



# SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PUBLIC MINUTES

December 3, 2020

The regular bi-weekly Legislative Council Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held by teleconference, on December 3, 2020 at 18:00.

**\*\*\*Content Warning: Please note certain discussions pertain to sensitive matters. An additional CW will be provided in the minutes.\*\*\***

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

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

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker presents the Land Acknowledgement.

3. Attendance

Councillor Morgan is absent.

4. Adoption of the Agenda – **APPROVED**

VP Finance moves to amend the agenda, to add 'Audit Overview'.

VP University Affairs motions to move the confidential session to before Old Business.

Councillor Smith motions to approve the agenda as amended, seconded by Councillor Bonan – **APPROVED**.

The agenda is adopted.

5. Guest Speakers

a. Budget Revisions -- **APPROVED**



VP Finance notes that the main sources of revenue for SSMU are student membership fees, Gert's sales, building and space rentals, donations and sponsorship, and admission and registration fees. For general student fees, VP Finance notes that the original budget predicted around \$2.5 million, but the revised budget based on predictions is \$2,677,776.61. He notes that this is based on increased enrollment since last year, as well as predicting an 8% decrease in members for winter 2021, because he notes that some students don't come back. For Gert's sales, VP Finance notes that the original projection for revenues was \$245,900. They note that it has been revised down to \$108,100, due to the fact that Gert's has been delayed for reopening, as well as delayed traffic due to COVID-19. On business rentals, he notes that they originally predicted \$172,017 in revenues, but that it has been revised down to \$64,992. He states that this is due to the fact that the building opening was delayed due to COVID, and the rental income began in November instead of September. For building space rentals, the original budget predicted \$97,000 in revenue, but it has been revised to \$52,000, due to COVID. For donations and sponsorship, they predicted that they'd receive \$111,500, but that it has been revised down to 26,500. VP F notes that this is due to the fact that there are less sponsorships and donations due to COVID. On admission registration fees, he notes that \$49,000 was originally predicted, and later revised down to \$15,000, due to the fact that there are less mini courses being offered, due to COVID. On total revenue, he states that they are expected to make \$4.7 million. He states that this is different from the actual revised full year forecast due to the fact that it includes service fees, funding fees, menstrual hygiene fees, and the academic fees as well. For expenses, VP Finance notes that the main expenses for SSMU are salaries and benefits, Gert's materials and supplies, professional fees, and cleaning services. Regarding salaries, VP Finance notes that they were originally anticipating \$1,555,667.04. He notes that it has been revised down to \$1,439,585.24, due to staffing changes in the Gert's and mini courses department. For benefits, he notes that it was reduced for the same reason.

Speaking on Gert's, VP Finance notes that the prediction was \$149,815, but that it has been revised down to \$64,390, and noting that it is lower because Gert's is opening half a year later than was anticipated. On materials and supplies, the original was \$52,741.66, but that it has been revised down to \$48,841.66, citing the lowering due to the building reopening delay.

On professional fees, he notes that they originally budgeted \$100,000, but that they have revised it to \$150,000.

For cleaning services, he notes that it was originally \$282,399.96, but that it was revised down to \$193,849.96, due to the building reopening delay. He notes that the original total expenses is roughly \$3.3 million, but now it is predicting just over \$3 million.



On the operating budget, VP Finance states that it has been revised in November. He separates operations into sections: University Centre building operations, general administration and IT, governance, Gert's bar, programming activities, and then restricted departments.

On University Centre building operations, he states that the three changes in this section were the events. He notes that they were originally projecting revenue in the area of \$40,000, but that it has been revised down to costing SSMU \$5,830.40, due to the fact that they lost the projected revenue because of COVID and the delayed building opening.

For the other department of the University Centre, he states that the original was \$249,913.80 cents, but that it has been revised down to \$234,863.80, due to the building reopening delay.

On 3501 Peel, he states that the original was \$310,390 and revised down to \$221,174, which was lower because of COVID.

On general administration and IT, he states that the original was \$829,992.82, which was revised up to \$879,992.82, noting that they are anticipating some expenses.

For governance, he notes that this includes the executive portfolios, as well as communications and a few other things. He states that there are no changes here.

On Gert's Bar, VP Finance states that the original budget was \$110,831.96, which was revised down to \$63,326.68, due to the fact that it is opening half a year later than expected.

Speaking on programming activities, he states that the two departments that got changed in this category were mini-courses and sponsorship. On mini-courses, the original was \$29,948, and it was revised to \$31,580.

For Sponsorship, he states that it was originally \$1,866, but that it was revised down all the way to \$85,386.

He states that total projected revenues originally predicted were \$3,338,937.52, which is now down to \$3,115,879.13, but notes that it is made up for in reduced expenses, which has been revised to \$3,190,595.40. He states that the original budget predicted a slight deficit, but the revised budget predicts a \$96,283.73 cent surplus.

Question Period:

There are no questions.



VP Finance motions to approve the budget revisions, seconded by Councillor Bonan — APPROVED.

The Budget revisions are approved.

b. Audit Overview

VP Finance states that the audit is complete, and thanks the SSMU accounting team for their work in assisting with the audit over the past few months.

VP Finance notes that the audit took longer than usual, due to the fact that SSMU didn't have a general manager for a long time, and they wanted to ensure that the controls remained in place during their absence, as well as COVID, meaning that half of the audit was digital, and half of it required physical documentation. He states that it required a lot of work to compile all the necessary documentation. Going forward, they note that the team has decided to move fully digital going forward.

VP Finance highlights the roles of the auditors. He states that they identify and assess the risks of material misstatement or misstatement of the financial statements. They also obtain an understanding of internal control relevant to the audit in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in circumstances. They also evaluated the appropriateness of accounting policies used. He states that they conclude on the appropriateness of management's use of the going concern basis of accounting. As well, they evaluate the overall presentation structure and content of the financial statements.

On improvements and next steps, he notes that the auditors want to see SSMU Daycare financials consolidated with SSMU overall financials, given that as a not-for-profit, SSMU levies fees from the membership to fund the daycare in part, and that as such, the daycare should not be as separate as it is. He also notes that they recommend trying to ensure that financial controls are communicated thoroughly with relevant parties and continuing to receive appropriate approvals for payments. As well, they recommend that SSMU modify their lease agreements with people renting space in the building.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

6. Report of the Steering Committee



The Speaker presents the Report of the Steering Committee.

7. Announcements

The President thanked the VP University Affairs and the Senate Caucus team for dealing with the Senate last night, and commended their efforts.

8. Question Period

There are no questions.

**\*\*\*Content Warning below.**

9. Generative Discussion - S/U Policy

VP University Affairs notes that there have been numerous motions submitted to the Senate concerning the re-implementation of the S/U policy, including one in September 2020, which failed at the committee level, and one that was submitted to Steering recently that was rejected. They note that it was rejected for technical reasons, including a perceived lack of due diligence. They note that the motion was revised and resubmitted on the day of the Senate, with the intention of raising it from the floor. They note that a professor ended up challenging the Steering Committee's decision, and a long discussion followed. They state that in the end, the second revised motion was sent back to Steering for another round of revision. They note that the meeting is tomorrow, but that preemptively, SSMU has released a petition collecting signatures and support. They note that they are not confident that they can push this motion through themselves, given that there are only two students on Senate Steering.

Councillor Reed asks if they can provide the rationale of the Principal and those opposing on their sentiments against the motion. VP University Affairs responds that it largely has to do with logistical concerns, as well as adding to the already overburdened workloads of ordinary administration. However, they note that this policy was also implemented in the winter with much less warning, much faster, and with a much more impaired administrative system.

VP University Affairs states that the idea that it couldn't be implemented now, despite advance warning is hard to believe. As well, they note that administrators believe that students won't know what they're getting themselves into by signing up for S/U. Such could be the case is that students could S/U it, not knowing that it could impact their chances at graduate school, or medical or law school.

Councillor Smith motions to extend by one (1) minute, seconded by Councillor Bonan – APPROVED.



VP University Affairs further states that one of the arguments they heard was that it is the responsibility of faculty and administration to make the decision for students because students are not capable of making an informed decision on it.

Lastly, they also heard that administrators suggested that the value of a McGill degree would be less because students would not 'work as hard' if they took the S/U policy. VP University Affairs states that the arguments haven't been supported by much evidence or explanation or argument.

Senator Parsons states that there was also the Academic Policy Committee Report. Senator Parsons states that this committee was the one to originally shut down the S/U policy in September. There were three main reasons that it was shot down: administration was anticipating that there was the belief that students knew what they were getting into coming into the Fall, and that students would be able to adjust. As well, they believed that extending the S/U option might have negative consequences for students' CGPA. The third reason had to do with student success and wellbeing, stating that administration believed it important, but that there were many other ways faculties and instructors have adopted their courses with this in mind.

Councillor Smith motions to extend by two minutes, seconded by Councillor Bonan – APPROVED.

Senator Parsons notes that while faculties and instructors have adopted their courses, there's many moving variables. She states that the execution and results of upholding student success and well-being have not proved to be fruitful.

Senator Parsons notes that Steering rejected the motion last night for a lack of 'due diligence'. She states that typically, for motions that had issues of due diligence or had simple edits to make, according to Section Three of the Terms of Reference, it would be sent back to the submitters, and they would be able to make the changes. She states that it would be either put on the agenda for the upcoming Senate or the following Senate that would have happened in January but notes that's not what has happened. There were a few ways they could have gone about it, noting that they ultimately chose to submit a motion beforehand with the edits to raise it from the floor, with the amendments, from the Steering Committee, as they thought it would be more fruitful.

On the motion, Senator Parsons states that there was a footnote that was incorrectly cited, as well as issues with the consultations. She states that some professors who sit on Senate were concerned about grade inflation, suggesting that everyone would S/U something lower than an A, and that there were some students who didn't want it. She notes that these claims are largely without merit, stating that the policy is something students not only want, but that they need.

