



SSMU GENERAL ASSEMBLY WINTER 2022 MINUTES (CONSULTATIVE FORUM)

February 21, 2022

The General Assembly Winter 2022 Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held by teleconference, on February 17, 2022 at 18:00.

CW: Gender violence, sexism, harassment, and anxiety. These Minutes may include content that a reader may find offensive.

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

The Speaker calls the meeting to order at 18:06 on February 21, 2022.

Note: Due to lack of quorum, this Winter 2022 General Assembly will become a Consultative Forum, all items approved in this session will be presented to the Legislative Council for approval.

2. Land Acknowledgement

The Speaker presents the Land Acknowledgement.

3. Adoption of Standing Rules – **ADOPTED**

The Standing Rules are distributed.

Seeing no modifications to the rules, VP Finance Sader motions to adopt them as distributed, seconded by Councillor Wan.

Seeing no opposition to the Standing Rules, they are adopted.

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

Seeing no modifications to the agenda, Councillor Zhang motions to adopt the agenda, seconded by Councillor Coussa.

Seeing no opposition, the Agenda is adopted in a Consultative Forum.



5. Minutes for Approval

a. Fall 2021 General Assembly Minutes 2021-10-18 – **APPROVED**

Seeing no changes or corrections to the minutes, they stand as distributed.

6. Announcements

a. Announcement by the President: Addressing the Constituents

President Daryanani thanks everyone for joining the General Assembly. He presents himself for those who don't know him. When he first came into his position as President in June 2021, he was aware that SSMU has not always been a safe workplace for students of colour and marginalized groups, and he has witnessed this firsthand. For this reason, part of his platform was to make SSMU more accessible and equitable. Unfortunately, three and a half (3 ½) months into his term, the Board of Directors decided to suspend him with pay in a confidential session from which he was excluded. When the President asked for the reason for his suspension, he was met with further retaliation and extensions of his suspension. He was barred from performing his tasks as President, and still does not understand why he was suspended, and why the Board lied about him being on leave of absence. On Sunday, February 13, the Board asked him to return to his role, because the reasons for the suspension were deemed inadmissible. The suspension was not his choice, and should not have happened. When the President was first suspended, he was committed to respecting the process, but during this time the Board did not comply with its own suspension conditions. There was no real interest from the Board to resolve the issue in a fair and timely manner. He does not believe the Board's actions were in the interests of anyone at McGill. During this time, Board members made their decisions behind closed doors, tried to censor student media, manipulated rules of procedure and further abused their power.

The decision to reinstate him [President] was only made after he was forced to resort to spending thousands of dollars on legal aid. Had he not resorted to legal counsel, it appears to him that the suspension would have been extended until the end of his term. The fact that the Board of Directors asked him to resume his responsibilities and duties confirms what he suspected: that his suspension was unreasonable and unjustified. The Board of Directors should have known better. The rumours and misinformation resulting from his absence have left the President stained in the eyes of many fellow students. The misleading narrative that he had been on leave of absence led students to believe that he had been delinquent in his duties. This rhetoric often plays into the narrative of people of colour being unfit for positions of authority, and in an institution as overwhelmingly white as SSMU, his unjust suspension constitutes a double standard, which he does not believe would be levied against a white Officer. This is not an isolated incident, but it was an instance that harmed his professional and moral credibility.

The President continues that during the few months he was in office, he had received many disclosures and complaints from SSMU employees who were distraught and reported their experience of harrassment and discrimination. Student money being misused is taken away from the funds that



students pay to SSMU to represent them properly and to provide them with services. They are better than this, and they must adapt their services so that fairness is the underlying principle of what they are doing. In light of the many issues of SSMU's workplace climate, his main priority is to make SSMU a more inclusive, equitable and accessible place. While he is determined to finish his mandate, he has not been permitted to serve as Chairperson of the Board of Directors or even attend their meetings, which renders him incapable of completing any of his tasks. Now that the Board of Directors has reinstated him, they should ensure that the harm they caused will not further prevent him from doing his job. Going forward, whether or not the motivation behind the suspension was nefarious, what is important is to learn from this, and as elected representatives of the community, they must do better. The SSMU has an obligation to make campus safe for everyone. Despite the injustice, he is determined to fulfil his obligations as President and to complete his mandate. He does not consider this to be fair, and is willing to answer questions, and is mindful that some elements are confidential.

7. Question Period:

The Speaker announces that because this General Assembly has not reached the required quorum [350 Members], this General Assembly is now a Consultative Forum, and none of the motions approved today are binding, and will need to be approved by the Legislative Council. Second, the Speaker asks that everyone change their name on Zoom to the name they would like to be addressed.

Question:

Councillor Coussa asks what the President believes of the statements about SSMU being an unsafe space for women and gender minorities, and women of colour.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that this is not the first time these concerns have been brought to him, and he is sorry for everyone experiencing an unsafe environment perpetuated by the SSMU. In his opinion, the SSMU should work to improve policies and processes to ensure the policies are not abused in a way that further traumatises individuals and prevents SSMU from being a safe space. The SSMU needs to ensure that their Human Resources policies are equitable, and empowered in a way that they have the financial and legislative resources to pursue policies. He indicates that these concerns are long-standing, systemic issues and it is their responsibility to respect the concerns brought forward and the processes used to address these situations. He is confident that in the last few months of his Presidency, he can make some changes.

Question:

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos asks if President Daryanani sees any correlation between his suspension and the article released in the McGill Daily about sexism in the SSMU. When the



President came back to the Legislative Council, they [Council] debated the topic of sexism and that they do not feel safe with President Daryanani in their meetings.

Answer:

President Daryanani states that this question is leading and disrespectful. After delivering his remarks, this question continues to alienate him and force him out of office. He asks the Speaker to reconsider this question.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin calls a Point of Order for attacking the Speaker.

The Speaker will consider the points of order and will reconsider the rules.

Following Article 2.8.2 of the Standing Rules of this meeting, the Speaker sustains the first point of order and asks that Councillor Pérez Tiniacos refrains from using further comments directed at the President. He will not be sustaining the points of order against the President, but asks him to preserve a polite language.

Question:

SSMU Member Abigail Popple asks if the Executives have any comment on the absence of VP University Affairs, and if her absence is related to the toxic environment discussed at Legislative Council last Thursday.

Councillor Coussa advises the Executives, especially the male Executives, to answer this question. She notes that it is shameful for SSMU that an Executive is unable to work because she feels unsafe in her environment. She believes they have failed VP University Affairs Downie. Many other women and gender minorities feel uncomfortable in the working environment at the SSMU.

Answer:

VP Internal Affairs Paulin responds directly that Councillor Coussa said it best, and if people have questions about VP University Affairs Downie's absence they can direct them to her the VP, as she is still available and continuing in her duties.

Question:

Councillor Applegate states that the question is directed to President Daryanani. The Councillor states that President Daryanani has been saying that there has been ongoing discrimination against women and gendered minorities, and asks, considering VP Downie's



absence, how determined he is to building a new concrete framework for SSMU, even if it means restructuring the entire SSMU.

Answer:

President Daryanani responds that he is surprised that the blame has been put on an Executive who has been forced out of office by the Board to continue to fix the problems. Personally, he remains committed to make SSMU a place where everyone feels comfortable. Over the three (3) months he was in Office, he laid the foundation to carry out an Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Committee to ensure that such feedback is well received; to ensure that HR processes are safe; to ensure they have anti-racist and anti-oppressive training for all councillors, senators and staff. He remains committed, but the five months taken from his presidency will prevent him from doing this efficiently. He is disappointed that SSMU continues to be a place where individuals do not feel safe, however he thinks the responsibility is on every individual to change that.

Councillor Coussa motions to extend the question period by 10 minutes, seconded by VP External Affairs Delouvrier.

Seeing no opposition to the extension, the Question Period has been extended.

