



SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PUBLIC MINUTES

2020-10-08

The regular bi-weekly Legislative Council Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held by teleconference, on October 8, 2020 at 18:00.

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

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

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker presents the Land Acknowledgement.

3. Attendance

The Speaker notes the presence of the Clubs Representatives, the First Year Councillor, the Services Representative, the Theology Representative, and the Music Representative.

4. Approval of Minutes

- a. Legislative Council Public Minutes 2020-09-24 – **APPROVED**

Councillor Collins motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel.

The minutes are approved.

5. Statement from the Board of Directors

The Speaker asks the VP University Affairs to present the Statement from the Board of Directors, in the President's absence.

Senator Daryanani makes a point of personal privilege to request the VP University Affairs to read the whole statement.

VP University Affairs motions for a two minute recess, seconded by Councillor Smith --APPROVED.



VP University Affairs notes that the statement is a point form summary of the concerns that certain Directors had concerning the Motion Regarding Amendments to the Equity Policy to Ensure Equitable Communication Practices. VP University Affairs notes that there were concerns that were brought forward in regards to the possibility of Equity and HR complaints being brought forward ensuring the implementation of amendment 1.5.1 B. Specifically, these concerns state that should these amendments be implemented, the Equity Commissioners will need to evaluate the case by case each complaint based on acceptable communications. As well, they note that the Legislative Council will possibly need to supervise and define the stances and positions of acceptable communications of the society in virtue of its democratic and political nature. In accordance with the possible language barriers between English and French, there might arise issues of interpretation and translation. For example, profanity in English may not be as defined as it is in French. They note that the Board also deemed that individuals with different religious beliefs may not feel comfortable seeing public communications or the use of profanity from the Society's representatives. Furthermore, the Directors also desires further clarification as to how 1.5.1.b will be specifically defined and supervised, as it may open SSMU to liability and administrative incapacity. For example, should a staff member interpret make communication with informal language as a lack of professionalism and possibly file a complaint. There were further concerns with 1.5.5, regarding, Specifically, the director's desire for an amendment to remove the speaker as, the role is not involved in public communications, but it should be amended to, the communications department rather for the more, the board believes that they may encounter difficulty in conforming with informal language in public communications. For example, should a SSMU staff member interpret communication with informal language as a lack of professionalism, and thus files a complaint.

They also note that the Board desired an amendment to remove the Speaker from consideration, as the role is not involved in public communications. Furthermore, it should be amended to the Communications Department rather. Furthermore, the Board also believes that they may encounter difficulty in conforming with informal language in public communications, specifically with reference to legal and HR matters for the Board, and Legislative Council's dealings with social justice and political matters.

Question Period:

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel asks if the Board of Directors has considered that the Equity Commissioners already partake in fairly substantive equity decisions, including fielding all equity complaints, and the fact that they sit on the Human Resources committee. As such, he asks why this is a sustained concern in light of these features of the Equity Commissioner's job description.

VP University Affairs states that they do not share the concerns with regards to placing this under the oversight of the Equity Commissioner, and furthermore, agrees with Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel as this article falls within the realm of what would be considered their mandate as Equity Commissioners.

Member of the Gallery Andre Lametti notes that his concerns are noted in his submitted document.



Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel asks if individuals would be amenable to a changing of wording in order to address these concerns, to say that the ‘following principles should be espoused during disciplinary measures and/or with respect to equity complaints.’ He believes that this may alleviate some liability concerns that would result from the binding of wording.

The Speaker notes that this interjection will be struck, as it does not directly pertain to the statement.

6. Adoption of the Agenda --**APPROVED**

VP University Affairs notes that members of Senate Caucus are referred to as ‘Senator ‘surname’ and to reflect such a change on the report of the Senate Caucus representative, item 15.e)

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel notes that items 13g) and 13e) are not accessible in the Drive. The Parliamentarian notes that he will adjust such issues.

Councillor Smith motions to approve the agenda as amended, seconded by Councillor Williamson — APPROVED.

Senator Daryanani motions for a three minute recess, seconded by Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel — APPROVED.

7. Report of the Steering Committee

The Speaker reads the Report of the Steering Committee.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

8. Guest Speakers

The Speaker notes that there are no guest speakers this evening.

9. Announcements

VP University Affairs notes that there are many professors that are requiring students have their cameras on, during lectures or synchronous lectures. However, after this was brought to the attention of AGSEM, this could be a possible breach of Quebec privacy laws. Furthermore, they ask if individuals are in any lectures where the professors require cameras to be turned on, to bring it to their attention.



Councillor Bulhoes states that as part of the education program, education students are required to do one field experience and internship per semester, ranging from three weeks in length to an entire semester. She notes that after the 'red zone' called by the Quebec government, schools were one of the gathering places that the government had decided must remain open. Councillor Bulhoes notes that many McGill Education students are currently on their Stages, including herself. She notes that there are concerns that student teachers are being sent into school without proper PPE, or having to pay for them out of pocket.

Councillor Karasick motions for a five-minute extension, seconded by Senator Daryanani. —
APPROVED.

Senator Daryanani states that the Faculty of Arts is having a Town Hall on remote learning tomorrow at 1:00 PM. Furthermore, he states that one of the ways that they can pressure the University to make university-wide changes by bringing concerns to various faculty departments. He states that if anyone has concerns that they'd like raised, to email him at artssenator1@ssmu.ca.

10. Question Period

a. Question de représentant Gwiazda-Amsel

The Speaker reads a question submitted from Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel.

