**Arts Undergraduate Society of McGill University**

**Legislative Council**

**January 14th, 2020, 6:00 PM**

* 1. Call to Order (0:00)
		+ 6:04 pm
	2. Territorial Acknowledgement (0:48)
		+ 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 waters on which we meet today.
	3. Roll Call (1:15)
	4. Meeting Minutes for Approval: [Meeting Minutes AUS Council November 27th 2019](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Meeting-Minutes-AUS-Council-November-27th-2019.docx) **| APPROVED** (4:27)
		+ Amendment
			- CSAUS: I just wanted to clarify on a page where I raised an objection to the consideration of the question… Clarifying that when I said it was page 450 of Robert's Rules that I was referencing, I meant to say page 267. There's also an amendment I would like to formally add in the dialogue between CSAUS and HSA. I was recorded saying, "No, it did not pass," and I actually said it DID pass, and I would move an amendment accordingly.
		+ Minutes approved, with amendments
	5. Approval of the Agenda **| APPROVED** (6:51)
		+ CSAUS: Motion to Add Late Motions to the Agenda **| PASSED**
			- Second mover: HSA
			- Motion passes
		+ Agenda approved, with amendments
	6. Announcements (7:34)
		+ CSAUS: The Canadian Studies journal, Canadian Content, has extended its deadline to this Friday (January 17, 2020). If you have any work that's related to the study of Canada, in any subject or area, please submit in English or French. We love our bilingual submissions.
		+ RSUS: Little bit in advance, but March 20: RSUS is in the midst of organizing a trip to Quebec City to see some cool Catholic architecture and other religious sites. It will cost between $10-30. We're hoping $10. It isn't completely finalized yet, but if you are interested, don't hesitate to contact someone from RSUS or look out for more information as it comes.
		+ MUGS: [1] The Undergraduate Geography Journal, Fieldnotes, is both open for submissions and looking for some editors. looking for submissions and editors. [2] Our next social event, the next *Pints, Lines, and Polygons,* will be Thursday the 23rd. We're gonna be meeting in the MUGS lounge in Burnside. If you're interested in either of those, it's going to be in the listserv and the Facebook page.
		+ VP Internal (on behalf of the VP External); Work your BA is happening from January 20th to 31st. It's going to be really exciting so please check it out. There's also the Non-Profit Fair as part of Work your BA on the 29th.
		+ IDSSA: The IDSSA is looking for peer reviewers and layout editors for our publications, Catalysts and Chrysalis. More info to apply is on Facebook page.
		+ VP Finance: Next Tuesday (January 21, 2020), all external departmental associations in compliance with the audit will have their cheques for their winter semester allocations ready for collection. If you have submitted all your audits, it will be ready.
		+ VP Academic: The Peer Tutoring applications for all departments have been sent out. The deadline to apply is the 19th of January. And the budget has been expanded.
		+ JSSA: On January 23rd, from 6:30-8:00 pm in ARTS 160, the JSSA is having our first Wine and Cheese, which we have called *Manischewitz and Mozzarella.* We invite anyone who wants to come to come.
		+ HSA: The HSA would like to encourage everyone to attend our trivia night this Thursday from 7-9 pm on history-related topics. It will be at Le Coin Social, and the winning teams will get free pitchers of sangria.
	7. New Business
		+ [Motion to Amend the Accountability By-Laws](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/7-1-Motion-to-Amend-the-Accountability-By-Laws.docx) **[late]** (11:39)
			- [Motion to Amend the Accountability By-Laws](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/7-1-Motion-to-Amend-the-Accountability-By-Laws-1.docx) **[added seconder] | PASSED**
			- Moving (VP Internal)
				* This motion is to add a section into the Accountability By-Laws that mandates that we do departmental oriental training. Just because we haven't had anything in the by-laws or the Constitution about this before. So we just wanted to add this in and just to make sure all people are attending because it's mandatory and its really important for all departmental executives to know more about the execs so they can hold them (the execs) accountable to their roles. So, I'm adding three clauses into it. The first one is 7.1, and that mandates that the executives organize two departmental orientation sessions, ensuring that they don't conflict with religious observances and that they happen at the same time when equity training needs to happen, which is the second week of October. 7.2 gives background information on what the departmental orientation should cover and essentially should cover departmental executives for their roles. And 7.3 says anyone who fails to attend the training shall be suspended from their position, and they can be reinstated at the next Legislative Council meeting. I also want to add that I am completely open to any amendments people may have or any ideas people have to improve this.
			- Second mover: CSAUS
			- Questions
				* HSA: My question is with 7.3. I was just wondering: is there any precedent for this? What does the suspension actually entail? How are you going to make sure anything substantially changes? What would stop the VP Events of a departmental association from continuing to attend that association's meetings and helping out with events, if that's what their job entailed?

