

Association étudiante de l'Université McGill Située sur les territoires traditionnels des collectivités Haudenosaunee et Anishinaabe.

**Students' Society of McGill University** Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories. ssmu.ca | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

# SSMU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PUBLIC MINUTES

November 21, 2024

The regular bi-monthly Legislative Council Meeting of the Students' Society of McGill University (SSMU) will be held in Leacock 232 on Thursday, November 21, 2024 at 18:00.

1. Call to Order: 18:08

The Speaker calls the meeting to order at 18:08. The acting Speaker for this meeting is Deputy Speaker Fallis.

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.

L'AÉUM reconnaît que l'Université McGill est située sur le territoire traditionnel et non cédé des nations Anishinaabeg et Haudenosaunee. L'AÉUM reconnaît et respecte ces nations comme les véritables et constants gardiens des terres et des eaux sur lesquelles nous nous rencontrons aujourd'hui. En outre, l'AÉUM s'engage à respecter les lois et coutumes traditionnelles de ces territoires.

3. Attendance

The Speaker takes attendance.

Present: Councillors Chen, Kalaga, Weissman, Renaud, Kim, Bongiovanni, Bérubé, Nounke, Li, Engo, Crema Black, Kohler, Zhao, Kumar, Abu Alkhair, President Taylor, VPs Baltes, Zahidah, Jolicoeur, Solomon, Berglas.

Absent: Councillors McKay, El Murr, Pinard-Milette, Farhat.



ssmu.ca | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

4. Adoption of the Agenda – ADOPTED

The Agenda is distributed.

Proxy Islam states that she is an ASUS representative and notes her presence.

Seeing no additions or opposition, the Agenda is adopted.

- 5. Minutes for Approval
  - a. SSMU Legislative Council Public Minutes 2024-11-07 APPROVED

The Minutes are distributed.

Seeing no changes or opposition, the Minutes are approved.

6. <u>Report of the Steering Committee</u> (3)

The Speaker presents the Report of the Steering Committee. She states that they met on November 14. She asks Councillors to carefully consult the documents for each meeting, which are made available to them every Friday before a meeting and made public the Monday prior. They should consider whether each motion should be debated, and the Speaker notes that she will try to constrain debate to the suggested times noted on the agenda. Those reporting at the next meeting include the First-Year Council, the Black Affairs Committee, the Funding Committee, the Services Review Committee, the Accountability Committee, the Building & Operations Management Committee, the Solidarity Funding Committee, as well as the President, VP Operations, and VP Internal. She also notes that the next meeting is the last one of the semester, and there is no confidential session tonight.

- 7. Executive Reports (9)
  - a. <u>Vice-President Finance</u>

VP Jolicoeur presents her report. She prepared the revised budget in October, which was approved by the Board recently. They are no longer projecting a deficit and will be in a more financially sustainable position in the future. The official numbers along with a report will be published within the next two weeks. The main changes since the original budget include some layoffs, the removal of unnecessary software, and changes to their insurance policies. Last year's audit was complete, and the auditors will present at the next Board meeting and the statements will be released. These documents will have a deficit because they are from this fiscal year. The accounting form process was automated, and it is still undergoing troubleshooting. VP Jolicoeur is in the process of updating documentation about



ssmu.ca | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

student fees to reflect the funding they collected this year. She is also resolving minor club banking issues, and collected the finalized Services budgets after they collected their fees. She might set up Services bank accounts, because all of their transactions go through the cheque request process, which limits the Services' independence and financial oversight. The Finance Committee is running smoothly, and they are processing 20-30 funding applications per week and strictly adhering to guidelines to avoid early depletion of funds. The Funding Commissioner has resigned, so the extra work will be shifted over to VP Jolicoeur until she finds a replacement. The Finance Committee has not yet met.

## b. Vice-President External

VP Solomon presents his report. He states that he has been working with President Taylor on SSMU's ongoing legal cases. He has been supporting student protests, and met with the McGill administration to discuss the implications of the cap on international students. He also met with other VP Externals on campus to discuss the election and referendum period. VP Solomon met with the Campaigns team to discuss the Get Radical 2025 campaign: a 10-week period with weekly workshops to create an activist community. He has been working with the Community Affairs Commissioner to create a food bank on campus, and they are currently looking for a fridge. He ran a clothing swap on November 14, which was a great success. The Milton Parc Relations Working Group has restarted efforts and will be meeting in December. QPIRG's Critical Campus Tours have been very successful, and their events have been very well attended. The Community Solidarity Fund ran a successful fee increase, but due to confusion with the referendum process, the fee will only go into effect next year as McGill changed the deadline for referendum questions. The Community Solidarity Committee processed six funding requests. VP Solomon has been working with the Indigenous Affairs Commissioner to have a permanent Indigenous art gallery in the SSMU building, and he has been working with the Black Affairs Commissioner to finish the Black Students' Solidarity Policy. The first French-language policy in SSMU history was passed recently.

