**Arts Undergraduate Society of McGill University**

**Legislative Council**

**February 27th, 2019, 6:00 PM**

* 1. Call to Order
		+ 6:00 pm
	2. Territorial Acknowledgement
		+ 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 February 13th 2019 (Postponed to February 14th 2019)](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AUS-Meeting-February-13th-2019-Postponed-to-February-14th-2019.docx)
		+ Motions
			- RSUS: Motion to Suspend the Rules?
				* Speaker: We're doing the minutes right now, so you'd have to motion after the minutes when we're approving the agenda.
		+ Minutes approved
	5. Approval of the Agenda
		+ RSUS: Motion to suspend the Rules and move all unfinished and new business to before the Secretary General's stuff because everything's time sensitive
			- Questions
				* Speaker: Before which one?

RSUS: Both.

* + - * + Speaker: Including the late new business?

RSUS: Yes.

* + - * Voting
				+ Motion passes
		- President: Motion to add Motion for Course Fee: POLI Course in Italy to the agenda. We already approved it but with the wrong course code, so we need to re-approve it with the correct one.
			* Voting
				+ Motion passes (added to New Business as item 9.14)
		- Voting on agenda as amended
			* Agenda approved
	1. Announcements
		+ VP Communications: I have two announcements. One, I've heard from people that they thought I sent the first release of the listserv for POLI 339. While I sent it, I was not the individual that drafted the content of that email. Two, announcing for transparency reasons - I have a pre-booked interview call at 9 pm so I have to leave at 8:45. Just wanted to tell you all that; if you see me leave, it's for the interview, which was booked much in advance.
		+ Arts Senator Wilson: Just a reminder that McGill University is still accepting feedback on the Revision to the Sexual Violence Policy.
		+ VP Social: Disclaimer - As some of you might know, I'm currently on a semi-health leave that involves not coming to Council. But I'm here tonight because it's important as exec, as an incumbent, and as incoming exec to be here. Given the Secretary General's presentation tonight, I want to be here for transparency and to show that I'm taking responsibility for my actions. Please excuse me if I don't talk or say something weird.
		+ CRO (Elections AUS): All referendum questions have to be passed today in both English and French for the question to be voted on at referendum. Send it to elections.aus@mail.mcgill.ca by 5 pm tomorrow for questions initiated by Council. Questions initiated otherwise needs 150 signatures and to be submitted to the AUS office by 5 pm tomorrow.
	2. Presentation from AIESEC McGill
		+ AIESEC: My presentation's going to be 15 minutes.
			- Speaker: That's not…
			- President: Presentations are five minutes. After your five minutes, a member of Council can motion for an extension.
		+ AIESEC: My name is Jane. AIESEC's relationship with AUS is on the brink of permanent change in 2 ways; this vote will make us go to a new direction. The first change would be between the Faculty and AIESEC's internship office. This first change, as outlined in the motion (Motion to Pass the Policy on Ethical Student Employment, which Jane wasn't shown beforehand) penalizes us for being a third-party organization. These conditions will be applied to us by the AUS execs. The reasons we were given are that AIESEC participates in voluntourism, students being unsatisfied with their experiences, unpaid internships being a barrier to marginalized students, and reports of students being sent to unsafe places in their internships. We haven't been shown this motion so I'll be referring to it as "Motion To Cut Ties With AIESEC." We have 20-30 members working to send these participants to various internships through the year. Every one is matched with manager in McGill to ensure the smoothest and safest experience possible. Our top 2 countries, the ones we send the most interns to, are Brazil and Indonesia, followed by Mexico, Poland, Greece, and China. We're a student group and our best strength is knowing the gap between students and McGill and knowing which opportunities McGill provide. We do the best we can with the decreasing paid internships worldwide. Within these constraints, we do the best we can, only charging a $5000-6000 fee that includes meals, accommodation, ground transportation, etc. Nevertheless, it's understandably a barrier to financially limited students but we provide groceries and financial opportunities. We're beginning to try to make AIESEC eligible for course credits or FIO financial help. AIESEC was founded during WWII, during which it sent students to facilitate cross-cultural relationships. I believe AIESEC understands the dangers of this neo-colonial trend of voluntourism; we go through great lengths to tell participants how inappropriate it is to use these opportunities to sensationalize their own lives. We're seeking new ways to overcome these notions. But to put such a high emphasis on voluntourism is modern day colonialism, because voluntourism reinforces the idea that developing countries are helpless without Western involvement. If the basis for AIESEC being for voluntourism is perhaps a Western ideal of white saviourism, then perhaps we need to rethink our values.
			- Motions
				* President: Motion for a 2 minute extension for concluding thoughts

Second motioner: VP External

Motion passes

* + - AIESEC: Our impact goes beyond just sending students abroad. We don't have many paid internships but this doesn't mean we can't better organize our funds. Now let's assume that if we're given open communication and time to address the concerns on the table, we can fix the issues outlined in the Motion. AIESEC is a facilitator of volunteering, which doesn't mean we provide direct opportunities, which means AUS doesn't support us. But why are direct opportunities the only valid ones? There's a wider context to this communication - if Council's purpose is to help student opportunities, the only reason to completely cut us off is if no reconciliation was possible. But I don't think that standard has been met. I'm here to ask Council to take the motion brought forward today and that AIESEC and AUS form a working group to determine what the full extents of these incidents are and to tackle our concerns together. What our relationship should look like moving forward.
			* Questions
				+ VP Social: So would you agree that AUS' priority is the safety of our students?

AIESEC: Essentially, I was trying to explain AIESEC's commitment to safety through my presentation, which unfortunately I didn't get to the full details and process and I apologize. Because we're a student group, we take these cases very seriously and we have many different procedures in case to prevent these. Because we're a student group and we see the dangers in voluntourism and being placed in unsafe places, we're constantly looking for new ways to adapt to people's needs and wants.

* + - * + Arts Rep Sanchez: Yes or no - are you aware that the average McGill course is $500 for less than 8 weeks of volunteering experience, which is equivalent to the internships of your organization?

AIESEC: Yes, I am aware of the Quebec tuition fees. One, we understand that our program fees, we're trying to provide opportunities to go abroad with the most basic and cheapest option available. Two, we understand the financial realities of students in McGill and we provide alleviates to get financial aid.

* + - * + HSA: You're being criticized for voluntourism and you're saying that isn't the case. Could you explain why it isn't voluntourism?

AIESEC: To simply say, basically, the definition of voluntourism is the Western-centric analysis that the first world people go to a developing nation and promotes a personal feel-good kind of thing. I can testify that we're not that because we explain to our participants during the outgoing preparation seminars how inappropriate it is to go with this mindset. We prepare tools to say that you're not going to travel, you're going to provide a service, you're volunteering.

* + - * + Equity Commissioner: You mentioned that you have bursary opportunities available. Would you tell me what students receive bursaries or how many are offered?

AIESEC: Is it possible to get an AIESEC representative to answer?

Gallery (AIESEC Representative): So basically, it's based on demand. If the participant is asking for financial aid, that's when you would give it. It doesn't happen quite happen. If there's an application process then we grant it. We don't have a specific number but the ones who ask usually agree.

* 1. Unfinished Business
		+ [Motion to Approve Amendments to the EASSA Constitution](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/EASSA-Constitutional-Amendments-Motion.docx) [PASSED]
			- EASSA: Repeating things that you already heard - basically we're doing seven minor changes and some more major. We're amending the Constitution because it hasn't been updated since 2014 - some things are really outdated. Some things just don't belong there. Some are minor language changes including striking out things like "Internet" instead of "social media." Our biggest changes: we used to have a VP Fundraising position, but it hasn't been filled in ages because we don't have enough people. By changing this part, we're ensuring people can run but there's no pressure if there aren't people running because this position isn't necessary in our operations. Another one: we're allowing ANY people active in the department to be able to run. Every year, we have positions where no one runs, because majors and minors aren't interested in running, and that becomes a problem. If we extend the eligibility condition to people with 12 credits instead of minor or major candidates only, we'd make people who would have been otherwise disqualified be engaged and let them run.
				* Questions

VP External: I couldn't see the actual appendix on the website but I have a couple of questions. 1 - When it says in your constitutions that, "Executives hold application process and flip a coin" - were you aware of the new departmental elections process outside the AUS, and would this adhere?

EASSA: What we're doing is going through the AUS process. We noticed the "flipping coin" and thought that was outdated. We're just striking that for that sake. We're striking all of the older things that aren't necessary since they're concerning paper ballots and actual physical elections and since we know that AUS is holding online elections. That's why we're doing these changes - just to follow through.

Speaker: Sorry I forgot to add the appendix to the agenda but it is on the agenda for the 14th.

CRO (Elections AUS): I just want to confirm that the Constitution adheres to the election laws passed last Council. All elections have to be followed through Appendix X and if there are any differences. Does it adhere to Appendix X?

EASSA: It should? It should be the same motions that we passed it through and we were told it was fine.

* + - * + Voting

Motion passes

* 1. New Business
		+ [Motion to Change BASiC’s Name](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Change-BASiC_s-Name-1.docx) [AMENDED] [PASSED]
			- BASIC: Hi guys… oh shit… We have the motion to change our name from BASiC to ASUS. **Whereas,** the Bachelor of Arts and Science Integrative Council (hereinafter referred to as the BASiC) currently has difficulties recruiting students for executive, council, and committee positions due to low name recognition,

**Whereas** the BASiC does not conform to the standard for the names of faculty student unions at McGill,

**Whereas** the BASiC is commonly mistaken for a departmental student society,

**Whereas** the Memorandums of Agreement between McGill and the Science Undergraduate Society will be renegotiated in Winter 2020,

**Be it resolved,** that the Science Undergraduate Society’s General Council accepts the results of a referendum to be held by the BASiC among its constituents to change the BASiC’s name to the Arts and Science Undergraduate Society (ASUS).

* 1. BASIC: Can you guys pretend Sciences and Arts is in this? (Council says yeah) Okay cool
	2. Speaker: Friendly amendment - all Science things will be changed to ASUS
	3. [Motion to Change BASiC’s Name](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Change-BASiC_s-Name-2.docx) [AMENDED]
	4. Motions
		+ Arts Senator Wilson: Motion to add all those amendments now?
			- Speaker: It's a friendly amendment so we don't need a motion
			- Arts Senator Wilson: Oh.
	5. Questions
		+ VP External: Has the referendum already been held or is it to be held?
			- BASIC: It hasn't been held yet. We just want you to accept the results of whatever the referendum vote may be. Even if it gets redacted by our constituents, fine, but if it gets accepted we'd like you to accept these changes.
	6. Voting
		+ Motion passes
	7. [Motion QSSA to Rescind Previous Motion to Hold Separate Departmental Election](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-QSSA-to-Rescind-Previous-Motion-to-Hold-Separate-Departmental-Election.docx) *(Note: the previous motion was passed at AUS Legislative Council on January 16, 2019)* [PASSED]
		+ Speaker: This previous motion was passed prior to the working group regarding separate departmental elections.
		+ Moving
			- QSSA: Since it's pretty straight forward I'll just leave it.