Question:

SSMU Member Abigail Popple states that President Daryanani mentioned that being unable to chair on the Board was rendering him unable to complete his mandate, however from her understanding of the Constitution, people who are not Canadian citizens do not have a voting place on the Board, and to Popple's knowledge President Daryanani is not a Canadian citizen. They ask if the President would like to elaborate on how being prevented from being on the Board has prevented him from completing his mandate.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that the Board is the SSMU's decision-making body, so he does not have any ability to listen to concerns brought up during the meetings. Luckily at SSMU, to ensure that a President who is not a Canadian citizen can sit on the Board, there is a provision that if the Board is not a voting member on the Board, they should serve as the Chair of the Board. It is in the Internal Regulations of Governance, under the Chair section.

Question:

Councillor Coussa states that during the last Legislative Council meeting [February 17, 2022], she had asked a question to the male Executives: if they would resign if they made women and



gendered minorities unsafe. VP Downie has said that she feels unsafe due to the recent change in the SSMU structure. She asks President Daryanani if he would resign if he knew that he was part of the problem that makes SSMU an unsafe space for women and gender minorities.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that he thinks the question was leading, and states that he does not think that SSMU is a friendly space, and it is their job to make SSMU a safe space. He asks Councillor Coussa how he could be part of the problem, since he has been suspended for the last five (5) months and these issues continue. As a Board member, Councillor Coussa knows why he was suspended and he thinks that a false narrative is being perpetuated, that as a person of colour he does not deserve his position.

Councillor Coussa calls a Point of Order, as President Daryanani is misconstruing what she said.

The Speaker advises President Daryanani to keep from creating rumours.

Councillor Coussa clarifies that she is a woman of colour.

President Daryanani continues that he finds it surprising that as a Board member and a member of the Human Resources Committee, which has failed to follow the proper framework for President Daryanani's suspension, that Councillor Coussa continues to place the blame on someone who has been restricted and asked whether he would resign. The Board of Directors only acted once he sought for legal counsel, and again this question is being asked. It makes him question the motivation of Board members, who have allowed for a motion for his resignation to come forward. It seems shameful that the Society is being run by a Board who wants their President to resign when there is no reason behind the suspension.

The Speaker reminds President Daryanani that he can motion to appeal the Chair's decision should he feel the need.

Councillor Coussa clarifies that she is not here as a Board member, she is here as a student and as a woman of colour. She asks VP Student Life Heisele Cubilla to elaborate on the new spaces at the University Centre.

VP Student Life Heisele Cubilla answers that there will be three (3) new spaces at the University Centre, including a prayer space. They are still trying to figure out the logistics, and more will come soon.

Question:



Councillor Pérez Tiniacos asks the executives if they received a letter signed by all members of LC plus 50 members of the Society stating that they do not feel safe about their presence on SSMU, if they would resign.

Answer:

VP Finance Sader confirms in the affirmative.

VP Student Life Heisele Cubilla answers yes, that she trusts her constituents.

VP Internal Affairs PaulinAffairs answers yes, they were elected based on democracy, and if the students are not happy with their term they have a right to take it away.

VP External Affairs Delouvrier Affairs answers yes as well, and if the student body is dissatisfied, resignation is an option no matter the reason.

President Daryanani shares that he received a suspension letter from the Board. Earlier in his term, there was a letter of non-confidence as a retaliatory move to a complaint he filed. It would be important to understand the motivation behind such a letter, why it is being sent. There are dissenting opinions at SSMU, and there are ways to resolve issues other than resignation. He wants to ensure the letters have merit. There are processes for removal, and respecting them is crucial as they were built to make them fair, not for individuals to abuse them. He collaborated with a process that asked him to stay suspended, and it is what brought him back. After violating his rights, was the Board able to suspend him in the first place, and he would be surprised if the same thing happened with a councillor. The Legislative Council tried to ask for his resignation, and the President asks them to consider why the Board postponed that motion. The reason could be that the motion was unfounded and based on a rhetoric that is false and misrepresented. He would think twice before asking someone to step down from their position.

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos motions to extend the question period by 15 minutes.

Seeing no opposition to the extension, the Question Period is extended by 15 minutes.

Question:

Councillor Dakdouki asks female-identifying members of SSMU what the process of removing an Executive from Office is.

Answer:

VP Internal Affairs PaulinAffairs answers that there is a clause in the Constitution for calling for a special General Assembly, which has to be called by the Board of Directors with a certain



number of people for quorum. As long as there is a reason, they can call for the meeting and they can pass a motion for the removal of an Officer if they have quorum.

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos adds that only 50 signatures are required, from members of the Society, or a resolution can be passed by the Legislative Council. This would initiate the process of removing an officer.

The Speaker will begin enforcing the two (2)-minute speaking time rule.

VP External Affairs Delouvrier clarifies that a call for a Special General Assembly for removal of an Officer can also be led by the student body, with 200 signatures from the student body, representing students from at least four faculties with no more than 50% of the students coming from one (1) faculty.

Question:

Councillor Zhang asks, that as a woman of colour working on the Legislative Council and someone who is not part of the Board of Directors, how much personal accountability the male Executives are willing to take for creating an unsafe environment, which she herself and many other women and women of colour do not feel safe in, at this time.

Answer:

VP Finance Sader answers that this is a hard question to answer, because he does not know if he has contributed to an unsafe environment. He states that when situations have come up, he is someone who believes in righting wrongs, and stepping into processes to ensure that people are more comfortable moving forward. He has continued to take this stance, and hopes that if he makes people uncomfortable, those processes can be used so that he can change his behaviour. He does not know how much accountability he can take given that he has not been extensively informed about his own behaviour.

Question:

Councillor Zhang asks each male Executive to answer the question.

Answer:

President Daryanani apologizes for Councillor Zhang's being unsafe, as this is not what we intend to do at SSMU, and extends an open door for feedback. He answers that he has an open-door policy, and respects when staff share their perspective on how they can do better. As executives, they are elected to carry out the wishes of SSMU, and he is open to doing better,



as is the Society. In terms of culture, a lot of work needs to be done. Taking accountability for individuals is very important.

VP External Affairs Delouvrier answers that he thinks that VP Finance Sader's answer was accurate, as it is difficult to take accountability for things one is not aware of, but accountability is key to holding a position of authority. He tries to hold himself accountable to the best of his ability. The biggest thing he has learned is that teamwork is necessary for working in the Executive Committee, and thinks they need to do better.

The Speaker reads a question submitted by an anonymous constituent of the General Assembly:

Question by constituent:

"Would you have any comments on the recent article about racism and worker's oppression at SSMU? Any comments on that, since Execs said they would resign if they made people uncomfortable."

Answer:

VP Finance Sader answers that it is an important article, and the content needs to be addressed. He has never made any statement in the article, and stands by that. It brings up important questions that need to be addressed.

Question:

Councillor Gurung asks if they can ask a question on behalf of Councillor Saad, who is dialed into the meeting but cannot use audio.

Answer:

The Speaker allows this.

Question:

Councillor Gurung asks, on behalf of Councillor Saad:

"The President is supposed to be a leader, guide the Society, represent students' best interests and be a positive force towards the McGill Community. Regardless of why the President was on a leave of absence and despite what transpired between the President and the Board of Directors, the President is currently not fulfilling the President's purpose, nor is the President a positive force in the SSMU community. The fact that we've discussed nothing but the President for the past while is proof of that. The President can claim that he intends to finish his mandate and do what is best for students, but will the President acknowledge that stepping down may actually be what is best for students?"



The Speaker reminds everyone to keep their questions short.

Answer:

President Daryanani asks the Speaker to reconsider whether the question is leading within the Standing Rules.

The Speaker states that the Standing Rules for the General Assembly are lacking in terms of decorum rules, but even if they refer to the standing rules of the Legislative Council, there is little in terms of leading questions. This question was long, and the President has the right to refuse to answer it, but the question did turn into a speech, and the Speaker asks members of the GA to avoid these types of questions.

The President asks for the question to be rephrased so that it can be acceptable.