Councillor Smith motions to extend by one minute, seconded by Councillor Bonan – APPROVED.



Senator Parsons states that at Steering, they tried to take the approach in showing their efforts to bring forward the motion, in going through every channel possible. Senator Parsons notes that what is most important about the motion is that students are struggling right now. Some of the messages that students have sent in are heartbreaking. She states that their mental health concerns are not something to take lightly, and that it is not something that McGill Senate should be pushing aside over technicalities. Senator Parsons encourages everyone to get in contact with the individuals in the Senate within your faculty, as well as your faculty's staff at large, to try and encourage support. She encourages everyone to reach out to her if someone wishes to receive the contact list for their faculty.

Councillor Smith thanks all of the Student Senators, VP University Affairs, and the President. They note that this issue has brought them the most amount of feedback and emails that they've received. He believes that the arguments the administration has made are invalid. He also makes reference to the lack of good governance associated with the Senate, and the behaviour of removing access to Senate meeting records.

Councillor Gundermann states that last semester, because of the pandemic, the curve in the Management Faculty was suspended and the S/U option was implemented. He notes that this led to an incredible grade inflation and an average GPA of about 3.85, which he believes discredits the whole program. He asks how the VP University Affairs would respond to arguments of grade inflation and threats related to academic integrity.

Senator Parsons states that ultimately, students can choose whether or not they desire an S on their transcript and notes it may be a worry for students wishing to apply to graduate school. However, she states that she doesn't believe that grades should ever come above mental health.

Councillor Karasick thanks all of the Senators for their work. He states that it is very telling about the way the administration responds to the things that they insist on knowing better than students.

VP University Affairs states the fact that every second comment made against the motion was presented by the Chair of Senate, who is tasked with impartially governing and ensuring good governance within the Senate, while at the same time, Steering voting to approve another motion that it had not seen, while at the same time, voting down their motion on the grounds of due diligence is troublesome, according to them. They state that while concerns over grade inflation and academic integrity are valid, McGill is in a global pandemic right now. VP University Affairs states that they've heard testimonials from students that are considering dropping out, or they have relapsed, or are considering self-harm, substance abuse, and more than one testimonial noting that they are considering suicide. They state that while concerns over grade inflation and academic integrity are valid, in their opinion, they have no place in this conversation. They state that they need to take care





of our students, and to keep them alive and successful at McGill, before we can worry about their academic future.

Councillor Bonan states that it is no secret that the Faculty of Law is very rigorous academically. At the same time, he notes that most of the law firms that students wish to go to, “good” law firms have had released messages. Councillor Bonan reads a statement from Davies law firm regarding mandated pass-fail options or elective pass-fail options. He notes that Davies understands that it is an extremely difficult and challenging time for many Law students who are facing isolation, remote learning, and general uncertainty around what the academic year will look like. They note that the firm is committed to a holistic review, reviewing both academic and non-academic accomplishments. They look for candidates who are well-rounded, motivated, creative, and problem solvers who will enrich and strengthen their team with their diverse experiences, achievements, and personal stories. They state that applications or current candidacy with Davies will not be negatively impacted or pass/fail, or credit/no credit grading.

Councillor Reed states that for engineering, the Canadian Accreditation Board of Directors has also not spoken out against the implementation of pass/fail options. He states that while the top ten percentile of the last semester was a 4.0, and that though there may be a valid concern related to it, there are three arguments against it. Firstly, he notes that people get evaluated individually by graduate schools, not by the school overall. He states that many universities are doing the same thing as McGill, and it is not concerned with potential employers or graduate schools. Secondly, are the concerns related to mental health. Lastly, he states that no one will be negatively affected by the choice of whether or not to do something. Councillor Reed asks for the petition to be included in the chat.

Councillor Bonan motions for a 15-minute extension, seconded by Councillor Parsons – APPROVED.

**\*\*\*Content Warning for the discussion below.**

Senator Parsons reads a testimonial from a student. She notes that this student is contemplating suicide, and even their most productive friends are struggling to do their work. They state that they don't wish to disappoint their parents, as they sacrificed a lot, so they could come to McGill, and thus, are unwilling to drop out. Senator Parsons states that the policy comes down to helping our students. She states that at this moment, the Senators present are responsible for doing whatever they can to alleviate some of students' pain. She states that it is not out of reach, and they need everyone's support. She encourages everyone to contact the Senators in their faculty, their faculty as a whole, and email them as much as possible.

The Speaker, Lauren Hill, speaks on the issue, as an individual of the Society. Lauren states that she is currently applying to law schools and grad schools, and notes that some people may have opposition





to the S/U policy because of its ramifications that it may have with admissions. She notes that she has applied to many programs, and not one of them has indicated they are looking unfavourably on S/U policy. She notes that this includes top universities, and top research universities in Canada, noting that Suzanne Fortier indicated yesterday would harm their reputation as a 'top university.' Furthermore, Lauren states that many of these universities have no issue with accepting students who have chosen to S/U a grade due to the pandemic, or more largely, attend a school where S/U policy is accepted.

VP University Affairs asks if they can motion to endorse the approval of the extended S/U policy.

The Speaker notes that they may do that after they have concluded the generative discussion.

VP University Affairs notes that they will move it after a confidential session.

VP University Affairs motions to move Confidential Session to before Consent Items, seconded by Senator Parsons – APPROVED.

#### 10. Confidential Session: **19:23**

The Speaker asks all members of the gallery to leave at this time.

Councillor Smith motions to enter into confidential session, seconded by Councillor Bonan -- APPROVED

The Legislative Council enters into Confidential Session at 19:23.

#### 11. Recess, Consent Items

The Speaker notes that no item received consent approval. She also notes that they have accepted the motion from the VP University Affairs.

#### 12. Old Business

- a. Motion Regarding Amendments to the Committee Terms of Reference 2020-11-19 – **APPROVED**

Question Period:

Councillor Wan inquires on sections 1.8.58, and asks about the rationale behind the 20% designation, as it seems quite high. He also asks how many applications would fall under the 20% threshold versus



having lower percent thresholds. VP Finance notes that there are few applications that go over 20%. He states that through consultation, they decided that a threshold was necessary. He states that initially, they weren't going to indicate a threshold, but he believes it important that if there is an application that exceeds 20%, that Legislative Council, and further, the Board of Directors, should be made aware of it and then they should approve and then ratify it at the respective committees.

Councillor Wan asks about Section 1.4 E, where it currently states that there is one (1) Director, he asks if it would be possible to add to the one Director, who is not an Officer, to provide more diversity. VP Finance notes that he is amenable to that.

Debate:

Councillor Wan motions to amend Section 1.4.e, to amend where it says 'one Director' to 'one Director who is not an officer.' This is friendly to both the mover and the seconder.

Councillor Wan motions to amend the 20% threshold to 15%. This is friendly to both the mover and seconder.

Voting Period – APPROVED

In favour: 27

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 0

The Motion Regarding Amendments to the Committee Terms of Reference 2020-11-19 is approved.

b. Motion to adopt a SSMU 5 Year Plan 2020-11-19 -- **APPROVED**

Question Period:

Councillor Wan inquires about the second-floor cafeteria, which in the motion, states that attempts to create one in the past failed. He notes that given the revitalization, if there are any changes being made to ensure that it won't be a failure again. The President responds that in the Plan, it doesn't specifically specify that it will be a second floor cafeteria again, noting that it was only one of the options among others that are available to that space, noting that the other alternative is turning it into a student lounge space. He notes that it would be up to the Operations team to put the proper measures in place to ensure that would be successful this time around.



Councillor Smith notes that on page 12, on the section on Communications staff, it says on the side section with the list of number of positions, four (4), but the actual one only says three (4).

The President notes that it was an error on his part, and that it should read three.

Councillor Wan inquires about the student-run pharmacy. He states that in Quebec, pharmacies must be run by pharmacists. He states that as McGill doesn't have a pharmacy program, he is wondering how the student-run pharmacy would work, given that they would require a pharmacist.

The President states that it doesn't say 'student-run' pharmacy. The plan for it is to be a third-party pharmacy, such as Jean Coutu, or Pharmaprix, noting that it would be run by pharmacists.

Councillor Wan states that in the overview of operations, it notes that SSMU should have solely student-run operations. He asks how the pharmacy would run in line with each other. The President states that given the desire from students for this, there is the possibility to have student staff at the pharmacy, or to adjust the wording.

Debate:

Councillor Karasick moves to amend the wording to change to 'primarily student-run.' The President accepts this as friendly.

VP University Affairs moves to amend the number of Communication staff from four (4) to three (3), as a correction. The President accepts this as friendly.

Councillor Smith thanks everyone for their work on the Plan.

Voting Period -- APPROVED

In favour: 27

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 0

The Motion to adopt a SSMU 5 Year Plan 2020-11-19 is approved.

[Recess begins at 20:12.]

[Recess ends at 20:23.]

13. New Business



a. Motion Regarding Amendments to the SSMU Positions Book 2020-12-03 – **APPROVED**

VP University Affairs motivates. VP University Affairs states that when they were going through the Positions Book, they noticed that the section that concerns SSMU's advocacy regarding menstrual hygiene product access, used as the basis for SSMU's menstrual hygiene product program was entitled Gender Equality. They note that this is misleading, as the majority of the position all have to do with access to menstrual hygiene products. They note that the position outlined near solely outlined menstrual hygiene product access. As well, framing it as equality between the two genders, implicitly stating men and women, is transphobic. They note that women are not the only individuals who seek access to menstrual health products.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

Councillor Karasick notes that subsections 8.1 and 8.2 are actually broader than just menstrual justice, to the point that he believes that renaming the entire section does the disservice to both of those subsections. He recommends creating a new section for menstrual justice while keeping 8.1 and 8.2 within Gender Equality or renaming it to Gender Equity. VP University Affairs responds that they initially did not see a reason to make a separate section. However, upon reconsideration, they believe that a section on Gender Equity would be worth expanding on, even if they are not planning on doing so right now. Thus, they note that they can see the value in leaving a section specifically pertaining to gender-based advocacy. Senator Parsons notes that she is amenable to this amendment.

