



# SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PUBLIC MINUTES

February 11, 2021

The regular bi-weekly Legislative Council Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held by teleconference, on February 11, 2021 at 18:00.

1. Call to Order: **18:08**

The Speaker calls the Legislative Council to order at 18:08.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker presents the Land Acknowledgement.

*The SSMU acknowledges that McGill University is situated on the traditional and unceded territory of the Anishinaabeg and Haudenosaunee nations. The SSMU recognizes and respects these nations as the true and constant custodians of the lands and waters on which we meet today. Further, the SSMU commits to and respects the traditional laws and customs of these territories.*

3. Attendance

Proxies for Senator Daryanani and Councillor Rhamey are present.

4. Approval of Minutes

a. Legislative Council Public Minutes 2021-01-28 -- **APPROVED**

Councillor Williamson motions to approve the minutes, seconded by Councillor Bonan -- APPROVED.

The minutes are approved.

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

VP Finance motion to move the Motion to Renew the McGill Writing Centre Fee to the beginning of New Business, as they have someone from the McGill Writing Centre to answer questions, and it would be unfair to have them wait until the end.



VP Student Life inquires if it would be possible to add another motion, the Motion to Approve a Fee for the Muslim Students' Association. The Speaker notes that it will be accepted.

Councillor Smith motions to approve the agenda, seconded by Councillor Bonan -- APPROVED.

The agenda is adopted.

## 6. Report of the Steering Committee

The Speaker presents the Report of the Steering Committee.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

## 7. Guest Speakers

### a. UCRU Bylaw Review

Mackenzey Metcalfe presents.

Metcalfe states that she is the Vice President of External Affairs at the University of Western Ontario Students' Council, as well as the Chair of UCRU. Metcalfe notes that UCRU is a coalition of student unions that work together to promote inclusive, affordable, high calibre undergraduate university education, with increased access to undergraduate research. She states that UCRU has been working towards formalization, through the creation and eventual approval of the bylaws.

Metcalfe states that SSMU has until February 25 to review the bylaws, and to provide any feedback. Metcalfe notes that the UCRU Board of Directors has been working on the bylaws since their term began in May. She states that they have worked with the ten schools that are members, to ensure that everyone's interests and concerns are remedied in the bylaws. Furthermore, Metcalfe notes that withdrawal from UCRU is easy. She states that each school can leave whenever they wish, as long as they follow their own internal bylaws, and provide UCRU thirty days notice. The voting system on the UCRU Board is one-school, one-vote, and notes that UCRU will only ever represent U-15 universities. As well, she states that the bylaws provide a good starting point for UCUR, and outlines relationships that the corporation already abides by, and outlines current existing practices. Metcalfe notes that within the bylaws, there aren't mentions of elections of representatives or policy process for example,



noting that those topics are better suited for UCRU operating policies, and don't need to be legally binding.

Metcalf highlights past work that UCRU has done, including launching a national climate change survey, a policy library, a debt-free degree campaign, and meeting with over seventy different Members of Parliament during their Lobby Week in November. While they are doing a lot, it is difficult without any money and without formal structure. Lastly, they currently rely on a lot of her resources at Western University Students' Council.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks about the section concerning interpretation, and asks what efforts will be made to ensure that UCRU communication is made available in French as well.

**Answer:**

Metcalf states that they have spoken about that numerous times at Board, and it comes back to the lack of capacity that UCRU has, noting that they only have two bilingual members on the Board currently. The provision of French is dependent on who is within the organization based on a given year, and they hope to utilize the formalization so that they can work towards having staff and an executive director.

---

**Question:**

VP Finance asks what the financial requirements are to be a part of UCRU.

**Answer:**

Metcalf states that there are no financial requirements of being a part of UCRU. Concerning costs, UCRU will take whatever cost comes in and they will divide it by the ten schools, and everybody will take it out of their federal advocacy budget. However, the cost has never been more than a thousand dollars. UCRU eventually hopes to work towards a fee, but notes that there is no mention of a fee in the bylaws, and that the bylaw does not make the commitment of McGill University.

There are no further questions.

The Speaker thanks Mackenzy Metcalfe for the presentation.



## 8. Announcements

The Speaker announces that the Winter General Assembly will be occurring next Tuesday at 6:00 PM EST. All Councillors are expected to attend.

Finance Commissioner, Sebastien Duckett, encourages everyone that when evaluating fee levies this evening, to consider the financial aspects of the proposals, including considering documentation and financial justification provided. He states that he will be present to answer questions for clarification, and offer factual correction. As well, he encourages questions to be directed to the VP Finance.

VP External states that Council should have received some emails concerning SENSE electoral reform, as well as the UCRU climate crisis survey.

There are no further announcements.

## 9. Question Period

### Question:

Councillor Smith inquires about the possibility of Principal Fortier attending a meeting of the SSMU Legislative Council.

### Answer:

VP University Affairs indicates that there are not currently any hard plans for the Principal to attend a meeting. However, they note that they may be joined by the Deputy Provost, Student Life and Learning (DPSLL), at some point before the end of the semester.

---

### Question:

Councillor Wan inquires about the Finance Committee report, and asks if either the VP Finance or Finance Commissioner have any potential suggestions for the motions presented tonight, specifically concerning amendments.

### Answer:

VP Finance states that given that the report was presented to Council two weeks ago, he states that the timeframe was a bit tight between then and now, and especially given that referendum items had to be submitted to the DPSLL by February 1, meaning that services would have three days to implement the new processes for renewal motions, which he stated was unfeasible. However, he states that going forward, they will be moving forward with some of the recommendations within the report that will be brought to a future Legislative Council and implemented next year, providing services enough time to accommodate new procedures.



---

**Question:**

Councillor Gundermann, based on the report from the Finance Committee, inquires about the potentiality of holding off on certain renewals or shortening duration of renewals.

**Answer:**

VP Finance states that he consulted with services concerning their fees, and that all services indicated that they have expressed interest in keeping their fees. He notes that some services expressed an interest in increasing their fees, but that he made the recommendation to not do so, given the fact that they hadn't been spending all of their money this year. As far as renewing the fees, he states that the standard timeline is three to five-years. Furthermore, he states that even if they are passed, they can be amended in the meantime.

---

There are no further questions.

10. Recess, Consent Items

[Recess begins, time unknown.]

[Recess ends, time unknown.]

The Speaker announces that 2/22 motions passed by consent vote: Motion Regarding the Creation of the Gender and Sexual Advocacy Committee, and the Motion Regarding the Referendum Question on the Renewal of the Anti-Violence Fee. She notes that all other motions will come to the Legislative Council to be motivated, scrutinized, questioned, debated, and voted upon.

11. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the McGill Writing Centre Ancillary Fee Referendum Question 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP University Affairs motivates. VP University Affairs states that the McGill Writing Centre is an amazing service offered by the university dedicated to helping students improve their writing, which is a skill that transcends all facets of academia.

VP University Affairs yields to Dr. Yvonne Hung.

Dr. Yvonne Hung presents. Dr. Yvonne Hung notes that writing is a shared activity across the university, and notes that their philosophy is that writing is a skill, like any other skill, and that it benefits from practice and feedback. She states that the tutorial service is a nice compliment to your



academic experience, granting one-on-one time with somebody who is experienced and trained to look at your writing. She states that the service has been around for a number of years, and that they have been fortunate to benefit from the generosity of the student community. She states that while she understands that this question is being considered in the context of many fee questions, she assures Council that the ancillary fee is used solely for creating available hours on a schedule available in both evening and daytime, as well as the weekends. She states that the one piece of feedback that they get is to improve the amount of time and hours available, especially during crunch funds. She states that they are limited to what they can offer, but that they do the best they can. She notes that currently, they are concentrating all their efforts on getting hours onto the schedule.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks if there is a budget available for the fee, and if not, if zero-based budgeting, as outlined in the Finance Committee Report, if that was utilized to justify the fee increase.

