



**Meeting Minutes of the Fall 2020 MSS General Assembly**

**2020.12.01**

**(1) Call to Order and Standing Rules**

Meeting called to order at 6:43 PM.

**(2) Land acknowledgement**

The MSS acknowledges that McGill University is on the traditional territory of the Kanien'kehà:ka, a place which has long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst nations.

**(3) Approval of the speaker**

*No objections to proposed officers of the GA.*

*Accepted nemo contra*

**(4) Approval of the Minutes**

*Accepted nemo contra*

**(5) Adoption of the Agenda**

*In-favour: 114*

*Against: 0*

*Abstain: 8*

***Agenda is adopted.***

**(6.1) Report of the Vice-President Finance, including a Presentation of the Budget and audited financial statement**

*066 - Motion to move in-camera*

*026 - Second*

*[Entered Confidential Session]*

*[Ended Confidential Session]*

**(7.1) Motion to Adopt the 2021-2024 MSS Strategic Plan - Motion pour adopter le Plan Stratégique du MSS 2021-2024**

215 - Just to define the strategic plan, the goal of the Strategic Plan is to help with continuity and longevity, given that there are new members joining the MSS every year. We create a strategic plan to help guide future councils with the work they should do. This year is a year to update the Strategic Plan. I want to quickly overview the previous Strategic Plan. [See 2021-2024 MSS Strategic Plan]

200 - Old strategic plan created last academic year and was supposed to be passed in winter GA 2020. This was cancelled. Thus now is being discussed at this GA. [attach document]

*146 - Motion to extend by 5 minutes*

*For: 91*

*Against: 20*

*Motion carries*



200 - Two parts of strategic plan: The first part was a focus group from MSS members of all four years. The second part is a survey to guide selection and directions to guide the strategic plan. Task force consulted VP Education and VP Wellness since most responses touched education and wellness.

Direction for anti racism was added this Fall. Link to the strategic plan is available publicly. Focus group held with GC to discuss this direction. National organizations were also consulted (e.g. BMSAC). [attach document for methodology]

**New Strategic Plan** (<https://www.mcgillmed.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/4.1-Strategic-Plan.dotx.pdf>)

Strategic direction #1: Optimizing transparency and communication with members.  
Strategic direction #2: Integrating campus Outaouais into the MSS.  
Strategic direction #3: Increase accessibility and sustainability of events and opportunities.  
Strategic direction #4: Improve and maintain student spaces.  
Strategic direction #5: Medical education advocacy.  
Strategic direction #6: Wellness advocacy.  
Strategic direction #7: Anti-racism advocacy.

Refer to the document for each direction's details.

#### Question Period

20 - Q: *For strategic direction #7, because the executive changes every year for the most part, how do you envision this being implemented because there are so many portfolios?*

200 - Right now we have a Gantt chart, created last spring by the anti-racism advocacy task force.

215 - Towards the end of the last academic year, Black medical students at McGill shared different tasks, and these were distributed among MSS members in positions that could advocate for them. This is passed down to future council members.

146 - Q: *How does MSS envision increasing diversity in the actual executive team?*

215 - It's two-fold. Firstly, it has been identified that there is a general lack of diversity in medicine. So the first step would be to increase diversity in the application process from the get-go to get more diversity in McGill medicine. Right now there is a policy to encourage students from diverse backgrounds to apply, but the specifics on how we will do that is not out yet.

#### Debate

25 - *Direction #7.3. The way it's phrased right now sounds pretty general. Can you tell us how you intend to carry this out specifically, and how do you plan on having the faculty make specific changes on this point?*

215 - The strategic plan is supposed to be more general, and the specific actions are left to the council of the upcoming years. It gives liberty for the upcoming councils to learn and adapt to challenges. Specifically to barriers, one of the things we're working on is that the



admin committee has committed itself to starting the Black Student Admissions Pathway (BSAP), which will hopefully address some of the barriers to accessing medicine.

146 I would like to ask about accountability and what it means to hold the MSS accountable for these overarching goals, given that there is a different council every year and hence different priorities?

26 - I used to be president of the MSS two years ago; it was not the end of a Strategic Plan year, but we conducted a mid-Strategic Plan review, and regularly (bi-yearly/yearly) there is a review of the Strategic Plan. For example, in a previous review, if a point was decided it was not relevant, and from within we have our own grading system (green, red, and yellow) to see if things are going well or not, to direct executive roles every year. The SP is taken extremely seriously every year by the council. I would ask for your comprehension and trust in your elected officials.

*Vote - adoption of the strategic plan*

*For: 96*

*Against: 1*

*Abstain: 17*

***Motion carries.***

**(7.2) Motion Regarding the Decentralisation of Health and Social Services - Motion concernant la décentralisation du système de santé et de services sociaux**

137 - I am moving this motion. The motion emerged from the recent development of the decentralization of the healthcare system. "Dresser le portrait de la COVID-19", what COVID has highlighted in the QC healthcare system. Prior legislation that has led us to the current structure of healthcare governance. Healthcare workers demanded a meeting with the minister of health for the decentralization of healthcare services. The decentralized structures (CISSS, CIUSSS) have become dangerous for patients and workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. The minister didn't meet with physicians and didn't comment on the open letter. The RQMDSS group was formed and advocated for the same thing. We would like the MSS would like to recognize that and stand with the healthcare workers for the decentralization of healthcare and its governance.