Councillor Gurung calls a Point of Order. They clarify that the Speaker states that while he opposes this question, it was acceptable for this GA meeting. With that, Councillor Gurung asks President Daryanani to refuse the question or answer it, because the question is still acceptable.

The Speaker states that if he makes a decision and someone does not agree with it, they can appeal it to the Chair. Once a decision has been made, members can comment on the decision and the Speaker can review it. For the time being, he stands by what he said, as it was justified. Any questions that turn into speeches will be interrupted. He advises President Daryanani to focus on the question and to decide if he wishes to answer it.

President Daryanani responds that he understands why members of the Society do not see him the same way as they did when he was elected. He was elected to be President, and appreciates that the democratic processes are robust. It was not an easy decision for him to run for Office, and he had to extend a year of his degree, sacrifice his opportunity for post-graduate studies, and delay his immigration proceedings. He knew that SSMU is not a welcoming environment, but did not think he would be blamed for the bad judgement of the Board of Directors in suspending him. He asks the members of the GA what they would do if they were suspended without a reason, and despite asking for explanations, five (5) months later they are told they can return. He asks them how they would feel if a body with so much power chooses to make a suspension to further target a democratically elected leader. It seems as a double standard, as the Board of Directors is not being held to the same standards as the President.

The Speaker states that he feels the tensions rise, and reminds that members can leave the meeting if they are feeling uncomfortable. He advises everyone to call points of order when needed.



Question:

Abigail Popple asks Directors if, now that President Daryanani has returned, he has access to documents concerning his suspension, particularly minutes from confidential sessions of Board of Directors meetings.

Answer:

VP Internal Affairs Paulin answers that all information concerning an individual is confidential and they do not have access to it.

Question:

Councillor Applegate asks the President, as someone who was democratically elected, to what extent does he respect his coworkers' and constituents' concerns, whether or not he deems them fair.

Answer:

President Daryanani responds that safety is his priority, and all he is asking for is a safe return for himself, and he states that he was not treated fairly in a process that was abused. This was his first priority when running for President, as he knows that SSMU is not a friendly place. This GA is an example of that, and he has been silenced. Confidentiality has been used as a weapon, when it is meant to be used safely. If they cannot maintain a safe environment, they are breaking the law. The number one priority for all organisations should be safety for their staff and members.

The Speaker states that the Question Period has elapsed, but he has received a question in the chat. He advises the person who sent in the question to email it to the Speaker to ask it during the next Board of Directors meeting. He also advises everyone who has further questions to come to the Board meeting. He advises to cease the question period and continue it at the Board meeting.

Val Masny motions to suspend the rules to add a point to the agenda, a discussion on the environment at SSMU and how it can be corrected, seconded by Councillor Perez Pérez Tiniacos.

Seeing no opposition to the suspension of the rules and the discussion point, it is added to the agenda.

The Parliamentarian asks for clarification on the subject of the discussion.

Val Masny clarifies the discussion point.



Question:

The Speaker asks Val Masny if they would like to add a duration to their discussion point.

Answer:

Val Masny suggests 15 minutes, and the discussion can be extended if needed.

Question:

Councillor Coussa asks the Speaker if the question from the chat was read.

Answer:

The Speaker answers that it was not read and the question period is over. He advises her to send a question by email to the Speaker to be asked at the Board.

Councillor Coussa motions for a short extension of the question period, seconded by Councillor Javed.

The Question Period is extended by two (2) minutes.

The Speaker states that he will read the question he received in the virtual Zoom and then accept motion to extend the question period. After that, he suggests that further extensions are not considered.

The Speaker reads the question sent in the chat by a constituent:

Question by a constituent:

“The SSMU President has said previously that he was suspended and the reasons were unknown. However, the President stated earlier that “the reasons for my suspension were deemed inadmissible and unfounded,” meaning that the President in fact knows the reasons for his suspension he previously denied. My question to President Daryanani is, what were the reasons for the suspension and who deemed them inadmissible and unfounded?”

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that the SSMU process was not as logical as expected, so he notes other inconsistencies. The first suspension was supposed to be from September 23 to November 25, 2021, and he was told that when this time lapsed he would be reinstated. That did not happen, and his suspension was extended four more times. On February 13, 2022, he received a letter stating that the reasons for suspension were inadmissible. He notes that nothing has changed other than he still cannot attend Board meetings. He does not know what



happened over the past five (5) months. He thinks the most important thing is to ask questions to those who know the answers, because he does not know them.

The Speaker states that the Question Period has elapsed. He presents the SSMU Translator for the session.

The Translator presents themselves and states that they are there if anyone needs translation.

Councillor Gurung motions to extend the Question Period by five (5) minutes, seconded by Councillor Coussa asks Councillor Gurung if she can ask a follow-up question before Councillor Gurung's question. There is no opposition.

Seeing no opposition to the five-minute extension, the Question Period is extended.

Question:

Councillor Coussa asks a follow-up to President Daryanani, stating that he did not answer the constituent's question. She repeats the question, and asks him to answer it.

Answer:

President Daryanani asks Yara Coussa to clarify the question.

Yara Coussa repeats the question, which was asking about the reasons for the suspension and who deemed them inadmissible and unfounded. He provided a timeline, but no answer to the question. Constituents deserve transparency.

President Daryanani disagrees, as he answered the question. It is disappointing that the question is asking for an answer he does not have. He was not provided with a reason for the suspension, which was later deemed inadmissible. He asks someone to shed some light on why he was suspended, and why the reasons for the suspension were deemed inadmissible. The Board knows the answer, and they can provide it. Asking the President this question undermines his legitimacy. The process was not logical, and it still seems as if the questions are coming to him when he does not have the answers. He needs to know the reasons, and would appreciate a Board member telling him.

The Parliamentarian informs President Daryanani that his speaking time has elapsed.



Councillor Gurung motions to extend the question period by 15 minutes, and a member of the GA seconds the motion to extend the question period.

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos opposes the motion to extend.

Seeing an opposition, the Speaker entertains a vote.

Councillor Gurung asks if general members can vote as well.

The Speaker answers that all members present here can vote as it is a General Assembly.

The motion passes with 14 votes in favour and 1 vote against. The Speaker entertains a 15-minute extension.

Question:

Councillor Gurung asks President Daryanani, who has stated that his rights have been violated by the Board, to clarify what rights were violated and to reference an aspect of the Constitution or a Quebec labour law that supports his claim. She asks if he is planning to take action, as they are channels on which grievances should be brought to within SSMU, and he has suggested that people use them if they have issues with his presidency, and she wonders if he is going to use the channels, or bringing the grievances in meetings but not taking action.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that they have violated his rights as an employee and as an Officer. The Board did not comply with its own suspension conditions, they did not provide reasons for the initial suspension, which violates the principle of natural justice in Canadian law. They did not provide him the opportunity to comment on any reason they provided, which they did not provide in the first place. Second, his suspension was extended four times unjustifiably, which is a prejudicial delay as well as a breach of his employment contract. His term lasts one year, from June 1 to May 31 [of the following year], and the suspension negates the purpose of the mandate he was elected for. This violates Section 10.10 of the Constitution, which clearly states that a suspension of an officer should be for a determinate period, and extending his suspension four (4) times rendered it indeterminate, and the last extension did not provide a determinate date. This shows that the Board of Directors had no interest in resolving this in a fair and timely manner. The other violation is of Section 16.1 (Standard of Care), which states that the Board should exercise their power and act honestly and in good faith with the view to the best interest of the Society.

The Speaker states that President Daryanani's speaking time has elapsed.



Councillor Gurung motions to extend the President's speaking time by one (1) minute, seconded by VP Internal Affairs Paulin.

Seeing no opposition to this extension, the President's speaking time is extended by one (1) minute.

President Daryanani continues that he does not think a five (5)-month suspension is the exercise of care nor diligence of the Board. He asks for an extension of two (2) minutes.

Councillor Gurung motions for a two-minute extension of President Daryanani's speaking time, seconded by VP External Affairs Delouvrier.