**Answer:**

Dr. Hung asks for clarification concerning zero-based funding. Councillor Wan yields to the Finance Commissioner.

The Finance Commissioner notes that zero-based budgeting involves a way of budgeting money so that every dollar is pre-justified based on a cause, and not simply justified based on previous use of that expense. He clarifies and asks Dr. Hung if the budget is created in a way that is motivated by the needs of the students, and if all the funds will be used, as opposed to having surplus funds roll over to the next.

Dr. Hung explains that the money is looked at through a pot, that they use to fill a schedule. She notes that when budgeting, they look at what they have in the fall, winter, and how it will sustain it in the spring and summer.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Karasick asks if the motion is constitutional, especially given the SSMU's past policy on a moratorium on McGill ancillary fees until divestment.

**Answer:**

The Speaker clarifies, and notes that the policy Councillor Karasick is referring to applies only to new ancillary fees, or fee increases.



---

There are no further questions.

Debate:

VP University Affairs explains that the Writing Centre provides an undeniable service to the student community, and that it is something that many students depend on. Furthermore, they state that the fee is quite reasonable. They note that they believe that it is unfortunate that the fee cannot be increased, but that the least they can do is renew it. VP University Affairs encourages everyone to vote in favour.

Councillor Wan motions to approve the resolution by unanimous consent, seconded by VP Finance. This is approved.

Voting Period:

Vote on the Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the McGill Writing Centre Ancillary Fee Referendum Question 2021-02-11 -- UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

## 12. Old Business

- a. Motion Regarding a Policy on Harmful Military Technology 2021-01-28 -- **APPROVED**

Question Period:

### Question:

Senator Parsons inquires about recent conversation around academic freedom at McGill, and asks if McGill's response to this mandate and to possible future Senate questions that come forward will change, and asks if there is a plan to address academic freedom arguments.

### Answer:

VP External states that McGill doesn't define academic freedom within its statement relevant, noting that it is already unclear. He states that McGill doesn't have a very strong basis to make statements about academic freedom. Secondly, he states that the idea that academic freedom interacts between the funding of research isn't consistent within the notion of academic freedom of academics, and notes that funding of research isn't necessarily justifiable.

Senator Parsons motions to extend VP External's time by two (2) minutes, seconded by Councillor Bonan -- APPROVED.



VP External continues that in regards to advocacy, the extent to which the passage of the motion will affect McGill's stance is going to depend on the advocacy that follows from the motion.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Bonan inquires about stakeholder engagement, and states that within the motion, there was a lot of student engagement, but wondering that based on the impacts of the policy, if there were any conversations with any stakeholders within the research groups considered.

**Answer:**

Lia Holla, one of the authors of the motion and policy, responds that the policy is for the benefit of students with the purpose of increasing transparency in the research that is done, and to provide transparency as to where the funding comes from, and where it goes towards. She states that the motion is advocating for more ethics and transparency, and not necessarily for any of the research to stop, but potentially for what it goes towards. Maya Garfinkel, one of the authors of the motion and policy, adds that even if there are certain things about military connections that couldn't be disclosed, a huge part of what they are looking to reveal is financial transparency.

---

Senator Parsons motions to extend Question Period by seven (7) minutes, seconded by Councillor Williamson -- APPROVED.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Reed asks what the policy goal's going forward, and how they will fit in the role of the VP External, given that it is direct University advocacy.

**Answer:**

VP External notes that there will be crossover, and interaction with the UA portfolio.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Karasick states that they spoke a bit about switching the research from military technology to other areas, but asking about the possibility of some researchers seemingly changing their area of research, but whose findings contribute to the same ultimate goals.

**Answer:**





Lia Holla affirms that that is a valid point, and states that the point of the motion is to recognize that research not intended to be used for the development of harmful military technology can nonetheless lead to, or contribute to, harmful military technology. She states that this is why the policy defines harmful military technology.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Williamson inquires about how this policy will have on classes, such as POLI 452, which is Conflict Simulation. She states that while the class does cover peacekeeping topics, it also or extensively discusses how war games can be used, designed, and implemented.

**Answer:**

VP External states that the policy does not directly target courses, and is more so concerning the development of harmful military research. Lia states that the policy does not pertain to learning about militarism or development of military technology, but rather, the researching and development of harmful military technology.

---

Question Period is extended by Councillor Bonan, seconded by Senator Parsons -- APPROVED.

---

**Question:**

Senator Parsons states that the current policy speaks mostly about accepting funds for research projects. She asks about the scope of the Senate, and asks if they are planning on adding terms specific to military funding and research concerning it. She asks if the motion will include a mandate to advocate for transparency with respect to military funding of research at the Senate, and asks what the role of the Senate Caucus would be.

**Answer:**

VP Finance states that there is a mandate to advocate for the adoption of provisions, such as increasing the transparency of military-funded research.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Collins asks if any other student unions in Canada have passed similar policies through their respective chapters of SPD, and if they have delivered any substantial outcomes on affecting university-level policies.



**Answer:**

Maya Garfinkel states that there is not something exactly like this at other universities. Garfinkel states that in 2009, the policy was revoked specifically because other institutions did not have such a policy. Lia Holla adds, and notes that the VP External, if the policy is approved, advocates for the adoption of similar policies in other universities across Canada, and notes that they are hoping for McGill to be the first, and at the forefront.

---

There are no further questions.

**Debate:**

Councillor Karasick states that he has two concerns with the motion. He states that firstly, unlikely divestment, where the motion seeks to have the university divest from fossil fuels and put the money somewhere else, the motion essentially seeks to remove the entire branch of funding and provide no alternative. Secondly, he states that there are a lot of errors within the motion, such as the use of mined uranium in Northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba. As well, he notes that the military-industrial complex doesn't address what nuclear disarmament is.

The President notes that within section 5.2, given that the President's role on the Board of Governors isn't to lobby the Board of Governors, but rather, to act in the best interest of the university, he states that the policy would mandate the President to do something that their role does not allow them to do.

VP University Affairs states that it is important to make distinctions between advocacy to completely abandon military research and military technology, and rather, simply play for transparency. They state that there is a time and place to advocate for the cessation of military research, but that this motion is not that. They state that while they recognize the concerns over lost funding streams and the impact that this would have on labs that are currently conducting research, they state that they have yet to see how this policy will directly impact them.

Councillor Reed states that they agree wholeheartedly with the basic premise of the motion, and is pleased to be supporting it. They state that while Councillor Karasick brings up some fair points, they note that the motion does not advocate for unilaterally ending all military research without any alternative recourse.

Lia Holla states that in regards to the factual inaccuracies, she states that the information concerning Northern Saskatchewan was published in a recent paper by a PhD student, an associate professor at



the University of Waterloo, and notes that she would be happy to send them the source. She reads out the research. Concerning the military-industrial complex, she notes that it was defined by Eisenhower. Concerning their definition on nuclear disarmament, she states that their term is very similar to the definition used by the International Campaign on the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons (ICAN).

Councillor Karasick motions to extend debate by five (5) minutes, seconded by Councillor Wan -- APPROVED.

