**Arts Undergraduate Society of McGill University**

**Legislative Council**

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

* 1. Call to Order (0:00)
		+ 6:11 pm
	2. Territorial Acknowledgement (0:08)
		+ 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 (0:30)
	4. Meeting Minutes for Approval: [AUS Council November 13th 2019](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/AUS-Council-November-13th-2019.docx) **| APPROVED** (3:21)
		+ Amendments
			- VP External: In one of the first few paragraphs you described the [Face to Face] trip as being in the summer, but it is actually in the winter. You might wanna [change that]…
				* Amendment approved
		+ Minutes approved, with amendments
	5. Approval of the Agenda **| APPROVED** (5:39)
		+ Amendments
			- President: Motion to Add Late Motions to Agenda **| PASSED**
				* Second mover: CSAUS
				* Motion passes
			- RSUS: [Attempted] Motion to Move the Statement and Questions from Councillors before the Questions for Moderated Discussion?
				* Speaker: It's not an order, those are just documents for people to reference. Both should be considered as prompts for the overall discussion.
		+ Agenda approved, with amendments
	6. Announcements (6:46)
		+ CSAUS: [1] Our CSAUS Pub Night unfortunately did have to be postponed. Just be conscious of that and you'll be sure to hear announcements from me about that when we do get a new date on that. Hope to see every single one of you beautiful people there. [2] If you are in the Canadian Studies department, we are having an End of Semester pizza party in Ferrier, at the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada (Room 105). Details to be sent out via the listserv. If you have questions, just come up to me.
		+ RSUS: So, this is kind of a personal announcement. I represent RSUS, but I am a person with a name, and that name is in the process of changing. Thank you to our lovely Speaker and our lovely Secretary General, Marie and Nathan. My name is in the middle of being changed. I am, for the first time, today, signing something with my new legal name. I am non-binary and there's been some changes in my family, related to divorce. So, got a whole new renovation on my name. I want to take this moment to remind everybody in this room of trans/non-conforming students and any students and constituents they have who have changed their names, because it's a really long and difficult process. And my process isn't even done, but because of the support that I've gotten, I get to use my new name, even though it's not official in Canada, yet. Yeah, keep that in mind. That's why my name will change suddenly. Don't be weirded out by that, I'm still the same person.
		+ VP Services: We had our AUS Holiday Party yesterday, and we have a lot of leftover food. So if you look out to the tables out there, we have some sandwiches and desserts laid out. I know we're going to be taking a lot of breaks throughout the night. Feel free to go out and get something to eat.
		+ GSFSSA: The GSFSSA will be hosting a movie night tomorrow at Otto Maass room 328. We are viewing "Gender Revolution: A Journey with Katie Couric." Hope to see you all there.
		+ HSA: [1] The HSA is proudly hosting its last event this semester, which is on December 4: the HSA Exam Support Club. It's really been a great semester for us, we've hosted a record of 10+ events, this semester. So we look forward to seeing everyone at the last one. [2] Just passing on a message from the executive. Just a reminder to our constituents in History that our office is in Leacock 629. We welcome feedback on the events or on general activities throughout the semester as much as possible. Again, room 629; check online on our website for office hours.
		+ VP External: The Mental Health of AUS Committee is holding the M-HAUS of Relaxation in HSSLM3-17B tomorrow and Friday (Thursday, November 28 & Friday, November 29) from 10-5. So, if you ever want to take a study break, feel free to drop by.
			- IDSSA: We'll have games and snacks and it'll be a great time.
	7. Presentation from McGill Scarlet Key Society (10:52)
		+ Presentation (McGill Scarlet Key Society)
			- My name is Eric van Eyken. I am an alumnus of McGill, and I was a VP Finance of AUS back in 2003-2004. It's fantastic to see this room has doubled over 15 years. Great to see such great attendance. I'm here to talk to you very briefly about McGill Scarlet Key Society. So, the McGill Scarlet Key has been given for about a century, and it's McGill recognizing excellence and student leadership at the university. Basically, anybody who is not U0 is eligible to apply. You're recognized in application for your outstanding contributions to student life at McGill, which all of you are engaged in. I'm looking to let you know about this - and you non-binary people - and have you be leaders and to let your colleagues know and encourage them to apply. You can see the McGill Scarlet Key website; an application should be made available shortly. I'll email Jamal (President) to get it in the listserv and hopefully that can be passed onto the student body. I'm very much looking forward to you guys helping to encourage your peers to apply or to apply yourself. What does the McGill Scarlet Key Society recognize? Not just being involved as a student leader, which you are, but going above and beyond, and recognizing those who are truly engaged in making student life their mission on campus. Usually about a hundred people who apply across the university and approximately twenty-odd keys are given out. You need two reference letters - hopefully from your peers recognizing your contributions, but it can be from professors, as well. Applications will be open until the end of January. We'll have a committee session meet in February to decide. If you'd like to sit on the committee, we need ten volunteers across the university, to help decide who should be recognized, I'll leave some business cards here, feel free to email me. It'll be one Saturday or Sunday in the end of February. What you get if you're recognized by the society: you get a pin, a certificate, a cocktail with the principal at the Faculty Lounge, and hopefully you're then recognized at convocation, as well. You can read a bit more about us on the website and there are also bios and lists of past winners. Thank you so much for your efforts and hopefully in acknowledging your peers or yourself as a student leader. Thank you!
		+ No questions
	8. Moderated Discussion Period on the Free Trip to Israel Offered to some AUS Executives (14:31)
		+ Documents for Reference
			- [Questions for Moderated Discussion on Free Israel Trip Offered to AUS Executives](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Questions-for-Moderated-Discussion-on-Free-Israel-Trip-Offered-to-AUS-Executives.pdf)
			- [Statement and Questions Brought by Councillors at 13 November Meeting](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Statement-Questions-Brought-by-Councillors-at-13-November-Meeting.pdf)
		+ Statements (16:07)
			- Arts Representative Adin: I'd like to inform Council that I have decided to decline the Hillel trip. This was a result of various reasons. So, I spoke with various people, both constituents and non-constituents in my capacity as an Arts Rep and as just me, Adin Chan, the individual. I heard their perspectives and the way they saw this trip. That ultimately led to me changing my heart about attending the trip. On top of that, this whole situation was serving as a distraction to my academics, my personal life, and my friendships. For these reasons, I have decided to decline the trip. I'm happy to keep on discussing this with people, if they so choose. Thank you.
			- VP Finance: I don't have an opening statement. What I said last week stands. I just open the floor to questions from councillors with comments and concerns. I'll allocate as much time to this discussion.
			- Arts Representative Andrew: I am the same way. I do have a question: are we going to be answering questions from last time and from the Google form?
				* Speaker: We're not doing an explicit Q&A period to maximize the number of individuals who get to speak. If you want to use two minutes to address any of those questions now, you can. Otherwise, we'll get into a normal discussion and I'll try to allocate time evenly to different people so that everybody's voices get to be heard.
			- VP Finance: I'll try to go through questions for people, one by one. First question: yes, I was aware that this trip closely resembles trips sanctioned by the United States. No, there was no condition of confidentiality that was asked of me. Three, regarding why I did not notify Council of my decision. I applied to the trip. I didn't plan on notifying Council until I was accepted to the trip, and the timing of acceptance was between Council sessions, so the Council learned immediately of my acceptance and application for this trip. I do have a general understanding of the events that happened during POLI 339, mainly the exec overreach and lack of transparency. I know in great detail that there were people who saw it and know about it to a much greater effect. I think it had to do with the unconstitutional nature of the executive decision made following Council's decision - that was the main issue. Now, #5: I don’t believe my acceptance of trip represents an overreach or abuse of my position. I won't go into super great detail, I'm sure this will be discussed as the discussion proceeds. That was just to make my position clear. Finally, the two points about the harm and nature the individual suggests this trip causes to Palestinian students; I don't think I can provide a neat answer to that, in any sense. Although I will say that I don’t believe that I represent all students in any meaningful capacity. I don't think I have that right. I don't think I was ever given the right, by any Palestinian students on campus, to articulate Palestinians' views or to speak for them in any way. I am extremely aware that this trip is extremely negatively viewed by, probably, the majority of Palestinian students on campus. I tried to inform myself of those perspectives and gain the understanding from where they come from. I don't feel comfortable saying that I represent all students in any meaningful sense. To answer that final question: I don't think that question applies to me or applies to people in this room. Just, general view, again. More depth can be taken up during discussion.
				* RSUS: It doesn't need to be answered. I think the second to last question, which was the last one you answered… Because it was addressed to yourself and to the Arts Representatives, it became more worded for representation, but there was concern in the prefacing statement, which was red, about the fact that you were not the only VP Finance that was offered this trip. And that bears consideration. Nothing else needs to be said there but it might be prudent to frame that in regard to how these questions address you specifically as a VP Finance.
			- Arts Representative Andrew: I'll answer these questions. The first one: I have been made aware that the Maccabee Task Force was one of the groups funding this program. However, Hillel Montreal has made it clear to me that any funding from this trip is taking with no strings attached and no donors had any influence on program - content, goals, processes, or anything. I was not asked that this be confidential, but the reason I did not include this in my report is because I've always seen this as personal in nature and not something to be disclosed to Council. But I am also aware of the issues of transparency surrounding McGill's involvement with BDS during the controversies of POLI 339 last year. Which is why when SPHR sent all AUS executives an email, I responded transparently that I am indeed participating in this program. What precedent does this set? I do not believe this sets any precedent. As I've made clear, my position as Arts Representative had no influence with my participation in this program. As I have mentioned, I have participated in other Hillel Montreal events in the past, which is why I applied to this program. The question whether or not I can justly represent Palestinian students: that is a very important question, and it's something that… Obviously, this is always a problem with representation: how do you represent the people you're supposed to represent? But in my job as Arts Representative, I have always been open to listen to the opinions of others. That's why, when I informed SPHR that I was indeed participating in this program, I also told them that I was willing to answer any comments or concerns regarding this issue; I would make sure voices are heard. Whether or not I can be able to act responsibly beyond the scope of the Israel-Palestine conflict? I think I demonstrated, this past semester, that, especially through my involvement in SSMU Legislative Council, that I enable discussion, fight for student services, and promote accessibility. Thank you.
		+ Discussion (23:37)
			- CSAUS [Point of Information]: Pursuant to AUS Standing Rules, those who intervene in Council have to be members of the Faculty. Is that rule still in effect through our moderated discussion?
				* Speaker: Yes, it applies to all of Council.
				* CSAUS: A member of the gallery would have to be a member of the Faculty of Arts or Arts Sci. I was just wondering for general clarity.
				* RSUS: How would we enforce that?
				* Speaker: This is a polite request, to please only intervene if you're in Arts or Arts Sci.
				* CSAUS: It was more a question of how the Standing Rules apply in this case, 'cause we're kind of in a moderated discussion.
				* Speaker: They still apply.
			- Gallery (Ghida Mawlawi): A general question to the executives: what should give the AUS executives the privilege to be able to visit Israel/Palestine, when you, the VP Finance, said that it's a sensitive issue for Palestinians. They themselves have claim to the land - it's their homeland - and they do not have the right to visit their home. So how can random AUS executives should not only have the right to visit Israel/Palestine but they can go free of charge when people who have their homes there can't even return there. And I would like to reinforce that Israel has violated international law by not letting Palestinian refugees go home back, so what type of paradox would it be to let random executives to go on such a trip, free of charge, when people who actually have claim to the land can't go there? Don't you think that's offensive to Palestinian students on campus? We always brought up the rights of Israeli students feeling same on campus, and, okay, I acknowledge that. But what about Palestinian students? Don't you think they would be offended by your statement about going to the trip and claiming that you will remain objective when clearly the funding of the trip is not objective?
