concerns of the buildings that they use most frequently. That being said, she thinks it is still important to at least somehow recognize those names in this motion. She states that they don't have to "name names", but the motion could nevertheless recognize that there are buildings on campus honoring or glorifying problematic figures with their names.

Councillor Daryanani highlights the fact that the land acknowledgement clearly states that SSMU should challenge neocolonialism in any way or form. He states that removing these names is in line with that statement. He also highlights that the Arts Building was also recently renamed to the McCall MacBain Arts Building, after a \$200million donation, and highlights it shouldn't be difficult to change other names at McGill. Lastly, he states that if people have issues with McGill as a name, then the sentiment should be equally applied to the other buildings. As such, he stands against the amendment.

Councillor Chase states that demanding to change the names is a serious step, and notes that the Council has not been provided about what each individual has done. He believes it needs more research, and believes that advocating for changing names at this time may be quite a far step in a direction that is unrepresentative of students.



The President states that he is generally in support of Councillor Dixon's amendment and appreciates it. However, he also thinks it is important to recognize what marginalized students are asking for, especially the ones that have been consulted with regards to this. He states that if naming specific names is an impediment to part of the motion as a whole, he notes that he wouldn't be opposed to the removal, but he does think it's important to have both aspects included in there. He states that at the bicentennial committee, there were a lot of discussions surrounding the name and McGill's colonial legacy and recognizing it as well as celebrating the histories of those whose stories haven't been shared simply due to the fact that they come from a marginalized background.

The President motions to amend to include a section saying “the removal of corrupt commemorative names that honor otherwise glorify problematic historical figures”, seconded by VP University Affairs.

The President motivates.

The President states that it is important to include the concerns that have arisen from consultations with different groups representing marginalized students.

Debate on the amendment to the amendment:

Councillor Chase believes the extra sense is overly vague, and is not in favour of adding this into an official policy of the society, as it will lead to very open interpretation of what one would define as problematic. He provides an example of someone who opposes the sugar industry, and thus, who would be against the name of the Redpath buildings.

VP University Affairs indicates her frustration at the situation, and believes that Council is having a debate whether or not they can say that names that glorify problematic historical figures are bad is incredibly disappointing. She indicates that she was not expecting the motion to be so contentious. She believes that the power SSMU has in advocacy is significant.

Senator Lametti believes that there has been a conflation of multiple points of view, especially concerning the most recent point that was made. He believes it is naive to say that not keeping these names is tantamount to believing slave ownership is a good thing. He states that the Faculty of Medicine has their own problematic characters, namely William Osler. He states that the Medical Student Society is undergoing proper research and establishing a nuanced position on the issue. He states that having an incomplete list with no references, in the middle of the policy is improper. Furthermore, he states that it should be its own main motion, properly researched and done with proper consultation. Lastly, Senator Lametti states that doing so neglects the responsibilities to represent it and to be diligent with the motions that Legislative Council passes. As such, he indicates his support for Councillor Dixon's amendment.



Councillor Rhamey echoes the sentiments of the VP University Affairs, recognizing that the situation boils down to whether or not they acknowledge the issue, even if it is a vague position. He agrees with the fact that in delineating a list, it potentially limits the amount of names that have been included and the possibility for future research that would unveil other things. However, he states that he believes this isn't necessarily like a contentious principle to adopt. Furthermore, he reiterates that this is a policy and not a plan, and as such, no resources are actively being committed. Rather, this serves as an attempt to decolonize McGill, or even supporting such an act.

VP University Affairs understands that a list was not the best way to go, and apologizes for that oversight. That being said, she believes that it is still important to bring awareness to those individuals who have problematic histories.

Voting on the amendment to the amendment:

In favour: 17

Opposed: 7

Abstaining: 4

The amendment to the amendment is approved.

Debate on the amendment:

Councillor Kaye motions to amend, seconded by Councillor Daryanani.

Councillor Kaye motivates.

Councillor Kaye believes a strong compromise would be 'education and advocacy regarding bringing to light the injustices that these historical, starkly problematic figures inflicted.'

Debate on the amendment to the amendment:

There is no debate.

The President moves to adopt by unanimous consent, seconded by VP External.

The amendment to the amendment is approved.

Debate on the main amendment:

There is no further debate.



Voting on the amendment:

The President motions to adopt by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Dandamudi.

The amendment is unanimously approved.

