



SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PUBLIC MINUTES

January 14, 2021

The regular bi-weekly Legislative Council Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held by teleconference, on January 14, 2021 at 18:00.

1. Call to Order: **18:14**

The Speaker calls the Legislative Council to order at 18:14.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker presents the Land Acknowledgement.

3. Attendance

Councillors Bulhoes and Reed will arrive late.

Councillor Morgan is absent.

4. Approval of Minutes

a. Legislative Council Public Minutes 2020-11-19 – **APPROVED**

Councillor Smith motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Councillor Williamson – APPROVED.

b. Legislative Council Public Minutes 2020-12-03 – **APPROVED**

Councillor Karasick motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Councillor Bonan – APPROVED.

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

Councillor Smith motions to approve the agenda, seconded by Councillor Wan – APPROVED.

6. Report of the Steering Committee



The Speaker presents the report of the Steering Committee.

7. Guest Speakers

a. Divest McGill Metro Boycott

Samuel Alguero presents on behalf of Divest McGill.

Alguero notes that Divest McGill is engaging in a boycott of Metro current, over the dissatisfaction with the McGill Board of Governors and their lack of ability to pass a motion for divesting.

Alguero notes that on the Board of Governors sits Maryse Bertrand, who is also the Vice Chair of Metro Inc. He notes that Maryse earns a retainer of \$120,000, and has half a million dollars in shares in Metro. He notes that Maryse also sits on the board of Metro Inc. They state that they are trying to target Maryse through their boycott of Metro, to pressure Maryse into supporting divestment at the university.

Alguero notes that Metro Inc. is a mega corporation, owning not just the 300+ Metro stores across Quebec and Ontario, but as well as 400 additional stores, including Adonis and, Super C, and Food Basics. He further notes that they are a member of Canada's major grocery store industry, making them a member of a huge oligopoly.

Alguero states that in June of 2020, Metro coordinated with other companies to conduct a wage cut to its workers, that was coordinated with other members of the grocery store industry, during the middle of the pandemic, cutting their workers' pay by around \$2. However, he notes that at the end of the year, they gave large bonuses to their top five executives that amounted to \$3.46 million; as for the Metro workers for all their hard work, Metro gave them gift cards to Metro.

Alguero indicates that the corporation is hugely problematic in its perpetuation of wealth inequality in Ontario and Quebec, placing some of its executives among the wealthiest people in Canada, and putting workers in a situation of working poverty.

Alguero presents the slide noting all connections between McGill and Metro Inc. He states that in 2019, McGill invested \$50 million in the oil and gas industry.

Alguero states that one of the primary reasons they are proceeding with the boycott is for professional pressure of Mrs. Bertrand, so that she can encourage divestments on the Board of Governors from McGill's \$50 million in investments in the fossil fuel industry. He notes that they are two situations that are possible from this boycott campaign. Firstly, he states that she can reconsider her beliefs on



McGill's investments, or she can step down from the Board of Governors, stating that both would be very fruitful. In terms of promoting divestment at the university, both methods would show members of the Board of Governors that there are indeed consequences to investing in extremely disastrous industries, such as the fossil fuel industry. Alguero notes that according to industry insiders; Metro has one of the highest ranked grocery store industry brands in Canada. As such, he states that it is valuable to them to not see the brand tainted. Alguero notes that they are trying to get the boycott campaign to as many individuals as possible, and to circulate information about the campaign, and to potentially get a motion passed at the Legislative Council. In terms of leverage through SSMU, Alguero notes that they currently have media coverage and have the support of a broad section of the McGill community.

Alguero notes that they are asking Councillors of the Legislative Council to engage and support their boycott of Metro Inc. He states that one of the basic things they can do is to not shop at a Metro namesake store, including Metro, Super C, and Adonis. As well, Alguero hopes that they can receive support on a future motion on support for the boycott, as well as marking 'interested' on Divest McGill Metro boycott Facebook events. Alguero states that if any individual wishes to get involved as an organizer, or wishes to start attending their weekly pickets, that they can fill out the Google Form linked.

Alguero states that it would be great if all of Council could attend, so that they could show both public and private support for the Metro Inc. boycott, and that it would help in furthering the sustainability goals of Legislative Council.

Question Period:

Question:

Senator Daryanani states that a lot of students in the Milton-Parc community rely on the grocery stores nearby, including Metro, Jean-Coutu, and Provigo. He asks if there will be an active campaign to promote other grocery stores to those that are not problematic. Senator Daryanani states that the list is pretty comprehensive with the ones that are problematic, so that it is hard to assume that other grocery stores nearby are not problematic. Senator Daryanani asks if there would be a more positive side of the campaign to encourage change and make it convenient.

Answer:

Alguero states they often handout papers or brochures that show a list of local grocery stores surrounding the specific Metro. He states that he is asking everyone to shop locally, and on the sheet, they mark which stores are local and provide alternatives. Alguero states that while Provigo is nearby and an alternative, he states that there are many problematic aspects with Provigo, including coordinating with Metro in the wage cut that was applied to workers in



June, as well as being a mega-industry, and one of the major players in the oligopoly. He also states that they currently have a working group that is conducting research round specific Metro stores, looking at prices at local grocery stores and other grocery chains and comparing them to Metro's, to promote economic incentives to not shop at Metro. As to why they are starting with Metro and no other chains like Provigo or Maxi, he states that it is because they have to start somewhere, and what they do to Metro may encourage other stores to change their practices as well.

There are no further questions.

b. Students for Peace and Disarmament

Maya Garfinkel, Anika Hundal, and Lea Holla present with Students for Peace and Disarmament (SPD).

