

## **SSMU Council Meeting**

### **Thursday, October 1st, 2009**

Attendance: Pauline Gervais, Sarah Olle, Tom Fabian, Nick Drew, Annie Ma, David Marshall, Sarah Woolf, Sebastian Ronderos-Morgan, Corey Omer, Joel Lightbound, Marco Garofalo, Joshua Abaki, Ivan Neilson, Jose Diaz, Myriam Desrosiers, Emil Briones, Mitran Mehta, Rebecca Dooley, Lorna Sampson, Alexandra Brown, Lauren Hudak, Zach Newburgh, Janina Grabs, Billi Wun, Xiao Yu, Daniel Keresteci, Taunia Rifai Archer, Mark Bay, Jade Calver, Donnie Gagliardi, Barbara Dourley, ZiLi Wang. .

#### **1. Call to Order 6.25**

Hudak: My name is Lauren Hudak. Sorry that the meeting is starting relatively late, that will hopefully not start again in the future. Everyone should have the SSMU Guide to Roberts Rules on the table for you. It is pretty self-explanatory. It's the handy list on page 16. Several things to begin with, you can refer to me as Madam Chair. Please remember to not speak unless you are called upon. Try not to have any side-conversations. Also, you don't have to make a point of privilege to go to the bathroom. We will see when you go out. You are allowed to speak in French, but please speak slowly and clearly. Firstly, Zach will go around the room for a role call.

Newburgh: We have created a new document, we are marking down who is in the room and who is not, since that is important for voting.

VP Ronderos-Morgan: There might be some councillors arriving late.

Newburgh: The simple majority of delegates is 13, 2/3 majority 17.

#### **2. Approval of the Minutes**

Hudak: Are there any corrections to the minutes?

VP Diaz: On page 6, I said that I left the bar open until the **first** week of July.

***Amendment passed.***

President Neilson: I would like to move to approve the minutes (Seconded by VP Diaz)

***Minutes approved.***

#### **3. Adoption of the Agenda**

VP Diaz: I would like to motion to adopt the agenda (seconded by President Neilson)

***Agenda adopted.***

President Neilson: I would like to amend the agenda, after the question period I would like to insert guest speakers and reorder accordingly. Or I would like to adopt the second version. (Seconded by Senator Marshall)

***New agenda adopted.***

VP Diaz: I would like to motion to amend the agenda to move the guest speakers after announcements.

***Motion to amend agenda approved.***

## 4. Question Period

Hudak: There are only 30 minutes according to the by-laws allotted to the question period, and every question and answer sequence has to be in a 5 minute period.

No questions.

## 5. Announcements

Omer: There is a coalition of clubs being formed for a food drive for student poverty. SSMU has agreed to support the coalition. I would like to support execs and councillors to sit on tables, that would be great. Our proceedings would go to the organization Bon accueil. If you are associated with a club, please contact me, we are open to accepting everyone interested.

Dourley: The MUS has finished their new website with a new logo, [www.musonline.com](http://www.musonline.com). If any other groups are interested, I can send you the contacts of our designer.

VP Dooley: There will be 2 focus groups on October 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> about course evaluations, I would encourage you to attend.

VP Olle: We will be holding a controversial events town hall on the request of Mendelson, this will be the Thursday before Canadian thanksgiving at 5.30, it is important to hear students on their opinion of students on campus.

Briones: This weekend the McGill Symphony Orchestra will be playing, on 7.30 at Pollack Hall. Also, we are looking for more advertisement revenue, so if you know anyone who needs advertisement, we would be interested in having it.

VP Brown: Council retreat is this weekend, it is one of the most important weekends with lots of information. Please talk to Execs if you cannot come. It is part of your duties as a councillor.

VP Diaz: Motion to amend the agenda, move speakers from 6.8 to 7.G. (Seconded by May).

***Agenda amended.***

## 5. Reports of Officers

## A. VP University Affairs, Rebecca VP Dooley

VP Dooley: I will just draw attention to some points in my report. A research project is happening right now, on student employment at McGill, we are looking at the existing labour allowed, and are also conducting research on student services and undergraduate student research, McGill published very high percentages of which we are sceptical. The New Equity Commissioner is Jonathan Hann, he is great. Then, the Academic Round Table is composed of myself and the VP Academics of different faculties, and I would like to see great things come out of meetings. As for the university committees – thank you for all who volunteered to sit on one, but there are still some that are open. If you are interested in sitting on one, please contact me. On October 15<sup>th</sup>, we have Senate, some questions may relate to rights for francophone students and Mac Shuttle. I sent out a memo for early release of the exam schedule, and the tentative exam schedule will be published next week, but I will still meet with the representatives to discuss different possibilities of making it even earlier. As for H1N1 – please visit the website – [www.mcgill.ca/health/personalplan](http://www.mcgill.ca/health/personalplan). I am in the process of preparing SSMU itself. Then, there have been different improvements – for example, coffee is now allowed in the McLennan libraries if you are using covered mugs. For the Sustainability fund – I am still at work with Jim Nicell and Jonathan Glencross to instigate a fee levy, with funds matched by university and alumni, in order to provide resources to get sustainability to a next level. If you want to learn more about this, come see me. As for course evaluation – I proposed the idea to make it more attractive to students like [ratemyprofessor.com](http://ratemyprofessor.com). Please come to the focus group, there will be free pizza at the focus group. Ivan and I will be meeting with the principal on Friday and with the Deputy Provost Mendelson next week, so please let us know of issues if you have any. I will later in the meeting talk about the conflict of interest policies.