**Whereas,** new electoral guidelines for an alternative elections process have been adopted by council on February 14, which were not in place when the QSSA first passed a motion to opt-out of the elections process of Elections AUS;

**Whereas,** the QSSA was a member of the Departmental Elections Working Group who drafted these new electoral guidelines;

**Whereas,** the QSSA represents approximately 10 departmental minor students and is therefore able to deal with the small number of potential candidates for elections without relying on Elections AUS;

**Be it resolved,** that the QSSA’s previous motion to hold elections independently from Elections AUS be rescinded in order to follow the newly updated opt out by-laws.

* 1. [Point of Parliamentary Inquiry] Arts Rep Sanchez: Are you the proxy for QSSA?
		+ QSSA: No? I'm the VP External
		+ Arts Representative Sanchez: Oh! Sorry, I thought you were a proxy.
	2. Voting
		+ Motion passes
	3. [Motion for Certain Department to Op-out of AUS Elections (updated 27 February)](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Small-Department-Opt-Out-1.docx) [PASSED]
		+ Moving (RSUS, JSSA, CSA)
			- Every department who wants to opt-out of elections has to adhere to these by-laws. So instead of having 11 motions from 11 departments, we thought we'd have this one. It concerns opting out of elections and running the way we decided last council.
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	4. [Motion to Approve the Revised McGill Psychology Students Association MPSA Constitution](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Approve-the-Revised-McGill-Psychology-Students-Association-MPSA-Constitution.docx) [PASSED]
		+ Speaker: This motion already passed in SUS so if there are any amendments made, it'll go back to SUS.
		+ Moving (MPSA):
			- SUS contacted MPSA to amend its constitution. We don't have an appendix but we reverted and revamped the entire thing. We had to amend the election process because it was outdated so we revamped it to reflect the online AUS elections, elaborated on the duties of the exec, and reworded the entire thing. This needs to be rushed because we need it in place before March 11, when election information is released to all of our members.
		+ Questions
			- ESA: Because you're both in Arts and Science, do you have the option of having elections run by SUS?
				* MPSA: No, our elections are through AUS.
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	5. [Motion to Bring the Question Limiting the Voting Platform of the Executive Committee to Referendum (Updated 27 February with Translation)](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Bring-the-Question-Limiting-the-Voting-Platform-of-the-Executive-Committee-to-Referendum-1.docx)  [PASSED]
		+ Speaker: Updated version which was translated was uploaded today
		+ Moving (Arts Senator Wilson + VP Finance)
			- These two motions are in response to the events of POLI 339. The first limits the platforms on which votes can be held. This would add two clauses that are bolded (12.2.1 and 12.2.1.1) - these will move down two points but be in the same article if our other thing is passed. Vote can't be held on social media and official votes are binding and do not include straw polls.
			- VP Finance: The reason we have the latter is because we use a lot of slang for our communications, which may be a grey area.
		+ Questions
			- Arts Senator Sanchez: Is it "proceeding" or "preceding"?
				* Arts Senator Wilson: Should be "preceding." Friendly amendment
				* [Motion to Bring the Question Limiting the Voting Platform of the Executive Committee to Referendum](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Bring-the-Question-Limiting-the-Voting-Platform-of-the-Executive-Committee-to-Referendum-2.docx) [AMENDED]
			- Gallery (Robert): It seems the purpose of 12.2 is to let executive committee make action outside of Council, but does 12.2.1.1 let executive committee get permission from the Council in anticipation of an emergency? I don't understand.
				* VP Finance: I think it would be approved for the year.
		+ Debate
			- President: I want to thank QSSA for the translations because mine were terrible.
		+ Voting
			- On the motion as friendly amended with typos fixed
			- Motion passes
	6. [Motion to Bring Question Restricting Scope of Executive Committee Voting to Referendum (Updated 27 February with Translation)](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Bring-Question-Restricting-Scope-of-Executive-Committee-Voting-to-Referendum-1.docx) [AMENDED] [PASSED]
		+ Moving (VP Finance):
			- The executive committee can't vote again on a topic that the legislative council already voted on. This explicitly states that's not a thing and also stated in the Secretary General investigation.
			- Arts Senator Wilson: Currently 12.3 is what will now become 12.2.1 - if we passes, what we just approved will become the two below
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	7. [Motion to Amend FIO Bylaws](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Amend-FIO-Bylaws.pdf) [PASSED]
		+ Moving (Arts Representative Karia):
			- Hi everybody. I wrote up these by-laws amendments with the help of the rest of the exec committee to also address issues brought up by the POLI 339 matter. The first one I'll read out.

Whereas, the clauses as they stand allow for breaches to democracy and inhibit transparency;

Whereas, this is a small step AUS executive can take towards reconciling its relationship with all Arts constituents;

Whereas, the AUS is committed to prioritizing departmental consultations on matter pertaining to all students in the faculty;

Whereas, the following amendments create a check and balance on the executive’s power to make decisions;

**Be it resolved that** the following amendments to the AUS FIO bylaws be made: 2.2 To approve any FIO, the representative departmental association’s recommendation must be presented to AUS Legislative Council and must be ratified by a simple majority vote. **The motion must also include an up-to-date syllabus, itinerary, and budget.**

**2.2.1 To the best of the departmental association’s abilities, a Professor or Faculty member with knowledge of the course must attend Council to address Councillors’ questions and concerns.**

2.3. 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~~ **it must be tabled until the next Legislative Council meeting.**

**2.3.1 If the decision must be made before the next Legislative Council meeting, Councillors must be advised of the motion and its contents by the Speaker via email with a 72 hour notice of voting. After 72 hours have elapsed, Councillors can email their vote to the Speaker.**

* 1. Questions
		+ BASIC: If it says in the Constitution that the AUS Exec has all the power of Council in between Council meetings, and the Constitution overrides the by-laws, then how would this be enforceable? Wouldn't this just be void?
			- Arts Representative Sanchez: The nature of certain decisions are very different. For example, in exec committee, we might approve some stipend fees, but anything substantial that we believe the Council should have a decision on goes to Council. Perhaps a friendly amendment to include discussing with the Speaker or Secretary General to see what is "substantial" should be in order.
			- VP External: I think also the FIO by-laws are specifically in regards to fees whereas the Constitution regards other things. So, technically, all fees have to operate under the FIO by-laws regardless. I think. Which also touches upon what Arts Representative Sanchez said about the nature of things being different. If it's a fee, it operates under this motion.
			- ESA: This also goes under there. Right now, the current by-laws require a departmental association to approve it. This still stands but there's another part of the by-laws that's different in terms of making a fee different from another motion.
				* Arts Representative Karia: I didn't get the question.
				* Speaker: It wasn't a question. It was another answer [to BASIC's question].
			- Deputy Secretary General: Just looking at the Constitution, I think there would be an issue with this because in it, it says "all the powers of Council in between Councils" - I think if they wanted to add this to the FIO by-laws, it'd also have to be added to the Constitutions EXCEPTING FIO decisions
				* Arts Representative Karia: Yeah, that does make sense. My interpretation/knowledge of the Constitution doesn't have anything about fee approvals. I would have to write that right now and add it to the agenda and add it right now.
				* Speaker: We do have a lot of things on the agenda, so…
				* Arts Representative Karia: Yeah, I can do that
			- Arts Representative Sanchez: Can we just pass this for next Council?
				* Speaker: They're due tomorrow at 5 pm, so no.
			- Arts Senator Wilson: Given that these by-laws are shared with the AUS and SUS, does the SUS have plans to amend them too?
				* President: We'd have to bring these to SUS, I have a meeting with the SUS President, so I can do that.
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	2. [Motion to Amend the AUS Constitution VP Services Role with Translation](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Amend-the-AUS-Constitution_EN_FR.docx) [PASSED]
		+ Speaker: This was already brought up but now it has translations, I believe that is the only difference
		+ Moving (VP External):
			- This was approved 2 weeks ago, just to have the potential of a VP Services role being approved via referendum. I unfortunately don't speak French so I had the translator do it. But I didn't realize it only had to be the question so I accidentally made her do more work than she had to.
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	3. [Motion to Approve the Revised CSAUS Constitution [late]](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Approve-the-Revised-CSAUS-Constitution.docx) [PASSED]
		+ Moving (CSAUS):
			- Hi everyone, my name is Mackenzie, the President of CSAUS. Our Constitution hasn't been updated since it was originally written in 2007. It's very much in need of changes. The main changes were making explicit what we were doing in practice (how often we did meetings) and clarifying certain things in terms of procedures to remove a member, to clarify election procedures, and to specify the number of members who make up our executive. We're moving to have the amended version, which was approved by our exec and by the Constitution by-law review committee, to be accepted so that the revised roles can be effective for elections this year.
				* CSAUS: Adding a couple of friendly amendments like wrong numberings that I would email to you [the Speaker]
				* [CSAUS Amended Constitution – Feb 2019](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/CSAUS-Amended-Constitution-Feb-2019.docx) [AMENDED]
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	4. [Motion to Bring the Question Regarding the Arts Computer Lab Fee to Winter Referendum 2019 (with Translation) [Late]](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Bring-the-Question-Regarding-the-Arts-Computer-Lab-Fee-to-Winter-Referendum-2019-1.docx) [PASSED]
		+ President: This is the same motion that I brought to council 2 weeks ago. Our translator translated it so this is the translated version. Hopefully once approved we'll send it to referendum tomorrow. Also if anyone has any ideas about laptop lending or the computer lab please let me know because I’m having a meeting with IT in 2 weeks.
		+ Questions
			- VP Finance: Can you tell IT to respond to my email about Fridge Door Gallery putting up their art?
				* President (sarcastically): McGill ignoring students? That has never happened before!
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	5. [Motion to Pass the Policy on Ethical Student Employment](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/POLICY-ON-ETHICAL-STUDENT-EMPLOYMENT.pdf) [AMENDED] [PASSED]
		+ Moving (Arts Representative Sanchez):
			- So this policy essentially works as a way to propose the AUS takes a strong stance on unpaid internships, voluntourism, and other questionable organizations that go against our mandates. We propose that we say explicitly in writing that we don't condone these opportunities. The motion gives definitions as well as the policy and providing mechanisms of reporting as well. As an executive, we've been stringent on not allowing unpaid internships and voluntouring organizations to not work with us. This will go into practice so that in future execs this practice is maintained
		+ Questions
			- Arts Senator Wilson: Will this become a by-law or a statement?
				* Arts Representative Sanchez: The latter.
			- HSA: I was wondering - I appreciate the statement against unpaid internships. But to my understanding, the AUS has a lot of stipend positions, where people aren't paid by the hour. So it concerns me that the motion's inconsistent with the fact that people in the AUS aren't paid for their labour.
				* Arts Representative Sanchez: I can see how that's a double standard. It does say that there's no specific numeration at all as opposed to our stipend volunteers. Every year we do look to increase it because everyone at AUS does work hard.
			- ESA: I know many departments such as my own have portfolios of which students can help out - like the events portfolio. Will those positions be counted as unpaid internships?
				* Arts Representative Sanchez: Are they volunteers?
				* ESA: I don't think they are. I just want to make sure they're not included in this motion.
				* Arts Representative Sanchez: I'm confused about the nature of what they do, but there can be appeals about any organization that does fit under the definition to the Equity Commissioner, so there's that possibility. There will also be a working list of organizations that the assistant has to base that off of.
			- PSSA: I'm wondering, for this policy specifically, if there is a definition of "unpaid internships." But I was wondering if there's a student group that does get exempt - if a student falls out of the definition, can there be a procedure specified that allows them to be re-recognized by the definition?
				* Arts Representative Sanchez: If you scroll down, yes, it would be brought to the execs or to Council.
			- Equity Commissioner: I'm interested to know why "MLM"s (multi-level marketing) are allowed to be associated with the AUS but voluntourism isn't. I'm pointing out Point 3.
				* Arts Representative Sanchez: That's a spelling mistake. It should say "may NOT."
			- PSA: I had a question with Section 10 under reporting - the formal apology and cancellation of services part. Would there be any means for renumerations or retroactive payment?
				* Arts Representative Sanchez: What's the specific context you're using as an example?
				* PSA: If… let's say someone was working in a position that was deemed to be an unpaid internship. I don't see how this policy would allow for any fixing operations other than an apology. Is the only recourse just an apology?
				* Sanchez: I'm open to suggestions but there's only so much we can do. Can I defer to Maria?