			- Arts Representative Adin [Point of Parliamentary Inquiry]: Does the AUS Standing Rules have anything regarding banning shows of support?
				* Speaker: No, there's not, but I strongly recommend jazz hands [instead of clapping or knocking on desks]. Silent and a great show of support.
			- HSA: I would like to issue clarification as a councillor signing the letter last session, asking for answers from our exec. I've been approached by many constituents, and I want to make my stance clear, as I find that many of the questions on the form do not address the concerns of my constituents. I have not declared myself to be officially affiliated, in any way, with BDS. But this is a red herring, regardless, because my personal political views on the Israel-Palestine conflict are irrelevant to the issue at hand. The objective facts of this issue is that elected officials, who are supposed to serve their students, accepted a financial gift in the form of trip subsidization from an on-campus interest group, which is a potential violation of SSMU's rules surrounding conflict of interest. Referencing the points that a person made on Question 5, I would be asking all of the same questions, had this been trip subsidization for any other program, serving any other states' interests. I do not believe it is appropriate for execs, while serving, to get free trips from these interest groups, if the funders of these trips are on record saying the goal of these trips is to influence those leaders to vote and act on issues in specific ways. This is true regardless of the political context in question. I am also not satisfied that this trip is personal in nature, as opposed to professional or political, given the on-the-record statements from both the Maccabee Task Force and the Hillel chapters on the goals of these trips. As well as recent evidence released by the SSMU Executive, that indicated that the trip was specifically targeted at the Executives for the purpose of them being elected student leaders, and not personal. To conclude, I would like to reiterate what I asked last Council, and that is that all the members of this Council should condemn any efforts to weaponize our concerns of transparency against us. We should reject the rhetoric that councillors or executives are bad people simply for doing their elected duty to voice concerns about the transparency of the executive. I respect deeply every member of the executive and every member of the gallery who took the time to be here today. And I would simply ask that when we are asking the questions like the ones on the form, that that same respect be leveraged to anyone who has questions. Thank you.
			- GSFSSA: My question is similar as to last time, but I'll try to be as clear as possible. When exactly did both of you inform Council of the fact that you were going on the trip - when was it mentioned? And when did you find out that you were going on the trip? How long was that period? Secondly, what's concerning to me is that if SSMU, BSN (Black Students' Network), and SUS ("I believe, but not sure") recognized that there might be a potential conflict of interest in accepting this trip, I'm wondering why both of you would feel that this somehow would not include you? It's been mentioned that you both personally applied to the trip, so it doesn't seem like you were solicited, so that's fair. But what's still concerning to me is that neither Hillel nor AUS Executives have made it clear if whether you were AUS Executives influenced whether you were accepted into that trip. So what I'd like to have on record is: at any point, did the fact that you were an AUS Executive come up? Or do you feel that it might have been an influence?
			- Arts Representative Adin: I can speak to the timeline on that. In the week on question, on Monday, around 5 pm, I got the email of acceptance. It was Wednesday morning that the McGill Daily article came out. Then on Wednesday, we had the Legislative Council in question. I applied [to the trip], I think, the week before [Canadian] Thanksgiving, or something like that. That's the timeline. With regards to your question: in the interview process, they asked what my extracurriculars are, just like any other application process, in my opinion. In my view, there was nothing particularly extraordinary or any emphasis on extracurriculars, but they did ask that question. I can't speak to their selection process.
			- VP Finance: I might try to address some of these questions. For the sake of the timing of the results, that (Arts Rep Adin's account) was all correct. I applied much later than he did. I applied maybe the week before I initially got the notification of acceptance, just to make that clear.
				* GSFSSA: Sorry, do you mind specifying the date?
				* VP Finance: It would have been - I don't know off the top of my head - it would have been, in like, the second half of October
			- VP Finance: With the selection process, I cannot speak specifically to the methodology of how someone was selected. I know for a fact that a lot of the people going on this trip are not affiliated with student government or in any positions of responsibility or authority. While I think it is the case that the interests and, perhaps, characteristics that made me interested in this role made me interested in this trip, I don't believe, and I've seen no indication of this, that it is my particular role as VP Finance that would have qualified me for this trip.
			- ASSA: I don't know if I'm allowed to ask this, I'm wondering if both of you guys could just answer the questions that were asked by the person in the gallery, just because you didn't come back on that, and I think that's important.
			- Arts Representative Andrew: I'll try to answer… there's a lot of questions. I'll answer the gallery first. I do want to make clear that I’m not going as an AUS Executive. I have no right to be able to visit this region, it's only a privilege. And I recognize that there is a great injustice in barring people from traveling there. But we are traveling to both Israel and Palestine in areas that both Israelis and Palestinians cannot be able to travel to, and I do recognize that. I also want to make clear that I did submit a conflict of interest form when I found that this could be a potential conflict of interest. Pursuant to SSMU's regulations, they ruled that it was not a conflict of interest. In terms of the SSMU letter, I never received it. I received something else, but I didn't receive the one that the SSMU VP Finance received. Mine never mentioned "student leader." I found out that I was going on the trip before the last Council meeting but after the previous one, so it was in between the two. In the application process, the fact I'm on the AUS never really came up. It had no influence, to my knowledge.
			- WIMESSA: Concerning the question of whether or not the fact that being a student leader has played a part in the selection process, I can actually just read the invitation that was sent by Hillel McGill to SSMU Executives, which was referenced in the McGill Daily article. Just gonna read out the explicit references to student leadership. The letter says, "Congratulations! We are so excited to invite you to a once-in-a-lifetime, unique opportunity for a select group of student leaders at McGill University this upcoming winter break. This document acts as an official invitation for you as one of the student leaders for this trip. We've identified you as an invaluable student to have for this trip due to your student leadership experience and connections on campus. Hillel McGill is bringing a cohort of top student leaders, both Jewish and non-Jewish, to Israel and Palestine from December 29th, 2019 to January 8th, 2020 for an intensive experiential seminar that will explore the region's deep history and grapple with nuanced political and religious realities from various angles and perspectives. You will also have the opportunity to connect with other student leaders and engage in meaningful conversation while learning from each other." This is further down, for an extra point on the student leader aspect to it: "This is a very special opportunity for select group of leaders - a total of 20 students from McGill will be participating on the trip."
			- Gallery (Abigail Drach): I just wanted to circle back to another point that's been brought up a few times about the funding being from the Maccabee Task Force, and how that organization does not only have explicit political motives that have been well-documented to specifically persuade student leaders to have very specific stances and to take specific actions on issues pertinent to actions. But also, Maccabee Task Force was founded by Sheldon Adelson, who is a well-known Trump supporter, and in fact was one of the biggest funders to Trump's campaign. And so, I just don't think we can separate the fact that this money is coming from a well-known Trump supporter. And as an Arts student, I feel incredibly uncomfortable with my representatives attended a trip funded by an organization founded by a Trump supporter, regardless if that is in an official capacity or in a personal capacity.
			- CSA: I just kind of want to spend a little bit more time clarifying that going on the trip as an individual, going on it as an representative… You were elected for the year. You don't get to pick and choose the moments during that year whether you get to be an individual or whether you get to be an AUS representative. You were elected with the understanding that you were gonna be representing everyone for the entire year, and that includes anything you do in the entire year. You don't kinda get the privilege to pick and choose, willy nilly, when you want to be a representative and when you don't. Everyone in this room sitting in the Council tables was elected for the year, and we should all proceed with that understanding.
			- VP Finance: I'd like to try and clarify the distinction between individual and an public office holder. Conflict of interest rules seek to make that distinction: when are you an individual and when are you an office holder? AUS doesn't have a formal policy on this, so I've looked at SSMU's and Canada's Conflict of Interest Act, which is applicable to parliament. The definition says as follows, "A public office holder is in a conflict of interest when they exercise an official power, duty, or function that provides an opportunity to further their private interests or those of their relatives or friends or to improperly further another person’s private interests." Let's be clear on what my official powers, duties, and functions are, they're set out in the AUS Constitution. In this particular case, a conflict of interest would constitute something like this: if Hillel Montreal were to request some kind of funding or request records from AUS, I would have to recuse myself as a party subject to conflict of interest, in this particular case. I think that's the most important distinction. The reason I act as an individual in this case is because I am taking on this particular thing, this particular trip, with the knowledge that my roles and duties within the organization, as defined by the Constitution and the By-Laws, would not interfered on because of this trip. If they were, it would be my duty to make that clear and to recuse myself from the decision-making process. That's, I think, an important point to understand and to clarify what I mean by "representative" and "non-representative." What I mean is: do I exercise my official duties and function or do I act as an individual?
			- Gallery (Erin McDonald, U4 Arts): So, I'm curious about the way those opposing the trip view the councillors involved. Do you not see them as free-willed individuals with critical thinking skills, able to formulate their own opinions and perspectives? You say the trip is a conflict of interest, you take away their agency and assume that they could not be objective about the content of this trip. I find it troubling that you cannot trust your peers in this way.
				* RSUS: This isn't an issue about the councillors themselves. I fully have confidence in the councillors who were elected in the same way I was. This is about the precedent that it sets. The issue about this is that, taking an all-expenses paid trip in this situation, it is not that you are going on a family vacation. It is not that I don't think you can't look at the information being offered to you and making critical analyses. We all got into this school, we are all very clearly capable of making critical decisions. However, the issue at hand is that McGill, as weird as it may seem to people sitting in this room and to people on campus, is very important to the international sphere. One of the questions that was proposed was, "Why are you so disproportionately concerned with Israel?" And the answer is because McGill is disproportionately involved with Israel. And it's not just Israel, but it's other countries as well which have similar human violation, similar issues. And the problem is if we accept that people can take subsidized trips to Israel to promote specific political interests regarding a geopolitical of that issue, we open up the doors for other interest student groups to do the same, not just to AUS but to SSMU, SUS, and other bodies.
			- Gallery (Adam Gwiazda-Amsel; SSMU VP External): I wanted to say two things. One is about the SSMU Conflict of Interest Policy, the other is about the prevalence of the Israel-Palestine conflict debate on campus. [1] About the SSMU Conflict of Interest Policy, there's a distinction to be made between what someone can see as a potential conflict of interest. I think what [VP Finance] Stefan is saying is, "Oh, if something comes up then fine I'll recluse myself. There's also something to be said concerning conflict of interest. [2] Prevalence of Israel-Palestine on campus. It's not just that the AUS Council happens to be fixated on it, it's an issue which comes up year over year, which I think lends itself as to why Hillel offers these trips. Students aren't being offered trips to China or trips to Europe; these students were offered these trips. It's not AUS Council being fixated on Israel-Palestine, it's the entirety of Israel-Palestine finding its way over and over again onto campus, which is a big reason that student leaders and students on this campus are saying, "You can't divorce yourself as an individual from this larger issue on campus." You don' get to make the decision that you are an individual student and not a representative. The last thing I want to say is that we can have this debate and argue about semantics, but ultimately, the lived experiences of students should be prioritized. This is something that we recognized quite a bit with other individual students on the campus, last year, in which AUS endorsed the campaign. We should prioritize them over some legalistic definition of terminology and I think it would be relevant to view our own risqué history as a good way to determine what to do in these situations.