## c. Vice-President University Affairs

VP Berglas presents their report. They state that a good VP University Affairs should empower students to mobilize. Their goals this year have been to make student participation more accessible, and every advisory board and committee has been filled for the first time in many years. These groups are not very well organized, so they have been asking McGill to get more groups up and running. The Senate Caucus team is very strong and meets weekly on Mondays. VP Berglas has also been working on researching the security situation on campus, and speaking with those submitting complaints. They met with Security Services as well. They attended the McGill Community Council, met with faculty senators, and reviewed accessibility policies. They recently onboarded the Accessibility Commissioner, who is available for consultation. VP Berglas gives a notice of motion for an Amendment to the Internal



<u>ssmu.ca</u> | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

Regulations of Operations & Sustainability to insert a clause limiting the number of gendered bathrooms in SSMU buildings.

- 8. Reports by Councillors (6)
  - a. <u>PT/OT (POTUS)</u> **POSTPONED**

Seeing as Councillor Farhat is absent, the PT/OT report is postponed.

b. Dentistry (DSS)

Councillor Kim presents the DSS report. He states that DSS had two general meetings, one in August and one in October. They held an event to celebrate their students, and had dinner with all the Dentistry students in September. They had a Loupe Fair, where companies were invited to present their loupes to second-year students. They are currently finalizing the Mont-Tremblant trip, which was postponed to January. The DSS sold merchandise, held events with TD, RBC, and Colgate. They are planning to support the Federation of Canadian Dental Students' Association's conference in Vancouver in January. Councillor Kim is supposed to sit on the Health & Dental Review Committee, but the committee has not met yet.

- c. Education (EdUS) POSTPONED
- d. Arts and Sciences (ASUS) **POSTPONED**
- e. Environment POSTPONED
- 9. Reports by Committees (6)
  - a. Gender and Sexual Advocacy Committee

VP Berglas presents the Gender & Sexual Advocacy Committee Report on behalf of the Gender & Sexual Advocacy Commissioner. This committee's most important task is dispersing the QUIPS Bursary, for queer students struggling with finances such as rent or groceries. The committee also creates a space for queer students to discuss issues on campus, such as gender-neutral bathroom implementation, the use of preferred names, and issues at the Wellness Hub.

## b. Indigenous Affairs Committee

VP Solomon presents the Indigenous Affairs Committee Report on behalf of the Indigenous Affairs Commissioner. He states that the committee has been working on the Indigenous art exhibit, and they have scoured the building to determine which spaces were available. They have begun reaching out to artists in the McGill and Montreal communities, and have been working towards sharing a consistent report on the Mohawk Mothers' case. They have been writing blurbs for the SSMU listserv, and have booked an Indigenous host and drag queen for the opening of the art show. The committee is also looking to get a plaque where the James McGill statue used to stand. They have also been reviewing cheque requests and equity complaints.



#### Association étudiante de l'Université McGill Située sur les territoires traditionnels des collectivités Haudenosaunee et Anishinaabe.

**Students' Society of McGill University** Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories. ssmu.ca | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

- c. SSPN **POSTPONED**
- d. Finance Committee **POSTPONED**
- e. Strategic Planning Committee **POSTPONED**
- 10. Question Period (5)

The Speaker states that members can ask questions during question period. If members have a question, they should raise their hand and they will be called on. She asks members to state and spell out their last name for the record when they speak.

Member Magrill asks VP Solomon to define consultation and to give an example.

Councillor Kalaga states that there is a question period and debate period for the motion, and notes that this is a question period for the reports.

The Speaker clarifies that this question period is general, so members can ask questions about anything. She notes that the motion entertained later will include a question period about the motion, and asks members to keep questions related to the motion until then.

Member Magrill states that their question had nothing to do with the motion. They ask the President to answer the previous question.

VP Solomon answers that they have a Consultation Policy and refers the member to this document.

Member Epstein asks VP Berglas what negative consequences the fight against security measures would have on minority groups on campus, such as Jews, who require these security measures to feel safe.

VP Berglas answers that many people feel safer with security measures in place. They recently hosted an EDI working group with various minority groups on campus, and they heard that people felt racially profiled by the security guards. They perpetuate discrimination, and do not adequately keep students safe. Safety is important, and security should be replaced with services such as Drive Safe or Walk Safe.

Member Epstein asks VP Berglas how many Jews were included in the EDI working group.

VP Berglas answers that they did not ask everyone if they were Jewish, but notes that they themselves are Jewish.