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

Voting Period -- APPROVED

In favour: 27

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 0

The Motion Regarding Amendments to the SSMU Positions Book 2020-12-03 is approved.

b. Motion Regarding the Clarification of an International Political Position 2020-12-03 --  
**APPROVED**



VP University Affairs motivates. VP University Affairs states that SSMU has been and will continue to be called on to take political stances and make statements on international or geopolitical issues. They state that there is no established position of the Society with regards to any kind of international-facing advocacy. They note that SSMU has no standing opinions on the respect for human rights, peace, or democracy, noting that it has largely been up to the discretion of the Executive Committee. They note that the issue arises that the Executives do their best to consult established positions in SSMU's established policies but notes that most don't apply to the majority of international issues that SSMU is called to speak on.

VP University Affairs explains they worked on this motion with the VP External and consulted the Executive Committee to try and come up with a list of beliefs of the Society that they believe should be unilaterally accepted among the membership. VP University Affairs notes that they tried to keep it as non-contentious as possible, so that they would at least have some type of foundation for which to make any kind of internationally-facing political action. They note that the reality is that not all motions could be brought forward to the Legislative Council. They note that ideally, this shouldn't be a debate about whether or not SSMU should take stances on geopolitical issues or should speak out on international crises, because SSMU has done so in the past and will continue to do so in the future. They note that it should be a debate about whether or not SSMU should have some kind of theoretical framework to approach those situations when they do arise, because they are currently 'flying blind.'

Question Period:

Councillor Smith asks why the Quebec Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms is not listed in Section 15.13. VP University Affairs states that according to them and the VP External, they have lost faith in the Quebec Charter, especially given the Society's documented positions on Bill 21 or the PQ. They note that the Quebec Charter is quite extensive and is farther reaching than the Canadian Charter. They note that they have seen some pretty egregious oversights or lightened violations of the Quebec Charter that they believe have them to generate some hesitation towards involving the Charter in their position. They state that while they agree with the implementation and adherence of the Quebec Charter in practice, they note that they have issues with the execution of the Quebec Charter that they did not wish to introduce, as a means of reducing holes in their positions, or contradictions with past political advocacy.

Councillor Reed thanks the VP University Affairs for bringing this to Legislative Council. Councillor Reed notes that Section 15.7 notes a promotion of elements such as colonialism, imperialism, expansionism, and globalization. They ask the VP University Affairs if they believe SSMU is an anti-capitalist organization or feel that SSMU should be an anti-capitalist organization. VP University Affairs responds that they will do their best to avoid getting into their personal opinions, but notes that they do believe SSMU is an anti-capitalist organization, and that it should be as such. In their



professional opinion, they note that they don't believe that SSMU has explicit anti-capitalist positions, but that they express anti-capitalist sentiment in nearly all of SSMU's sustainability efforts. In the position of Environment and Environmental Sustainability, as well as in the Sustainability Policy, they note that it is quite explicitly expressed that SSMU opposes environmental extractivism and the promotion of corporate interests over the environment, which in itself is an anti-capitalist sentiment. They further note that SSMU has associated itself with numerous anti-capitalist groups, and notes that many of SSMU's services express anti-capitalist views. Thus, though they state that they could agree that SSMU does not have a position on anti-capitalism, they note that SSMU has expressed anti-capitalism, in between other policies and positions, as well as organizations and services SSMU has affiliated and associated themselves with.

Councillor Gundermann asks two questions. Firstly, he asks if there was any form of framework, such as a Charter or other criteria that they used to form the motion. Secondly, they asked if other university student societies also have similar frameworks. VP University Affairs states that in regard to other student associations, it is an interesting mix. They note that there are student associations that are consistently less policy than SSMU is, that focus their efforts more on direct campus advocacy. On the contrary, they note that there are also other student associations that are vocally involved with national and international politics, noting quite a mix. VP University Affairs believes SSMU is somewhere down the middle of those two poles. They note that as indicated in Section 15.3, they looked at university-guaranteed rights and freedoms, and the values that are espoused by international organizations. As well, they also note that they looked at SSMU's other governing documents, as well as the other positions they have taken, on positions such as affordable housing, environment, Indigenous equity, gender equity, accessibility, as well as Indigenous solidarity, sustainability, climate justice, global access to medicine and so on. They state that they drew inspiration for the motion from all of SSMU's policy positions, and tried to find common themes, as well as looking towards international organizations for forms of consensus.

The President asks if there is some way to further clarify or provide consultation to both sides of a 'conflict' so that when statements are publicized, there is no 'shock' associated with release of SSMU positions.

VP University Affairs notes that the thing about positions is that they aren't mandates in and of themselves but rather, statements of belief. They note that they attempted to do it in the section concerning Impact and Next Steps. They note that it sets out the expectation that with all positions, not only will they comply with SSMU's governing documents, but makes the Executive Committee responsible for consulting Council and any relevant student groups. They note that they don't believe that the position itself is the correct place to do it, however. They also state that a better place to discuss it might be the next motion on the agenda.





Senator Daryanani reads from the papers:

“Globally, the East Asian Community is facing an unprecedented wave of racism due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Community members have been victims of verbal insults, physical harassment, and even hate crimes. The East Asian ethnicity has been made a scapegoat for the negative repercussions of the ongoing public health emergency. The East Asians’ traumatizing experiences are usually under-reported in the mainstream media; McGill should not follow suit.

While the SSMU Executive Committee has previously released a statement condemning Anti-Black racism, leading us to believe that the SSMU’s stances on racism are to never reinforce or promote racism for any member of McGill’s diverse Student Body, the release of statements by SSMU, such as the “#SAVE12HKYOUTHS” Statement, can be used to further reinforce systemic Anti-Asian racism, even though it is not the intended effect. Many racist comments on social media were spurred by the Statement, causing significant psychological distress among Asian students. Many of the Legislative Council members have received concerns from constituents regarding the Statement, that they are misunderstood, ostracized, and ultimately harmed by the community they are very much part of. The Statement indirectly puts the community into a more agonizing situation as a target for people to channel their anger on.

The SSMU’s mission is to “speak out for [us] and advocate for [our] interests”, therefore, such reinforcement of SSMU’s values will create a safe, inclusive and non-hostile environment. As such, we are kindly requesting the Executive Committee to release a statement condemning Sinophobia and Anti-Asian racism as a means of reconciliation to the East Asian community at McGill.”

Senator Daryanani notes that it is clear that statements will create divisiveness. He notes that while SSMU has made statements to denounce white supremacy, SSMU’s position against anti-Asian racism is not clear. He notes that statements will divide communities and asks if political positions and statements made on behalf of this motion will harm McGill students.

VP University Affairs notes that SSMU has made a statement condemning anti-Asian racism in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, and notes that while SSMU has not made a subsequent communication, it is not accurate to say that SSMU has been silent on anti-Asian racism. They note that it is important to remember that the motion is not whether the SSMU should be making statements but believes that no statements are intending to harm students. They note that while individuals may be upset with some of the positions of the Society, it is not a fair assessment to indicate that a statement is inflicting harm. They note that it is in everyone’s best interest to have an established framework to approach situations through. They note that without a shared framework, more individuals will be harmed than if they had a framework. They also believe the motion will clarify SSMU’s efforts in making statements, as well as much more sound, grounded, and legitimate.



Senator Daryanani does not disagree with anything in the motion, and believes that it will provide clarity, but notes that it will not solve the issue that some students may feel ostracized, or when comment sections create division amongst students. He asks what the ultimate purpose of position is, if at the end of the day, it will harm students more than it will bring them satisfaction that a student society is citing one party more than the other. VP University Affairs states that statements will be made either way. They note that the motion is not to debate whether SSMU should adopt political positions in the first place, given that SSMU is a political organization. VP University Affairs does not see the harm that Senator Daryanani is illustrating that is coming from this position, noting that the position will not create more animosity that exists already. Furthermore, they believe that the motion may actually serve to prevent animosity.

Councillor Smith motions to extend VP University Affairs' speaking time by thirty seconds, seconded by Councillor Williamson – APPROVED.

VP University Affairs notes that the motion is not about SSMU's mandate or ability to conduct political activity, but rather, improving their capacity to do so. They note that it will improve SSMU's ability to conduct political advocacy in a way that it is founded in common belief, as to make more-informed statements and messaging.

Councillor Zhang thanks VP University Affairs for bringing the motion forward. She asks how Executives would consult the Legislative Council in regard to statements, in terms of concrete steps.

VP University Affairs believes that there should be procedural frameworks for how statements are approved but notes that this is not the motion to explain how to do so. They note that they are interested in working on it but notes that the Positions Book is not the appropriate vehicle to lay out such a framework. They further note that this is not an actionable motion that mandates SSMU to make political statements.

Councillor Collins states that all of the articles in the Appendix are political. She notes that by grouping all of the beliefs together, it serves to discredit some of the nuances that at least some of these positions may have. She notes that she has not had the opportunity to consult her constituency yet, due to the ongoing mental health crisis and the S/U policy decision. Due to the political nature, she is not comfortable with the blanket approval of all beliefs. Is not to say that she doesn't agree with them, or that she believes others should disagree with them, but rather, she notes that it is just another case of a political motion coming from the Executives, that is not the Legislative Council, noting that Legislative Council is the most democratic body. She asks if VP University Affairs believes that Legislative Council is the most appropriate body to be taking on these kinds of decisions rather than it is coming from the Executives.



VP University Affairs believes that this should come through Legislative Council. They note that as Executives, they are also members of the Legislative Council. They state that this is coming from Executives, as Executives are dealing with many controversies over political advocacy. They note that this is not the will of the Executive Committee being opposed by the Legislative Council. They also disagree with the characterization that the Executive Committee is not a democratic body. They agree that the position is very long and far reaching but notes that political advocacy is very diverse in its issues. They realize that the potions may be expanded upon, but that the goal of this motion is to tie up loose ends, and to form a base.

