



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Meeting Minutes of the Legislative Council

November 3, 2011

1) Call to Order 6:14 pm

3) Adoption of the Agenda

The motion was passed to adopt the agenda.

4) Approval of the Minutes

Councillor Bi made a motion to amend the minutes on page ten to strike Vice-President Pedneault's statement and the QPIRG representative's response. Councillor Bi expressed that she was not comfortable with the views expressed. President Knight said that everything said in open session is on the record and everyone is accountable for what is said.

The minutes were approved without amendment.

5) Report of the Steering Committee

President Knight said that the Steering Committee met on Monday, and was happy to welcome Councillor Lessard. They reviewed the agenda and stood for issues, but stood for questions.

Councillor Chaini said that the IGC Committee added a Councillor, and this has to be added to the agenda for that member to be included officially. Councillor Paterson has stepped down from IGC and Councillor Winer is the interim IGC Committee member. There will be more elections at the next Council so President Knight said that election will take place then.

6) Guest Speakers

6a. Lev Bukhman, ASEQ Representative

Mr. Bukhman said thanks for inviting him here. He is the founder and executive director of the Quebec Student Health Alliance, with Britany they are here to talk about the largest and arguably most important service to SSMU. This presentation is for Councillors to give students information about the plan and will discuss the history, the evolution, ASEQ at a glance, and the SSMU plan highlights. He will be answering questions about what the SSMU health and dental plan is and why it exists. It is a health care program which exists to pay for expenses not covered by government health care. The government program is not complete and necessitates having some plan for things not paid for by the government. The SSMU plan is paid for and funded for SSMU members under a student mandate and funded entirely by students. There are no subsidies from government or other organizations. Why should this plan be provided by SSMU for its members? Why is this covered for all students in the first instance and why should they have to opt-out? One of the most important points about why the structure exists as a group plan that people can opt-out-of rather than opt-into as individuals is that the current cost of the SSMU plan is \$195 per students per year, and international students are covered under the plan. The alternative if there was not a SSMU health and dental plan for students would be to buy individual insurance or buy no health coverage at all. The Blue Cross website's quote system was shown as an example of how much this coverage would cost for individuals. Using the no-obligation quote system, the cost of an individual plan was specified for a Quebec resident who is single, a student, female, 22 years old, and the approximately the same coverage as the SSMU plan. An individual plan with Blue Cross for that student would be \$1300/year, a cost which is arguably out of the reach of the costs of students. After receiving the quote, the student would have to apply. There is a long questionnaire about health costs previously incurred by the applicant. This health plan shows the problem in the US where if you



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

are not on a group plan, you cannot have health insurance at all. The group plan from SSMU offers coverage to everybody without requiring application or medical questionnaires and people who need the plan the most are not excluded from the coverage. That is the rationale and motivation for this plan when it was instituted 17 years ago. The motivation is that in absence of a group plan like this, students would have to buy individual care and those with the greatest need would not have any coverage at all. The nature of the individual plan is the problem, though Blue Cross is a not-for-profit insurer. This plan was created by a referendum of students. In 1997, dental was added and in 2005 the costs was adjusted regarding coverage and plan fee. This was refreshed and mandated by students. The economics of the plan also suggest the proverbial question: should we have a plan that costs a little and covers a little or costs a lot and covers a lot? Today the plan is in a good spot. It is 19 years old and integrated at McGill. There is a high level of awareness of the plan for students. The feedback is that the plan is important consistently and is used by thousands of students every year. It is functioning every day. About ASEQ, it was founded by Lev in 1996, and SSMU was one of its founding partner schools, founded with the express purpose of administering health plans for university students. Mr. Bukhman is extremely proud of ASEQ's SSMU and McGill partnership. Very proud that SSMU was volunteer for the ASEQ experiment which was very successful—now 55,000 students across Canada are served by ASEQ. ASEQ is proud of roots here. The ASEQ is not an insurance company, but is hired by SSMU and works as consultant and advisor in negotiations with the insurance company, and also handle administration and service of the plan for students. There are many thousands of visits and calls from students. The ASEQ service is meant to be one-stop solution to diminish burden on SSMU about answering questions and feedback on service is always welcomed. If there's a problem it very quickly ripples through community, and it is very important to provide a high level of service.

Brittany said that with Vice-President Patel, there is a lot of discussion about how to help students. There have been a lot of changes to the plan since 2005 to create long-term stability in the plan so that SSMU could set up some reserves. SSMU has decided to increase coverage for the plan since 2005. Also, some coverage has been added on the dental side of the plan, and vaccines as well. Since 2005, the numbers indicate stable increases in claims in the plan and want to put the plan in question again for students through a referendum. They will be looking for SSMU to have a referendum in the winter to talk about the plan more. Top categories of prescription drugs are oral contraceptives, unclassified therapeutic agents (tend to be expensive and target very specific treatments like multiple sclerosis, arthritis, and some cancers), antidepressants, and vaccines.

Questions:

Councillor Khan asked about tuition coverage in the case of a prolonged medical absence from school. Mr. Bukhman replied that if student has to withdraw from the University because of medical reasons, the student covered for \$10,000 of tuition and \$1,000 for textbooks. He furthered that when ASEQ was first founded, students to save money with provider networks: dentist, chiropractors, and doctors reduce their services for students, from coast to coast. There is a goggle maps search tool on the ASEQ, so the location of providers can be very easy to find. 50-60% of SSMU members utilize the networks. For example, dental preventative services were covered. In this case, students are providing \$0 out of pocket based on network coverage. Plan coverage paid for by insurance company from the premiums. The network coverage is coming for free from the dentist. Students can find information about the website from ihaveaplan.ca, and can find out how much is covered, how to submit claims, and find out where ASEQ is located. Claims can be dropped off at ASEQ's office, 1134 St. Catherine. Their toll-free number is 1-866-795-435.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Vice-President Clare said that she understood SSMU benefits were increased, but asked whether that was a result of rising expectations or rising demands.

Mr. Bukhman said that in all cases the job of ASEQ is to maximize the value for SSMU in negotiation for insurance coverage. The total cost of the plan is based on the claims. When there is lower coverage, there are lower claims, and the plan is at a lower cost. Higher claims and higher coverage means higher costs. There in the year of 2006-2007, a choice was made to increase the cost, and another choice can be made soon between decreasing cost of plan or increasing coverage. There was a wish-list of coverage based on information from students and there would have been a range of options about what kind of coverage to provide. Options are put to the SSMU Executive and the decision was made to increase the coverage. In 2008-2009 the plan was fully funded in terms of coverage, and this has continued until this year. There has been a slow, normal increase in claims. Every year there is an increase in claims of 2-5%. Every year the dental association of Quebec increases their fee by 2-5%. Therefore, even if the same number of students got the same number of appointments from year to year, the cost of the plan will increase. Over five years that is 20%. This slide illustrates that there was a package and fee for students, and the coverage was increased above what was proved by referendum. Now, however, seven years after referendum the compounded inflation is fully used up. ASEQ is agnostic about it, but SSMU should consider making changes this year, reducing the coverage or raise the price of the coverage.