*Speaker allows the President to speak on Arts Representative Sanchez's behalf.*

* 1. President: You're asking if we'd provide a stipend to someone subjected to an unpaid internship?
		+ PSA: Yeah
		+ President: We're more addressing the root of the problem, like the tools that contribute to these organizations anyway. At the end of the day, our money is for Arts students only. We can look into creating a different fund for that effort but our money is for people who work for us.
	2. Gallery (AIESEC): How did you distinguish between claims of organizations that are redeemable and organizations that could be resolved? What is the policy guaranteeing that you'd actually communicate with student groups?
		+ Arts Representative Sanchez: The AIO recommended that we don't work with AIESEC. You can always appeal any claims - there is a process (to appeal) if you genuinely believe that it's been handled badly - you can always go to the Secretary General or to the Equity Commissioners. That being said, I'm not sure what else you want me to do.
		+ VP Academic: Essentially, the crackdown on voluntourism is coming with the collaboration with the Arts internship office, especially to groups that are coming into classrooms and harassing students for personal information. A lot of profs are coming forward and saying groups are randomly coming in and passing around a sheet. So there are safety issues with personal information, and with not having the safest conditions in the trips themselves. Want to make sure the internship processes, especially for people going abroad, is safe.
	3. HSA: (1) Is the AUS considering taking steps to make sure their staff is paid by the hour, and; (2) Is the AUS considering having their staff be unionized, considering this policy is about equitable employment?
		+ Arts Representative Sanchez: We have been looking into that and I think Mia is more qualified to answer the financial part. In terms of unionizing student employees, I am not positive that anything is being done but that's a great suggestion.
	4. Voting
		+ Motion passes
	5. [Motion to combine FMC Funds [Late]](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-combine-FMC-Funds.docx) [PASSED]
		+ Moving (VP Finance):
			- So the FMC split into 3 different funds. As of now, there is only $6000 remaining in the Special Projects and Journal Funds. The Journals Fund will apply for individual funds like $500-600 and the Special Projects Fund has a huge range and can apply for bigger projects. This motion would combine the three funds into one fund for the rest of the year so we could fund more journals and special projects. We would obviously prioritize Supplementary Departmental applications, but we receive less of them than Special Projects and Journals applications.
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	6. [Motion to Renew and Increase the AUTS fee [Late] [Translation of motion passed 14 February]](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Renew-and-Increase-the-AUTS-fee-1.docx) [PASSED]
		+ Speaker: This motion was previously passed but we're bringing it back with translation.
		+ Moving (VP Finance):
			- Now it's been translated. To summarize: to double the AUTS fee from $1-2 for full time arts students, half of that for part time, and half of THAT for Arts and Science and CLASHSA students.
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	7. [Motion to Renew the AUIF Fee [late] [translation of motion passed 14 February]](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Renew-the-AUIF-Fee-1.docx) [PASSED]
		+ Moving (VP Finance):
			- It's just to renew the fee. AUIF funds a lot of things on campus like capital improvements and departments wanting new furniture. Consider applying next year!
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	8. [Motion for Course Fee: POLI Course in Italy](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-for-POLI-Course-in-Italy.docx) [AMENDED] [PASSED]
		+ Moving (POLI 359 Professor):
			- I'm here again! Basically, this is the same thing we discussed last time. The only reason I’m back is because there was a mistake! There was an error in the course number. So we need to make sure that the right number is there. The fee advisor sent us back here, not for any change, it's the same thing, but it's a matter of changing the course number. I'm here, if there are any questions, by all means.
			- Second motioner: ESA
		+ Points
			- [Point of Order] VP Communications: It says "POLI 339" in the title.
				* Professor: Thank you.
				* Speaker: Yikes.
				* [Motion for POLI 359 Course Fee in Italy](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-for-POLI-Course-in-Italy-1.docx) [AMENDED]
				* President: I'm sorry, I know POLI 339 is a serious topic and I didn't mean for this to happen. I was stressed.

Speaker: 3 and 5 are close on the keyboard, I forgive you.

* + - Professor: Thank you for entertaining this motion despite all these other motions.
			* Council: Thank you for staying here through all these other motions!
		- Voting
			* Motion passes
	1. Speaker: And now, we'll move to the Accountability Survey
		+ Arts Representative Karia: I'm really sorry, but can I motion to add a question to referendum to make FIO by-laws in the Constitution? *(Note: Refer back to item 9.6 on the agenda.)*
			- Second motioner: VP External
	2. [Motion to Bring Question Regarding AUS Course Fee Approval Capabilities](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Motion-to-Bring-Question-Regarding-AUS-Course-Fee-Approval-Capabilities.pdf) [PASSED]
		+ Questions
			- CRO (Elections AUS): Are the whereas clauses written in French as well? They need to be passed with French.
		+ Points
			- [Point of Order] VP Finance: It only says only the question needs to be in French.
				* CRO (Elections AUS): My bad. But could you make them in French?
				* Arts Representative Karia: I just want to pass it so that it can go to referendum. Only the question needs to be in French?
				* CRO (Elections AUS): Yeah, my bad.
		+ Debate
			- Arts Senator Wilson: Motion to amend to bold the specific amendment?
				* Arts Representative Karia: It's the last sentence.
				* Friendly amendment - last sentence (the amendment) bolded.
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	3. Presentation of the [Accountability Survey Winter 2019 Results](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Accountability-Survey-Presentation-Winter-2019-.pdf) by AUS Secretary General
		+ Presentation *(Execs are out of the room)*
			- Secretary General: So we do two accountability surveys every year and this is the one for the second semester. We'll be going through numerical results and execs with concerns can address them.
			- 1.1 - "Do you believe the AUS executives have adhered to the Policy?"
				* We find it troubling that we got 10 responses and 8 rated the exec's adhering as 3 out of 5. This is a drop from previous semester and previous years.
			- The President is generally approachable during office hours and adequately + professionally addressed questions.
			- The VP External is generally available and approachable during office hours. Because of the timing of the survey, we only got 10 responses. The VP External addressed questions well generally.
			- The VP Internal has a wider spread - some concerns. Generally they're okay, but a wider spread.
			- VP Communications - some concerns with widespread office hours approachability in office hours. Some concerns for answering questions, with most people thinking this is fine, but a couple of concerns.
			- VP Finance has been available and approachable in dedicated office hours. Most people seemed to find she's answering concerns.
			- VP Academic - most people happy with office hours. Both office hour availability and adequate answering of questions have 1 concern out of 6 responses.
			- VP Social - quite positive responses. Some concerns about adequate professional address but generally favourable.
			- Former Arts Representative Figueredo - concerns with availability in office hours. He has now resigned so he CAN address them, but he probably won't. Same with addressing concerns. Very problematic but probably will not be addressed.
			- Arts Representative Sanchez - 3 responses, 2 are only 3/5, that's a concern that she hasn't been available in office hours. Two more negative responses that she's not addressing concerns adequately.
			- Arts Representative Karia - 3/5, 4/5, and 5/5, edging towards more favourable responses concerning availability of designated office hours. Some concern about addressing questions professionally and adequately.
			- We only got 10 responses. I know the timing was bad, especially with POLI 339. It was hard for us to know how much people are concerned or if concerns are being met or if there are issues that need to be addressed. It only takes a couple of minutes so we encourage in the future to do it if you can. We're always looking to improve feedback on the survey so please let us know.
		+ Questions
			- HSA: Thank you. I know for myself the survey was difficult to fill it out because I've never seen the execs during office hours. Maybe to have some way to have a control for that, maybe more people would be willing to fill it out if they didn't have to fill out the office hours part?
			- QSSA: How many answers do you usually get for these surveys?
				* Sec Gen: We got forty last semester. Last year, that was forty too. So this was a lower turnout. A lot of the substantive concerns were about the POLI 339 vote so given the timing, that's something to keep in mind.
			- AGELF: Last semester, I sent an email to make sure we were added to the survey, but we didn't get it this semester.
				* Secretary General: Hi, we reached out to the VP Internal to add you to the list, but we had a resignation so we had to get the (outdated?) mailing list from the President, and we were told we probably wouldn't have everything.
			- Equity Commissioner: How is it chosen who the survey's sent to? Equity didn't get this either.
				* Secretary General: It's for volunteers, both stipend and non-stipend, and AUS Exec. We were given a Google sheet and we were told to send it out. Maybe this could be improved.
				* Speaker: I was wondering if there was a different process last semester?