They note that global military spending has reached a post-Cold War high, totally \$1.9 trillion dollars. They provide a list of what could be done with \$1 trillion dollars.

They state that the COVID-19 pandemic crisis could and should be addressed by supporting healthcare and other life-sustaining activities, not with military equipment and personnel prepared for war. They state that they wish to divest, so that their priorities can be reevaluated, and that they can stand up to those who are holding hostage their abilities to invest in education, sustainable development, feeding the hungry, housing the homeless, and those facing intrinsic inequalities in society.

They define the military-industrial complex, stating that it is a network of individuals and institutions involved in the production of weapons and military technologies. They note that it involves the companies and sectors of government that fund research technologies used in warfare, as well as universities, such as McGill, and other private businesses that accept funding and create these technologies, the companies and manufacturers that sell the technologies, the lobbyists who advocate for governments to increase their military budgets and buy the technologies, and the governments and militaries that use those technologies in warfare or otherwise.

They state that military and technology have had an extremely intertwined relationship over the past 50 years, which has led to catastrophic humanitarian consequences. However, they also remind Council that technological advancements have led to creation of crucial items that we use in society, noting that that many of them have started as military projects.

Speaking in a McGill and SSMU context, they define that harmful military research is a systematic investigation of scientific knowledge with the purpose of improving existence or future endeavors that



contribute to violence against individual groups and environments. They state that many of the technologies were created during the Cold War for espionage purposes, and that the technology disproportionately affects low-income communities as well as Indigenous communities.

They discuss nuclear weapons, noting that the technology was researched by many universities in the United States during the 1940s, resulting in part to the Manhattan Project. They state that their testing, development, and sale of nuclear weapons have led to catastrophic human, humanitarian, and environmental consequences that have disproportionately impacted Indigenous communities, such as Soviet Union nuclear testing in Indigenous communities in Kazakhstan. They state that Kazakhstan citizens were brought to sites of nuclear weapon testing, and placed at different distances from where the nuclear weapons were detonated, and brought back to the medical lab to learn more about nuclear weapons. They furthermore indicate that this case study is not just an anomaly, and that there is a repeated history and many case studies of Indigenous communities being disproportionately affected by the military-industrial complex, such as how the nuclear weapon industry disproportionately affects Indigenous communities in Northern Saskatchewan.

They note that contrary to popular belief, Canada does have a very harmful impact in terms of militarism. They state that Canada is currently making a bid to acquire a new fighter jet, which will cost \$19 billion. They note that many have been protesting this, and pushing for the government to reinvest the money in social services, pandemic relief, and healthcare, but that there has been no response from government officials. They state that Canada has taken part in many bombings by the air force in Iraq and Syria in 2014, 2015, and 2016, many which have resulted in civilian casualties. As well, they note that Canada has contributed to continuing the instability of the region through their military actions.

They note that there are no reports on the carbon emissions or environmental impact that these military interventions and developments result in. They note that this is especially important when considering that the US military is the biggest user of petroleum in the world.

They indicate that McGill works with contractors and the Canadian Department of Defense. They state that their research eventually results in harmful military technology, noting that many research labs at McGill are run by military interests. Given that McGill is an innovative university in Canada, they believe that McGill should be looking toward research opportunities that are approved by students, and that the students deem innovative.

They highlight two labs in particular. The first, Shockwave Physics Lab, stating that it is McGill's longest-standing military lab in the department of mechanical engineering. They state that the basic principle of the lab is to study the sharp change of pressure in the air resulting in and from explosions. They note that the research in the department is funded and bought by Research and Development



Canada, the US Department of Defense, and other military manufacturers. They state that the research is being conducted in the basement of MacDonald Engineering. They also note the computational fluid dynamics laboratory, also within the department of mechanical engineering, specializing in the development of complex 3D modelling software for use by the aerospace industry and arms manufacturers, such as Loughheed Martin and Bell Helicopter. They state that over the past year, they have also been working on technology for enhancing the performance of military plans and jets. They state that while the lab does not directly create weapons, their connection to various companies demonstrate that the lab is indeed connected to the larger apparatus of the military-industrial complex, and that it does impact technology such as military planes and jets. They state that they are aware of a link between the project and Loughheed Martin called the Falcon Project, a US military project which seeks to develop a variety of hypersonic aircraft to carry missiles and undertake surveillance. They also make Council aware of another agreement, between Bombardier and McGill, noting that the company was given the right to veto any application of McGill research which may work against their corporate interests. They note that the information that they have about the companies is limited, and that there is a lack of transparency between McGill and the student/general community. They note that the information that they have about McGill's military research is from access to information requests, stating that the documents were released only as requested after multiple years by previous campaigns. They note that the documents are heavily redacted and withhold financial information. They state that part of the reason they are going to put forth the policy they are going to be promoting is because they believe in greater transparency and more an ethical research apparatus at McGill.

They state that in the 1970s, McGill was the only Canadian university to appear in the CIA fact book as a site of war unrest during the height of anti-Vietnam war activism. They note that McGill is on a strong foundation of peace activism at McGill.

They note that there were a couple of steps taken in regards to regulations for more transparency into McGill's military research. After this resurgence of demilitarization, SSMU passed the policy for a Campus Free from Harmful Military Technology. They state that since the policy's expiration, the SPD is developing and improving the policy so that the McGill community can continue to make strides towards transparency and ethical research.

They state that with the policy, SPD's main goal is to advocate for transparent and ethical research on campus, in addition to creating a space for educational discussion about peace and disarmament and being active in allyship of other groups on campus whose values align and intersect with SPD. They note that they believe the policy that they will be promoting and bringing to Legislative Council is an important step towards a more transparent and ethical research sphere on campus.