Debate on the main motion:

Councillor Dixon highlights an issue with section 7.2 with the fact that it would allow for consultation with all constituent groups of Solidarity Alliance McGill. He highlights the fact that the club of the New Democratic Party would be consulted, but not the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party of Canada for their respective campus clubs. He believes that the motion focuses on only a certain subset of students, as opposed to focusing on the needs of students as a whole. He also highlights the notion of being an intellectual working, and notes it is absurd.

VP External moves to amend, seconded by Councillor Kaye.

VP External motivates.

VP External motions to amend the wording to “the promotion of access to high quality education as a public interest in human rights”.

Debate on the amendment:

VP External states that it came out of a lengthy conversation with a constituent. He states that the rationale behind accessible work and accessibility policies are to remove undue barriers to access. He states that everyone, on the merit of their academic skills and achievements, should be able to pursue a high quality accessible education. He states that it was the original goal of the clause in the first place.

Councillor Dandamudi states that she had a constituent reach out to her in regards to section 5.2 that high level education be deemed a human right, but it's patently absurd to declare that access to university should, in fact, be a human right granted to all individuals. She does believe that an amendment is necessary, but notes whether or not it should be following the wording of the VP External is up to a debate.

Voting on the amendment – APPROVED.

The President motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Kaye.

Debate on the main motion.



Councillor Chase motions to amend, seconded by Councillor Franceschini.

Councillor Chase motions to amend the amendment, seconded by Councillor Franceschini.

Councillor Chase motivates. Councillor Chase states that there should be a town hall to hear student concerns regarding academics.

Debate on the amendment to the amendment:

VP External applauds the sentiment of the amendment, he is unsure of how it fits into the policy in terms of a standard operating procedure. He inquires if this is a one-off mandate, or to hold annual town halls, and more largely, is unclear on what is being suggested.

The President also indicates this confusion. He states that if it is supposed to be recurring, he suggests including it in a separate point. However, if it is a one off event, he would encourage the Councillor to amend the policy to mandate next year's executive to hold such a town hall.

Councillor Chase indicates that he meant it as a semesterly town hall. Councillor Chase retracts his amendment to the amendment.

Debate on the amendment:

There is no further debate.

Voting on the amendment:

VP University Affairs motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded by The President.

The amendment is unanimously approved.

Debate on the main motion:

Councillor Chan inquires on the rationale behind including statements concerning intellectual workers, and asks if it means the SSMU is advocating for students to be paid.

Councillor Chase motions to amend, seconded by VP External.

Debate on the amendment:

There is no debate.



Voting on the amendment:

VP External motions to approve unanimously, seconded by Councillor Chase – APPROVED.

The amendment is unanimously approved.

Debate on the main motion:

VP External indicates that the inclusion of statements concerning intellectual workers was his notion. He notes that this is a value espoused by SSMU in the past as an extension of the Policy on Accessible Education. He notes that working towards the total elimination of tuition is in the policy that's being renewed here. He states that in the Background and Rationale, the eventual elimination of all education fees is something that SSMU endorses. He indicates that students entering the workforce is key to the economy, and university acts as a form of job training. He also notes that in the 1970s, the Liberal Party party ran on a platform of free tuition and a student salary for all students. He notes that this is not unprecedented and is in line with some of the history of the advocacy work that SSMU has and continues to do around accessible education, such as supporting the unpaid internship strikes.

Councillor Chase indicates that this notion is very theoretical and states his belief that he does not think it should be formally included in adopting as a position of the Society. Furthermore, Councillor Chase believes that this issue should be addressed to a working group in order to develop a much better policy.

The President states that it is his opinion that clause 4.1 in its entirety gives sufficient context for an average student reading it to understand the rationale behind why SSMU is taking the positions espoused in the document as a whole, specifically with regards to free education as well as the student stipend. He states that SSMU, both through general assemblies and referenda have reaffirmed its commitment to advocating for free tuition. He also notes that the notion of a student stipend is not unprecedented, noting the actions of Denmark. As such, he indicates his support for keeping the wording in.

Senator Lametti states that he believes paying students is a lofty goal that he ultimately agrees with. Until then, he hopes that they stop increasing student fees or ancillary fees and extra fees for small items.

VP External indicates that this policy indicates how much the SSMU wishes to advocate for public investment in education. He notes that as compared to the rest of Canada and the United States, Quebec has had historically low tuition because of people continuing to fight for it.