## B. VP Finance, Jose Diaz

VP Diaz : Je vais parler bilingue, alors je commence en français. J'ai commencé le processus de révision du budget, pour pouvoir présenter le nouveau budget le 15 octobre. Au moment, il n'y a aucun councilor dans le comité du budget – mais je vous encourage d'y participer. Nous sommes en train d'engager quelqu'un pour le poste de Coordinateur du comité de gestion de portefeuille. Pour répondre à la question de Councilor Pedneault concernant le programme d'investissement soutenable – on va pas suivre l'initiative, parce qu'on n'aurait pas de contrôle sur notre investissement. Maintenant, on l'a avec notre stratégie. A Gerts, on avait la hot tub party – on n'a pas eu la quantité de personnes qu'on attendait, mais on avait un bon temps. On a un projet de marketing – on va faire du recherche, ils vont dire leur opinion, et nous donner une analyse de marché. On va se concentrer sur les produits que les étudiants préfèrent, et leur impact dans les bars. I'm going to switch to English now. As for Haven Books – the main things going on are the following: first, the issues of the Haven name. Last year, council made the decision to change the name to SSMUsed Books if we could not use the Haven name any more. Before the deadline, we got an okay to keep the name. Now, we are trying to work with them to formalize a complete agreement for our responsibilities, etc. Then, there have been some issues with the inventory – there were glitches of the previous software, since there have

been books stolen or missing, there are some books in our inventory that we don't actually have, so we have started the process of counting all our holdings, and are now in the process of updating this with new information. We have changed the inventory system to a system called ProphetLine. This was a decision of Operations Committee of last year and the bookstore manager, but there had to be modifications made, and the final version was delivered way before the deadline. Therefore, we have not been able to switch to the new system yet, that will hopefully happen in the Fall transition. Right now, we are having many sales during the busy period of Semester, but then, there is often a great lull, so we need to come up with new things to sell. Operations committee is looking into that. Last year, we thought of a computer repair system, but the idea was abandoned because the start-up costs high and there were issues because of liability etc. Please be aware that councillors went out to residences two years ago and to get students to cosign their books, we want to bring this up again. Then, for the Health and Dental Plan, there were issues with opt-outs because Canadian students who submitted their proof of residence late to McGill just had their status changed, and when they wanted to opt-out, ASEQ was not informed. The issue has been taken care of. Then, on Senate meeting – there will be reports on the past year as well as on presentations of statistics on service usage, and we talked to McGill of the advertisement opportunity of CaPS and myfuture.

#### **Questions:**

Mehta: That Gerts was now offering food is not very well known – my friends heard about it through me. What advertisement are we making about it? The general student population does not know about it.

VP Diaz: We are still in the phase of the trial period, we are offering pizza and food ourselves, but we want to see how people are responding to prices, etc. It has been going on for 3 weeks. We still need to analyse how this is going. Once trial period is over, we can start up with more serious advertizing.

Ben: I'm the new bookstore manager.

### **C. VP External Affairs, Sebastian Ronderos -Morgan**

VP Ronderos-Morgan: The big event this week was the demonstration earlier today. It was very windy and cold, but the demonstration went well, there were probably about 400 people from unions, student representatives, etc, there were not enough McGill students there, but nobody is perfect. I did the promotion for this. Then, generally, the CREM, the coalition intending to bring student issues to the municipal elections, fell apart. The initial meeting was not attended, so I am now working on other plans to engage students in the municipal elections. Then, my research project on our relations with the Milton-Parc community has been finished, that will be able to inform future interactions. I also had a meeting with the PGSS VP External, and there will be a transit survey going on, that will be a survey to get more data on transit and student usership before more steps are taken for PGSS and potentially other organizations. Then, we had a meeting with the political attaché of the Education minister, and did a bit of lobbying on three issues – first of all, we asked for the deadline for TaCEQ recognition. She said that they would come up with guidelines

by February, and afterwards there would be the possibility for us to apply. We also talked about the MBA tuition hike – she said that McGill hadn't follow the proper procedures, and theoretically needed the approval of the Minister of Education to move forward with this. Finally, we asked for the deadlines for the discussed governance bills – the education committee hearings will be concluded on October 6<sup>th</sup>, and then there will be information sessions to review the proposed legislation. Finally, for the Tuition truth website – it is only waiting for final content before it will be officially re-launched. Also, a SSMU employee, my campaigns coordinator, resigned and I am in the process of looking for a new campaigns coordinator.

### **Questions:**

Mehta: Regarding MBA tuition hike, how would students doing MBA be affected if McGill has to suffer repercussions from the Ministry?

VP Ronderos-Morgan: She was not forthcoming with an answer, she was only saying that McGill had trespassed the proper procedures. She wouldn't give me any further answers.