VP Internal: The AUS President would send an email to the executive in question and let them know that they're suspended from their position. We would also inform the rest of the executive of that decision, maybe the departmental association president, just to make sure that they're also complying. The department's president would be responsible for making sure that this person actually doesn't do their role, doesn't attend meetings, and doesn't "do their job," I guess.

* + - * + ASA: I remember last time that there were two members of BASiC that had been suspended because they thought that Frosh training counted as orientation, and I was wondering if in any of the equity things that there was anything that states if there's any outline of how and when these people would be contacted, or if it would be completely their responsibility, should this pass.

VP Internal: I'm moving something related to equity training specifically in the next motion that I have, and that will stipulate exactly what kinds of changes will be considered and alternatives for the AUS equity training. For this one… sorry I forgot your question, could you repeat it one more time?

ASA: I'm wondering if there's any implication or [if it's] written anywhere of how or what responsibility the AUS has to contact these people or if this is just going to be passed with it being the group's entire responsibility to make sure they know. I just want to clarify.

VP Internal: In any motion that we move to suspend people from their positions, it would stipulate that the [AUS] President must notify the department in question. We would put that in the motion of suspension, I think, because it's the responsibility of the departmental association.

* + - * + VP Finance: There's no intention to apply the structural aspect of this, correct?

VP Internal: No, not for this one, actually. I think we may have forgotten to add that here, but in the equity training motion that I'm passing, in the other motion that I have, that will retroactively apply to people who haven't attended equity trainings last semester. But I'm not doing it to this one.

* + - * No debate
			* Voting
				+ Motion passes
		- [Motion to Amend the Equity By-Laws](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/7-2-Motion-to-Amend-the-Equity-By-Laws.docx)**[late]** (16:29)
			* [Motion to Amend the Equity By-Laws](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/7-2-Motion-to-Amend-the-Equity-By-Laws-1.docx) **[amended] | PASSED**
			* Moving (VP Internal)
				+ This is similar to the last one. We have nothing in our [Equity] By-Laws right now outlining any consequences for people who don't attend equity trainings. We've done this in the past where we've suspended people, but there's nothing in the rules saying we have to suspend people. So, I'll go over what I've added to the Equity By-Laws. 4.1.3 says that any executive who doesn't attend the equity training will be suspended. They can be reinstated at the next Legislative Council meeting. 4.1.4 says that the Equity Commissioners will be responsible for making sure that people are attending alternative trainings; they'll approve the alternative trainings that any executives bring forward if they miss AUS equity training. Until now, it's been my responsibility, and I feel like it might be better suited for the Equity Commissioners to decide that[, instead]. For 4.1.5, it says that any executives whose departments fall under AUS and SUS are able to attend one or the other training, which is what we've done in the past, I just wanted to put it in writing. Lastly, I have another be-it-resolved clause, which mandates that executives who haven't completed the equity training from last semester will have to complete one in January, which we'll organize right now with the Equity Commissioners. And then once they complete that training, then we'll suspend the people who haven't done the training.
			* Questions
				+ CSAUS: So I just wanted to re-pose the question the VP Finance posed to the VP Internal earlier: you do intend to impose this retroactively?

VP Internal: This one, I do intend to impose retroactively. I've decided not to do this for the departmental ones because there was nothing at all in the By-Laws about having a departmental orientation. But this one is like… we have a written precedent for having equity trainings. I figured this one should be retroactively.

* + - * Attempted amendment
				+ CSAUS: Motion to add (trainings which include but are not limited to) Residence Hall Council equity training and Inter-Residence Council equity training.

Speaker: We're gonna finish discussing with questions and stuff. And then we'll come back to voting on amendments after that. One thing I will point out though is that, I think it was in the other one, you have to attend a training every year. Following the assumption that people attend residence training like this when they're first years, they probably are on departmental associations in second year or higher, so it probably… yeah, anyways.

* + - * Questions
				+ BASiC: Thank you for bringing this up. You mentioned that regarding going to either/or of the [Arts or Science] Faculty equity trainings. You mentioned that we have done that in the past. What happened with BASiC, then, with regards to theirs? The motion that was brought up to suspend them?

VP Internal: So, I looked into that afterwards, and I noticed that I actually received no emails from any of the people I moved to suspend last Legislative Council. I actually didn't receive any information about the fact that they did Frosh training. So, I don't know if they said that to the SUS Equity Commissioners, but, to my knowledge, they didn't attend training and they didn't give me any reason for not attending training.

* + - * + CSAUS: I thought we had tabled the motion that as suspending the three members of BASiC because there was an unclear point as to this resolution… there were some clarity issues. I thought that the three BASiC VPs were not suspended because the motion is on the table as we speak? I'm confused. Could the VP Internal clarify the situation of that?

VP Internal: I wanted to pass this [motion] before I do any suspension stuff because there's nothing in the By-Laws stating that we have to suspend people. These three people won't be suspended.