Seeing no opposition to the extension, the President's speaking time is extended by two (2) minutes.

President Daryanani continues by stating that he is certain that the Board was advised by their legal counsel that should he not be reinstated, there would be serious legal consequences. He asks the Board of Directors to answer this question. As for the second question, whether he considered taking legal action, he answers that he has spent thousands of dollars on this process, and is determined to complete the last few months of his mandate to do the job he was elected for. It could very well lead to legal action, if the Board of Directors continues to abuse this process that is meant to protect individuals and the proper functioning of the Society. He is concerned with the Board's actions, which continue to hide what happened in a secret setting, and it is disappointing that President Daryanani has had to resort to legal action to engage in legal counsel. To put him through this legal process was painful and unnecessary, when the Board could have properly followed its own legal counsel. It is a matter of resources and reason, which he does not have an answer to. He hopes the Board rectifies the situation as best it can.

Question:

Councillor Qazi asks the General Assembly members what they think about the intersectionality of minorities being excluded from being able to aggress other minorities.

Answer:

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos answers that intersectionality is when a person may be suffering the effects of an aggression coming from their backgrounds (i.e., a queer person of colour suffering from homophobia and racism). Aggression can come from any background, and being from a minority does not exclude someone from being able to commit other aggressions.

Councillor Gurung indicates that a lot of statements made tonight have lumped different acts of oppression into one cohesive theme of marginalised groups feeling unsafe at SSMU. She thinks that it is important to acknowledge that creating a safe space for marginalised groups needs to be intersectional. Shielding oneself from criticism on the basis of one minority access



is a big problem, especially when criticism is being levied against a different group (i.e., being a person of colour who creates an unsafe environment for gendered minorities).

Councillor Coussa responds that she agrees with Councillors Gurung and Pérez Tiniacos, and states that one can be a woman and racist, and be a person of colour and still be sexist. One can face multiple systems of oppression and still participate in others. Councillors of colour and female councillors of colour face multiple barriers to getting their work done.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin states that these kinds of behaviours are not perpetuated by SSMU's permanent staff, and it is not an ingrained way of acting within the operations of the Society. There is a difference between the political aspect of the Society and its operational aspect. She wants to ensure that this is kept in mind, because the operational side of SSMU is not involved in the political aspect.

Question:

Councillor Gurung states that the President stated in his answer that the Board was advised by their legal counsel about ramifications of actions that could be taken. The President believes that the Board could have followed their legal counsel's advice and reinstated him in a more appropriate manner. He asks the President if he can reconcile how he knows that the Board did not follow their legal counsel and what the basis for that statement is, and if he can reconcile why his legal counsel is more accurate than the one the Board has received in regards to this matter, and clarify why he thinks the Board did not follow their legal counsel.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that he has no access to the Board of Directors, but the fact that he is present at the meeting shows that the Board received legal advice to reinstate him. This means the Board followed their legal counsel's advice and the advice was probably to reinstate him and not extend the suspension.

Question:

Councillor Gurung asks the President a follow-up question. She clarifies that she is not verifying what happened at the Board meeting, she is just restating what the President has stated that he assumed. She asks, if the President believes the Board of Directors has followed their legal counsel in reinstating him, what the reason is for assuming that the Board has not been following their legal counsel all along and that they have abruptly changed their trajectory and are listening to their legal counsel at this time. If the President believes that the Board has been listening to their legal counsel all along, she asks why he believes that the Board would change their answer at this point in time.

Answer:



President Daryanani answers that Councillor Gurung's question is speculative, and he does not wish to speculate on what the Board's decision-making process is. He states that the Board acted in a way they should not have, and aligned with a trajectory that should have been followed long ago, and he thinks that there are lots of possibilities. They may have hastily suspended him, they may have been acting with a conflict of interest or a bias, they may have understood the law the same way he did, there may be further legal ramifications that he did not consider. If he was able to name this many legal violations, he would say that it is only fair that his instinct is correct. A reasonably fair process could have ended earlier and would not have used the unfounded reasons to carry out processes. The Board can make mistakes, and legal counsel can make mistakes. It may be possible that the legal counsel did not know all the facts. He is not one to speculate, when he can be transparent with his constituents.

The Speaker tells President Daryanani that his speaking time has elapsed.

President Daryanani asks for an extension of his speaking time. He motions for a one-minute extension. Seeing no second, the President does not get an extension.

The Speaker calls for a quick break due to the tension of the question period. He accepts motions.

Councillor Javed motions for a five-minute recess, seconded by VP External Affairs Delouvrier.

Seeing no opposition, the Speaker entertains a five (5)-minute recess.

The Speaker points out that he has been following a wrong precedent, and he will be removing the time limit for the discussion, but at his discretion he will be entertaining motions to call the question.

Question:

VP External Affairs Delouvrier states that President Daryanani can empathise with him on the difficulty of being an international student, one difficulty being not having access to all documents and not knowing what is going on at all times. The President has multiple times stated that he does not know the reasons for his suspension, and stated that at the original time of the suspension he received a letter informing him of his suspension. He asks the President if the letter can confirm that it did not include a reason for the suspension.

Answer:

President Daryanani notes that VP External Affairs Delouvrier is a member of the Board.



VP External Affairs Delouvrier calls a Point of Order on the basis that he has never seen or taken part in the drafting of a letter.

President Daryanani indicates that VP External Affairs Delouvrier has access to documents that the President does not have access to, and he does not empathise with VP External Affairs Delouvrier for being an international student, because their positions are completely different. Being an international student means that the Board of Directors should accommodate to them, to allow them to be on the Board of Directors and to pride on SSMU's mission and values. VP External Affairs Delouvrier was not suspended for five (5) months, and he knows the reasons for the President's suspension. He asks VP External Affairs Delouvrier if he can enlighten the General Assembly on the reasons for President Daryanani's suspension.

VP External Affairs Delouvrier calls a Point of Order, considering the tone of the President. He asks that the comments be retracted and an apology be provided.

The Speaker understands the tone may have been heated, but he cannot sustain this point of order, since it does not contravene any of the General Assembly standing rules, and he does not think it would constitute disrespectful behaviour or offensive body language.

Question:

Councillor Dakdouki asks a Board member if an individual is suspended, whether they are informed of the reason.

Answer:

VP Internal Affairs Paulin yields her time to VP Finance Sader.

VP Finance Sader responds that is standard procedure, but in situations where suspensions occur, generally they go through their legal team, who writes the letter.

Question:

Councillor Holton asks a follow-up question on VP External Affairs Delouvrier's question; if this letter contained any indication of the reasons for the suspension.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that he redirects this question to a Board member, who can read the letter, rather than paraphrasing it and keeping everyone in the dark. It will save everyone's time.



VP Finance Sader states that he did not confirm nor deny the existence of a letter, he was simply referencing the Board's standard procedures. As such, he will not be engaging with this discussion and will not comment on this situation.

Councillor Gurung states that VP External Affairs Delouvrier's question was directed to the President, and asks that he answer this question. As VP Finance Sader said, the Board cannot confirm nor deny the existence of a letter, but the President can confirm or deny whether he received a letter. She redirects this question to the President.

President Daryanani answers that he can show everyone the letter if they wish. He asks the Speaker if this can be done.

The Speaker answers that this cannot be done at this time, but asks the President to send it by email.

President Daryanani answers that this should be open to the whole McGill community, not just Councillors and Directors. There were no clear reasons for the suspension, there are still no clear reasons, and the Board did not explain anything. He is at the meeting to be transparent. He poses the question back to the Board. He would share his screen to show the letter and the legal documents from the Board.

The Speaker states that if the President wishes to show a document, the Speaker can speak with the dais on the matter.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin motions to suspend the rules and add this as a point, seconded by VP External Affairs Delouvrier.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin motion to add a point (8) to the agenda: Presentation of the Suspension Letter by President.