*TW: Misgendering*

* 1. Gallery (David A., Political Science & History): My question and comment is kind of just related to the fact that there appears to be, on this Council, a lot of talk about the propaganda stick or biased nature of this trip. But this seems to me kind of half-baked evidence that is not directly related to the trip in Montreal itself. And I would like to ask if the people mentioning this have actually seen the itinerary themselves, know how the trip is structured, know who they are meeting with… It appears to me like a lot of argument about using examples from other exterior sources, as opposed to the actual trip at hand at McGill. And then I also want to follow up from a previous question which the RSUS rep mentioned, in which she basically said that the trip would be- I'm sorry, *they,* they used the trip as a way to answer an agenda. And the question remains important, which is do they believe that the students participating in this trip are unintelligent and do they believe students participating in this trip are incapable of critical thought, regardless of what may or may not be presented to them on this trip.
	2. HSA [Point of Inquiry]: Is there anything in the Standing Rules about whether it's appropriate to repeatedly ask the same questions to a person when they've already answered it? Asking whether or not students going on the trip are unintelligent is the same thing that the other person from the gallery asked. From an equity perspective, it is concerning if people are badgering over and over again with the same questions.
		+ Speaker: There is nothing in the Standing Rules about that. I don't recommend people ask the same questions. Assuming if things have been answered, it doesn't allow room for a larger space of debate and larger consideration of the issues.
		+ CSAUS: I believe the Standing Rules allow for the Speaker, if we are running behind time, that they can rule speakers out of order if the question or the point is redundant, that can be ruled out of order. It is at the point of the chair.
		+ Speaker: Yeah, that's a thing, that doesn't make it easy to enforce. Anyone who was here last year knows that's a difficult thing to enforce. Typically, I just ask that people open up the policy space and the debate that we have so that you can have a more critical lens or more critical debate and perspectives on what is going on, and not focus on the same types of questions.
	3. CSAUS [Point of Information]: The section I was dealing with earlier only actually applies to members of gallery. Councillors can oppose questions as they wish, as they're bound by the rights and privileges of Robert's Rules, whereas members of the gallery are solely bound by Article 7.
	4. MUGS: I just wanted to go back a bit to some of the previous discourse about whether or not this trip would violate any formal conflict of interest policies. I think that kind of discourse might be a bit in the wrong direction because, well, something doesn't necessarily need to be formally against the rules in order to be unethical. So the concern is, as AUS Executives, you may wear two hats as both a student and as an executive, but you are still one person. Now the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has long-time been a very contentious issue on campus, and it may very well be called upon as executives and as elected officials to deal with any situation this year that may deal with this sensitive topic. And the fact that you are taking a trip subsidized trip powered by an organization with an explicit agenda raises serious questions w whether or not they violate formal conflict of interest policy. So, I hope that this fact will remain in the back of everyone's minds throughout this discussion.
	5. Arts Representative Adin: Point of Parliamentary Inquiry? Actually, nevermind.
	6. Gallery (Ashley Schulman): I would like to pose the question of how is this topic under the jurisdiction of this Council? This trip is an educational opportunity, for all purposes, completely separate from any position held at McGill. Therefore, I do not see how attacking this trip is under the jurisdiction of the Arts Undergraduate Society, seeing as it is not a political organization. Anyone is able to hold their opinion about the trip, but using personal/political agendas and using your positions on this Council to state against it is also an abuse of power. People on the Council should not have to limit choices during their personal lives to hold office. This trip is during a break and I do not believe that there is a rule that all councillors or members of this committee need to make public their December break plans for the approval of their constituents, regardless of what they may be. Additionally, if someone who holds a position in any legal office is interested in learning about the Israeli conflict, I don't see how a student government committee can stop them from doing that.
	7. IDSSA: Just to give my two cents about that last comment, I think we're here as executives to represent the concerns of our constituents. So, no one is mandating their actions. It's just we're here to express our concerns and represent our constituents the best as we can, including Palestinian constituents that may be concerned, as well as people in approval of the trip itself. I think making it seem like the questions and concerns aren't valid… I don't think that's a very good part of this conversation.
	8. GSFSSA: What remains unclear to me regarding SSMU constituents' concerns is that the reason this is taking place is when we… These two executives didn't notify us they were going on this trip. Somebody who read out the letter that was given out to the SSMU Executives. We're also, as executives, lacking information here. If there is a sort of considerable difference between what was presented to SSMU execs and to you, I think it would be very useful for all of us if we were to see the letter that you received, so that we would have a better understanding of how this decision came to be. I also think that it would be incredibly beneficial if we could see the application form - not the one you filled out but the actual questions. I think a lot of discussion here is about whether or not your role as an AUS executive was taken into consideration when you were offered this trip. It is the case that SSMU Executives and BSN Executives, who I would say are similar, who occupy similar roles to you, they felt that it was the case. If you feel that there is some distinction between your role as an AUS executive and that this trip being offered to you was somehow different from SSMU and BSN executives, I would encourage the both of you to present with us information so that we don't have to keep going around with these inquiries.
	9. HSA: I would just like to preface this I respect members of the gallery for sharing their concerns as constituents. But, to be frank, the comparison of me going to, like, Florida and someone taking, while they're serving as an elected official, an all-expenses paid trip from an interest group. Like, if you're really telling me that if they went to Dallas when their mandate/funders… when their explicit goal is to influence policy makers, whether they be student policy makers or elected policy makers, to have certain views is in any way comparable to what is more objectively a personal vacation? The entire point of our inquiry is that it is unclear if there is a divorce between what is personal, professional, and political. I don't think it is outside of the mandate of this committee to answer these questions. If you want more evidence that these thoughts are deeply intertwined with the politics of our campus, it is not just personal. One question I noticed that was very salient with the thoughts that I had with regards to how people are… again, Hillel McGill, to my knowledge, has not released a statement that has answered all of SSMU's questions yet, but the people associated with the trip who have cooperated with the statements condemning the editors of the McGill Daily for being anti-Semitic or bad people. It just goes to show there are intersections between what is personal and, in some people's views, what is political. It's intertwined with the issues on this campus and that's what opens this up for us to voice our concerns for our constituents. It's our job to hold the executive to account.
	10. VP Finance: Just, once again, I believe that I am the AUS VP Finance when I exercise the duties and functions of my role, and that I am Stefan Suvajac when I don't. That's my opinion in the lack of a standard conflict of interest practice. That said, I believe that as an individual, I have views that people would perhaps disagree or agree with, and I am completely respectful of that fact and the fact that my views are not going to be accepted by everybody. I am also respectful of this Council's role and understanding in determining the distinction between the individual and the public office holder, in this case. I think that needs to be said. So, I guess all I'm trying to get at here is that this is a very legitimate discussion and that I deeply appreciate the opportunity to show why I believe there's a clear distinction between my participation in this trip as an individual and my participation and function as the VP Finance of the AUS. I think another very important point is in all of this is that Council to be able to ask questions. It's clear that this trip does have potential to future discourse and impact on decision making. I think it's also important to ask, in participating in this trip, how I intend to reduce the impact on the organization. How, if this were to become a clear conflict of interest, how the organization could ensure that there is no influence on the execution of duties as defined by government documents.
	11. BASiC: It's… Correct me if I'm wrong, but it's my understanding, VP Finance, that on your invite or acceptance, it said, "Dear student leader." I was wondering you could answer my question as to whether you think the line between individual and student leader was bordered at all when the invite or acceptance said, "Dear student leader"?
	12. ASSA: My question kind of ties on what BASiC just said. The first person to talk in the gallery mentioned the question of privilege. And the Arts Representative recognized the privilege that he had by going to this trip as a non-Palestinian. And also as an executive of this Council, based on the letter of acceptance they received that mentioned that they were leaders. I was wondering that it is part of your duties to recognize the privilege that you have. Whether it's on a racial question, gender question, whatever, I think that the students expect you to recognize your privilege or the privilege that others have and justly knowing recognizing that privilege. So, just wondering what you think about that?
	13. Arts Representative Adin: I wanted to say a few points, apologies if this is a little disjunct-ed. I agree with the member of HSA that it is absolutely the responsibility of councillors to keep the executive accountable. You are doing a respectful job so far, so I commend that and hope it continues, going forward. I wanted to address the points made by MUGS regarding the conflicts of interest. I was at the Board of Directors meeting at SSMU, where this was brought up. Just to report back to you, and this is going to be made available on Thursday; don't worry, it's not confidential. Anyways, there are three types of conflict of interest: a real one, an apparent one, and a potential one. So, the Board of Directors found that there is, in that rank of severity, a potential conflict of interest should they discuss issues regarding Israel-Palestine. And the remedy that the Board of Directors found is that individuals recuse themselves from any discussion, in that setting, when they talk about the region in question. Specifically, in the SSMU context, this was for Chairman Wright and Chairman Levitt. Or Chairwoman Wright, pardon me. So, the solution that the SSMU Board of Directors found was that in conversations discussing this region, they would recuse themselves of that and therefore, that potential conflict of interest would be remedied. So I thought I'd pass that along just to clarify what the Board of Directors found for the benefit of Council.
	14. GSFSSA [Point of Information]: Would it be possible to just know what these letters say? I think there's like a bit of confusion as to what letters you both received. I think it would be hugely clarifying. I don't know if everyone else feels the same.
		+ Speaker: Straw poll, do you think it'd be helpful to have those letters of information. So, at the end of the day, I think that's up to the individuals going on the trip. I can't force that, and I don't think Council can force it, unless there was a formal investigation, but I'm not sure we're at that stage in the process.
		+ GSFSSA: Sorry, I wasn't trying to suggest they did.
	15. CSAUS: Motion for a 5-Minute Recess **| PASSED**
		+ Motion passes