Councillor Chase is concerned about how paying students as intellectual workers would be funded, especially considering that in the Background and Rationale of the motion, it says that there will be eventual replacement of any and all ancillary and tuition fees with alternative methods of funding. He states that it seems like the motion is grasping at straws, and notes that there is no real plan in order to do this.

VP External states that in past SSMU stances from 2014 to 2017, and notes that there are ways for education to be quite accessible. He states that the Quebec government pays more for education than students do.

Councillor Marcoux motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Dixon.

Voting Period:

In favour: 21

Opposed: 2

Abstaining: 2

This motion is approved.

- i. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Human Resources Committee Terms of Reference 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**

Question Period:

Senator Lametti asks why there was a decision to add the Governance Manager rather than the General Manager who would have a similar knowledge of governance, but would also have other considerations such as the human resources of the Society in general.

The President indicates that the Governance Manager was included as a resource person as they have the general full knowledge of what is occurring in the Society. He states that the Human Resources Committee is intended to exclude the General Manager and that it is intended to be an arm's length body away from the General Manager with direct human resources delegated oversight from the Board of Directors. He states that it is reflective of the changes that were made by the Board of Directors with the reporting structure.

VP External asks if it is better suited for the General Manager to be a member in cases where the HR complaint or consideration is not about the General Manager.



The President takes the point in cases where the General Manager could come in on a case-by-case basis, in specific matters that didn't have to do or weren't related to the General Manager. He however would caution against adding the General Manager as a member of the committee itself.

VP External states that he does not believe the Governance Manager's view extends as far as human resources. He states that he does not believe it appropriate for this role to oversee these matters. He also states that the conflict of interest policy would take care of the General Manager's recusals in cases where they themselves are being investigated.

The President notes that the Governance Manager was slotted as the "resources" person due to her consistent attendance at meetings of the Executive Committee, Board of Directors, and Legislative Council.

VP External motions to amend, seconded by Councillor Fried.

VP External motivates.

VP External indicates that the first portion would replace the Governance Manager with the General Manager, and secondly is to mandate the Human Resources Committee to create and present a formalized investigative procedure for the GSVP and for the Equity Policy. He states that this allows for clear timelines. Furthermore, he states that it means that people who submit grievances know what the process looks like, how their complaints are being handled, and how quickly they can expect to receive a response.

[Departure of Councillor Kaye at 21:39.]

Debate on the amendment:

The President opens the floor to the Governance Manager and General Manager.

The Governance Manager states that the reasoning behind adding her role as a non-voting member of the committee was simply to provide context or to help clarify details that are maybe missing or information that can be used, so all situations or parties to any matters that her role is privy to.

VP External states that the General Manager has a bird's eye view of the Society, and notes that part of the reason the Governance Manager completed additional responsibilities, was due to the absence of a General Manager in general.

Councillor Fakhri notes that this discussion was brought up during the HR meeting where the amendments were brought up. He states that they figured that the main purpose of the HR Committee was to hold Executives and the General Manager accountable, whereas most of the other work with



other staff is the responsibility of the HR manager in the department by themselves. He notes that given that one of their main objectives was to hold the General Manager accountable, they did not believe it would be ideal to have them on the Committee and furthermore, because they wanted someone as a knowledge resource, they added the Governance Manager.

VP External states that there should be a level of student oversight in general, and indicates that he is disappointed to hear the perception of the HR Committee is meant to only hold the General Manager accountable. Furthermore, he states that if there are grievances that are being submitted, they should be handled by a group of individuals who have some mixture of context. He states that's why there is an Equity Commissioner, Board members, Executives, and a professional member of the permanent staff.

Voting on the amendment:

In favour: 9

Opposed: 4

Abstaining: 12

The amendment is approved.

Debate:

VP External notes that he heard of other recommendations such as increasing the number of Board Directors, which didn't make their way into the motion. He asks if someone would be able to elaborate on some of the recommendations that didn't find a way into the final motion.

Councillor Fakh states that the two noteworthy seats considered were the President and the VP Finance memberships. However, he states that one of the main goals of the HR committee is to hold the Executives and General Manager accountable, so it didn't really make sense to have the Executives on the committee's membership as well. However, he states that there was not much contention surrounding it, but notes it may potentially be reconsidered in the future.

Voting Period:

In favour: 17

Opposed: 1

Abstaining: 5

This motion is approved.

j. Motion Regarding Student Concerns about the OSD 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**



Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

Councillor Mackie motions to amend to add the dates for when the emails are sent, seconded by Councillor Fried.