President Daryanani believes the letter should be presented by VP Internal Affairs Paulin.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin states that the presentation would be from the President.

The Speaker states that if the President does not wish to present the letter, the agenda point can be removed.

President Daryanani will do the presentation.

The Speaker entertains a vote on the addition of agenda point 8.



The Speaker asks if there is any opposition to the presentation of the suspension letter by the President. He states this is the alternative to voting. He explains that voting is done by his discretion, and a suspension of the rules requires a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority vote. If no one opposes, the agenda point is added.

Councillor Dakdouki asks if the Speaker has a copy of Robert's Rules that can be shared with the Assembly.

The Speaker does not have a copy that he can share, but states that they use the Robert's Rules of Order complemented by SSMU-specific rules, particularly the Standing Rules of the General Assembly. The Speaker sometimes uses the Standing Rules of the Legislative Council, which are more in-depth, to call certain decisions. He states that if there is an error, Members can send the Speaker a message via Zoom or call him out of order.

Question:

Councillor Dakdouki asks who is part of the Dais.

Answer:

The Speaker notes that the Speaker, the Parliamentarian, and the Speaker on-call are part of the Dais.

The Speaker asks if there are any further points of clarification, and apologises, as he should have clarified from the beginning.

Seeing no further points of clarification, the Speaker asks if anyone is opposed to suspending the rules to add agenda point 8: Presentation of the Suspension Letter by President. Presentations are always followed by a short question period.

Seeing no opposition, this is unanimously approved and the agenda item is added.

The Speaker states that the question period has elapsed.

Seeing no motions to extend the question period, the Speaker moves to agenda item 8.

8. Presentation of the Suspension Letter by President

The President presents the Suspension Letter.

The Speaker presents Robert's Rules of Order for clarification.



The Speaker continues the question period on the presentation of the Suspension Letter.

Question Period:

Question:

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos asks, based on the President's previous statement, if this is the only letter communicated to the President, as he stated earlier that he received many suspension notices, and some correspondence from SSMU's lawyers.

Answer:

President Daryanani that it is not, but if they have to go through his whole file, it will take the whole meeting. He thinks they should have a bigger agenda than just this topic. The letters should be accessible to Councillors if the Board allows it.

Question:

Councillor Dakdouki asks President Daryanani, seeing that VP Finance Sader mentioned that the regular proceedings require lawyers to send suspension letters, if they can see that letter.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that perhaps VP Finance Sader can show that letter, since he is saying that it exists.

Question:

Councillor Gurung asks if the President is able to show them the letter from lawyers. As she mentioned, VP Finance Sader's comments were general, and it would not be appropriate for him to do so, as that would entail confirming or denying. The President has alluded to his letter, and she asks if he would be able to show this letter.

Answer:

President Daryanani states that he holds no power above anyone present, and they all have the ability to share their screen. He asks someone else to share their screen to show the letter. If a full presentation is needed, perhaps the Board can do it.

Question:

Councillor Dakdouki asks a follow up question. The Councillor states that only one person has confirmed the existence of this letter, President Daryanani. The President is in a position to



show it, and he has mentioned that he is willing to show all letters if necessary. They ask him to show the letter.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that the letter will not satisfy the General Assembly. He does not have the reasons for this suspension.

The Speaker asks the President to keep his tone more parliamentary.

President Daryanani continues that he expects the ASsembly to have more respect for him. He asks the Board to present their reasons for his suspension.

Question:

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos inquires with the Speaker to suspend the rules, to inquire if the General Assembly would like to see this letter, as the President has stated that he is committed to transparency, especially since the Board has stated that the information concerning the suspension is confidential.

Answer:

The Speaker states that if the President would like to present the letter, the motion can be sustained. If the President does not wish to proceed with the presentation, it cannot be sustained.

President Daryanani answers that if councillors are not satisfied with the letter he already presented, they should not direct their questions to him.

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos calls a point of order, since their question was directed to the Speaker and not the President.

The Speaker states that if the President would like to present the letter of suspension, they can motion for it. If not, they will call the question of a presentation out of order.

President Daryanani answers that he will not present.

Councillor Gurung calls a point of order, and asks the Speaker if the President's most recent statement is in order.

The Speaker calls for a two-minute recess.



The Speaker presents the points he has established with the Dais.

- 1) They will be enforcing a speaking list, which will allow for debate to be more polite, and will help the Dais select the next speaker from the Assembly.
- 2) The Dais reminds everyone to remain respectful to one another, and respectful of decorum. If there is a continuous disrespect of decorum, Members will be removed from the meeting.

The Assembly will be continuing with the debate.

Question:

Councillor Gurung asks how the general members can access the speaking list.

Answer:

The Speaker states that the speaking list will be displayed on-screen, if not the link will be sent in the chat.

Question:

Councillor Gurung asks how members will be able to add their names to the list.

Answer:

The Speaker clarifies that he will be adding the names to the list based on the 'raised hands' via Zoom.

The Speaker continues the Question/Answer Period from the presentation. He asks if there are motions.

Seeing no further motions, the Speaker continues the Question Period.

Question:

Councillor Dakdouki asks President Daryanani if he is able to show them the letter he received from SSMU's lawyers.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that he has done his presentation and shown the necessary documentation for the GA to come to its own conclusion. As members of the Society, they deserve to ask the Board how their money is being spent and what communication is being



sent to employees. He thinks this question is better suited to the Board of Directors, as he does not have the time to present it this evening.

Question:

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos asks, taking into account that the President has previously shared that he was suspended and knowing that the Board cannot legally show the GA any information but the President can, why he cannot show them this letter, knowing that the GA wants to see it to help with transparency.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that he understands that everyone is curious to find out what took place, and he knows questions have come up about the suspension at the Legislative Council. He asks if it is not a bit ironic that the Board has the information but the Board of Directors lied to everyone, saying he was on a leave of absence.

The Speaker asks President Daryanani not to use the word “lie.”

President Daryanani states that his use of the word is true.

The Speaker states that it is an assumption, and that word can be used only if President Daryanani has proof and is willing to share it. He asks the President to retract his comment.

President Daryanani states that the Board was “economical with the truth”.

Councillor Gurung calls a Point of Order. She asks the Speaker to consider how President Daryanani’s rephrasing is alluding to the same connotations as lying. Councillor Gurung asks that the President kindly rephrase or retract his statement.

The Speaker states that he appreciates the President’s rewording, because while it does carry a similar connotation, it is much more appropriate for a parliamentary setting.

Question:

Councillor Dakdouki states that they all take allegations by SSMU very seriously, and the GA is there to listen to President Daryanani as well. Because the public has not received any information regarding his absence other than the statement from representatives, the Councillor asks if the President is willing to show the GA this letter, considering it is the only



piece of evidence the President has regarding his statement about not being given a reason for suspension.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that, for the past five (5) months, he has been trying to obtain information concerning the reasons for his suspension. He did not go on a leave of absence, and is disappointed that that is the information that was given to the public. It is their right, as members of the Society, to know where their representatives are. They work on the mandate to represent them on the goals they wish to achieve. He states that he has presented the letter that was used by SSMU to suspend him. He suggests for Councillor Dakdouki to ask the Board.

Question:

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos asks, if the President had previously stated that he had been in contact with the Board, but they never told him the reason for his suspension, and since he mentioned the existence of this letter from SSMU lawyers, if he has nothing to hide, why the President will not show this letter. The GA will then be able to judge whether the President was being truthful.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that everyone has been asking for the same thing the past five (5) months. He gave them the answer, which is not proving to be satisfactory at this point. The President cannot do anything further in regards to this. It is not his job to defend the Board of Directors' decision to suspend him, the Board is able to use confidentiality to cover their actions. He asks the Board for the truth. Subjecting him to the same questions over again is the same harm as what the Board has caused him.

The Speaker reminds everyone that he will call for people to raise their hands once they reach the bottom of the speaking list.

Question:

Councillor Dakdouki asks President Daryanani what he believes the importance of confidentiality is in the work of the Board of Directors.