*5 minute recess*

* 1. Discussion, continued (1:06:44)
		+ Speaker: I did receive, from an anonymous individual, information on the trip package for the trip we're discussing here today. So, I've posted that in the AUS Council group.
		+ BASiC [Point of Information]: How long would you estimate we would need before 9 pm to get through everything we need to get through? Just a ballpark estimate. I mean, do we have a cap tonight?
			- Speaker: The cap is always 9 pm, because that's when the room is booked until. If we don't have discussion on any of the motions, we could probably get through it all in about an hour. Maybe less. 'Cause we have three presentation, six motions, and reports. If we didn't do reports we could probably get through all of the presentations and motions in roughly half an hour or forty minutes. But that'd be putting the presentations on a pretty tight timeline and not entertaining any questions. Usually we don't have too many questions but it depends on the nature of the content.
		+ Gallery (Willa Holt): I just wanted to circle back to something that was referenced earlier. When we were talking about how different people received different information, I just wanted to bring up that information that was presented to SSMU is about the same trip discussed and presented to different representatives. So, even though, like, to some extent it doesn't matter whether you had the information or not initially, but you have it now. Because it was made clear in the letter about the same trip, the organization internally was seeking out student leaders, even if they did not make it clear to you, at the time, in your application. So I feel like the discussion regarding who received what initially and who knew what when they were applying… It doesn't matter anymore because we're here now and we have the SSMU letter! We know what they were thinking internally and we know what they were saying to some people. And we need to keep that in mind, because it's not really a question anymore.
		+ WIMESSA: On that point, I feel like we can conclusively clear up that this is absolutely a trip aimed at student leaders in the package that you shared in the Facebook group. The first paragraph, I'm guessing this document was what every participant was sent, literally says, "This is a unique opportunity for a select group of McGill student leaders, and we’ve identified you as someone who would be an invaluable participant on this trip." So, given that this is no longer debate, I'd like to ask the two individuals who are still planning on taking this trip how they are still claiming that this has nothing to do with their status as student leaders.
		+ RSUS: This is a little bit of a different point, but I feel like since we've confirmed that this was very much aimed at student leaders and this was explicitly stated in the material provided to those who were accepted for the trip, I also want to address: there were a lot of concerns about this within the questions that were received and has also been somewhat vocalized by some of the people who are here tonight regarding their representation. Obviously, there were a lot of people who have been very vocal about concerns for how this affects Palestinian students, and other students who are affected by this, including myself, but there have also been questions about how we are supposed to be representing Jewish students. And I just want to take a moment to point out that I am Jewish and I helped write those questions in that prefacing statement. I know there are other people today, here, who have expressed concerns about this who are Jewish. My executive is… Four people out of six are Jewish, and we unanimously agreed about the fact that this trip is not okay in its lack of transparency. Furthermore, I have had many constituents of mine come up to me and tell me that they are concerned about this trip, some of whom are Jewish. I really want to make very clear that while we're discussing this, just to be careful about portraying Jewish people as a monolith supporting Israel, because we're not. And we are not a political monolith; that's a dangerous stereotype to fall into. I completely understand the concerns about not being represented, but I'm going off of the concerns of my constituents and the rest of my executive team. Nobody in favour of the trip has spoken to me, none of my constituents has voiced this to me. And I just wanted to be completely transparent about that and bring that to everyone's minds.
		+ CSA: Hi, yeah, if I can just add to that: I, too, am also speaking on behalf of my executive, and I am also of Jewish-Israeli descent. And I recognize that I am in a very difficult position, however I do need to act with everyone in my executive in mind. And that's really important. And I'm sensitive and opposed to comments calling any Jews that are non-Zionist a "self-hating Jew." I've heard those comments around campus, whatever, and I wanted to dispel any worries about that. I, personally, am very conflicted about this topic. However, I'm doing my best to represent my executive. And I just want everyone to know that it may seem a certain way, one way or another. However, you don't know what goes on with each student's executive, and you don't know how everyone's responding to it, how everyone may feel. So I just wanted to add to that, as well.
		+ Gallery (Erin McDonald, U4 Arts): This is just a very brief point that was said a while ago. The History (HSA) representative made a comparison, as an example, where he compared Hillel McGill to a registered lobbying group in Dallas, Texas. And just for those who are familiar with Hillel, it is in no way a registered lobbying group, and I think that should be made apparent to everyone here and that was kind of an inaccurate representation.
		+ AHCSSA: With the permission of the Speaker, I would like to read out Hillel Montreal's mission statement: "Hillel Montreal is dedicated to enrich the lives of Jewish students at three Universities and four CEGEP campuses, as well as three off-campus locations throughout Montreal and its surrounding areas to get involved. Hillel Montreal supports and facilitates student initiatives that promote Jewish values. With an open-door policy and no membership fees, everyone is welcome to contribute to maintaining a vibrant, young Jewish community through grassroots programming and volunteering. Hillel promotes developing leadership skills to equip tomorrow’s leaders today."
		+ CSAUS: I'm seeing Council is starting now to get into to the finer tuning points of discussion, and I realize there are no questions exhausted against any of us, fellow Councillors or executives. We do have things… I would implore Council to think about moving on, if we could proceed to New Business. And maybe we could schedule this to the end of the meeting, 'cause I do know everyone wants to get their opinion on it. And I do know everyone wants to make their viewpoints heard, that we maybe get to New Business, first.
			- Speaker: So, are you moving to table this to the end of the meeting?
			- CSAUS: No, I'm just imploring Council to keep that in mind: that we have business items that are important, like ratifying FMC decisions and amending the Inter-faculty IRP. That's something we should do by the end of the night. Just a reminder.
		+ Gallery (Claire Diamant, U0 Arts): I was just wondering if other members of the Council will disclose either their acceptance of the trip or them being approached by Hillel? 'Cause I know there are other people who have been approached. That's all.
		+ Arts Representative Andrew: I did want to talk about the student leaders. Hillel Montreal explained that the definition of "student leader" has nothing to do with student government, which is why the vast majority of participants are not connected to student government. I wanted to reiterate that the reason I'm involved in this program is because they thought I would be a good fit for this, 'cause I would want to learn more, not because they wanted to influence me. They made it explicitly clear that upon the return of it, that there were no expectations for me. Furthermore, the fact that the SSMU has asked me to recuse myself from any issues - and I’m going to talk to the Secretary General to make sure that I am all good with AUS. I think that proves that there's no apparent or perceived conflict of interest.
		+ Gallery (Ashley Schulman): I would just like to bring up the point I don't think that any councillors, Jewish or non-Jewish identity, is pertinent to this discussion. I think it should be around the basis that this is not under the jurisdiction of the AUS. And secondly, I know many of you represent constituents, Jewish or non-Jewish, that have reached out to you in support of this trip. So, I would appreciate if those emails that I know many of you received or were also spoken to/about. Again, I would encourage people on this Council to not use their personal political beliefs to influence their decisions on this, because you're allowed to feel however you feel on the conflict, but you cannot prevent someone from learning more about it.
		+ JSSA: Just going off of the point brought up by the gallery. I've had members of my constituency reaching out, one of them sent me a question asking, "Why do certain elected members of the Legislative Council feel as though they have license to only represent certain members of their constituency?" There are many Jewish-Israeli students who are supposed to be represented by Legislative Council, but they're vilified by certain members of the Legislative Council. How do members who oppose this trip reconcile the fact that they're engaging clear personal bias as opposed to acting in consideration with all their constituents in mind?" And, me personally, I would like to ask why this is kind of devolving into debate on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict instead of the nature or way this trip is being handled.
			- RSUS [Point of Information]: That was the question I was answering. That was literally the question I was answering. It wasn't out of the blue, it was me stating that those students are represented. And students who have come to me… That was the question.
		+ Arts Senator Henrique: Just as requested by a member of the gallery, and as I have disclosed before, I was invited to the trip and declined to participate. Thank you.
		+ Gallery (Ghida Mawlawi): I'm not sure why we're still arguing about the nature of this trip, whether it's propaganda or not. Many gallery members have made the argument about this trip being an educational trip. It is not an educational trip because when an outside organization comes up to you with a trip free of all costs, they obviously have an agenda. They're not gonna do this out of the goodness of their heart. If you're looking for an educational opportunity, please do so, but don't do it at the expense of Palestinian students on this campus, whose voices are always oppressed. And also, please, I would like certain executives to stop stalling because this issue needs to be resolved and keep[ing on] ignoring this issue won't resolve it. Thank you. (1:22:58)
		+ Gallery (Max Michaelson[?], U1 Geography): I'd just like to comment on that past comment. And assuming the nature of the trip, assuming the content of the trip are all speculation because the information has not immediately been publicized to everyone in this room. So, speculating on the content of the trip as propaganda or of an oppressive nature to the Palestinian students is just another argument that is not valid at this time. I'd just like to point out that the representatives of this Council, again, have a duty to represent all constituents, so, yeah, regardless of their stance on this issue, it is the personal freedom of each member going on the trip to decide freely whether they do or do not accept the trip. And, y'know, one viewpoint on the conflict or another viewpoint should all try to be heard by each constituent.
		+ GSFSSA [Point of Information]: Just a response to the constituents. So, I'm genuinely-
			- CSAUS: [Attempted] Point of Order-
			- GSFSSA: It's just really quick-
			- CSAUS: This is a Point of Order-
			- Speaker: Okay, sorry, CSAUS, I didn't call on you.
			- CSAUS: On a Point of Order-
			- Speaker: I'm gonna let the Point of Information to be completed, first. You have a very quick comment?
