**Arts Undergraduate Society of McGill University**

**Legislative Council**

**February 13th, 2019, 6:00 PM [Postponed to February 14th, 6:00 PM]**

* 1. Call to Order
		1. 6:01 pm
	2. Territorial Acknowledgement
		1. AUS would like to acknowledge that McGill University is situated on the traditional territory of the Kanien’kehá:ka, a place which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst nations. AUS recognizes and respects the Kanien’kehá:ka as the traditional custodians of the lands and water on which we meet today.
	3. Roll Call
	4. Meeting Minutes for Approval: AUS Meeting Minutes January 30th 2019
		1. Changes/Corrections:
			+ WIMESSA: There was no mention of the harsh treatment to the WIMESSA and ASSA councillors. Please add ASSA's attempted Point of Order and the Speaker's refusal of that to the second-to-last page of the minutes.
			+ RSUS: I'd normally never correct the minutes, but this actually could reflect very badly on me. On page 11, the minutes say I said, "This room is very ethnic." I definitely never said that. Please strike this from the minutes.
			+ PSA: On page 10, change, "The Italian government" to, "The Italian government, just as with any other government".
			+ PSSA: The PSSA had no bearing on the conception or approval of POLI 339. On the bottom of page 7, please acknowledge that Arts Representative Figueredo was wrong and that the PSSA did not have any role in approving POLI 339
			+ WIMESSA: On page 10, change, "Jewish legislation" to, "Israeli legislation".
		2. Minutes stand for approval with amendment
	5. Approval of the Agenda
		1. Changes
			+ VP External: The Motion to Approve the Proposal of the Departmental Elections Working Group (9.7) and the Motion to Create the VP Services by Referendum (9.8) were submitted late. They're both time-constricted and have deadlines. I'd like to motion to move items 9.7 and 9.8 on the agenda to before item 7 (Presentation from AUS executives regarding POLI 339)
				- Second motioner: VP Finance
				- Motion passes
			+ PSSA: Motion to move Motion to Ban the Recording and/or Taping of AUS (item 9.9 on the agenda) to before item 7 on the agenda
				- Second motioner: President
				- Motion passes
			+ Arts Senator Wilson: Motion to Add Senate Letter to Advisory to the Agenda
				- Second motioner: President
				- Motion passes
			+ President: Motion to add 9.1, 9.2, and 9.3 to before 7
				- Second motioner: CSUS
				- Motion passes
		2. [Point of Information] Arts Senator Wilson: Could Council motion to move all of New Business to before 7 on the agenda?
			+ Speaker: It might be easier to move #7 after all of New Business
			+ *All of Council marvels at this ingenuity. Motions to cancel all the prior motions of moving items from New Business to before #7. Motion passes.*
		3. Changes, continued
			+ Arts Senator Wilson: Motion to move item 9 (all of New Business) on the agenda to before the Presentation from AUS executives regarding POLI 339
				- Second motioner: ACE
				- Motion passes
			+ GSA: Motion to move GSA's Departmental Report to after New Business, before the Presentation from AUS executives regarding POLI 339
				- Second motioner: VP External
				- Motion passes

VP External: It's possible to push reports to the next Council

Speaker: Then I'll move the GSA report back to its original position (cancelling GSA's motion)

Second motioner: VP Finance(?)

Motion passes

* + - * [Point of Personal Privilege] BASIC: I'm here as a proxy for BASIC
			* PSSA: Can we move item 9.9 on the agenda to the front of New Business?
				+ Second motioner: Arts Senator Wilson
				+ Motion passes
		1. Agenda adopted as amended
	1. Announcements
		1. President: Logistics - Unfortunately, there are no active listeners on standby today. The iPad (which is normally placed by the door for councillors to use to sign out if they have to leave Council early) is being used by BdA tonight, so if you want to sign out early, I'll put the sign-out document in a place where people can write that they're leaving
		2. CRO, Elections AUS: If Council wants to submit a referendum question to the elector, Council must ratify the question by today's meeting. Must be passed by 2/3 of the Council and questions must be forwarded to deputy post. All questions are due February 21\* in English and French in the AUS Office
			+ *\*The due date was extended to February 28 later in Council.*
		3. DESA: On Thursday, February 21, HSA and DESA are hosting a semi-formal. Tickets are on sale: message one of our execs! It's $8 for cash bar and $13 for two drink tickets
		4. Arts Senator Wilson: McGill University is still accepting feedback on the Revision to the Sexual Violence Policy.
		5. VP External: Building in Management Committee in SSMU sending survey to see what people want in their buildings. Please share among constituents.
		6. Speaker: I'm Husayn Jamal, the Speaker for the SUS. I worked for the AUS in this role last year. I am not as familiar with the Standing Rules in the AUS. Please let me know if I make a mistake and I'll do my best to ratify them.
			+ *Note: Husayn Jamal was this Council's Speaker, as AUS' usual Speaker, Marie Fester, was unavailable.*
		7. Secretary General: As we'll be talking about POLI 339, I'll be here to lead the discussion and to accept questions.
	2. Unfinished Business
	3. New Business
		1. Motion to Bring the Question Regarding the Arts Computer Lab Fee to Winter Referendum 2019 [PASSED]
			+ Moving (President)
				- This fee is expiring this year. We need to vote for it to go to referendum for students to decide whether they want to have the fee.
			+ Voting
				- Motion passes
			+ [Point of Order] PSSA: The Motion to Ban the Recording and/or Taping of the AUS Legislative Council Meetings was supposed to be the first order of New Business
				- Speaker: I'm so sorry, you're right.
		2. [Motion to Ban the Recording and/or Taping of AUS Legislative Council Meetings] [Late] [PASSED]
			+ Moving (PSSA + MESS)
				- This motion was created to create a guideline/rule for the taping and recording of AUS Council meetings. In the Constitution as it is now, there is no rule prohibiting this. I believe it's the AUS' duty to create a safe space that facilitates discussion and in which councillors feel comfortable. This motion would respect the safety of gallery members and councillors.
			+ Questions
				- VP Finance: If a McGill newspaper wanted to record Council, would that be allowed with this motion?

MESS: It's something I thought about, in terms of livestreaming. I didn't know how I personally thought about it, but all the pertinent information about and discussed in Council is already publicized in the minutes and documents, so I feel there is no need for a livestream in a newspaper if you have these documents.