Councillor Wan states that a large portion of his constituents are members of the Francophone community. He notes that some of the statements mentioned earlier are quite concerning. He asks what message the act of voluntary exclusion of the Quebec Charter sends to Quebecois students at McGill and asks how it will be perceived by them.

VP University Affairs states that the very same question could be made regarding SSMU's advocacy regarding amendments to the PEQ or advocacy against Bill 21. They note that the SSMU takes stances against the Quebec government fairly frequently. They hope that Quebecois students do not take it as a personal attack, because it is very much not. They note that while Quebecois members may disagree or may not feel represented, they note that it is not inconsistent with the rest of SSMU's political activity.

Councillor Bonan thanked VP University Affairs for bringing it to the Legislative Council. Councillor Bonan notes that the link between the Quebec Charter and the current Quebec government seems a bit strange, given that the Quebec Charter is not something that's new, or that was ratified by the current government. He asks if including it wouldn't necessarily indicate that SSMU is supporting the current government.

VP University Affairs notes that that is a fair assessment. They note that their rationale for not including the Charter was due to hesitation. However, they note that they are not strongly opposed to including it. They note that the document does an excellent job at capturing many things that the Canadian Charter does not cover. They note that if someone wishes to, during debate, move an amendment to that effect, they would be amenable to it.

Councillor Wan states that the Canadian government has taken many actions that run contrary to the Canadian Charter, but reference is still made to the Charter, despite the fact that the Quebec Charter was excluded for the very same reasons. He asks how they believe the double standard will be perceived by students in the context of SSMU, with already strained relations with them, such as francophone students.



VP University Affairs states that it is a fair assessment that the Canadian government has done many things that have run contrary to the Canadian Charter. They note that to clarify between the Canadian government's violations and the Quebec government's, the SSMU has taken very clear stances against actions of the Quebec government violating the Quebec Charter, whereas, that can't necessarily be said for the Canadian government's actions in regard to the Canadian Charter. Once again, they note that they are open to including it. They note that they understand the point, and do not see any issues in including it. They note that it wasn't intended to create disharmony, and thus, are amenable to making that change, as they see the potential for it to be able to generate a bit more harmony.

Councillor Bonan inquires on how they can ensure that the positions are representative of their constitutions on positions on certain topics. He understands that they're elected, but he does not believe that at the end of the day, that they ran on uncertain political opinions. He understands that while they are representatives, he is wondering how the two can coalesce.

VP University Affairs states that SSMU passes political positions frequently and doesn't believe it is different. He states that all individuals should be consulting their constituents frequently. Furthermore, they state that the Legislative Council is responsible for constructing the political framework of the Society.

VP University Affairs asks Councillor Bonan to repeat the question. Councillor Bonan repeats the question.

VP University Affairs states that the same could be said about any political position that the Society takes. If anything, they believe that this position is a bit more founded than some other positions SSMU takes, noting that past positions in the Positions Book is often simply a reflection of the views of the Legislative Council at that time. Contrarily, the beliefs espoused in this position were sourced across quite a few of the governing documents.

Councillor Page explains that looking at section 15.13, many of the positions rely on a definition of human rights that is outlined in the Canadian Charter. However, he notes that there are other political ideals that are pretty contested in definition. He is wondering if there exists any guidance, or if any guidance could be introduced as to how the SSMU should seek to define if these beliefs have been breached, for example, with 15.2, and competing definitions of democracy.

VP University Affairs states that there is a level of detail required to execute political activity. They note that there are a number of sources they can look to, to determine whether or not a nation is democratic, or whether or not consent of the governed truly applies. Largely speaking, they note that they would refer to international consensus, and notes that it is not up to SSMU to decide. Lastly, they note that the position is a statement of beliefs and does not commit SSMU to speaking out on these



issues, noting that it's not a mandate. They note that this is consistent with other Society positions, and the preambles of various SSMU policies.

Senator Daryanani asks how they can issue a clause that says cultural diversity will be celebrated when the diversity of ideas, identities of individuals, are going to be disregarded when certain statements may be divisive.

VP University Affairs states that it is not fair to question if the SSMU believes in cultural diversity. They note that it displays a lack of nuance in stating that because SSMU issues statements that people may not necessarily agree with, that SSMU actively marginalizes people. They note that they have yet to be provided an example where SSMU has deliberately cast aside, disregarded or alienated a specific subset of individuals, aside from just releasing statements that they may or may not agree with. They note that as a political organization, it is impossible to satisfy everyone's beliefs at the same time. They note that they are concerned that a moderate and non-contentious position has been bogged down by concerns over whether or not SSMU should be political, or whether or not SSMU should issue statements, noting that they do not believe that it should have an impact on the position itself, given that that is a separate question. Furthermore, they note that they don't believe that rejecting a political position, based on the fact that individuals may not agree with some unrelated political statements that were made prior is necessarily a fair execution of their responsibilities as Councillors.

#### Debate:

Councillor Gundermann notes that he cannot, in good conscience, support the motion in any way, shape, or form, and furthermore, urges all Councillors to vote against it. He notes that it has nothing to do with solidarity and issuing statements. Rather, he states that the framework is representing a fringe political ideology and placing SSMU on the political spectrum. To Councillor Gundermann, he states that the purpose of the motion is clear, and that it tries to legitimize past and future statements and does not take into consideration the repercussions it would create. He notes that the two recent posts have resulted in several hate comments that discriminate against McGill statements. He notes that as much as the Executives can say that this is not the intention, the statement and the tangible consequences that they choose to actively ignore, whether they believe that SSMU should issue political statements or not, there seems to be a clear compromise. He notes that he believes that having the statements go through the Legislative Council before they were published could solve the dilemma, regardless of the controversialist of issues. He states that they can agree that the statements do not have any backing with justification. He notes that if Council agrees on statements and supports them, they have increased justification. As well, he states that if they agree that the intention is not to harm any students or cause discrimination, Legislative Council discussing the statements could discuss all potential threats to students. To him personally, Councillor Gundermann believes that SSMU should not issue any political statements because it unnecessarily alienates the student body



but notes that that is for another discussion. He states that in the end, he does not believe there should be any framework for any potential statements in the future.

Senator Daryanani motions to postpone the motion, seconded by Councillor Smith.

Senator Daryanani motivates. Senator Daryanani notes that due to the lack of consultation regarding the positions, he notes that there are a whole different range of positions taken in the motion. However, he notes that tabling would allow for increased consultation, and clarify any positions.

Debate on the motion to postpone:

VP University Affairs states that to postpone the motion would to shirk away from their political responsibility. He notes that regardless of Councillor Gundermann's personal opinion, SSMU is a political society, within the Constitution. They note that SSMU conducts political activity. They note that the nearly all of the work of the SSMU is inherently political, and to shirk away from it, is to deny their obligations in the governing documents. They note that if this motion is to be postponed until January, that they would like a very clear reason on what positions require consultation. They note that if there is any specific section that an individual would like to further consult in regard to, they would be open to hearing it. However, as it stands now, they believe that the motion to postpone is simply a move to shirk political duties. They note that they don't believe that many people are debating the contents of the position itself, and note that they've primarily heard that Councillors are in favour of the multiple aspects of the position itself, or at least agree with it. They note that they see hesitation to move forward with the motion as in contrast with the inherently political mandate of the Society, whether or not they believe that the SSMU should participate in. They state that Legislative Council should not debate whether or not the Society should be political, given that it is enshrined in the Constitution.

Councillor Bonan states that it keeps being brought up that there was no opposition against the points of the motion, but he believes that there hasn't been an opportunity to bring up such concerns yet, given that they were only in Question Period before, and now on this motion to postpone.

VP Student Life states that she is against postponing the motion. She notes that this motion should continue to be debated, especially in regards to Councillor Bonan's point. She believes that the intention behind the motion is to create legitimacy in the statements that are put out into the Society. Rather than questioning the role of making political decisions, she states that they should speak more on what has been outlined, and the values the motion wishes to promote. She notes that the creation of the motion is extremely important, and notes that it would reduce the amount of backlash they may receive. She encourages individuals to continue discussion.





Councillor Reed speaks against postponing the motion, not because he is in favour of the motion, but rather, individuals have thoughts ready for debate.

Councillor Wan speaks in favour of postponing the motion, as he is wishing to further consult with his constituents. He notes that this would be something his constituents care deeply about but given that the motion was only made publicly available to them three days ago, he was not able to consult with constituents beforehand. He notes that at the core, he is accountable to his constituents first, and wants to make sure that they feel representation.

Senator Daryanani thanks everyone for their input. Senator Daryanani states that a wish to postpone is to protect student interests at all levels, by consulting them to ensure that they agree with the positions proposed here. He believes that they are lacking consultation and clear positions to vote on it currently. Regarding delaying it to January, he states that it doesn't make a difference considering that the Executive Committee has been doing their job in publishing statements already, but they do not wish to create more harm in a relatively sensitive time, considering other university concerns. As well, he also wishes to ensure that further statements published by SSMU are not harmful to students' wellbeing.

Councillor Sood echoes the statements of Councillor Wan and Senator Daryanani, noting that they should be consulting their constituents before making a decision concerning the motion.

VP University Affairs echoes the comments of the VP Student Life, and notes that it was premature to move to postpone, as clearly, there are many individuals with thoughts on the motion. They note that if it is postponed, it is inconsequential, but it is clear that the motion itself still deserves to be debated. They note that they would hate to see the motion postponed before Legislative Council gets to debate it, given that there have not been opportunities to debate thus far.

VP Student Life motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Smith.

Motion to call the question – APPROVED.

In favour: 22

Opposed: 4

Vote on the Motion to Postpone – FAILED.