Question Period:



Question:

Councillor Wan asks if SPD has any direct ties to Demilitarize McGill, or if they are a completely distinct organization.

Answer:

The presenters note that they are a separate and independent campaign from Demilitarize McGill. They note that a lot of their research has been on the foundations of Demilitarize McGill's research. They note that they have been building on their research, as they are only two years old and haven't had the chance to build up the research foundation from scratch. However, they note that they have distinct goals from Demilitarize McGill, being more focused on transparency and ethical, as opposed to simple abolition. They note that they are more focused on the short-term goals in this case, which is to create a space for discussion about demilitarization and advocating for transparent and ethical research through policies.

Question:

Councillor Wan asks if there have been any other labs or research groups in other faculties that they have noticed or that they've found participate in military research.

Answer:

The presenters respond that these two labs are the two labs that they've done the most research on and feel comfortable discussing. They also note that in the range of 2011 to 2015, there was a lab in the Department of Psychology, as well as labs within the Faculty of Science.

Question:

Senator Daryanani inquires how they can support their work, and that they would like Council to provide support.

Answer:

SPD notes that they will be bringing forth a policy at the next Legislative Council that will be in support of ethical research on McGill's campus. However, they note that they would love for Councillors to participate in other ways, and encourages everyone to like their Facebook page.

Question:

Councillor Reed asks SPD if they are looking for a direct restoration of the previous policy that was present on campus concerning military research, or if they are looking for something new.



Answer:

The presenters respond that they have been reading criticisms by Demilitarize McGill on the policy that did exist. They believe that SPD is in favour of a policy that replaces it, that has been improved. They also note that they wish to reiterate their support for finding new research opportunities on campus, especially for students in STEM. They state that the transparency aspect is very important because students in the faculties that are funded by the military-industrial complex should know the implications of that research.

There are no further questions.

c. MUSTBUS

Alexis Zhou presents on MustBUS. They note that they are working to become an ISG that would be affiliated with SSMU.

Zhou notes that MUSTBUS stands for McGill University Student Transport. They state that after the COVID-19 pandemic, they are planning on having direct bus trips to Toronto, New York, Boston, and Quebec, on weekends and holidays. They state that the goal is to empower the students to reach their potential. They state that they are proposed \$3.50 per semester per student fee levy. They note that students can travel near-unlimitedly for as low as \$19.00 each way.

Zhou explains that MUSTBUS submitted their question in the Fall 2020 Referendum, and received an 85.7% approval rating, which is a higher approval rating than many SSMU services. They note that this shows that the service is needed by the student body, and that there is a high demand. Zhou further states that they are experiencing a climate emergency in Canada, and note that the transportation sector is the second-most industry responsible for the highest amount of carbon emissions, directly following the oil and gas industry.

Zhou states that accessible transport is difficult for many students. They note that while ridesharing is an option, it is not necessarily safe. They note that MUSTBus is focused on mobility justice to give every student at McGill the equal opportunity to travel, whether it's for a job, entertainment, or connecting with their loved ones. Zhou notes that student-run transportation is already occurring at Cornell, the University of Waterloo, and UC Davis.



Question Period:

Question:

Councillor Bonan asked if in regard to the Referendum, if they discussed the ability to opt out. He notes that the opt-out would probably affect a lot of things, including the price.

Answer:

Zhou states that the referendum was more of an opinion poll, to gauge the interest of the McGill student population. They also note that they have conducted AMAs on McGill Reddit.

Question:

Councillor Bonan restates his question, and notes that the carbon estimates of coach buses, when conducted, are assuming a full-capacity bus.

Answer:

Zhou states that the fee would be opt-outable, and that they believe every McGill student should have the freedom to choose. They also agree to the fact that there is more nuance to carbon calculations than the simple chart they presented.

Question:

Councillor Wan asks if the MustBUS student fee passes, if representatives from SSMU or any other organizations that they consulted will be offered seats on the Board of Directors to overlook the operations and finances of the organization.

Answer:

Zhou responds that they are welcome of any oversight from SSMU.

Question:

The President inquires about the \$19.00 pricing, and asks if individuals would actually be paying that price. He notes that MegaBus advertises prices as low as \$10.00, but that those tickets very rarely exist in reality, and that they [students] often end up paying above \$50.00 per trip. He inquires if the \$19.00 is a fixed rate, and if not, how high prices could go.

Answer:



Zhou states that it is an unfortunate situation in Canada concerning the oligopoly. They state that the \$19 is not promotional pricing, and that it is real pricing they are planning to implement. They also note that the \$19.00 includes every single fee on top of that.

Question:

Councillor Lee notes that through the semester, the demand for travel will vary, and asks how MUSTBUS will acknowledge such demands.

Answer:

Zhou responds that the issue concerning MUSTBUS is not that they'll be running empty buses, but rather, their service will be unable to meet the entirety of the demand, which means that they expect the majority of their buses to be full.

Question:

Councillor Smith notes that MUSTBUS will be offering trips to the United States. He states that cross-border travel for American and Canadian students is easy, with relatively few limitations. However, he notes that for many other international students, this is not the case, including travel authorizations and visas. He states that many students may not know the restrictions, and states that for organizations who would be working to transport students across the border, there could be fines. He asks how they are prepared to make sure that students who are able to cross an international border are able to do so.