* + - * Debate
				+ AHCSSA: I find this a little problematic because of the lack of transparent governance. How are other people who are not here [in Council] supposed to see what's going on? In terms of logistics, I think it's not transparent to do this kind of thing.
				+ MESS: To speak to that, it's my personal opinion that you can access all the necessary events and you can read what has transpired through the minutes and documents. You can also reach out to fellow Councillors and executives to find where to navigate.
				+ CSUS: Given that technology's becoming more and more prevalent in today's society, I don't see why livestreaming should be prohibited by bylaws. I don't see why the AUS wouldn't start doing this soon. Nobody should be embarrassed by what they say in Council; it's all on record, after all.
				+ AHCSSA: I have one more comment. There's a reason we have open and closed sessions. I don't know how this works in terms of formality, but if there's a request to make a session closed, it'd make sense to have no recordings during closed session. But if it's open session, recording should be allowed.
				+ Equity Commissioner: This motion was created in response to councillors and gallery members being taped without their consent or knowledge last Council (during which they questioned and debated POLI 399's fee). People filming Council meetings can be essential and necessary for transparency, but people need to understand that they're being filmed. Last session, people were filming to inflict violence and for their personal reasons, not to help others. This motion was in response to that issue in specific, not about livestreaming, so I believe this motion is about protecting people from non-press recordings created for negative reasons.
				+ MESS: I share the sentiment of the Equity Commissioner. Footage and recordings can be manipulated unfavourably and can be weaponized, for lack of a better term. I think minutes are transparent and that they paint the full picture. Videos, on the other hand, can be taken out of context. That doesn't foster a safe environment for Councillors or gallery members. This is more an opportunity to protect, not to hide.
				+ Secretary General: Given the topic of what we're discussing and how it pertains to the integrity process as a whole, we should be able to share to the whole community. Perhaps we could ask for people's consent before recording and that could be a compromise.
				+ DESA: Would the movers be open or friendly to suggest an amendment to this motion to explicitly make an exception to campus press, and to only bar random gallery members taking videos without the consent of other Councillors?
				+ PSA: It's my personal opinion that having the ability to livestream would actually be an accessible means of delivering these sorts of committee meetings' information. We also just saw that we spent much longer amending minutes this Council than any other, and we realized there were some parts of the minutes that weren't accurate. The accuracy of the minutes largely relates to a Councillor making sure they remember what they said, word for word, as they remembered it. Maybe if AUS took it on themselves to record Council, it would be publicly accessible. This motion is not a good idea: it would be more accessible and fair to everyone in the room if we allowed and implemented recording.
				+ HSA: While I agree it'd be great for the broadest possible AUS community to see what happens in our meetings, the critical point being brought up here is intent and for knowledge. While the intent of campus press livestreaming would be good, I can't see an instance where someone in the gallery filming, without the knowledge of Councillors, would be meant in a way or with a motive that are in the same vein as the campus livestreaming it. I think it's a great idea to explicitly add something like "only the campus press can record."
				+ ASA: I want to echo HSA and say that I think we've heard several times that it'd be so nice and accessible to livestream this meeting. This is true, but it comes down to consent or that you'll know there'll be a livestream of you when you come to this meeting, and not just someone random behind you with a camera using their footage for their own use. The only kind of footage that should be allowed is the AUS using the footage on their website. Just echoing this kind of sentiment. Thank you.
				+ President: A Motion was brought up by DESA and I'd like to amend the motion: should campus press want to livestream the meeting, it needs a 2/3 approval from Council.
			* Motions
				+ Motion (DESA): Be it further resolved, that in order for a campus press to film and/or record in a meeting, they must proceed with 2/3 majority consent of the AUS Legislative Council.

Second motioner; VP Finance

*Speaker attempts to start a vote*

[Point of Order] Arts Senator Wilson: We don't need to vote on a friendly amendment

Speaker: Oh. Is the amendment friendly?

MESS + PSSA: Amendment is friendly

* + - * Debate (continued)
				+ PSSA: The first two "be it resolved" clauses ask to change the Constitution, but I want to strike when it says "Article 9 of the AUS Constitution" and put in "Standing Rules of the AUS Council" to clarify we want to change the standing rules of this Council, not the Constitution, which in that case we would need to wait until referendum. We want this motion to cover THIS Council only.

Second motioner: VP External

Amendment is friendly

* + - * + CSUS: Regarding the amendment "be it further resolved" scenario, the requirement of a 2/3 majority vote to pass seems high to me. Contentious issues are where we should have the best record taken. If there's reasonable knowledge of people being recorded and a field of vision of the camera recording, this issue is moot. We should have people outside of Council be aware of what's happening in Council.
				+ ASSA: While I understand that it'd be useful to have recordings of contentious debates, it's these debates that put people's identities at risk and we shouldn't undermine that or belittle that because it's a reality on this campus.
				+ CSAUS: I'm worrying that we don't have precedent that defines who's press or not. Having governments say who can and can't record is a dangerous level of precedent for any government to set. As electors, you were elected to represent your department. You know you're in a public forum and it should give you the higher burden of saying what you and your department stand for. Recording doesn't change that.
				+ SLUM: I want people to keep in mind that not everyone in this meeting is an elected official. Many gallery members have come to speak their own experiences and they didn't sign up for this "higher burden" and merely want to state their personal experiences.
				+ GSA: Regarding the issue of precedent, we covered that as an executive by having that vote. Smaller press would be recognized by us. If a Speaker didn't want to be recorded, and they said, "Please don't record me," would there be an issue of that? There's a pretty easy solution that once recording starts, if you don't want to be filmed, you could just say that.
				+ PSSA: Maybe in response to that: it's problematic to ask people to put themselves in positions where they have to specifically ask not to be recorded. If you're representing your constituency, why would you be ashamed to represent them? This motion is good because it creates that basis where people don't have to ask not to be recorded. It puts more power into the agency and safety of the person instead of into the press -and that was the sentiment behind creating this motion in the first place. Addressing the points brought up about representing the constituency and not being ashamed to do so: it's easier to say that when your individual identity isn't at risk by doing so. I'm pushing for you all to understand the main reason for this motion is not to tamper with freedom of speech or accessibility of Council, it's more so to make a safe environment for councillors to best represent their constituents.
				+ AHCSSA: Two things. One, I'd like to refer to the comments of the Equity Commissioner about consent. I think an alternative to all of this could be having consent forms for everyone who comes into the room every Council to sign, asking if they're okay with being filmed. I don't know where that fits in with all of this. Secondly, I'd like to ask the movers of this motion if they've looked at Quebec law. Just as SSMU's a corporation, I think AUS is one too, and according to law, corporations have to keep all their meetings open and filmed.
				+ Secretary General: In the interest of timing and the things in the agenda coming before the substantial proceedings, we should move the motion as amended and see how it goes from there.
				+ MESS: How haven't the meetings been open since then? I don't believe that this motion necessarily alters the openness of meetings in the past.
				+ ASSA: Arguments for approval have been about transparency and accessibility. I feel like the minutes do a good job of being really detailed about what the discussions entail. I think recording wouldn't add anything to accessibility that the minutes already do.
			* Motions
				+ Arts Senator Wilson: Motion to Call the Question

Second motioner: MESS

Motion passes

* + - * Voting
				+ Voting on motion as amended
				+ Motion passes
			* Speaker: As per the Standing Rules, it is now forbidden for members of the gallery and Council to record.
		1. Motion Regarding Lack of Affordable Food and Refreshment Option in the McLennan-Redpath Complex [PASSED]
			- Moving (ESA)
				* PM's contract with basement of Redpath is expiring and coming under review. We want to advocate for an affordable healthy option for the McLennan-Redpath basement.
			- Debate
				* Arts Senator Wilson: I would've enjoyed if the movers had elaborated on the feasibility of this. It's not feasible for the Arts Senators to directly advocate for this. SSMU wants to have a committee for a contractor to survey all food at McGill. Arts Senators can't do anything to resolve this. I'd like to motion to strike the last clause, where it says that, "the AUS recommends that the Arts Senators advocate for an affordable option for food and refreshments in the McLennan-Redpath Complex."
				* AHCSSA: I see that SSMU president has arrived, if you'd like to speak to this on debate.