The Speaker notes that last year, the question on the Referendum on the Equity Fee did not include a change in the nature from opt-out to non opt-out, as well as an increase and inquires why it is different this year concerning the mental health fee?

VP Student Life states that they moved this motion to increase the mental health fee and also make it non-opt-outable. She notes that one of the reasons for this is because, as part of a commitment to prioritizing mental health at the university, and especially in the COVID context, she believes it important that they are able to obtain as much funding as possible for this fee. She notes that they felt it was important enough for it to be non-opt-outable. She also notes that within the Mental Health Policy and Plan that was moved last year, there is a plan to make the fee non-opt-outable by 2021.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel understands that the state of mental health of students at McGill is not optimal and that the Wellness Hub isn't doing enough. He notes that the question is why this question is, at the same time, asking to increase the fee, as well as make it non-opt-outable. He states that this was not permitted to Vice-President Madeline Wilson, who attempted to do the same thing with the Equity Fee. Furthermore, he states that it seems as though students need to be asked these two separate questions, otherwise the question risks being blocked by the Office of Student Life and Learning.



VP Student Life thanks Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel for pointing that out, as she was not aware. However, she notes that she is more than willing to alter the motion to make it two different questions.

Councillor Bonan motions to extend question period by three minutes, seconded by Councillor Wan — APPROVED.

Councillor Smith notes that two (2) weeks ago, the report was released on the University Student Assessment Policy. He asks the VP University Affairs what the part of the report that surprised them most was, and how it will impact their advocacy on assessments moving forward. VP University Affairs notes that the thing that surprised them most was the uniformity of opinion and the willingness of students to speak out against the administration's current policies regarding assessment and the university's current practices. They also note that the working group to amend the university student assessment policy has recently been struck. They state that so far, it is the opinion of the committee that the assessment process needs an overhaul.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel asks for an update regarding community engagement, to make sure that students have a sort of presence in Montreal and the ability to engage with the Montreal community. The Speaker notes that they do have an individual in attendance who will be presenting on the Community Engagement this evening.

Councillor Smith motions to extend by five minutes, seconded by Councillor Wan — APPROVED.

VP University affairs states that the aspect of the External portfolio was not delegated to another executive. However, they note certain examples of community affairs that they have worked on includes the consultative process for the Royal Victoria Hospital project.

11. Recess, Consent Items

The Speaker explains the purpose of Consent Vote.

The Speaker notes that the following were not approved by consent vote: the Motion Condemning the GNL Québec-Gazoduc Énergie Saguenay Project, the Motion Regarding Renewal of the SSMU Ambassador Fee, the Motion Regarding Increase and Scope of the Mental Health Fee, and the Motion Regarding the SSMU Daycare Fee for Fall 2020 Referendum were approved.

However, the Speaker notes that Motion Regarding the Renewal of the Musician's Collective Fee unanimously approved.

12. Old Business

- a. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Equity Policy to Ensure Equitable Communications Practices 2020-09-24 -- **APPROVED**



Senator Daryanani asks why individuals opposed the motion. The Speaker notes that the question is open, and thus, does not mandate an individual to reply.

Councillor Karasick notes that regarding the statement from the Board of Directors, there was a concern that different religious beliefs might not feel comfortable seeing public communications using profanity, but asks what part of this resolution actually does that effect. VP University Affairs states the concern was based on the outlines of the amendments that would extend to official channels of communication, that depending on an individual's religious beliefs, they could be in some way offended or made uncomfortable seeing profanity through an official channel.

Debate:

Member of the Gallery André Lametti, who sits on the SSMU Board of Directors, reminds that the reasons why the Board objected to the motion is available. Furthermore, he encourages Council to make changes based on that feedback.

VP University Affairs states their belief that the concerns of the Board of Directors did not warrant having this amendment sent back to Legislative Council. Furthermore, they believe it was overstep. Councillor Karasick echoes the sentiments of the VP University Affairs.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel states that if the Legislative Council or the Board of Directors has preoccupations with respect to individual behaviours of, Councillors, executives, or members of the communication team and would like to define their expectations with respect to communication, it is more appropriate to establish such concerns within a policy that would outline the communication practices as a society in a communications policy.

André Lametti states the statement from the Board is a compilation of reasons given by several Directors, which is perhaps why it seems not to flow together or to be a concise compilation. He echoes the sentiments of Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel.

VP University Affairs states that they continue to be unsure that the reasoning as presented by the Board is justification enough to return the report to Legislative Council. Furthermore, they state that the amendment is well within the precedent set up by the Equity Policy. They state that it would not contribute more to the workload of the Equity Commissioners that they are not already trained and vetted for.

Senator Daryanani speaks on the fact that religious beliefs may be offended due to the use of swear words and harsh language. He states that there needs to be more cultural openness when it comes to understanding the different cultures' different ways of perception. Senator Daryanani invites a Director to justify how and when such a situation would occur. He states that religious beliefs are necessary to accommodate, but at the sametime, there are too many things to accommodate.

VP University Affairs states that, through all of the concerns that were brought forward by the Board of Directors, there is one concern that they agree with, however they would not go so far as to say that it



was justification enough for refusing gratification. They state that they agree that in 1.5.5, the systematic implementation should perhaps not fall under the responsibility of the Speaker.

VP University Affairs submits a friendly amendment to propose the amendment to articulate 1.5.5 to amend the 'Speaker' to read 'Communications department.' Councillor Williamson, the seconder, provides her approval.