## **D. VP Internal, Alex Brown**

VP Brown: There has been a website meeting – our priority is to get the French site launched, then we would like to make the site more intuitively accessible. 4Floors is coming up, and planning for that has started. SSPN started meeting, and we did a preliminary brainstorm, though there are still 2 seats for councillors left that need to be filled. Also, CAF had its first meeting, and had great ideas for the year. The Committee on Alcohol Policy was crazy. Come talk to me for the details. There will be many meetings throughout the year. The call for motions for the GA has gone out, everyone can write motions, you can go to [ssmu.mcgill.ca/ga](http://ssmu.mcgill.ca/ga) to have a look at more information. You are all part of SSMU, and the success of GA depends on you. On Monday evening from 4 to 6, we will have a motion-writing session in the SSMU lounge. Motions will be due October 9<sup>th</sup>, and the GA will happen on October 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Fabian: Who sits on the committee for Alcohol Policy?

VP Brown: There are representative of residences, of the special events planning office, the first year office, SSMU, PGSS, security, health, and risk management.

Dourley: What is the feeling about Frosh and alcohol? Are we moving towards a dry campus?

VP Brown: No. They are interested in cleaning up behaviour on campus, especially during Frosh, but they are not interested in dry campus. In daytime on-campus events shouldn't be booze-loaded, though. They realized that students do not seem to be able to drink hard and behave responsible, so the more correlation will be more linkage for the administration.

## **E. VP Clubs and Services, Sarah Olle**

VP Olle: The past two weeks were very intense, I spent 2/3 of my time on Choose Life-related issues. Their first event was great from an organizing point of view, everybody respected fire exits, and I am happy with how calm the event happened. I got a lot of questions, so I put into my report the 2 main ways to remove a club status from a given club: you can bring a motion to this body, with 14 days notice, or we have a body called Judicial Board who can decide on those matters. As for the QPIRG opt-out – the QPIRG opt-out movement is very vocal on campus. A departmental association was spearheading the movement, which is an interesting development, I have been speaking with QPIRG and other students about this. Then, I have a more in-depth report on Activities Night, please read it. As for Old McGill, our yearbook, we did several interviews for Editor-in-Chief. Since the girl we really wanted declined the position, we are still looking for an Editor-in-Chief. Culture Shock is happening again, this is a week-long event series hosted by QPIRG and SSMU. It is a cool event, and the programming is unusual to the SSMU portfolio, though we are including more introductory and 101 events. It is coming along very nicely. As for the referendum – although it is very far away, we have already submitted questions, and submitted them to students accounts to check their feasibility, the questions that I submitted is for a TV McGill fee levy and the Ambassador Fee. Faculties often apply to get funding for trips to represent McGill at conferences, etc, and this would be creating that kind of fund. The McGill Tribune Independence would have come to referendum in the fall, however, the Tribune is behind on preparing for campaign and look into incorporation, so it will come in winter.

### **Questions:**

Omer: Is there any way to get information on student opt-outs, and to know how many people opted out?

VP Olle: We can gladly provide this information.

Omer: For the Culture Shock week – what are you doing to make it the least offensive possible to certain student groups?

VP Olle: I'm there. We have a contract written – either party can reject any event that might be difficult. We are very cautious about Israel/Palestine, but the events that we have been planning are much more nuanced than usual. We would be glad to talk about that in more depth with you.

## **F. President, Ivan Neilson**

President Neilson: Council retreat is coming up this weekend, it would be an opportunity to get caught up on what is going on this year and every year, to understand situation on campus, strategize accordingly. We will leave at 6.30 tomorrow, and be back at 4.30 on Sunday. Then, there will be a Controversial events town hall, I encourage you to come, the more input from students we have, the better. The GA – will be October 21<sup>st</sup> at 2.30 pm in the Shatner cafeteria. The deadline to submit motions will be 9<sup>th</sup> of October. We are in the process of interviewing people for the position of General Assembly coordinator, this is something that I would like to promote it as an institutional thing. Elections McGill are fully up and running. If anyone has any questions about Elections McGill, they can contact the CEO. As for BoG – there is not that much happening this week, we met last week to approve

the financial statements, McGill still has a deficit-reduction plan to be deficit-free by 2012, they are handling their expenditures very defensive and conservative. We also approved a new president, but that is still confidential. I also hired two new green positions, a Green Events Coordinator and a Green Building Coordinator. As for Alcohol policy – I was contacted by the office of Deputy Provost, who want to set up a meeting with student leaders and an outside consultant on alcohol policy. Then, I have several upcoming meetings for the week – amongst which a meeting with the Principal and the Deputy Provost on Friday.

**Questions:**

VP Diaz: What will Councillors need to bring to council retreat?

President Neilson: There is wifi internet, it's McGill internet, but they'll need to bring sleeping bags and blankets, all meals will be catered and prepared, if you have any other questions, just come talk to us. There will be a little free time for work.

President Neilson: Motion to amend the agenda and put the Francophone commissioners to 8b.

***Agenda amended.***

## 6. Reports of Committees

### Executive Committee report

President Neilson: For September 21<sup>st</sup>, we had the approval of the campaign coordinator contract, but he has since resigned. We approved Organic Campus to be on campus Monday and Wednesday as well. We allocated Nightline's part of the base fee to TV McGill and McGill First Aid. We approved new request forms to apply for CLF, the Clubs or Green Funds, hopefully the process is much simpler now. Finally, we have contracts approved that concern my hirings. For September 30<sup>th</sup>, we approved minutes, and approved several clubs, we also approved the contract for the Minicourse supervisor, and approved the appointment of a CKUT Board of Director member. We also approved to attribute more money to the UA research assistant stipend, and approved the hiring of the Equity Commissioner Jonathan Hann, and we approved the hirings of the Green positions. I would like to motion to ratify exec report - I would like to withdraw my motion and yield my time to questions.