Answer:

Zhou states that the United States has one of the most repressive immigration regulations in the world. They note that they are on the forefront of challenging immigration enforcement, noting that they will not cooperate with United States custom border protections, and notes that they will not supply passenger information to US immigration authorities before arriving at the border crossing. They state that they are familiar with the immigration procedures, and have experts on the team concerning this. They note that on the website, it will clearly indicate that passengers must possess certain documents before entering the United States. They state that prior to boarding the bus, they will remind each and every passenger to produce the travel documents. However, they note that they will not ask them to open it, because they respect everyone's right to travel, and that they do not support immigration enforcement. They also note that in the very unlikely scenario that an individual is refused, they will have partnerships with taxi companies in the region, and would be able to return to Montreal safely.



Question:

VP University Affairs inquires about the scope of MUSTBUS consultation.

Answer:

Zhou states that they [MUSTBUS] have done consultation and engagement with students as early as 2019.

Question:

Councillor Karasick asks for clarification on how MUSTBus works. He asks if it is a plan to subsidize travel through Greyhound and MegaBus, or if they are actually planning on setting up their own distinct bus company.

Answer:

Zhou states that they will be working with neither of the companies, and notes that they are planning on starting their own bus operation, entirely independent from MegaBus. They note that they will be working with licensed bus operators.

Question:

VP Finance asks if they have any financial estimates or documents to present for the \$3.50 fee levy or the ticket prices they have mentioned, so that members of Council and that he can review it, and look over it, as well as asks if there will be any startup costs.

Answer:

Zhou notes that they have prepared a finance estimate as part of the ISG application, and notes that they will be able to review it in detail once the ISG application has been submitted to the VP Student Life.

Question:

Councillor Reed is in favour of the idea of having an affordable means of student transport, but inquires about the models they are using in terms of demand, and if they can provide more detail on how they came to the belief that they would be easily able to consistently fill buses.

Answer:



Zhou states that due to the number of McGill students, as well as those with connections to the United States or Ontario, it will be reasonable.

Question:

Councillor Wan asks how MUSTBUS is currently operating, as they currently don't have a student fee to fund their operations.

Answer:

Zhou states that they are not operating right now, due to COVID-19. They note that before the pandemic, in 2020, they organized two pilot trips to New York. As to paying their staffers, they state that they believe in paying them in fair manners, and state that wages will be reflected in the budget, as part of the ISG application.

Question:

VP External asks if they are planning on raising funds from other sources, and not only SSMU students.

Answer:

Zhou explains that a significant portion of their funds will be coming from a SSMU fee levy, as well as \$19.00 fares. They note that they are also open to ideas such as social financing, with non-profit organizations. However, they note that this would only be a small percentage of their budget.

Question:

Councillor Karasick asks if they are planning on running trips every week, as well as asks if they believe that there might be a risk that people would over-focus on certain times and under-focus on others.

Answer:

Zhou responds that even if the bus is not full, they have a buffer in place to guarantee that the bus will still be running. They note that it is likely that they'll see a spike in demand during times such as right before Spring break, and they will adjust their number of buses accordingly.



Question:

Councillor Wan asks if MUSTBUS has consulted the SSMU Finance Committee, and if so, what has their opinion been on the eventual student fee by MUSTBUS.

Answer:

Zhou explains that they consulted the 2019-2020 VP Finance of SSMU last year, and notes that they received positive feedback from him. Further, they have not engaged with the Finance Committee yet, but that they will be happy to start the process and engage with them.

Question:

Councillor Reed asks about the extent that the schedules will account for travel time, given that a trip to New York, which is roughly a seven-hour drive, is more difficult than a trip to Toronto. He asks that leaving early on Friday, it may cut into class time, but that it makes leaving more feasible, and asks if this is a consideration.

Answer:

Zhou states that the scheduling involves many different factors, including class time and the time needed for making the trip. There is no ideal situation, but that it is about making compromise and they will try to reach a balance on how they can proceed.

Question:

Councillor Smith brings up the point that MUSTBus indicated that they wouldn't engage in information sharing with the United States' government. He wishes to draw attention to Chapter 49 of the United States code, section 44.09 which deals with passenger sharing. Councillor Smith states that it requires the Secretary of Transport to require sharing passenger information. He notes that air carriers are required to provide passenger manifests, which include names, dates, passport numbers, and visa information of passengers. He states that the US has changed their regulations and notes that it also applies to passengers travelling by land by bus. He asks if they have done any consultation with legal counsel, either in the United States or Canada who specializes in transportation and immigration law.

Answer:

Zhou notes that they are familiar with regulations and jurisdictions in Quebec, and that they comply with both those regulations and those in New York City. Alexis also states that they are compliant with the USDA regulations, carried out by the US Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. Alexis also states that mandatory bus carriers and border patrol does not



apply to bus carriers, so they are exempted from the rule. Furthermore, they note that they do not expect to see any change in this direction, but if it does, that they will respond accordingly.

Question:

Councillor Wan asks for a plan if the MUSTBUS dips into ‘the red’ and asks if there will be an expectation for SSMU to contribute financially.

Answer:

Zhou indicates that this is an unlikely scenario, and that they would not ask for financial handouts.

Question:

Councillor Smith asks what legal consultation they’ve held thus far.

Answer:

Alexis states that they are working with lawyers currently.

There are no further questions.

The Speaker thanks Alexis Zhou for their presentation.

8. Announcements

Councillor Smith announces that Hirundo, the McGill Undergraduate Journal of Classical Studies, is currently accepting submissions for its 2020-21 edition. Papers coming from any discipline are eligible, provided they address a topic related to Classical Studies. Anything related to the ancient Mediterranean can be submitted. In the past, papers on art history, philosophy, economics, literature, philology, linguistics, history and gender studies, have been accepted. Individuals may send your submissions (as a word document) and/or inquiries to hirundo.history@gmail.com and the deadline to submit is January 24, 2021.