			- GSFSSA [Point of Information]: So, at least in my capacity as a member, I'm just trying to find out whether or not this does constitute a conflict of interest. And I would hope that in presenting this information, everyone here could find out whether or not it does constitute a conflict of interest, which I had spoken about with the executives. So, I don't want our aims to be misinterpreted as being a witch hunt, we're just genuinely wanting to find out the information. Thank you.
			- CSAUS [Point of Order]: I just want to clarify to Council that Points of Information should be used to clarify procedural points, and shouldn't be used to seek recognition from the Chair. I think it's important for Council to know that.
			- HSA [Point of Information]: On the back of our placards, it does not necessarily have to pertain to procedure. It just says, "To ask for information," i.e. that could be interpreted as clarification for something that was just said by the representatives.
		+ Arts Senator Henrique [Point of Personal Privilege]: I wasn't able to see for long enough when you projected the trip information package, so maybe for the reference of those in the gallery, you could put it up again. And also let constituents ask questions. Thank you.
		+ Gallery (Benjamin Lawson, Psychology & Political Science): Much has been made aware of the funding of the Maccabee Task Force, which has led to this trip being called politicized? Could we please be clear that the political nature of this organization is anti-BDS? Do the representatives here really think that the existence of Israel is a valid political question to be asking representatives who have an opinion about it?
		+ SSA: Just to like… I don't think anyone is trying to talk about or litigate the BDS issue. We're asking to figure out if this is a conflict of interest. I think it's quite upsetting that we keep going back to this game of trying to put the blame on us. We're simply trying doing our duty to our constituents and we should not look at this as some sort of way to vilify anyone at Council. Nobody's making any particular claims or makings statements of whether Israel should or should not exist. Nobody's making any of those claims. People are just trying to litigate the main problem that… The fact that they have not disclosed the positions they have gotten. The trip, to the rest of the Council, is or could be… What we're trying to determine is whether it's a conflict of interest, whether or not we support BDS. That's an issue that we've talked about on McGill campus before and time and time again it comes up. Please let's not detract from the main issue today by relaying such a contentious issue, okay?
		+ HSA: Just because there is campus press here, I would like to clarify what the intention of what I was trying to say to the member of the gallery was. When I said "interest group," I meant it in like the literal definition of the word of "interest" as in "the state of wanting to know or learn more about something or someone." I apologize if I, in any way, tried to undermine… I think that interest groups can do great work, and I think, in many cases, Hillel Montreal does great work and I never meant to imply otherwise. I was going by the literal definition and I do not believe that I explicitly said or implied in any way, by comparing this interest group to other interest groups that exist, that [Hillel Montreal] was a registered lobbying group. And I do want to note, pursuant to what I said at the beginning of Council, the focus of this body and of Legislative Council, pursuant to what people have said, should not be trying to weaponize individual remarks and questions that Councillors have against them. I just wanted to use this chance to clarify because I really don't want people to misperceive what I meant. In addition to what members of the gallery have said, I do not think it is not appropriate to inject things like - for simply asking questions of transparency - anti or for one cause or, in any sense, believing these things. I think the focus should be back on… All we're trying to do is ask questions for our executives that we have a right to be answered for our constituents, many of whom have questioned me asking for clarification.
		+ BASiC: Just to answer a question from a member of the gallery: two members of BASiC, including myself, did receive invites, passed down from others who received invites. We did not get it directly from Hillel Montreal, but we have both declined.
		+ AHCSSA: Since so far, from what I've seen, the consensus of the room is that people are interested to see or understand the conflict of interest policy, I would suggest, in the interest of time, maybe giving a week period to finalize the conflict of interest stuff. I know that the SSMU Legislative Council is meeting tomorrow to discuss it further. I wonder if that would be acceptable for everyone to just see what happens with SSMU and then, like, come back. It's also 7:57 pm, so just in the interest of our New Business.
		+ Gallery (Yasna Khademian): I just have something about transparency. I've been keeping a list of the people who have either accepted or been invited on the trip, and so far, there is around 15-16 people involved in campus politics who have been offered or are going on this trip. It seems to conflict… I know not all of them are going, but 15+ have been offered this trip. And so, I'm trying to understand where the AUS Executives get off saying that "there aren't many other student leaders going on this trip." Because, based off of the tally that I've been keeping, it doesn't seem to be that way.
		+ Arts Representative Adin: So, a few points. Just to add onto that, I think it is an important detail to notice, like, when people are reached out by word of mouth instead of directly by Hillel Montreal. I think that is an important nuance that should be taken into consideration when we talk about numbers. But more importantly, I want to address… I agree with my colleague, SSA there. It is my hope that this discussion doesn't become a proxy discussion about the Israeli-Palestine conflict in general. My colleague in GSFSSA… obviously, there are general questions that want to be asked about conflict of interest. I just want to add some clarity because I think that's still in the air, here. There are two questions that the SSMU and AUS… so there are two different realms, if you will. AUS doesn't have a conflict of interest policy, so there is no mechanism by which we can enforce any sort of rules. Should there be one? Obviously, yes, we should write one. In general, any organization should, but that's separate to [the issue at hand]. The conversation right now is what rules currently bind the situation. In the AUS sphere of things, there's no technical things. In the SSMU thing, which is, if I were still going on the trip, I would be bound to, and Councillor Chase would be bound to, and SSMU Councillors are bound to. Again, just to reiterate and clarify, what the SSMU Board of Directors found is that there is a potential future conflict of interest. Should SSMU discuss issues about Israel-Palestine, they would recuse themselves from the room, and that's the extent to which the conflict of interest is acknowledged and then remedied.
		+ President: Also, I was informally told about the trip by a friend, but I declined the offer. Just to follow up.
	2. JSSA [Motion to Cap Debate]: Per Arts Rep Chan's comment that, within the AUS, there is no conflict of interest, I have motion to cap the debate and move onto the next point of interest for time's sake, to get through the rest of Council. **| FAILED**
		+ Second mover: Arts Senator Henrique
		+ Motion fails
	3. Discussion, continued
		+ VP Social: Hi, just something for the interest of time… I do know that we have a lot of other things that are really important to get to. So if people could please be mindful of that, because this is the last Council [of the semester]. If people have other questions for… I'm making the assumption that the majority of them will be directed to… Councillor Chase and the VP Finance, if it's necessary, we can always brainstorm another thing. We can maybe do an AMA on Facebook, or something. It'd be timed to guarantee a response from them. But there are a lot of motions and New Business that can't be done without an emergency Council. And I would rather those things be done before the new semester.
	4. Arts Senator Henrique: Motion to End Debate at 8:10, keeping priority to those who have not yet spoken **| PASSED**
		+ Second mover: CSAUS
		+ Motion passes
	5. Discussion, continued
		+ VP Finance: I'd just like to, first off, regarding the document that was presenting. Seeing the first page, I can confirm that this was the document that I received. I think this might help answer the question that was asked by the VP External and by GSFSSA. Yes, that's one point. The second point is that I agree with a member from the gallery that I don't think it makes a difference. I think just, going on the trip, regardless of how you do it. That said, we can re-address direct questions about conflict of interest. It's true that the AUS does not have a conflict of interest policy with which this can be measured. That said, I personally apply the standards from parliament from Canada to understand where it's appropriate for me to recuse myself from decision-making, such that my attendance on this trip would not affect the operation of the organization (AUS) and the execution of my functions and duties as outlined by the [AUS] Constitution and By-Laws. This is something I stand strongly by. It's difficult to have this conversation without a conflict of interest policy. If there is [a policy in the works], I'm more than happy to work with any interested councillors to apply it or making a working group to develop this matter. In any case, to ensure that the distinction between myself executing the functions of VP Finance and myself as an individual do not come into inflation during the time that I occupy this role. Again, yes, that's all.
		+ Gallery ("Samuel," U2 Arts): I would just like to voice my support to the people going on the trip taking the opportunity to reinforce their ability to think critically.
		+ Gallery (Abigail Drach, U2 Arts): As a constituent, and in light of the fact that we are closing up this conversation, I would really appreciate some certain conversation to be had about how to move forward. I believe yesterday, the SUS Exec, in fact, voted to express their opposition to these trips and make a statement. And, in fact, seek out a workshop to learn more and to be educated more about the context of these trips and in the issues on campus, and so, I think the AUS could take some guidance from that model.
		+ RSUS: Just to speak on, like, something going forward, I think one of the biggest things is that we're all gonna have two months after this session to talk and reconvene. And I understand [that], and am very excited and looking forward to this break. But I hope that all the councillors who have voiced any concerns, one way or another, with how this has gone. Clearly there is a need for a conflict of interest policy within AUS. And the VP Finance himself has stated he would be happy to work with that. And I would like to invite anyone to message myself, and I would like to ask the Secretary General, if possible. I would like to come up with a working group to have something ready for when we have our next session. I understand that the next semester hasn't started and we have the break coming up, but this is very important because it clearly needs to be set up. One of our biggest issues was the fact that the precedent this could set. But if we set up a very clear conflict of interest policy, we can ensure this never happens again.
		+ GSFSSA: I just had a quick question for [Arts Representative] Andrew. If you could just confirm that you also received the same letter [that the VP Finance did]?
			- Arts Representative Andrew: I believe so, yeah.
		+ Gallery (Adam Gwiazda-Amsel; SSMU VP External): I want to applaud the efforts of those Councillors who've voiced the need for an AUS-specific conflict of interest policy. I think that any policy is, of course, adapted to its own governance body, and to use something like the Canadian parliamentary system, or even the SSMU policy… this represents the sort of determination that's being made. Specifically within the Faculty of Arts, a lot of conversation has been had around this topic. We all remember POLI 339 last year! Just to reiterate that getting overly legalistic is not necessary the most constructive way to fall on this issue.
		+ Gallery (Yasna Khademian): I'm just wondering if anyone on the trip would be comfortable sharing who else is involved in this trip and is on student government? For transparency?