**Questions:**

Abaki: What are the clubs Deca U and Mastermind?

VP Olle: Deca U promoting leadership opportunities through speaker series, workshops, etc, and Mastermind's mandate is to give everybody the possibility of being "awesome" through attaining their goals.

Bay: Are there more excess funds from Nightline?

VP Olle: There is some remaining money, but it may have to be addressed in our budget revision first.

VP Diaz: Motion to ratify exec report (Seconded by VP Dooley)

***Motion to ratify exec report passed.***

Omer: Motion to table the guest speakers (Seconded by VP Diaz)

***Motion to table guest speakers passed.***

## 7. Old Business

### A. Council Committee Elections

Hudak: Ballots will be distributed. Blurbs are available to make a more informed decision.

VP Brown: If a councillor was running for several committees at once, they are able to withdraw.

Desrosiers: I would like to remove myself from the Affaires Francophones and Student equity committees.

***Hudak: Joel Lightbound is then the appointed Affaires Francophone commissioner.***

Hudak: With that said, with those ballots we will e-mail you the results. Now are the live-elections for committees that are left. The first committee: ***for Financial Ethics Review Committee, who wants to sit on it? Joel Pelneault and Xiao Yu.***

***Hudak: The next opening is for the investment advisory committee: Mark Bay. The next committee is General Assembly Committee: Gagliardi. The next committee is Nominating Committee: Mitran Mehta and Barbara Dourley. Then the Presidential Affairs Committee: Mitran Mehta and Billi Wun. The next committee is SSPN: Calter and Taunia Archer. The next committee is budget committee: Annie Ma, ZiLi Wang, Daniel Keresteci.***

## 8. New Business

### A. Motion RE: Councilor By-Laws\*

President Neilson: This will only be a notice of a motion, this is coming for next time, I have been planning to have by-law changes pertaining to councillor attendance. It will make sure you don't miss consecutive meetings without letting us know, I will send it out.

### B. Motion RE: Acclaimed Candidate By-Laws\*

VP Olle: 4 out of the 6 executives of this year were acclaimed. We are trying to implement some new by-laws that would make candidates who are acclaimed do something. We would like to require acclaimed candidates still have more than 50% of the votes. This will also come for next time.

### C. Motion RE: Porn!\*

VP Olle: We mention pornography in our by-laws, apparently, SSMU takes a stand against pornography, but I don't know whether that has really a place in our by-laws, I will bring it next week as well.

\*requires leave of council

## D. Motion RE: Fall Electoral Period\*

President Neilson: These are the dates for the Fall electoral period, the referendum period and the elections for the First Year Council. The Nomination period is from October 12<sup>th</sup> to November 2<sup>nd</sup>, we wanted to leave it open for as long as possible in order to encourage more candidates. Another thing to note is that the deadline for referendum questions is October 16<sup>th</sup>. The first candidates will be meeting on November 2<sup>nd</sup>, polling will be on the 6<sup>th</sup>, polling closed on the 12<sup>th</sup>. Are there any questions about this?

### Questions:

Abaki: What elections can we expect?

President Neilson: All of the First Year Council Executive. Otherwise, there will only be referendum questions.

Ma: Motion to approve motion RE: Fall Electoral period (Seconded by Wun).

***Motion RE: Fall Electoral Period passed.***

## E. Resolution Regarding Echoes of the Holocaust Event\*

VP Olle: This is not as fun as the previously mentioned motions. The question at hand is: Does the Choose Life Event "Echoes of the Holocaust" so contravene the SSMU Equity Policy and Constitution to such an extent that it should be censured and demanded to be shut down? This event violates the SSMU Equity Policy by being oppressive, disrespectful, and coercive. These violations demand that the SSMU step in to censure and demand the event be prohibited. Choose Life will be hosting speaker Jose Ruba's talk entitled "Echoes of the Holocaust: Abortion and Genocide: when personhood is denied, the unthinkable becomes reality.". According to the Choose Life President Natalie Fohl, "The focus of the presentation will be on how dehumanization and denial of personhood has justified some of the greatest atrocities the world has seen, including the Holocaust and abortion." Comparing abortion to the Holocaust violates human dignity. The implication in this comparison is that post-abortive women are comparable to Nazis. This suggestion is sickening. Moreover this attacks post-abortive women, a marginalized group, clearly violating our Equity Policy. Choose Life has argued that the comparison is not between post-abortive women and Nazis, but Canada and Nazi Germany – both Nazi and Canadian society have engaged in absolute denial of personhood. To compare Canadian society's legalization of abortion to the Nazi regime's racial policies and consequent atrocious genocide of six million Jews among