* + - * + AHCSSA: In the be-it-resolved clause, you mentioned a possible equity training between now, January 14th, and January 31st. I just wanted to know if this were to pass, how soon would we be notified of the next equity training?

VP Internal: I sent an email to everyone yesterday. It's kinda late, I'm a little behind. I think it will be at least two weeks that I notify people; I give two weeks advance notice. But we're still deciding things. It will be 1.5 to2 weeks that people be notified.

* + - * CSAUS: Motion to add (trainings which include but are not limited to) Residence Hall Council equity training and Inter-Residence Council equity training **| PASSED**
				+ Debate

MUGS: I was on my residence's hall council last year and 'cause I missed the original equity training I had a makeup session. It was about 12 to 15 minutes inside the Rez Life office. So, I really don't think that all hall council trainings should be considered equivalent to all these other far longer and more detailed trainings that a lot of people get.

RSUS: Yeah, I definitely think that it's a good idea to make it easier for first years to join departmental associations. Like, I understand the reasoning behind it. But it's been a while since I've done equity training at residence. The full one, not the makeup one, and it still wasn't great. My other concern is just that those equity trainings are not… my understanding is that for Frosh and for Floor Fellows, the equity training… they're supposed to be the same. And Rez Project, which is now "Our Shared Spaces" is different, so they don't necessarily coincide, even if they're trying to achieve similar goals.

VP Finance: As far as I understand, 4.1.4 allows the equity commissioners to make the decisions, either way. This amendment, in any case, is simply a suggestion; it's not an actual direction. I think adding whatever training should be up to the equity commissioners: the equity commissioners should be allowed to go through the content to see if it's equivalent to all the other equity trainings. Whether that's a level that people can be trained at. I think this amendment is fine as a suggestion as to what's permissible.

* + - * + Voting

Amendment passes

* + - * CSAUS: Motion to Delete the Second Be-It-Resolved Clause
				+ Moving (CSAUS)

I would like to move the amendment. The amendment is not technical in nature at this point. It actively deletes the last be-it-resolved clause. I theorize that it's, quite frankly, problematic to apply resolution retroactively, especially something with this grave of a consequence. I see where it can be seen as necessary but there are constitutionality issues with it, applying this *ex post facto.* I think that due care needs to be taken in notifying the affected people who haven't done the equity training as opposed to applying a one-take-fits-all solution to it, especially this late in the year. I understand the importance of this training but I think it's unfair to summarily add this requirement and then saying, "If you don't do this requirement that we just added by this day, you know, everyone is fine, except you, you're getting suspended." That's why I'm moving this amendment.

* + - * Debate
				+ RSUS: To my knowledge, this has been part of practice, it just hasn't been institutionalized. I have a friend who runs a SUS department, who's President, and I don't know whether or not this has been institutionalized, but we were talking about what happened with BASiC when this happened. And per my understanding of AUS and SUS departments, this has always been the practice, it's just better to have it written down in the constitution. He had somebody in his department who was notified. It's the people who weren't notified who are off the table, but they're not being suspended. He was notified, and he didn't show up, and at being, "You're going to be suspended now"… they know they have this timeframe where they'll no longer be suspended. This isn't new. This is something that people who have suspensions know about, barring the not-great case with what happened with BASiC.
				+ HSA: So, with regards to the specifics of the date, I believe the VP Internal said earlier that, in general, they hope to provide two weeks' notice. But, let's say for example that I was an AUS executive who was, as is the case of HSA, just recently in the beginning of January. I'm a current executive but presumably, I don't know if there would be a makeup session, but there'd be less than 2 weeks' notice. Like, if that exec was me, I'm pretty busy in the next 2 weeks because I'm involved and organize my schedule well, and I wouldn't be able to attend and that wouldn't be any fault of my own. And I imagine there could be other cases like this. So should we not change the dates in this clause to something more extended to give people a more reasonable chance to have a makeup equity session?
				+ PSSA: I would just like to ask the VP Internal a couple of questions of clarification, if you could, just for the record. It's my understanding that you would be suspended if you had been contacted and there would be notice that you had not done the equity training before you're suspended. Correct?

VP Internal: I would definitely try to notify people about the other equity training that's happening before they are suspended. My approach would be to send them an email and have them attend it and tell them they have 2 more chances to attend an equity training before they are suspended. I definitely wouldn't want to put them in a position where they have no idea about the new equity training and then have them suspended, I think that's totally unfair. I would try to give people advance notice that there is an equity training happening, especially if they might be suspended later.

* + - * + HSA [Point of Inquiry]: When are the makeup equity sessions for this semester?

Speaker: The dates haven't been finalized yet.