In favour: 10

Opposed: 16

Return to Debate on the Main Motion:



VP University Affairs notes that they do not believe that there is a situation that they can achieve where all SSMU members are satisfied. In the case of releasing statements, they note that one (1) person will oppose the release of a given statement, while another group may be in support. They note that instead of focusing on how they can satisfy all SSMU members, they should be contemplating what SSMU can do to ensure that decisions that are taken are well-founded, to ensure that they're agreed upon by at least the legislative wing of the Society, to ensure they are founded in some kind of common principle of what they believe the Society should stand for. They note that this is what the motion is trying to clarify. Regardless, they note that whether a statement is released or not, there will always be students being dissatisfied. Beyond that, they believe that the conversation has strayed from the motion itself. They encourage Councillors in debating and voting on the motion, to question whether or not SSMU should be political or whether SSMU should weigh in on these issues, but whether or not the position itself is agreeable. They note that regardless of if the motion passes, SSMU will continue to conduct political activity. They encourage everyone to consider the substance of the voting in debate and voting.

Councillor Gundermann notes that VP University Affairs has mentioned several times that SSMU is a political organization, which he notes is true. However, in terms of framework, he notes that the VP University Affairs has mentioned that people don't seem to disagree with the content, but he believes this is wrong. Furthermore, he believes that a student society should not align itself with one single political ideology, but rather reflect the diversity of the student body. He notes that while he disagrees with the issuing of political statements, he understands the arguments for issuing those statements. However, he believes that all political statements should first be considered by the Legislative Council so that they can continue to condemn arbitrary international political conflicts, and where people can express their political beliefs.

Councillor Bonan notes that the VP University Affairs has made it clear that SSMU is an anti-capitalist organization. However, he notes that at last Legislative Council, they had a presentation from Lester Asset Management talking about SSMU's investments, which are inherently capitalist. Furthermore, many students on SSMU would believe that they are inherently capitalist, not even management students alone, bringing up disagreements with various portions of the motion.

VP External states that in respect to the content and purpose of the motion, he believes it important to recognize that as a difference between what the success of the motion would do for the Legislative Council and for SSMU as a whole, and what sort of circumstances it may be invoked. He believes that an argument about which governing body is most appropriate to make such a statement is the matter of a different motion, more specifically, the matter of the subsequent motion being considered this evening.



VP University Affairs motions to extend by one minute, seconded by VP Finance – APPROVED.

He notes that it is important to go back to the substance of the motion and identify which clauses individuals like and which they wish to debate, rather than debating how the position may be used or invoked. Furthermore, VP External notes that the communications framework is a separate framework from the kind of establishment of a political commitment that is being made by the representative body of the SSMU.

The President asks if it would be more suitable to discuss the next motion first, and then come back to this one. The President motions to table, seconded by Councillor Gundermann.

Vote on the motion to table the Motion – APPROVED.

In favour: 17

Opposed: 8

Debate:

VP University Affairs states that there are a couple of important considerations that have not yet been made. They state that a lot of the discussion has fallen under the idea that it is the responsibility of Council to represent the views of all their constituents. However, they note that this is not the case. Referring to the Representation clause of the Constitution, they note that it says that the Society shall act as the official voice of its members, and that it shall act in the best interest of its members as a whole. While they note that this is true, they note that this does not mean that the Legislative Council, as a political organization, needs to reflect the beliefs of all of their members.

They state that it is well within their right to use their own best consciences in acting as a progressive representative body that serves marginalized and alienated groups. They note that ignoring the concerns of marginalized groups in favour of avoiding controversy or representing as many people as possible, would be contrary to SSMU's Equity Policy. Furthermore, they state that their first priority as a Society should be to give a platform to those who don't already have one to support marginalized communities, and to support alienated communities. For example, they note that they do not believe it would be an order for SSMU to support (or to even tolerate or consider) white supremacy, despite the fact that there are members within SSMU that might espouse white supremacy. They note that keeping in mind the positions and policies that SSMU already has made clear positions, because it is impossible for SSMU to represent everyone, and furthermore, inadvisable to represent certain beliefs within the Society. They state that it is SSMU's responsibility to be progressive, to set standards, and to be leaders, not just echoing the beliefs of the membership without any critical thought. Furthermore, they state that adopting more progressive or different beliefs from certain members is



not the same as excluding them. They note that it should be SSMU's concern to support members of the community that need it the most, and that the only way they can do that is by having a legitimate, at least somewhat consensus-based Legislative Council-approved framework through which SSMU can participate in political advocacy. They note that there is a great concern for the potential of harm that arises when SSMU remains silent, and when they don't speak for their membership.

Councillor Reed notes that while they agree about the fact that SSMU should be representative of the people who are most marginalized. They recognize that everyone at Legislative Council was voted in on the idea that they would represent their constituents to the best of their abilities. However, he states it would be unwise to suggest that if they fail to do that, then they would fail to be a meaningful advocate for marginalized peoples by being more democratic and by conducting more consultation with their constituents. He notes that it is important to make a clear distinction. He notes that it is important to have a student society that attempts to represent, or at least respects, a diversity of opinions within reason, while still maintaining advocacy for those who are most marginalized. He notes that while SSMU has made political statements for some time, he notes that many of the statements have led to controversy, and notes that the controversies aren't helping. He notes that as a body who is responsible for looking at SSMU's best course of action, he thinks it is important that they ask the question if SSMU should make political statements.

Councillor Wan reiterates the emphasis on the motion he referred to that was passed at the MSS General Assembly. He states that they had a similar motion in which they decided to talk about public policy statements, and notes that this is the motion that they had produced. He notes that it was a product of extensive consultation, and that as a result of the consultations, they were able to make those conclusions. For example, they decided that positions that were already adopted didn't require further consultation with constitutions. As well, he notes that it is very cautious in its implementation, including the inclusion of a one-year duration on the policy, with reassessments after the period to see if the policy accomplishes what it intended to. He notes that he does not believe that the current SSMU initiative has been subject to the level of consultations that he is comfortable with, and thus, notes his opposition to the motion.

Councillor Bonan notes that the VP University Affairs had mentioned an example of white supremacy and speaks on the matter. He notes that while he agrees that it is obviously ridiculous and would never endorse such a statement, firstly, because it is abhorrent, and two, that he is a representative member of his constituents and he does not believe a majority, or even a small part of his constituents would be in favour of it. However, he wishes to emphasize that they are elected as representatives, and that is why they are there. He speaks on BLM, noting that his constituents are overwhelmingly in favour of the movement, and that that is why they would be happy with the statements that have moved forward. However, he notes that some of the examples in the motion at hand, especially 15.7,



would face significant disagreement from his constituents. He notes that he will be opposing the motion, because he does not believe Tahiti representative of how his constituents feel.

Councillor Collins states that she finds it a bit disrespectful to suggest that Councillors are scared of backlash. She states that it is safe to say that, even among Councillors here, that there are a lot of different political views and different lived experiences based on various socioeconomic circumstances. She knows many of the Councillors personally and knows that none of them are spineless. She states that to suggest that they are skirting their political responsibilities because they are scared of backlash is a bit unfounded, and that despite the divergence of views that have been demonstrated among Council in previous sessions, the sentiments tonight, with regards to this motion, seem to be pretty widely agreed upon.

Councillor Williamson states that she does not believe that the points that have been suggested as non-contentious actually are, in reality. She states that they hold incredibly neoliberal beliefs that may face high disagreement. She states that she believes that the motion should be voted down, because though they may not be able to represent all of their constituents, she does not believe that this is a representative list of ideas and norms that all of the students of McGill can agree upon.

VP University Affairs extends a personal apology to Councillor Collins, noting that it was not their intent to imply that the Councillors present today were voting on the basis of fear of controversy. They stand by the assertion that they believe that SSMU does have political responsibilities that should be prioritized but apologizes for further implications. They note that they have immense respect for everyone present. They note that they wish for Council to consider that statements, even if they aren't approved by everyone, are meaningful for marginalized groups of people. They state that the goal of the motion isn't to force the Society into a political ideology, but rather, to respond to the concerns of constituents and to support students and student groups that are asking for SSMU to support them. While they state that they should consider any drawbacks to statements released, they note that they can't agree with the portrayal that these statements have not been meaningful for student groups. They note that while some people may disagree with SSMU's statements, they note that they do not believe it can be conflated with marginalization or alienation. They note that it should be recognized that they will not be able to satisfy everyone, and that it should be accepted.

VP University Affairs' time is granted for one minute. VP University Affairs continues.

VP University Affairs states that when they are deciding on the political views of the Society, they think that it is of course important to be representative and to consult, but where there are competing needs, where students disagree, they do not believe it should be based on a percentage of students that feel one way or another. They note that SSMU has commitments to equity, to human rights, and



to advocating for those who are marginalized, and for those that are oppressed. They state that that should prevail over simply the whim of the majority of students.

The President states that if the motion fails, political stances are going to continue to be ambiguous and continue to be decided on a case-by-case basis, which has been done prior, but notes that it has created a lot of controversy. The President thanks the VP University Affairs for bringing the motion forward.

Councillor Reed states that it makes sense to have some level of consensus on exactly what kind of politics that SSMU wishes to collectively address. However, they note that 660-plus students from the East Asian community have signed a petition and signed a statement that said that harm was done, and that they experience genuine difficulty because of this, including discriminatory comments on the posts. He notes that while they do not fault SSMU communications for that happening, he notes that it is important that they think about the consequences of their actions. He notes that when done in a well-motivated and appropriately democratic fashion, SSMU statements of international solidarity, specifically in cases of human rights, can be positive. However, he notes that this motion, in numerous places, however, goes well beyond the scope of human rights, including Sections 15.4 and 15.7, concerning capitalism. He states that while SSMU works with capitalist and anti-capitalist constitutions, such a position would be inherently hypocritical given that SSMU has an investment portfolio. He notes that while working with anti-capitalist institutions is one thing, embedding it within SSMU's principles is different from collaborations. Furthermore, he also believes that there are some statements regarding economics that are highly debatable, such as 15.9 with humanitarianism and deregulation, and 15.10, about the dismantling of class systems. He states that these aren't even necessarily things that he personally disagrees with, but he believes it extremely hypnotical and damaging to pretend to be an anti-capitalist institution.