André Lametti disagrees with the status quota of equity matters. He states that this would currently fall out automatically under the Equity Committee. He states that communications of official policies are usually under Council control. He also notes that 1.5.5 could create problems when the SSMU was called to make technical or governance communications.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel states that the two items highlighted in André Lametti's letter had to do with Human Resources as well as communications with respects to Human Resources, and the Equity Complaints Committee. He notes that it does not seem that there has been a solution-oriented document in the report from the Board of Directors.

VP University Affairs states that they personally do not believe the reasons presented are reason enough for the Board of Directors failing to ratify the decision.

However, they state that there are situations in which plain-spoken language might not be completely suitable. They note that 1.5.5 is aspirational in nature and not procedural or any kind of formal mandate. They echo that SSMU should aspire to continue to practice the use of equitable language. They state that the motion was written about by the McGill Tribune is a very positive light.

Senator Daryanani motions to extend by two minutes, seconded by Councillor Smith — APPROVED.

VP University Affairs states that the Equity Commissioners are still responsible for all Equity complaints, including in the grey zones, such as concerning HR matters. They state that to refuse the amendment to the policy would to reject the Equity Policy itself. They also state that it would not add any additional workload on the work of the Equity Commissioners.

Senator Daryanani motions to call the question.

The Speaker explains the process of calling the question. Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel notes that there are still individuals wishing to speak. Senator Daryanani withdraws the motion.

Councillor Collins states the point from the Board of Directors regarding religious beliefs, she states that it is not indicative of the Board's overall beliefs of the motion, and that Human Resources and communications matters were mainly prioritized. She notes that she would like to see this passed in her capacity as the Arts Representative. She also notes that profanity should only be used on a necessity-based basis, and ensure that the Dais are treated with respect.

Councillor Karasick states that any amendments onto 1.5.5 would allow the opportunity to be used, and believes such amendments would be better for a communications policy.



VP University Affairs moves the motion to re-label 1.5.5 to 1.5.2; seconded by Councillor Williamson.

Senator Daryanani moves to call the question, seconded by Councillor Smith — APPROVED.

Voting Period:

In favour: 22

Opposed: 1

Abstain: 3

The motion is approved.

The Speaker asks an individual to motion to suspend the rules, to allow the new Councillors to introduce themselves. Moved by VP Student Life, and seconded by Councillor Williamson — APPROVED.

The Theology, FYC, Clubs, Services, Music, and Francophone Affairs Representatives introduce themselves.

13. New Business

- a. Motion Condemning the GNL Québec-Gazoduq Énergie Saguenay Project 2020-10-08 --
APPROVED

VP University Affairs motivates. VP University Affairs states that they were contacted by the Arts and Science Federations, asking for their input on the Gazoduq-Saguenay project. They state that there are numerous student associations signing onto this statement, condemning the project. They state that the project was projected to increase gas emissions by 50 million tonnes of carbon dioxide gas released. As well, super-tankers would be transporting natural gas through critical habitats of the St. Laurence beluga whale, and further endangering communities. They state the motion is well within SSMU's Sustainability Policy.

Question Period:

Councillor Wan asks if they think that this motion would pose difficulty to Engineering students attempting to gain a job in this sector in the future. VP University Affairs states that the motion is no different than past motions, policies, and plans of the SSMU, posing no additional risk.

Councillor Reed asks about the claim made to increasing greenhouse gas emissions, and asks for information where the claim was made from. VP University Affairs states that they were statistics provided by the Arts and Science Associations Federation, by a study by Collision Fjord.



Councillor Kurkcu asks if the SSMU checked the project's own mandates and how they explain the projects, rather than just the given statements of the Arts and Science Associations Federation. VP University Affairs states that they consulted those documents, and believe that the document came off as largely pro-oil propaganda.

Councillor Bonan notes they are also an engineer, and notes that the project is very pro-fracking and pro-natural gas, and not in line with SSMU's existing policies.

[Recess begins at 20:03.]

[Recess ends at 20:13.]

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

In favour: 20

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 3

The Motion Condemning the GNL Québec-Gazoduc Énergie Saguenay Project 2020-10-08 is approved.

b. Motion Regarding Renewal of the SSMU Ambassador Fee 2020-10-08 -- **APPROVED**

VP Finance motivates. VP Finance states that the SSMU Ambassador fee is highly sought-over and heavily utilized. He states that it provides monetary support for groups that represent SSMU at external conferences, and has done so since 2010. They state that the approval of the fee will allow this fee to continue to be utilized. They note last year, that their spending for the Ambassador fee was more than the total funding available. However, because of COVID-19 placing conferences and meetings online, VP Finance has chosen to keep the fee at the rate it is now.

Question Period:

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel asks that by keeping the fee at the same level, if it is expected that the gains received by reduced prices will be able to be carried on into following years' that will allow it to offset any shortfalls in funding due to the lack of an increased fee. VP Finance replies that they will have to play the fee by ear. They state that if the fee is not able to cover the next few years, it can be amended. However, they state that it should remain at this rate for the time being.

Councillor Collins asks if the University contributes at all to such funds. VP Finance replies that they are not sure what the University covers from their end, and states the fee is utilized quite heavily, and worries that if it is not renewed, student groups will not be able to attend external conferences.



Councillor Khodadadi asks what kind of funding there is. VP Finance asks for clarification. Councillor Khodadadi asks what student groups can request for funding from the Ambassador Fund. VP Finance states that they can apply to the Funding Committee to cover the deficit from a trip.