VP External announces that the record of votes from the second to most recent Legislative Council are now uploaded on the website.



VP Student Life announces that Activities Night is happening next week, on January 21 and 22, 2021. She states that it is happening on the same site that the Fall Activities Night took place.

There are no further announcements.

9. Question Period

There are no questions.

10. Services Review Committee

VP Student Life notes that from the last committee allocation, there were no Councillors allocated to the Services Review Committee, and asks if there are any Councillors interested in sitting on the committee.

Councillor Awan puts his name forward for consideration.

11. Recess, Consent Items

VP University Affairs motions for a 10-minute extension on the recess, seconded by Councillor Smith – APPROVED.

[Recess begins at 20:11.]

[Recess ends at 20:27.]

The Speaker announces that three (3) out of the four (4) items passed by consent vote this evening. They note that the only motion not approved by consent was the Motion Regarding the Vice-President Sustainability and Operations Positions 2021-01-14.

12. Accountability Survey Report

The Speaker presents the report of the Accountability Committee. She notes that she serves as one of the co-chairs, with the Parliamentarian serving as the other. She notes that they have one (1) Director, five (5) members-at-large, as well as the University Affairs Secretary-General.

The Speaker states that the Accountability Survey is conducted annually, and based the conduct of the survey off of five principles: equity, constructiveness, fair assessment, quantitative assessment, and qualitative assessment. For quantitative assessment, she notes that they referred back to the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 Accountability surveys, and proceeded to adjust their set of dimensions



necessary. On the dimensions, they decided on the Availability and Approachability of Office Hours for Executives, Responsiveness to Questions and Requests for Executives, Fulfillment of Mandate and Platform for Executives, Participation during Council for Councillors, Constructiveness during Council for both, Conduct/Respect for Elected Office for Executives, Conduct during Meetings for Councillors, as well as the Effort to Speak French for Executives.

She further explains that there were multiple changes from the 2019-2020 Accountability Survey. She states that the Survey was conducted completely virtually this year, as opposed to being both paper and digital. As well, they also granted Councillors and Executives the opportunity to submit qualitative feedback in cases in which the dimensions that they provided failed to capture relevant perspectives and information, or if Councillors had any other relevant comments. The Speaker notes that the Accountability Committee of 2018-2019 followed a similar structure, offering the ability to provide qualitative feedback for Executives only. This year, the Speaker notes that they expanded the opportunity to provide qualitative feedback on Legislative Councillors/Council-at-large as well, which is, in recent history, something that hasn't been done prior. Additionally, the scoring system reverted to the 10-point system, as opposed to utilizing the McGill grading system in determining performance. She notes that while they understood that people were familiar with it, due to their academics, they deemed that this wasn't representative of their scores, understanding the nuances within scoring.

As well, Executive performance is no longer simply averaged as a whole. She notes that the Accountability Committee decided that they wanted to encourage increased transparency and accountability to the Legislative Council, and thus, will be highlighting each Executive's performance individually in public session, as well as generalized comments.

In regards to methodology, the Speaker states that they distributed the Accountability Survey in both English and French. She notes that all questions were ranked on a scale of 0 to 10, followed by optional qualitative feedback opportunities. She notes that this took place over winter break to ensure that Councillors had an adequate amount of time and to ensure that survey results remained accurate and thoughtful. She states that this is a change from last year, as in year's past, they used to be conducted over one-15 minute break during Council, but they believed it wasn't enough time. She notes that last year, many people put all zeros or all tens because they didn't care or didn't have enough time, and that they wanted to provide Councillors an extended opportunity to provide relevant information. Following, Lauren notes that all surveys were anonymized. Following that, all feedback was averaged to represent the mean score of each Councillor on each given dimension. She states that given the misunderstandings of the scale system, that there was a belief among some Councillors that the scoring was based on a 1-5 scale, as opposed to a 0-10 scale. She explains that the responses from those Councillors were noted and omitted to prevent any statistical misconceptions.



On learnings for improvement and next steps, though the instructions for completing the survey were clearly communicated, there still seemed to be a disregard for some portions of the instructions, noting that numerous Councillors continued to provide feedback for themselves, regardless of the fact that it said not to. As well, even though the Committee had distributed the survey at the beginning of the winter break to allow Councillors an extended portion of time to complete the survey, they nevertheless noticed that there was still a trend of rushing the survey with some Councillors picking 10 on every single dimension or 0 for every single Councillor, seemingly without merit for some of them. Going forward, the Speaker explains that the Accountability Committee should further instill the importance of the survey to Councillors, and that Councillors should be mindful that their disregard for accurate scoring reflects both poorly on them, as well as misrepresents the performance of their fellow Councillors.

In year's past, the Survey has been conducted twice a year, but they are hoping that as a result of potential amendments to the Accountability Committee Terms of Reference, that the survey will be conducted once per Legislative Council year. They are hoping that the Survey continues to be conducted over winter break, with the Survey results being presented at the first Legislative Council of the winter semester. She also states that the survey should be completely conducted through digital form, going forward, as it reduces the burden of manually inputting scores, as well as ensuring that papers cannot be misplaced. She also notes that in the future, when the Legislative Council is back in-person, that the dimension concerning Conduct is revised to better reflect current circumstances, such as behaviour during the Livestream, to ensure that scores are better reflective of reality.

She states that regarding next steps, Councillor scores will be shared individually following Council.