Vice-President Clare said this might seem like an obvious question but asked if allowing more services to be covered means more people will use the service.

Mr. Bukhman said that's right. With vision care increased, that will add a couple hundred thousand students who use the plan.

Councillor Kunev asked if Mr. Bukhman could talk about looking at other insurance companies. Currently, ASEQ works with Sunlife.

Mr. Bukhman said that ASEQ doesn't work for Sunlife, and Sunlife are just the suppliers of the plan. Over the history of the plan, ASEQ, with SSMU, has gone through about four insurance companies. Right now ASEQ works with four different insurance companies across the country—they work with whatever company offers the best deal for students. The insurance companies are considered in terms of the short term, and in the long-term based on fundamental costs. Claims on the plan account for 90% of insurance claims made on the plan. Their share of the cost is small. They are thinking in the long term always, making sure that SSMU is ahead of the curve. There is flexibility in adjusting the fee because student fees passed by referendum. Needs are almost infinite but resources are limited. If maximize for one year, will be caught short after two years. The SSMU plan today is in a very good place compared to where they were in 2005—there is 25% more coverage than provided by referendum. There is a structure to build up reserves for the plan and that has been a successful strategy for SSMU for the last 7 years. The question is whether coverage should be reduced or fee should match coverage. There will be a choice made later on in the year.

Councillor Hernandez said that he is on the swim team. Only 20 physical therapy sessions per year are covered in the plan. A lot of people on the swim team go to physical therapy twice a week. Is there an additional plan for athletes that could be supplement?

Mr. Bukhman said the cost of the plan would make it uneconomical. That would be an opt-in type of plan and a plan that would cover 50 sessions would have to cover anticipated cost incurred. That kind of coverage never actually works. Athletics students are major stakeholders in the program and that should be made in the decision-making process. That kind of question has to be considered when the fee is



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

being reconsidered. For other people, dental or drugs are more important. The decision should be made by all stakeholders for a balanced decision.

Councillor Kourilova said that undergraduates and PGSS accepted an increase in the cost of health services. However, there were diverging interests in undergraduate and graduate level. What accounts for these differences and is there a difference in the PGSS and undergraduate plan?

Mr. Bukhman said that he is referring to student services fee for health services which is different from ASEQ's plan. The fee was for McGill health services, and ASEQ will cover all of the services not offered by McGill health services. Their operations are supplanted by a student fee. There are various campus committees that oversee the increase of that fee but it is not ASEQ.

Councillor Burnett asked whether, in the situation where large for-profit companies provide students with services, would those companies have an undue incentive to interfere in the processes of those student unions? Mr. Bukhman asked for clarification. He clarified that it makes sense for a company to provide a service to student unions and might want to influence their internal policies. President Knight rephrased in another way: considering the possibility that SSMU might say that they are moving to another company, does that create an incentive for those companies to meddle in the internal affairs of that union?

Mr. Bukhman was still unsure of exactly what the question was asking and said that he would be happy to answer a more direct question. The entirety of their work is working entirely with student associations across Canada. He said that ASEQ is very familiar with the nuances with the student organizations that it functions with and their field is one which reputation is pretty important. The reputation of ASEQ is wholly unblemished in terms of track record and history—ASEQ would not dream of interfering in politics of the association. ASEQ has a set of ethics and values that are always practiced and its track record is unblemished

7) Announcements

President Knight said that if Councillors have not sent your office hours to secgen@ssmu.ca, they should do that. There is a Strategic Summit coming up in clubs lounge about student space on campus on November 18th from 12-5pm. Next weekend, on Sunday, November 10th, McGill is hosting the Canadian women's soccer championships.

Senator Paterson said Tuesday November 8th from 6-9pm, Education will be screening the movie *Waiting for Superman*.

Councillor Stettin said that the referendum will be open for voting between November 4th and 10th and we should make sure that everybody knows about it because QPIRG and CKUT's existence depend on these questions. There will be a teach-in about tuition hikes at the Y intersection.

Vice-President Clare said that Senate Caucus is compiling as much data as possible about how the strike is affecting students in the long-term. If anyone has information or knowledge, please send it to the survey. If you are interested in contacting services directly in help please let her know.

Councillor Clarke said that this month is Movember. The law faculty is raising awareness about prostate cancer—please donate to the cause.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Councillor Uribe-Arango said that Halloween party on Monday. He did not see any SSMU Execs, even though they were all invited. There will be a wine and cheese next Thursday in Douglas at 7pm.

Councillor Burnett said that the AUS is holding its first general assembly at 5pm on Tuesday November 8th in the SSMU cafeteria. Please come if you are in AUS. Also, the GSDFFSA is holding a mixer for small arts program to talk about what's going on in terms of funding and academic issues in Gerts from 7-10pm on November 11th.

Councillor Hernandez seconded the point about soccer and Sunday RSVQ rugby championship.

Vice-President Plummer said that next week is the Quidditch World Cup is happening in New York and McGill is currently ranked the best team in Canada

Councillor Kunev said that engineering competition on Wednesday and will be participation himself. On November 16th, come in the afternoon in the Trottier building. Engineers design race cars and other structures in competition.

Vice-President Pedneault said that the November 10th demonstration is happening next week and leaving Roddick gates at 2pm. The March will be leaving from UQAM and will be marching back to the Roddick gates where the march will end. There will be over 100,000 students on strike that day across the province which is 1/3 of all Quebec CGEPs and Universities.

Vice-President Fraser said that the advanced room bookings are now taking place and thanks for all submissions. They will be getting back to them within two weekendd. Make sure everybody votes starting tomorrow.

Councillor Jean-Claude said that discussion will be happening on refugees right on Wednesday, November 9th at 3:30 pm by Social Work.

TedX McGill is sold out, but there will be registration online starting tomorrow for additional space for students to see a live broadcast. There will be 400 tickets available for students to watch from the McIntyre building.

The Redpath Museum flashlight tours will be taking place every hour on the hour starting at 11pm and running until 2am (there are 2 because it's daylight savings time). It was really popular last year and he expects that it will be popular again this year. This is an event run jointly by the SSMU and the Community Engagement Committee.

Vice-President Fraser made a motion to move question period till after the motion regarding the approval of SSMU's financial statements and suspend the rules to amend the agenda to move question period to after 9)a.