*Tre Mansdoerfer, SSMU President, was in the gallery this Council.*

* + - * + ESA: I specifically used the word "recommend," I wasn't mandating anything. I'm not calling arts senators to do this, but I'd be open to friendly amendment
			* Motions
				+ Arts Senator Wilson: Motion to strike the last be it further resolved clause, "Be it further resolved, that the AUS recommends that the Arts Senators advocate for an affordable option for food and refreshments in the McLennan-Redpath Complex."

ESA, RSUS, AHCCSA, JSSA, GSA: Motion is friendly

Last "be it further resolved" clause is struck.

* + - * + President: Motion to call the question

Second motioner: VP Finance

Motion passes

* + - * Voting
				+ Voting on motion as amended
				+ Motion passes
		1. Motion to Renew and Increase the AUTS fee [PASSED]
			- Moving (VP Finance)
				* The AUTS puts on a production in Moyse Hall every year. This year, they performed Spring Awakening. Right now, their fee is a dollar and it ends up being $14,000 a year for them, but the cost to rent Moyse Hall alone is $23,000. They also want to buy the expensive rights to more popular plays. We're looking to double the fee from $1 to $2 so they can expand to better production, materials, and more popular plays.
			- Debate
				* Secretary General: Motion to call the question?

Speaker: You don't need to move to call the question if there's no debate

[Point of Order] Arts Senator Wilson: The Secretary General is not a voting member of Council, so they can't move motions.

Speaker: Looking to the AUS President on this matter.

President: I don't know why you're looking to me on this, but it's true. The Secretary General can't vote or bring motions to the table.

* + - * + BASIC: I want some clarification on the actual question. It says, "Students and from .50$ to 1$ for part-time Bachelors of Arts Students, and half for Bachelors of Arts and Science Students depending on their status?" Does this mean that Bachelor of Arts and Science students, if this motion passes, would then pay a 50-cents AUTS fee every year?

VP Finance: Yes.

* + - * Voting
				+ Motion passes
		1. Motion to Approve the Decisions of the FMC from January 23 and February 5 [PASSED]
			- Moving (VP Finance)
				* We need to approve the FMC's decisions.
			- Voting
				* Motion passes
		2. Motion to Renew the AUIF Fee [PASSED]
			- Moving (VP Finance)
				* The AUIF is up for renewal this year. We take on fun projects every year. We want to renew it for the next three years, and then it'll be up for renewal again.
			- Voting
				* Motion passes
		3. Motion to Approve Amendments to the EASSA Constitution [POSTPONED]
			- Moving (President)
				* I'm motivating on behalf of the people. Due to the snow, they couldn't come to the meeting today. CRBC did go through the Constitutional amendments. There was a point that said they would flip a coin if there was a tie? So basically a lot of the Constitution was old and outdated, and we updated the outdated points.
			- Questions
				* VP External: Looking at the motion itself where it says, "Allowing executives to hold an application process for additional executive positions," I'm wondering how it's gonna come into play with the motion I'm presenting right after this. Is it gonna fall into line with it?

President: From what I remember, I believe that if no one feels throughout the elective process, they would need to elect someone from the electoral body

* + - * + [Point of Information] VP Finance: One of the movers is the EASSA President, who doesn't sit on the Council, so we need a second motioner

Second motioner: VP Finance

* + - * + CRO, Elections AUS: Some of the provisions of this motion go directly against the subsequent motion.

Speaker: Please reserve this point for debate, not for question period.

* + - * Debate
				+ Arts Senator Wilson: I'd recommend that if there are inconsistencies between this motion and the bylaws, it'd be in our best interest to table this motion, given that we have a long Council ahead of us.

[Point of Information] President: Was that a motion?

Arts Senator Wilson: I… guess?

* + - * Motions
				+ CSUS: Motion to postpone this motion to another Council

Second motioner: Arts Senator Wilson

Motion postponed

* + 1. [Motion to Approve the Proposal of the Departmental Elections Working Group] [Late] [PASSED]
			- Moving (VP External)
				* 2-3 weeks ago, we struck a working group to bring something to do with internal departmental elections to February 13's Council. There were issues of inconsistencies among departments if they chose to opt out of AUS elections, as we've seen in the past few Councils. We want to propose these amendments that would outline the rules for how departments structure their internal elections and interview processes.
			- Questions:
				* CSAUS: What power does the Equity Commissioner have on the interview process? Can they veto anything?

VP External: The Equity Commissioner would just be there for consultation and not have any kind of veto powers. Same for if the CRO were there - just to provide that check and to provide suggestions. Just a check. No veto power.

* + - * + MUGS: Is the process the same for inter-faculty departments who choose to opt-out of faculty elections?

VP External: I don't think we discussed that.

CRO, Elections AUS: That part of the Constitution has not been amended so inter-faculty departments are still permitted to opt-out.

* + - * + CSUS: Is the opt-out still automatic and granted? Inter-faculty departments are given opt-outs? Does that still stand?

VP External: Yes.

* + - * Voting
				+ Motion passes
		1. [Motion to Create the VP Services by Referendum] [Late] [PASSED]
			- Moving (VP External)
				* This is something discussed last year. In general, the execs have a lot of burnout and there are particular portfolios that spend more money on their labour, like the VP Internal, because that portfolio manages all the bookings. There's no way [for the VP Internal] to take a day off because departments need to run their events. I made some propositions of creating a new position called VP Services that deals with all the service aspects of the AUS and to allow the portfolio to grow like the AUS is always growing. Managing the ARTS SUMS that tends to not get as much attention in the VP Internal portfolio, so we'd like to move it to the new VP Services one. VP Services duties would include managing table bookings, the essay center, peer tutoring, photography services, the arts computer fund committee, and the sponsorship committee. This would be going to referendum. We're not voting on it now.
			- Questions
				* ESA: Will this be filled next year or the academic year after that?

VP External: If this passes by referendum and a member of Council wants to fill the position through by-council appointment, then it'd be filled next year. If no one in Council wants to fill it, then we'd run a by-election for the academic year after that.

* + - * Debate
				+ [Point of Information] AHCSSA: What's "by-council appointment"?

VP External: People in a Council committee running via appointment and we vote on it in Council.

* + - * + [Point of Information] SLUM: Is that the same process we used to elect Billy [Kawasaki] as VP Internal?

VP External: Yes.