On Executive performance, she notes that on Availability/Approachability in Office Hours, they received an 8.8. For responsiveness to Questions/Requests, they received an 8.5. For mandate/platform they received an 8.6. For Constructiveness, an 8.1. For Conduct/Respect for Elected Office, an 8.8, and for Effort to Speak French a 7.0.

For individual Executives, the Speaker begins with the President. She notes that on Availability/Approachability in Office Hours, he received an 8.7. For responsiveness to Questions/Requests, they received an 8.3. For mandate/platform they received an 8.8. For Constructiveness, an 8.2. For Conduct/Respect for Elected Office, an 9.2, and for Effort to Speak French an 8.0. For qualitative comments, she notes that the President could participate more in discussion and debate, given that he is the spokesperson of the Society and often offers a unique perspective. As well, she notes that he has also been commended numerous times for being a very eloquent speaker as well as being excellent in his position. She notes that many Councillors noted that he keeps meeting proceedings moving efficiently, and that he was a natural leader. The President has also been commended them for utilizing concise language, allowing all individuals to understand



his interventions. She also notes that there was an encouragement to speak more French in Council. Councillors also found that he is considerate towards all Councillors, including those that have differing opinions from him. As well, some note that it is clear that President Earle cares deeply about doing his job well, reflected in the fulfillment of his mandate. Lastly, she notes that President Earle could benefit councillors and executives by playing a more active and assertive role in describing, substantiating, and when needed, defending the actions taken by the Executive Committee.

VP Student Life, for Availability/Approachability in Office Hours, VP Student Life received an 8.9. For responsiveness to Questions/Requests, they received an 8.6. For mandate/platform they received an 8.8. For Constructiveness, an 8.3. For Conduct/Respect for Elected Office, an 8.9, and for Effort to Speak French a 6.7. For comments and concerns, VP Student Life is respectful during meetings, great in her role as VP Student Life, very eloquent in her answers, and kind and respectful to all Councillors.

As for VP Finance, the Speaker notes that on Availability/Approachability in Office Hours, he received an 8.9. For responsiveness to Questions/Requests, he received an 9.0. For mandate/platform he received an 8.8. For Constructiveness, an 8.6. For Conduct/Respect for Elected Office, a 9.0, and for Effort to Speak French a 6.3. For comments and concerns, the Speaker notes that he has been noted as 'exceptional in his role as VP Finance'. She also notes that he has received comments that he is respected by all, and should contribute more in Council, as the position of the VP Finance can give a lot of insight into determining the best course of action for SSMU on many issues, as well as the fact that Legislative Council could benefit from VP Marpole's eloquence, and knowledgeability.

In regards to VP External, the Speaker notes that on Availability/Approachability in Office Hours, he received an 8.2. For responsiveness to Questions/Requests, he received a 7.7. For mandate/platform he received an 8.0. For Constructiveness, a 7.5. For Conduct/Respect for Elected Office, an 8.9, and for Effort to Speak French a 7.0. For comments and concerns, VP External has been commended for having very professional conduct. She notes that some have noted that there was a lack of urgency and conciseness in delivering information, and that VP Ogunremi could benefit from working on speaking more concisely during the Legislative Council. As well, she notes that he was commented as having participated consistently in discussion during the Legislative Council, providing thoughtful and thorough answers to questions, not only regarding his own portfolio, but also in discussions pertaining to other executives and their portfolios, displaying dedication to his teammates.

The Speaker asks for a 10-minute extension. Councillor Smith motions to that extent, seconded by Councillor Williamson – APPROVED.

As for VP University Affairs Brooklyn Frizzle, the Speaker notes that on Availability/Approachability in Office Hours, they received an 9.1. For responsiveness to Questions/Requests, they received a 9.2. For mandate/platform they received an 8.4. For Constructiveness, an 8.0. For Conduct/Respect for Elected



Office, an 8.1, and for Effort to Speak French a 7.0. For comments and concerns, VP University Affairs has been commented to be ‘a pleasure to work with’ and eloquent in their responses. They note that VP University Affairs has been commented to have shown a perceived willingness to progress a personal highly contentious agenda, which can hinder constructive dialogue at times. However, the Speaker notes that they also have been commended for having a very strong, constitutional understanding. As well, the Speaker notes that they are very skilled in their position, and looks out for various student groups that may otherwise be underrepresented. Some Councillors note that VP University Affairs can consider making their interventions and Council more concise, as to limit the amount of times their statements are repeated and to ensure that statements are easily understood. As well, VP University Affairs could consider ensuring that the responses to those with opposing opinions are not perceived as potentially ‘aggressive’. As well, the Speaker notes that according to a Councillors, VP Frizzle is by far the most engaged member of the SSMU Executive and during the SSMU Legislative Council. However, she notes that there was a concern with the way the VP University Affairs responded to the motion, considering the Clarification of an International Position, appearing that they seemed to reduce the reduce the experience of some Chinese students, which was even more concerning that at past Legislative Councils, Chinese gallery members had described experiencing racism and targeted harassment in the controversy stemming from the statement. Though they note that they are certain that this was not the VP University Affairs’ intention, the Councillor nevertheless hopes to see more care in their discussion of such topics in the future. Lastly, the Speaker notes that the VP University Affairs have defended their own views with patients and assertiveness while, while ultimately displaying a clear dedication to working towards compromise and effective solutions for all.

In regards to all Councillors, the Speaker notes that for Participation During Meetings of the Legislative Council, they have received a 6.6. For Constructiveness of Contributions during Meetings of the Legislative Council, Council has received 6.9. Lastly, for Conduct During Meetings of the Legislative Council, Council received an 8.3.