* + - * + VP Finance: I'd like to speak to "retroactively applying." Let's apply this to something else. If there was a clause on termination in the financial by-laws that I added this meeting that said, "Departmental allocations will be reduced by x amount." And then I retroactively apply that to the Fall semester, that would be completely incoherent and contrary to just about every governance, first of all. I think that the first case should apply here: if a rule wasn't in place, then someone new shouldn't be held accountable to it. If a rule wasn't in place, I don't quite see how it's possible as an organization to hold people to rules that didn't yet exist.
				+ CSAUS: I wanted to echo the sentiments of the VP Finance. And also, I'm sitting here, and I'm kinda looking at the wording again and letting it sit in my brain for a bit. I very much do love, honour and agree with the principles ensuring that everyone is equity trained and making sure that AUS is a safe and equitable place, but also come to the sense that we shouldn’t be applying regulations *ex post facto.* And we should be allowing people due process and not just summarily suspending people. If the VP Internal wants to suspend people, let them bring a motion before Council suspending each individual person so that we can have a debate on the merits of it, not just the merits of suspending people on a be-it-resolved clause. I really think that we should be thinking of the example that the VP Finance gave in thinking how this might apply to other situations, and think of how this could be a slippery slope.
				+ BASiC: Just to confirm, our BASiC executives, at the end of last semester, two of them were actually suspended by SUS briefly and then did a makeup equity training on [January] the 13th and are now officially reinstated. Given the clause that we just passed, just to confirm for myself, the VP Internal could clarify, this won't retroactively suspend our BASiC executives again?

VP Internal: No, because they didn't attend the makeup equity training, so it wouldn't apply to them. They're not suspended.

* + - * + VP Academic: [1] Didn't you mention that there was precedent for equity training mandated for all executives? [2] Process of suspension would be introducing a motion to Council, moving the suspension, and then the suspension would be instated?

VP Internal: Yes, both of those things are correct. What would happen is that at the end of the next leg council meeting, we would have the individuals in question who haven't done the equity trainings by the 31st, and then we would decide whether to suspend people. I wouldn't suspend people without bringing it to Council and having everyone agree. And that's my intention.

* + - * HSA: Motion to Amend the Second Be-It-Resolved Clause
				+ Moving (HSA)

For the sake of, for example, the cases that I mentioned of people just onboarded, would you be amenable to changing the January 31 date to February 8 or 10 so that people who are just learning they have to do an equity training now, basically, would have more than 2 weeks' notice to schedule an important thing.

VP Internal: I think that's actually a great idea. I did not think about the executives who joined more recently so I'd totally be amenable to that.

* + - * + CSAUS [Point of Order]: Because this is an amendment that strikes through, I'm not entirely sure it's germane to amend it to add text to the strikethrough.

Speaker: No, this is an amendment to the original be-it-resolved clause.

CSAUS: My apologies. I do intend, though, to motion to strike it again. Just making my intentions clear.

Speaker: We're going to entertain them in the order that they were presented. So yours, then HSA's. If yours doesn't pass, then…

* + - * Debate, continued
				+ PSSA: I'd also like to stress that we keep hearing that we're retroactively putting forward something. But it was always stated very clearly that executives in departmental associations would have to do equity trainings. Like, that was always very clear. My one question is hand-in-hand with what HSA was asking. There's been very real examples where it's not a lack of wanting to attend these meetings, it's just everyone's schedules are very busy, McGill's a very busy place. If people had communicated with you and had open communication, would you be willing to extend this 2-week date if they were being very open about their concerns and why they aren't attending and making sure they will make up this session? That's the only issue I see of this time because it's been clear that this is a requirement. It is inherently more unequitable to have a list of shaming individuals and voting on them one by one at Leg. Council instead of having conversations with the VP Internal and having more quiet suspensions where they can then be reinstated later. The question itself was: if there is constant communication with you regarding missing a makeup session, just 'cause, for example, there was one offered on a Jewish holiday in the Fall. So, if there's communication regarding why they're missing meetings or what are the limitations to this… would you extend this two week period to make it more interactive for students.

VP Internal: I would definitely be open to doing that. With the motion as it stands right now, I think it's probably better for us to change the date from January 21 to make it a little more accessible and have it later. That would solve the issue of people not being able to make the meetings.

* + - * + VP Finance: I think that what this motion is saying is that these new rules will apply as of now and people failing to attend will be brought up in a separate motion to be suspended. Is that the correct understanding? This is not being applied retroactively? You're applying new rules? That's a different case? Like they're not automatically being suspended now because they didn't attend before? There's gonna be a separate motion vis-a-vis this?

VP Internal: Yes.

* + - * + ASA: About the 4.1.4, I think it's good that it would be left up to the equity commissioners to determine some of the more slightly changed trainings. I don't think we need an answer to this today, but it would be good to note on working out a timeline, like finding out on September - knowing which training would count for this so we can determine what we can attend and what not to 'cause as HSA said, a lot of us have a lot of other things going on. So, it's not open to interpretation and I can see the issue of someone thinking one thing is open but it's actually not and they find out about that. So if that was found and that communication was made in a timely manner that would be helpful, I think.
				+ CSAUS: I'm a little bit confused as to wording of the last be-it-resolved clause. So, does the VP Internal intend to bring motions back to council suspending… sorry to use BASiC as an example, but BASiC executives? Do you intend to bring motions like that back to Council even with this be-it-resolved clause? Because this be-it-resolved clause currently authorizes an automatic suspension. That wording as it is would mechanize as them being summarily suspended. I'm a little bit confused as to what our goals are, here. If you could clarify, please.