The Speaker notes that this is a friendly amendment.

Voting Period:

In favour: 23

Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 0

12. New Business

a. Motion Regarding History SSMU 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**

Councillor Chase motivates.

Councillor Chase states that the goal of the motion is to address the issue of institutional knowledge within the Society. He states that the motion will mandate the next President of the Society to determine whether SSMU should have a department focused on maintaining the historical documents, understandings, and lessons learned of the Society, or if there are other alternative ways this can be presented to the Legislative Council when appropriate, and if they decide to pursue a further course of action to do so. He states that the motion is merely to mandate an executive to start considering an idea.

Question Period:

VP External states that the SSMU archives are currently accessible to the General Manager. Given the previous General Manager had professional training as a library technician, he asks what Councillor Chase's thoughts are on having the General Manager as the SSMU Historian as they are already recognized as the resource person who is supposed to help with institutional memory.

Councillor Chase states that he would be open to that discussion. He hopes that there would be reports of lessons learned from each of the years so that students are able to go back and look at what



happened in previous years, to look at what were the major discussions of the year and what the major issues that had to be dealt with in the year were. As well as granting both SSMU Officers and for the student body at large to be able to learn more about SSMU as an institution and its history in the past years.

Debate:

The President states that his belief that it's a particularly good idea that they start looking into how SSMU could build their institutional memory long-term in terms of writing it down and having it in an easily digestible format. He notes that this was an initiative conducted by the previous General Manager. He also notes that the McGill yearbooks added significant value in institutional value before they were terminated. He indicates his support for the motion.

Councillor Mackie states that the name is not fitting, given that when she read the name, she thought it was in regards to the upcoming bicentennial project, whereas this seems more in line with principles of accessibility, accessibility, and institutional memory. However, she notes her support for it.

Senator Lametti inquires if there are any concerns that this overlaps with any existing system in SSMU.

Councillor Chase states that he envisioned it as a separate department, like Elections SSMU, that could impartially document these things. He notes that that may not be realistic, which is why he included clauses for other proposals, such as the General Manager serving in this role.

Voting Period:

In favour: 15

Opposed: 2

Abstaining: 9

The motion is approved.

b. Motion Regarding Safe Sidewalks 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**

[Recess begins at 22:10.]

[Recess ends at 22:20.]

Councillor Chase motivates.

Councillor Chase states that it would mandate both the current and incoming Executives to have a proposal and presentation to Council to improve the safety of the sidewalks from snow and ice,



notably the ones on campus hills. He states that travelling on hills, such as the one leading up to Upper Residence can be dangerous, as they are not well-maintained.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

VP University Affairs indicates that this is an interesting motion, and appreciates the spirit of it. She states that one of the other problems that also comes along with safe sidewalks is the failure of the University to close on any day that is particularly dangerous for individuals to make it to campus. VP University Affairs asks the Councillors who moved if they would be amenable to adding a section regarding lobbying the university to be more lenient with campus closures due to weather conditions.

Councillor Chase states that while it is a good idea, his concern is that McGill would have to extend the academic calendar in order to add snow days so that classes are not missed.

Councillor Mackie states that this is important. Given that the Faculty of Law is on top of a hill, she states that there was a situation two years ago where people from the Faculty of Law were walking on Dr. Penfield and were falling into the street. She notes the conditions are dangerous and believes that it is a reasonable motion because it sets out the VP External to try and find a solution.

Senator Lametti notes his concerns about the motion, and more so, the ideas that are being advocated for. He states that posts and ropes don't seem like the best idea, given that it first off alerts snow removal operations, as well as the lack of total protection it offers. Instead, he states that the best way to go about this is advocacy. Second of all, he believes that advocating for online classes provides better advocacy.

Councillor Fried states that as living in Upper Residence, he has fallen many times on the walk down University, as have many of his constituents.

Councillor Chase states that whatever proposal is made is going to have to be negotiated with the city. He states that they might not be using posts and ropes. But he overall believes that there needs to be more infrastructure for the hills.

Senator Lametti motions to remove the second paragraph and background and rationale, seconded by Councillor Fried.

Debate on the amendment:



Councillor Chase indicates that he is opposed to this amendment because he believes that including this in background and rationale is to be able to make sure that such an idea is relevant for the VP External when they are considering the proposal. Furthermore, he states his trust in the office of the VP External and the City of Montreal to be able to best design such infrastructure so it would not impede on city services.