Councillor Collins asks for clarification in conferences. VP Finance states it is mostly utilized by groups such as Model UN and Debate.

Councillor Wan asks if they believe that it would be better to change the 2025 timeline to one that is closer, so that they have a sooner opportunity to reflect on funding levels. VP Finance states that they addressed that with the Governance Manager, and states that they kept it as is, as the fee can be amended in the meantime without adjusting the time.

Debate:

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel states that it may be worth looking at using the Club Fund, SSMU Ambassador Fund, and the Campus Life fund to use for general SSMU funding.

Councillor Wan motions to amend the Fall 2025 deadline to Fall 2022, seconded by Senator Daryanani.

Debate on the amendment:

Councillor Wan motivates, stating that as COVID-19 ends, that student activity will skyrocket, and may not be able to properly address demands. VP University Affairs respects the desire to have a re-examining, they believe that by lowering the timeline, this may be an issue, as they already have the opportunity to amend the fee in a referendum. They state if the fee levy timeline is shortened, the SSMU will have to argue for the renewal fee, and the increase of the fee as well. They note that the timeline can be amended, and notes that this is superior, as it would still ensure the presence of constant funding. Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel states that the logistics proposed by the amendment don't make sense, due to the way the 'No' vote works. They state that it doesn't add anything, but puts sustained risk on the survival of the fee. Councillor Wan thanks them for their points, but notes that a closer deadline forces SSMU to be more accountable. As well, he notes that it limits the SSMU's opportunity to run into deficits. VP University Affairs seconds the sentiments of Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel. They state that by shortening the fee, they are not protecting themselves from a deficit, if both campaigns fail. They state that if the increase fails, the \$2.00 fee will still exist until 2025.

VP Finance states that Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel brought up strong points. VP Finance states that they should keep it with an expiry in 2025, and that he will re-examine it come next semester, and inform the incoming VP Finance.

Councillor Karasick echoes the sentiments of the VP University Affairs and Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel. Councillor Karasick also does not understand how it would be adding a deficit.

Voting on the amendment — APPROVED



Senator Daryanani motions to approve by unanimous consent. This is seconded. There is opposition, and the motion fails.

In favour: 12

Opposed: 10

Approve: 5

Debate on the main motion:

VP Finance states that it was brought to their attention that McGill may not accept a two-year fee.

VP University Affairs motions to suspend the rules to re-enter into debate, seconded by Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel — APPROVED.

Senator Daryanani motions to table the amendment. This fails to receive a second. The Speaker explains the action of tabling.

VP Finance states that the IRs of Finance do not state anything of the sort, but notes that generally speaking, fees should last between three to five years.

Councillor Wan motions to amend the amendment adding a clause that if fees must have a timeline of three to five years, that the timeline would revert back to 2025, seconded by Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel.

Debate on the amendment to the amendment:

Councillor Wan motivates. Councillor Wan states that the majority of Legislative Council approves of a shortened timeline, and this would be in light of McGill regulations.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel states that they are in complete disagreement, as it is unnecessarily complicated. As well, they note that a question containing stipulations creates complications, and notes that the DPSLL has the opportunity to send the question back.

VP University Affairs echoes the sentiments of Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel. They note that furthermore, this question is unnecessarily complicated and may not be understood by the Membership.

Voting on the amendment to the amendment:

In favour: 13

Opposed: 7

Abstain: 7

Debate on the amendment:



VP University Affairs states that the comments made by themselves and Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel still stand. They believe it unlikely that such a question will be approved by the DPSLL, and strongly advises against the amendment. Councillor Karasick states that the amendment seems strange.

VP Finance states that the deadline should be kept at 2025. They state that the McGill website advocates for fees that are at least three years in length, and would not appreciate this fee. On the deficit, VP Finance states that the fee ran a \$3000 deficit last year, however, notes that the fee will most likely run a surplus this year, which will allow them to address it.

Councillor Collins echoes the sentiments from Councillor Karasick, noting that she is having difficulty following it.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel asks what the ramifications of a 'No' vote would be. The Speaker notes that it would strike down the amendment, including the amendment to the amendment.

Vote on the amendment — FAILS.

In favour: 6

Opposed: 14

Abstain: 7

The motion to amend fails.

Debate on the main motion:

There is no further debate.

Vote on the main motion:

In favour: 20

Opposed: 4

Abstain: 1

The Motion Regarding Renewal of the SSMU Ambassador Fee 2020-10-08 is approved.

c. Motion Regarding Increase and Scope of the Mental Health Fee 2020-10-08 --

APPROVED

VP Student Life motivates.

VP Student Life states that the motion both increases the fee and makes it non-opt-outable.

VP Student life states that the fee is at \$0.40, and that they would be raising it \$1.66, to implement Wellness World, which is a digital portal seeking to centralize wellness resources across campuses, and to allow more directed support. VP Student Life states that herself and the Mental Health



Commissioner were first made aware of the project in May. They state that over the summer, they engaged in consultation efforts with groups such as Queer McGill and the Black Students' Network.

VP Student Life also states that the fee addresses the Mental Health Policy and Plan, which stipulates that by 2021, the fee should be made to be non-opt-outable.

Question Period:

Councillor Wan inquires about the price of the contract with Wellness Hub. VP Student Life states it would be approximately \$1.22 per student.

Councillor Lee asks if there were other candidates, as opposed to Wellness World. VP Student Life states that one of the biggest draws to Wellness World was that it was a by students, for students project. She also states that they were able to offer feedback, and that the portal offered much flexibility.