Member Mendelson asks what the consultation process looks like for a motion about security measures on campus, and how they decided that this motion is in the interest of most SSMU members.

VP Berglas clarifies that the member is referring to the statement approved by the Legislative Council. Statements are different from policies; stances created by the Council come from a history of a desire for demilitarization at SSMU, which is set out in its governing documents.

Member Mendelson asks VP Berglas to expand on this history and how it currently reflects the desires and needs of the student body.

VP Berglas answers that it is hard to determine the desires of a student body, as they only have two referenda a year with low turnout. When they hold meetings and hear voices from marginalized communities, they feel the need to elevate the voices of those who do not have power.

Member Manevich asks VP Solomon to explain the minimum requirements of SSMU's Consultation Policy.

VP Solomon refers the member to the Consultation Policy, which is available on the SSMU website.

Member Manevich asks VP Solomon how the Policy is interpreted, because it does not clearly state the requirements.

VP Solomon answers that it is important to discuss the implementation of policies when they are unclear. He discussed this issue with the Governance team, and it became clear that it is important to address issues based on precedent. If a certain group was consulted in the past, it would be relevant to consult them again or consult a similar group. People's perspectives should be heard, and policies may not perfectly reflect all groups' desires, but as many voices as possible should be included. The Black Students' Solidarity Policy involves various voices and is attempting to incorporate them into the Policy.

The question period elapses.

11. Recess, Consent Items (5)

The Speaker states that there is one consent item. She entertains a 5-minute recess.

The Speaker notes that members can participate in debate and ask questions, but cannot raise motions. They can raise points of orders, though.

12. Motions



**Association étudiante de l'Université McGill** Située sur les territoires traditionnels des collectivités Haudenosaunee et Anishinaabe.

**Students' Society of McGill University** Located on Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe, traditional territories. <u>ssmu.ca</u> | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

> a. <u>Motion Regarding the SSMU Policy Against Antisemitism 2024-11-07</u> (VP Solomon) -**NOT APPROVED**

VP Solomon presents Motion 12a. He states that the Legislative Council fell short of its responsibilities at the last meeting. When discussing a matter important to many students, they failed to give it the focus it required. Tonight, they have the opportunity to do better, to commit to actionable progress. He is a proud Jew, and his background bridges both Zionist and anti-Zionist perspectives, Israeli and American perspectives; he is committed to protecting Jewish students from any background. This policy promotes inclusion, recognition, and respect for diverse perspectives. This is why he consulted with Hillel McGill via a roundtable discussion, met with their Advocacy Coordinator, and attended holiday events with various groups throughout the years. He reached out to Chabad at McGill for their feedback, because understanding people's perspectives is crucial for meaningful representation. This Council received input from students, and now they must focus on amending the policy through respectful discussion. VP Solomon motions to extend his speaking time by 1 minute and 30 seconds.

Councillor Kalaga seconds this motion.

Seeing no opposition, VP Solomon's time is extended by 1 minute and 30 seconds.

VP Solomon continues that the Policy's actionable elements include providing kosher options at SSMU events, bi-yearly meetings with Jewish groups, observance of key Jewish holidays when planning events, hosting events about anti-semitism, facilitating information relating to the Office of Mediation & Reporting, and meeting with the Dean of Students and the Jewish Students' Liaison Office. The Policy also includes a definitional framework, drawing from academic consensus and SSMU policy. The definition comes from the Jerusalem definition and the Nexus document, and the framework contains ostensible examples of anti-semitism. Three things must be taken into account: the intent, context, and impact, and there are three sections of examples of anti-semitism: traditional anti-semitism, anti-semitism related to the Israel-Palestine conflict, and other examples related to the Israel-Palestine conflict. This Policy protects Jewish students regardless of their relationship to Israel. The work the SSMU has done is a step forward to show its commitment to greater sensitivity regarding McGill's Jewish community, and delineates protection of speech in line with other laws and governing documents. At the last meeting, they discussed the history and theoretical background of the Policy; now they must move forward to refine and amend to take action on the Policy.

The Speaker entertains questions.

Member Mendelson asks it is the SSMU's responsibility to define anti-semitism.



ssmu.ca | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

VP Solomon answers that the Policy outlines instances of anti-semitism, and does not provide a firm definition of anti-semitism. He begins the Policy by providing a non-exhaustive list of examples of anti-semitism, because these examples arise on campus. Currently, the SSMU does not have a way to address discrimination against Jews. they cannot predict what is or is not anti-semitism, but the Policy looks at existing literature to approach this issue with more sensitivity.

Member Litback asks why VP Solomon uses the JDA definition of anti-semitism rather than the IHRA definition, which is recognized as the more appropriate definition. Forty-three countries have adopted this definition; the JDA definition is much more controversial.