* + - * Voting
				+ Motion passes
		1. [Motion to Send Letter to Advisory Committee for the Selection of a Deputy Provost (Student Life and Learning)] [Late] [PASSED]
			- Moving (Arts Senator Wilson)
				* About 2 weeks ago, the EUS passed a similar letter; basically there's currently a DEPSLL. Seconds all of these suggestions from the EUS that are not engineering-specific. I wrote this letter by myself and didn't have time to consult. If there are any amendments, please do.
			- Voting
				* Motion passes
		2. Presentation from AUS executives regarding POLI 339

*The Secretary General replaces the Speaker as the mediator of this discussion.*

* 1. Presentation
		1. Secretary General: As you may have seen on the Legislative Council Facebook group, we [the Secretary General portfolio] have informed people now that we've suspended the result of the AUS executives' FIO vote following investigations regarding undemocratic and unconstitutional behaviour. There were concerns about transparency and there was confusion about the supposed "time constraints" of the motion. We're accepting complaints and by looking at complaints we have right now, we are willing to resolve the issue now. Given this is a time-sensitive issue, we're trying to resolve it as quickly as possible.
		2. President: I'm open to correction from my fellow execs. I am very upset and I wrote this statement with a lot of emotions. The majority of the exec is sorry. Initially we apologized to our departmental representatives and we apologize to our constituents for the stress we have caused. The AUS executive committee vote was an absolute breach of the AUS Legislative Council's trust. After the motion failed at council, the professors were distressed and started emailing the President email repeatedly. We'd like to highlight the power dynamic that emerges when a professor repeatedly emails a student as it adds to the pressure of the situation. I know that we were elected to represent you at an admin and professor level, and I apologize for succumbing to these dynamics and I hope that we can put checks and balances to prevent this situation in the future. On February 7th, the exec was told that we needed to decide on this class fee ratification due to the FIO by-laws, clause 2.3 stating that if a decision must be made when AUS Legislative Council is unable to be convened, the AUS Executive Committee must contact the representative departmental association if and when possible for their recommendation. This recommendation can then be ratified by a simple majority of the AUS Executive Committee. We decided against bringing to council for reasons such as the time constraint, and wanting to avoid the emotional labour brought to the last council. I personally thought the executives would vote against the motion which is why I voted against bringing it to the legislative council. Furthermore, some of us suspect an executive told the professors this by law so they could frame it in this way. From that vote, on February 8th, we discussed on our Facebook chat. This was our first mistake, we tried to meet but were unable given we were spread out and/or busy at the time. This should have been our priority so we apologize. To break down the vote, we had 4 Yes, 4 abstentions, and 2 Against. From this vote and situation, Billy Kawasaki, our VP Internal has resigned. He felt among others on our team bullied and harassed into voting in a way according to the goals of others.  The environment in the chat was hostile and militant for those who wanted the ratification of this class. We tried to do another vote without abstentions to decide but some executive did not want to be yes or no. I will admit that I messaged one of our executives at the time in order to vote as I wanted another no vote in order to stop this process. I realize in hindsight that was a mistake on my part so I am sorry. The executives against this expressed our anger and frustration with the situation but were met with further hostility and anger. On February 11th, I sent a ratification letter to Mary Jo McCullough, the Director of Student Accounts who then sent it to SSMU for ratification and they ratified it to be sent to the Deputy Provost of Student Life and Learning Office. I have called Mary to see if we can take back our vote and she said it has never been done before. She sent me to Linda Webb who handles finances who suggested I go to SSMU who sent me to the DPSLL office. So, Fabrice Labeau, our deputy provost, has informed me that if we can get SSMU on board, we should talk to him again about rescinding the vote. This story is not to make excuses because put simply, we messed up very badly. We promise to rectify the position.
		3. VP Academic: I wanted to say that I'm sorry that I couldn't do more to stop this. I wanted to explain what and why I voted. I voted against calling an emergency council because I thought the ultimatum to call Council given to me was arbitrary. It was weird that the deadline was on a Friday and I didn't see how waiting five days until next Council would make a difference. I wanted folks to be able to consult their constituents and to mobilize. I thought it wouldn't be fair to call an emergency council on a Friday evening and potentially not have enough councillors to go forward with this. I personally voted No on overturning this decision because of the labour that went into the last Council; who are we to overstep people's shared stories and say that this course is more important than the stories that were shared. It was gross to undermine all that went into this meeting. I'm sorry that I couldn't have stepped up and do more. I tried my best to support Maria in this conversation and to calm the discourse down because it was getting super hostile. I didn't think it would come to this outcome but when you're in the minority, it's hard, because in democracy it's the majority that wins. I'm disappointed and that's why I personally didn't sign any statement released because I didn't want to be included in this. I was so embarrassed of what was going to come out of this. I'm sorry that I couldn't have done more and I honestly don't know what I could have done in this situation. It was intense, things were not great, and now words don't mean shit; I had a statement prepared but fuck that. Sorry for the language. I've been supporting Maria in contacting people and supporting Rebecca in being as transparent as possible yesterday in the Facebook group when councillors were holding us to accountability. That was my way of apologizing for this situation that I would not have liked to be in but it wasn't my choice since I'm in the AUS team. Please let me know if there's anything I could have done to clean this shit up or done anything differently. I tried to do what I could do in that moment.
		4. Secretary General: We have received complaints about the accusatory language in the Facebook group. Please keep this in mind. This isn't easy for anyone dealing with this.
		5. WIMESSA: I want to say that I appreciate that apologies were offered and I appreciate efforts especially by the women of colour of the AUS that are trying to rectify this situation. I do have a lot of things to say. I am so extremely uncomfortable sitting in this room. I'm dismayed, outraged even, by the leadership in this room. I was recorded and taped, told I had no idea I was talking about, that my ethnicity made me biased, that my concerns were petty, proxy, and privileged, and our village names were thrown around as if they didn't matter. You made me sit here and prove my humanity to my constituents. You made me sit here and defend my humanity, my right to speak, my identity, and more. Your response was to overthrow a decision made. Your response was to remove me, everyone in this room, and worse, every Palestinian in McGill, from this decision. I truly have no idea how you can comfortably sit in this room and say that your actions were as fair and equitable as your statement says. It became my upmost importance to sit in this Council to represent my constituents, so that's why I'm sitting here today, that's what I came here to do. I ask that you answer questions transparently because it has had a lot of real and harmful effects in this room.
		6. DESA: First of all, thank you to everyone who's been a part of trying to rectify this situation. Thanks to WIMESSA, AUS President, VP Academic, and the many departmental execs who were rightfully outraged by what happened. I received many emails from my constituents who were confused and were saying they can't trust the integrity of Council and they felt like they were being intentionally kept in the dark. Though I was also unaware, that didn't and doesn't matter. I want to bring up concerns that we have. I heard that an emergency Council couldn't be called within 24 hours, but I didn't recall ever being called if a Council could be called in the first place. I think a Council could have been called last week. I'm concerned that a vote that was made at Council could be overturned in the first place. I'm very upset. I think that this calls the integrity of us as an organization into question and a lot of students are upset and we really need to work to fix this. At this point, this isn't just a course, this is about us being transparent, accountable to students, and democratic. Right now, we are none of those things, and we need to be something.