Councillor Wan asks if there have been any performative indicators put forward by this company. VP Student Life states that the Wellness World organizing group is relatively new, and notes that she does not have access to indicators. VP Student Life states that the Executives were able to test the Wellness World platform, and notes that they were all satisfied.

Councillor Wan asks how Wellness Hub would overlap with the services that clubs and services provide. VP Student Life states that there would be no overlaps. She states that it would show all available resources offered by Clubs and Services, and intended to compliment different groups doing work on mental health work. She notes that it is not a resource that provides 'treatment,' serving to aggregate information.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel asks if this is applicable to the Quebec context, as it was developed by the University of Ottawa. VP Student Life states that every aspect of McGill's portal is made to reflect the desires and interests of McGill.

Councillor Reed asks about the centralized navigation system, and asks if this system has to be manually updated. VP Student Life states that new wellness resources would have to be added manually.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel speaks on risk factors and resource implications of the motion, speaking on the fact that the Mental Health Commissioner would largely be overseeing the project, and asks if this has been reflected in the Commissioner's contract. VP Student Life replies that the fee is meant to pay for Wellness World, not any additional hours for the Mental Health Commissioner. However, VP Student Life notes that the Mental Health Commissioner does not expect for this work to be more than the time permitted by their contract.

Councillor Reed asks if there are any results from UOttawa that prove engagement. VP Student Life states that the fee will be served to establish the pilot portal. Furthermore, they state that in Winter 2021, they would conduct consultations, monitoring, and research into if students use the portal.



Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel states that for individual wellness events, it does not seem that the filter would pick those up. As such, he suggests that this would serve as a multimedia platform for a Commissioner to manage. VP Student Life states that she is not too sure in regards to the administrative workload of the portal, but does not believe it would be on the Mental Health Commissioner to do that work.

Debate:

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel motions to divide the question. This motion is seconded by Councillor Wan.

The Speaker explains what a motion to divide the question is.

Debate on the motion:

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel motivates, explaining the rationale for dividing the question.

Councillor Wan speaks in favour of the question, and would look for unanimous consent.

The motion has been approved by unanimous consent.

Debate on the main motion:

VP University Affairs speaks in favour of both questions stating that this is an incredibly useful fee, and by keeping it non-opt-outable, they can ensure the security of the fee. As well, they thank VP Student Life for her answering of numerous questions.

Councillor Wan motions to further divide the question, dividing the opt-outable question and the increase of the fee, seconded by Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel.

Councillor Wan states that he believes the act in making the fee non-opt-outable could be contentious.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel speaks in favour of the motion. They note that the Office of Student Life and Learning does not allow for the submission of questions entailing both making the fee non-opt-outable and raising the fee.

VP Student Life notes that she and the Mental Health Commissioner are in favour.

The motion to divide the question is approved by unanimous consent.

Debate on the main motion:

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel motions to vote in unanimous consent for parts 1 and 3, that is, the renewal of the fee and the change in nature of the fee, seconded by Senator Daryanani.



Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel motivates. Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel notes that McGill should be paying for this, but they aren't.

There is no opposition. Thus, the question parts will stand approved.

Senator Daryanani motions to call the question regarding the increase, seconded by Councillor Smith — APPROVED.

Voting on the main motion:

In favour: 17

Opposed: 5

Abstain: 0

Return to item 13.c).

VP Student Life states that it would not be within their best interest to increase the fee and make it not-opt-outable, as they put preference on the increase of the fee.

Councillor Wan asks why one question is only being considered for revision.

VP Student Life states that the fee is to ensure they have enough funding for Wellness World. She states that in order to obtain that successfully, they believe it would be beneficial to make it opt-outable. She states that the opt-outable portion comes secondary.

Debate:

Councillor Wan indicates his opposition, due to the fact that Wellness World is significantly new. As well, he notes that a \$40,000 payment poses a financial risk, and would look towards deferring the payment by a year to understand the benefits of Wellness World.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel states that if there is a concern that SSMU is overcharging, such a discussion should occur here. Furthermore, he states that it seems like it overlaps with the Wellness Hub. Furthermore, he notes that if McGill is the first group to use it, they should not be paying for it.

Councillor Lee inquires on the use of Wellness World, in terms of potential future integration with the Wellness Hub.

VP Student Life states that Wellness Hub is extremely useful, as it seeks to address gaps that exist in current McGill mental health structures. Additionally, she raises the point of a one-year trial period. She states that in this case, if students believe that Wellness World is something they believe in, and think it is necessary, they will act accordingly. VP Student Life states that they are hoping for future McGill administration buy-in.



VP University Affairs states that the separation of the question addresses concerns on if the Wellness World should be student-funded. Furthermore, they state that McGill would not be the first university to implement the system. As well, they note that the Executive Committee has tested it out prior, and believes it worthwhile to at least send it to referendum.

Councillor Morgan motions to suspend the rules to move her report to immediately, to ensure that she can present this evening. This is seconded by Councillor Smith — APPROVED.

Councillor Wan states that SSMU does not have enough information on Wellness World, nor metrics on its reception at UOttawa. As well, while he believes that the fee should be increased, he is unsure if it should be delegated to Wellness World. As well, he suggests moving it to the Spring 2021 referendum, to provide SSMU more time to obtain metrics on the performance of Wellness World at other universities.

Senator Daryanani echoes the sentiments of Councillor Wan, and moves the amendment to remove the second question, and to simply ask if the Mental Health fee should be renewed.