Secretary General: Last semester it was the same survey but they were sent a week and a half apart from the other survey. Given everything happening this semester, we chose to send them out at the same time. Just the timeline was a bit different from last semester.

* + - * CSAUS: Are the emails being sent to departmental emails or individual "mail.mcgill.ca" emails?
				+ Secretary General: There's a blend with some putting departmental and some putting personal
			* CLASHSA: I think in past years, it's been posted on the Facebook group and we're all pretty active on there. Maybe that can also help next year if people's emails are missed.
		- *Exec are asked to return*
	1. Presentation of the [Findings of Secretary General on Poli 339 Executive Vote](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Secretary-General-Report-on-POLI-339-Vote.pdf) by AUS Secretary General
		+ Presentation:
			- Secretary General: We are the Secretary Generals. This is Nathan, my Deputy Sec Gen. I want to acknowledge how difficult of a time it has been for everyone. We want to thank you for the many emails with complaints and evidence and we've taken those into account in producing this report. We're aware that it was posted very late and that's because the lawyer got back to us at 3:57 am. We'll go through the report and have a Q&A at the end.
				* **Introduction:** The Secretary-General Portfolio, composed of the AUS Secretary-General (Sophie Zhao) and Deputy Secretary-General (Nathan Mendel), has received complaints about the constitutionality of a vote undertaken by the Arts Undergraduate Society (hereafter “AUS”) Executive Committee on the POLI 339 course as well as about the behaviour of specific executive members. This AUS Executive Committee vote noted that it overturned the Legislative Council’s decision from January 30, 2019 to not approve a fee for POLI 339.

On February 14, 2019, the AUS Secretary-General portfolio suspended the Executive Committee’s vote on POLI 339 and launched an investigation in response to the complaints it has received. This document documents the findings from the Secretary-General’s investigation as per the recommendation of legal counsel.

* 1. **Parties:** The parties relating to this matter are the Legislative Council and the AUS Executives, whom we investigated. Specifically, the AUS Executives at the time of the POLI 339 vote (Feb 8, 2019) were:

President: Maria Thomas

VP Academic: Chloe Kemeni

VP Communications: Jamal Tarrabain

VP External: Rebecca Scarra

VP Finance: Mia Trana

VP Internal: Billy Kawasaki

VP Social: Kim Yang

Arts Representatives: Andrew Figueiredo, Ana Paula Sanchez, Garima Karia

Since the vote, VP Internal Billy Kawasaki and Arts Representative Andrew Figueiredo have resigned from their positions. They are still included in the results of this investigation given that they had been occupying their positions in the AUS Executive while the vote had been cast about POLI 339.

* 1. **Role of the Secretary-General Portfolio:** The Secretary-General Portfolio is responsible, according to AUS Accountability Bylaws, for addressing complaints brought against executives. Specifically, when a complaint is brought against one or more of the executive body of the AUS, the Secretary-General is tasked with ensuring that the complaint is brought to the President and the specific executive within 3 business days. If an informal resolution cannot be resolved, the implicated executive must address the concerns during the next Legislative Council of the AUS. Due to the strong public interest in this case, the Secretary-General Portfolio has seen fit to present this investigation to the AUS Legislative Council.
	2. **Scope of the Investigation:** There are two broad issues to be examined by the Secretary-General portfolio:
		+ If the actions of the Executive Committee regarding the POLI 339 vote violated the AUS Constitution.
		+ If the actions of individuals in the Executive Committee violated their duties as outlined under their respective employment contract and the AUS constitution and by-laws.

This report will address both in response to the complaints the portfolio has received.

* 1. **Material facts**
		+ On January 31st, 2019, the AUS Legislative Council voted against the approval of a fee of $1000 for the POLI 339 course with 14 no votes, 13 yes votes, and 9 abstentions.
		+ On February 7, 2019, the AUS President had been emailed an updated syllabus of POLI 339 by Professor Waller. She posted this document the same day in the AUS Executive Slack channel.
		+ A poll was created on February 7, 2019, on facebook messenger about whether to call an emergency legislative council. 6 executives voted no and 4 voted abstain.
		+ On February 8, 2019, Arts Representative Figueiredo created a facebook messenger poll in the AUS Executive Committee chat to vote on the POLI 339 course; the motion passed with 4 yes votes, 4 abstentions, and 2 no votes.
		+ On February 8, 2019, President Thomas created a second facebook messenger vote poll with the title: “Do we approve of the Poli 339 class?” This vote had 3 yes, 2 no, and 1 abstention.
		+ On February 8, 2019, then-VP Internal Kawasaki created a third facebook messenger vote poll with the title: “Do we approval that the POLI 339 Course fee is Reasonable”; there were 3 yes votes and 4 no votes.
		+ The AUS Executive Committee sent the results of the first vote to the professors on February 8th, 2019.
		+ The AUS released on February 12, 2019, a statement regarding an executive decision to overturn the decision made by the AUS Legislative Council on January 31st regarding the course POLI 339
		+ The Secretary-General portfolio released a public statement on February 14, 2019 stating that releasing the Facebook Messenger and Slack chats would not violate the AUS Constitution, noting that this was not a request to release the chats, as that is beyond the purview of the Secretary-General portfolio.
		+ On February 14, 2019, the AUS Legislative Council engaged in a discussion moderated by the Secretary-General about the POLI 339 vote.
		+ On February 20, 2019, the VP Communications sent an email titled “AUS Detailed Statement and Apology Regarding POLI 339” which was signed by all sitting executives at the time other than Arts Representative Sanchez. In it, the executive body issued an apology and description of events surrounding the POLI 339 vote, as well as a 78 page redacted chat record of the Facebook Messenger conversation in which the Executive Committee vote on POLI 339 had been cast.
	2. **Investigation of the Actions of the Executive Committee**
		+ **Voting Protocol**
			- The AUS’s By-laws Regarding FIOs notes in article 2.2 that to approve any FIO, the representative departmental association’s recommendation must be presented to AUS Legislative Council and must be ratified by a simple majority vote.
			- Article 2.3 of the By-laws Regarding FIOs notes that if a decision must be made when AUS Legislative Council is unable to be convened, the AUS Executive Committee must cont- oh, that's a typo, it should say "contact," not "contact." 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.
			- The POLI 339 course is in political sciences department, which is represented by the McGill Political Science Students’ Association (hereafter “PSSA”) as its departmental association.
			- The PSSA President, Bella Harvey, confirmed via email on February 17, 2019, that the PSSA did not present a recommendation to the Legislative Council nor the AUS Executive Committee at any point regarding POLI 339. PSSA President Harvey also noted via email on February 14, 2019, that no member of the PSSA executive was consulted post the Legislative Council vote by either the AUS or the political science department. She stated that post the council vote, there has been no communication between PSSA and AUS, and that there was never any consultation about the second vote.
			- This situation contravenes the AUS’s By-laws Regarding FIOs articles 2.2 and 2.3.

**Finding 1:** The Executive Committee did not attempt to receive a recommendation from the PSSA. This contravenes Article 2.3 of the AUS By-laws Regarding FIOs.

* 1. **Arts Representative Votes**
		+ The AUS Constitution, under Article 11.1, states that there shall be a Committee of Council called the Executive Committee, which shall govern the AUS between meetings of Council in a manner consistent with policies set out by Council and the General Assembly. This Executive Committee, under articles 11.2, shall be composed of the positions outlined under The Parties Involved section of this report (the AUS Executives and the 3 Arts Representatives).
		+ Article 11.3 of the AUS Constitution notes that Arts Representatives to SSMU shall serve as non-voting members of the Executive Committee.
		+ The Executive Committee vote (the first of the 3 facebook polls from February 8, 2019) counted the vote of the Arts Representatives, which contravened the AUS Constitution.
		+ 4. AUS Executive Committee chat records (which were released publicly) suggest that the Executives had been aware that Arts Representatives are non-voting members:
			- Arts Representative Sanchez stated that “Arts reps can [vote] because it is common practice now” (Feb 8, 4:23PM)
			- President Thomas stated that “it is stupid that arts rep dont get a vote i agree” (Feb 8, 4:25PM) and “but right now thats how our documents are” (Feb 8, 4:26PM)
			- Arts Representative Sanchez stated that “but at this point it is common practice @Andrew Figueiredo” (Feb 8, 4:26PM) and that “Common practice superseded bylaws” (Feb 8, 4:30PM) “In frosh context” (Feb 8, 4:30PM)
			- President Thomas stated that “if everyone else is okay with it i think arts reps should count at this point” (Feb 8, 4:29PM) e. President Thomas stated that “there are times we have purposefully forgotten by laws for all of us (aka frosh payment)” (Feb 8, 4:29PM)
		+ The aforementioned exchange suggests an awareness that Arts Representatives are non-voting members under AUS regulations, as President Thomas noted and as would have been made known to everyone else through reading that message if they did not already know that from the Constitution, which had also been their responsibility to know.
		+ The aforementioned exchange suggests a deliberate decision to contravene the Constitution by counting the Arts Representatives’ votes. Had this not occurred, the vote on the motion would have resulted in “No” instead of “Yes” since all three Arts Representatives had voted yes in the first poll.
		+ The aforementioned exchange suggests that one or more members of the AUS Executive body may have “purposefully forgotten by laws” (AUS President, Feb 8, 4:29PM), referring to frosh payment, which would be a circumvention of the Constitution. This statement forms grounds for a separate investigation by the Secretary-General portfolio into Executive conduct and accountability.

**Finding 2:** The Executive Committee’s vote on the motion regarding an FIO for POLI 339 constitutes an invalid process, as it violates Article 11.3 of the AUS Constitution.

**Finding 3:** The Executive Committee accepted the results of their vote on the motion regarding an FIO for POLI 339. The Executive Committee was aware that the procedure was invalid. The Executive Committee actively and purposefully contravened Article 11.3 of the AUS Constitution.

* 1. **Power of the Executive Committee**

The AUS Constitution and by-laws do not clearly confer or deny the power of the Executive Committee to supersede the authority of the Legislative Council on the grounds of new evidence. This is an area of ambiguity in the Constitution. The interpretation of the Constitution falls outside the jurisdiction of the Secretary-General Portfolio.

* 1. **Investigation into the Individual Actions of Executive Committee Members:** As according to the AUS Constitution Article 19.1:

*“Any member of the AUS Executive or representative to SSMU may be removed from of ice for impropriety, violation of the provisions of this Constitution and by-laws, delinquency of duties or misappropriation of funds.”*

This section deals with the individual actions of the members of the Executive Committee.