8) New Business

8a. Motion Regarding Approval of SSMU's Financial Statements

Luciana Ierfino of Richter-Chamberland made the presentation. Richter-Chamberland has been in charge of the audit two years in a row, and Ms. Ierfino has been involved in the project each year. She is in charge of the independent auditors' report. The responsibility of Richter-Chamberland is to make sure that in the financial statements and in recording process, there are no misstatements. The audit was very efficient and



easy and things always given on timely basis. The audit engagement is to reach a conclusion about whether the statements were reasonable and whether there are errors in the statements. There is a test on sample bias about higher risk and areas where there might be errors based on qualified opinion. Ms. Ierfino also pointed out that these statements did not highlight SSMU daycare/nursery because the value added of providing this information would not be great. Financial statements are fair and no material errors. On page 4 of financial statements, there is a statement of operations. Overall revenues decreased by 40,000 which represents a 5% decrease. There was a net increase of \$18,000 which is a 3% increase. Operations were fairly consistent from the prior year. Revenues increased by \$25,000 because of changes in coat check, pricing strategy and expenses on new events increased as well and security increased also because of larger crowds. There is a related expense until December 2011. The food and beverages revenue went down because less students were using services of SSMU. A 60% increase and interest revenue increased because of larger cash balance. Salary expense went down and events increased because of Faculty Olympics, Homecoming, and Frosh increases. Publication revenues decreased by \$88,000, a 40% decrease from prior years because the Tribune is now a separate entity. This is due to student fees for TVMcGill and in Book Bazaar also. In the statement of operations there has been a mortization of property which is an accounting concept, not representing cash outflow. For the investment line there is an evaluation of assets including bonds and shares to increase in share value to adjust amounts paid as of May 31, 2011.

Page 5 indicates that shares for public corporation larger and market not doing so well. Two box certificates cost 1.2 and others 1.4. Investments can drop as much as the shares. Page 3 of the financial statements shows the balance sheet as of May 31, 2011. This is pretty much consistent with prior years. Significant variance for cash is 3.3 million last year compared to 3.6 million this year. As part of the 3.3 million there is \$212,000 restricted for internal SSMU clubs. Prepaid 32,000 increase because SSMU changed their supplier and this was a positive gain. On page 11 item 6 there was a decrease due to the mortization but there was a change to the equipment purchased for \$9,000 including furniture and computers. There is further information in the section outlining cash flows. Again, this is pretty much consistent to prior years. Ms. Ierfino went through the numbers of financial statements, and accounting policies by McGill. Revenue recognition for accounting. She also wanted to highlight note 3 and next year's financial statements. There will be a new fiscal period effective January 1, 2012, and there may be changes for non-profit organizations that would affect the SSMU. Interim fund transfers, and capital disclosures would be changed. On page 14, the statement of operating budget versus funds would be different.

Questions

Councillor Bi asked to clarify what taxes SSMU pays and where it's embedded in these statements. Ms. Ierfino said that because the SSMU is a Not-For-Profit incorporation, no federal or provincial income taxes are paid by the SSMU.

Vice-President Patel said that note 3 mentioned in shift in accounting standards from gap to IFRS-he asked how the SSMU will be impacted and what are your recommendations?

Ms. Ierfino said that the IFRS are new standards for not-for-profit companies. If there are any significant changes there will be full disclosure of those changes. There won't be significant changes in operation of new standards versus current standards.

The motion to adopt the 2010-2011 statements clearly passed.

9) Question Period



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Councillor Paterson asked how room allocations going for this semester and how are allocations being done for groups. What happens if groups are not making the most of the space they are allotted on a weekly basis. Asked if there are any internal policies seeing that clubs being granted rooms are using the room to their greatest advantage (especially when there is high demand), for example, having a small meeting in a large room.

Vice-President Fraser said that clubs are limited to 10 hours per week. Another thing is that there are so many bookings at once, so groups are approved if they get first priority as clubs, services, or ISGs. Mary Yang, the receptionist, asks Vice-President Fraser about specific room bookings that have to do with case-by-case calls. She does not check on groups and since the strike she has made it clear that there are weekly office hours and groups should consider very carefully how they use space. She encouraged groups to keep that in mind when they book rooms.

Councillor Bi asked that elaborate on the decision to give Radical Frosh \$4,050 from the Campus Life Fund and offering free rental of SSMU building.

Vice-President Patel said that SSMU has a mandate to support student groups above and beyond all other groups. About Radical Frosh, he was on vacation but full confidence in the decision that was made by the Executive. Historically, Radical Frosh has been given money from the Campus Life Fund like any other group and is given the same considerations as any other group on campus.

Councillor Bi said that the Campus Life Fund is not a fee that students opt into, and is wondering why Radical Frosh was granted more money than they asked for.

Vice-President Pedneault said that the reason why \$4,050 was given is because that is the amount that they needed to break even. They had asked for \$5000. It is not unusual for them to apply and get what they ask for. He remembers asking the Executive that they be granted \$4,050. President Knight said this was already ratified by Council and was approved from the summer.

Councillor Kunev asked how many clubs have been contacted about their name change

Vice-President Fraser said maybe 50-60 clubs have been contacted, but she does not want to give inaccurate figure. There are more to go.

Councillor Latham said that on behalf of a management student, he was asked to pose a question. Why did SSMU donate money to MUNACA?

Vice-President Pedneault said that SSMU has never given a check to MUNACA. Students decided to print their own t-shirts and \$200 money was subsidized from campaigns budget so that they could be sold for \$8. They were on sale at the SSMU front desk. He got an e-mail from a student which was unhappy and responded saying that it was their mandate to support this union and the strike.

Councillor Latham asked him to specify where that subsidy came from

Vice-President Pedneault said that the money came out of the campaigns budget under his portfolio under the clothing line.

Councillor Khan said regarding the name change, what was done to the university to advocate for the use of the McGill name?

Chair Tong said that any questions of that nature should wait until the discussion on the MOA.

Councillor Burnett said he has been approached by a number of constituents about the limited information to that is being given to students about the strike and what is being negotiated, and what the dispute is over.

Councillor Stettin said at the last Council meeting it was supposed to be his responsibility to send out a letter to undergrads about the strike. He failed to do that and apologized.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

President Knight said that Vice-President Pedneault and Councillor Stettin's comments came her way and she has been looking over them so that the letter can be sent out. She is making sure not to empty rhetoric. Other feedback has not been received.

Vice-President Pedneault said that he is trying to find every link to every statement that's been made and incorporate as much as possible into the statement .

Councillor Paterson said that Councillor Kunev earlier didn't necessarily want to know how many clubs had been contacted, but she would like at some point in the evening for her to compile that list at some point this evening so that the number of groups who have to change their name is recorded in a public forum. If two clubs were to book the same space at the same time and both the same group type, for example, two IGCs, how would preference be chosen among those groups?

Vice-President Fraser said that there is the ad hoc interest group committee to handle those issues. About club names, she will get Councillor Paterson the information tonight. Council already has the list. It is a little less than half of the groups on that list that will have to change their names. Councillor Paterson said that she would count the number of groups that have to change their names. [She later reported the count at 132 groups, including all categories of clubs, services, and affiliated groups as outlined on the MOA document].

A Councillor addressed a question to anyone from the faculty of management, and asked what is being done to recover 10,000 that Casco is missing and lack of funding in events.

Councillor Latham said that Casco is a philanthropic event and every year the money raised goes to Children's Hospital. They are falling short this year and there will be smaller donation than they would have liked because of changes in structure of Management leadership. There is now a centralized corporate relations team, whereas before there was a corporate relations manager from each club. There have been a few issues in terms of learning curve which board of directors looking at. Casco will be holding additional events after the event is run to add additional sponsorship and is hoping to make up for all the shortfalls. Councillor Koulova said that there has been a lack of communication with corporate relations team. The committee is going to provide a detailed report, look into the issue and hopefully resolve it. The team hopes to clarify how the board of director of directors committee which speaks to the corporate relations team is free.