VP Internal: My initial intention, based on what SUS does and SSMU does, they bring individual names to Council and we are able to vote on that, as far as I know. I'm willing to do either. I also understand the point of having quiet suspensions. For now, that was what this motion was, was for the next Legislative Council, we would bring people's names forward and suspend them because they hadn't attended equity trainings.

Speaker: We can change the [proposed makeup equity training] date from January 31st to February 10, which would then push back the [Council] meeting for discussing suspensions to… not the next meeting, but the meeting after that.

* + - * + HSA: I know I have to amend this again, but pursuant to what you just said, is it actually necessary? Does the VP Internal have the authority to suspend them without having to out them to all of Legislative Council? Is that necessary per the Constitution? Or could we just take out that whole part about Legislative Council and be more quietly suspended, and you (VP Internal) would know that and the departmental executives [involved] would know that, on a need-to-know basis? And they would just be put back in as soon as they complete it (the makeup session). I don't know if that's possible, but, speaking to PSSA's concern, if there are legitimate reasons (personal issue, some sort of actual justified issue, just wasn't communicating)… is that something…?

VP Internal: I think the solution is that is to just change the end of [the clause] to say, "Will be suspended by the VP Internal by February 12, 2020." I feel like if we do that that will solve it because I don't actually know if we have the authority to do it without the Legislative Council giving me the authority. But I feel like if we do that, that'll solve the issue.

HSA: Friendly amendment

* + - * + Speaker: How many people fall under this list of people who have not yet attended training?

VP Internal: 10-15 people

* + - * Voting on CSAUS' Amendment (Motion to Strike the Second Be-It-Resolved Clause) **| FAILED**
				+ Motion fails
			* Voting on HSA's Amendment (Motion to Amend the Second Be-It-Resolved Clause) **| PASSED**
				+ Motion passed
			* Voting (on the whole motion)
				+ Motion passed
		1. [Motion to Approve FMC Decisions](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/7-3-Motion-to-Approve-FMC-Decisions.docx) **[late]** (44:22)
			- [Motion to Approve FMC Decisions](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/7-3-Motion-to-Approve-FMC-Decisions-1.docx) **[added seconder] | PASSED**
			- Moving (VP Finance)
				* Just a standard procedural motion to approve the decisions of the FMC meeting from November 28, 2019.
			- Second mover: CSAUS
			- No questions
			- No debate
			- Voting
				* Motion passed
		2. [Motion to Support Strike Against Bill 21](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/7-4-Motion-to-Support-Strike-Against-Bill-21.pdf) **[late]** (45:54)
			-  [Motion to Support Strike Against Bill 21](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/7-4-Motion-to-Support-Strike-Against-Bill-21.docx) **[updated]**
			- [Motion to Support Strike Against Bill 21](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/7-4-Motion-to-Support-Strike-Against-Bill-21-1.docx)**[amended time] | PASSED**
				* Moving (RSUS)

There is a protest that's happening from Friday to Monday (January 17th to January 20th). Other Faculties have organized to strike, including Education and Law. I believe they're the only ones. They're striking on both Friday the 17th and Monday the 20th, but we were not able to get a General Assembly in time to strike on the 17th, so we're just voting to strike on the 20th. RSUS, last year, put forward a motion denouncing Bill 21. Our last whereas clause is very similar to their very last whereas clause, where, "The AUS exists to represent all McGill students in the Faculty of Arts and to promote their welfare and interests." Considering that we, as students, who are negatively affected by Bill 21, within this Faculty, it is within its interests to support the means of protesting of that which oppresses them. The point of this is to not only formally be like, "Council supports this," but to put out a statement on social media within 24 hours that will communicate these things so that people actually show up to the General Assembly, so that we have quorum and that we can vote to have a strike because if people don't know, then they won't show up, and it doesn't really do anything. I'm not going to bother you by reading the whole statement, but right there, indented, is the statement. It has been signed onto by the lovely WIMESSA, HSA, and PSA representatives.

* + - * + Questions

JSSA: I'm wondering why it was decided that the GA is happening on a Friday.

Speaker: I can speak to that. We only received the petition [calling for a General Assembly] on Friday (January 10) evening at 6 or 7 pm, which meant that we couldn't secure a room booking until Monday. And we're supposed to give five days' notice before a GA. So if we had held the GA on the day the petition originally called for, we would have blatantly been in violation of the Constitution. We heard back and confirmed with [SSMU VP External] Adam and a Facebook event was made yesterday. Depending on how you count days, you can pretend like it was five days, because you have all day Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday to hear about the GA on Friday. Also, Leacock 132 is super hard to book.