* 1. **President Maria Thomas**
		+ As according to AUS Constitution Article 12.9.1, the AUS President is responsible to Chair the Executive Committee.
			- *Please note there is a formatting error in the current version of the Constitution whereby the AUS President's responsibilities are not all listed under Article 12.4. We have cross-referenced the Constitution with the AUS President’s contract to determine this responsibility.*
		+ As chair of the Executive Committee, the President is responsible for ensuring that the actions of the Executive Committee comply with the AUS Constitution and by-laws.
		+ As chair of the Executive Committee, the President has a responsibility to establish the procedures by which the committee will function and ensure these procedures are followed.
		+ The following are quotes of President Thomas’s messages to the Executive Committee Facebook Messenger group:
			- “There are times we have purposefully forgotten by-laws for all of us (aka frosh payments)” (Feb 8 2019, 4:29 PM)
			- “@Billy for context in the summer, frosh bylaws countered contracts so we followed contractgs [sic]” (Feb 8 2019, 4:29 PM)
			- “If everyone else is okay with it I think arts reps should count at this point” (Feb 8 2019, 4:29 PM)
			- “Because I understand its [sic] not easy to break a bylaw” (Feb 8 2019, 4:30 PM)
		+ In the Facebook chat, President Thomas revealed that Arts Representatives could not vote in the Executive Committee after the first poll on approving a motion for an FIO for POLI 339. Arts Representative Figueiredo, Arts Representative Sanchez, VP Social Yang, VP External Scarra all identified that they had not previously known this rule.
		+ In the Facebook chat, President Thomas asserted that she has been keeping track of Executive Committee votes throughout the year in order to ensure that Article 11.3 related to the Arts Representatives voting powers, was upheld.
		+ President Thomas allowed the Arts Representatives votes to be counted (see 5c above).
			- Secretary General: Typo - "5c" should be "4c."

**Finding 4:** President Thomas did not execute her duty to ensure the Executive Committee’s compliance with the Constitution and By-Laws. She knowingly allowed the Executive Committee to violate Article 11.3 of the AUS Constitution.

* 1. Secretary General: Just to clarify - because we already discussed that the exec committee as a whole caused this, the reason we are presenting an individual section on President Thomas is that she has an extra duty to lead the exec committee.

**Finding 5:** President Thomas did not execute her duty to establish and uphold proper procedural rules for the functioning of the Executive Committee. These actions led to procedural issues and resulted in the Executive Committee following an invalid process. This constitutes a delinquency of duties and impropriety.

* 1. **Arts Representatives Andrew Figueiredo and Ana Paula Sanchez**
		+ Article 3 of the Arts Representative Contracts states:

*3. The Arts Representatives to SSMU agrees to follow the principles governing the AUS ...*

* 1. The principles governing the AUS are outlined in the AUS Constitution and by-laws.
	2. The following are quotes of Arts Representative Figueiredo’s messages to the Executive Committee Facebook Messenger group:
		+ “It’s been happening all year without an issue. I take issue with the notion that suddenly we can invoke something that in precedent wasn’t done all year.” (Feb 8 2019, 4:24 PM)
		+ “Why is it okay to go with procedure when it comes to frosh and committees but suddenly that changes out of the blue” (Feb 8 2019, 4:45 PM)
		+ “Do we really need to send a statement at all tbh?”
		+ If somebody asks that’s one thing”
		+ But if not why just play it off as if nothing changed”
		+ “Agree to disagree on that - I don’t think it’s wrong to avoid flak”
	3. The following are quotes of Arts Representative Sanchez’s messages to the Executive Committee Facebook Messenger group:
		+ “No its in the constitution”, “that we don’t”, “But I think we can’t just suddenly apply it now” (Feb 8 2019, 4:11 - 4:12 PM)
		+ “Arts reps can because it is common practice now” (Feb 8 2019, 4:23 PM)
		+ “And tbh really invalidating to bring that up, bc we all work very hard.” (Feb 8 2019, 4:24 PM)
		+ “but at this point it is common practice” (Feb 8 2019, 4:26 PM)
		+ “Common practice superseded bylaws” (Feb 8 2019, 4:30 PM)
		+ “We are not breaking the constitution @Billy” (Feb 8 2019, 4:44 PM)
	4. Arts Representative Figueiredo agreed with Arts Representative Sanchez about Arts Representatives votes being common practice (Feb 8 2019, 4:26 PM)

**Finding 6:** After the Chair of the Executive Committee, President Thomas, clarified the constitutional restraints related to Article 11.3, Arts Representatives Figueiredo and Sanchez placed further pressure on President Thomas to take action that contravenes Article 11.3. The actions of Arts Representative Figueiredo and Sanchez contradict their agreement and duties as outlined in Article 3 of the Arts Representatives contracts.

* 1. Deputy Secretary General: That just means that they were putting extra pressure to go against the Constitution, which is in violation of their duties as Arts Reps.

**Finding 7:** Arts Representative Figueiredo suggested that the results of the Executive Committee vote not be presented for ratification to the Legislative Council. This was a suggestion to take action which would contravene Article 12.3 of the AUS Constitution. This action does not uphold the trust placed in him by the Legislative Council as a member of the Executive Committee.

* 1. **VP Academic Chloe Kemeni, VP Communications Jamal Tarrabain, VP External Rebecca Scarra, VP Finance Mia Trana, VP Internal Billy Kawasaki, VP Social Kim Yang, and Arts Representative Karia**
		+ The investigation into the actions of the above Executives is inconclusive. As part of the Executive Committee, these individuals did not uphold the Constitution.
		+ Deputy Secretary General: Omitted Arts Representative Karia's first name by accident.
	2. **Conclusion and Recommendations:** The Executive Committee vote on POLI 339 was suspended by the Secretary-General portfolio on February 14, 2019, pending the results of the investigation. After gathering relevant facts and conducting interviews with the AUS Executives, the Secretary-General portfolio deems the Executive Committee vote on POLI 339 unconstitutional. It violates Article 11.3 of the AUS Constitution and Article 2.3 of the By-laws Regarding FIOs. It does not have validity under the AUS Constitution and Bylaws Regarding FIOs.
		+ Deputy Secretary General: I know that a lot of specific-to-this-issue things were clarified in motions that are going to referendum now, but there were areas in the Constitution (like freedom of information requests) and confidentiality that are still quite grey. We still recommend that these areas and the whole Constitution be opened because there are formatting errors and it all be opened and reviewed as a whole document instead of pieces.

The actions of the Executive Committee satisfy Article 19.1 of the AUS Constitution to remove Executive Committee members from office.

At the core of this complex issue lies the question of the extent to the AUS Executive Committee’s power. The AUS Constitution neither provides nor denies the Executive Committee the power to overrule the Legislative Council in cases such as these. This is one of many areas where the Constitution is vague or ambiguous. It is thus the recommendation of the Secretary-General Portfolio that the Legislative Council opens a large-scale review of the entire AUS Constitution in order to clarify these many grey areas.

As according to Article 18 of the AUS Constitution, the Judicial Board of the Student Society of Mcgill University (SSMU) has the role of interpreting the Constitution. Any concerns with the findings of this investigation or over the correct interpretation of the Constitution can be appealed to the Judicial Board.

The Secretary-General Portfolio believes another key factor in this situation is the lack of knowledge displayed by many of the AUS Executive Committee. It is thus the recommendation of the Secretary-General Portfolio that a motion be presented to Legislative Council requiring members of the AUS Executive Committee to attend an information session on the AUS Constitution and By-Laws, facilitated by the Secretary-General Portfolio.

* 1. Deputy Secretary General: We can also hold workshops on Legislative Council's abilities and powers and a reading of that in Council. There were complaints from Council members who misinterpreted the Constitution or didn't know what they could or couldn't do.

The Secretary-General Portfolio hereby closes this investigation.

*“As for the consequences for the actors responsible for the findings in the present investigation, the AUS Constitution as a mechanism in place according to article 19 as mentioned hereabove.”*

*“19.2 A motion to remove a member of the Executive or representative to SSMU must be presented in writing to the Speaker of Council and signed by at least eight (8) members of the Council, or one hundred and fifty (150) members of the AUS and 7 distributed to the AUS membership. The motion to remove will then be inscribed on the agenda of the next meeting of the AUS (Council or General Assembly). A person against whom a motion to remove is directed shall be afforded the opportunity to respond to the allegations made at the meeting.”*

It is the right and prerogative of Legislative Council to determine the next steps related to this issue.

* 1. Deputy Secretary General: That was an investigation into the voting and we also found it necessary to investigate the individual actions of the AUS execs. For structure, we've listed the points, and the facts are what we used for the findings, which are the conclusion for that section, in case anyone wondering was happening.
		+ Just to clarify - due to the nature of the forum of the discussion took place, it was hard to know what people were saying at what time and if people understood what was happening. We cannot identify conclusively if there were or not actions that violated their contracts or the AUS by-laws. Moving forward, it is your duty and privilege as Council to make that decision. We cannot offer more information on that in a neutral manner.
		+ Interviews were committed with all execs except for Arts Representative Karia.
	2. Motions
		+ AHCSSA: Motion for a 5-minute recess
			- Second motioner: Arts Representative Sanchez
			- Motion passes