*2-minute recess*

* 1. Presentation of [FAC Projected Budget 2019-2020](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/FAC-projected-budget-2019-2020.xlsx) by the VP Communications (1:44:04)
		+ Presentation (President)
			- Basically, the Fine Arts Council is mandated to present their budget to Council. They kept their revenue from the AUIF: $30,000. This is what they plan to spend for the year by event, and the projected amount of money they expect to spend. I'm not in charge of this committee this year, but I was VP Communications last year, so if you have questions, I can try to answer them in [VP Communications] Yoana's absence.
		+ Questions
			- MUGS: could you clarify what the line item "for applicants" means? The $15,000 towards the end.
				* President: "Applicant" refers to the fine arts groups that apply for FAC funding. I'm assuming the general language is there because we have yet to get any applicants. Down the line, the applicants' budget would go down.
	2. Presentation of [Arts Frosh Budget 2019](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Arts-Frosh-Budget-2019.xlsx) by the VP Social (1:46:16)
		+ Presentation (VP Social)
			- The first half is revenues, the second half is expenses. The specific lines I wanted to bring people's attention to: for Sponsorship ("xxxx"), we were expecting sponsors. Those numbers are based off of what we got last year. For the Expenses tab, everything is broken down by event. Also, a tab breaking down more in detail what printed materials are ("third one: Printing Costs"). The next line I wanted to bring attention to is the Coordinators: the total amount there is the coordinators' stipends, including my own pay. My pay came from the Frosh budget because I do not max out my hours during the year: 50% of my portfolio is in the summer. That's why it came out of the Frosh budget. The next thing - the "2-3 bars" - what that means is… In the past, there were a few bars during the bar crawl that ask not just for the tip, but some restaurants also want us to subsidize food and drink costs, which is totally fair. It's usually just 2-3 restaurants and bars that ask this, but this year, we had a lot more ask. We don't know why. The larger $ amounts like Frosh concerts and Beach day, for example, those are lump sums. Those are all different expenses allocated all together between 8-9 Faculties. Lots of ledgers, payables, and accountables being consistently tracked and paid out. That's the net amount that AUS owes in their part. After that, I think everything else is pretty clear. “Miscellaneous expenses” just means buffer: we had a $5K buffer just in case an incident arises and we have to pay it. Sometimes venue gets angry and want us to clean things, but this year we got lucky and didn't have to tap into that.
		+ Questions
			- Secretary General: How much were you paid for the summer?
				* VP Social: $4500.
			- Secretary General: Just for context for the departmental executives. So, how many hours are you paid for in the summer, and what is that number like in relation to numbers allocated to executives for the school year?
				* VP Social: I honestly don't know. [VP Finance] Stefan's explained this like 8 times and I still don't remember the hours. I was approved for 360 hours in the summer. I calculated… They're not all logged into my T-sheet, but in August alone, I worked 600 hours, and in the last 2 weeks of Frosh, I worked 22-hour days.
				* President: The number of hours allocated to the VP Social is 360 hours in the summer, and it hovers around 250 hours for non-Work Study executives. It's in the budget.
				* Secretary General: If I may, I'm pretty sure the amount for [non-Work Study executives during] the school year is 340 hours.
				* President: Oh! Pleasant surprise.
	3. Presentation of the [VP Finance Funding Memo F1920-02 on Surplus](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/VP-Finance-Funding-Memo-F1920-02-on-Surplus.doc) (1:51:08)
		+ Presentation (VP Finance)
			- Read the whole document, it's easier to read than for me to explain. These are the formal reasons why departmental rollover surplus has not been administered this year like it was in previous years. The first reason: the process and the standards were not outlined in the Financial By-Laws. Any decision about amounts and tracks is arbitrary. Second, departmental surplus and rollover doesn't exist in the way you think it does. If it's internal as revenue, it's an expense, saying your department is reallowed to incur that expense. Unless your department raises more in cash sales or sponsorship, then it's automatically a deficit. What rollover surplus would entail is, "In this particular year, you didn't incur these expenses, so you would get those un-incurred expenses to the next year." And, in accounting, there is no proper way to do that. It simply can't be done. You can do that manually, but that wouldn't have anything to do with proper accounting; you can't close accounts and reopen them if you were to do this. The process and standard for this is not up to date. The entire process would be arbitrary. The last section is not complete. I will complete point 3 later, but the general premise is that in certain years, assuming they would get un-incurred expenses, in those years you could incur surpluses without anticipating it to come back to you. Then they could choose to… These have been transferred from year to year. Not technically very sound and very arbitrary, given the extremely low standard for recordkeeping we've had in the past years. The last sentence is incomplete. No public organizations allow departments to carry over surplus in this way because of the accounting relationship I've described in previous years. In no circumstance does it make sense to administer it as it's been done in previous years. Then there's the FAQ regarding these decisions. The general principle is that I do agree that accumulated surplus should be used to advance the needs of students, but it needs to happen within the context of consistent and technical rules that are not arbitrary and are based on good records and accounting principles. This section elucidates potential options for how the organization can go about doing this. There are a lot of technical considerations for this to happen and in line with generally acceptable accounting practices. Here are some remarks and guiding principles as part of this decision making. In the new year, these decisions are ongoing. As far as the decision goes, this elucidates the reasoning for it.
		+ No questions
	4. New Business
		+ [Motion to Approve AUSec’s New Logo](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Motion-to-Approve-AUSec_s-New-Logo.docx) **| PASSED** (1:56:36)
			- Moving (AUSec)
				* I'll keep it short and sweet. It's cute. Do you want to pass it? Thanks.
			- No questions
			- No debate
			- Voting
				* Motion passes
		+ [Motion to Ratify the Amended Constitution of the GSFSSA](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Motion-to-Ratify-the-Amended-Constitution-of-the-GSFSSA.docx) **| PASSED** (1:57:05)
			- Moving (GSFSSA)
				* Hi. So basically, we've updated our Constitution. So, we were Women's Studies, Sexuality, and Diversity Studies. We've updated language to reflect that [we are now the Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies Students Association] and included a land acknowledgement. Made it (the Constitution) reflect realities. Please pass it. Thank you.
			- No questions
			- No debate
			- Voting
				* Motion passes

MIRA: [Attempted] Motion to Add the Motion that I just sent you?