The Speaker reminds members to address their questions to the Speaker.

VP Solomon answers that the IHRA definition is not fully agreed upon; the City of Montreal and McGill have rejected it on multiple occasions. Human Rights Watch and other organizations went to the UN to bring up examples of how the definition has been used to wrongfully label criticism of Israel as anti-semitism, suppressing non-violent activism against Zionism. When implementing a new policy, they need to examine SSMU precedent. In 2021, the Divest For Human Rights Policy was ratified despite being challenged by Hillel McGill. There is a focus on divesting from the company Oshkosh, which was accused of practicing apartheid in Israel. This was a fact recognized by the Board of Directors and Judicial Board, but would have been denoted as anti-semitic by the IHRA definition. It would be contradictory to other policies to use the IHRA definition.

Councillor Engo asks why non-Jewish groups were consulted in defining anti-semitism.

VP Solomon states that consultations are clearly outlined in the relevant section of the Policy. He believes that Councillor Engo is referring to a letter circulating in favour of the Policy, and refers her to the consultation section of the Policy.

Member Broughton asks VP Solomon for an expansion on his choice of sources and citations.

VP Solomon answers that he cited SSMU precedent; the number of footnotes is large, but that is usually how motions and policies are formatted at SSMU. Human rights organizations or the UN were cited for matters of international law, and specific examples came from non-academic sources such as popular culture or politics.

Member Magrill states that the documents referred to in the policy are the result of many hours of consultation, and notes that specific sections of the JDA were omitted. They ask why some sections were omitted.



ssmu.ca | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

VP Solomon answers that there was a lot of deliberation about this; this aspect of the JDA is crucial. Because there are two definitional frameworks, they decided to take the best from each framework. Not everything in each definition is applicable to SSMU or McGill. The issue with the JDA definition's principle of equality was that it was quite long, and would not be helpful for the Equity team to use. Instead, they included other examples about Jewish coexistence with other communities in Israel and a section about Jewish self-determination.

Member Maitliss asks VP Solomon how the policy will protect racialized Jews.

VP Solomon answers that the IHRA definition has many components about Israel, and this policy has 35 components, many of which address the intersections of anti-semitism and racism. Discrimination against Jews of colour include microaggressions about their Jewish identity, or questioning or delegitimizing their identity. The consultation process improved this section, and protects racialized Jews.

Member Ortega asks VP Solomon why the IHRA definition is insufficient for SSMU.

VP Solomon answers that the IHRA definition only has 11 components, and describes anti-semitism based on a certain perception of Jews. It is too broad and would make it more difficult for the Equity team to implement, because they would need IHRA experts to help interpret it. Even though Canada has adopted a version of it, no university has adopted it. This definition only causes additional political strife, and harms communities by sowing division and targeting people who are acting in accordance with international law and free speech.

Member Levkovsky asks VP Solomon why SSMU is qualified to omit certain aspects of the JDA definition.

The Speaker reminds everyone that during the question period, members should ask their questions through the Speaker.

VP Solomon answers that in 2018, there was a one-year motion that contained suggestions from the committee that drafted the motion. They added clauses that catered the framework used to the McGill community. The principle of equality may make sense to experts, but the Policy must be accessible and readable to everyone. He would be grateful for amendments that would address this, without using broad terminology.

Member Manevich asks VP Solomon why the re-adopting of the 2018 motion was deemed inappropriate, and how he chose which groups to consult.



VP Solomon answers that the 2018 motion was not re-adopted because it was contradictory; the key takeaways from that motion are included in the new Policy. The 2018 motion was not specific enough, and said that criticism of Israel could be seen as malicious, which conflicts with current SSMU policies and Judicial Board decisions.

Councillor Kalaga notes that, during the last Legislative Council meeting, he asked for a letter to be read. He states that there is another letter in support of the motion, and requests that this letter be read. He notes that personal beliefs have nothing to do with this request; he would simply like both perspectives to be heard. There are people who could not be present at the meeting, so their opinions should be presented as a letter.

The Speaker notes that they are still in question period, so this motion will need to be added in the debate period.

Councillor Kumar asks VP Solomon why the five-year period was chosen for the Policy.

VP Solomon answers that the five-year period is customary for SSMU policies. He chose the January 1 deadline because it is more convenient for policies to expire near the end of a semester.

Member Benzaquen asks if VP Solomon consulted with Hillel and Chabad, and if he did, what their recommendations were. If he did not, he asks why the groups did not want to be consulted.

VP Solomon answers that he reached out to both groups for consultations. His dialogue with Hillel was very positive, and he took into account their feedback. They felt as though including the phrase "from the river to the sea" was about supporting the various constitutional arrangements between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea, rather than a political statement. He will propose a motion to take this phrase out. Hillel also felt that it was not stressed enough that Jewish self-determination is equal under the UN, so this change was made.