millions of others from marginalized groups belittles the racism that motivated the Holocaust. This is incredibly disrespectful to Jews and other groups who were targeted by the Nazi regime. This violates SSMU's Equity Policy of promoting "anti-oppressive environment that fosters a culture of respect and facilitates our mission of service, representation, and leadership." Some may argue that, because this event demands the utmost respect for the lives of both people killed in the Holocaust and fetuses, it falls within the mandate of Choose Life and should be allowed. However this argument fails to consider that respecting human life is far more nuanced a notion than "people should not be killed". Respecting human life also means respecting the dead. Jose Ruba uses the figures, stories, and images of Holocaust victims in order to provoke disgust and outrage, which he then tries to aim at abortion. This event seeks to use the millions of dead in the Holocaust as an offensive emotional ploy that disrespects human life. Some may argue that, since this event happens in an enclosed area and will only be attended by the people who choose to come, those who would like to attend should be allowed to. However this argument fails to consider that though only a few may attend, the intention of this event is to make information available to all students. It should be treated as though every member of the SSMU were going to attend. Choose Life's event must be governed by policies of the SSMU. The content of the event must thus reflect respect for others. When freedom of speech is exercised, it is assumed it will be respect. The right of freedom of speech is limited when the thing said is so harmful or offensive to others that it seen to infringe on their rights. According to the SSMU Equity policy, "No student organization should have the effect of limiting dialogue on these legitimate topics provided that such discussion is conducted in a respectful and non-coercive manner." This event clearly lacks the respect needed in order to dialogue about these topics. Some may argue that, since Jose Ruba will be providing time for question and answers, this event continues to open up a dialogue about abortion. By stopping this event from happening, we would be stifling an open discussion. However this argument fails to consider that the issue goes beyond discussion or debate. Tacking on a question and answer period does not justify the disgusting content of what was said before it. Moreover the value of debate stems from the assumption that it will have a constructive outcome. McGill University and the SSMU both strongly encourage well-informed academic debate even on the most delicate of issues. However this event is entirely inhospitable to thoughtful and educated debate. This is most clear by Jose Ruba's use of imagery of victims of the Holocaust and aborted fetuses. By presenting these graphic, incredibly disturbing images, the speaker is using shock and scare tactics to force his point of view. The SSMU Constitution impels the SSMU to "demonstrate leadership in matters of human rights [and] social justice". We must be those leaders and demand human rights and social justice. The SSMU Council should censure this event and demand McGill stop it from happening.

President Neilson: I would like to motion to limit speaking time per person to 2 minutes (Seconded by May).

***Motion to limit speaking time per person passed.***

VP Brown: Motion to temporary suspend the by-laws to have a pro-con-pro-con debate for as long as we see fit (Seconded by Yu).

***Debate time extended indefinitely in a pro-con-pro-con fashion.***

Hudak: I would like to remind council that no member can speak twice in the same debate according to the by-laws. First, we will have a brief question period for the resolution.

Yu: Can we ask for the background of the speaker of the event?

VP Olle: Jose Ruba is a pro-life activist who does the speech around different universities, he is the head of the "Centre for Bioethical Reform", and if you go on the website, it gives you a pretty good background on the organization that he is from. It does events, and has a "genocide awareness project", where they post pictures of aborted foetuses to raise awareness for the pro-life cause.

Yu: Does he have affiliation with the university?

VP Olle: No, not with McGill University.

Hudak: Please only ask 1 question at the time.

Sampson: Is this also a violation of the club itself and its mandate?

VP Olle: It depends on your interpretation of their mandate. I quote: "The Club's aim is to promote respect for human life and human rights from conception. The Club seeks this end primarily through:

- Educating members and others on the value of human life from conception by providing information about child development and hosting speakers
- Encouraging dialogue on life issues, such as sexual ethics, pregnancy, child development, abortion, adoption, and parenthood by holding discussion groups and being open to public discussion at educational events
- Compiling and making information on pregnancy options and post-abortion help available online and at club events
- Helping student-parents get practical support
- Providing opportunities for members to practice explaining the pro-life position
- Note: Conception is defined as the moment fertilization occurs."

Wang: Could you clarify your point that it is the speakers' intent to inform any student at McGill about this?

VP Olle: Yes. This was to clarify my answer to arguments that he should be allowed to talk because, if he says offensive things, it will only be heard by a limited audience, but the club is promoting the event to everybody and shows the intention to have anybody participate, they would like to spread the information to as many people as possible.

Keresteci: Is there a section in the SSMU by-laws to censure group meetings, or have there been any precedents?

VP Olle: There is nothing written in the by-laws or the constitution, and the only example I can think of was last year when the Turkish Student Association who invited a Genocide-denier to campus. The Executive Committee to stop McGill from allowing the event from happening, but McGill refused to do so.

Garofalo: What are our tools of recourse? What are we able to do if they are violating the student ethics code? Do we have tools to take some benefits away if they go ahead with the event?

VP Olle: In terms of taking away the Club Status, please refer to the section in my Exec report.

Hudak: Technically not in the resolution.

Wun: Since they are a SSMU club, can we mandate them not to have the event?

VP Olle: You can add that into the resolution, and propose that we should mandate them to stop the event. However, I received no notification that the club would be willing to do it. The situation is tricky, since it is not in our own building, it is hard to take anything away from them.

Keresteci: Is McGill administration doing anything similar to analyze the situation?

Hudak: That question is not in order since it does not touch the resolution directly.

Sampson: To what extent does SSMU and our relationship with Professor Mendelson dictate what he can do in the situation? Should the resolution pass, what is his responsibility in this case?

VP Olle: Professor Mendelson has no stated duty to do anything that we say, but in general he has been receptive to student concerns. Unfortunately, the Daily news editor said that he had expressed in a meeting with the Daily that he was not willing to cancel the event.

VP Dooley: Could we ask not to put any websites on the screen before viewing them beforehand?

Hudak: Yes. I'm sorry.

Yu: What is the Deputy Provost's concern with not cancelling the event founded upon?