For qualitative comments, the Speaker notes that given the sensitive nature of numerous comments, as well as individual Councillor feedback remains private by convention, no individual comments will be revealed. However, the Speaker makes general comments. Firstly, she notes that it is important that everyone remain respectful to other Councillors, as well as the Dais, both during meetings, as well as on private chats, during meetings or concerning the meetings. She also encourages all of them to be mindful of the amount of time that they take to speak during Council meetings, as to better allow a more fruitful discussion, that contains multiple diverse perspectives. As well, she notes that Councillors should refrain from personal attacks, or attacks or acts of perceived aggression towards their peers and the Dais, and to conduct themselves respectfully and calmly during interventions. She notes that she, as well as the General Manager and Governance Manager are available to speak to if they have questions, or concerns, or comments. She also notes that Accountability Complaints are



available if any individual wishes to launch an Accountability complaint. She also notes that she is always available, if they have any concerns with fellow Councillors or any related issues.

Question Period:

Question:

Councillor Collins asks if Councillors can receive their individual comments privately.

Answer:

The Speaker notes for the comments that are not 'sensitive in nature', she will happily share them.

There are no further questions.

13. New Business

- a. Notice of Motion Regarding the Accessibility Policy and Committee 2021-01-14

VP University Affairs motivates.

VP University Affairs notes that the first Accessibility Policy adopted in 2016 was very well done, but it was unenforceable. They note that the policy is to modernize the policy to a relatively new context, as the context of accessibility on campus has evolved very quickly, especially with SSMU's relationship with the OSD. They note that the majority of the updates actually centre around expanding the mandate and forcibility of the policy to ensure that both the Executive Officers and the Society more generally can be held accountable for their mandates. With this, they note that they have set up the office of the Accessibility Commissioner and Accessibility Committee.

- b. Notice of Motion Regarding Amendments to the Nominating Committee Terms of Reference

The Parliamentarian motivates.

The Parliamentarian states that the Nominating Committee has been asked to amend interview guides for various positions that they nominate for, including Directors, Judicial Board Justices, and International Student Representatives. He notes that the changes are to reflect that, as well as grammatical changes.

- c. Notice of Motion Regarding Amendments to the Accountability Committee Terms of Reference



The Speaker motivates.

The Speaker states that as indicated in the earlier report, they would like to amend the Terms of Reference to alter the amount of times the survey should be conducted in a year, as well as clarifying contradictions. She notes that the amendment would enforce the Survey being conducted once a year, as well as amend the dates of presentation of Committee reports.

- d. Motion Regarding the Renewal of the Indigenous Solidarity Policy 2021-01-14 --

UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

The Motion Regarding the Renewal of the Indigenous Solidarity Policy 2021-01-14 is unanimously approved.

- e. Motion Regarding an Amendment to the Standing Rules for the 2020-2021 Legislative Council 2021-01-14 -- **UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED**

The Motion Regarding an Amendment to the Standing Rules for the 2020-2021 Legislative Council 2021-01-14 is unanimously approved.

- f. Motion Regarding Vice-President (Sustainability and Operations) Position 2021-01-14 – **APPROVED**

Councillor Smith motivates.

Councillor Smith states that as a result of the Miller v. SSMU Judicial Board decision, the Vice-President (Sustainability and Operations) Position continues to be within the Constitution, regardless of the fact that the position is not currently active. He notes that the Legislative Council of 2018 made the change to remove it, given the closure of the University Centre, as well as some behind the scenes issues.

Councillor Smith further explains that the CGRC of last year moved to amend the Constitution to remove the position. He notes that currently, the portfolio has been divided among the other executive portfolios and other portfolios within SSMU. He states that the position will be coming up for election, unless the provision is extended.

Question Period:

There are no questions.



Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period – APPROVED.

In favour: 28

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 0

The Motion Regarding Vice-President (Sustainability and Operations) Position 2021-01-14 is approved.

- g. Motion Regarding Legislative Council Committee Allocations 2021-01-14 --
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

The Motion Regarding Legislative Council Committee Allocations 2021-01-14 is unanimously approved.

14. Executive Reports

- a. President

The President presents.

The President notes that for meetings, he is meeting with the Governing Documents Researcher, looking at other student unions, to see what other documents that they are using, such as a Code of Conduct. He states that there will be a report coming out towards the end of the semester concerning it.

For Advocacy and Representation, he states that he had a meeting with the VP University Affairs and the Dean of Students following the highly contentious Senate, as he wished to understand why students were so upset.

As well, he notes that he had met with Principal Fortier and Provost Manfredi, due to comments that were made with concerns about Workday.

Concerning the Board of Governors, he notes that the new Chancellor, John McCall MacBain was announced, as well as the reappointed of the Dean of Law.



The President also notes that there was the special Senate meeting, concerning the amended S/U policy.

He attends a standing meeting with the Sustainability Commissioners, and notes that there are numerous upcoming events.

He is currently drafting the Committee Terms of Reference for the 5-Year Plan Committee, which he is hoping to bring to the next Council.

He also indicates that he attended the Finance Committee meeting last week. As well, he met with the Francophone Affairs Commissioner and Councillor Wan, regarding some of the translation errors on recent Listservs.

SSMU is currently interviewing for the Gert's Bar Manager position.

Over the break, he was able to meet with the SSMU President from both 1989 and 1979. He states that the Executive Team is going to meet with the Executive Team from 1989. As well, he notes that the President from 1979 is actually John McCall MacBain, the new Chancellor for McGill. The President notes that he is an ally to students in his capacity as Chancellor, and that he'll help SSMU push things, such as divestment, on the Board of Governors.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

b. VP University Affairs

VP University Affairs presents.