Councillor Reed's time is extended ad libitum.

VP External states that it is important to recognize the different concerns that are at stake, and to consider how SSMU makes its decisions. He states that much has been said about consultation, and political judgement of Executives and Councillors. He notes that he'd like to add that the motion is a motion seeking to clarify SSMU's political commitments.

Councillor Bonan motions to extend VP External's speaking time by one minute, seconded – APPROVED.

VP External continues that if the motion is defeated, they need to think about whether it is the nature of the motion itself of what the motion it intended do, and furthermore, how Council can best approach this issue otherwise, as the motion is an attempt to address a problem that has been





commonly identified in Legislative Council. He notes that they are not only here to debate the motion, but to debate the substance and the purpose, and how the substance can be improved, and the future of the motion. He states that if Councillors believe that if there is more consultation be done, he thinks it is fair. However, he notes that Council should think where they should with the motion.

VP Student Life states that there is a concern about the Executive Committee making these decisions and taking stances without consultation from the rest of the group. She notes that as they have seen with the Hong Kong statement, as well as the Armenia statement, these are motions as a result of this motion that they're passing, and the one that has already been passed, that would have gone to Legislative Council if the frameworks were in place. VP Student Life notes that in situations of low to no urgency, the Executive Committee would bring these items to Legislative Council in order for them to have a more broad and representative discussion, because she agrees that the Executive Committee is a less representative body than Legislative Council. She states that it is important to create a baseline framework for SSMU to put forward motions, and to write statements that they can later debate. As well, she notes that she has heard the point regarding capitalism, and she notes that this can be something that is taken out of the motion, and that it is changeable if necessary. She however notes that it would be wrong to postpone even further if there are only one or two things in the motion that individuals don't agree with. VP Student Life states that the benefits of passing the motion today is much greater than the detriment of pushing it off and continuing to look at it again in January.

Senator Daryanani motions to object to the consideration of the question, seconded by Councillor Wan.

The Speaker explains what an objection to the consideration of a question is. Senator Daryanani motivates.

Senator Daryanani notes that his point of consultation holds. He states that given they have debated some of the points against the motion. He states that it makes sense to ask for some more time for Councillors to consult their constituents regarding this matter and SSMU's positions, given that these are long-term positions. To him, it seems a bit ironic that many of the positions within the motion are very democratic and liberal, yet the motion wasn't even moved by the most democratic or representative body. They note their deep respect for the VP University Affairs and all of the Executives but note that the Executive Committee is objectively not the most democratic body.

Councillor Collins states that she doesn't understand is that a lot of students have indicated that these geopolitical statements have impacted them in a negative way, and yet, it seems as though there are some sentiments coming from individuals that they believe that the students should not have felt this way, which seems out of line with the social justice sentiments that characterize these statements.



Secondly, she states that in terms of student consultation, she notes that she didn't consult with students on the motion because it is December, meaning finals season, as well as the fact that they are in the midst of a mental health problem. She states that she would be more comfortable voting on a political motion tonight if she wasn't voting on thirteen positions. She notes that she does not agree with the motion from a democratic standpoint.

Councillor Bonan moves for a roll call vote, as the motion is as contentious as last time, seconded by Councillor Smith – APPROVED.

The Speaker notes that the vote will be conducted through roll call.

VP University Affairs states that they take very seriously the accusation that they have disregarded the concerns of BIPOC students. They note that they believe it was meant in good faith. However, they state that it is important to consider that there are multiple perspectives in these very nuanced situations, including multiple disenfranchised or oppressed groups involved. They state that if the interest in postponing is for Councillors to further consult to have a stronger perspective of what their constituents are interested in, that is fine. However, they note that the motion as it is proposed now is something they stand by.

VP Student Life states that it is important to adopt, or at least consider, the motion today rather than postponing it to January. She states that she is of the belief that many of the things that are outline in the series of positions are aligned with the Constitution and aligned with SSMU's other governing documents. She states that it is important for Council to consult on every statement, or every position that they take moving forward, but that this particular motion is for the most part, uncontroversial.

Councillor Karasick states that he fully respects the importance of consultation, and will continue to consult on all types of motions. However, he notes that his only consideration in this case is that he doesn't know how much consultation would change the vote. He states that he feels Councillors are set in how they wish to vote, and whether or not they consult won't change it, more than maybe a few people.

Councillor Wan states that he is not against the motion per se, but that given the motion passed within his faculty recently, he thinks that in order for him to support such a motion, he believes there needs to be some improvements, including more extensive and deeper consultation. He also notes that the Quebec Charter should be included in the motion.

Vote on the motion to object to the consideration of the question – FAILS.

Councillor Reed motions to submit amendments, seconded by Councillor Mulvaney.



Councillor Reed motivates. Councillor Reed states that he has come up with these amendments that he believes would be appropriate for limiting the scope of the stance to something that reflects universally-held views on human rights, on social justice, and on equity. Furthermore, it limits the content that makes statements that imply views on anti-capitalism, or that make either unsubstantiated or difficult to substantiate claims about macroeconomics, and also contain rhetoric that may be either disagreeable or inaccessible to certain members of the student society.

Councillor Reed outlines the amendments. He notes that 15.4, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7, 15.9, and 15.10 have been amended or redacted.

Councillor Reed's time is extended by five (5) minutes.

Councillor Reed notes that it is in the interest of everybody to have a consolidated framework, and one that is truly agreeable. He notes that while he does not necessarily submit the amendments with the expectation that will allow the motion to be passed, he does believe that its scope remains limited to the promotion of human rights, equity, and social justice.

[Recess begins at 00:24.]

[Recess ends at 00:34.]

Debate on the amendment:

VP University Affairs states that it is important to distinguish that when Councillor Reed states that they are agreeable amendments, that they are agreeable to him. They note that this does not necessarily mean that they are agreeable to the majority of the Society, especially in regard to item 15.7. They note that while SSMU may have an investment portfolio, SSMU nevertheless associates with anti-capitalist services, organizations, as well as holds various similar positions, including in its positions related to environmental, sustainability, exploitation of physical and human resources, anti-expansionism, anti-colonialism, and Indigenous solidarity advocacy. They note that while they haven't come across a document that clearly indicates that SSMU is anti-capitalist, they note that every other document implies as such. Thus, they state that to deny that, would be to deny SSMU's policies and advocacy on various issues.

Senator Parsons motions to extend speaking time by two (2) minutes. – APPROVED.

They note that SSMU's opposition to class systems is fairly enshrined within SSMU's Equity Policy and the Policy on Indigenous Solidarity. They state that SSMU previously had positions on demilitarization and disarmament. They note that while the amendments are an attempt to establish a more centrist



approach for the Society, it would disregard existing policies of the Society, as well as past advocacy. They state that nothing in the policy is new, and notes that that is important to acknowledge.

Councillor Bonan notes that Councillor Reed's amendments allow for the motion to be a little less focused on one ideology, but that it doesn't necessarily focus on another either. He states that the amendments don't necessarily take away in terms of going against something that was in the motion. He also notes that he is of the view that one does not have to be anti-capitalist to believe in climate change.

Councillor Karasick states that some of the changes in the amendments would be more controversial than others. He notes that they should approach them change by change.

Councillor Wan makes an amendment to the amendments put forward to include the Quebec Charter, seconded by Councillor Bonan – APPROVED.

Councillor Reed notes that the amendment is friendly.

Councillor Karasick motions to divide the question, seconded by Councillor Smith.

Councillor Karasick motivates. Councillor Karasick indicates that there are some amendments that are more contentious than others. He believes it would best to go over and discuss them individually, and to debate and vote on them point by point.

Debate on Section 15.4.:

VP University Affairs states the section on self-determination was based on the Indigenous Solidarity policy, which calls on the SSMU to support self-determination and self-governance frameworks.

Voting on Amendment of Section 15.4 – APPROVED.

Debate on Section 15.5:

VP University Affairs states that this section was originally from the former policy against Harmful Military Technologies, which specifically advocated for the SSMU to take a stance in support of demilitarization. They also note that it is in line with past statements that the SSMU has made.

Councillor Reed notes that it is not the intention of the amendments to object to past policies, but rather, how SSMU will conduct actual political work, specifically with respects to releasing statements.



Councillor Karasick indicates that they agree on this amendment. He notes that they fear that 15.4, if unchanged, might put SSMU at a stance that would be against the self-defence for minority communities.

VP University Affairs states that 15.5 comes from SSMU's existing policies, and notes that SSMU has already adopted this position, even if it is not contained with the Position on International Solidarity. They note however, that they are ambivalent about this particular amendment.

Voting on Amendment of Section 15.5 – APPROVED.

Debate on Section 15.6:

VP University Affairs notes that this section is a bit less strongly fitted to SSMU's current positions and policies compared to other ones.

Voting on Amendment of Section 15.6 – APPROVED.

Debate on Section 15.7:

VP University Affairs states that this one has been extracted from SSMU's Climate Justice Policy, and the Sustainability Policy. They note that regardless of the outcome of the amendment, SSMU, at least politically, is anti-capitalist and will continue to be anti-capitalist, regardless of the amendment.

Councillor Bonan notes that you do not have to be an anti-capitalist to be against climate change, and notes that a lot of developments in regard to fighting climate change have been due to the capitalist movement.

Councillor Reed notes that he has not put forward such amendments to run counter to other policies of the Society, nor does it preclude the Society from making any future statements on anti-capitalism.