VP Olle: It would be good to ask the press corps that. Also, although he might not stop it, it would still be a great stance for us to take to show that we, as a student organization, condemn the event.

Abaki: Do you think that you are in a conflict of interest since you are VP Clubs and Services and will have to work with this club in the future, while you are bringing this motion to the floor.

Hudak: We will not entertain the question, it does not pertain to the motion.

VP Diaz: Motion to appeal the decision of the chair to entertain the question.

Hudak: We will not entertain the motion.

VP Diaz: Motion to suspend Roberts Rules.

Hudak: We will not entertain the motion.

Briones: When will we have the opportunity to ask about the background?

Hudak: You do have that opportunity, but things which are not related to the topic are out of order.

VP Ronderos-Morgan: Motion to move into the committee of the whole. (Seconded by VP Dooley)

***Motion to move into the committee of the whole passed.***

Abaki: As VP Clubs and Services – isn't that going to affect your relationship with the Choose Life club if you get this motion to pass.

VP Olle: We will review our conflict of interest policy soon. However, I don't think it falls under this category. I have a very good relationship with Choose Life, I met with them yesterday, and can assure you that I am handling the situation 100% professional.

Marshall: Motion to move out of the committee of the whole.

***Motion to move out of the committee of the whole approved.***

Omer: I would like to motion to end question period and move into debate.

***Motion to end question period and move into debate passed.***

**Debate:**

VP Ronderos-Morgan: I have a point of information – could we form the gallery in a pro-and a con-speakers ?

Hudak: Yes, that would be a good idea. Also, please mention your points in a positive and conducive matter. We will have debate indefinitely.

Omer: Motion to suspend the preference of councillors, and allow the Choose Life representatives to speak first on the con-side.

Hudak: I will take that into consideration.

VP Ronderos-Morgan: As somebody who sat on body last year when the question was about granting full club status to Choose Life, I have some concerns that I would like to voice. I am speaking in favour of this motion. There were some concerns of councillors in terms of granting status to the club, who were mainly concerned about the ramifications of graphic images. In response to that, on October 2<sup>nd</sup> 2008, a representative of Choose Life said that they had “decided against graphic images”, and again on February 12<sup>th</sup> 2009, the VP External said that they had “decided to take a more gentle approach” – these are commitments of important individuals in the club which pertained to reassure the councillors about existence of the club. Unfortunately, if you google Jose Ruba’s name and click on the button about educational activities, it becomes clear that he uses visual tools in his activities, especially in the genocide awareness program. Additionally, there are many links on the Choose Life website that link to very graphic images. I am very worried about Jose Ruba coming to speak, and about the nature of this presentation. Promises were made to councillors who were worried about events, and these commitments have not been respected, they have gone right ahead in their first year of existence with these activities. It’s a real shame that they misled council in believing in abide by promises that they made.

Bay: Point of order: We had decided to limit speaking time to 2 minutes.

Hudak: True. We will pay attention to the time.

VP Diaz: Motion to introduce an amendment. I would like to amend the motion and include: Be it further resolved, that if Choose Life so decides to continue on and have the event after its censure, Choose Life will automatically become ineligible to SSMU funding for the remainder of its existence as a SSMU club. (Seconded by VP Ronderos-Morgan)

VP Olle: As author, I accept it as a friendly amendment.

***Amendment “Be it further resolved, that if Choose Life so decides to continue on and have the event after its censure, Choose Life will automatically become ineligible to SSMU funding for the remainder of its existence as a SSMU club.” automatically accepted.***

Hudak: Now we need a speech of negation.

Fohl: As to the commitment the councillor was talking about – we did not make a commitment in council to that extent, the indication how we would tend to organize our events was not a commitment, and you will not find anything in our mandate which would support that. I find it is relevant that people are warned ahead of time that there will be graphic images used. Then, I want to apologize for not making more clear the comparisons that will be taking place. The event will not seek to compare the 2 events of the Holocaust and abortion – that cannot be quantified or compared. However, we are expressing our belief that abortion is dehumanization of unborn, just as the Holocaust was the dehumanization of its victims. The discussion will be on whether or not unborn children are dehumanized by the current abortion laws. Stopping this event is censoring group on campus. It would be an unfair discrimination of our club, it is censorship and misuse of SSMU's power. We would be talking about if dehumanization contributes to discrimination.

Briones: The issue is not to abuse SSMU's power to prevent club from expressing their views. In question is the fashion with which view is expressed, and there is nothing wrong about being responsible, with the right of free speech comes a certain responsibility. I realize that the intention was not to compare the Holocaust with abortion, but fact is that the used title of the speech makes it blatant that there is a comparison, which is inappropriate and disrespectful.

Lightbound: To start with, the issues is not whether we are pro-choice or pro-life or if we agree with statements of Ruba or if Choose-Life has broken promises. The issue is whether we want to impose a limit on the right of SSMU group to assemble or limit free speech, and it is a different thing if it is quasi-private setting, if information is not distributed to student population as a whole, do we want to limit free speech? I don't think so.

Marshall: I would like to motion to amend the resolution. I would like to replace the first be it further resolved clause with "Be it further resolved that the SSMU inform Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) Morton Mendelson that SSMU has censured this event and inform him that permitting it to continue contravenes the desire of this representative body."

VP Olle: What is the difference to the original motion?