* 1. Speaker: It'll be a motion to suspend the rules to address a new item. If we could get through the last few motions, then do that motion, then do the reports, I think that would be a much smoother process.
	2. [Motion to Approve FMC Decisions](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Motion-to-Approve-FMC-Decisions.docx) **| PASSED** (1:58:27)
		+ Moving (VP Finance)
			- This is just a standard procedural motion: it's just the decisions of the Financial Management Committee (FMC). For the Decisions Specific note, the AUS budget changes were made to reflect the updated Frosh budget. The amounts haven't changed at all.
		+ Questions
			- Arts Senator Henrique: I noticed that three departments are being granted Special Project Fund budgets and two departments are being granted Supplementary Fund budgets. I was wondering if that was specific to those departments, if others are eligible, and if so, how would they go about that.
				* VP Finance: The distinction between the two are: one (Special Project Fund) is external and two (Supplementary Fund) is standard AUS operation. Any organizations affiliated with AUS are eligible to apply for the Supplementary Fund. Anyone at McGill can apply to the Special Project Fund and to the Journal Funds. The Supplementary Fund is specifically for AUS departments and affiliated organizations.
			- VP External: Would you be able to provide information as to McGill Hacks' Special Projects Fund budget? Why are they applying for $3500?
				* VP Finance: Every organization has to provide a budget detailing how their expenses will be broken down, or their application will be rejected. McGill Hacks is a huge conference; their annual budget is $75,000. It's (the $3500) in line with what AUS has been provided to them in the past years. McGill Hacks is an entry-level introduction to hacking targeted to non-experts, which is, generally speaking, Arts students. The vast majority of people that attend their conference is Arts students at McGill.
		+ No debate
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	3. [Motion to Amend the Inter-Faculty IRP](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Motion-to-Amend-the-Inter-Faculty-IRP.docx) **[late] | PASSED** (2:01:35)
		+ Moving (VP Social)
			- First of all, I'm sorry if I sounded irritated. I'm working on my tone. I'm trying to get through this, so if I speak too fast, feel free to raise a Point of Personal Privilege. Some changes are more about wording to be more conclusive, specifically on October 30, we left the debate on the condition that I came back with updates, specifically about the appeal process and probationary period. If you look at Item 8, regarding Article 9 called "Appeal," the appeal process has been instilled. The probationary period has been defined to be 4 weeks for people being investigated and 1 week for the Faculty committee to collect statements if a complaint falls within the scope of the policy.
		+ Questions
			- BASiC: Thank you for all of your hard time. What is the process moving forward with regards to BASiC being part of the Inter-Faculty IRP? I spoke to Julia and Kianoush, the previous execs, about it.
				* VP Social: I do not recognize those names. I do not have messages or emails about it from them. The last time I spoke about it was at [October 30's] Council. We came to the conclusion that, technically, BASIC is a department. So, until you become a Faculty, it doesn't make sense for you to be signed onto the IRP, even though you have your own Frosh, I know. With that being said, I think that we are trying to find a way to safely encompass your Frosh that does not entail passing on those names to whoever is on the ArtsSci Frosh committee, in a way that does not legally breach confidentiality. So, we are trying to look for a way to do that. I have consulted lawyers a bit regarding that conversation. Come talk to me about the two people that were supposed to talk to me, because I do not have messages from them.
			- CSAUS: I want to thank the VP Social for their work. I was wondering if the VP Social could give a timeline for the ratification of these amendments in other Faculty Councils and, specifically, who she consulted in formulation of the appeals process.
				* VP Social: For MUS, I’m not sure, I believe SUS passed it last night or the week before. Science definitely passed it first. Engineering is slated for this Sunday. Hopefully for AUS, it'll be tonight. In terms of consulting with the appeals process, I did most of my communication with the other Faculties, and we shared the same concerns. They would bring it up with our group chat with [SSMU VP External] Adam, who was representing for SSMU. I didn't necessarily message Adam about it directly or send him emails, because I know my concerns are being shared and being expressed sufficiently by the other Faculties, and we talked about this a ton. Other faculties have consulted their boards of directors, presidents, or equity commissioners.
			- Secretary General: I was wondering if you've looked at them in terms of our existing HR policies and our termination policy, specifically at Article 10. In that, terminated employees must receive authorization from the Secretary General. I don't know if that's related to this in terms of removing people from positions in events and how that'll be worked into the IRP.
				* VP Social: I think that's something that AUS needs to look at, but as far as I was concerned, I was hoping to work with your portfolio to have AUS conform to what the Interfaculty IRP needs. The other faculties do not have a Secretary General portfolio, only equity commissioners, executive, and two boards of directors. This is an AUS-specific rift/obstacle. I was definitely hoping to sit down with yourself and [Deputy Secretary General] F-X to work that out.
				* Gallery (Adam Gwiazda-Amsel; SSMU VP External): It doesn't interact with the HR policy because the IRP doesn't have scopes for termination, only banning. Additional provisions can be made to the AUS IRP, but in the Interfaculty IRP, it won't be. The thing being brought up are amendments.
				* VP Social: The amendments in the most recent draft are in the Google Docs. Screenshots. A lot are from Science, but I correspond a ton with them very much, including the ones made by Wendy. A lot of the concerns she brought up I also had already thought of or resonated with a ton.
				* Gallery (Adam Gwiazda-Amsel; SSMU VP External): The version SUS passed at this Council?
				* VP Social: To my knowledge, yes.
			- VP Finance: The majority of Faculties have operational IRPs at this point. I don’t know whether or not there were people on these lists. I wanted to ask whether or not these lists will be grandfathered into this Interfaculty IRP or will people on the IRPs just be on individual faculties'?
				* VP Social: We unanimously agreed that these people on the Faculty IRPs should be grandfathered into the Interfaculty IRP without having to do another investigation. I'm not clear where we stand on that because it's more of a precarious situation, especially legally.
				* Gallery (Adam Gwiazda-Amsel; SSMU VP External): It's dependent, legally speaking, on consent clauses that people signed for events. Someone has to agree that they will be subject to IRP. Obviously, they won't do it once they've been penalized. Now, definitely the people who did the events this year will be grandfathered in because they signed a consent form for the Interfaculty IRP, and none asked to see it. In terms of previous Faculty IRPs… Essentially, the idea behind the Interfaculty IRP… Insofar as they were found "guilty" under the Faculty IRP, they would also be found guilty under the new policy and be banned from all four faculty's events, especially since the language in this new one says "under any time," without having to go back and look at any new person and take the interview testimonials. Because I don't think anyone wants to have to go back and recount their experiences.
			- VP Finance: Just to clarify, you're suggesting they will be grandfathered?
				* VP Social: Insofar as the two policies don't differ in the respects of the person being penalized, yes. In my understanding, both IRPs are similar in this sense.
				* VP Finance: Will there be a timeline on whether it'll be definitive, since it's still speculative?
				* Speaker: They would have to check with lawyers, so they'll get back to you on that.
		+ No debate
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes
	4. [Motion to Suspend Departmental Executives](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Motion-to-Suspend-Departmental-Executives.docx) **[late] | TABLED** (2:13:52)
		+ Moving (VP Internal)
			- These people are part of interfaculty departments and they received 13 chances to attend an equity training but attended none. SUS Equity is moving this motion, so it's important we also suspend them.
		+ Questions
			- CSAUS: These individuals are all from interfaculty departments. So is the issue is that they didn't attend both?
				* VP Internal: They haven't attended one total.
				* CSAUS: With the criteria the VP Internal used for granting exemptions, if you received some applicable training? Because I know Floor Fellows were exempt, but people who received similar training were not exempt.
				* VP Internal: I used that from the last VP Internal, which included floor fellow training and Frosh training.
			- BASIC: Were these people warned about the suspension directly to their emails?
				* VP Internal: They will be by December 1. I personally didn't reach out to any people and I'm not sure if SUS did. We'll be warning them about their suspension on December 1
			- ASA: In the future, like, it sucks that they had 13 opportunities and didn't go, but could there be procedure so that they could be reached out to before being suspended?
				* VP Internal: I agree there should be a procedure, and I couldn't ask people if they had been contacted.
			- Gallery (Adam Gwiazda-Amsel; SSMU VP External): Are there plans to have a general understanding of what Council-equivalent equity trainings are? Are you interested in doing an all-faculty thing?
				* VP Internal: Absolutely. There are a lot of issues. There's nothing about this in the Constitution or in the Equity By-Laws… There's a lot of room to formalize what equity trainings mean. I'm definitely interested in reforming our procedures to make sure we have more clarity in the future.
			- CSAUS: One, this motion wasn't written by you?
				* VP Internal: It had the words of the SUS Equity Commissioners in it, and I adapted it for the AUS Legislative Council.
				* CSAUS: When the SUS Equity Commissioners came to you, did you consult any AUS policy or regulation on the suspension of departmental executives? Because for me, that question is that, even if SUS is doing one thing, we're our own sovereign body, and this sets a dangerous precedent for people to be suspended without notice.
				* VP Internal: In the past, what we've done is we suspended people for not attending equity training. According to 4.1 of the equity by-laws, it makes sense for us to suspend people. There's nothing formal. We need to pass this for SUS' motion to stand.
			- President [Point of Personal Inquiry]: Can I answer a question to CSAUS?
			- HSA [Point of Order]: I would like to move the question, seeing as we have time-sensitive issues we need to get to.
			- BASIC: It's my understanding that initially, members who had gone through Frosh training were exempt from the second session. Both our VP Internal and VP Communications had done the Frosh. I know that maybe we received notification that Frosh was no longer a suitable replacement, but if that is how it went down, would you be able to clarify how many times they were reached out to after being notified that the Frosh no longer counted?
				* VP Internal: I'm not sure who sent out that Frosh didn't count so I'm happy to consult the SUS Equity Commissioners on that.
		+ VP Internal: Motion to Table this Motion **| PASSED**
			- Second mover: CSAUS
			- Motion passes
		+ HSA: Point of Information would you accept a motion
	5. [Motion Regarding Support of the AGSEM Teaching Support Campaign](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Motion-Regarding-Support-of-the-AGSEM-Teaching-Support-Campaign.docx) **[late] | 2:21:18**
		+ Moving (President)
			- This is just a motion that says the AUS Leg[islative] Council endorses their efforts.
		+ No questions
		+ No debate
		+ Voting
			- Motion passes