*[5-minute recess]*

* 1. Questions
		+ AHCSSA: Are there active listeners?
			- Speaker: Yes, the Equity Commissioners are here.
	2. Announcement about active listening:
		+ Equity Commissioner: The Equity Commissioners will be present for questions. If you need active listener just pull us aside or message us on Facebook.
	3. Presentation (continued)
		+ Secretary General: We'll host an informal Q&A period. It doesn't have to be questions it can be comments.
	4. Motions
		+ AHCSSA: Can we motion to table all departmental reports 'til next Council?
			- Speaker: I'm sorry, but I'm not going to entertain that motion because we've tabled them for the past two meetings. We're here to discuss accountability issues and even though they're online, you guys need to present your reports.
	5. Q&A
		+ SLUM: I was wondering if the Sec Gens have sent the report to the Dep Provost?
			- Sec Gen: We published it at 4:30 am and we sent it specifically to President and Speaker emails and Facebook group. This (sending the report to Dep Provost) is not a process that we're involved it but we're happy to forward it to them.
		+ HSA: What plans do you or the Exec have to publicize this report?
			- Secretary General: We believe it should be accessible to anyone who's concerned about it. The Sec Gen Portfolio doesn't have any duties to send it out. But it's accessible in the Facebook group
			- VP Communications: I can share it on the AUS Facebook group and on the first listserv after reading week, I can include a link for people to read it.
		+ Gallery: Regarding Deputy Provost, I understood that their offer was that if SSMU rescinds their ratification, Dep Provost would overturn the Exec's vote?
			- President: Updates on that - SSMU has agreed to suspend their vote so we reached out to Dep Provost. Since there's no precedent for this, they refuse to overturn our vote. So Arts Rep Karia pointed out that our vote was unconstitutional and that McGill cancels classes all the time so I've been trying to set up a meeting with them to advocate these points.
		+ HSA: Thank you. Given that the report mentions that there are grounds for impeachments for all exec members, I was wondering what the execs' responses are to it and what measures they're taking to be held accountable, their thoughts on voting unconstitutionally, and what their plans are for repairing the trust that was lost.
			- Arts Representative Sanchez: I just wanted to elaborate on the conversation I had with Deputy Sec Gen Mendel, where we spoke about establishing a constitutional research position, a position to have someone to see the inconsistencies in the Constitution. There needs to be a massive overhaul [of the Constitution] and we need someone dedicated to doing that - a position established is something I want to work on to my fullest capacity this semester.
			- President: This meeting has given me a lot to think about. I feel like I failed all of you. So I'm going to think about it and if need be, I will resign, given that I was in charge of the exec committee and I should not have let the Arts Reps vote and this is all coming back to me. I just need some time to wrap things up and to move forward.
			- VP Communications: I do want to go off what Maria said there. As the exec outlines very clearly, this isn't something just Maria engaged in - it was the totality of the exec. I think it's fair that the whole exec addresses their concerns from the HSA and proceeding forward, we do try to regain the trust. Our first step was the statement we released and publishing all the chat. I'm the first to acknowledge that that isn't enough - there's more that needs to be done. We're working on removing or altering the by-laws that allowed something like this to happen so that it can never happen again. If you're interested in setting up in a meeting with me to discuss how the AUS can repair this trust, please do. At this moment, other than what we've done already, I can't think of things that we can do. I do want time to think about this to think about how we can truly heal the divisions and damage we've caused.
			- VP Academic: Same thing. I definitely opened and need to go to a Constitutional review workshop. Clearly I contributed to this whole fiasco. We were thinking of what we can do this year to fix things up. Like a Constitutional review committee or amending by-laws or creating new ones in the Constitution. Very open to suggestions and whatever sentiments of the report. Once again, I apologize to everyone for this disaster.
			- VP External: Definitely echo the sentiment before. Also will be reflecting on this. I'm hoping that through continuing - right now I'm also doing the room bookings as VP Internal - I'm hoping that ensuring things don't fall into the cracks it won't happen - I agree with Chloe that I should have attended the constitutional and by-law review committee. This whole thing has been sitting very heavily with me. Frankly I’m disappointed in myself. I'm also open to have conversations with people, yeah.
			- Arts Representative Karia: I want to echo what the rest of the exec said, especially what the report said that there was a gap of understanding between the Arts Rep position and our personal understandings. As an Arts Rep, I take responsibility for that. Going forward, the changes I want to pursue are not only structural and we want to demonstrate positive structural change but also to do with the spirit of the position. Definitely want to echo conversations and hearing dialogue from our constituents to see how transparency can be re-instilled, especially within the context of the arts rep position
			- Arts Senator Wilson: I'd like to say to the portion of the report that outlines the actions of President that I understand the constitutional responsibility that she has over the exec committee, but I want to stress that she is not at 100% fault for this. I'm not speaking as a friend but as an Arts Senator when I say she's a great fucking president and it's deeply troubling that the report seems to put the blame of this situation solely on her.
			- WIMESSA: I want to echo the comments made by Arts Senator Wilson. I find it disturbing that one of the few execs who has tried to be as transparent as possible is the one who is taking the heat for some very shitty actions by other executives. I think, in addition, that she's one of the only ones who's given a truly substantive apology, not just talking about the future but also acknowledging what's been done is also important. I'd like to hear from Arts Reps Karia and Sanchez and why they're only talking about what can be done in the future but not making any accountable apologies for what they did that directly violated the AUS Constitution. Yeah, I'd just like to hear from them about their exact thoughts on what they've done.
			- Arts Representative Sanchez: Thank you. I, of course, take full responsibility for my actions and for the lack of my ability to follow the Constitution because of the lack of knowledge. A Constitutional workshop is necessary. I want to talk about the section about the President's responsibilities. One of the specific issues about the Constitution is that there are things we don't really apply anymore, for example, the Constitution states that Maria is responsible for chairing the exec committee when in actuality, that responsibility is given to the Arts Reps. I am obviously really disappointed in myself and in my role and honestly I do need a bit more time to give a fully substantive response and reflective one to this. But yeah, it's a really saddening situation and I'm sorry to have had any part in this.
			- Deputy Secretary General: It was not the intent of the report to shift the blame towards President Thomas. We have to work within the confines of the Constitution and the by-laws. Their nature, which we've already established they're lacking in areas, and the chats in which they took place, we found it difficult pinpointing, without placing subjective understanding of what happened, any specific blame to other execs, but it's not our intent to pinpoint the blame on President Thomas only. The Constitution only allows us to place certain blame at her feet. The decision of the exec committee is as the committee as a whole, not just President Thomas.
			- GSA: I think it was very clear that as Secretary General, you have to operate by some objective standard. I found the chat interesting that I've had discussions about it. We read the same chat and some people had the opposite interpretations of it so we'll have to make decisions of what we think of it. I agree we should look to what happened, but as short term actions are concerned, I think it'd be a good thing for the exec committee as a group to make a statement to the Deputy Provost saying, "Hello, AUS exec committee here, you need to cancel our decision," and if we get pushback, then we should make it public. We, as Council, should make a statement, because regardless of POLI 339, you should not think the class should pass because overriding the AUS Council would be a dangerous precedent to pass. If somebody could write a more concise straight-to-the-point statement to the Dep Provost, because I'm terrible at writing statements, then we could make a difference in this issue. Sorry for taking so much time.
				* Secretary General: If it's to the Council's interest, I think you should have a vote on it, if it's to Council's interest.
		+ ?: In addition to what WIMESSA said, his question wasn't why to Arts Representative Sanchez. She's the only one who didn't put out a personal apology. Why was she the only one who didn't regard this issue? She's literally the only one that didn't acknowledge it. I want to know why she's not commenting on anything?
			- Arts Representative Sanchez: I was away on leave so I wasn't privy on any communications that happened after Feb 9. I did apologize on the Facebook group, however, and am happy to have that included in the listserv.
			- Secretary General: We have been in contact with Sanchez, but since the date that she stated (Feb 9) she hasn't been in contact. We don't know the situation past our own portfolio.
		+ MESS: I had a question for Arts Reps Karia and Sanchez, if they're comfortable. I was hoping they could address the letter circulating that a lot of departments signed onto, calling for their resignation. If they don't feel this is pertinent or if they can't address it they don't have to, but for accountability's sake, I would like them to.
			- Arts Representative Karia: Okay, so, I'll start that I think to my knowledge, that letter was written before the Secretary General report was released to the public, so that was the first thing. Additionally, we hadn't been contacted or personally addressed until now about the letter, our thoughts about it, etc. Arts Rep Sanchez can add onto after I’m finished since she has her own thoughts. I will say that we found that a lot of the claims that were being made had to do with an interpretation of our votes. We were voting on the question about the fee and nothing else. We're also very much disappointed and hurt at allegations being made against us on the basis of that interpretation. In response to an earlier question because I wasn't called - I also apologize for taking part in the exec vote as a whole, it was unconstitutional. Being put on the spot like this is very difficult because it's very personal. I'll have more thoughts on this going forward, it's just hard now. We have an op-ed with some thoughts we had, but this was also written before the report. I'll yield the rest of my time to Arts Rep Sanchez.
			- Arts Representative Sanchez: Just echoing that, I understand that people want answers right now and it's important for understanding what happened. I am sorry for taking place in the unconstitutional vote. Sorry, let me gather my thoughts if that's okay. I was really saddened but also understood why and thought it was important that these departments did demand accountability. However, yeah, I would like it to reflect that it was created prior to the report and that I have reportedly asked constituents and departmental associations to contact me with any concerns, and not a single one sent me any questions that I had signed on. I am really committed to hearing exact concerns and actually having the time to process things and provide a better answer. I'm sorry if I haven't been very articulate, it's been a lot to think about and it has taken an enormous toll as I'm sure it has for everyone else.
			- Arts Representative Karia: Secretary General, would I be able to use more time?
				* Secretary General: I'll circle back to you.
		+ CSA: I think that there are two points of evidence that haven't been addressed. As VP Social Yang said in her statement on the group, there were allegedly certain people on the committee "PM"-ing (private messaging) people to vote a certain way. Is there any evidence as to who was doing that and why? That evidence is important if we're thinking about resignations and impeachments. Nevermind on the second point.
			- Secretary General: This is something I asked the AUS lawyer about. For DMs (direct messages), unless both people consent to it being released, its release violates Canadian Privacy Law. The chat was public information that we could use in the chat. We're not at liberty to violate the law even if its' relevant.
			- CSA: In this case, I think at this point I highly recommend the people to come forward because we all know it happened and this is highly inappropriate.
			- VP Social: I wanted to say that yes, this did happen. I can't comment on other execs, but I did have people messaging me. I'm happy to reveal who they are, but privacy laws are the only reason I'm not revealing them because I don't want to get in trouble with the law. I've been very transparent otherwise.
				* Deputy Secretary General: The messages themselves may be protected under law, but, just to clarify, you are allowed to say who sent you messages. You may not be able to post screenshots, but that's where the privacy laws are more clear. Not that I’m saying you have to or should reveal who they are.
				* VP Social: Then I will. One of them was former Arts Rep Figuereido. He more than once explicitly messaged me asking, "Is there anything else I can do to make you say 'yes'?" That's why I said "plain and simple, I'm going to be using my vote how I want it." The second person: they'd messaged me because they were not fully privy to how busy I was during meetings. I can't check my phone during meetings, but they thought I was purposefully ignoring the chat. That person, Maria Thomas, messaged me to please vote in the poll. She didn't influence my vote, she just said, "Please vote," because she wasn't aware of the vote or that I wasn't purposefully ignoring them.
		+ CSA: My other point of evidence is that the only people to vote "yes" was every single Arts Rep and none of the execs. That hints to me that there was teamwork involved with voting, whereas voting is supposed to be a representative and individual thing. There might not be evidence, but it's something to consider.
		+ SLUM: This is something we discussed with former Arts Rep Figuereido last council but the other two arts reps weren't able to be present. There's a lot of talk about how the Arts Reps were voting on a fee but specifically, in the context of Council having already voted on this, I think it's not fully honest to say that it was "just about on a fee," specifically when you're voting in favour of overturning Council's decision. Further, in the op-ed, it was unclear, and maybe they can clear this up, but there's talk about Figuereido basically inciting the process of doing a re-vote based on the opinions of some students that it was unfair. And I don't know… how I read it, it sounds like it was the Arts Reps going forward with that or if it was the whole exec. Maybe you could answer that too. Those were my questions.
			- Arts Representative Karia: I'll go in order. Starting with the questions from CSA - all three of us going the same way. Everything I say, while there are ways for me to back myself up, I hope there's trust and understanding that we're all doing the best in our situations. I'm willing to disclose any other proof - we did not coordinate our vote in Council or in ex-comm. I was not contacted by any of the other reps to vote a certain way. I voted on the fee in ex-comm the same way I voted in Council. I hope my testimony provides a bit of context to that question. There's not a lot of things we can do to substantiate that but if there's anything you can think of I'd be happy to provide it. To address SLUM's questions, I'll speak for myself. I apologize for partaking in the vote in ex-comm. I expressed in the chat that I did not want to overturn the original decision. That's why I did not vote in favour of having an ex-comm vote. I did not support that idea and actively said I did not support that and did not feel good going forward without Council consultation. I answered the question was being asked of me in the poll. I thought he fee was reasonable so I voted yes. Hopefully, the authenticity to which I'm bringing this to Council holds a little bit of weight for those who did not believe me - I said multiple times that I did not think we should have the vote within ourselves and that it was not a good way forward. Hopefully those two things provide context for everyone and addresses everything. Thank you.
		+ HSA: Follow-up - The deeply concerning thing was the vote of the Arts Reps and VP Internal to overturn the vote. I want to hear from Arts Rep Karia - you said that you weren't in favour of overturning the vote, but you did in my understanding. So I’m confused by that.
			- Arts Representative Karia: I'll say this was the way I understood the process in my head and this is how my votes were cast. I voted yes on a question about a fee. The question was if the fee was reasonable. I did not say yes because I wanted to overturn a vote made by Council before. I voted yes at the Council and I stayed consistent with that in ex-comm. I see how that is being conflated or being misunderstood and hopefully what I said before - the fact that I said before the polls were even created that I did not want to have an ex-comm vote substantiates that when I cast my vote, I was thinking that we can vote so I’m going to vote on that because the asks I made earlier on what forum this was going to happen were already addressed. Hopefully that clarifies it - ultimately my vote was not representative of anything of the fee. I regret for participating in it. Thank you.
		+ CLASHSA: While we're talking about consistency of voting, I want to ask Sanchez why your vote was changed. What changed in that one week? Was it the document? You used to be abstention.
			- Arts Representative Sanchez: I had been told by Arts Rep Figuereido that there was a petition of 170 students who wanted to take the course and I was also told by multiple students on campus that they were incredibly disappointed by the results of the vote and thought that it was unfair. I took those considerations seriously and that's why I changed my vote. I thought that if it would have reduced the original harm and went in a utility-maximizing approach of what would bring the most amount of good and the least amount of harm.
		+ PSSA: I just… think that in voting… While I understand that it's public and not everyone voted to enter the vote in the first place, by voting "Yes," you overturned the decision that Council made. And I think the "voting based on consistency" argument is problematic when you know for a fact that when Council voted, on the 30th, a lot of gallery members and councillors were putting emotional energy and experiences in this conversation. And knowing full well that Council voted no, to overturn it, that in itself… I don't think consistency is a justification when you already know your Council made a decision. I think in that scenario, you're doing a disservice when a voting body already voted a certain manner and you go against that KNOWING that. I understand there have been vocal groups on voting Yes and No but I think by defaulting to having conversations with some constituents and not others, it's unfair when there was already a legislative body.
		+ VP Communications: I have to leave at 8:45 because I have a pre-planned call at 9. I apologize to everyone who has questions for me or for exec. Contact me at my Communications email and I'd be more than happy to have a meeting or discuss further. I'm really sorry and I know this is terrible timing, but I've had this meeting scheduled for a while. I'm really sorry and I look forward to moving to rectify this situation according to what you guys want.