Senator Lametti believes that the motion is not very realistic and distracts from real things that the Society should be advocating for.

Voting on the amendment:

In favour: 16

Opposed: 4

Abstaining: 4

The amendment is approved.

Councillor Marcoux motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Fried – APPROVED.

Voting Period:

In favour: 19

Opposed: 2

Abstaining: 1

The President motions to suspend the rules to enter directly into confidential session to facilitate the Elections SSMU Presentation – APPROVED.

Return to Legislative Council in public session.

Councillor Fried motions to re-enter confidential session, seconded by Councillor Mackie – NOT APPROVED.

c. Motion Regarding the Accessibility of Council Documents 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**

VP External motivates.

VP External states that the motion is in response to some of the changes recently made to documents. He states that earlier in the year, it became impossible to download, print, and copy files, which makes writing motions a little bit more inaccessible. As well, he indicates that sharing with constituents has become more difficult.



Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

Councillor Mackie indicates her support for the motion, stating that it has made amendments incredibly difficult as well as doing proper consultation.

Voting Period:

In favour: 23

Opposed: 0

Approved: 0

This motion is approved.

- d. Motion to Condemn the Present Form of the Policy on Harassment and Discrimination Prohibited by Law 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**

VP External states that the rationale for the policy follows very close to the rationale behind the advocacy work that the SSMU did in 2017-18 on the Policy Against Sexual Violence. As well, he notes that the policy on harassment only allows for complaints against individuals and not against departments that have a history of discriminatory practices, not recognizing the role of microaggressions and repeated harassment. He states that this is a platform point that both the incoming VP External and VP University Affairs elect have supported, and after their elections, have agreed to take on this advocacy work.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

VP University Affairs thanks him for the motion, as it brings to light the glaring error in McGill governance. She notes that in 2021, the Policy will be coming to revision in the Senate.

Voting Period:

In favour: 20



Opposed: 0

Abstaining: 0

This motion is approved.

- e. Motion Regarding the Creation of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Diversity of SSMU Events 2020-04-02 **APPROVED**

Senator Garneau motivates.

Senator Garneau notes that due to the last Council, it appeared there was an interest in the broader cultural issue about the lack of non-drinking events rather than solely trying to increase the non-drinking events.

Question Period:

The President inquires about the second substantive clause, which mandates the President to hire a researcher, and asks the movers to explain why they decided to mandate the President rather than the VP Internal, who serves as the larger director of events.

Senator Garneau states that it is due to a larger cultural issue within SSMU. Furthermore, he states that having someone not directly involved in it directly would be ideal in assessing the place of non-drinking events within the VP Internal portfolio.

Debate:

VP External indicates his support for the motion. He notes that it is well-written, and thinks that the roles and responsibilities of the committee are fantastic. He also appreciates the role the President has as a supervisor and directing the work of the researcher.

The President thanks the movers of the motion for bringing forward a motion to Council for such discussion. He states that if a committee is created, he does not believe the process will be as efficient and the changes won't be implemented as quickly.

Councillor Fried inquires if the movers would be amenable to entertaining the suggestion of adding an Inter-Residence Council Representative to this committee, considering that the committee involves event planning and that it's absolutely within the IRC portfolio and within its mandate to plan non-alcoholic events.



VP Internal states that the best way forward is to hire an Inclusive Events Researcher who does their own work, and then there is a committee that would implement the work done. She notes that she does not see the benefit of having a committee that deliberates on research as it is ongoing.

Senator Garneau notes that the reason a committee is desired is to ensure that the VP Internal and the Equity Commissioner are being consulted through everything, as much as possible.

Councillor Fakih indicates that the committee would meet infrequently, given that most of the recommendations would have to be submitted by the fall semester. He indicates that the meeting would be to discuss the recommendations that the researcher came to. He states that given the significance of the recommendations, they did not want it to be just one person coming up with the decisions. Furthermore, he states that other members of the committee are to serve as checks of power, as well as to ensure everything is going well.

The President motions to extend by two minutes, seconded by Councillor Mackie.

Councillor Fakih states that in terms of composition, there were suggestions from adding people from Faculty events portfolios, as they recognized that they would be useful people. In terms of adding a member from the IRC, he states that he would prefer to add a member from SACOMMS or from another relevant committee, and as such, would not be amenable to the proposition.