The Speaker entertains debate. She notes that questions can still be raised, but debate period allows Councillors to debate and propose motions if they wish.

VP Solomon states that members of the gallery cannot raise motions.

The Speaker notes that this is correct.

Councillor Kohler states that there is a mandate within the Policy to hold semesterly meetings with Jewish student groups and the Board of Governors and Senate. She asks how this process would work.



President Taylor answers that this could be done via Google Form, which would allow students to submit complaints to himself and VP Solomon, who could bring these concerns to the relevant bodies, without knowing the identity of the complainants. Technically, this would allow non-SSMU members to make complaints, but having the complaints heard is more important than determining whether or not the complainant is a SSMU member.

Member Stainsby asks why only examples of anti-semitism related to the Israel-Palestine conflict were cited, when many students experience anti-semitism outside the context of the conflict.

VP Solomon states that the Policy contains more examples in other sections. Section 3.3 A includes a page and a half of general guidelines, and states that all allegations must be taken seriously. Anti-semitism stemming from language, actions, and media, regardless of the Israel-Palestine conflict, should be considered. The use of slurs and stereotypical insults are anti-semitic, as are assaults on Jews or synagogues based on their relationship to Israel. Vandalism or professional anti-semitism are also included.

Member Milder asks for a Councillor to read out the letter in support of the Policy.

The Speaker answers that a Councillor can motion to read out the letter.

Councillor Kalaga motions to this effect. He asks for the Speaker to read it.

Councillor Zhao seconds this motion.

Seeing no opposition, Motion 12b is added to the agenda.

Member Rosenberg asks VP Solomon why the IHRA definition was discarded in this Policy rather than amended, and why he described it as overly broad. They note that this description set off alarm bells in the Jewish community and could cause strife among Jews.

VP Solomon answers that over 100 human rights organizations sent a letter to the US Secretary General with their concerns about the IHRA definition. Its lack of specificity, in the context of a university, is inappropriate. A film festival celebrating Palestinian culture was shut down because of threats from the city that had adopted the IHRA definition, claiming that it contravened it. There was a local Palestinian film festival recently that could have been shut down had the IHRA definition been brought up. Kenneth Stern, the author of the IHRA definition, stated that it should not be used on university campuses. Stern believes that, as a Zionist, anti-Zionists should have a space to speak, so long as their speech does not contravene any free speech laws.



<u>ssmu.ca</u> | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

As the letter has been received, the Speaker convenes the Steering Committee to review it before it is read.

The Speaker reads out the <u>letter</u>.

The Speaker entertains debate.

Member Sverko thanks VP Solomon for the guidelines; as a SSMU employee in the human rights file, they are helpful to guide the complaints process. They ask whether legal professionals were consulted in the drafting of this motion, and ask the Speaker to avoid allowing questions that have already been raised.

VP Solomon answers that they have received legal guidance in the past when dealing with similar subjects. If this Policy passes, the Board would decide whether or not to ratify it.

Councillor Engo motions to read out the letter against the Policy.

The Speaker asks if Councillor Engo is referring to the letter read out at the last meeting.

Councillor Engo answers that it has been updated. She can share the update with the Parliamentarian.

Councillor Kim seconds the motion to read the letter.

Councillor Kohler states that, since the letter was read for all Councillors at the last meeting, this may not be the best use of their time.

The Speaker asks Councillor Engo to send the letter to the Parliamentarian, that way, the Dais can determine whether it was substantially updated. She suggests not reading it again, as it was already read, but states that it can be shared.

Councillor Weissman states that the only update is more signatories on the letter.

A member clarifies that the letter is now a brief, and asks to read out this letter instead.

A member states that both letters should be read in the name of fairness.

The Speaker clarifies that they are voting on adding the motion to read the letter to the agenda.

The Speaker entertains a vote on the motion to read the letter against.



The motion passes, and the Speaker convenes the Steering Committee to review the letter.

A member clarifies that the only updates to the letter are the section numbering and the signatories.

The Speaker asks Councillor Engo if she would still like the letter to be read, considering that there are no substantive changes.

Councillor Engo answers that it is important to have both perspectives read out.

A member asks the Speaker to refuse to read the letter as it has already been read.

The Speaker calls for a 2-minute recess.

The Speaker states that the letter will not be read as it has not changed in substance. It is available in the minutes and was already read. As per Robert's Rules of Order, if a question has already been resolved in a previous meeting, it does not need to be readdressed. The Speaker would appreciate it if amendments on the motion were proposed.

A member asks for this decision to be noted in the minutes.