			+ Secretary General: The integrity of the AUS is what we're investigating right now and that's why we've suspended the vote. I want to thank the Equity Commissioners who've also been working on this - any situation where an individual is thought to have acted outside of their range is being investigated, and that's currently what's being investigated
		7. Arts Representative Figueredo: Thank you for sharing your concerns with this topic. I admit I did message somebody to try to get them to vote the way I wanted. That was not necessarily the right thing to do. We were informed by the professors that there was an impending vote at the end of the week. We were only asked to hold a vote at 6:28 pm in 24 hours as Council-mandated. By our choosing, we would have brought this back to Council. We meant to, and all of us brought this to the chat. I mentioned my discomfort at screenshots being posted and at the language used in the chat. I did not post on the Facebook group for that reason: I felt that the rhetoric was becoming toxic. I'm sorry if I came off as silent: I meant to address this in person. Everyone wishes this could have been brought back to Council, but that said, the lettering of the Council was followed. I blamed the department and the professors but we were forced to do what we did in the situation. I was attacked personally numerous times in the Facebook group, and this really re-opened some of my mental health issues from last semester. I'd like to note that it was always my intention to bring this back to Council and to bring this back the right way.
		8. VP External: On our communication channel we used on Thursday, Feb 7, 2:56 pm, the other alternative was calling an emergency council. I didn't think that the emergency council should have happened and it would have been undemocratic for the exec to overturn it regardless. I have the timestamps of the chat.
		9. SLUM: There's this talk of professors pressuring members of AUS exec and that's why they felt a decision needed to be made. But as many people have pointed out, the ball was in the AUS exec's court: it wasn't necessary to concede to the profs' wishes. By Quebec law, if you wish to charge an extra course fee, you need to have it approved by a student union. I'm not sure the profs were allowed to ask for a re-vote in the first place. It's their fault for not presenting the information in a timely manner.
			+ Secretary General: I'd be interested bringing to the table why the professors needed the deadline, the factors of the deadline, who issued it, etc.
		10. PSSA: As PSSA, we're upset by the first part of this exec statement. That's another thing, beyond what we're talking about, that was a little problematic. It puts ownership of deciding courses and course fees on the departments, which is hypocritical because the departmental consulting was overturned by this exec vote. This statement falsely implies that the PSSA lobbied for this course. We didn't motion this and we were explicit about the fact that we had no part in this.
		11. ASSA: I want to thank the people shedding more light on what's been happening underground that we didn't know about. I want to say that the statements saying how the process has been going don't reflect the fact that their democratic intent is disingenuous. A lot of people and colour and Palestinians were heckled, and their identities were marginalized and put on the line for this last Council. This seems like a reflection of that. Asking people to just move on from this as if it hasn't harmed people is kind of a shitty thing to say. A lot of people have put a lot on the line, like mental health, safety, etc. This is true not just of the behaviour of the AUS executive but also of the nature of this course.
		12. Arts Senator Wilson: Please refrain from collective addressing or from saying "we." When you're speaking about this issue, it's your own personal opinion, so please acknowledge that.
		13. AHCSSA: All the execs are human. Please acknowledge that. I'd like to acknowledge that the language surrounding this rhetoric is rude, hostile, and hurtful.
		14. DESA: We're an accredited union in Quebec. We're recognized by Quebec. I personally think the only way to move forward and to allow constituents and everyone to think they can have faith in the AUS is resignations. I'm not calling on anyone to resign. If you encouraged this blatant breaking of democracy and encouraged people to manipulate the by-laws to serve the professors' wills, you should not be on Council.
		15. HSA: To echo DESA's point, this is something I studied. The departmental associations were literally founded to stand up to professors for the students' rights. To have our decision be broken by people bending backwards for the professors is a gross violation of our very history and purpose.
	2. Questions
		1. RSUS: For the sake of transparency, Arts Representative Figueredo stated that he was, in his belief, responsible for the pressuring of one exec member who later resigned. What was this pressure?
			+ President: This is my personal opinion - I was met with a lot of hostility and anger from certain executives. I'm not comfortable sharing exactly what they said, but basically it was demeaning what I was saying, invalidating what I was saying, and questioning my strength as a president. I'm not the best but I fucking do my job. Women of colour never take credit for that, for doing our jobs. I was annoyed at the distress that came from there. In regards to Billy, he received a message saying he couldn't change his vote since it was "closed." I'm sorry that I missed it - that wasn't true at all. He definitely could have changed his vote, but I missed that message because we had so many other messages coming through. The chat was very militant - angry, screaming, threatening to resign. I was upset myself; I acknowledge that maybe I was a bit militant.
			+ Secretary General: Any clarification on the "closed poll"? It would help the question.
			+ Arts Rep Figueredo: I was accused in the chat of "having an agenda." I was told that this issue doesn't affect me in any way when it actually does, because it compromised my mental health and well-being. This decision was something very regrettable. Despite all these tensions, we want to overcome this and we all have the best intentions of the AUS in mind. At the end of the day, we're trying to make this right. We realized that we collectively fucked up and there was division that didn't need to happen.
		2. ASSA: I also wanted a clarification on why we needed a re-vote. What made our original vote invalid and why did they need a new vote to go to Council?
			+ Secretary General: Why did we need a re-vote?
			+ *Question goes unanswered until later.*
		3. Gallery: I have a question for Figueredo. I understand that you've apologized. I think actions speak louder than words and I want to ask if you've considered resigning. As an Arts student, I'm not comfortable having a "representative" who represents professors instead of me, and who overturns democracy for them.
			+ Arts Rep: No, I'm not going to resign. It wasn't just me who voted in favour for this. This vote passed in the Arts executive committee; I wasn't the only one who voted in favour. I think it's a ridiculous double standard to hold me to.
		4. Gallery (Patrick): I have 2 questions. This statement, put out late near midnight by the exec, listed two things that supposedly led to this overturned vote: time-sensitive nature and new information. We have no at all facts about (i) what this new info was, and; (ii) what timeline made it sensitive. I'd like to answers for both of those.
			+ VP External: I want to preface this by saying I was in a conference on Friday, so I wasn't available to convene with the executive committee in person. We were given a "syllabus" but it wasn't a syllabus in the sense that it was readings, it was more of an itinerary of what the trip would look like. This was the supposed new information. The timeline might have been arbitrarily imposed.
			+ Secretary General: Any other responses or proof that the timeline was not arbitrarily imposed? This is a contentious point.
		5. CSA: What made the vote on January 30 invalid? I want the AUS to reflect on who they serve. Are we serving the students or are we at the beck and call of the professors? My other question is do you actually think the Constitution or the by-laws are neutral, and that they cannot be subjected to bias.
			+ President: There technically wasn't any reason that we couldn't overturn the vote from AUS Council. There were Motion A[, the one presented on January 30's Council,] and Motion B, [the one the professors provided after the vote,] and Motion B was slightly different because they provided more information, like the itinerary. Regarding the by-laws, I absolutely agree. I need to speak to SUS to edit the by-laws to ensure they cannot be subjected to bias, like you said.
	3. Motions
		1. AHCSSA: Motion to recess for 10 minutes
			+ Second motioner: VP Social
			+ Motion passes