VP University Affairs states that the Student Rights Researcher is preparing a second report, on COVID-19 impact. They also note that they are working with the Mental Health Advocacy Coordinator and advocacy team to coordinate their report, and to coordinate their university-facing advocacy.

They also note that they have checked in with all of the special researchers. They state that the preferred names usage report is close to completion, and it should be out in the coming weeks.

Senate Caucus met and discussed the agenda of Senate and the plans for new constitutional revisions.



On Equity and Advocacy, they note that BACoN is still meeting, and that they approved the preliminary reports and their front runners. The report will most likely be brought to the next Council for discussion.

On Equity infrastructure, they note that the Black Affairs Commissioner is actively transitioning into their role. As well, they note that the hiring process for the Accessibility Commissioner is underway. They state that they are meeting with the Equity Commissioners to revise the Equity Policy. As well, they state that they are currently working with UGE to hire the Gender and Sexuality Commissioners for university advice.

For academic resources, they note that the Library Improvement Fund is running a very significant surplus, due to COVID-related project cancellations.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

c. VP Finance

VP Finance presents the report.

VP Finance states that the Finance Committee is conducting an investigation into SSMU student fee policies, and notes that the report is essentially complete.

They note that the 2021-2022 Budget is currently being worked on, and that they are currently collecting departmental budgets from the department heads and compiling all of the information. He notes that they hope to have the budget completed by February 19.

VP Finance notes that he is currently drafting a finance website to consolidate all SSMU financial-related information in one space.

As for Funding Committee, he notes that it had the first meeting on January 11, and they approved nine funding applications.

For clubs and services, he notes that the recent lockdown has made it nearly impossible to distribute club resources, and notes that he is recommending that clubs hold off on applying for credit cards. For the Fall 2020 club audit, he notes that the deadline is January 25, 2021. On services, he notes that he is working on a new position, the Services Finance Coordinator, stating that it will provide extra



support for services related to finance. For service credit cards, he states that the services frequently use their credit cards, and that there have been no major issues so far.

For SSPN, he notes that they are holding their second virtual event on January 23, 2021.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

d. VP Student Life

VP Student Life presents.

For Clubs, she states that on the Clubs Portal, they received a demonstration from Eventus, and that they are currently continuing to schedule demos from other providers.

She notes that Winter Activities Night is happening on the 21st and 22nd of January, 2021.

VP Student Life notes that the first Club Committee meeting will happen next week.

For the SSMU Events Committee, she notes that meetings are still happening weekly. However, she notes that they have been shortened, because they have decided to postpone the grand opening of the building, due to the lockdown.

She notes that they are currently working through a list of clubs that are currently inactive, and hopes to come up with a list that she can provide the next VP Student Life about best practices for operating virtually.

For Services, VP Student Life is continuing to do space agreements for all of the Services and tenants in the building. As well, she is continuing to hold meetings to touch base with the Services to check in on them, to see how they are doing. She notes that there are many service fees up for renewal in the upcoming referendum.

Concerning mental health, she notes that they held their Mental Health Round Table meeting on January 7. She notes that they are planning Mental Health Action week, which will happen this semester.

In regard to family care, she notes that the Family Care Policy recently expired on January 1st, 2021 and that it will be renewed for the year.



She notes that the Committee on Equality and Family Care meeting occurred on December 9, and that there will be another meeting this semester.

As well, the VP Student Life notes that she has been working with CL&E to figure out ways to engage with students online.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

e. VP External

VP External presents.

VP External thanks all Councillors for filling out the Accountability Survey, and thanks the Accountability Committee for organizing it, noting that the feedback is very valuable.

VP External notes that he sits on the Advocacy Committee of UCRU, and states that they are working to conduct a climate emergency survey of undergraduate students at U15 universities.

For federal political affairs, he notes that the Ministry of Immigration has granted a one-time renewal of expired or expiring post-graduate work permits, because it means that former international students who have been unable to meet the work requirements required for permanent residency applications have been granted extensions to make the application and not be deported.

He notes that the CEGEP and Quebec university student associations met on December 9th, discussing education after the COVID-19 pandemic, Bill 21, and international students.

On provincial and municipal affairs, the Coalition against the PEQ has reformed, demanding a meeting with the Minister of Immigration, Francization, and Integration, and to make the PEQ an electoral issue in 2022.

Councillor Bonan motions to extend by five (5)-minutes, seconded by Councillor Williamson – APPROVED.

VP External is in the process of reaching out to other student unions to discuss the potential for a public assembly on the condition of international students, noting that it is important that more



awareness is raised. He is working to bring Bill 21 back to Council, noting that SSMU's motion to oppose it expired last year.

On political research and infrastructure, he notes that he has drafted a political research guide for the Political Researcher. He notes that Community Affairs hosted a virtual event on tenant rights that happened on Tuesday, noting that 110 people showed up.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

15. Confidential Session: **21:33**

The Legislative Council enter into a confidential session at 21:33.

16. Adjournment: **21:42**

Legislative Council re-enters into public session at 21:40.

Councillor Bonan motions to suspend the rules, seconded by Councillor Smith.

The Speaker notes that in her position as one of the co-chairs of the Accountability Committee, the Committee is also conducting an Accountability Survey at large for the Society, based on the role of the Executives outside of their role in Legislative Council. She encourages everyone to share it with their respective constituencies.

Legislative Council adjourns at 21:42.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Earle', written over a horizontal line.

Jemark Earle, President