Councillor Karasick states that the motion notes that the Society will advocate for the succession of harmful military research, and notes that it is hard to deny that there is a goal to remove the funding from McGill. Furthermore, he notes that anti-nuclear weapon organizations also tend to be anti-nuclear power.

VP External states that the point that the administration will not accept the motion should not apply, and states that SSMU should set their own standards for the university's operations. As well, he states that definitions and facts can be amended and resolved.

The President motions to extend the time by two (2) minutes, seconded by Councillor Williamson.

Lia Holla states that McGill's standards for ethics or transparency should not impact SSMU's standards.

Maya Garfinkel notes that the policy is not to advocate for the Senate to take on a policy that is similar to this. She hopes that the motion can be an important step towards more ethical and transparent university research apparatuses.

The President motions to amend, striking 5.2 and 5.2.0.1, as it is outside the role of the President, seconded by Senator Parsons.

Debate on the amendment:

VP External states that past Presidents have lobbied the Board of Governors to divest on a number of occasions, and that there is a history within SSMU of the President advocating the Board of Governors to divest from fossil fuel companies.

VP University Affairs states that they do not think it would be completely accurate to say that it is outside the role of the President to advocate on the Board of Governors. They note that if that were true, then there wouldn't have been a fall reading week, or progress on divestment. VP University Affairs states that past SSMU Presidents have established a precedent of representing the views of the Society to the Board of Governors.



VP University Affairs moves to add to the last sentence of 5.2 ‘in a manner consistent with the code of ethics and conduct of the Board of Governors and McGill University.’

The Speaker notes that the original amendment is to strike 5.2, and given this, the amendment that they’ve suggested would be running counter to it, and strikes it out of order.

The President states that there is a large difference between lobbying, advocating, and representing student interests. He states that while past SSMU Presidents have successfully advocated for issues, he would not argue that they lobbied.

Senator Parsons moves to make an amendment to 5.1.0.2. The Speaker notes that this will currently be out of order, as the debate is currently on the amendment on 5.2 and 5.2.0.1.

Voting on the amendment -- APPROVED

In favour: 15

Oppose: 9

Abstain: 1

The amendment is approved.

[Recess begins at 20:13.]

[Recess ends at 20:23.]

Senator Parsons motions to amend 5.1.0.2 and 5.3.0.2, to remove lobbying and instead say ‘advocate for students, and to delete ‘the office of the VP Research and Innovation and the APC and its subcommittees,’ and remove ‘Principal and VP Administration and Finance. As well, in section 5.4, remove the lobby and replace it with ‘advocate on behalf of students’ and take out ‘VP Research and Innovation.’ Councillor Smith seconds the amendments.

Debate on the amendment:

Senator Parsons motivates. Senator Parsons explains that the amendments are more in line with President Earle’s amendments, in terms of advocating on behalf of students, rather than lobbying for a specific cause or purpose.

VP University Affairs states that it is one thing to discuss about the role of the President on the Board of Governors, but that they do not believe that they can argue about the role of representatives to the University, regardless if the word advocate or lobby are used. They state that they don’t believe the



word difference between advocacy and lobby will change the actual execution of this policy. They state that by removing the individuals involved, the policy just becomes less effective.

VP External states that they would accept the wording change from 'lobby' to 'advocate' as a friendly amendment, but asks about the rationale for the actors and bodies being removed.

Senator Parsons states that there wasn't any intent in removing the individuals and bodies within each amendment, but that it made more sense, reading it, to take them out. However, to respond to the VP University Affairs concerning changing the word 'lobby' to 'advocate,' they state that there is power in the words that they use. She notes that 'advocating on behalf of students' recognizes the different stakeholders that have a stake in this issue, and with lobbying, that it pushes forth a certain interest, and does not believe it a synonym thing.

VP University Affairs thanks Senator Parsons for the explanation. They state that they were not fully clear on the intention behind the amendments when they first spoke. They state that there are connotations of good faith with the word advocate, that may not be present in 'lobby,' whether or not they personally agree with the connotations. They state that they see the value in recognizing advocacy, and state that there is no harm in changing the word. However, they state that it is important that they inscribe in the policy, what the advocacy would look like, and given this, that they should include the individuals in the policy.

Senator Parsons states that while she would accept that, she hopes that VP University Affairs could make a suggestion to make the sentences grammatically correct.

The Speaker notes that that is not possible to change it, as it would run counter to the intent of the motion. Instead, she states that the amendment can be struck down.

Voting on the amendment -- FAILS.

The amendment fails.

Debate on the main motion:

VP University Affairs moves to amend, striking 'lobby' from 5.1.0.2, and 5.3.0.2, and replace it with 'advocate on behalf of students,' seconded by Senator Parsons.

Debate on the amendment.

VP University Affairs motivates.



VP University Affairs states that this will be a better policy if it is accepted.

There is no further debate.

Voting on the amendment -- APPROVED.

Debate on the main motion:

VP External moves to amend in 5.4, to the same wording effect, seconded by Councillor Smith.

Debate on the amendment:

There is no debate.

Voting on the amendment -- APPROVED.

Debate on the main motion:

Councillor Smith motion to call the question, seconded by Councillor Williamson -- APPROVED.

Voting Period on the main motion:

In favour: 22

Opposed: 7

Abstain: 2

The Motion Regarding a Policy on Harmful Military Technology 2021-01-28 is approved.

b. Motion Regarding a Position on Institutions of Public Safety 2021-01-28 -- **APPROVED**

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

Councillor Wan motions to amend, under article 4. This is taken as friendly. The amendment is friendly.



There is no further debate.

Voting Period:

In favour: 29

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 1

The Motion Regarding a Position on Institutions of Public Safety 2021-01-28 is approved.

### 13. New Business

- a. Notice of Motion to Amend the Internal Regulations of Elections and Referenda  
2021-02-11

VP Finance motivates.

VP Finance states that following the Fall 2020 elections, the Elections SSMU team believes that an addition needs to be made to the IRs to facilitate more student engagement in referendums, and strengthen SSMU democratic infrastructure.

VP Finance states that this includes a specific period to form 'No' campaigns, which can be formed up to three days before pollen starts, and lower the signature threshold to '25' to count for limited formation time. As well, Elections SSMU are also working to ensure compliance with IRs, to make referendum questions available to students for review as early as possible, to allow for the formation of dissenting opinions. As well, he notes that there is another amendment that all 'fee questions must be reviewed by the VP Finance during the Nomination Period.

- b. Motion Regarding the Creation of the Gender and Sexuality Advocacy Committee  
2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

This motion is approved.

- c. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Increase of the SSMU Membership Fee  
2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP University Affairs motivated.

VP University Affairs states that they have been working to present this motion, to compensate Legislative Councillors and Student Senators for their work. They state that after discussions and



consultation with the finance and accounting departments and each SSMU manager, that they came to the conclusion that the best solution would be to increase the Society's membership fee. They state that after doing some budget calculations with the wages assigned by the HR department and hourly allocations based on estimates for Senators and Councillors, that they came to the total of \$1.20 for all members of SMU per semester.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Councillor Karasick asks how this would work for Councillors who already get paid from outside organizations.

**Answer:**

VP University Affairs states that this is something that came up during consultation with the Senate Caucus, and notes that this is going to have to be decided on a case-by-case basis, and between senior leadership of the respective faculty associations. They state that it will be up to the faculty associations if they would like to continue compensating their representatives for internal responsibilities that they perform within their respective faculty associations, but notes that there will be a standing offer to compensate Councillors and Senators for the work they perform for the Society.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Gundermann asks how Councillors would be paid, and asks if it would be based on an hourly wage.