*Arts Representative Figueredo leaves the room during recess*

* 1. Statement (VP External)
		1. An individual just fucking left the room. All of us are dealing with our emotions and mental health and for someone to be able to leave the room is super frustrating. There was one individual in our chat who thought we shouldn't make the statement [regarding the overturning of the POLI 339 vote] at all and advocated for us to not send an email to the public. It was paternalistic to say that there are councillors who can't make decisions and that there are some things that the public shouldn't know. I want to say that there is no denying that all of the executive is responsible. Absolutely we were in violation of the Constitution and by-laws. But there were certain members of the team who pushed for this to go forward and we did our best to stop this. We had a motion ready to overturn the decision if it weren't for the Secretary General investigation. I wanted to put this all out there.
			+ Secretary General: Regarding the individual that left, he announced that if he has any questions for him specifically, he is downstairs. There are a number of you who have him on Facebook. If you feel he is necessary, he is open to coming back.
			+ RSUS: I would like to call him back.
	2. Motions
		1. SLUM: Motion to Call Arts Representative Figueredo Back to Council
			+ Motion passes
			+ *CRO, Elections AUS, goes to retrieve Arts Representative Figueredo*
				- *[2 minutes later]* CRO, Elections AUS: I can't find him.
	3. Statement
		1. ?: I'd like to start off by thanking the executive members who have been transparent and who want to shed light on this process. I believe the events that have transpired today require us to take a serious look at the democratic nature of the AUS. For many students, the democratic machinery of the AUS is like a labyrinth that many students do not know how to navigate. I would like to point out the structural issues with the fact that such an undemocratic decision could have been made without sufficient information backing it. Like one of my colleagues, I'd like to point out the long legacy of solidarity and strength of student unions encountering pressure being placed on students by faculty members. I'd like to highlight issues with members using their positions of power to pursue issues not on their agendas.
		2. Gallery (Robert): I wanted to ask a Constitutional question. I was concerned about the undemocratic nature of what I felt was the decision. I looked up the Constitution. Under 12.2, the executive committee shall have all the powers of Council, 12.3 says all resolutions and actions of the executive committee taken between Council meetings must be taken to Council for ratification. I wanted to make sure the ratification vote was taken. I was concerned because the VP External brought up that there was one executive who didn't even want to bring up the decision to the public. This is utterly unacceptable.
			+ Secretary General: We have the Constitution sections you mentioned on record and this will be something we'll look into during our investigation.

*Arts Representative Figueredo re-enters the room.*

* 1. Arts Rep Figueredo: I have screenshots to prove that I said we should have brought this issue to Council so please don't make lies about me. I also left the room because I was forced into an anxiety attack due to the blatant harassment and bullying directed toward me.
	2. VP Finance: I want to thank everyone because this is hard for everyone. At the end of the day, what we did was a mistake and all the questions you asked were valid. These may not be proper justifications because it (the decision) was over a very short time period and over Facebook messenger. This doesn't excuse our behaviour but this is why a lot of the decisions came out the way they did because you can't really moderate a conversation on Facebook: it comes down to whoever can type the biggest chunk in text. I wish we could have found a more conducive method. Maria talked to the DEPSLL and we would need to talk to SSMU (who also ratified the decision) and see if they'd want to overthrow this decision
	3. Gallery (Tre, SSMU President): I want to confirm that AUS should check with DEPSLL to see that the motion actually was approved. It was approved on Feb 8. You'd have to check with DEPSLL but I can't imagine them saying no.
	4. President: Follow-up - If SSMU is on board with rescinding our vote, DEPSLL will take it. It's up to SSMU now.
	5. Secretary General: Can we do a straw poll to inform Council where we stand with this decision?
		1. [Point of Order] Arts Representative Figueredo: I think there's too much pressure in the room to do this poll.
			+ GSA: Seconded; it's not appropriate.
			+ AHCSSA: I second this.
			+ ASSA: But last week, emotions were also high. There was also "too much pressure in the room" last week, so I don't see why we shouldn't do a poll based on that reason.
		2. AHCSSA: Last week, we did a confidential vote, so maybe this week we should do a confidential vote.
		3. DESA: Why are we having this discussion? This decision has been suspended. We shouldn't have to have a straw poll. Council has already decided.
	6. Motions
		1. CSUS: I'd like to motion to call the question. It's up to SSMU. We're not getting anything done. Let's wrap it up.
			+ Speaker: The direction I received was that the Secretary General would be moderating this discussion from a procedural point. I'm not sure if this part of the discussion was meant to adhere to the Robert's Rules. A motion to Close the Debate might be the closest thing to what you're looking for. Given that, I believe that the determination should be made by the Secretary General.
	7. Statements
		1. WIMESSA: I came here with a few more questions. Maybe we can make more room for councillors to actually ask questions. I don't need white people to tell me or speak for me that I'm done talking when I'm not.
		2. CRO, Elections AUS: Just to uphold democratic process, if there was an opinion asked to close the debate, it's appropriate to hold the vote.
		3. [Point of Order] ASSA: I asked the question an hour ago and it's still gone unanswered. I'd asked why we needed a second vote in the first place.
		4. Equity Commissioner: Secretary General, you're doing a great job, despite this not being in your portfolio. I also want to say that this, as ASSA and WIMESSA have said, this is an informal way of the gallery and Council to ask the AUS executive questions. If we gravitate away from Point of Orders and formal Standing Rules and go towards an informal Q&A, we might be able to help them ask the questions they wanted to ask today. The choices you've made have been the best choices of the moment. I think Council would benefit from a Q&A section.
			+ Secretary General: Could you clarify the Q&A section you're referring to?
			+ Equity Commissioner: People came to answer questions directly to the executives, so I think we should
		5. AHCSSA (Point of Order): I'd like to say in response to some councillors' comments: please don't make identity attacks. I have never disclosed my identity to Council because I don't feel safe enough to do so. Please refrain from attacking people's identities.
		6. Arts Senator Wilson: Elections AUS, please consider extending the deadline of referendum questions.
			+ CRO, Elections AUS: The by-laws say the deadline is "fifteen days" - we took it as fifteen business days, but it can also be interpret it as fifteen days, so we'll extend it as follows.
		7. PSSA: I want to say "thank you" to the exec who have been more transparent and actually talking. There are execs who are silent or not here. That's problematic because it shifts visible guilt onto those who are present. They're taking on disproportionate labour. I wonder if we can extend this conversation into the next Council meeting when more execs are present. I feel like the current conversation is not reflective of the whole exec. There's a weird tension where some exec have been more vocal and some have not. Certain exec are taking the heat and most of them are women as well.
		8. VP Social: I was also thinking about what PSSA said. The reason why I was silent today was because I'd already made a lot of my points clear online. I'd like to make more points clear but cannot do so without others' consent. I don't trust myself to talk myself, too. I've been in a hypomanic episode because of my BPD; I physically cannot talk right now without doing something I'll regret. However, with that being said, I welcome any questions and emails. I'm still active on Facebook and active on my job, but I don't want my silence to be interpreted as pushing the blame on other execs.
		9. VP Communications: One thing I've tried to do was not take up space and listen to concerns. I'm really sorry that we're all here right now. No one wants to be here and that's our fault, and I apologize. I voted how I voted on the Facebook page and I get that me trying not to take up space has put the burden of labour on the rest of the executive, predominantly WOC, and I apologize. Sorry, I apologize to anyone who has found my silence to be complacency or to be a lack of caring for this issue. Rather, I truly have tried to listen to your points, to hear your feedback, and apply that to myself. If you have any concerns for me specifically, please contact me at my email or on Facebook. I stand by my abstention. I don't think this vote should come back. Again, I'm sorry to anyone upset by my silence.
		10. CSA: Direct question for the AUS - Boiling down to what's been discussed in this convo, I want a Yes or No answer: did the AUS go against the decision made by Council to serve the interests of the professors of ONE department and not from the students representing all the departments. Aside from this rescindment via SSMU, what's the AUS going to do to restore our trust in them as student representatives?
			+ VP External: This vote absolutely went against the vote of the legislative council. Some of us vehemently disagreed with that because of its unconstitutional… we didn't agree and we definitely did not uphold the AUS' interests or rights.
		11. WIMESSA: Why wasn't the original Council vote valid? Professors can't move a motion in the AUS so who was the one that moved the second version ("Motion B," as the President called it) of this motion? As for the Secretary General's suspension of this decision - is it only suspended until the investigation is over or is it suspended forever? Finally, about AUS' statement on fairness and equity - I want some solid concrete examples of how the AUS hopes to restore equity and our faith in this institution.
			+ Secretary General: The third one addresses our portfolio, so I can directly answer that one. Our portfolio is a third party not affiliated with the exec to keep accountability within the student body and the execs. Given the complaints, we have suspended the VOTE, but this is not a permanent suspension of the entire issue. If it was not constitutional, we will not abide by it. We would take the steps to reverse the decision to restore the democracy.
			+ VP Communications: About how to regain trust - I honestly don't know if we can, and I'm sorry. But I do have some suggestions. One is maybe bringing a motion to Council that can demonstrate our actions and one that publicly states what we did was wrong and violates the rules of Council. If Council reached a different decision and approved the course and if the Executive had come in after receiving the syllabus and denied it, it's still terrible because we shouldn't have overthrown the decision in the first place.
			+ President: I'd like to apologize to ASSA for not answering their question. I want to stress that the original vote was not invalid. It was a valid vote but our overturning vote was in response to an entirely new motion when the professor sent more than what they had previously by sending the itinerary of the course. The original vote was valid but the executives capitalized off of the power that we had and went off of the other new motion that we had for the course fee to be ratified. I understand this is laborious but we can't really restore your trust in us and it's not our job to decide how to do that.
		12. Speaker: Just to let you know - the AUS booking for this room ends at 10 pm. They'd like us to leave by 9:55 pm.
		13. *A discussion of the Facebook group and entertaining the possibility for the Facebook chat votes to be made public*
			+ Arts Representative Figueredo: We were informed that our votes would be confidential within the group.
				- Secretary General: Who or what clause said the votes would be confidential?
				- Arts Representative Figueredo: There's no clause.
				- VP Social: I don't remember anyone saying in the beginning that this was a confidential vote - this just came up in person and we went with it
				- VP External: I don't recall it being explicitly stated but someone could have brought it up. It wasn't the best method to hold this vote but we were all in different places in the city and it was difficult to keep up in messages so it was possible that it was stated. I myself wasn't aware that this vote was confidential. Clearly not the best way for it to happen.
				- Secretary General: Reminder - your execs are also full-time students and it's not easy to get everyone together.
				- Gallery: Can we not overturn the confidentiality of this vote since it wasn't made available for everyone and because it was so chaotic and not clear? Can we overturn that?