Answer:

President Daryanani answers that he does not know the importance of confidentiality, but it seems now as if the importance of confidentiality continues to deprive information about how decisions are made. It is not the first time this has happened, where confidentiality has been used to cover for unknown things or things that individuals do not want to reveal. In this



instance, he has chosen to speak out on this, and has still been silenced. He states that the Board has been using confidentiality as a weapon.

The Parliamentarian states that President Daryanani is indirectly attacking the Speaker, which is out of order. The Parliamentarian asks him to rephrase and stick to decorum.

President Daryanani apologises to the Speaker. He clarifies that he is referring to the previous point of order raised by VP External Affairs Delouvrier and other members of the General Assembly. It has nothing to do with decorum. He is speaking about his experiences, about how painful it is to demand answers time and time again and being told that information is confidential. He does not mean to attack anyone.

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos states that the President knows that the Board cannot release information concerning Human Resources and an employee, and that he is the only one who can release information, and that Councillors have asked the Board of Directors many questions about the President at many Legislative Council meetings. Most responses came from VP Finance Sader, who stated that information was confidential. They ask, considering that the President is the only person who can reveal information, why the President will not share the letter.

President Daryanani asks for clarification as to the reason the Board cannot talk about this matter.

The Speaker takes motions for extensions seeing as they have elapsed five speakers.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin motions to call the question, seconded by Councillor Pérez Tiniacos seconds the motion to call the question.

The Speaker clarifies that calling the question means ending the discussion point.

A member of the Assembly objects to calling the question.

The Speaker entertains a voting period.

Abigail Poppo asks whether they can call the question in this case, as they believe it can only be used when voting on motions.

The Speaker states that they have been using the call the question feature in general, and he is pretty sure that it can be used to end any point, but he will verify Robert's Rules. For the time being, the Assembly can call the question as they have done before.

The Speaker entertains a voting period.



Abigail Pople motions to end the question period after the next speaker, seconded by Councillor Coussa.

The Speaker states that they will first vote on the motion to call the question, and if it does not pass they will vote on this second motion.

The Speaker states that the Assembly can modify the motion to call the question after the speaking list is exhausted. He entertains a vote on this motion.

Seeing no opposition, they will move on to the last speaker on the list, and then move onto the next item on the agenda.

Question:

Abigail Pople asks President Daryanani or a member from the Board what constitutes a sufficient reason to suspend an officer.

Answer:

VP Finance Sader answers that it is variable, there is a section in regards to this in the [SSMU] Constitution. In general, there are a lot of reasons that the Board of Directors may decide to suspend someone. Given the current topic, he does not want to allow people to read into his statements. The Board needs to maintain confidentiality and guarantee that what they are saying is not read into. They will always consult their lawyers on suspension to ensure the reasons are acceptable.

The question period is now exhausted and there are no further questions or points.

9. Discussion:

- a. Current environment/atmosphere at SSMU and how to correct it

Val Masny states that they would like this discussion to be generative, to try to find solutions and stay as respectful as possible. They have seen that SSMU can be toxic, and they think it would be beneficial to have this discussion, so that the Legislative Council or the Executive Committee can work to make SSMU a better place.

The Speaker clarifies that since they are in a discussion point, there is no requirement for questions to be posed, but Members of the Assembly shall pose their points with the Speaker.



Question:

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos calls a Point of Order. The Councillor seconded the motion, so he asks if he should be allotted the second speech.

Answer:

The Speaker answers that there is no rule, but generally the first speech is given to the mover of the motion to allow discussion to focus on what they wish it to focus on.

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos states that all Officers get training on human resources issues and confidentiality by the legal team. The Board of Directors cannot disclose any information regarding any cases, especially HR cases, which is what they have been telling the members and General Assembly in the past five (5) months. They state that it is suspicious that President Daryanani is open to providing any information, but would not provide the letter from the lawyers. The whole GA wants to see this letter, and if there is nothing to hide, they can all move forward and decide what actions to take.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin states that the point of the discussion was to talk about the environment at SSMU and how to fix it. She states that there have been a lot of claims, which is brave. The SSMU does need to take these claims into account and act on them, instead of just listening. SSMU has reformed their HR system, and at the past Board and Legislative Council meetings, they have had Anti-Violence Coordinators present. She has also been working with Councillors Coussa and Javed on the Anti-Surveillance Master Plan, and they may want to work on something similar for anti-oppression as a whole. She would be more than happy to work on that. Looking at what has been done, they can expand upon it to have concrete solutions instead of growing tensions between members. She looks forward to hearing solutions.

Councillor Dakdouki states that having the AVCs present at the previous Thursday's Legislative Council meeting was reassuring, because the topic at hand was tense. They add that, something that has been mentioned a lot tonight is confidentiality, which has been used to hide the workings of SSMU. They are not familiar with the confidentiality rules, and are willing to hear from executives or councillors. They are interested in how confidentiality is used to protect people, and if there are any places where it is used to hide transparency, and how this can be changed.

Sam Baron states that being more accountable to students can be increased by SSMU's Gender and Sexual Violence Policy (GSVP), which is handled by AVCs. There are items related to that which are slightly problematic. The fact that AVCs who run the GSVP are students makes it so that Policy is not as strong as it could be, and they think that professionalising the AVCs will help legitimise the policy.



Councillor Pérez Tininacos states that they do not feel comfortable with the current composition of the Executives, especially when they heard that a former Arts Representative who became Senator made comments that made Councillor Perez Pérez Tiniacos's female friends uncomfortable. They are grateful that the AVCs are present, because at the beginning of this meeting they had a panic attack. Councillor Pérez Tiniacos notes his sadness that VP University Affairs cannot be present at this meeting.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin states that she appreciates the ideas heard so far from Sam Baron and Councillor Dakdouki, and she has written them down. She likes the idea of professionalising the Anti-Violence Coordinators (AVCs) and perhaps the Equity Commissioners. She is currently working on a Media Transparency Plan that she was hoping to bring to the Legislative Council's next meeting, and adding a clause on confidentiality and how it works at SSMU, in terms of information and how it is enacted. Adding a transparency policy that would be enacted in the next year would be good as well. If any other Member has ideas, she is more than happy to share the plan with councillors and students to ensure that it adequately represents what students want to see at SSMU.

VP Finance Sader states that their policy on confidentiality is to contact lawyers when issues come up. The Board could not reveal some things tonight because they could not contact their lawyers, which they will do at the soonest availability. It would be useful to bring in lawyers to discuss these issues at the Legislative Council, so that everyone is on the same page.

Alexandra Mircescu states that it was made clear at the last Legislative Council meeting that many female-identifying people are feeling unsafe with SSMU's current environment. These views were expressed much more with the return of the SSMU President. It has been clearly established why the Board must maintain confidentiality. Given that President Daryanani is the only one who can end this difficult conversation, they ask him to come forward with the letter to help the process of mending their wounds.

Question:

Councillor Coussa asks if they are still in the discussion point.

Answer:

The Speaker clarifies that every five (5) speakers, they ask for motions and will vote on them. If there are no motions, they will take more speakers.

Abigail Popple asks if they can suspend the rules of five-intervention motion to allow people to be added to the speaking list. If people want to present motions, they are not cutting someone's speaking turn.



The Speaker does not sustain this motion, because they could have motions throughout the list.

Asa appeals the Speaker's decision to overrule this motion.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin states that this does not follow Robert's Rules.

The Speaker states that there is a majority vote, he would be open to adopting this method.

Councillor Coussa asks for clarification on what the appeal is, but seconds the appeal.

The Speaker clarifies that he ruled the method of proceeding out of order, because it does not fit within the rules.

Abigail Popple clarifies that it was appealed because the Speaker ruled the motion out of order without submitting it to a vote.

Councillor Coussa seconds the motion to appeal the decision of the Speaker.

Asa states that the appeal is debatable.

The Speaker motivates the appeal.