**Answer:**

VP University Affairs states that Councillors and Senators would be employees in the same way that part-time student employees exist at SSMU, and notes that it would be an hourly wage. They note that Councillors and Senators would be responsible for self-reporting the hours that they worked.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Bonan states that there are a lot of faculty executives that are not on the Legislative Council or Senate Caucus, and wouldn't be paid. They ask if the draw towards running for the VP External position, simply because it was paid, was considered. Similarly, they note that on the LSA Executive, only the VP External would be paid.

**Answer:**





VP University Affairs states that that was one of the first things that they considered, but states that outside of the larger faculties, there were concerns about who would be paid to compensate. They state that the faculties would prefer the SSMU to compensate the representatives. They state that the important distinction in this compensation is that they are compensated for their service to the Society, not necessarily just for the position that they were elected for. They state that they believe that there will be some discomfort in the initial implementation, but think it is important to stress how integral Councillors and Senators are to the Society.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks if they have considered the possibility of individuals holding more than one position, such as someone who serves as a Councillor and Senator.

**Answer:**

VP University Affairs states that there are plenty of individuals within the Society that have multiple jobs, and states that it is possible to report hours that they work for different positions. Furthermore, they state that Directors are unable to be compensated.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Smith asks what the consensus was in the consultations within the faculty associations, and asks what the onboarding process would look like for Legislative Councillors or Senators, and how it would differ from the generic SSMU onboarding process.

**Answer:**

VP University Affairs states that there was a lot of consultation that occurred over the summer with the President's Round Table, and states that the general consensus was that this was the best solution. They state that this motion was the product of consensus and approval of every faculty association that was consulted during the summer and fall semesters. As to the second question, they state that training would not look very different from the training that Senators and Councillors have received. They state that there will be some rudimentary HR onboarding, in terms of internal policies that SSMU employees have to abide by.

---

Councillor Smith motions to extend by four (4) minutes, seconded by Councillor Williamson.

**Question:**



Councillor Sood asks that if the motion is passed, if it will be advertised in other places than the referendum.

**Answer:**

VP University Affairs states that if the referendum passes, the membership would be notified. They state that they would be hesitant to promote a campaign to show that Council and Senate positions are compensated, because they don't wish to affect the reason and nature for which individuals run for Council or Senate positions.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Wan states that there are faculties that have different SSMU fees, less than any other faculty - Law, Medicine, and Dentistry. He asks why the amendment would be a fixed amount.

**Answer:**

VP University Affairs states that it is due to simplicity, stating that it was easier to budget for a flat fee, and that it would be simpler to implement, and easier to operationalize. They state that since representative positions are going to be receiving the same hourly wage, that it makes sense that students for those faculties are reimbursed equitably.

---

Councillor Bonan motions to extend by two (2) minutes, seconded -- APPROVED

---

**Question:**

Councillor Bonan states that the VP University Affairs has suggested that there was far-reaching consensus. However, he states that from his President's perspective, he didn't get that same idea, and wonders what the VP University Affairs meant, given that there was expressed disagreement with paying representatives.

**Answer:**

VP University Affairs states that they didn't hear any dissenting voices. They state that there were representatives who didn't voice VP University Affairs's opinion, but that they really only heard indications of approval for the plan.

---

There are no further questions.



## Debate:

Councillor Smith appreciates the VP University Affairs for putting the motion together. However, he notes two concerns. First, this motion creates a certain degree of inequity among faculty executives, between those paid and not paid. Second, he states that it could open a Pandora's box with regards to the role of Councillors to SSMU and certain executives.

[Councillor Rhamey arrives at 21:21.]

Proxy for Senator Daryanani, Adrienne Tessier, states that she is strongly in favour of the motion. She states that speaking personally, she has two jobs in addition to her role as a Senator. She states that she is supporting herself through university. She wishes to highlight the amount of unpaid hours that herself and other Senate colleagues put in on behalf of students advocating for student interests. She states that the time that she spends as a Senator are opportunity costs, stating that it is not time she can spend on her studies or other jobs, but that at the end of the day, she needs to pay her bills. She notes that compensation would be excellent recognition of all the work that Senators do. As well, she notes that Senators put in so many unpaid volunteer hours advocating for students, sometimes against administrations and professors, who are paid full-time for their work on Senate.

Councillor Gundermann expresses his opposition to the motion. First, he argues that the motion would create the wrong incentives for people to be running for these positions. Second, he notes that he consulted with the MUS President, and he stated that the consensus among Presidents was that it would not be possible to pay Senators and Councillors.

Senator Parsons echoes the sentiments of Proxy for Senator Daryanani. She states that there is a lot of work that goes into what takes place that is not always seen, such as the Fall Reading Week advocacy and research. She also notes that before COVID-19, she was working three (3) jobs and paying her bills herself. She states that doing so is incredibly difficult if you want to be able to help your students. She states that not being compensated for their work leads to intense anxiety, leading to not knowing if they'll be able to finish schoolwork. She states that in regards to Councillor Gundermann's comment about compensation making people run for the wrong reasons, she states that she can't imagine someone wishing to work this many hours and work this hard for this kind of money. As well, she states that for bigger faculties like Arts and Science, it is easier to get the funds to pay their executives. However, she notes that for smaller faculties, this is not possible.

A ten minute extension is moved and seconded -- APPROVED.

Councillor Reed states that they come from a faculty that does not pay any of its executives, and states that it is against the very principles to pay its elected members. However, they state that they could



not possibly oppose this on the basis that they believe that people in the positions would run for them for the wrong reasons. As well, they state that paying elected members of SSMU would actually increase the number of individuals that are available to run. They note however, that they believe some kind of further consultation and agreement will be needed within individual faculties in order for this to happen, and states that they would've liked to see further consultation with faculties that do not pay their executives on principle, just to see how this played out.

Councillor Merali states that it is important to view this motion as not a reward for being elected or as an incentive for people to run in elections, but rather as an accessibility and equity measure. They state that SSMU has had a position in the past while against unpaid internships, specifically because they provide advantage to those who can spend the time and who can afford to take on these opportunities without being compensated for their labour. They state that this motion fits very well into SSMU's existing positions.

Councillor Kunze--Roelens states that the point on accessibility is a very important point. However, she notes that what worries her is the incentive that this poses, and states that financial incentives aren't always the best ones to actually achieve better performance. She was wondering if other types of rewards have been considered.

Councillor Collins asks if the VP University Affairs could elaborate a bit more on the consultation done with the Scholarships and Student Aid office, regarding eligibility for work-study subsidization, because something that she is interested in is the fact that there are some students who are representatives who have to work multiple jobs to pay their bills, but also states that there are a lot of her peers whose parent pay for everything, and states that this income would be disposable income.

VP University Affairs states that they consulted with the Director of Scholarships and Student Aid, and states that the reality is that only about a third of Councillors and Senators would be eligible for work-study subsidization. They state that they see that option as a long-term cost reduction method, rather than something that can be depended on from year to year. They state that it is their goal to set up a standalone fund that can sustainably support the wages of Councillors and Senators without depending on subsidization from scholarship and student aid. They also state that one of the benefits of this being under the base fee is that if they achieve subsidization, some of the money could be reallocated to an area within SSMU that requires more funding. Concerning consultation, they state that they attended all meetings of the President's Round Table. As well, they note that they extended offers to all of the Presidents and VP Academics, and attended consultation meetings that they were invited to, and stated that if there were better solutions, they could not find them. They state that while they recognize that there are still concerns among leadership of some faculty associations, they state that there is only so much that they can solve at SSMU. Furthermore, VP University Affairs states that their first priority is ensuring that SSMU Representatives who serve the Society contribute to the



functioning of the Society, and states that while they would love a solution that works perfectly for student associations, it is simply not possible.