VP University Affairs states that there have been some misunderstandings. Firstly, in regard to Councillor Bonan's point, they note that it is not because SSMU supports sustainability and climate change that they are thus, anti-capitalist. Rather, they note that it is in the policies on sustainability and climate justice, where the SSMU acknowledges the harms of capitalism and positions SSMU against capitalism. They also note that it would be a mischaracterization to describe positions as past policies. They note that they are current policies that currently govern how the Society is run, and currently govern the positions of the Society.



Councillor Gundermann states that whether or not one agrees with the statement or not, they can agree that this section is highly polarizing and a very divisive issue. Thus, because of that, Councillor Gundermann does not believe it could fit in this framework, given that this position wishes to espouse somewhat universal criteria that is representative of the student body.

Voting on Amendment of Section 15.7 – APPROVED.

Debate on Section 15.9:

VP University Affairs states that this section was keeping in line with the stated anti-capitalist positions. However, they do not agree with the characterization that socialization and social services are specifically opposite to deregulation, austerity, and financial destabilization. They note that if the problem was specifically humanitarianism, they could've removed the word, and doesn't not believe the whole section should've been altered.

Councillor Karasick states that this section is fairly uncontroversial in comparison to some of the others, noting that many universities across Quebec and Canada have had similar policies.

Councillor Reed notes that that is a fair point and would personally look favourably upon the removal of humanitarianism, because of the implications of certain economic policies being blatantly anti-humanitarian, which is politically tenuous, and difficult to substantiate. However, he notes that social work is important, and is tenable for the Society to defend.

VP University Affairs motions to move an amendment to the amendment, which would keep 15.9 the way it is, with the exception that humanitarianism would be removed. The mover and seconder indicate that this is friendly.

Voting on Amendment of Section 15.9 – APPROVED.

Debate on Section 15.10:

Councillor Reed indicates that the phrase of dismantling class systems is a bit opaque, difficult to define, and also tends to be heavily rooted in political ideology. Thus, it should be something that when referred to in a statement, should be something that is done on a case by case basis.

VP University Affairs states that positions of dismantling class systems and more generally, in support of socioeconomic mobility and equity make up a significant portion of the background of SSMU's Equity Policy. VP University Affairs states that regardless of working, if SSMU were to support socioeconomic mobility and promote equity, it would thus involve the dismantling of class systems.





VP University Affairs states that they were surprised that this section was a target of an amendment, given that SSMU has been very dedicated to such a belief in its services it provides.

Councillor Reed states that most of the concern has to do with the idea of the phrase ‘dismantling,’ which can be difficult to define. He states that if such wording is to be used, it should at least utilize clearer definitions.

VP University Affairs suggests that they could use a word like ‘discourage’ in replacement of the word, or to reword it to say that socioeconomic mobility should be favoured over class systems.

Councillor Reed indicates that they would support the wording suggested by the VP University Affairs. This amendment is friendly.

Voting on Amendment of Section 15.10 – APPROVED.

Debate on Section 15.13:

Councillor Karasick does not believe that this one will be controversial and asks for it to be approved by unanimous consent. This motion is seconded.

Voting on Amendment of Section 15.13 – UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Debate on the main motion:

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

Voting on the Motion -- APPROVED

In favour: 18

Opposed: 2

Abstain: 3

The Motion Regarding the Clarification of an International Political Position 2020-12-03 is approved.

- c. Motion Regarding the Release of Statements and Official Communications 2020-12-03 – **APPROVED**

VP University Affairs motivates. VP University Affairs notes that there exists a lack of current procedural frameworks for the release of statements, and the concerns of the legitimacy of statements released by the Executive Committee, the motion seeks to clarify the relationship between Legislative Council and Executive Committee in terms of releasing statements and the abilities of both



parties to do so. Furthermore, it also makes note of the importance of consultation on both sides. They note that the motions go a long way in reassuring Councillors in how statements should be released going forward and will help to direct future debates, especially around the political positions of the Society.

Question Period:

Councillor Karasick notes that a lot of the contention in regards to political statements are usually when international positions are taken. They are curious why the motion is more encompassing than simply just international positions alone, given that he believes that Council would not oppose the Executive Committee taking a stance of SSMU when it comes to issues such as the lobster fisherman issue in Nova Scotia recently. He is curious why it is. VP University Affairs responds that broadly speaking, international concerns are not the SSMU's only source of controversy within the Society. They note that the goal was to be a bit more encompassing. Furthermore, they believe that although they could limit it to purely international politics, the concern is that not all controversial statements are international, and not all international statements are controversial. They state that they didn't want to reinforce the idea that all international advocacy is inherently controversial.

Councillor Smith asks if the mover of the motion could define 'urgency' and 'complexity'. VP University Affairs notes that they would point to the internal PR guide, noting that there are a few forms of statements. They note that there are urgent statements concerning natural disasters or pressing emergencies that would need to be communicated between 12 to 24 hours later. Yellow statements also exist, within 24 hours, going out in response to pressing recent developments, such as major political developments, citing various examples.

Councillor Smith motions to extend by one (1) minute, seconded by Councillor Bonan – APPROVED.

VP University Affairs states that in terms of complexity, they had in mind statements that Council may not have a stake in, outside Council's purview, or something that could not be debated at Legislative Council, such as SSMU operational and human resources matters.

Councillor Reed follows up on the question concerning complexity. He notes that the notion strikes as paternalistic, with the idea that the Executives would have some take on an issue that needs to be made but can't be debated at Council and cannot understand any example that would be relevant in that example. He asks if the VP University Affairs would take an amendment to strike the word complexity as friendly.

VP University Affairs notes that they'll divide their answer into parts. Firstly, they state that there may be instances where Council might not necessarily be a stakeholder in a statement for reasons other



than urgency or confidentiality, for example, financial developments or changes within SSMU internal structure, or building announcements. However, they note that if someone wants to bring forward an amendment to strike it or reword it, they would be fine. They note that they generally wish for it to be rather all-encompassing, so as to avoid introducing complications later on. They note that if there is a better word to rephrase, they can change it, however, they couldn't think of a stronger alternative at the time.

Councillor Kunze--Roelens motions for a fifteen-minute recess, seconded by Senator Daryanani – APPROVED.

[Recess at 22:30.]

[Legislative Council resumes at 22:45.]

Councillor Karasick notes that his question is also in line with the other questions regarding the secrecy and confidentiality clause, noting confusion. He wonders what kind of information would be too confidential for Legislative Council, but simultaneously, be able to be spoken of publicly in a statement.

VP University Affairs indicates that it is usually a matter of confidentiality until release, rather than absolute confidentiality, such as operational changes, changes within SSMU's internal structure, and HR matters. They note that there are statements that the Executives make that are confidential until they are released. As well, he notes that there is also confidential information that is not accessible to Council. They note that they don't realistically see the Executives issuing many statements of the sort, but wished to err on the side of safety, attempting to tie up as many loose ends as possible.

Councillor Smith thanks the VP University Affairs for their response. He understands that while legal and financial matters are out of the purview of the Legislative Council, there is a body within the Society, being the Board of Directors of Directors, whose jurisdiction is to oversee such matters. Thus, he asks why the Executive Committee should make such statements, rather than the Board of Directors of Directors.

VP University Affairs notes that it's a matter of precedent. They note that though the Board of Directors of Directors does have the ability to release statements, statements are nearly always delegated to the Executive Committee to write and release the statement.

Councillor Wan asks if the situations regarding the Armenia or Hong Kong statements would have occurred with this motion, and if the actions or outcomes would have changed.



VP University Affairs indicates that the Armenian post was not released on behalf of the SSMU, so there wouldn't have been any changes. However, they note that for the Hong Kong post, it would not have been able to be released on behalf of the Society without going through Council.

Councillor Wan asks how the Board of Directors of Directors fits into the statement of understanding. They note that any initiative by the Legislative Council must be ratified by the Board of Directors. However, he notes that the same standards are not maintained for exec issued statements.

VP University Affairs states that the Board of Directors isn't formally included in it, as the Board of Directors does not release political statements, as it is not within the mandate of the Board of Directors. Furthermore, they note that the Board of Directors typically delegates responsibility of statements to the Executive Committee.

Councillor Smith states that the statements on Armenia and Hong Kong were stated to share on behalf of student groups. He asks for clarification on why one would come to the Legislative Council, and one wouldn't.

VP University Affairs states that the Hong Kong post was released with another student group, but was released on behalf of the SSMU, between SSMU and McGill Students for Hong Kong. Thus, it would've had to go through the legislative Council. Whereas for the Armenia post, SSMU didn't have a role in writing it, but was rather, a statement of solidarity, shared by the SSMU.

Debate:

Councillor Wan states that the Medical Students' Society had their General Assembly two days ago, and notes that they adopted a position concerning political statements to be made by the Medical Students' Society, without complications of the membership. He notes that the position differs significantly from SSMU's position, including this motion and previous work as well. He states that since he has not had an opportunity to consult further with his constituents, he has no choice, but to vote against the motion based on the information he has concerning his constituents' beliefs, democratically expressed during the General Assembly.

VP University Affairs states that they have heard quite a bit of hesitation from Councillors on voting on the motion before consulting with the membership. They believe that while consultation cannot be understated, they note that they believe that there is a difference between adopting the Five Year Plan, for example, or passing a policy, where Notice of Motions are present. They note that Notices of Motion provide Councillors extra time to consult their constituencies. They note that while sometimes, Councillors may be given less time to consult to their membership, they note that they have been democratically elected, and would urge them to have the confidence to exercise their best



judgment and understand that extensive consultation for every motion may not be entirely necessary. Furthermore, they note that they did not actually wish to bring the motion to Council and didn't wish to set up the framework. However, they note that the motion is being brought at Council's behalf by an attempt from the Executive Committee to extend an olive branch and set up a framework, and to answer concerns of constituents and Legislative Council.