President: I want to point out that only a couple of people said that this vote should remain confidential and all of us agreed to that at this point. I personally think we need to be transparent and release our votes and I agree with what was just said. I frankly want to send screenshots of the chat. We had an NDA and it's grey as to whether we can release this information or not. There's something wrong if we can't release these conversations like we're hiding that. I'd suggest the execs who are against this to reconsider not wanting the votes to be released.

CRO: From a constitutional point, there are no provisions regarding confidential voting. The only thing it says that if an executive committee discusses things in a confidential context, arts reps shall not attend.

* + - * + BASIC: I'd like more clarification on the statement that was emailed out: *"In the case of POLI 339, a topics course in Political Science (Developed Areas), the course was defeated in council by a margin of 14 No, 13 Yes, and 9 Abstentions. However, there was necessary information which was not received at the Legislative Council of January 30, 2019. This includes the absence of the Professor teaching the course to answer course questions, pertinent documentation (potential syllabi, et cetera) not available, and the lack of required Departmental Student Association Endorsement."* Arts Senator Omu stated that if there was a motion to table where the profs could speak to this, but Arts Representative Figueredo said, and I quote, "I gave the same information as the prof before this, it'd be a double standard to vote for this, it'd be hypocrisy of the highest form." We voted because the mover gave us the impression that we had all the information necessary at the time. What was the thought process in creating a new vote, who created the new vote, and why was it undemocratically overturned when there was no basis for this.

Arts Representative Figueredo: In the minutes, there are numerous questions where I answered, "I don't know." There were a lot of things that we didn't know. At the end of the day, there was new information we didn't know about. I apologize if I gave off the impression that I knew everything because I didn't.

* + - * + DESA: Firstly, I want to ask a question to the exec. This [vote] is purely because Facebook was used as a communication. If this meeting were to have happened in person, there would have been minutes taken. Since this conversation happened on Facebook, can the conversation be considered minutes, and if it can be, can it be released to the public? Another question: Given that this is an ongoing investigation and we're looking into the suspension of the vote - I've also been informed that there's a J-BOARD motion to look into this. This is time sensitive and they only have 5 days left - we need to come to an option today. I'd also like to caution some councillors against weaponizing social justice language. You shouldn't be apologizing for "taking up space" when we're asking you to answer questions. We're also a lot of marginalized people. Be mindful of weaponing language, especially matters of mental health - don't blatantly use mental health as a means to divert questions or criticism, especially since we all have mental health issues.

Secretary General: I'd have to ask the person when the deadline is but they're prepared to file the J-BOARD motion and freedom of information requests tomorrow.

CRO, Elections AUS: The Freedom of Information Act is about personal information. The use of Facebook messenger is personal. It could be considered minutes but it is private messages being sent. Freedom of information acts are for internal documents for groups. To my understanding, they do not apply to DMs.

Answered questions of Facebook meetings notes - yes, they could be meeting notes

* + - * + Gallery (News editor of The Daily): I want to stress the importance of transparency. Could we have more information about what the investigation is and what the implications of not being able to table a motion are?

Secretary General: We have the responsibility to inform the person being complained about within three days of the hour of being complained. We've been speaking to relevant authorities. If you have a more specific question about the investigation, you can email me, and I'll do my best to answer you.

* + - * + On behalf of PSSA: It's rare for all three Arts Reps to vote the same way. Certain councillors said they did not have an agenda doing this. To Arts Representative Figueredo: You said you don't have an agenda and that you wanted to bring this to Council, but you also said you were pressuring other folks to vote against the wishes of Legislative Council on January 30.

Secretary General: Regarding the first, I reviewed the Constitution with the Arts Reps' roles to SSMU. There's no clause saying Arts Reps can vote, and this was confirmed too. Although sometimes they have voted historically, they don't have voting power in this case.

President: When I stated in the chat that arts reps couldn't vote, they didn't believe me. I stressed that this was true and that I knew because I used to be an arts representative. I was met with hostility and I regret in hindsight not for sticking up for that myself but ultimately the arts reps threw a fit when I said their votes didn't count.

Secretary General: It's moot whether they voted the same or not because they didn't have the right to vote in the first place.

Arts Representative Figueredo: I guess we all have an agenda. But I didn't like your implication that I have some hidden motive behind my vote.

SLUM: One way of voting was to not overturn Council's decision and the other way of voting was to overturn Council's decision. I don't think these are equal points of view to push for. My opinion is that it was more problematic to push to overturn Council's decision than to push to maintain it, hence the "agenda" point.