Mental Health Commissioner, Julia Caddy, echoes what has been said by Senator Parsons, and Councillors Reed and Merali. She states that as a member of AUS, it is not uncommon for there to only be a few applicants on the ballot for positions such as Representatives to Legislative Council. She states that it is unfortunate to only have two options to vote between when there are two available positions. They state that as much as she appreciates everyone's efforts, she also wants to feel like she is making a democratic choice in terms of choosing between people, and echoes the importance of equality of opportunity. The Mental Health Commissioner also asks for clarification, stating that within the Legislative Council job description, it specifies as a qualification, fluent communication in both English and French, whereas in the Senate job description, it is fluent in English, with French as an asset. She asks if that was intentional, and if so, what the reasoning behind it was.

Councillor Karasick states that the incentive of being paid doesn't really hold true, and cites his past experience with the Concordia Student Union.

Councillor Sood wishes to address Councillor Gundermann's concern that would incentivize people for the wrong reasons. She states that they could certainly keep tabs of the people who apply to be representatives, but notes that it is worthwhile.

Councillor Wan states that the points brought up by VP University Affairs and others are very valid and that the intent of the motion is fair, but notes that because he is planning on re-running for the same position next year, he encourages everyone who is in the same position as him to abstain due to the inherent conflict of interest.

Councillor Gundermann states that he is not generally opposed to having some form of compensation, but just does not believe that students should pay the salaries of Councillors and Senators. As well, he states that they do not believe that they should be considered internships, considering that there are other individuals, such as faculty and club executives that also work hard, and are not paid. He states that the argument doesn't hold up.

Councillor Smith motions for a two (2) minute extension, seconded by Councillor Bonan -- APPROVED.

Councillor SMith states that they believe that less French is required for Senate position is due to SSMU's standing as a company in Quebec, and notes that they are technically a French corporation.



Senator Parson's states that not paying Executives as a reason to not compensate Councillors and Senators are left up to each faculty and not up to SSMU. She states that faculty and club executives are not the issue at hand right now, and states that the issue is paying employees of SSMU.

Councillor Reed states that it may not be logical to suggest that because faculty executives aren't paid, then some of the representatives shouldn't be paid. They state that they realize that some representatives are elected by faculty constituents, but ultimately, SSMU has a policy against unpaid internships.

Voting Period on the motion:

**In favour:** Councillors Awan, Councillor Lee, Councillor Kurkcu, Councillor Reed, Councillor Page, Councillor Khodadadi, Councillor Fernandez, Councillor Sood, Councillor Merali, Councillor Drew, Rhamey, SSMU President, VP University Affairs, VP Student Life, VP External, VP Finance, Senator Daryanani, Senator Parsons (18)

**Opposed:** Councillor Gundermann (1)

**Abstain:** Councillor Collins, Councillor Karasick, Councillor Smith, Councillor Mulvaney, Councillor Bulhoes, Councillor Bonan, Councillor Kunze--Roelens, Councillor Wan, Councillor Ge, Councillor Morgan, Councillor Zhang, Councillor Nelson (13)

The Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Increase of the SSMU Membership Fee 2021-02-11 is approved.

Councillor Smith motions to suspend the rules to move to 13.k), seconded by Councillor Rhamey -- APPROVED.

- d. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Amendment of the Constitution 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP University Affairs motivates.

VP University Affairs states that in order for remuneration to work, the Constitution must be amended, which currently precludes Councillors from being paid for their work. They state that if the motion doesn't pass, it will only be Senators being compensated.

Councillor Smith motions for a one minute recess, seconded by Senator Parsons -- APPROVED.

Question Period:



**Question:**

Senator Parsons asks why only Councillors are included in the amendment to the Constitution, and not Senators from Senate Caucus.

**Answer:**

VP University Affairs states that in the Constitution, there are no clauses that indicate Senators cannot be compensated for their work.

**Question:**

Senator Parsons asks if the Board of Directors will be responsible for compensating or authorizing the reimbursement of Councillors, or if it will be a different body.

**Answer:**

VP University Affairs states that it is necessary to stipulate that the Board could authorize the compensation of non-employees, but states that in the case that Councillors are employees, that they don't need to specify that the Board can authorize their compensation.

---

**Question:**

VP Finance asks if it would be easier to have the Vice-President (Finance) authorize the reimbursement, or would they like to keep it as the Board of Directors.

**Answer:**

VP University Affairs clarifies and states that the article is just being removed from the Constitution. They state that there would no longer be anything specifying the procedures for compensating Councillors.

---

There are no further questions.

**Debate:**

Councillor Karasick states that it would be *silly* to not pass this motion, given that the last one passed.

A motion to approve by unanimous approval is considered, seconded by Councillor Williamson --  
APPROVED.

**Voting Period:**

Vote on the Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Amendment of the Constitution  
2021-02-11 -- UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.



e. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the Midnight Kitchen Fee  
2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP Finance motivates. VP Finance states that Midnight Kitchen has been a Service at SSMU for many years. He states that their opt-out fee of \$3.35 is up for renewal this semester. He states that Midnight Kitchen has done great work over the years, and that they've continued to do amazing work during the pandemic, and urges everyone to approve this motion.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks if there is a budget available for this renewal.

**Answer:**

VP Finance states that because there was only a three-day time period before the motions were submitted to the DPSLL, it wouldn't have been fair to have services draft up on an entirely new motion to justify the funding. That being said, he notes that he is willing to send interested individuals their budget for this year.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Karasick asks for examples of what Midnight Kitchen has done during COVID.

**Answer:**

VP Finance states that the rationale section mentions it briefly, but that they provided emergency food support to student groups and community groups through free grocery baskets, prepared meals, pick-up services, and food donations.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks what the current baseline allowable discretionary funding is, and asks what the dollar amount difference between this percentage versus the 20% suggested in the motion, and asks what the historical uses of the fund are.

**Answer:**

VP Finance states that the 20% discretionary fund is normal for Midnight Kitchen. He states that they have helped to feed the vulnerable, and states that the discretionary funding is very much in line with their mandate.

---





There are no further questions.

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

The Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the Midnight Kitchen Fee 2021-02-11 is unanimously approved.

- f. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the Safety Services Fee 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP Finance motivates.

VP Finance notes that the safety services includes MSERT, SACOMMS, DriveSafe, and WalkSafe. He states that the fee of \$3.97 is up for renewal and non-opt-outable. He states that there were some discussions of potentially increasing the fee, but given that some of the services haven't been able to function to full capacity, they have not opted for that option. Nevertheless, VP Finance notes that the renewal of the fee is still important because they are working on different initiatives in line with their mandate.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Councillor Wan states that according to the Finance Committee's report, MSERT has brought over a \$26,000 surplus, SACOMMS a \$71,000, and Walksafe, \$3,800 surplus. He asks if this has been taken into consideration when making the decision to maintain the same fee levies.

**Answer:**

VP Finance states that the report did mention the surpluses, as well as the renewal, and notes that the services are aware of their surpluses. They state that the fee renewal comes down to increasing their operations to accommodate their surplus.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Reed asks if it would be fair to say that the fee surpluses wouldn't have been the case if it were not for the pandemic?