VP External states that SSMU's own documents do not have a way of coping with working groups. He states that the issue is that regardless of the composition of the committee and no matter what executive the Researcher is put under, the result will nevertheless be specifically steered. He states that the composition of the committee eliminates the problem of having just one research director.

Councillor Fried motions to amend, seconded.

Councillor Fried notes that IRC constituents are also members of the Society, and notes that the only thing the IRC does is plan events. He notes that serving on the committee is within the purposes of the IRC. He also notes the addition of the IRC is within the interest of this committee. Furthermore, if the committee wants to coordinate events with IRC, and simply because a lot of the events that they're going to be planning should certainly be marketed to first years. He thinks that having a representative from an explicitly first year body, would be crucial to the success of this committee.

Debate on the amendment:

Debate:



Councillor Chase notes that the reason the IRC seat was taken out of SSMU Legislative Council was because they are essentially an external, whose representation can be done through the First Year Council.

Councillor Fakih notes that if they are willing to sit on the committee, they could also apply to becoming the members at large. He states that they tried to make the committee as small but as consultative as possible. He states that if they wanted to open up to add more seats, he notes they would rather want someone who is more involved within inclusivity such as a SACOMMS Researcher.

Senator Garneaus echoes the sentiment of Councillor Fakih. He states that while IRC Members are encouraged to be on the committee, they should not be prioritized. He states that he would be open to an amendment to add them to the one of the people that the researcher would consult, but does not think it necessarily as a value to have them on the committee.

Councillor Fried reiterates the need for first year representation on this committee. He states that engagement with first years is crucial to the society's mission. He states it is necessary to have some sort of representation of First Years. He states he would be amenable to the change suggested by Councillor Chase.

Councillor Fakih inquires about the timeline of when the First Year Council will be formed.

VP Internal notes that FYC elections happen in early September.

Senator Garneau notes that the committee is to do research on the place of drinking and non-drinking events within the VP Internal SSPN portfolio. He agrees with the need to consult First Year Councillors, but does not see the value of being on the committee.

VP University Affairs reiterates that the committee is not to engage every group on campus. She understands and appreciates the need for first year residents in consultation, but notes that given the committee is specific to events that are playing either in the VP Internal portfolio or the SSMU as a whole.

Councillor Chase states that it is his position that the inclusion of one person from FYC is not going to change much from the committee. He states that all it will do is make sure that there will be at least one first year represented.

Councillor Fried echoes the sentiment of Councillor Chase, and indicates the importance of reaching out to first years and ensuring that their experience with SSMU and that the events that they go to within SSMU are inclusive and accessible. He states that having some sort of representation on this committee would certainly adhere to its mission and in the interest of research.



VP External motions to call the question on the amendment, seconded by Senator Garneau – APPROVED.

Voting on the amendment – FAILS.

In favour: 8

Opposed: 16

Abstaining: 0

The amendment fails.

Debate on the main motion:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

In favour: 21

Opposed: 1

Abstaining: 1

The motion is approved.

13. Reports by Committees

a. Executive Committee

The President presents the report.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

b. Community Engagement Committee

VP External presents the report.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

c. Service Review Committee --**APPROVED**



VP Student Life states that the Services Review Committee has conducted their annual audits of the SSMU services. He notes that the review criteria focuses on usage, efficiency and accessibility, as well as the mandate fulfillment. He states that there are three grades that are attached or that are given – pass, pass with reservation, and fail. He states that all services passed, with two receiving reservations – Plate Club and the QBM. He states that ASN failed.

Question Period:

VP External inquires what it means for the failure of the ASN, asking if it means that they will have their service status revoked or if there is a grace period.

VP Student Life states that they do have a grace period of one academic month.

Senator Lametti motions to approve the report of the Services Review Committee, seconded by the President – APPROVED.

d. Clubs Committee --**APPROVED**

VP Student Life presents the report.

He notes that the last meeting was yesterday. He notes that they work well through all the applications, and have reviewed and approved the final two interim status clubs.

Question Period:

VP University Affairs inquires about the status of HeForShe McGill, given its rejection at the previous meeting.

VP Student Life indicates that it is not on the amended Clubs Committee report. He states that it will be assessed and approved at the Board of Directors at a later date.

VP University Affairs asks if there is a requirement for clubs to adhere to the policies of the SSMU, in particular, the Equity Policy.