Knight move the board of directors meeting from 10a-10d

10) New Business

10a. Discussion Regarding SSMU – McGill MOA and Lease

Members of the gallery held up "We Are All McGill" signs which President Knight asked that they hold up higher, and said they made her so sad. The lease expired on May 31st. The main issue they have been fighting with McGill about has been about the McGill name. President Knight believes that the Vice-President clubs and services was open with the student body with what is happening in writing as clearly as possible. Executives are speaking in that capacity as McGill students and not as McGill, but Executives are the ones to disseminate this information. Because there is no signature on the MOA, the SSMU is currently squatting in this building. This has been the major issue in negotiations and document preparations, etc. McGill has made it very clear that they are making decisions. The Council will be voting on whether SSMU should sign the MOA in confidential session, and wanted time for questions to be asked.

Chair Tong said that this open session is meant more for the gallery to be involved in the discussion. He will entertain one question from a Councillor and the next from a gallery member and will alternate as such.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Vice-President Fraser said that a document was handed out to the gallery about this. Everything said there was handed out at an earlier date. It will be given to the press tomorrow. This is an official statement up to this point about signing the document. President Knight and Vice-President Clare have been negotiating. It's been a really long struggle for McGill to understand. There were many, many arguments with McGill. Sometimes they listen, sometimes they refuse to listen. In terms of what has been done to consult with groups, it is unfortunate that a lot of groups could not be consulted with in the summer. TVMcGill and McGill outdoors club were discussed this, and a lot of the name change issues are similar between groups. Chapters of other organizations at McGill use the McGill name in a certain way. In the MOA, the University wants to change the names of those groups to "McGill students for..." e.g. Oxfam/Unicef. For the past two years they refused to let students to use the McGill name at all. It has been significant that they have agreed to the terminology "McGill Student". The points that McGill made in the case of chapter groups were that if these groups are fundraising, McGill does not want them to be confused with parts of the university that may also be asking for funds. In terms of legal liability, they don't want to be sued for the wrong reason. The University wants to be clear that groups are affiliated with student society and not university itself. Keeping things consistent as possible is important—chapters of external organizations, athletics, outside clubs, and services are different but they said that they want names to be consistent among student groups. Now she is contacting all different groups. It was agreed upon in negotiations that since the SSMU was unable to consult with student groups right away about being able to negotiate about the McGill names that could be chosen e.g. McGill Student Nightline, Nightline, and others (instead of McGill Nightline). President Knight said that McGill Undergraduate Cancer Research Fund is another organization whose name they wanted to change. McGill Students' Society for Cancer Research was offered, and there were a few other options. Now, Vice-President Fraser has been sending e-mails individually to all student groups affected. The email that she sent to everybody was Appendix A of the MOA containing all of the offered name changes. She said that e-mail will outline how groups cannot use the McGill crest, emblem, font, and what their group name will have to be. That is for groups that already existed. If groups want to use the McGill name, this outlines the MOA as it has been negotiated and outlines how new groups can use the name. It is an unfortunate situation as a result of a lot of negotiations and the university that is really concerned about their liability and reputation. Thanks to Vice-President Clare and President Knight for participating in the process of negotiation. Vice-President Clare said that we will be probably talking about this for hours. If anyone would like to discuss this issue further outside the session, please make an appointment. If a group of you want to come to any office, the discussion doesn't have to stop here. This is being consideration that the vote will be tonight, but we have to discuss.

Chair Tong entertained a 15 minute question/statement period:

Councillor Khan said that he sees what is happening is the McGill is not realizing that students are an integral part of their university. The administration thinks that they can do anything they want to us in terms of threatening us in terms of memorandum of agreement. He would urge all student societies to get together and make the university realize that it is not just the administration that is McGill, but we are all McGill.

Chair Tong said that each speaker will get one minute. Gallery members, please say your name, faculty, and year

Joshua Redel is in software engineering and was the engineering society president. He said that that engineers are not ok with this. EUS will be negotiating with the university soon, and Joshua urged the Council to bear in mind the rest of the faculty and school Student Societies on campus. McGill has already asked engineers to



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

change their names to some of their organizations, that run events not only in the city, but in the nation and around the world. McGill's rationale about the use of their name makes sense in a corporation but, we are in a university they want to try to protect to brand but we are their brand! This Council must not give into their pressure tactics about lease of the building. Not just for logo, not just for names of clubs, but faculty associations and any battle in the future. Finally, this isn't meant to be attacking on students themselves. We think that as students we can go to the province of Quebec to fight tuition increases but we are afraid to fight our own university. We need to bring it closer to home sometimes.

Councillor Paterson finished her tally of clubs affected. Her count is 132, and given the document forwarded earlier there are 51 in group one (non-external groups), 61 in group two, 3 in sports, 9 in services in media, and 11 in the last category.

Vice-President Fraser said that she has contacted all of category one and most of category two groups. There remains 20-30 groups to be contacted which she will contact tomorrow.

Vice-President Pedneault said that the perspective that he has developed not to information about the specifics of the negotiation but systemic perspective to understand financial list of separate bodies. They usually get a negotiation and how they instrumentalise SSMU and the people they work in them. Executives have worked really hard to understand what this is about. They have been pouring so much effort into this. The university doesn't have the work that they usually have to do because of SSMU services and clubs. They pass off the work they have to do to the Society. It has been difficult for Vice-President Fraser, Vice-President Clare, and others put so much into this. Thinks that what he has seen with the University and the negotiation process is that the University has consistently just said no. When lawyers was brought to the table and General Manger Gervais was at the table, to use Josh Abaki's expression, we were able to put a knife in the chinks of the brick wall in the university. Some groups can get the McGill name but some can't. The "negotiation means no" approach is the same with MUNACA and AGSEM right now. McGill's thing has been "no, next point." This has to do with the fact that the university wants to develop its brand. This is a really difficult situation where without signing an MOA we could be in trouble.

Mark Kojima in U4 computer engineering represents some of the clubs on campus. These clubs are all part of community, clubs and services bring a lot to the University's recruitment stance, and they brag about what clubs and services have to offer. Pictures of student events are shown on promotional material. These clubs promote cultural belonging, political, environmental, humanitarian causes. These clubs are all part of the McGill brand helping McGill build this brand. He refused to believe that 132 clubs are a liability to this university. It is a positive to its reputation and Council should take that into consideration when they vote. He said he truly appreciates the number of hours that the executives have put into this document but council does not have to accept it.

Councillor Stettin said that this should not be about whether or not we're scared about not signing the MOA. He was very heartened by the fact that so many people showed up. That shows two things—the solidarity between students and that we do not need to sign this. The entire university can come together to fight

The Vice-President Finance of EUS said that he fully respects the negotiations, he asked who was at the table with her and did you try to bring it further than the Deputy Provost?