* + - * + [Point of Personal Privilege] CRO: People in the gallery, please do not smirk or laugh. Remain quiet and have respect for others.
				+ CSA: I want to thank everyone for stating their mental health and it shouldn't have been necessary to do so. But we are having this discussion because at last Council, we made it clear that people's safety did not take precedence over academic opportunity and we weaponized academic opportunity. Please keep safety in the back of your heads because we wouldn't be having this discussion in the first place if safety truly was at the forefront of our priorities.
				+ Equity Commissioner: I think we should be yielding this time to the gallery since they've made the time to come here and they have questions. In terms of Facebook messages being minutes, anything that is under the official AUS logo and communications within AUS people would be followed up and investigated if there was an equity complaint.
				+ Gallery: Regarding the group chat, would that be considered a private DM (direct message)? It seems like a semi-public space, with multiple people having been involved, but I understand if people view it as a private group.

VP External: I think because we discussed votes in it, it would be considered a meeting and a meeting space, given that we couldn't meet in person and we voted in it. As such, I think it should be treated as a meeting space for this purpose. Side note: Mia (VP Finance) is outside on the phone right now with Arts Representative Karia, who couldn't be there because she's at a UN conference, and Arts Representative Sanchez can't be here because of a health leave.

* + - * + Gallery: I'd like to point out the ways in which our identities have been made to not feel welcome in this Council. Especially last council, when they were not only shamed and weaponized to use against us, especially by people without the emotional capacity to understand why this supposed "academic opportunity" does not trump our safety, our identities, and our experiences, but also devalued and delegitimized.
				+ Gallery: I wanted to know who moved the motion to be re-voted on and if we can make the motion public?

Secretary General: The Arts Representatives did.

Gallery: All of them?

VP External: All of them took it upon themselves to email the professors to determine what the next steps should be.

* + - * + AHCSSA: Relating to when we talked about the blunt of the emotional labour being directed to only the executives that are here at Council and talking - the same goes for the arts representatives. Two of them are not here so Figueredo, who is here, is taking the slack for them. Just saying.
				+ ESA: I was wondering if the execs intend on undoing this decision if it is, somehow, taken as Constitutional and thus doesn't have to come to Council, so that councillors don't have to relive the emotional labour a third time

VP External: I know that I already have a motion ready to go. If this WAS found Constitutional, I would 100% find a way to undo it myself instead of bringing it to Council

VP Communications: I want to know if Council's okay with us overturning this decision. Us as execs voted to approve the course so I want to confirm with council for full transparency that if this opportunity arises, you'll be ok with us overturning our vote. Making sure that there's full transparency and accountability and we're representing what you want. I'm fully supportive of overturning the vote among us, I just want to know what you think.

* + - * + Gallery (Patrick): Someone asked what you guys could do to restore students' trust. Unfortunately I haven't heard a lot of concrete proposals, so here are some. 1 - Make it an open constitutional question whether Facebook things can be released as public record. You should find that out instead of making us file information requests. Find a way, don't make us do it for you. 2 - With respect to what DESA said about the J-BOARD submission - we don't have a clear idea about what this body wants or if this decision can be reversed in time. We need an answer asap. Focus on finding things concretely so that the rest of us don't have to do it for you.
				+ Gallery (Robert): I'm not the one Patrick's referring to but I have considered the J-BOARD thing. The deadline is TOMORROW for filing a J-BOARD motion. I'm still considering it. The Constitutional requirement is that there must be an affirmative vote to rescind anything taken outside of Council. It's in the Constitution - any executive action taken outside of Council has to be ratified in Council.
				+ President: People have reached out to me that they've been receiving angry and hateful looks while speaking. Please be respectful.
				+ Gallery (Tre, SSMU President): J-BOARD operation is ten days, not five.
				+ Secretary General: I have an urgent message so I need to take a recess.
			* Motions
				+ President: Motion for a one minute and thirty second recess

Motion passes

* + - * Questions
				+ Equity Commissioner: I suggest that the Gallery ask their questions now so that may be recorded and all answered consecutively afterwards.

[Point of Order] GSA: I think it's valid for us to get to ask questions, not just the gallery.

* + - * + RSUS: We know in the general sense what the new information presented was that caused this decision. Can we know the specifics or what elements made the exec think they should have been overturning Council's vote from two weeks ago?
				+ Gallery: I was wondering in the statement that AUS released, it said the vote was on Thursday, but the student body weren't notified about the vote until late Tuesday night, and I was wondering why that was.

President: We didn't release the statement until late Tuesday night because the letter ratifying hadn't been send to SSMU or DEPSLL until Monday and the issue was sent out on Tuesday. I had hope that the vote was going the other way so that's why I took my time sending the documents but we should have sent them earlier.

* + - * + GSA: (i) Did the arts reps vote? (ii) Were they allowed to vote under Constitution? (iii) If they did vote, and it's found that they weren't allowed to vote, would this overturn the decision and force us to not ratify this at Council?

Speaker General: Yes. This is something we're looking at.

* + - * + CLASHSA - Speaking to the Constitution and whether Council not ratifying an executive decision making it invalid - would the vote automatically be invalid because we haven't ratified it today?

Speaker General: In the precedence of my time in this portfolio, I haven't seen this before, that's why I want to carefully go through the case laws before giving you a definitive answer.

* + - * + HSA: If it were found that should we not ratify the decision today, it would be void, would that retroactively make it void?

Speaker General: Good question. Before addressing the rest of the questions, what does the room think about taking a vote to ratify the decision?

HSA: A sufficient number of stakeholders and people with valuable important things to say about this decision have left the room because this has gone so late. I wouldn't want to deprive them the opportunity to vote on this.

CRO, Elections AUS: Because the exec stated that they'd bring it into Council and this is a Secretary General conversation, this technically isn't a ratification. My understanding is we can't go into voting yet

HSA: Is an exec were to bring it up now, could we do that now

President: Yes. I hate to deviate but I wanted to get a feel if people wanted to amend referendum dates if we have the time.

Secretary General: We have 7 minutes. You would be willing to bring up the motion which we would vote on and you'd like to amend the referendum dates.

* + - * + VP Finance: About ratifying the decision - we were told that we couldn’t bring a motion to table because current motions are suspended.

Secretary General: Yes, it's in the Constitution that when the Sec Gen portfolio suspends a decision, all motions pertaining to that decision cannot be brought to the table.

BASIC: I think it'd be a mistake to vote on this now considering that we were under the impression/understanding that any potential motions pertaining to this decision were suspended.

* + - * Statements
				+ Equity Commissioner: AUS Equity does have a survey that you can answer and ask questions there if you want to, if you haven't had the chance to ask questions today. All the resources are on the AUS Equity Facebook page.
				+ VP Communications: If you have any questions for the exec you want answered right away, email me and I'll make sure the whole exec sees that and we can draft responses to that.
			* Last questions
				+ MUGS: Given the fact of the time-sensitive nature of this motion, why did it take a week to obtain the necessary information, making it impossible for Council to convene in time?
				+ MESS: What do I tell my constituents and fellow council members about AUS' next steps moving forward?
				+ CSUS: It'd probably be best to open a google doc to compile all the questions. We have 4 minutes left, there's no way every question will be asked and answered in that time, so let's not do that now.
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