Marshall: It should be clearer to the group Choose Life that we don't agree with them. This amendment makes it more open to the group Choose Life that it is against the will of their constituency as a whole to go forward with the event.

VP Olle: Amendment accepted.

***Amendment to replace first "be it resolved"-clause with "Be it further resolved that the SSMU inform Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning) Morton Mendelson that SSMU has censured this event and inform him that permitting it to continue contravenes the desire of this representative body." Passed.***

Omer: In my role as C & S councillor, I have spoken to our constituents and looked at it on 3 levels. "I have tried to balance the countervailing positions on this issue and have both spoken to a mover of this motion and have canvassed the position of the group organizing the event as well as some of my constituents.

I have looked at the event on 3 levels:

**Policy:**

- ☑ This body must always function while remembering that the power of democracy must constantly be counterbalanced with our commitment to minority rights and the protection of that minority from the tyranny of the majority.
- ☑ On the other hand, at times the majority must also protect itself when the actions of the minority shock the morality and conscience of McGill students. The event may, therefore, merit a restriction on freedom of expression.

**Clubs:**

- ☑ Clubs should be encouraged to fulfill their missions as approved by SSMU. I believe this event in general falls within the mandate of Choose Life.
- ☑ Other club's positions and the views of the general student body must also be taken into account though. Having considered the notions which may be drawn from its title and the disturbing ideas that may be inferred by extension from its message, many students and clubs, including Hillel McGill – the club representing many Jewish students on campus, have expressed their distaste to me, asking that I convey their views to this body, and have petitioned against this event occurring.

**Event:**

- ☑ I regret that the discussion based purely on personhood was not carried forward as an event on its own without reference to genocide as in such a case freedom of expression would undoubtedly outweigh any concerns in such a situation.
- ☑ The event's visuals, title and the website of the organization which the speaker is part of all suggest that the reference to the Holocaust and personhood are not in fact purely academic and intellectual and are meant largely to incite an emotional appeal as well as shock value among viewers and listeners.
- ☑ The fact that the event is in an optional-to-view environment, does, I believe, militate in favour of allowing it.

Nonetheless, personally, on balancing these countervailing points, I believe they lean in favour of this motion. I sincerely hope Choose Life in no way takes this as a rejection of their views which are entitled to as much protection as any other. Their sensitivity to other groups and their concerns should be heightened at future events though.

I am against the amendment to make future funding of the club conditional on their cancelling this event."

Bay: I personally disagree with the message and with the method of the message, but we have to protect student's right of free speech, which is the only reason to allow the event, but very important one. They do have the right to express their opinion, and we have the right to disagree and protest the event and show distaste for it. There is no reason for censure, just finding it very distasteful does not mean we should censure it.

Gallery: I met with Prof. Mendelson this afternoon to talk about the controversial events town hall and the event. I will speak as individual and journalist. I have followed Choose Life since its beginnings, and I found all 3 events so far personally offensive, especially the usage of shock value to threaten women's rights, so censure is something that was coming up in my opinion. They are offensive against women's rights. Please read my opinion piece in the Daily.

Mehta: I will begin by what councillor Bay said, I am also pro-choice, but I believe that women rights need to be respected. I also agree with councillor Lightbound on the quasi-

private setting, so instead of censoring the event, we should offer the ability to a pro-choice club to hold their own seminar. We should face controversial issues head-on, by censoring events, we are close-minded. This is reality, the Holocaust happened, and although the marketing of this event was extremely distasteful, the freedom of free speech very important, it is the foundation of our Western society, so I feel that we should defend personal freedom over opinion.

VP Dooley: I want to speak briefly to councillors. We have the responsibility to encourage free speech on campus, but also, this body has responsibility to maintain the safety and respect of our students. I don't feel that this event can be defended by free speech, because it does not promote academic discussion, somebody who would go to the event and speak against it would run the risk of being demonized, we have the responsibility to uphold our constitution and our equity policy. We have a responsibility especially to marginalized students without a voice in greater society.

Woolf: My views on this matter have been heard a lot. I would like to clarify – this university is not quasi-private, it is public university, so that not an argument. The point continuously brought up is the freedom of speech infringement through this motion. People are encouraged at all times to come together and practice their right of free speech, but a club status is not important for that. We are behold to our constitution and the equity policy, so we don't have a choice in this matter, we all agree that marginalizing particular groups on campus is bad. Our constitution is telling us that we have to do something about it, so I suggest we change the conversation to what we are going to do.

Omer: In terms of striking funding – is the amendment unconstitutional?

VP Olle: Funding and club status are entirely separate, remove funding does not take away club status at all.

Gallery: I spoke to Jeanette..., who debated Jose Ruba at Carlton university, and she said that he will make every point he can, his images are a show of gore, they are not medically possible, he showed many images of bloody vulvas, none of the women attending could speak afterwards in the discussion, they felt harassed, and I would not feel comfortable of submitting women to this objectification.

Bay: I would like to move to previous question (Seconded by Wun).

***Move to previous question approved.***

Omer: I would like to motion to divide the question, and vote on the first two “be it resolved” clauses separately from the last ones (Seconded by Yu).

***Motion to divide the question failed.***

Dourley: Motion to secret ballot (Seconded by Fabian)

***Motion to secret ballot passed.***

Hudak: If you are for it, write pro, if you are against it, write con.

Motion passes with 25 affirmations, 2 negations, 2 abstentions.