AHCSSA: Just on a technical note, the motion says, "AUS General Assembly scheduled for Wednesday, January 15-" Oh that's updated. Yours has the correct date. Also, just, I don't know. The whole Friday thing… I wish we could strike at the same time as everyone else, as Law and Education. If we're already having the GA after [the strike], is there any chance we could have it on Monday.

Speaker: But Monday's the second day of striking. There are two days of striking.

AHCSSA: Oh, okay. Yeah, that's hard.

VP Finance: Does the strike motion… if the GA actually reaches quorum, would that not have to be passed by referendum as well?

Speaker: Yes, but that can be done on the weekend.

CSAUS: Education put out a statement on their Facebook page on Sunday stating they failed to meet the quorum to pass the online vote [on their Motion to Strike]. Has there been updates with any of the other Faculties planning to strike? Moreover, does anyone have any updates on Education's progression to strike?

RSUS: From what I know, for what hasn't been officially voted on the strike… I believe Law was unable to officially strike. So, there's a Wild Cat strike being organized. For those of you who don't know, [a Wild Cat strike] is not technically a strike legally or under any governmental recognition of a strike. But people are still striking. So, Education could, I don't know if they actually are, they could go on a Wild Cat strike. We could go on a Wild Cat strike on Friday.

CSAUS: Who was the primary organizer of this effort? Was it AUS? Was it departmental associations? Because I just heard about this about - and I'm on Council - like, 24 hours ago, and it was a shock. I support it but it was vey… I was like, "Oh I didn't know that was happening."

RSUS: So the SSMU VP External, Adam [Gwiazda-]Amsel - so if you've heard the name "Adam" come up in this discussion, that's him - as part of the Office of External Affairs, there has been ongoing organization regarding opposing Bill 21. Starting on Monday, January 6, Adam started off the semester by trying to get this strike to happen, [by] going around and getting a petition signed. We got 200 signatures among AUS. Though it's a small fraction of the AUS itself, it does meet the quorum for a petition. We got that and submitted that and it had to get verified. It was started by the SSMU VP External who then went forward to departmental associations that he had rapport with within different Faculties, including myself and other departments within the AUS. We did reach out to other departments… not all of them, it was very rushed and it was the beginning of the semester. Yeah, there were efforts to spread this as far as possible. But again, time constricts.

ESA: Not to get too technical on this, and I'm assuming we've reused the same language as other motions, here. But in the first whereas clause, where it's referring to the CAQ's bill… I do believe it is customary to refer to the Governance Bill and not the political party forming governance. When we're dabbling in provincial politics, it's important to be careful.

RSUS: I took this directly from the motion put forward in April [of 2019] that I cited from the AUS before. It was put forward by the CAQ prior to them forming. The bill itself was created specifically by the CAQ before they took the provincial government, then it was passed by the current CAQ majority government. Technically, it is a CAQ bill. I can change it, I am amenable to changing it, but the reason I put it like that is because that's literally how it was phrased before the CAQ even had majority.

JSSA: Another question that I had is that to my knowledge, the JSSA was not contacted at all to help sponsor this bill. Bill 21 does negatively affect Jewish people as well. And I was wondering if any other Jewish groups were contacted about this protest or motion.

RSUS: I should have done a better job contacting other departmental associations. I would be happy to work with any amendments you have to this. As far as the protest goes, I'm not organizing that, so I would speak to Adam [Gwiazda-]Amsel, SSMU VP External. From what I know he has been working with Jewish groups both on campus and off campus. I also don't like the Friday day but it's bureaucracy so I apologize. It's been a rough time. I'm very sorry.

BASiC: Just a comment. I'd like to thank everybody for putting together this motion. I will be voting for.

HSA: Are people allowed to show up late? How is this going to work, especially 'cause this is technically during class hours.

Speaker: I drafted out a doc that AUS will be sending out on email and on Facebook. People will be able to arrive between 4:30-5:00. Half an hour for people to come in, then we go through signatures. We've done it once in the Fall for the Climate Strike GA, we'll be able to have an idea of what we're doing better than the Fall, and hopefully it'll go by quickly. So, between 4:30 to 5:00 is when people can arrive.