Vice-President Clare said that in previous negotiations between the SSMU and the university, Mendelson came in. Vice-President Clare said that this executive was the third Executive team coming into negotiations.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Vilma Campbell is representative from McGill legal services. President Knight and Vice-President Clare have a standing meeting with Mendelson and they would bring up MOA in that meeting. He would refuse to listen. In terms of negotiations he made extremely clear that the SSMU would be talking with Vilma. In negotiations they would spend a lot of time talking about why anime club is the same thing as comic book club and shouldn't have to change their name. They asked to bring it to DiGrappa or anything but because of the Principal's taskforce last year, these situations relocated to the deputy provost. He was the top of the chain. President Knight said that they were told very clearly that no one other than Deputy Provost's Office is interested in dealing with them. Negotiations had a very legalistic focus based on risk management and liabilities. Negotiations with other staff members, they have agreed that it is a ridiculous process. On August 31st there was a meet with the Principal and Vice-President Clare and President Knight said it was on the agenda when it was to be discussed with Mendelson only. There could be tactics if we took this with a letter to the Board of Governors. This would come with a recommendation to the deputy provost along with lease. The lease has potential to be 15 year lease instead of a 5 year lease. You can understand how when main advocate for this agreement has to present this at the Board of Governors, that is also negotiating with a very problematic structural situation. Lastly, it is very difficult to negotiate when there is not equal footing. McGill has the power and Vice-President Clare and President Knight were told explicitly that they were not on equal footing. Until the MOA is signed, the University was not willing to sign lease of daycare either. The only reason why they lease space to the SSMU, so they say, is because of the special relationship between SSMU and the University as outlined in MOA.

Vice-President Plummer said he feels similar to Vice-President Pedneault and is torn because it is not obvious to him why there is the suggestion that it should be signed now. Particularly, it has been made clear that part of the reason why it should be signed is so that the SSMU will get their fees, and the Deputy Provost said he would give them some of the fees.

President Knight said that to clarify fee situation standard MOA says that we receive fees on September 15th and legally required to give fees after 30 days from close of registration. Were told they could have fees when they sign MOA. Her understanding is that McGill is not able to simply refuse to give fees because this is outlined under Quebec law and it is not internal policy. The Arts Undergraduate Society was cited in the past, and there was no proof that AUS was financially responsible and not responsible to give fees. With the approval of audited statements the fees should be given. To answer question, the timing of negotiations is an issue because the documents expired on May 31st and should not have fallen to us to negotiate this. Squatting creates a lot of pressure in that legal fact. She was involved in the closing two weeks of negotiations in May. Given that they did not start negotiations on the long list of names until May it is not feasible. Consequently, this Executive inherited a process already underway, not in a beneficial way to SSMU. Obviously this Council will decide whether or not to sign. There is a set of pros and cons that this Council has to deliberate on. What needs to be considered are the best interests for students and student groups.

Raffy, in engineering, spoke from the gallery. He said that his question has to do with who was sitting at the negotiating table. If they were really nice they would be pushing trademark documents. The difference between you, as SSMU, and McGill is that you should be able to mobilize students. We are all proud of our community. Why did you decide not to mobilize students? Our legacy will be stated in signing the MOA.

Vice-President Clare said that the majority of the negotiations started during the summertime. It took a long time changing gears from negotiations that they spent with the last executive, entering a room where all they heard was "no." As the school year has approached and been underway, there have been other factors which took a lot of time. She wants to be as honest as possible. She does not think that this addresses the priorities of the SSMU as students fundamentally. If Council decides not to sign the MOA and feels that we have that



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

capacity, we will have to work within that framework going forward. Sometimes there wouldn't be meetings with negotiators because they were at hearings. They did not want to go to clubs before anything was written in stone. If they look at the names they have been willing to grandfather, fought about midnight kitchen, but queer McGill was immediately grandfathered.

President Knight said this started to happen in the summer. She said that the negotiators attempted to get them to sign very quickly at the beginning of their term. This would be the best time for them to sign. This is not a new issue and students have rallied around the McGill name before. Students have rallied for many causes. She thinks that it is very difficult to believe that after many years of this issue being discussed and sometimes yelling matches, and sometimes either party walking out of the room that they care what students think. This strikes to the heart of many students and alienating many of the most involved groups on campus. Said that this has an impact on alumni involved in these groups over the year e.g. McGill outdoors club has existed since 1936. What they have known as the MOC may becoming the MSOC. They have described in many different ways and repeatedly that these are the arguments. They have heard them all before and will hear them again. Particularly in the light of recent "we are al McGill" statements by the university, this has been a long and heartfelt process. If our constituents and council tell us not to we will not.

A motion to extend by five minutes passed.

Someone asked for a point of information and said that they appreciated that the councillors speak first but would like Councillors' questions before moving into in-camera, as this will be discussed there as well. Chair Tong said he would if they pertain to the gallery.

Larson is a former councillor, on the interest group committee, and is in music. This is the top issue that this Council will decide on, and she said thank you so much to Council for hosting this discussion tonight. She very much appreciates that Executives have fought for these changes and finds it kind of appalling that as a student of McGill who may or may not care about tuition. She hopes that everyone laughed when they opened HMB's email two weeks ago. She would like SSMU to mandate working on the our campus our community project. It is appalling that students are brought in here to do the things that McGill should be doing, and everyone in this discussion should be talking about the McGill community in general.

Chair Nizam asked Councillors and gallery members to respect the speakers and asked that there be no applause.

Allen Cyril, a former executive of engineering, spoke from the gallery. He was holding a sign in front of him which says we are all McGill. Tons of students like him have put in tons of effort. As former Vice-President internal of engineering he gets asked to participate in University events. When they do a terrible job of open house, they go to him and say that engineering should show off their groups. He says the University has hoodwinked groups when they say that groups should be called "Students..." rather than "McGill...". Vote no and for students' rights.

Vice-President Clare want to make it clear to those not present in the in-camera session Vice-President Clare and President Knight will be abstaining in the vote and want to make sure that they will not be involved in the vote because they were present in the negotiation.

Monique Devons in arts and science asked whether they have approached the alumni office. She wondered how the alumni would feel about it. This Council can't yes right now because not enough people know to show how much discontent there is about this issue.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

President Knight said that the negotiators have repeatedly told the university how much discontent there is. However, they don't agree. Regarding alumni, the alumni relations people will not send a message which says that McGill is messing up with student groups. We must call on large networks. In negotiations, there was a stalemate on this issue in a really negative way which was a lot worse when this Executive came into office. This issue involves attempting to negotiate in good faith. It was not feasible to mobilize a lot of students when we started negotiating in the summer. It is difficult to mobilize and use pressure tactics when not successful. If this body votes not to sign the MOA (Vice-President Clare and President Knight will not be voting) we will go back and tell McGill that they are responsible to constituents legally and will have to do that.