VP Student Life states that they are. He notes that when they apply for interim status, there are four things that the club cannot violate. He indicates that one of them is the Equity Policy. He states that if any one of them are violated, they are not granted club status. He states that HeForShe was reviewed last year, and the Clubs Committee did not find a violation in any of the policies. Furthermore, he notes that when they were reviewed for full status, it was more about their performance rather than their merits.

Councillor Chase motions for a five minute extension on question period, seconded by Senator Lametti.

Councillor Chase asks the VP Student Life to elaborate if there has been any club that the Legislative Council denied for political reasons or for being against the mandate of the Society.



VP Student Life states that the only one he can think of one group.

Report of the Clubs Committee is motioned and seconded – APPROVED.

14. Reports by Councillors

a. Councillor Franceschini (Arts/Science)

Councillor Franceschini presents the report.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

b. Councillor Dixon (Medicine)

Councillor Dixon presents the report.

Councillor Dixon notes that the MSS has motioned to adopt an IRP in spirit, working to develop something that will look like the IRP, but in the context of the MSS. He notes that the rollout would be in Fall 2020.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

c. Councillor Chan (Arts)

Councillor Chan presents the report.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

d. Councillor Bhutkar (Science)

Councillor Bhutkar presents the report.

Councillor Bhutkar states that the new Executives for Science have been chosen, and that appointed positions will be chosen soon as well.

Question Period:

15. Executive Reports

a. President



The President presents the report.

The President states that he is working with the Communications department, the Governance Manager and the Building Director to keep the Legislative Council accessible in the future, in the case that social distancing measures will need to continue into the Fall semester. He states that there is nothing to report on the Board of Directors or Board of Governors. He states that there was a meeting regarding the specific proposal of a Fall reading week in the week of Canadian Thanksgiving. He states that this proposal is in its next stage of being implemented.

The President notes that the Senate meeting was cancelled.

He states that he is very confident that they are going to see a Fall reading break in Fall 2021. He thanks all the members of the Ad Hoc Fall Reading Break Committee who helped in the work last year.

Lastly, he thanks his Executive team, the Dais, and the Governance Manager.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

b. Vice-President (University Affairs)

VP University Affairs presents the report.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

c. Vice-President (Finance)

VP Finance presents the report.

VP Finance explains the process of the Budget. He states that Council receives the first look, approves it in principle, and it is then directed to the Board. Once the audit is finished over the summer, it gets published to the SSMU website.

VP Finance states that they are beginning to meet with RBC to begin offering e-transfers.

He states that the investment portfolio and Finance Committee has been heavily delayed by COVID, but notes that they will be meeting tomorrow.



Question Period:

There are no questions.

[Recess begins at 00:21.]

[Recess ends at 00:31.]

d. Vice-President (Internal)

VP Internal presents the report.

VP Internal congratulates PTOT on winning Fac-O.

She states that FYC business has been conducted as usual.

She states that they have a draft of all the campus crops agreements.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

e. Vice-President (Student Life)

VP Student Life presents the report.

VP Student Life states that they have sent communications to clubs, giving them insights into what they can do to prepare for the change that's coming next year. He states that the Clubs Fund Fee passed during the Winter 20202 Referendum, and they are working on putting together an installation, step-by-step for the club portal.

For Services, he states that most of them have ceased operations or are operating in a limited capacity online.

He states that the keep.me.SAFE fee passed, and that students can use it through the app.

He states that the budget for the SSMU Daycare is in the process of being finalized. He also states that they renewed the MOA between Daycare and SSMU.

Question Period:



There are no questions.

f. Vice-President (External)

VP External presents the report.

VP External states that he is satisfied with the work he has done in his role this past year.

VP External states that in terms of institutional support for long-term campaigns, he believes the campaigns department of SSMU now has a very good idea of what it does.

In terms of provincial representation, he states that SSMU is on their way to developing new relationships with student associations they have not been in contact with in a while, which is quite encouraging.

He states that he was mandated to work on housing and exploring options with UTILE, which is something he did. He states that they are now exploring the location for the housing units, and will be finalizing a contract with UTILE outlining the various values that were identified over the past couple of years.

For Trash to Treasure, he states it will likely still happen, but that they are waiting for confirmation from McGill that they will be able to do it without volunteers.

VP External states that the union affairs are going fine. He notes that MCC, the legal community council, is meeting tomorrow to discuss next steps in terms of getting representation within the McGill's emergency operating centre structure in response to COVID-19.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

16. Confidential Session: **00:48**

The Legislative Council entered into Confidential session at 00:48.

17. Adjournment: **3:01**

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