* + - * Voting
				+ Motion passes
		1. [Motion to Ratify the Amended Constitution of the WIMESSA](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Motion-to-Ratify-the-Amended-Constitution-of-the-WIMESSA.docx) [late] (58:49)
			- [Motion to Ratify the Amended Constitution of the WIMESSA](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Motion-to-Ratify-the-Amended-Constitution-of-the-WIMESSA-1.docx) [added seconder] **| PASSED**
			- Moving (WIMESSA)
				* Last semester, WIMESSA held a General Assembly where we discussed some amendments [to the Constitution]. Most of the amendments are about, essentially, WIMESSA's mandate to take political stances. On one hand, we wanted to clarify that we do occasionally take political stances and we also wanted to clarify a way for the stances to be held accountable by the student body we represent, whether through Town Hall or an online vote. I believe that was most of it. There were some minor changes. Like 5.4, about the VP Internal's portfolio concerning social media accounts. There's more emphasis placed on helping students in World Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies and language minors with mental health services and internship information… and so on.
			- Second mover: VP Academic
			- Questions
				* VP Finance: There is one part that says, "WIMESSA will be held accountable by a majority vote of 50%+1% of the WIMESSA student body." Does that refer to actual 50+1% of people in WIMESSA or 50+1% of people voting in favour?

WIMESSA: Just people who vote.

* + - * + AHCSSA: I was just wondering if there was a Town Hall to propose the amendments?

WIMESSA: Yes. We held a Town Hall last semester and that's where we passed the amendment. So, that was on September 20th of last semester. It might be written as 2018 on the motion. Which would be wrong. It should be 2019. That's where we passed the amendments

* + - * No debate
			* Voting
				+ Motion passes
	1. Executive Officer Reports
		1. [President](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/President.docx)**[late]** [absent]
		2. VP Academic (1:04:04)
		3. VP Communications [absent]
		4. [VP External](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/VP-External.pdf) **[**absent] (1:05:18)
		5. VP Finance (1:05:46)
			+ Questions
				- CSAUS: What's the timeline on accepting other forms of payments (i.e. debit and credit) in SNAX?

VP Finance: I can't give you an exact timeline. I can just tell you it's being worked on and that it's a priority.

* + - * + HSA: Are the network cables [for debit payments] being installed in the OG SNAX location or the temporary one?

VP Finance: Network cables would be installed in the temporary location. For McGill, "temporary" means 2-3 years. Whoever replaces me [as VP Finance] can then take that on.

* + 1. [VP Internal](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/VP-Internal.pdf) (1:08:34)
			- Questions
				* AHCSSA: Thank you for taking care of the office things. I just wanted to ask if you could send an update once you know just so everyone knows we were displaced so, sad. Thanks.

VP Internal: I'm happy to do an update at the next Leg Council. I'll tell them or explain them. I'll talk to you directly about the offices and let you know if there's anything.

* + - * + MESS: I noticed that on the schedule for the Councils on March the 12th and 26th, those are all Thursdays. I was wondering if those are on purpose.

VP Internal: Yes, that's on purpose. For the month of March, Leacock 232 is booked for every single Wednesday. Thank you for bringing that up, because I want everyone to know.

* + 1. VP Services [absent] (1:11:16)
		2. VP Social [absent] (1:11:35)
	1. Reports of the Arts Representatives and Senators
		1. [Arts Representatives](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Arts-Representatives.pdf)**[late]** (1:13:13)
			+ Additions to report
				- Arts Representative Andrew: I have my office hours temporarily on Wednesdays from 10am to noon, but that will change, possibly, because of conferences. So, I'll let everyone know when my real ones are once I have them
			+ No questions
		2. Arts Senators
			+ Arts Senator Chloe Kemeni
			+ Arts Senator Henrique Mecabô (1:14:58)
				- Report

Nothing much is up. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to present something I have not prepared at all. The next Senate meeting, the first one of this year, is tomorrow. That's when they will finally address the big thing [that happened last Senate] where the Principal, who chairs Senate, interrupted a few of the student Senators and cut my mic, so we sent a lot of formal complaints and questions, and it'll be addressed. And thanks to the complaints, we might get the Chair to step down and give some power to the student Senators, so she'd have to act as a regular Senator.

* + - * + Questions

HSA: Why did she cut your mic?

Arts Senator Henrique: We had an open discussion on the internationalization of McGill, and their idea was for everyone to praise the university like "Oh we are so great for being so international!" But then the student Senators, who are usually the ones who engage the most on any item of the agenda, starting asking questions: "Well, if you wanted to increase percentage of international students, then you'd also have to increase the percentage of in-province students because of the Quebec government's requirement, then what does this mean for other provinces of Canada? Would McGill be disconnected from other provinces?" And they didn't like that we were asking that, so when I asked that for the second time, she cut off my mic. But I looked through the rules and there's no rule that allows the Chair to cut a Senator when they're speaking. But it's fine. We're kind of friends now, I went to her office and we discussed it. She gave me amazing chocolate cake. But it's still a question that the Secretary General will find it can be asked for the Chair to step down when the "regular" Senators are clearly stating an opinion. So that's an advancement for student Senators, I guess.

* 1. Reports of Departmental Associations
		1. [ASA](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/ASA.pdf)**[late]** (1:19:13)
			+ Report
				- Mixed media - ethnographic films in classes, photo essays, etc.
			+ Questions
				- HSA: The HSA received the exact same offer to co-host the Redpath Museum. They might have just like mass-emailed the departments

CSA: The CSA also received this offer. I think their liquor permit got denied, so they're trying to get it soon. That's the deal.