**Answer:**

VP Finance states that because the pandemic started in March 2020, it certainly did contribute to a lot of their surpluses. Furthermore, they note that these surpluses are not the latest concern moving into the new year, and states that the services are all taking on larger projects.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks about the difference between allowable discretionary funding versus the 10% requested by SACOMMS. As well, he asks why SACOMMS is requesting increasing discretionary funding limits, as this was not mentioned in the preamble, and asks what the historical uses of the fund are.

**Answer:**

VP Finance states that there was an Ad-Hoc Committee on Discretionary Funding last year. He states that as a not-for-profit organization, when they levy a fee for the student body, they are not supposed to give it out to external organizations without the consent or approval of the student population. He states that this is the rationale behind creating discretionary funding.

---

There are no further questions.

**Debate:**

Councillor Wan motions to amend 'Winter 202'6 to 'Winter 2022', seconded.

Councillor Wan motivates. Councillor Wan states that the rationale from changing to a five-year to a one-year timeline is that it forces the fees to be consolidated at an earlier time. He states that the problem with using the five-years in the future means that the next group of Executives may not have incentive to produce the required financial reforms. He believes that with the one-year timeline, Councillor can always vote to extend the current fees by another year or two years, if they require more time,

**Debate on the amendment:**

Member of the gallery, Mo Rajji Courtney explains that every time services have to campaign for fee renewals, it takes out a significant portion of their resources and energy. They state that a fee renewal in a year would cause undue effort placed on the safety services to have to campaign on behalf of having their fee renewed. They state that these are important services, and having them have to



campaign for their continued existence two years in a row seriously takes away from the ability for them to provide these services.

VP Finance echoes the sentiments, and states that if a burden should be placed, it should be placed on the VP Finance, Finance Committee, and the full-time staff, as opposed to the Services. Given this, he is opposed to have to change the fee timeline until Winter 2022.

Councillor Merali echoes the sentiments, and states that the Winter Referendum period is a tough time for students and services, as they are looking for new executives, and they are in transition, and the referendum period takes time away from being able to provide services with complete capacity and preparing for next year.

VP University Affairs states that while they appreciate Councillor Wan's interest in fee consolidation, they state that extending this particular full five-year period does not preclude them from consolidating fees next year. They state that if they adjust the fee period, they call the service's existence into question next year, and deprive them of their ability to make long-term financial plans. They state that this fee renewal is not the place to advance any kind of political agenda.

Councillor Williamson motion for a three (3) minute extension for Debate Period, seconded by Councillor Karasick -- APPROVED.

Councillor Karasick states that they do not believe that this motion is to try and force services hand towards fee consolidation. He states that all four of these organizations are going to see a significant uptick in their need soon, and it is not something that they want them to have to worry about.

VP Finance states that regardless of whether this fee comes up for renewal in Winter 2022 or Winter 2026, the fees can be consolidated in the meantime. As well, he states that the DPSLL requires that fees be renewed for a minimum of three (3) years.

Voting on the amendment -- FAILS

In favour: 2

Opposed: 19

Abstain: 8

Debate on the main motion:

Senator Parsons moves to approve the motion by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Williamson -- FAILS.



Voting Period:

In favour: 23

Opposed: 1

Abstain: 4

The Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the Safety Services Fee 2021-02-11 is approved.

Councillor Williamson moves to suspend the rules to entertain Councillor Morgan's report immediately, seconded by Councillor Wan -- APPROVED.

Councillor Smith motion for a fifteen minute extension, seconded by Senator Parsons -- APPROVED.

[Legislative Council returns from recess at 22:50.]

- g. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the Peer Support Centre Fee 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP Finance states that the Peer Support Centre is an opt-outable fee of \$0.62 per student per term. He states that their fee is set to expire after this term. He states that in Part 1 of the motion, it consolidates the Peer Support Centre into the Referral Services Fee. He states that he consulted with all referral service financial coordinators, as well as the Peer Support Centre Finance Coordinator, and note that they agree that it should all be consolidated. He states that if that motion doesn't pass and students don't want to consolidate it into one fee, then they will move into the second part of the motion, which is a simple renewal.

Question Period:

Question: Councillor Wan states that the Finance Report indicated that the Peer Support Centre rolled over a \$45,000 surplus, and similar with the other referral services. He asks if this has been taken into consideration during his consultations and the decisions to maintain the same fees.

Answer: VP Finance states that it wasn't the priority for fees to lower them or change them dramatically, as to ensure financial sustainability of the services of the Society. He states that the surplus will need to be taken into consideration moving forward.

Debate:



There is no debate.

Voting Period:

Councillor Smith motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded by Senator Parsons --  
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

The Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the Peer Support Centre Fee  
2021-02-11 is approved.

- h. Motion to Approve the SSAMMOSA Committee Terms of Reference 2021-02-11 --  
**APPROVED**

The President states that along with the Five-Year Plan passed, there was to be a committee created along with it.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Senator Parsons asks about the membership of the committee, and asks if there was a reasoning behind not having a Senate Caucus Representative, and asks how they would feel about adding a member of the Senate Caucus to the committee.

**Answer:**

The President indicates that it would be a friendly amendment. Councillor Smith echoes these sentiments.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Karasick inquires about the timeline for recruiting members.

**Answer:**

The President indicates that it will come at a future meeting. He states that the committee this semester will be operating in a 'soft launch' style.

---

There are no further questions.

Debate:



There is no debate.

Voting Period:

Councillor Wan motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded by VP Finance -- UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The Motion to Approve the SSAMMOSA Committee Terms of Reference 2021-02-11 is approved.

- i. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on Renewal of the Mental Health Fee 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP Student Life motivates.

VP Student Life states that the question is a renewal of the current fee, as well as a second question, which will make the fee opt-out to non-opt-outable. She states that they are doing this because in the Mental Health Policy and Plan, that one of the objectives this year is to make the fee non-opt-outable and also to increase it. She states that they have only decided to move it to make the fee non-opt-outable this year, and in the future, consider raising the fee.

The Mental Health Commissioner, Julia Caddy explains that it is widely accepted that students want SSMU to support their mental health and to take action. She states that this fee is integral to funding the positions of the Committee, and the work that they do. As well, she states that the non-opt-outable fee allows for increased feasibility of long-term and larger scale projects.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks how much money the Mental Health Fee is expected to gain by converting.

**Answer:**

VP Finance states that it will be approximately \$2,000.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks if there is a budget available.

**Answer:**



The Mental Health Commissioner indicates that due to the time crunch, they do not have an explicit budget. As well, it is also reflective of the fact that their usual activities have been so heavily impacted by the COVID-19 situation.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks if there are any challenges that they perceive with making the motion non-opt-outable.

**Answer:**

VP Student Life indicates that mental health affects everyone. However, she notes that some students do not favour non-opt-outable fees.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks if they see any benefits keeping it opt-outable as opposed to non-opt-outable.

**Answer:**

The Mental Health Commissioner indicates that they are looking to increase the fee moving forward, but states that they do not have enough information to make an educated increase to it at this point. She states that it would be uneducated to make an increase of the fee first, rather than focusing on the non-opt-outable nature.

---

There are no further questions.

**Debate:**

Member of the gallery, Mo Rajji Courtney stresses the importance of renewing the fee. They state that this is the first time the fee is being renewed since it was brought forward in Fall 2015. They state that McGill students are dissatisfied with the level of mental health support at McGill, but note that there is a lot of work currently being done. As well, they stress the initiatives that are funded by the Mental Health Fee. They encourage all representatives to support the fee.

**Voting Period:**

Councillor Williamson moves to approve this by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Wan --  
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.



- j. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the Anti-Violence Fee  
2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

The motion is approved by unanimous consent vote.