Councillor Wan reiterates the point that consultation is very important in their roles, and something he personally holds important in his portfolio. He notes that at the MSS General Assembly, they note that they held a poll and held several consultations to assess which subjects our members wanted statements by the Executives to be made without General Assembly approval. Following, they drafted a policy that was consistent with these desires, ultimately being passed at the General Assembly for a one-year period. He notes that this would be something he would be more in line with, and that unfortunately, this motion is not in line with the directions that both he and the MSS take.

The President asks Legislative Council if there are any concerns arising from the previous motion that Councillors wish to raise during this motion.

VP University Affairs states that if the Legislative Council wishes to set up policies on what the SSMU shouldn't make statements on, they can certainly do so in the future. They note that if there are concerns over the amount of time that is being given for consultation, it can be a larger conversation regarding the usage of Notices of Motion. They note that generally speaking, political messages are somewhat time sensitive in the sense that they are pressing matters, especially SSMU political activity. They note that the lack of understanding and foundation has been a source of concern over legitimacy, as well as questions over who and how statements should be released. They urge the Legislative Council to consider the substance of the motion, rather than just essentially the procedures that are currently in place.

Voting Period -- APPROVED

In favour: 23

Opposed: 6

Abstain: 4

The Motion Regarding the Release of Statements and Official Communications 2020-12-03 is approved.

The Speaker asks the Council to vote to suspend the rules in order to approve the amendment of the agenda to include item 13.d), noting that it was reviewed by the Steering Committee, but failed to be reflected on the agenda.



The motion to suspend the rules to that effect was moved and seconded – APPROVED.

The motion to suspend the rules to that effect was moved and seconded – APPROVED.

The President motions to pull 13.b) from the table, seconded by Councillor Smith – APPROVED.

- d. Motion Regarding an Amendment to the Timeline of Elections and Referenda  
2020-12-03 – **APPROVED**

The President motivates. The President notes that the motion is to shorten the election timeline, as it is very long and can contribute to voting fatigue.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

Councillor Karasick motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded – APPROVED.

The Motion Regarding an Amendment to the Timeline of Elections and Referenda 2020-12-03 is unanimously approved.

- e. Motion to endorse the "Motion to Extend the Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U) Option in Fall 2020" presented to the McGill Senate and mandate the Senate Caucus to draft a letter of endorsement to the McGill Senate Steering Committee, on behalf of the SSMU  
-- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

VP University Affairs motivates.

VP University Affairs states that there is a Steering Committee meeting tomorrow where they are planning to convince a room full of McGill University administrators to care about students. They note that this motion would allow the VP University Affairs to submit a letter to Steering, indicating that the Legislative Council supports the passage of the motion.

Question Period:

There are no questions.





## Debate:

Councillor Smith thanks the VP University Affairs and the Student Senators for their work on the motion. They state that the S/U policy is genuinely something that students want, and that it is a shame that administration is not listening to the concerns and recognizing the priorities of students.

Councillor Reed states that he would be surprised if this motion received anything less than unanimous support. Councillor Reed thanks everyone for their work on this.

Councillor Karasick echoes the previous statements.

Councillor Karasick motions to approve by unanimous consent seconded by Councillor Smith – APPROVED.

The Motion to endorse the "Motion to Extend the Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U) Option in Fall 2020" presented to the McGill Senate and mandate the Senate Caucus to draft a letter of endorsement to the McGill Senate Steering Committee, on behalf of the SSMU is unanimously approved.

Senator Daryanani asks if it would be appropriate to call a five-minute recess, so that individuals may read the reports themselves. The Speaker notes her opposition to this, citing poor governance, and noting that multiple committees have to formally report this evening, and cannot be postponed. Senator Daryanani retracts his motion.

- f. Motion Regarding the Adoption of the Gendered and Sexual Violence Policy  
2020-11-19 – **APPROVED**

Voting Period – APPROVED.

In favour: 25

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 0

## 14. Reports by Committees

- a. Executive Committee

The President presents.



The President notes that they signed on to the petition for the extended winter holiday. They also approved \$150 for full-time employees for any furniture or equipment expenses that they may have incurred due to working remotely. They also note that they hired a Black Affairs Commissioner.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

b. Funding Committee

VP Finance presents. VP Finance presents the closing balances of the various funds.

There are no questions.

c. Services Review Committee

The Speaker notes that a report for the Services Review Committee has not been submitted.

d. Accountability Committee

The Speaker presents on behalf of the Accountability Committee.

The Speaker notes that the Accountability Committee meets on an ad-hoc basis. And that they had their first meeting on November 23. She notes that they reviewed the Terms of References, the committee's focus for the year, as well as absences and missed reports. As well, she notes that they are discussing the Accountability Survey as well.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

e. Building Operations and Management Committee

The President presents.

The President notes that they will restructure the committee membership, given the departure of the Operations Director.



There are no questions.

f. Comprehensive Governance Review Committee

Governing Documents Researcher, Lauren Hill, presents on behalf of the Comprehensive Governance Review Committee. She outlines the committee's membership. She notes that the committee currently needs representation from independent student groups, as well as services. She also indicates that they need representation from one of the big four faculties.

The Governing Documents Researcher highlights the topics for discussion of each meeting. Lastly, she notes that she will be holding consultations in the Winter 2021 semester.

VP Finance inquires about the VP Finance position being appointed. The Governing Documents Researcher indicates that the idea was brought forward by Councillor Reed, as they noted that in the EUS, the VP Finance is appointed. She notes that it was a part of a larger conversation on whether the VP Finance should be a political office.

Councillor Karasick indicates that CGRC is a great committee to sit on.

15. Reports by Councillors

a. Councillor El-Zammar (Clubs)

No report is provided.

b. Councillor Williamson (Arts)

Councillor Williamson presents the report.

Councillor Williamson notes that there was the AUS Executive Accountability Survey on November 17, 2020. She notes that three motions were brought to Council, and two of them passed. She notes that AUS had a subsequent Council on December 1. She notes that she had a Mental Health Advocacy meeting this past week, as well as the Mental Health Round Table. ON SSPN, she notes that SSPN just finished hosting a scavenger hunt. For AUS, she notes that she is working with CaPS to plan 'Work your BA' and an NGO/volunteer fair. As well, she notes that the Arts Community Engagement Fund group partnered with Sex and Self and the Peer Support Centre to host a trivia night.

Question Period:



[INAUDIBLE] asks about the electoral reform motion. Councillor Williamson indicates that it was brought forward by CSAUS and asked the AUS to take a stance on electoral reform within Canada.

c. Councillor Page (FYC)

Councillor Page presents.

Councillor Page states that FYC has mainly been focused on social media to boost interaction with first years. He notes that usually, their budget is dedicated to hosting events, but since events are not possible, they are planning on holding giveaways.

Councillor Page notes that he has started to attend Affordable Student Housing Committee, and he is looking forward to setting up some sort of workshop for first years that will be moving out next year, on Quebec tenant housing rights.

Question Period:

Councillor Karasick asks how Councillor Page is enjoying SSMU. Councillor Page states that it has been a lot of fun.

d. Councillor Khodadadi (Music)

Senator Parsons presents on behalf of Councillor Khodadadi.

Senator Parsons notes that MUSA has a buddy program underway, where upper years get paired with first years. She notes that certain ensembles are going to be in person, and notes that it'll be interesting to see how it works out.

Senator Parsons notes that MUSA is currently in the process of revising the constitution, and notes that they plan on submitting it for the Winter 2021 referendum.

16. Executive Reports

a. President

The President presents. The President states that he participated in Lobby Week last week with UCRU, meeting with numerous MPs. He notes that he met with the new Dean of Students. He also highlights the ongoing issues with Workday. He encourages everyone who knows individuals who have been affected by the Workday issues to contact him.



Question Period:

Senator Parsons asks when the date for the special Senate meeting will be. VP University Affairs states that it is somewhat ambiguous.

b. VP University Affairs

VP University Affairs presents. VP University Affairs indicates that they are currently working with the Mental Health Advocacy Coordinator organization in their report. VP University Affairs notes that Senate Steering is meeting tomorrow, noting that according to university statutes, they are required to call a Senate meeting on Monday. VP University Affairs notes that individuals have until December 9 to submit ideas for BaCoN naming. VP University Affairs notes that they are still working to make employment equity happen, and notes that they are on track for the winter referendum period. They note that they have hired the Black Affairs Commissioner, and that Black Affairs Committee is meeting.

Question Period:

Councillor Wan asks on updates to the Fiat Lux project.

VP University Affairs indicates that it is around 20-28 years down the road. They also note that Schulich is set to open in Fall 2021.

c. VP Finance

VP Finance presents.

VP Finance notes that the audit has been completed, as well as budget revisions. VP Finance notes that he is working on an improved distribution system for next semester. He notes that the Services Finance Coordinator is a new position that is being created. He states that SSPN's scavenger hunt was successful.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

d. VP Student Life

VP Student Life presents.



VP Student Life states that the Clubs Portal Committee is continuing to meet. She notes that she is conducting a project where she is assessing club activity, and hopes that by the end of the semester, she can have a list of all clubs and whether they're active or not. She notes that the Club Website Designer was hired a few weeks ago. She notes that for Services, they have recently updated the Services Review Criteria, in light of COVID. She notes that they are currently working on the direct audits. VP Student Life notes that they hired a new Daycare Director. For Student Services, she notes that she attended the Committee on Student Services, as well as the Scholarship and Student Aid office advisory board meeting.

Question Period:

Councillor Wan asks if she has any updates in regards to Wellness World.

VP Student Life notes that Wellness World was no longer deemed necessary, and thus, failed to be ratified by the Board of Directors of Directors, given that it was no longer necessary. She states that the Mental Health Commissioner is working with the team from Student Services to implement a similar form of Wellness World.

e. VP External

VP External presents.

VP External states that he participated in Lobby Week with UCRU last week. He also notes that he met with the BC Federation of Students. He notes that several meetings for CKUT have occurred. In regards to political campaigns, he notes that they have been capacity building.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

17. Adjournment: **02:57**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jemark Earle', is positioned above a horizontal line.

Jemark Earle, President