A member states that a suspension of the rules requires a <sup>2</sup>/<sub>3</sub> majority vote. They note that they did not receive a vote of <sup>2</sup>/<sub>3</sub> majority in favour of suspending the rules.

The Speaker states that the decision not to read the letter was made at her discretion.

Councillor Weissman makes an amendment to Motion 12a to remove parts of footnote 21, 22, 23, as well as footnotes 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, and 35.

VP Solomon states that these are friendly amendments. He proposes an amendment to remove part 3.3 C of the Policy.

Councillor Kohler asks VP Solomon if the section of the motion titled 'Alignment with Mission' could be clarified, as it only cites other policies and not the mission.

VP Solomon answers that this section of the motion was written as per the Anti-Oppression Framework of the SSMU, which has been adopted for many decades. It is also inline with the Equity Policy and Constitution. They are taking measures to address a nuanced situation that could result in harm to members if no measure is taken.



<u>ssmu.ca</u> | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

Member Epstein asks a Councillor to move an amendment on their behalf, to add a clause to section 3.3.

The Speaker asks Member Epstein to write down the amendment and share it with the Parliamentarian.

Councillor Crema Black asks to see the amendment written down.

Member Schleifer states that this Policy is important and the IHRA definition is more repressive than the Policy being proposed. It is important for humans not to live without hearing views from others, and they state that the IHRA definition is repressive because it narrows the definition of Jewish identity. This Policy does not limit Jewish identity.

Member Handlesman states that the McGill administration and SSMU overlook anti-semitism on campus. SSMU and its Council have the responsibility to pass a policy that addresses anti-semitism. This Policy reflects their views as a Jewish student and protects them from anti-semitic speech. They should reflect on the rationality of this Policy, and those who oppose it should propose amendments rather than critique it.

Councillor Kalaga asks if there is a way for Councillors to access an edited version of the motion to keep track of the amendments.

The Speaker states that they will link the copy being edited on to the agenda.

Member Mendelson states that, as a representative of MSS, they want to ensure that their students' voices are heard. The letter against the Policy was signed by 318 students, who think that the definition used was cherry picked from various other definitions, and does not acknowledge that criticism of Israel is anti-semitic. The consultations were misleading, and some Jewish student groups were not consulted. He asks for his time to be extended.

A member asks if it is not a breach of the rules of order to read from notes during a speech.

The Speaker states that as long as speaking time is limited to one minute, she will allow members to read from notes.

Member Mendelson asks for an extra minute to finish their thoughts.

The Speaker answers that a Councillor or Executive can extend Member Mendelson's speaking time.



Councillor Engo motions to extend the member's time.

Member Mendelson continues that if the Policy is passed, SSMU may risk a legal case. They ask for examples of the weaponization of anti-semitism, and share various perspectives from the MSS students. SSMU should work on bringing people together, rather than debating definitions.

Councillor Renaud suggests that points of orders are being used too liberally.

The Speaker reminds everyone that points of order are for procedural concerns.

Councillor Kumar asks for VP Solomon to share the documentation from his consultations in the name of transparency.

VP Solomon answers that on September 30, he received a response from Hillel. He also exchanged emails with Chabad around that time. He would be happy to share the dates and times of those responses. Other groups listed on the consultation section were emailed the same week. He is doing his best to ensure transparency and adequate consultation; presence at Legislative Council meetings is a form of consultation, as is meeting with groups and reading their letters. He is happy to provide any information necessary so that they can move on to amendments and voting.

Councillor Zhao motions to suspend the rules to add Motion 12c.

VP Solomon seconds this motion.

The Speaker entertains a vote on adding Motion 12c to the agenda.

Motion 12c is added to the agenda.

The Speaker asks VP Solomon to send the relevant documentation to the Parliamentarian to add to the agenda.

VP Solomon asks what he should send.

Councillor Zhao answers that the minutes should be shared.

VP Solomon asks if the emails would work.

Councillor Zhao answers yes.



Councillor Weissman motions to set the adjournment time to 21:00.

VP Jolicoeur seconds.

Seeing no opposition, the adjournment time is set to 21:00.

Councillor Engo states that the letter signed against the Policy received six times the number of signatures, which is an important consideration. She asks VP Solomon why so many more Jewish students are against a motion designed to protect them.

VP Solomon answers that he does not know if there is a discrepancy between the sharing of each letter. This is a bad sample size, and he believes that one letter was open for signatures for twice or three times as long as the other. So, it is not a good idea to try to draw conclusions from potentially skewed data. It is valuable to hear this information, and there are many reasons that someone would oppose a Policy.

Councillor Engo states that she surveyed the Jewish students in the faculties of Medicine and Dentistry, with Councillor Kim. 95% of students they surveyed were not in favour of the motion.