- k. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Creation of the Gender and Sexuality  
Advocacy Fee 2021-02-11 **POSTPONED INDEFINITELY**

VP University Affairs motions to postpone indefinitely, seconded by Councillor Smith

VP University Affairs motivates.

VP University Affairs states that they have realized that the efforts of the Gender and Sexuality  
Commissioner and Committee can be funded out of their casual staff budget for the time being.

- l. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the SSMU Access Bursary  
Fund Fee 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP External motivates.

VP External states that this is a bursary fund that is opt-outable, that provides bursaries to SSMU  
members. He states that the fund was first approved in 1999, and has since helped fund the tuition of  
over 2,500 undergraduate students at McGill.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

Councillor Wan motions to approve it by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Bonan --  
**UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.**





The Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the SSMU Access Bursary Fund Fee 2021-02-11 is approved.

m. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the University Centre Fee 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP Finance motivates.

VP Finance states that the fee goes towards funding the lease agreement with McGill, as well as some other costs associated with the building. He states that given the lease renewal is up after this semester, it is important that they renew the fee now.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks how the amount of 5.6% was calculated.

**Answer:**

VP Finance indicates that the lease agreement with McGill University increases at a rate of 5.6% per year.

---

**Question:**

Proxy for Senator Daryanani asks if the cost of the lease of the University Centre is somewhat offset by the leases held by SSMU for some of the other services or organizations in the building, like the Legal Information Clinic.

**Answer:**

VP Finance states that revenues help to offset the cost to a certain extent.

---

There are no further questions.

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:



Councillor Wan motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Smith --  
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the University Centre Fee 2021-02-11 is approved.

- n. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the the Renewal of the TVM: Student Television at McGill Fee 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP Finance motivates.

VP Finance states that TVM develops video production and media skills that are not readily available at McGill otherwise.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Councillor Wan inquires about the current surplus, and asks if it was taken into consideration.

**Answer:**

VP Finance responds that the priority of the motions is to simply renew it, and states that in the future, the Legislative Council could alter the fees.

---

There are no further questions.

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

Councillor Williamson motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Wan --  
FAILS.

Vote on the motion:

In favour: 23

Opposed: 1

Abstain: 5



The Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the TVM: Student Television at McGill Fee 2021-02-11 is approved.

- o. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on Discretionary Funding for Queer McGill 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP Finance motivates.

VP Finance notes that Queer McGill would like to implement 10% discretionary funding.

Question Period:

Question: Councillor Wan asks about some of the uses of the 10% discretionary funding in the past, and anticipated uses for the fee in the future as well.

Answer: VP University Affairs states that there is a strong desire within Queer McGill to undertake more philanthropic and charitable activities in the community, as well as to provide financial assistance to students.

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

Councillor Smith motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Wan -- UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The Motion Regarding Referendum Question on Discretionary Funding for Queer McGill 2021-02-11 is approved.

- p. Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the Access McGill Ancillary Fee 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP Finance motivates.

VP Finance indicates that this is one of the oldest fees that he has seen. He notes that it was established at referendum in 1988, but most recently renewed in 2015. He states that the fee is collected by McGill to contribute to making the university more accessible to students with disabilities,



and is used for direct student support. VP Finance indicates that it is a non-opt-outable fee of \$2.00 per student per term.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Councillor Karasick asks if this would violate the moratorium.

**Answer:**

The Speaker indicates that it would not, as it is a fee renewal.

---

There are no further questions.

Debate:

There is no debate.

Voting Period:

Councillor Wan motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Williamson --  
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The Motion Regarding Referendum Question on the Renewal of the Access McGill Ancillary Fee  
2021-02-11 is approved.

- q. Motion Regarding a Renewal and Increase of the WUSC Student Refugee Program Fee  
2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

The President motivates.

The President states that WUSC is a non-profit organization that sponsors refugee students, sponsoring up to three students per year. He states that there is a motion to renew the fee, and to increase the fee by \$2.00, which will allow them to sponsor one or two more students. He states that this is a wonderful initiative, and states that this is a unique and wonderful opportunity to allow them to study at McGill. He also notes that they have completed their consultations with the Scholarship and Student Aid office.

Question Period:



There are no questions.

Debate:

Councillor Smith states that he didn't know this existed until tonight, and he hopes that Council supports it.

Councillor Karasick echoes the sentiments of Councillor Smith.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Wan asks if the program funds the tuition, but also the living expenses.

**Answer:**

The President indicates that he is not certain.

---

Voting Period:

Councillor Awan motions to approve this by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Smith -- APPROVED.

The Motion Regarding a Renewal and Increase of the WUSC Student Refugee Program Fee 2021-02-11 is approved.

r. Motion Regarding MSA Service Fee Referendum Question 2021-02-11 -- **APPROVED**

VP Student Life motivates.

VP Student Life states that at the last Services Review Committee meeting, the committee approved the MSA as a Service. She states that the MSA is currently a full-status club that provides a lot of services to the Muslim student community at McGill University, as well as the general student community at McGill, such as a prayer space, as well as resources, events, programming, and social events. As well, they are hoping to provide a counselling service to McGill students, if the fee is passed.

MSA President, Mustafa Fakhri, introduces himself.

Question Period:



**Question:**

The President states that before the University Centre (UC) had been closed for renovations, the MSA had prayer space that was provided on the ground floor, provided free of charge. He wonders if this will continue to be the case.

**Answer:**

VP Student Life indicates that this will continue to be the case, but notes that when doing a space review in the UC, if there is another space that is more suitable for them, they can also accommodate for that.

---

There are no further questions.

**Debate:**

The President notes that he hopes that Council approves the MSA fee, as they do a lot of good work.

VP Finance echoes the sentiments.

Councillor Awan motions to amend, adding a question 'Do you agree to the allocation of \$2,000 of the MSA discretionary funding towards individuals, for the purpose of providing students with financial aid?'. This is accepted as friendly.

VP Finance recommends that instead of saying \$2,000, to say 5.6%, given that the fee will fluctuate from year to year. This is friendly.

Councillor Smith motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Williamson -- APPROVED.

**Voting Period:**

Councillor Wan motions to approve by unanimous consent, seconded by Councillor Wan -- UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Motion Regarding MSA Service Fee Referendum Question 2021-02-11 is approved.

14. Reports by Committees
  - a. Executive Committee

The President presents.



The President notes that there were very few motions passed by the Executive Committee. He notes that they hired a new Sustainability Commissioner, a new General Manager Assistant, a Special Event Coordinator, Services Finance Coordinator, and then adjusted the pay grade for the Sustainability Commissioners. As well, he notes that they signed onto an open letter in solidarity to call for the divestment of the CL pipeline. Lastly, the President notes that they amended the job description of the Francophone Affairs Commissioner.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

b. Community Engagement Committee

VP External presents.

VP External states that the Community Engagement Committee at SMSU has been pretty slow-going since the closure of the University Centre. He states that the vacancy of the Community Engagement Commissioner, as well as the temporary leave of the VP External, and the COVID-19 pandemic has severely limited community engagement opportunities.

However, he states that some important community engagement initiatives have been developed or are in the works, such as strengthening roles of other executives on the committee.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

c. Mental Health Committee -- **POSTPONED**

VP Finance motions to postpone, seconded by Councillor Williamson -- APPROVED.

The report is postponed.

d. Services Review Committee -- **APPROVED**

VP Student Life presents.