Asa states that the meeting adopted rule 6, that limits motions to every five speakers. They believe a member has the right to suspend that rule to add a motion whenever. They have not heard grounds from the Speaker or anyone else for ruling that motion out of order.

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos states that they believe this method was adopted by the General Assembly for the purpose of getting through the contents of the meeting, and they should be able to suspend the rules at any point. The point of the speaking list is to include new people every five speakers, to make the list inclusive, not to restrict motions.

Councillor Dakdouki adds that this motion is to appeal the Chair's decision, whose decision was not to approve a motion that would restrict when motions can be given. This goes against Robert's Rules, so the Speaker's decision should be upheld and this motion should be denied.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin agrees, as this is the most efficient way to conduct debate. It does not silence anyone, and makes debate run smoothly.

Abigail Popple clarifies that the five-member speaking list was adopted in the Standing Rules (point 6). They read the point. The rules are not arbitrary.



Asa states that it is confusing what this motion is, and confused this motion with the one that the ruling was made on. They state that a member has a right to change a rule, which is what they are voting on.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin states that she is uncertain as to what they are voting on, as she thought they were voting on the motion to appeal the Speaker's decision. The Speaker is allowed to make unilateral decisions.

The Speaker confirms VP Internal Affairs' point. He understands the point, and states that he considers this motion out of order, but since there is a motion to appeal the Speaker's decision, it would be undemocratic to do so.

Councillor Coussa asks that this debate around the format of the motion end to prioritise voices of women and gendered minorities who want to talk about their experiences at SSMU.

The Speaker states that he will be taking one more speaker on this debate.

Val Masny states that the independence is what matters here, and their remaining neutral. They think that the Assembly has entertained other suspensions of rules, and would invite the Speaker to not let their opinion taint whether motions are out of order or not.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin points out that it is the Speaker's job to make a ruling based on their understanding of the rules, so she believes the Speaker has not done anything wrong.

The Speaker states that this is out of order.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin retracts her point.

Val Masny continues that they would appreciate that the Speaker cite the rules when making decisions. They retract their motions because it is not pertinent anymore. They still believe in the independence of the Speaker.

The Speaker clarifies that he called Val Masny's motion out of order because he wanted to facilitate debate and avoid complicating things. His opposition was not based on opinion or ideological opposition, but based on practicality. The motion to appeal has not been retracted.

Asa withdraws their motion to appeal.

The Speaker On-Call states that if there are questions about parliamentary procedure, they can answer them throughout the meeting. The Parliamentarian can also answer these questions.

Seeing no further points, the Speaker takes speakers for the speaking list.



Councillor Coussa states that when she entered SSMU, she wanted to make a lot of changes, including making SSMU more accessible. She has tried to do that, but as a woman of colour, she has faced double standards that her cisgender male peers do not face. She is tired of working in a space where she does not feel safe nor valued, and she feels that the work that she and other women of colour do at SSMU goes unnoticed. Her experience is not unique, but she is in a place of privilege where she can share her experience. She thinks that a structural change is needed at SSMU, the representation needs to be true, because as it stands, SSMU does not represent the students.

Councillor Applegate states that they are present as the First-Year Representative to advocate for first-year students, and it took them a long time to understand the way SSMU operates and discover the toxic workplace environment. Most first-years do not know about SSMU, but they don't want the first-years to be led by a Society that has such a toxic work environment. There seems to be a need to restructure some parts of SSMU, putting an emphasis on transparency, accountability and detailing confidentiality. The first-year students are the future of SSMU, and they all need it to change if they want it to continue to be in existence.

The Speaker On-Call states that the Speaker took a break and they will be stepping in.

Councillor Dakdouki states that it is difficult to target an environment, but they think that having more women and minorities in positions of leadership could be a solution, and adding better training. Councillor Dakdouki is the Clubs representative, and they received training in the fall. They have spoken with Executives who told them that they had not been provided with exit reports from previous years. Having stronger institutional memory and providing additional training allows everyone, specifically women and people of colour, to have the information they need to permeate the upper echelons of SSMU.

The Speaker returns. He asks for further speakers.

Val Masny echoes Councillor Dakdouki's statement. This year, with the General Manager being on leave, this does not help institutional knowledge be promulgated through SSMU. Putting all that burden onto one position may be helpful for future members of SSMU.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin states that she liked Councillor Dakdouki's statement, and maybe having the first Council meeting be for training about how SSMU operates, gender and sexuality training, equity training could be helpful. Board will sometimes have training during meetings. Making training more accessible can be difficult. She is working on institutional knowledge, and having the GM bear the burden of all of this duty alienates full-time staff from the political aspect of SSMU, which affects their day-to-day jobs. She is trying to get full-time staff on committees to have institutional knowledge. VP Internal Affairs Paulin would appreciate to hear more about councillors' experience, and is open to hearing more ideas.



Councillor Infeld states that it is important to contextualise, in terms of the way the student body views SSMU. The Councillor does not wish to undermine anything that has been said, but believes the student body only sees a small part of SSMU, and it is important to remember that this is only one piece of SSMU, and there is much else that needs to be worked on.

Councillor Dakdouki states that in her experience as Clubs representative, she would like to discuss whether there is a better way to implement GSVP and Equity training. Many people will not listen to the presentations, which defeats the purpose. Club Executives don't like training, as they believe it does not pertain to their club. They ask if anyone has any solutions to this.

VP Finance Sader states that the point about training is excellent, and he thinks a lot of disconnections happen because SSMU is a student union as well as a company. It is an institution that has political bodies and permanent and casual staff. It is easy to forget the difference between the two (2), and Executives often work in the more corporate work environment, while Councillors work in the political environment. He does not have any solutions, but believes training would help a lot, since one of the major issues is bridging that divide. Speaking for himself, he is in the 13th hour of his workday, and his experience with SSMU is a lot more all-encompassing than it is for others. Often, people talk over each other at Legislative Council meetings since they have different perceptions of SSMU, and he notes there needs to be a better representation of SSMU. A lot of students only know SSMU through newspaper articles, which can cause a dichotomy between what SSMU is and what it is perceived to be, so a lot of people are scared to participate in SSMU.

The Speaker calls for motions. He informs the GA that it is getting late, and the normal end time for SSMU meetings is 22:00. Because they are still far from completing the agenda, they can go until 22:30. He notes that many people are running low and the places they are in are closing, and he urges everyone to consider speeding through the rest of the meeting.

Councillor Pérez Tiniacos states that, according to the constitution, to remove an officer the body can mobilise itself and bring a letter to the Speaker calling for the special GA. They state that the required number of signatures is 50, and asks if they need to provide a Google Form with the required signatures.

The Speaker wants to ensure that he provides the right answer, and states that he will get back to Councillor Pérez Pérez Tiniacos before the end of the meeting.

VP External Affairs Delouvrier states that 200 signatures are required, and they can be submitted in any form as long as they can be verified to the Speaker, so that they can set a GA, where the attendance must be 350 students. No more than 50% of the 200 signatures can be from one faculty, and at least four faculties must be represented.

Abigail Popple invites Councillor Infeld to respond to Councillor Dakdouki.



The Speaker answers that they can continue the discussion, but at this time the President has left the meeting since his phone has died. This is not to rush anyone, and if there is no motion they will continue to take speakers.

Councillor Coussa informs the councillor who was looking for recommendations and sends their email address in the chat, so that they can email them with ideas.

The Speaker states that since there are no motions, they will take more speakers.

Councillor Infeld responds to Councillor Dakdouki. They state that this is not necessarily a solution, but once they return to in-person, it will be useful to help people pay attention to the training. They admit that they have sometimes drifted off during training sessions, and they think going back to in-person will prevent this.

Seeing no further speakers, the Speaker entertains motions.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin motions to call the question, seconded by VP External Affairs Delouvrier.

Seeing no opposition to calling the question, the question has been called.