A member asks for the Speaker to call on everyone once before they speak again.

Member Maitlis states that many students are afraid to sign onto a letter out of fear of being doxxed. This Policy would combat this fear of being doxxed from both students and McGill administration. This Policy protects anti-Zionist Jews, who have been harassed on campus. They want to be able to express their views on campus, and without this Policy, that would not be possible. The Policy helps both Zionist and anti-Zionist Jews, and does not alienate anyone, as the IHRA definition does.

Member Gat states that if there was an issue regarding one's ability to express their views, the IHRA definition of anti-semitism could have been amended, rather than create a new definition.

VP Berglas states that the definition has expired and can no longer be amended.

Councillor Weissman motions to call the question.

Councillor Kumar seconds.

A member states that there was an amendment proposed.

Parliamentarian Bakar clarifies that this amendment was never moved.



The Speaker suggests displaying the amendments for Councillors to read, to see if anyone wishes to move it.

Member Epstein states that all amendments on the document should be moved.

VP Solomon asks what the procedure for voting by secret ballot is.

Parliamentarian Bakar answers that this is how they usually vote.

The Speaker adds that they vote by Google Form, and it can be anonymized.

Councillor Renaud asks what the difference between a regular and secret ballot is.

The Speaker answers that they usually collect email addresses when voting, but for a secret ballot they can turn this option off.

Councillor Renaud asks if the results will be published.

The Speaker answers yes, but it will not say who voted which way.

Member Stainsby asks, if this policy does not pass, what policy at SSMU protects Jewish students.

The Speaker answers that if the Policy does not pass, there is nothing in its place.

Councillor Crema Black answers that if the Policy does not pass, they can propose another Policy to protect Jewish students. The Policy was not approved at the last meeting because the Council was not able to come to an agreement on it, but they are working on that tonight.

The Speaker states that if there is no Councillor wishing to move Member Epstein's amendments, she will entertain the motion to call the question. She asks members to refrain from cross talk.

VP Berglas moves the amendment.

Councillor Kalaga seconds the amendment.

Parliamentarian Bakar asks where the amendment is going.

Member Epstein answers that it is going to the end of the definition section, right before the context section, on the top of page 13.



<u>ssmu.ca</u> | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

Councillor Kim states that he enquired with MSS and DSS students about this motion. He notes that he got a lot of opinions against this motion. He asks VP Solomon if he would be willing to consult the MMDJSA (McGill Medical & Dentistry Jewish Students' Association) to make amendments on the Policy.

VP Solomon answers that it would have been great to receive amendments two weeks ago, and states that further amendments can be proposed now.

VP Solomon states that this amendment is not in the right part of the document; it discusses systemic anti-semitism rather than examples of it.

Member Epstein states that the amendment should begin with 'or.' It should be separated from the examples of anti-semitism in the context of the Israel-Palestine conflict because it concerns systemic examples of anti-semitism in Canada. A separate heading could be added if seen fit.

VP Solomon suggests adding this to the general guidelines section.

Member Epstein answers that this amendment is supposed to be definitional yet an addition to the examples. The amendment should be part of the SSMU definition of anti-semitism, yet placed in its own section to avoid confusion with other sections.

VP Solomon proposes amending the Equity Policy to prevent confusion with this document.

Member Epstein believes that, since this amendment is contextualizing anti-semitism, it belongs in this Policy.

VP Berglas moves this amendment to the end of Section 1.

A member asks to shut the doors given the noise outside.

VP Solomon states that this amendment is not friendly.

The Speaker entertains a vote on the amendment.

A member asks if the amendment should be debated.

The Speaker answers that the amendment has already been debated.

The amendment is approved.



Councillor Weissman motions to call the question.

VP Solomon seconds and suggests voting by secret ballot.

A member asks for the Speaker to read out the amendment.

The Speaker reads it out.

Councillor Kalaga asks if the first two amendments suggested by the member were moved.

The Speaker answers that they were not.

Councillor Bongiovanni asks if the first two amendments were moved.

The Speaker answers no.

Councillor Bongiovanni asks if they are voting on whether or not to call the question now.

The Speaker answers yes. If the motion to call the question is approved, they will vote, otherwise, they will continue debate on Motion 12a.

Councillor Bongiovanni asks, if the motion to call the question does not pass, if the proposed amendments could be brought up once again.

The Speaker answers yes.

The Speaker entertains a vote on whether or not to call the question on Motion 12a.

With 7 in favour, and 8 opposed, the motion to call the question fails.

The Speaker resumes debate.

Councillor Kalaga moves the amendments suggested by Member Epstein.

VP Solomon states that these amendments are not friendly.

Councillor Crema Black seconds the amendments.