VP University Affairs asks if this would be an amendment to the amendment. The Speaker indicates that it would.

Senator Daryanani's motion is seconded by Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel.

Senator Daryanani motivates. Senator Daryanani believes there is a lack of consultation with UOttawa and the student population. Furthermore, he believes that there are already pre-existing mental health resources available. As well, he notes that the roles of Local Wellness Advisors are also responsible for aggregating information and pointing students in the right direction.

Debate on the amendment to the amendment:

VP Student Life states that there was significant consultation that occurred in the summer months, who cited that the portal file significant gaps.

VP University Affairs takes issues with how this was brought about procedurally. VP University Affairs states that the reopening was done to simply remove the non-opt-outable nature of the fee. As well, VP University Affairs notes that the provision of Wellness World stems from a desire of students in wanting such a service.

Councillor Wan states that he does not doubt that the VP Student Life did consultation, but notes there is little data to support the adoption of Wellness World at this time, and suggests waiting until Winter 2021.

Councillor Williamson states that the online resource of Wellness World offers students a significant opportunity to access services in an unprecedented mental health crisis.



Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel states that SSMU, in the past, paid for products that it did not end up using.

Councillor Smith motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Karasick — APPROVED.

Voting on the amendment to the amendment:

In favour: 10

Opposed: 5

Abstain: 8

Debate on the amendment:

VP University Affairs states that if the amendment was voted down, Senator Daryanani's motion would also be struck down. VP University Affairs argues that the motion was conducted in an underhanded way. Furthermore, VP University Affairs suggests that this motion be voted down as well. VP University Affairs stresses the importance and helpfulness of Wellness World. Councillor Wan does not believe that the amendment was underhanded.

VP University Affairs states that for all intents and purposes, the motion was already debated, scrutinized, and voted upon. Once again, they stress that such an action was connectedly underhandedly. VP University Affairs states that if it was the desire to amend this motion, it should have happened during Debate, but note that it did not happen.

VP University Affairs also asks if there is a way to appeal the decision.

The Speaker makes the distinction between the Objection to the Consideration of the Question and the Appeal of the Decision of the Chair.

VP University moves to object to the consideration of the question, seconded by Councillor Karasick.

VP University Affairs motivates. VP University Affairs states that such actions by Senator Daryanani were underhanded, and that such concerns were not originally addressed. VP University Affairs does not believe that the motion laying in front of them maintains the original spirit of the motion.

Debate on the objection to the consideration of the question:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

The Speaker notes that such a motion requires a 2/3 majority.

Councillor Smith motions to conduct the vote by roll call, seconded — APPROVED.



In favour: Councillor El-Zammar, Councillor Amballadah, Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel, Councillor Ge, Councillor Karasick, Councillor Bonan, Councillor Smith, Councillor Kurkcu, Councillor Awan, Councillor Reed, Councillor Zhang, Councillor Page, Councillor Williamson, Councillor Fernandez, Councillor Merali, Councillor Collins, Councillor Gundermann, Councillor Kunz--Roelens, Councillor Litvina, Councillor Sood.

Opposed: Councillor Wan, Senator Daryanani, Councillor Lee.

The Speaker notes that the motion in objecting to the consideration has been approved, and thus, debate will be re-entered.

Debate on the amendment to the amendment:

VP University Affairs states that anyone who voted in favour of the objection should vote against such an amendment. VP University Affairs states that if this motion is approved, it is against the spirit of the main motion.

Councillor Smith motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Bonan.

Senator Daryanani motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Wan — FAILS.

VP University Affairs motions to vote by roll call, seconded by VP Student Life.

VP University Affairs motivates. VP University Affairs encourages everyone to vote in favour of a vote by roll call, as the debate has become centred around fairness in parliamentary procedure.

In favour: 12

Opposed: 9

Abstain: 0

Vote by roll call:

In favour: Councillor Wan, Senator Daryanani, Councillor Lee

Opposed: Councillor El-Zammar, Councillor Smith, Councillor Amballadah, Councillor Karasick, Councillor Bonan, Councillor Kurkcu, Councillor Awan, Councillor Reed, Councillor Zhang, Councillor Page, Councillor Williamson, Councillor Fernandez, Councillor Kunz--Rodelns, Councillor Gundermann, Councillor Merali, Councillor Litvina, Councillor Sood, Councillor Collins.

Abstain: Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel, Councillor Ge

The Speaker announces that the amendment to the amendment has been struck.

VP Student Life motions to call the question, seconded by VP University Affairs — APPROVED.



VP Student Life motions to approve this by unanimous consent, seconded — APPROVED.

The motion is approved unanimously.

Councillor Smith motions to move the recess until now, seconded by Councillor Williamson — APPROVED.

[Recess begins at 23:27.]

[Recess ends at 23:37.]

- d. Motion Regarding the SSMU Daycare Fee for Fall 2020 Referendum 2020-10-08 --
APPROVED

VP Student Life motivates.

VP Student Life notes that the motion is a renewal and increase of the fee. VP Student Life states that they are proposing an increase of \$0.50, from \$2.50 to \$3.00. She notes that the Daycare has been running close to a deficit in recent years, due to greater operational capacity and staffing changes. As well, she notes that they hope to expand the SSMU Daycare, to better serve the student population.

Question Period:

Councillor Wan asks if she believes that they should include the previous question, noting the increase. VP Student Life submits a friendly amendment to that capacity.