*VP Communications leaves*

* 1. Gallery (Polly): As an Arts constituent, I'd like to express my concerns and disappoint that the sections on POLI 339 in Council are focusing on two people's votes, but I don't think it's fair to critique two people's votes when they were free to make these votes. I'm concerned that this is taking a turn as to how people they voted rather than why this vote happened like that in the first place.
	2. RSUS: My question is for Arts Representative Sanchez. Just to clarify something you just said: speaking for yourself, would you say that part of the reason you voted Against in the online poll was not to do with the fee as stated by a lot of people, but rather because of the petition signed by 150 people, while your constituency is in the thousands?
		+ Arts Representative Sanchez: How much did a petition influence my decision? Is that the question?
		+ RSUS: It's part of it, yes.
		+ Arts Representative Sanchez: Do you want to elaborate the rest of the question?
		+ RSUS: So you voted the way you did because of the petition?
		+ Arts Representative Sanchez: I believe the fee was reasonable and 150 students were interested and agreed that the fee was reasonable so that furthered my understanding of the situation. I don't know how that affected the rest of the exec who also participated in the vote.
	3. SLUM: To address the comment from the member of the gallery about the reason why so many departmental execs are focusing on the content of the vote. Yes, it's an issue that the vote happened at all after Council happened, but a lot of people find it troubling that certain members of the ex-comm took this opportunity of Constitutional confusion to overturn the vote. That's why we have specific questions about this issue.
	4. WIMESSA: I also want to add that if it weren't for how specific people voted, we wouldn't have this Constitutional crisis in the first place. If we look in the chat, there were people that refused to vote Yes because they were uncomfortable with overturning decisions. The apologies we heard were for breaking by-laws, but they weren't actual apologies. This is not just about technicalities or by-laws or Constitutionality, it's about abuse of power, even if it is about doing things in bad faith, even if it doesn't directly contradict the Constitution. I'd like to hear from the councillors who made this decision, if they're not just regretful that they're voted that way, that it was contradictory to the democracy of this institution and legislative members. I also want to say that I empathize that people are feeling singled out and personally attacked in these situations, but I also think that it doesn't mean that we can't be holding them accountable. They were elected to their positions to represent us all. I've also been feeling attacked because my elected representatives overturned the vote in a way that's been extremely harmful to people of my race and ethnicity. Tell me to my face that you're okay with the vote that you're made even though it's been so harmful and… yeah. I don't know.
		+ Arts Representative Karia: Can I ask that perhaps we're given time so that we can come back to it? The fact that I'm not saying anything doesn't mean I don't want to address this at all.
	5. CSUS: Since there have been questions about legitimacy of the votes, I'd like to read 9.9 of Standing Rules. No councillors may vote by absence or by proxy. I know CSAUS was being voted on by proxy in the original vote. The Speakers haven't been upholding this, so all the votes are illegitimate.
		+ Speaker: A vote by proxy refers specifically to an email vote. But if you send a proxy in your place, they can still vote.
	6. Gallery: Everyone state their name before the department because I'm taking notes.
	7. HSA: This is going to go in a bit of a different direction, about the statement that was sent out and for the statements sent out by AUS around the use of equity language. Specifically, "We apologize for any undue harm and emotional labour taken by these individuals." The continued use of equity language to avoid being held accountable for doing harm and actively making decisions that caused harm - I found it concerning that whoever wrote it, wrote it in a way to employ equity language and get value from that while also making a decision that was deeply inequitable. Especially how POLI 339 was discriminatory to students who couldn't take place in the course. I'd like to ask execs who write future statements to not do that.
		+ Arts Representative Sanchez: I wrote the initial statement on the 8th and it was a general, I just kinda typed it out, and it was a draft and I sent it to the rest of the execs before I went on my leave of absence. I was surprised to read the email as well because I didn't read any changes. I can't speak to the rest of the execs to how they decided to take how it was written. When I wrote it, it was just initial thoughts and I was subject to review it.
	8. ASA: Question for Arts Representative Sanchez. What was the reasoning behind the argument behind not revealing the second vote to the constituents?
		+ Arts Representative Sanchez: The intent behind that was to allow execs the same privilege that Legislative Council had. To an extent, to a lot of people, it could be perceived anything other than a vote on fees, and this something in particular refers to the conflict in the Israel-Palestine region. Regardless of what stance you take on the matter, if you took a stance about that on the course, if it was misconstrued, it would open harm to all the execs and I didn't want that to happen on anyone. It wasn't merely for self-protection but also for execs to feel comfortable voting to the best of their abilities.
	9. Gallery (U2 HSA student): I think it's important for departments to be accountable as well. I'm troubled by a petition was signed by HSA without my consent. I think the SSA was the only one who asked consent to sign an impeachment/resignation letter. WE are your constituents, we matter the most, so we'd like to reflect all matters of the AUS.
		+ HSA: I appreciate you bringing forth your concern. I'd like to have a conversation during my office hours. I think the question of asking consent to constituents has been brought up. That's something we can discuss more. Currently, in the Constitution, we're not mandated to do that. But if you feel like it should mandate us to, please speak to us. This is a representative democracy, not a direct one; you can't expect all constituents to be as informed and engaged as councillors are. I also think if we're being a representative democracy, people put their trust in representatives and trust that they'll make the best decisions. I'm uncomfortable with the precedent that all departmental decisions should go through every constituent, because it's non-functional.
		+ MESS: I definitely second the notion that I appreciate that comment. I want it on the record that there were departments that did consult their departments. I have a problem with gallery members assuming that none of them did and lumping us all together. MESS did consult their constituents. We had a form sent out. Unfortunately, that form was only live for about 6 hours.
		+ AHCSSA: For the sake of transparency for everyone, can the big departments (e.g. PSSA) say why they signed? I want to know what each departments' thought processes in constituents weighing in and signing. I want to clarify this whole thing - what MESS said it about having it on record that each department did their own thing and I guess the question about the gallery member was just about the HAS, so no one's coming for anyone here so out of respect, don't attack anyone.
		+ Gallery: I would like to echo what the other gallery member said, specifically about the PSSA. I've attempted to contact the PSSA in the few days after they signed it. I find it disturbing that neither me nor the other people that contacted them weren't responded to in the couple of days. I also think that individuals pointing out that representatives aren't under mandate to cater to everyone's concerns - you need to extend that yardstick to the Arts Reps - that defence can be applied to them too.
	10. Gallery: I'm just concerned since we're talking about being accountable to constituents, that Arts Representative Sanchez said that she was swayed by other constituents and that the vote wasn't made public, which was clearly a failure of asking people what they want. Afterwards, you didn't see the necessity of making the vote public for the constituents?
		+ Arts Representative Sanchez: I'm confused at the question and I'm going to need it be repeated. I made the stance that the vote should have been made public. I wanted to be as transparent as possible. The particular issue would have been that we did do a second vote and that since legislative councillors' votes were not disclosed after the fact, I was operating on that precedent.
	11. [Point of Personal Privilege] CSA: I need to leave, is that okay?
		+ Speaker: Yes? I established at the beginning of the year that you just leave whenever you need to as long as you sign out with the iPad or email me afterwards.
	12. AHCSSA: I'd like to refer back to PSSA because we didn't get an answer about referring to constituents signing onto the letter.
		+ PSSA: To the folks who are my constituents, I do acknowledge there have been a lot of messages we've received. We've been replying one by one slowly, sorry if you haven't gotten a response yet. I want it to be known that prior to Jan 30, I fully did consultations with people about POLI 339 because of the nature of what already happened - there was controversy about that from the beginning and we've been dealing with this for a very long time. I represented my constituents in the way that I voted - if you look at my voting history, I was representative of them, and as an Arts Rep last year, I constantly represented them. As for signing the petition - this was discussed among my whole exec, it was not a individual decision. The reason why we signed this was because of the position the PSSA's in. When this vote was overturned, the letter that was sent out by the AUS essentially had the first paragraph made it sound like the PSSA was consulted during this decision, which we were not. This not only pushed the blame onto us but was inherently a breach of the Constitution and the FIO by-laws. This gave us a lot of trouble because people thought we had a hand in making this unconstitutional decision overturning decision made on Jan 30. We wanted to sign onto this petition to make it clear that we had no hand in overturning the vote. Additionally, it seemed inappropriate that there would be a resignation petition mentioning the PSSA if the PSSA isn't supporting it. We also have a duty to represent our fellow legislative counsellors. We do first and foremost have the mandate to support our students, but in this scenario, it was also recognizing that the vote of the body was not respected. Through consensus of the PSSA vote, we made the decision to sign onto the petition for resignation.
	13. GSA: What we have done is we have received no constituency feedback. Even though we're a representative democracy here, while I agree that every little thing should not be grounds for calling them, on such an occasion, I feel it's such an exceptional circumstance where on the one hand I understand where the Council feels targeted as an entity, but the issue at the hand is transparency, democracy, etc. If you are to take a big stance on it, to an extent, we should actively seek constituency feedback. The GSA didn't do it - our stance was that we didn't want to annoy our constituents with that, but that was probably a mistake. While I get the representative democracy thing/argument, in that situation, I feel it's easy to say that "we're representative so you trust us, I hope." I'll close this by saying that even as a student, if you sent a certain feedback saying, "I'm against the call for resignation," reminder: it doesn't mean that 10 other people didn't say yes, sign onto that. I know the first person wasn't complaining about that but its' something to keep in mind as well.
	14. Gallery (Robert, U2 CSA student): I wanted to talk about point in the Secretary General report about education, constitutionality, by-laws, etc. It occurred to me that in the Constitution of the AUS, original jurisdiction falls to the judication board, and this doesn't strike me as practical because they have to follow a long board. SSMU has a position as a non-voting member known as Parliamentarian who can address these issues, and it seems to be that AUS would benefit from having someone who can serve these concerns and as a first reference point. Obviously appeal to or refer to judicial board if necessary, but there's no one who can provide immediate responses. There's a lack of education and I support the idea of having a conference about that in the beginning of Council. Having a position of quick and easy reference would be a good idea.
		+ Deputy Secretary General: That is definitely an issue that we faced, especially going through this investigation. There isn't a quick way of distinguishing what isn't under the Constitution and how to interpret it. If we suggested a review of it as a whole, that could be considered under whatever committee is reviewing it, but thanks so much for the comment.
	15. HSA: I think it's valuable to talk about the letter. I think your feedback on the process and your decision to sign it is valuable. But this is not the correct forum to discuss that, especially because this is regarding the Secretary General report and issues surrounding it. It might be valuable to not focus on this for the remainder of Council.
	16. Arts Representative Karia: I've been listening to a lot of questions. And so I hit everything or most things. I'll start by saying that again, I empathize with and regret the harm caused by this vote and the role I partook in that. I'm sorry about that for sure. I didn't know how the vote in ex-comm would end up and I want to emphasize my intent wasn't to overturn the vote. I'll let the chat speak for itself. I didn't go into the vote saying "I'll vote Yes because I want to overturn Council." Attributing intent to myself and the other Arts Reps, I know I can speak my truth in this space. Whether people want to be on my side or have opposing dialogue. What I wish is that I could have had more dialogue with Councillors, I hardly had any, and I wish I could have had more, so that this discussion of intent could become even more clear. This is an issue of intent, and I think that's why the letter (petition) about myself and Representative Sanchez was written. I hope people understand my honesty and goodwill going into this. I acted in good faith, I continue to work in good faith, and I hope that my thought process can empathize that. We made mistakes as an exec, but hopefully, though we continue to be held accountable and right those mistakes, we can understand that as students, it's all about making mistakes and learning from them.
	17. SLUM: I'd like the record to show that Arts Representative Karia reached out to departments, that they didn't respond, and that she feels that it was unfair that they didn't directly communicate with her. I'd like the record to show that Arts Representative Karia did reach out to me, I gave a time and said that I'd like to meet after the screenshots were released to have something more substantive, but she never responded.
	18. WIMESSA: I would ask the execs to say who they are apologizing to, what the harm was done, 'cause I don't think they know who they're apologizing to and for what.
		+ President: Our initial message was a general apology to everyone. We received concerns that our apology did not address certain issues, particularly those of Arab students. We've reached out back to that person to figure out how to regain their trust again and figuring out how to address the needs of every person in our body.
		+ Arts Representative Sanchez: Both of the public apologies I have made I have specifically listed that Muslim, Arab, Israeli, Jewish, and Palestinian students were deeply affected and I do not want to characterize the harm they feel because I feel like that's out of my purview. But I have apologized and have listed these concerns directly.