The Speaker entertains debate on the amendments.



ssmu.ca | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

VP Solomon states that they have a definitional framework for SSMU, and they already respect all federal, provincial and municipal laws. They do not need to refer to an external body when it comes to protecting students. Having this amendment included in the Policy would allow this external body's opinion to supersede SSMU's governing documents, which is dangerous. They should not abdicate their responsibility by referring to a body that does not know the needs of their community. This amendment is a dangerous attempt to circumvent the whole policy.

Member Hamilton states that the Canadian Special Envoy to Combat Anti-Semitism adopted the IHRA definition of anti-semitism, the weaknesses of which have been laid out. This definition would limit the freedom of speech of anti-Zionists. The CSECAS is not Jewish right now.

Member Magrill states that claims that this motion is representative and respectful of the entire Jewish community is not representative of the majority of the Jewish community's sentiments, as demonstrated by the signatures on the letter against this Policy.

The Speaker reminds everyone that they are debating the amendment right now. Once the amendment is voted on, they will return to debate on the motion.

Councillor Weissman motions to extend the time of adjournment to 21:10.

Councillor Zhao seconds.

Seeing no opposition, the adjournment time is set to 21:10.

Member Ortega states that the amendment would adopt the IHRA definition of anti-semitism, which curtails many members' free speech. The current motion, without amendments, does not curtail the free speech of those who object to it. Zionist students face no consequences with the motion as is, but if they are added, anti-Zionist Jews will face repercussions. The motion as it is already a compromise, as it treats all Jewish students equally. They urge the Council to vote on the motion without the amendments.

VP Zahidah states that this amendment effectively adopts the IHRA definition of anti-semitism. She hopes this is clearly understood by voting members, because it changes the motion being presented. She adds that this policy does not limit what is considered anti-semitism, but defines it in order to protect all Jewish students, anti-Zionists and Zionists alike. Clarifying the differences between political discourse and anti-semitism is a good thing for everyone on campus.

A member states that the motion as is is not a compromise, as most Jewish student groups on campus are opposed to it.



Member Marcus states that this Policy does not curtail anyone's free speech, and they urge the Council to vote on it.

VP Solomon motions to call the question on the amendment.

Councillor Kalaga seconds this motion.

President Taylor states that the first amendment is paradoxical because it has an 'or' clause.

Parliamentarian Bakar states that the amendments have not yet been put into the motion.

The Speaker asks where the amendments should go.

Member Epstein states that the amendments are 'or' clauses, and define anti-semitism as anything adopted by the Special Envoy, the courts, or the definition from the motion. The other amendments are more procedural and there is an action item urging the President to have an informal body to receive reports of anti-semitism.

The Speaker asks the member to clarify which sections of the motion the amendments should be placed in.

Councillor Kalaga motions to recess for 2 minutes.

The Speaker entertains a 2-minute recess.

The meeting resumes at 21:09.

Councillor Weissman motions to set the adjournment time to 21:20.

Councillor Zhao seconds.

Seeing no opposition, the adjournment time is set to 21:20.

The Speaker notes that the first amendment proposed makes the whole motion inactionable.

Member Nashen states that she is the Vice-President of the Jewish Law Students' Association. Members of her constituency and the Jewish community at McGill feel that this Policy does not protect them against anti-semitism. There have been guidelines set out to properly criticize Israel. Demonizing, delegitimization, and double standards are anti-semitic.



<u>ssmu.ca</u> | (514) 398-6800 | 3600 rue McTavish, Suite 1200, Montréal, QC, H3A 0G3

A member states that the question was already called.

Councillor Weissman motions to call the question on the amendment.

Councillor Renaud seconds.

The Speaker clarifies that they are voting on amendments 1 and 2 because they were moved at the same time. She entertains a vote on the amendment.

The amendment fails.

VP Solomon motions to call the question and vote by secret ballot.

Councillor Weissman seconds.

Councillor Islam states that voting members should vote as their constituents feel, rather than how groups implicated with the Policy feel. They will vote to represent the ASUS students, and suggest that other Councillors do the same.

The Speaker entertains a vote. She states that the voting form is in the Councillor Voting Directions document for this meeting, and entertains a 2-minute voting period. If anyone has issues with the form, they should consult the Speaker or the Parliamentarian.

With 10 in favour, 10 opposed, and 1 abstention, Motion 12a is not approved.

- b. Motion to read the letter in support of item 12a (Councillor Kalaga) APPROVED
- c. <u>Motion for VP Solomon to provide the emails from his consultations and for them to be</u> <u>added to the agenda</u> (Councillor Zhao) - **APPROVED**
- 13. Notices of Motion
- 14. For Discussion
- 15. Adjournment: **21:27**

The Speaker declares the meeting adjourned at 21:27.