Michael from the gallery in U2 Poli Sci said that he wants to make it clear that there are 0 negative consequences for not signing the MOA. It would be an affront to commonsense to change all of those names. One concern has been that McGill would kick us out of the building. If McGill really kicked us out of the building, students could cause a raucous so that they would regret it. The deal will still be on the table since it is all public knowledge. He does not see one single negative consequence in voting against the deal. Vice-President Clare said that they have thought about squatting and discussed this with the executive. In reality, Shatner is pretty prime real estate. The University is always talking about a lack of space. They are only technically required to give a student union a phone and a room. It would be quite easy for them to say that not signing the MOA indicates that the student union cannot manage its affairs, and use that rhetoric to seize the building.

President Knight said that the MOA is tied to the lease of the building and the daycare's lease. McGill refuses to sign the lease without signing the MOA. This is a concern because it is a crucial service for a number of student parents and not signing the MOA might leave 3-5 year olds on the street. Also there are some rights outlined in the accreditation act and other rights outlined in MOA so the legal relationship is up in the air at the moment. There are other aspects of the MOA that are important to the function of the Society. She said she has to respectfully disagree with that statement, and hopes that if there were really no negative consequences really that they would not be asking the Council for approval to sign. The Lawyer and General Manager say that having an MOA is very important.

Vice-President Clare agrees that there are negative consequences but McGill and wants to avoid negative headlines about toddlers.

President Knight made a motion to reconsider the decision of the chair. There was a straw poll about those wishing to speak. Chair Nizam said that if anyone has something new to contribute they will be prioritized. If you don't get called on, bring it to your elected representative and if you don't have something new to contribute please refrain from volunteering. There will be a four-minute extension with a one-minute speaking time.

Josh Redel said that there have been some very good points tonight. We don't need to come up with new arguments and battles, we can use those the words that have already been put forward by the administration—we are all McGill. There is a poster published by university relations office (which Josh passed around at the meeting) which reads “the student is the most important person on campus ... a flesh and blood human being ... students are our thing.” It also says “We are not doing students a favour by seeing them. Students are doing us a favour...” This is SSMU's mobilization. This is the start and SSMU has every person's support here.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Benjamin, a U1 computer engineer from the gallery would like to reiterate points made in another forum about this. Student groups do not want their names changed and there are 21,000 students for mobilization. Your obligation is to vote in our interests.

McGill is one of the 20 top universities in the world. He said he wonders how they would like it if Macleans reported that McGill kicked their own student society out of their building. We can fight this.

A member of the gallery said that the that McGill administration has approached the negotiations saying not on equal footing. He agrees. There are 25,000 students. McGill will come to understand students' position if a hard line is taken in these negotiations. All it's going to take starts here. Most active people in student life feel strongly about this issue, and will do everything they can. We can do this.

Vice-President Clare made a motion to have a short recess. This will be one for 8 minutes.

Councillor Dinell and her roommate Jenny performed a couple of great songs!

The Board of Directors had a meeting during the open session, which is recorded separately.

10d. Motion Regarding CKUT and QPIRG Referendum Questions

President Knight said that this was brought, as all motions are, to the steering committee. This motion was not found to be out of order. For those not on Steering, she wanted Rebecca here in case anyone had any questions. It is in order as said by Steering Committee

Vice-President Fraser said it was really great to have a lot of people in the gallery. It fostered more of a sense of campus community goes in support of this question in a very direct way. Councillors should consider that CKUT and QPIRG contribute strongly to student life on campus, and would like everyone, regardless of their feelings about this groups personally, to consider that they are supporting student life on campus.

Councillor Paterson made a motion to split the question, with one part of the question supporting QPIRG and one supporting CKUT. The motion to amend would be to strike this resolved clause and two doing the splitting. Then can motion to divide the question.

Vice-President Fraser said this is unfriendly. The reason why these are together is because QPIRG is a public research advocacy group and CKUT is campus community radio—each of them foster voices not normally heard on the McGill campus. Someone opposed to endorsing yes vote to CKUT is probably also opposed to QPIRG vote. A single question would do justice to this.

Councillor Winer said that he would consider it friendly, but because friendly amendments require support of all of the movers, this will remain unfriendly.

Councillor Paterson said the reason why she would like these questions to be split is that though she understands the point about similar intent and does appreciate the work of the two organization, she does not agree that people would necessarily vote yes to both. It's been proven time and time again that CKUT and QPIRG are not considered to be the same by students. QPIRG is a research group whereas CKUT is just a radio station. She is not saying currently yes or no because they are separate entities and it is not fair for them to be lumped into one.

Vice-President Pedneault said that a huge part of the referendum question is about the ability of the University to unilaterally move student fees online. The issues at hand here are not only CKUT and he would



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

be dismayed if SSMU wanted to vote yes in one case and no in the other case but would encourage people to not split this question.

Councillor Chaini agreed with Vice-President Pedneault and separating CKUT and QPIRG is not about specific student groups but student groups in general. This is about their existence not about what they actually do. This is not about student groups on campus but it wouldn't make sense to vote for one over the other because they are both independent student groups. She does not think we should separate these.

A motion to previous question passed. The motion was to split question into two resolved clauses. By a vote of 8 for 15 against and 0 abstentions, this did not pass.

Councillor Bi motion to amend to add "Legislative Council" after SSMU to read "SSMU Legislative Council."

Councillor Stettin said that Councillor Bi had not wanted a previous motion written this way because she felt that her constituencies would not feel comfortable with the support of the Council behind it.

Councillor Bi said that she has spoken to constituents who find it confusing. She would not appreciate the entire SSMU passing a yes vote.

Councillor Stettin said that when other things have been brought to the table by MFAS and others, motions have referred to the "SSMU" that endorses it, not just this body.

This was considered an unfriendly amendment.

Councillor Bi said that she respects that we represent our constituencies but we are a small population and the reason why this question is being brought forward is so that the student body will vote as a whole.

Councillor Latham said that as representatives, we are supposed to gauge the interest and sentiment of constituencies, so that when we vote on motions at SSMU Council, we are SSMU.

Councillor Bi said that there is a distinction between the Executive, the Legislative Council, and the population and saying that we speak on behalf of that is being too liberal with the term.

Councillor Burnett said the reason why we were all elected is to represent SSMU. There is no reason to represent a referendum.

Councillor Winer said that under the heading "Legislative Council" in article 3 of the SSMU constitution, a clause reads that the Council "should be empowered to ... make all decisions on behalf of the student body."

Vice-President Clare said that are elected as members of Legislative Council, the idea is to represent constituents.

A motion to previous question passed. By a vote of 1 for 23 against and 2 abstentions, this unfriendly amendment did not pass.

Councillor Paterson said that she was strongly encouraged by her constituent Council to vote no, but probably would have anyway to this not because she does not support CKUT and QPIRG, but when it comes to the matter of changing the opt-out system, she understands that there is a GA motion to change the system and does not like how it's being brought up on the ballot that their existence is in question. QPIRG and CKUT have another kick at the can in the winter semester of this year if this question does not pass.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Vice-President Fraser said that, regarding the opinion that this question is confusing or that it is two questions in one can be understood by the resolved clause of the 2005 referendum question. The question outlines student fees from which any will opt out, and clearly in 2005 the question of CKUT existence left fees opt-outable and existence and fee issues were not distinguishable from one another; there is nothing different between that question and this one except this time the fee is not opt-outable on the online system. This was not ambiguous at that time and meant going to the statement. In this wording getting a refund was made clear.