ASA: Yeah the liquor permit was brought up by the ASA President (currently Publications is sitting in for the President). Seems kind of exploitative and that there's issues with Redpath in general with exhibits and stuff. Interest project on the part of current acting President 'cause she's worked with Redpath and looking at grad school so it's people she knows and works with. If that makes it clearer as to why we chose to work with them

* + 1. [AGELF](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/AGELF.pdf) (1:23:18)
			- Report
				* We had our first meeting of the semester, and everyone showed up, so that was great. We are having a second hoodie/sweatshirt/tote bag/sticker sale to help with our finances. That will be going on for the next few weeks.
				* We also have been working on the Departmental Library Project that helps give our students in the department (or non-department students taking courses within the department) the option of borrowing mandatory books on the syllabus rather than buying them. So, we just finished that; there's a sign-up sheet - the mini library's located in the student lounge, which is in Arts 210. Currently working on modifying our Constitution - worked on it a lot over the break. Our first meeting on Monday was organized around that and we're probably gonna try to pass it in the next few weeks. Having our first 5-a-7 on January 30th, but we decided that after sending in report.
			- No questions
		2. [CSAUS](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/CSAUS.pdf) **[late]** (1:24:57)
			- Additions to report
				* Our pizza social [last semester] was not a seventh grade birthday party disaster like I said it would be in the Facebook [group]. It was an overwhelming success. We saw executives, like, the HAS representative there. We had some executives from RSUS come. The Recording Secretary made an appearance. It was an overall good time to be had. For those who missed it, we'll see you at the next one. It was the event of the century for sure.
			- No questions
		3. [WIMESSA](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/WIMESSA.docx)**[late]** (1:26:54)
			- No questions
		4. [RSUS](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/RSUS.pdf)**[late]** (1:27:47)
			- Additions to report
				* If anyone for whatever reason is interested in attending our meetings, they're on Mondays at 5:30 in Birks.
			- Questions
				* CSAUS: Gender neutral bathrooms in Birks

Third floor. It is accessible because we have an elevator. Single stall bathrooms.

* 1. Question Period (1:30:34)
		1. CSAUS: Will there will be pizza at the next Financial Management Committee meeting?
			+ VP Finance: Yes.

JSSA: Motion to Suspend the Rules to Add Late Motion (1:31:10) **| PASSED**

* 1. CSAUS: Second mover

Motion to Add a Statement to the 20 January Bill 21 Strike Support **| TABLED** (1:32:20)

* 1. RSUS: I just want to reflect that I very much agree with the JSSA. Again, I did not organize this whole thing. I'm very sorry. If I was in charge I would have hoped I would… if anyone is interested in getting involved please reach out to Adam Amsel. I wrote the original motion and I fully agree with what JSSA brought forward. I do want to put forward that I don't know if Adam consulted any Jewish groups at all. I just know he didn't consult the JSSA.
	2. HSA: That's just what I wanted to bring up. I signed this only because I was asked. I don't have in-depth knowledge to who he asked. What my understanding is that Adam said he had consulted a variety of groups. My concern is that if we send this statement out and Adam had consulted a Jewish group, we'd effectively be denying their status as a Jewish group by saying that he hadn't consulted any. That's the only concern I have to the wording of this proposal
	3. WIMESSA: Kind of adding to that, the concern is that we don't know if Adam consulted any other associations representing religious groups, so it's kind of tricky to apologize for what we don't know. So we need to be careful in how we kind of profile that.
	4. RSUS: Update from Adam: "I sent out three opportunities for consultation to Hillel, Chabad, and JVP." If that's the case, then organizing on the Jewish Sabbath sucks all around.
	5. CSAUS: Is the text available now? I didn't hear that in the original text.
	6. Arts Senator Henrique: This is the concern we've raised before. I think the apology is perfectly necessary. Last time we had a special email be sent out from the Legislative Council email. Is that what will happen this time, too?
		1. Speaker: Hopefully, Yoana should be sending out an email announcement that there is a GA it would be reasonable to have two sentences to the email.
	7. CSAUS: Would JSSA be amenable to having it go out in the original email that was gonna notify everyone of the strike?
		1. JSSA: Friendly amendment
		2. HSA: Adam wanted to make it clear that the intention was to have the General Assembly on the 15th and following those efforts to consult the Jewish groups and that was the plan. The circumstances made it so that the GA had to fall on the Jewish Sabbath. So it wasn't intentional.
	8. Adjournment (1:39:16)
		1. BASiC: Motion to Table and then Adjourn
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[Appendix B: WIMESSA CONSTITUTION Oct 2018](http://ausmcgill.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Appendix-B-WIMESSA-CONSTITUTION-Oct-2018.pdf)