Senator Daryanani inquires about the impact of COVID-19 on the Daycare, and if the Daycare will be operating on a surplus due to COVID-19. VP Student Life states that the SSMU Daycare and Nursery were operating at reduced capacity during COVID, but have been increasing capacity. She states that they are operating at 'full' reduced capacity.

Senator Daryanani asks if there is a 50% surplus, and if staff have been reduced as well. VP Student Life states that staff have not been reduced. As well, she notes that they have had a gradual increase in the number of children. She notes that they are continuing to use the full value of the funds.

Councillor Karasick asks if the fee would raise enough funds if needed in regards to increasing government regulations and restrictions.

Senator Daryanani asks whether the SSMU Daycare collects fees from parents and if so, why do McGill students have to pay for it. VP Student Life states that she is unsure if they are charging parents. She notes that the Daycare fulfills a need for student parents. She also notes that these values are stipulated in McGill's policies on student care.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel states that parents pay \$8.25 per day for Daycare. He states that the Daycare subsidizes items such as rent.



Councillor Khodadadi asks why the fee is non-opt-outable.

VP Student Life states that the fee has been non-opt-outable for some time. She states that it ensures the funding is reliable, and allows for better budget calculations. Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel notes that the Daycare operates on shoestring margins. He states that the Daycare would not be able to operate in line with opt-outable fee predictions.

Councillor Wan asks if the budget can be included in the appendix of the referendum question. VP Finance states that they could, but notes that as the Daycare is a separate entity, it is not necessary.

Debate:

VP Student Life states that the SSMU Daycare has an immeasurable impact on undergraduate students, and notes that it is perhaps one of the most important services SSMU provides. They stress that the Daycare operates with extremely limited profits.

Councillor Karasick states that the Daycare is extremely important. Councillor Karasick notes that as someone who was once in the McGill daycare system, he stresses the importance. Furthermore, he is cautious that the increase is so low.

Senator Daryanani states that his concern is part of the larger issue of individuals paying for SSMU fees that do not impact them, and states they will be moving to divide the question. VP University Affairs acknowledges the concerns associated with raising fees, but notes that this should be the last fee that such concerns are highlighted. They stress the fact that the Daycare is constantly at full capacity, and needs to expand in order to be able to provide space for more children.

Councillor Reed echoes VP University Affairs sentiments, as such efforts promote equity. Councillor Reed also states that the referendum is for students to decide if they should pay certain fees.

VP Finance echoes the sentiments of the VP University Affairs. VP Finance also notes that the \$0.50 increase is also expected to account for the deficit that the Daycare is incurring this year. As well, speaking on the non-opt-outable nature, he notes that the costs of operating the daycare are static, and an opt-outable fee would not be compatible.

Senator Daryanani motions to divide the question, separating the increase and the nature of the fee, seconded by Councillor Khodadadi.

Debate on the moved motion:

Senator Daryanani notes that SSMU easily moves fees, and notes that the nature of fees should be separated from the increase of such fees.

Councillor Karasick understands the purpose, but does not like the idea of putting a valuable service in danger due to a point of personal pride.



VP University Affairs reiterates the point that the Daycare is already running a deficit. Given that concerns over the lack of capacity, the fee increase is necessary to support the daycare. Furthermore, they agree that splitting the question would be reckless, as well as increases the possibility of a no vote in regards to the increase. Lastly, the VP University Affairs believes the increase necessary to respond to the deficit.

VP Student Life states that the fee and the increase are crucial to operations of the Daycare, especially in light of adjustments and concessions made to COVID. She is also concerned for the potential of separation, as it provides an opportunity for students to express discontent by voting no on the fee.

Councillor Collins states that it is students' responsibilities to review what the fee increases are, and what the referendum means for them, largely educating themselves on the importance of the referendum. She hopes that everyone will support the fee.

Councillor Smith echoes the sentiments of Councillor Collins, Councillor Karasick, and the VP Student Life and University Affairs. Councillor Smith believes that the amendment is not very thought-out, as there is a lack of security for the Daycare if the question fails.

Senator Daryanani states that the question does consider the risk. However, he notes that even if the increase fails, the Daycare would continue to operate normally. Secondly, he hopes that students are educated during the referendum period.

Councillor Reed states that it is not true that the Daycare would continue to operate normally, as outlined by the VP Student Life. Furthermore, he notes that the fix suggested by Senator Daryanani is merely cosmetic in nature, presented in essentially the same way.

VP Finance understands the concerns in raising non-opt-outable fees, but believes such concerns should not be highlighted in this specific forum, with the Daycare at stake.

Councillor Karasick explains that their issue with Senator Daryanani's point that raising the fees will put the security of the Daycare at risk, when he may be putting the security of the Daycare at risk. He notes that the Daycare will not operate the same if such an increase is not obtained, such as through needing to pay for increased sanitation necessities and PPE provisions.

VP University Affairs reminds individuals to not descend into personal attacks.

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel states that the question of the renewal shouldn't actually be at stake, but that it is dictated by the DPSLL.

Councillor Smith motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Collins.

Voting on the motion to divide the question:

In favour: 5

Opposed: 17



Abstain: 4

[Recess begins at 22:21.]

[Recess ends at 22:31.]

Debate on the main motion:

Councillor Gwiazda-Amsel moves to call the question, seconded by Councillor Smith — APPROVED.

Voting Procedure:

In favour: 19

Opposed: 1

Abstain: 2

The Motion Regarding the SSMU Daycare Fee for Fall 2020 Referendum 2020-10-08 is approved.