Hudak: The recording secretary would like to invite all speakers who read a prepared speech to bring their text up to her if they deem a verbatim account in the minutes important.

## F. Amendment Regarding Elections Posters\*

VP Brown: This motion is something that seems very trivial but I think it is a big deal. Every year, during election period, people find out how many posters they can print. Most of the candidates don't cover all of the buildings on campus, and there are a lot of posters left. I am moving to limit the poster limits. I have the building limits for posters, if you follow all the poster regulations, there are no more than 200 that you can hang up in all buildings. SSMU wants to be a leader on environmental issues, so we should be lowering our waste, and move to lower poster limits. Also, we used to elect a SSMU representative to the Board of Governors, there is one student seat, we had a problem with the university about that, so now the representative is by default the president. I would like to motion to strike that regulation from the by-laws since it is obsolete. I encourage you to support this.

### Questions:

Garofalo: When would it be appropriate to divide the question?

Hudak: After the question period.

Garofalo: Who is in charge of the poster regulations?

VP Brown: Sometimes the porters, sometimes the faculty societies.

Garofalo: Considering that student participation going down, would it be better to negotiate with students associations to increase poster limits than limit the posters allowed to print?

Motion to move to committee of the whole.

### ***Motion to move into committee of the whole passed.***

VP Brown: That defeats the purpose, there are posters everywhere. 8 posters in some buildings is a lot, more paper on the wall won't increase student participation, while I understand the desire to get students more involved, we are trying to increase awareness about SSMU and elections, so another 200 pages per candidate won't make a difference.

Garofalo: Motion to exit committee of the whole.

### ***Motion to exit committee of the whole passed.***

Keresteci: Are candidates allowed to distribute posters off campus?

VP Brown: There are many other things in the campaigning bylaws, you are allowed to handbill in any building on campus unlimited, and there are lots other ways for candidates to campaign that are open. I personally printed 200, but I didn't go to all buildings, and I hung up about 125.

Marshall: No other type or size of posters are allowed?

VP Brown: There are only posters by the size 8 1/2 by 11 allowed according to the bylaws.

Garofalo: I would like to propose an amendment and strike "17.2"

VP Brown: That is a whereas clause, and you can't amend a whereas clause, it is also irrelevant with what I am trying to achieve, that would be another discussion to another time.

Garofalo: I withdraw my amendment.

Marshall: Motion to make the amendment to include "or size" in 16.5.3 and 16.5.4.

VP Brown: I accept that as a friendly amendment.

Bay: Motion to debate.

Marshall: Motion to move to previous question (Seconded by Ma).

***Motion to move to previous question passed.***

***Amendment Regarding Elections Posters passed.***

## G. Memorandum RE: SSMU Conflict of Interest Policy

VP Dooley: I submitted a revised version – it is a resolution instead of a memo. This came out of many years of awkward situations of SSMU execs dealing with business of SSMU. We have a responsibility for the student body to make sure that it was held in highest ethical standards. This concerns students making decisions affecting ourselves and people we know, and this policy put in place will make it easier for people to abstain without explaining their reasons. Also, business interactions are important, where the acceptance of offers of gifts would be against our conflict of interest policy. We want to make sure that our processes are all ethical.

Marshall: In 3.4 - “gifts” is one that is in return for a business favour or a “promotional benefit” of 3.5?

VP Olle: In 3.4, the gift would be nominating the business favour, that wouldn’t be making a business decision in a fair way, but in 3.5, the company would accommodate the student organization making the deal

Marshall: Who determines the nature of the benefit? It could still fall under 3.4, since it could present a conflict of interest for future actions. Should we make a distinction there?

President Neilson: Good point, but the whole basis of the policy would be of full disclosure, so it would fall back to the higher body or the Financial Ethics Review. The policy is based on full disclosure, which is expected from all groups.

Abaki: I would like to move to amend 4.5, I would prefer that it would be “the Committee should refer it back to Council.”

VP Dooley: This amendment is not friendly, another option would be revising the wording. The policy allows for certain procedures, and adding in referring back to council would interrupt the flow of the policy. It doesn’t make sense with the flow of the policy.

Abaki: For example if all people on the nominating committee had a conflict of interest, referring it back to council would make a lot of sense.

Marshall: I would like to motion to include that “the SSMU will strike a new committee”.

Abaki: Part of the constitution of the committee could also be made up of council.

VP Dooley: I was concerned about bringing these matters to council for discussion, since they are very specific to a committee, they should not be debated in a body of 30+ people. I would want it to be reworded to bring it to council to defer to another committee or strike a new committee, I think that would be more respectful of the individual and council’s time.

Marshall: Alternate – of council or not?

VP Dooley: I would like to move to caucus for 10 minutes.

VP Dooley: I would like to motion to make these amendments:

4.5 If the number of students who are unable to vote as noted in 4.3 and 4.4 interferes with the Committee’s ability to achieve quorum, the chair will refer the matter to council which will appoint a Councillor (“replacement”) to replace the student who has declared a conflict (“conflicted student”).

4.5.1 The replacement will remain as a voting member of the Committee until such a time as the conflicted student, in conjunction with the chair of the Committee, is found to no longer be conflicted.

Ma: Motion to move to previous question.

***Motion to move to previous question passed.***

***Motion RE: Conflict of Interest Policy passed.***

## 9. Confidential Session

10.

Adjournment.....10.

40

\*requires leave of council