10. New Business:

- a. Motion Regarding the Nomination of the Auditor for the 2023 Fiscal Year 2022-02-21 --
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED AT A CONSULTATIVE FORUM

VP Finance Sader presents the motion to nominate auditors, which the GA needs to do every year. The company they have been working with the last few years is excellent, they audit them properly and explain issues that may occur. The accounting team is also very satisfied with the company. He worked with Fuller Landau in the summer, and they were great. There is no reason not to continue with this company, and VP Finance Sader urges the Assembly to pass this motion.

The Speaker entertains a question period on the motion.

VP External Affairs Delouvrier motions to call the question, seconded by VP Finance Sader.

Seeing no opposition to calling the question, the Speaker entertains a vote on the motion.

Question:

VP Internal Affairs Paulin asks if this motion needs to be sent to referendum since they do not have quorum.



Answer:

The Speaker answers that it would need to be sent to the Legislative Council for full approval.

Seeing no opposition and no abstention, the motion passes unanimously.

11. Report of the Board of Directors

The Speaker states that some Executives have had to leave. They will be able to present them at a later date.

The Parliamentarian asks for a break so that they can arrange the screen-sharing of the reports.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin motions for a five-minute break, seconded by VP External Affairs Delouvrier.

VP Internal Affairs Paulin presents the Board of Directors Report. The Board of Directors is composed of 12 members, and they are in the process of ratifying their 4 members at large. They are made up of four executives and four councillors, and the General Manager is a member as well. In order to be part of the Board, members must be 18 years of age, be a citizen of Canada, not be bankrupt, and be in good legal standing. It is the highest governing body of SSMU and responsible for SSMU's finances, operations, human resources and legal affairs. The Board ratifies the resolutions passed by the Legislative Council. In the past months, they ratified the judicial case SPHR v. SSMU, they reformed SSMU committees (Human Resources Committee, Building and Operations Management Committee "BOMCOM" was dissolved, and the Governance Review Committee was revamped). The SSMU purchased video security equipment for Gerts, approved the budget for Activities Night 2022, and purchased respiratory-style masks for students. If there are questions, members can email her or board@ssmu.ca.

Seeing no questions, the Speaker moves to the next report.

12. Report of Executives:

a. President

This report is skipped since the President is not present for the reading of the report.

b. Vice-President (External Affairs)

VP External Affairs Delouvrier states that his portfolio is centred around the upkeep of relationships outside SSMU, like union relations (and other student unions) and relations with the government. It also includes political, union and black affairs. He consults on Francophone Affairs, Indigenous Affairs



and Popular Education. He has hired two External Affairs Commissioners and a Policy and Mobilisation Researcher. He works with UCRU, which just had its lobby week to advocate for topics including mental health, student employment and financial aid, and supporting students with disabilities. There is also government relations, international students, inter associatif, to reaffirm certain topics. He is working to create an External Representation Committee to work on the representation within the student body. For community affairs, he works with a Community Affairs Commissioner and a Community Engagement Commissioner. They are working to support the Royal Victoria Hospital Site, the Affordable Student Housing plan, which they found land for recently, and the Student Hamper Program, which would help students with financial difficulties. There are two Political Campaign Coordinators, who work on the RVH site, advocate for the safe return to campus, support affiliated political campaigns, and work on the Anti-Surveillance Master Plan. For Black Affairs, they passed a fee levy to bring to referendum, worked with McGill's anti-Black Racism team, and worked on a Black students' space in Ferrier Building, which will be SSMU-managed. For Union Affairs, UCRU has been lobbying the U15 schools to grow the coalition, and he has been working to re-evaluate the coalitions and external affiliations, to ensure they are affiliated with up-to-date coalitions. VP External Affairs Delouvrier has worked on the digital infrastructure for the portfolio, which will allow future VPs External Affairs to better engage with the student body and make things easier internally in terms of institutional knowledge. He has also been working with External Affairs Commissioners for access to health and support resources, and has been sitting on CKUT's Board of Directors.

Question:

Val Masny asks if the VP External Affairs Delouvrier could expand on his work with the Mohawk Mothers in regards to the Royal Victoria Hospital, and how the External Affairs office is supporting them in their advocacy.

Answer:

VP External Affairs Delouvrier answers that they urged OCPM to consider the concerns and recommendations submitted by the Mohawk Mothers' memoir, and Mohawk Nation's published concerns. The SSMU have also released statements in support of exploring the site. If they get the site, they would like to work with the local Indigenous communities to not only respect but help them with the process of regaining their land.

There are no further questions.

c. Vice-President (Finance)

VP Finance Sader states that he works with clubs and services to help them manage their finances, he does general finances, accounting, and auditing. He ensures that funding is working well and he manages the health insurance plan. This year, he has been working on the Evaluation and Expansion of



operational needs, the Services and Funds COVID-19 surpluses, he has examined their investment portfolio, and worked on the Health Insurance Expansion for Transgender Students. He manages the day-to-day finances, the cash flow and the budget. He is responsible for upkeep of all SSMU bank accounts, troubleshoots issues with their bank accounts, and does general support. For services, he does budget review and variance analysis, approves purchases, does contract review and approval, helps them with honorarium payments, and helps them with long-term planning, growth and fee referenda when necessary. For general finance, he ensures the long-term Financial Stability of the Society, which includes creating the annual budget and the long-term financial plan (investments, staffing and operations, and COVID surplus). He manages the SSMU's cash flows and the investment portfolio. He also does the annual audit, and the day-to-day checkups. For funding, he oversees the distribution of over \$350,000 per year through the Funding Committee. The Committee approves the funding for all initiatives, available to all groups on campus. For the Health Insurance Plan, for which all SSMU members are automatically enrolled. The Health Plan includes drug coverage, dental care, psychology coverage, tuition and travel insurance. He is managing the Plan's reserves and considering a possible expansion due to surpluses, reviewing e-counselling options, expanding the insurance plan to increase coverage and address issues relevant to marginalised students, and refuting regulatory directives on the viability of collective insurance. This year, VP Finance Sader is working on the Expansion of Operation Needs, as mentioned in the 5-year-plan. He is also working on the Services' and Funds' COVID Surpluses, and re-examining the investment portfolio, which is going well.

Seeing no questions, the Speaker moves to the next report.

d. Vice-President (University Affairs)

This report is skipped since the VP University Affairs is not in attendance this evening.

e. Vice-President (Student Life)

This report is skipped since the VP Student Life Heisele Cubilla is not in attendance this evening.

The Parliamentarian states that members who have questions can reach out to VP Student Life Heisele Cubilla by email.

The Speaker states that the report will be uploaded to the SSMU website and questions can be sent to studentlife@ssmu.ca.

f. Vice-President (Internal Affairs)

VP Internal Affairs Paulin states that she oversees communications, events, First Year Affairs, governance and Gerts. For communications, she rebranded the Instagram account, they have done executive takeovers, she has been working on a social media transparency plan, and making SSMU a platform for clubs and services. For events, she has been working on SPN which has been doing well,



and is working on FACO, which will be called “FAKEO” this year. Grad Frosh is coming up, as well as SSMU awards on April 6, 2022. For first-year affairs, they did a study session, a town hall, and are hoping to do a prom in late March.

La Commission des affaires francophones a adopté la motion pour le frais d’accessibilité francophone, qui essaiera de plaider à l’administration pour plus de droits académiques.

For governance, she is working on the Committee Reformation Project to have full-time staff part of committees, on the 5-year-plan, the Anti-Surveillance Master Plan, the Media and Transparency Plan, and the Data Collection and Protection Policy to make information collected by SSMU safer. For Gerts, the Café is open, and the Bar will be open at full capacity starting March 7, 2022. They are hoping to have a St-Patrick’s Day event in March, and clubs can send emails for bookings in March.

Seeing no questions, the Speaker moves to the next point.

13. Adjournment: **22:33**

VP External Affairs Delouvrier motions to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Councillor Zhang.

The meeting is adjourned at 22:33 on February 21, 2022.

The Speaker thanks everyone for attending this General Assembly.