Chair Tong said he would take speakers from the gallery once all councillors have spoken.

Councillor Clarke said that at the University of Alberta the APRIG (research group) was opt-outable only on the premise and students voted to have it online. He is usually a confident person but when it involved walking into an office and telling them that he didn't agree with their existence it was tough to do that. They were all super nice. QPIRG is saying they are doing the best they can to create a safe space. Just as important is the appearance of a safe space. He has a hesitancy to vote in favour of this motion. If there is any reasonable concern we should just let students decide for themselves.

Councillor Winer said that QPIRG and CKUT have stated that during the opt-out period students will be able to come someplace on campus that not just their space, and that would be in the SSMU building.

Councillor Kunev said that repeating arguments does not advance the cause and in terms of professionalism would like to move sooner to confidential session. Not supporting groups' existence because you disagree with their stances is not something that this Council should do.

Councillor Stettin said that the QPIRG refundable system will be in student hands, and students will be controlling the way the refund system works. Right now it extends five days in the SSMU building and SSMU has a mandate not to be neutral but to "support the student groups and makeup the civic life in the community while supporting the ... life ... of our membership" in voting yes the Council would be both supporting the SSMU constitution and the General Assembly, where this motion was brought up.

Vice-President Pedneault said that anyone who has not opted out can show up to their general assemblies and meetings to mandate how they opt-out. They have committed not just being in their office during that period and having a table in the Shatner building. If people want to change that and make it more generous they can make that concern known. The political role that these services play is very important to bring up. In his first year he was a participant in Rad frosh and he enjoyed it. Radical frosh is the only one with specific activities for queer students. He met his current partner at Rad frosh and implications of the online system are that funds are being slashed dramatically not just on the work that they do and lives to many people. During their funding drive it has been a real eye-opening experience for them to explain in multiple what CKUT does. They have had to explain that McGill is doing these actions and this radio and these organizations provide a space for people on campus have dignity and have autonomy over their own lives. He is speaking from the heart right now and both organizations deserve their support.

Councillor Qin said that she is against this motion because we are not debating against their existence but it is the online opt-out system. Students should have their own opt-out system online. There should be another method established for them to win back their right for controlling this.

Vice-President Fraser said that in terms of proposed refund, the language of both referendum questions were changed to say "directly through CKUT" instead of "on the premise". After this referendum goes through it's in students' hands. She said that Councillor Clarke's point is very interesting but does not know the



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

specifics of that online system. The Minerva system provides little to no information about where these organizations are and the heart of this is democratic processes. Mandated the SSMU to do things like get rid of online opt-out system and make sure that the University is listening to students.

Councillor Chaini said that she agrees with Vice-President Fraser and should be thinking about what mandate has been saying. This is mainly about the existence of these clubs. The main issue is their existence. SSMU has a mandate to support student groups on campus. Not having QPIRG on campus at all would be a huge deficit to student life.

Councillor Latham said that this isn't a question of whether we should support these groups or their finances. Earning the right back to control their finances is something that they shouldn't have lost. He liked the idea of safe space defined as students making an informed decision and not just opting out blindly. Because of the fact that this went through a GA, he has a mandate from students to support this.

Councillor Shahid said that also not in favour and cannot vote on having them enforce their finances. This is addressed to the entire population of McGill and some of them don't support QPIRG.

Councillor Clarke said thanks and was not aware that students would be able to ask for modification on the 15-day opt-out period thing. If they went to the QPIRG GA and a majority said would like to have it online controlled by QPIRG would that be implemented?

Vice-President Fraser cannot speak for QPIRG and CKUT members but she said if you put a motion on the floor that is how the system works.

President Knight said that it is important to remember that this question is about existence and if you look at opt-out rates and the fact that 85% of students choose to opt in and some choose to opt out there is a clear majority not opting out. It is a minority of students that do not wish these organizations to exist. The point has been made that it is in other mandates to support the existence of these groups. If it says students should not have the right to opt out that would be different. The question of whether or not they should control their finances is the substantive issue and the issue is not about opting out.

Councillor Khan is here representing engineering and believes that most of the anti campaign was showing a beer and pizza slice and engineers were specifically defamed amongst them. There are so many students part of QPIRG and engineers as a whole are in support of QPIRG.

Councillor Bi read an e-mail to Arts Concillors from in Paul Surnac U3 Arts and Science who wrote that "on the one hand seems like a surefire way to kill them....students don't want to be the ones to kick..." these groups down. However, there is an "undue burden and a hassle from the relatively small amount" of money. The groups are using "pressure tactics" and this is direct democracy because it determines where "THEIR MONEY GOES ... Is there a way to maintain the status quo despite these two coercive referendum questions?" Councillor Bi said that based on that note, she will not be speaking in favour of this motion.

Councillor Burnett said that it is more than reasonable given many years of mandates to bring these fees under students' control and even if SSMU thinks that what is being proposed is not to some students' liking, this question is about whether or not these organizations should exist. Not having student controlled opt-out system puts these organizations at threat whether or not it's in the question.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Councillor Winer said that in regards to points about speaking with constituents, the assumption that all of us are in touch with constituents is not the case. Because a handful of students approached particular concerns it is important that those be voiced here. There are members within SSMU who would not support SSMU in general and what SSMU wants to do. Constituents on the whole are firmly in favour of a motion like this.

Councillor Stettin said that the GA assembly motion passed and this is a first time that a SSMU Council can defend that vote and this council has an opportunity to carry through the General Assembly of 2007.

Myriam Zaidi from the gallery said that if she gets a letter from someone she never met before, she would probably ask whether they want to talk. She would like to put a face on organization and see who they are before opting out. To the Council, she is asking for solidarity. You are all representative of organizations and if McGill imposed things on you without your consent, you would be angry. Students are entitled to come and decide how they want money to be reimbursed.

Councillor Paterson said that she would like to gently remind other councillors that reiterating is not a good idea for keeping debates concise.

A motion to previous question passed. By a vote of 19 for, 5 against and 5 abstentions, this motion passed.

10e. Motion Regarding SSMU Signing of AGSEM's Letter

Vice-President Clare said that regarding the motion, the letter was sent out to Councillors and was supposed to be confidential. She will be motioning to table the vote in confidential session because it is confidential. If it about specifics this can be voted on in public session, but specific aspects of the letter could be discussed in private if Councillors so choose. At this point, she would like them to make general assertions about this.

Jonathan Mooney of AGSEM, speaking from the gallery, asked that closed session be moved now.

President Knight said that kicking the gallery out now would probably not be best and Council is not ill-informed. If there could be specific questions addressed that would be helpful. Given the number of other items, she would request that we straw poll to see if people want to debate this motion.