VP External: Motion to Suspend the Rules and Add the Remaining Item/Motion (2:21:43) **| PASSED**

* 1. Second mover: BASiC
	2. CSAUS: Pursuant to Robert's Rules, I'd like to raise my objection to the consideration of the question **| FAILED**
		+ HSA [Point of Order]: Per precedent, it is in order to add late motions to the agenda, as it has been done at every single meeting in this Legislative Council. And to clarify, this is a motion to add a late motion to the agenda.
			- CSAUS: No, that motion didn't pass. I'm now using Robert's Rules of Order to call objection to the question. Given we've had very extensive discussion on this, I have an objection now to the question of the resolution. This motion I've moved forward is an objection to the question pursuant to page 450 of Robert's Rules of Order. It takes a 1/3 vote to overrule my objection according to the Robert's Rules, as it is a privileged motion.
			- HSA: Is there anywhere that clearly states in the AUS Standing Rules that says we have to obey the…
			- Speaker: Yes, Robert's Rules are the default anywhere the AUS Constitution and Standing Rules do not provide stuff.
			- HSA: Okay, so-
			- Speaker: We do have to entertain the motion. As [CSAUS VP External] Brent said, it's a 1/3 vote to overrule it.
		+ Motion fails
	3. Voting
		+ Motion passes

* 1. Late motion **| PASSED** (2:24:00)
		+ Moving (MIRA): This statement expresses our views on the summary of the debate, and we would like to re-emphasize to Palestinian students who have been personally affected by the executives' decision that we stand in solidary with their concerns and lived experiences of oppression. We do not believe any policy serves as a moral compass and this motion would have the AUS Leg[islative] Council endorse the letter publicized by SSMU in asking for increased transparency of McGill.
		+ No questions
		+ Debate
			- Arts Representative Adin: I just kinda take issue with the idea of the SSMU conflict of interest policy being a moral compass. I don't think anyone's advocating using that rhetoric. What I was trying to say is that when we're trying to judge whether things are conflicts of interest or not, which was the basis of the generative discussion, we need to use the framework given to us by institutions. Just to clarify my sentiment, I am not trying to call anyone out on this, I take a little bit of issue with that statement there.
				* HSA: Thank you, Adin, for your comment. I don't think this was in reference to anything you said. I think it was just - I did not personally write this sentence. But, I think, it just says, at certain points it was cited that going on the trip was fine because there were no violations of the conflict of interest policy. All this is trying to say is that that is not the give-all end-all of ethics and I don't think it was in reference to anything you said.
			- VP External: I just wanted to clarify, and I guess [President] Jamal could answer this. This motion does not specify who's gonna send out the statement, and I believe the VP Communications is not here. Would this need a be-it-resolve clause to amend the motion to add who would do it?
				* President: No, it says "next listserv," and the listserv falls under the purview of Communications.
				* VP External: My understanding is that the last listserv was already sent out, and I'm presuming this will be a special listserv. And I believe that in order to prevent confusion as to who will be sending the listserv, following precedence with other issues with the listserv, I just want to make sure that the Council is aware of how the process of sending the listserv will proceed.
				* President: So, I see what you're saying, but the language here says, "next listserv," and the listserv goes out every Monday, so I take this to mean it will go out in Monday's listserv sent by the VP Communications. It doesn't specify a special listserv that goes outside of those days. So if that's their intended goal, that's not suggested in the language. Otherwise, it'll be up to the VP Communications. Oh, sorry, I now understand what you're saying: [VP Communications] Yoana's not sending out listservs anymore. It would still fall under the VP Communications' purview, my apologies.
			- RSUS: Could we amend it to say, "Within the next 7 days?"
			- Arts Representative Adin [Point of Order]: It's Hillel Montreal, not Hillel McGill. It's an important distinction.
			- Arts Senator Henrique: I think it is a bit troubling to entertain this motion given that we don't have a lot of time. The appendices are somewhat long. Personally, I don't feel comfortable endorsing this motion or giving the VP Communications more work while she's away, and finals are approaching. I understand the point of solidarity but this could be done in the future, not in a rush.
				* HSA: The appendices are just for reference and to make the details of the trip information public; they're just points of reference. I don't think there's anything controversial. We don't think it would be conducive to table this motion. Palestinian students want us to take action now, and it's our duty as Legislative Council to speak up for constituents.
	2. AHCSSA: Motion to Table this Motion **| FAILED**
		+ Second mover: CSAUS
		+ Motion failed
	3. Voting
		+ Motion passes

*Council adjourns at this point in time (skip to Item 18 on the agenda), leaving reports for the next session.*

* 1. ~~Executive Officer Reports~~
		+ [~~President~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/President-1.docx)**~~[late]~~**
		+ [~~VP Academic~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/VP-Academic-2.pdf)
		+ [~~VP Comunications~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/VP-Comunications.pdf)
		+ [~~VP External~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/VP-External-1.pdf)
		+ [~~VP Finance~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/VP-Finance.pdf)
		+ [~~VP Internal~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/VP-Internal-1.pdf)
		+ [~~VP Services~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/VP-Services-1.pdf)**~~[late]~~**
		+ [~~VP Social~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/VP-Social-1.docx)**~~[late]~~**
	2. ~~Reports of the Arts Representatives and Senators~~
		+ [~~Arts Representatives~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Arts-Representatives.pdf)**~~[late]~~**
		+ ~~Arts Senators~~
			- ~~Arts Senator Chloe Kemeni (absent)~~
			- [~~Arts Senator Henrique Mecabô~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Arts-Senator-Henrique-Mecabo%CC%82-1.pdf)
	3. ~~Reports of Departmental Associations~~
		+ [~~GSA~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/GSA-1.pdf)**~~[late]~~**
		+ [~~ESA~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/ESA-1.pdf)**~~[late]~~**
		+ [~~MPSA~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/MPSA-1.pdf)
		+ [~~AGELF~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/AGELF-1.pdf)
		+ [~~SSA~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/SSA-1.pdf)
		+ [~~LAPSA~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/LAPSA-1.pdf)
		+ [~~PSA~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/PSA-1.pdf)
		+ [~~PSSA~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/PSSA-1.pdf)
		+ [~~QSSA~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/QSSA-1.pdf)
		+ [~~WIMESSA~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/WIMESSA-1.docx)**~~[late]~~**
		+ [~~GSFSSA~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/GSFSSA.docx)
	4. ~~Report of AUS Committees~~
		1. [~~AUS Accountability Committee~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Report-of-the-AUS-Accountability-Committee.pdf)
		2. [~~FEARC~~](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/FEARC.pdf)
	5. ~~Question Period~~
	6. Good luck with exams and happy holidays!
	7. Adjournment
		1. VP External: Motion to adjourn
			+ Second mover: CSAUS
			+ Motion passes
		2. Adjourned at 9:01 pm

Appendices

[Appendix A Nov 21, 2019 Meeting Decisions](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Appendix-A-Nov-21-2019-Meeting-Decisions.xlsx)

[Appendix B AUS FY2020 Operating Budget](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Appendix-B-AUS-FY2020-Operating-Budget-1.xlsx)

[Appendix C Oct 2019 GSFSSA Constitution Updates](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Appendix-C-Oct-2019-GSFSSA-Constitution-Updates.pdf)

[Appendix D WMST 2013 Constitution](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Appendix-D-WMST-2013-Constitution.pdf)

[Appendix E FMC Meeting Agenda November 21, 2019](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Appendix-E-FMC-Meeting-Agenda-November-21-2019.doc)