VP student Life states that the Services Review Committee has put forward a motion to approve the Muslim Students' Association as an official Service of the SSMU. She notes that they provided them with their constitution, their budget, and their application, detailing the list of current offerings provided to students, as well as new offerings they would be able to provide if they became a service.

VP University Affairs motions to adopt the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Smith -- APPROVED.

The Report of the Services Review Committee is approved.

#### 15. Reports by Councillors

##### a. Councillor Morgan (PT/OT)

Councillor Morgan presents.

Councillor Morgan states that PT/OT has a new website. She states that their focus for this semester is building institutional memory. As well, she notes that they have amended the position of VP Wellness and Equity to be two different positions. For events, she notes that there are upcoming virtual game nights.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

##### b. Councillor Awan (Clubs)

Councillor Awan presents.

Councillor Awan states that the Clubs Committee has started meeting again, and have been reviewing interim status applications, full status applications, and proposed constitutional amendments from various clubs. He notes that they have found that the quality of application is generally high. He states that concerning engagement, that club activities have been down even from last semester, and attendance at club events is lower, and Zoom fatigue is definitely taking a toll.

##### c. Councillor Reed (Engineering) -- **POSTPONED**

Councillor Smith motions to postpone, seconded by Councillor Williamson -- APPROVED.





The report is postponed.

d. Senator Daryanani (Senate Caucus)

Proxy for Senator Daryanani, Adrienne Tessier, presents.

She notes that Senate met on January 20, and that McGill Senate is coming up on February 24, which includes an open discussion on student experience with COVID-19. She states that there was a meeting for the Subcommittee on Teaching and Learning. As well, there has been some discussion about planning for Fall 2021.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

e. Councillor Gundermann (Management)

Councillor Gundermann presents.

Councillor Gundermann states that Board of Director elections are currently occurring, and states that they have had to extend the nomination period for certain positions. He states that the Couche-Tard has finally opened in the Bronfman lobby. As well, he notes that MUS unanimously approved the Digital Pride Network, whose goal is to build a network of LGBT+ students. He states that the winter involvement package will be released in March. He states that Winter Carnival has been cancelled.

Question Period:

**Question:**

The President asks how much Carnival Committee has raised this year for cancer.

**Answer:**

Councillor Gundermann indicates that he is unsure.

---

There are no further questions.

16. Executive Reports

a. President

The President presents.



The President indicates that he has met with the Governing Documents Researcher and the Governance Manager to discuss the Code of Conduct. As well, he indicates that he has worked with the VP Finance to work on submitting the referendum questions to DPSLL. He states that he attended a Board of Governors meeting today, and noted that there is an upcoming retreat. He states that he has attended BaCoN meetings. As well, the President notes that he met with the Deputy Provost of Student Life and Learning to discuss resumption of on-campus activities, and online components. As SSMU President states that he met with the Dean of Students about the eviction in first year residences. He also notes that he attended a town hall with the Green Party of Canada, with how COVID has affected students. He states that the Executives met with the Executive team from 1989.

Question Period:

**Question:**

Councillor Karasick asks if there is any potential for SSMU flannels.

**Answer:**

The President states that he can follow up with their supplier.

---

**Question:**

Councillor Nelson asks if it would be possible to follow up with him concerning the first-year evictions.

**Answer:**

The President indicates in the affirmative, and to send him an email, and that he can also attend IRC if they would like, as well as the Dean of Students.

---

**Question:**

Senator for Proxy Daryanani asks if the University offered any explanation about the fact that minors were kicked out.

**Answer:**

The President states that McGill said that they wouldn't evict minors, or students if they had nowhere to go.

---

There are no further questions.



## b. VP University Affairs

VP University Affairs presents.

VP University Affairs states that the Subcommittee on Academic Policy met, and discussed re-reads of assessments and exams. They note that the Committee on Student Services met on the 1st. VP University Affairs states that McGill Steering Committee met on the 4th to approve committee nominations and revisions to the Terms of Reference of the Senate Steering Committee and the Joint-Board Senate Committee on Equity. They state that they've been working with the Law Senator on a motion to institutionalize Queer History Month. They state that Senate Caucus has recently met to review Senate agenda items and recent student evictions, as well as SCAB. For BaCoN, they stated that they met with the DPSLL and the Vice-Principal, University Advancement yesterday to discuss the renaming of the University Centre. They state that unfortunately, that has prevented the renaming question from being included in the regular winter referendum. They state that the Gender and Sexuality Commissioner was hired on February 5. As well, they state that they assisted the VP External with External Affairs Coordinator interviews. VP University Affairs states that Equity Policy revisions are ongoing. They state that they are working with the Indigenous Affairs Commissioner to restructure and expand the portfolio. Concerning libraries, they note that they have received many funding applications, but that there is still plenty of resources left in the fund.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

## c. VP Finance

VP Finance presents.

On general finances and accounting, he states that budget revisions are underway, and expects it to be complete by the end of the month. He states that the Finance Committee continues to meet, and have discussed proposed new fees, and approved them. He states that the Finance website is still under construction.

For funding, he states that the Funding Committee continues to meet to approve funding applications.

For clubs and services funding he states that the Clubs Finance workshops took place on February 6 and 7. For club banking resources, VP Finance indicates that he has been working with the Club Finance Coordinator on a better distribution system, and notes that they are currently working with RBC. He is also working with the Services Finance Coordinator on many things, including a better



credit card reconciliation system. He states that he is still going to collect updated service budgets for the winter semester, but that it won't be a formal review.

For SSPN, he states that he worked with one of the members at large on budgeting.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

d. VP Student Life -- **POSTPONED**

The report is moved to be postponed, seconded by Councillor Smith -- APPROVED.

The report is postponed.

e. VP External

VP External presents.

Beginning with federal political affairs, he states that there have been three meetings related to UCRU, including the Advocacy Committee. He notes that they drafted and approved a motion for a submission for the federal pre-budget consultations. He states that the Board of Directors met two weeks ago.

On provincial and municipal political affairs, he states that he met with the Anti-Sexual Violence Mobilization and Advocacy Commissioner to discuss advocacy regarding Bill 64, which concerns amendments a particular privacy act in order to allow survivors of sexual violence at universities to be aware of the sanctions imposed on the respondent. As well, he notes that there was a recent meeting with the Anti-Bill 20 coalition. As well, VP External also states that the Political Researcher is hard at work, primarily on the International Students' Policy framework, and states that there is an expectation that there will be a draft prepared by the end of the week.

On Community Affairs, he notes that the Affordable Student Housing Committee met last week, and notes that it was productive, and that the committee drafted an agenda for the February 23 Public Assembly. As well, they are currently considering Trash to Treasure again.

For political campaigns, he notes that he recently completed the guide to political campaigns. He notes that they have begun conversations with CSU regarding campaign support for the unhoused population of Montreal.



On union affairs, he states that he has been in contact with AMUSE regarding residents' eviction situation.

Lastly, for governance, he notes that they finished the hiring process for the Community Affairs Commissioner and External Affairs Coordinator. As well, VP External notes that he met with the VP Finance to discuss funding sources for the Black Affairs Commissioner. He also notes that he met with the Governance Manager to discuss some items about the Constitution and the IRs of the Governance, as well as the Executive Progress chart. As well, he notes that he met with the Governing Documents Researcher earlier this week to discuss amendments to the Constitution and IRs of Governance, and helped draft a divest motion for the Winter 2021 General Assembly.

Question Period:

There are no questions.

17. Adjournment: **00:35**

Councillor Wan motions to adjourn, seconded by Councillor Smith -- APPROVED.

Legislative Council adjourns at 00:35.

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

Jemark Earle, President