*At this moment, the VP External sees the porters waiting outside the room and dashes out of the room to talk to them.*

* 1. Secretary General: It's 9:22 pm, just a reminder that we have to be out of this room by 9:50.
	2. Arts Representative Karia: I'd like to echo what Representative Sanchez just stated. I echo her statements and sentiments completely. For what it's worth, Representative Sanchez and I, in the original draft we wrote, we had a long clause about people. In the editing process, it was condensed. I know it doesn't express the same thing anymore, but I'd like the record to show that that was what we wrote and these are the sentiments we have.
	3. WIMESSA: I guess I'll reiterate the need for the harm caused to be directly addressed and apologized for. So what I really want to say is that what needs to come from the AUS at this point, and I appreciate the statement made by the President just now, is a direct apology and acknowledgement explicitly saying how the actions they made affected Palestinian and Arab students. Saying they were affected isn't enough. We deserve to hear from you why it really affects them and us. I'm uncomfortable by the earlier motion advocating for unpaid internships and quoted the definition of equal opportunities and so on regardless of age, ethnic identity, gender, etc. And that now we hear from our reps that they apologize for their actions. We deserve to hear that from them.
	4. Gallery: A lot of Jewish students on campus have been affected. I think we should have an apology as well. It has taken a toll on everybody involved in every way. We'd appreciate that too, thanks.
	5. Gallery: I know we're finishing up, but as a comment, I'm concerned in the way that Arts Representative Karia has said again and again that her intent was not to harm anyone but the intent was clearly to re-vote. I'm worrying that she's being loud in the way she's apologizing but not being loud in the harm she's done. I went through the chat and her opposition was not very firm and I'm concerned that she's hiding behind that now instead of owning up to it. Let's not focus on intent and instead on the actual harm that was caused. Thank you.
	6. PSSA: I think there should be an apology and acknowledgement that the overturning also invalidated the efforts and discussion that the Legislative Council put into this as a whole, and it's making us seek accountability. It's unfair for us to paint the brush and seeking accountability and deeming it as problematic because what we want in the end of the day is an apology for overturning a vote for people who show up every other Wednesday and talk to our students. We just try to represent our constituents the best but to have the vote overturned it's invalidating to know that we're trying to do our job but some votes matter more than others
	7. GSA: I completely acknowledge that even though I'm in the GSA, I'm a French white boy, so none of the marginalization themes concern me; I'm not among the first involved. That being said, my point is essentially that the Arts Representatives have a lot of explaining to do. But if you put them on the spot like that asking for an apology, I don't see that going anywhere good, because like us, they're being put under enormous pressure. This is not to deny that they haven't caused enormous stress, but I'd be surprised if they could have on the spot put out an apology that could satisfy everybody. I think they deserve time to gather their thoughts. Yes, I agree that they should apologize, but I have no right to decide those terms, but at the same time, asking for a live apology would lead to one regrettable part in a live statement that will essentially worsen the situation. This is my French white boy take on that. I'm just like, oh, I don't see that going in any direction; I don't think asking for an apology right now will make anything better. I don't think it's likely that an apology just like that will satisfy. Again, feel free to disagree with me. These are my two cents on the issue.
	8. ASA: I'm just thinking several execs have made official statements as well as op-eds, so if there's time to make op-eds, there's time to write apologies for students involved in this.
	9. VP External: Note on that - the porters are really upset that we are still here so we should probably wrap up and postpone reports. Also, everybody has to clean up their stuff. Make sure to push in your chairs because they're very upset. Be conscious of what's around you - push in your chairs and pick up the trash.
	10. President: I'd like to thank you (Secretary General and Deputy Secretary General) for all you do. I really appreciate you two.
	11. Secretary General: Thank you for coming everyone.
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		+ [~~VP Academic~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/VP-Academic-1.pdf)
		+ [~~VP Communications [Late]~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/AUS-VP-Communications-February-27th-Report-.docx)
		+ [~~VP External~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/VP-External.pdf)
		+ [~~VP Finance~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/VP-Finance-1.docx)
		+ ~~VP Internal [NA]~~
		+ [~~VP Social~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/VP-Social.docx)
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		+ ~~Arts Representatives~~
			- [~~Garima Karia~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Arts-Representatives.pdf)
			- [~~Ana Paula Sanchez~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Arts-Representative-Report_-Legislative-Council-February-27th-2.pdf)
		+ [~~Arts Senators~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Arts-Senators.pdf)
	14. ~~Reports of Departmental Associations~~
	15. ~~Question Period~~
	16. Next Meeting: March 20th, 6:00 pm
	17. Adjournment
		+ Motion to adjourn
			- Council adjourned at 9:32 pm