- e. Motion Regarding the Renewal of the Musician's Collective Fee 2020-10-08 --
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

The Motion Regarding the Renewal of the Musician's Collective Fee 2020-10-08 was unanimously approved during Consent Vote.

There is no further discussion.

VP Student Life asks how one would go back to a motion to re-enter debate, noting that it would change the nature of the Mental Health fee.

The Speaker notes that it would require a suspension of the rules, with a 2/3 majority.

VP Student Life motions to that effect. She notes that they would be seeking to remove the non-opt-outable portion of the fee. This is seconded by Councillor Gwiazda Amsel.

14. Reports by Committees

- a. Councillor Morgan (PT/OT)

Councillor Morgan presents her report.

Councillor Morgan states that they had their first Legislative Council on September 11. She also notes that the school underwent constitutional amendments. As well, she states that the school is organizing bi-weekly mental health discussions. She notes that Frosh was successful. As well, she notes that they are in the process of creating safe social events.



Questions on the Report:

There are no questions.

b. Executive Committee

VP University Affairs presents the report.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

c. Funding Committee --**APPROVED**

VP Finance presents the report, for three organizations.

Councillor Smith motions to approve the Funding Committee report, seconded by Councillor Williamson — **APPROVED**.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

d. Mental Health Committee

VP Student Life presents the Report of the Mental Health Committee.

VP Student Life highlights the Mental Health Awareness Week. VP Student Life states that the Mental Health roundtable occurs every third week. She highlights the development of Wellness World, and encourages anyone to reach out to the Mental Health Commissioner for questions.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

e. Community Engagement Committee -- **POSTPONED**

The Community Engagement Committee Report is postponed until the next meeting.

15. Reports by Councillors



a. Councillor Wan (Medicine)

Councillor Wan presents the Report.

Councillor Wan notes that they held a mix of virtual and in-person activities for Frosh. Furthermore, they note that Frosh was successful. They state that elections for Med1 Council occurred at the end of September. As well, the Executive Retreat occurred at the end of September. As well, the MSS are looking to sign onto the IRP. They note that the Halloween Party has been cancelled. As well, Councillor Wan notes that the GA is scheduled for December 2. Lastly, they note that they are working on setting up governance at the Outaouais campus, both locally and for SSMU. He notes that there have been no Health and Dental Review meetings thus far.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

b. Councillor Bulhoes (Education) – **POSTPONED**

Councillor Wan motions to postpone the report of the Education Representative, seconded.

c. Councillor Ge (Nursing)

Councillor Ge presents the report. Councillor Ge notes that the Funding Committee has met once. Councillor Ge notes that election by-law amendments have passed.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

d. Senator Daryanani (Senate Caucus)

Senator Daryanani presents the report. Senator Daryanani notes that there was a Senate Caucus meeting this week, and discussed the Athletics fee. He also attended two remote meetings, one with TLS and one with the Faculty of Arts. He also highlights the work of BaCoN, noting that individuals are eligible to submit names. He currently notes that he is working on a policy revamping the medical note policy.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

16. Executive Reports

a. President

VP University Affairs presents the report on behalf of the President.



VP University Affairs notes that the President has been working on the campaign for the referendum. VP University Affairs notes that CAMSR will be meeting in the next few weeks. VP University Affairs notes that they are continuing to work on the Five-Year Plan. VP University Affairs notes that the President attended numerous meetings.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

b. VP University Affairs

VP University Affairs presents.

VP University Affairs states that Senate met on September 22, discussing harm reductions and athletics facility funding. They also note that Senate Nomination Committee met. VP University Affairs notes that Senate Steering met on October 6. VP University Affairs notes that numerous associations met with Angela Campbell. As well, VP University Affairs notes that BaCoN has entered the deliberative phase. VP University Affairs notes that the overhaul of the HR policy was successful. VP University Affairs states that the Special Researcher on Preferred Names is entering their final stage.

A 30-second extension is granted.

For Libraries, VP University Affairs states that the Textbook Broke campaign has been revamped, and currently looking at altering the study hub process.

Question Period:

Senator Daryanani asks if the red alert will change anything related to Study Hubs, and if so, what plans does SSMU have.

VP University Affairs states that their protocol is simply in case if Study Hubs needed to be expanded. As it stands now, VP University Affairs notes that Study Hubs have been reduced.

c. VP Finance

VP Finance presents.

VP Finance states that the Finance Committee has met, and will be meeting every three weeks. He notes that the audit has begun. VP Finance notes that banking tokens will now be virtual. VP Finance notes that there have been very few Funding applications. VP Finance notes that the investment portfolio has completely rebounded.



Question Period:

There are no questions.

d. VP Student Life

VP Student Life presents the report.

VP Student Life presents the report. VP Student Life notes that Clubs workshops occurred on the 19th, 20th, and 26th. For Services, she states that she is working on space agreements for the University Centre. For communications, she notes that they have been doing interviews for the Communications Manager. For student services, she states that she has worked closely with CL&E. VP Student Life notes that she also attended a Life After Your Degree meeting.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

e. VP External --**POSTPONED INDEFINITELY**

Councillor Wan motions to postpone the report of the VP External indefinitely, seconded — APPROVED.

17. Confidential Session

There is no confidential business this evening.

18. Adjournment: **00:32**

Councillor Bonan motions to adjourn, seconded by Councillor Williamson.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Earle'.

Jemark Earle, President