The straw poll to debate was a majority.

Johnathan would like to suspend the rules to amend the agenda to move the in-camera session before all reports.

Vice-President Pedneault made a motion to suspend the rules to allow AGSEM representatives to give an update on their negotiations.

Johnathan Mooney said that the update is that there was a vote in favour of the use of pressure tactics. This was voted by a general assembly strongly in favour. There is also a mandate to get a talk about core issues. They couldn't respond on any of those issues so they voted on campus. There was a large rally on campus before a rally with MUNACA and they held signs about bargaining positions with the administration. There is another negotiation session next Wednesday and is hopeful they will come back with a meaningful response for these core issues-including TA hours. They usually say they will and then say they can't. Pressure tactics should not be disruptive to students or classes and stuff like that. High-profile coverage of the issue will be in the Gazette coming up.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

This motion regarding SSMU signing AGSEM's letter passed.

There was a motion to move in-camera session to the next point.

President Knight said that given the things that need to be addressed it is going to be a long session and all reports of committees and executives have to be public. It is not reasonable to ask members of the gallery to leave. She is happy to commit that all reports that she is responsible for will be very brief.

Councillor Jean-Claude said that he is sure that Council's decisions will be brief and he has a fair in social work in the morning. He does not want to leave early but urged to Council to move forward.

A motion to previous question on the motion to debate passed. By a vote of 15 for and eight against, that motion did not reach a 2/3 majority and did not pass.

President Knight made a motion to one minute per speaker and give minutes per report. A straw poll was taken.

Jean-Claude said that we all have perspectives that we will want to share in -camera.

President Knight said that there are things in reports that need ratification. By the motion that she just proposed and passed this can be passed without worrying about the fact that we have to deal with these reports afterwards. A motion to reconsider requires 2/3 majority.

The motion to reconsider was 14 for and 12 against.

The motion to amend the agenda failed by a vote of 15 for and 10 against.

11) New Business

11a. Interest Group Committee Report

Councillor Chaini stood for questions.

The report of the IGC Committee was adopted.

11b. Operations Management Committee Report

Councillor Canon said that he and Vice-President Patel were meeting about the market place and the committee is meeting from 1-3pm this Saturday.

Councillor Bi asked Vice-President Patel to elaborate on the report of the Gerts report.

11c. Equity Committee Report

The strategic summit for equity and diversity was last Friday and included the associate provost regarding equity. If you have any issues with their document you should voice them at the next session.

11d. Bylaw Committee Report

President Knight said that if you have further questions later you can e-mail the Committee. The bylaw committee is working on GA reform and electoral bylaws. If you have recommendations for things to change, please send things to her. If you have concrete thoughts about what should be done about the GA she will be considering them in the next week. Come out to that if you want. Being proactive is better than being reactive.

11e. Nominating Committee Report

The judicial board justices were approved.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Vice-President Pedneault asked “Why are none of our judicial board justices women?”

President Knight said that last year the Board was not recruited very well because the president didn't think it was legal so didn't work very hard to make sure selections were done properly.

This report was adopted.

11f. Executive Committee Report

President Knight stood for questions.

Vice-President Pedneault said it should be added under approvals by e-mail that

The executive report

12) Reports by Executives

12a. VP Clubs and Services

Vice-President Fraser put a heart at the top of her report. She said it was fun to support her fellow executives since her last report. There's nothing substantial to be reported orally, she already addressed advanced room bookings during announcements.

Councillor Kunev asked whether the report was sent by e-mail.

Chair Tong said it was sent by e-mail, it is on the website, and is in the document distributed to everyone by the speakers.

12b. Finance and Operations

Vice-President Patel stood for questions.

12c. Vice-President External

Vice-President Patel said November 10 is happening—be there!

He stood for questions.

Vice-President Fraser asked Vice-President Pedneault how the SSMU can get students involved in the demonstration. Send your availabilities, Councillors, between Monday and Wednesday if you have a one or two-hour block between classes and can give class announcements. He can give you a short blurb if you volunteer. You can also help by handing out handbills and getting that organized. If you want to see him later and get involved, come see him.

Councillor Bi asked the speaker to ask the Vice-President External if there was a more efficient cost than almost a thousand dollars for buses for the protest in Quebec City. Vice-President Pedneault said that was not intended to be 10 students on the bus, but at that time of the morning it was only 10 people. They left at 8am on Saturday. If expecting a low turnout next time, he will not do that.

Councillor Kunev asked Vice-President Pedneault about his meetings with administrators and what he is doing to make sure that there will not be such accusations in the future.

Vice-President Pedneault said that he and Councillor Stettin were sent letters by the administration. They were exonerated of all charges. It's been a long process. Basically it is his understanding that senators are bringing questions to senate. What happened was that McGill security sent a message to the Dean of Arts and that process is kind of messed up. If anything this is time consuming, but very successful for students. He has also considered filing a complaint for harassment.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Speakers
Bureau de Présidents du Conseil

Councillor Clarke said that there is a question going to be submitted to senate steering committee to be addressed at the November 15th senate meeting.

Councillor Uribe-Arango asked for more info on November 10th.

Vice-President Pedneault expected a turnout that is large, about 15-20,000. All of MUNACA is going to be there plus students and will be at least a thousand. The march is leaving UQUAM at 2pm so should be at McGill by 4pm. Some students will visit to speak about MUNACA and some students thought that they were not aware and guests had a condescending tone when students seemed like they did not understand what was going on.

Vice-President Pedneault said that he has only gotten good feedback and students who really appreciated the opportunity to have that discussion.

Councillor Burnett wanted to give the Council an idea of what the Quebec student union looks like.

12d. Vice-President Internal

Vice-President Plummer said that 4Floors was a great successes and thanked the Executive for sticking around because it was important to him personally and students loved seeing them. Some members of SSMU really wanted to be taken off the listserv. A particular member was taken off in the summer and was put back on the list was back on after add-drop. He was written to, saying that they are mandated to send info about referenda and elections. He was taken off because he wanted to be taken off and he was sent information about those conditions.

12e. Vice-President University Affairs

Vice-President Clare said thanks to her student senators. She would welcome all of them to come to the next senate meeting. That is on the Wednesday. They are going to be asking a question about disciplinary action against students.

Councillor Bi asked what a panic button is.

Vice-President Clare said that this was gotten through the MOA negotiations. The McGill Legal Info clinic is near the vending machines and one of their branches is student advocacy. A panic button was put in which is connected to security. Security would come in if they had to use the button. There is a question about jurisdiction because it doesn't necessarily make sense for McGill to be monitoring the button.

Senator Dinel said that HMB was on her feet at senate.

12f. President

President Knight said that the member who requested the list was granted access to the list and allowed to come look at it and take hand-written extracts. He could send a message to listserv if it was congruent to the act which he has not chosen to do. Athletes have been very successful.

Coucillor Paterson asked if the President is aware of the reason why the member accessed the membership list.

President Knight will follow-up and does not now if she is legally able to require that he answer.

A motion to move into in-camera session passed.

13) Adjournment 3:15am