*146 - Motion to extend by 5 minutes.*

*025 - Seconded.*

*For: 86*

*Against: 22*

*Motion carries*

137 - The timeline is that in 2005 the CLSCs, CHSLDs, and centres hospitaliers were fused administratively by Law 25 into CSSS. In 2015, Law 10 fused CSSS with other health/social services, including centres de readaptation/jeunesse/naissance, forming CI(U)SSS.



At the time in 2015, the FMSQ, CMQ, CSN, opposed the adoption of Law 10, citing the concentration of power in the hands of the minister and decision making by the boards of CI(U)SSS. Essentially, the minister of health has the authority to intervene in the structure in the boards of directors of the CISSS and the CIUSSS. Since the adoption of these laws, health ministers have been uniquely physicians - criticized for being hospital-centred, not allowing smaller organizations to exist in these centralized administrative councils and react to their local community as they see fit. The boards of directors, when they were fused, chased away a lot of smaller establishments from the new boards of directors.

#### Question Period

*Q: 122 - I was wondering if you could explain the relevance of the MSS to this motion and their position on the decentralization and the impact that it could have for the MSS?*

137 - If we take this position as the MSS, it also sets a precedent regarding our future political communications and public press releases. Also, this will perhaps be the only way for the MSS to take this position in the future if a motion later passes regarding public motions by the MSS. This is an act of solidarity with physicians and other healthcare workers who have made this request and are being ignored by the government. As people who will join the ranks, it is important that we position ourselves on these things. It can send a message to political leaders and allows larger federations like the FMEQ and CFMS to take similar positions.

217 - I would like to stress the fact that the opinions of doctors and medical students are vocal and have a weight in the eyes of the public. It is in the canmeds role to use our voices in public eyes and to have an important view and position on the matter.

*Q: 109 - I was wondering why these laws were put into place in the first place? What do they facilitate and on what level?*

137 - They are part of the new gestion public reform to cut costs, increase savings and improve quality by taking the stance that if we treat patients like clients, they will be more satisfied, quality will improve and costs will decrease.

#### Debate

017 - J'aimerais simplement rappeler que la position a été amenée entre autres par les médecins pour le régime public. On fait simplement se joindre à un mouvement qui est déjà en marche, et on incite les gens à favoriser les soins de la population.

146 - I want to speak in favor of this and express that the sentiment behind the movement is one to be in favour of, we'd like to see more of it moving forward.

217 - I would like to speak in favour of this motion because in addition to all that was presented, there is actually a body of evidence in the literature supporting local governance as compared to centralized governance in many countries around the world.



Vote

For: 100

Against: 1

Abstain: 18

**Motion carries.**

**(7.3) Motion to Mandate an MSS Position on the Standardization of CaRMS Reference Letters — Motion pour mandater une prise de position sur la standardisation des lettres de référence CaRMS**

026 - To give background, there are some changes to the carms process with the pandemic. Over the last few months, the class president for 2021 has been on multiple round tables to speak about this. Use standardized letters of reference, not applied to 2021. Family medicine group decided to use a standardized letter, but it has been withdrawn. The FMEQ recently adopted to go completely against the use of these reference letters as application criteria, but it seems unlikely that this discussion will move forward. Based on meetings with other student groups (ex. AFMC), it seems more likely for 2022 onward, things will move towards having standardized letters for all. It is a big debate, for and against. If you're interested you can campaign for or against, and we can take an official position on it, before the 2021 CFMS Spring meeting. It is easier to have something backed up by student opinion. The General Council can run either campaign. It is best before the 2021 CFMS spring meeting, so we should have a position before then.

039 - Even though the discussions are advancing and moving forward at the AFMC level, it would nice for the MSS to have a stance on this. If this general assembly could take a formal position it could really help us. It can help to take a clear position about all of our CaRMS cycles.

Question Period

223 - Q: *Just a question, what would the format of the standardized letter be?*

026 - Something that hasn't been completely figured out yet. Fam med has put a lot of checkboxes, *is this person excellent, very good, etc.* There's a portion for narrative comments, some yes or no comments, "have you worked with them enough to assess/give a recommendation?".

137 - Q: *Pourquoi on mandate que le conseil general doit mener une campagne pour ou contre, est-ce qu'il y a un precedent?*

026 - Oui alors en fait techniquement si le MSS fait un référendum et la campagne finit par un contre, y'aura pas de référendum, mais on pense que c'est un enjeu assez important pour informer les étudiants. C'est une histoire similaire aux électives 4 qu'on avait eu il y a deux ans. On veut s'assurer que ça va être une décision prise consciemment pour et avec tout le monde.



039- [yeah i'm getting this from the recording] Si je peux ajouter, on a déjà commencé à recenser et à prendre des arguments pour développer les campagnes pour et contre. On veut vraiment que le corps étudiant puisse prendre une décision éclairée.

### Debate

75 - I want to speak in favor of the motion. Minimal reason not to move forward, it promotes a democratic process and allows us to have discussions about it. I invite everybody to vote for this and to have subsequent conversations about it.

025 - Hi, so I also would like to speak in favor of this motion, I think that when we're advocating for students' opinion, and values about CaRMS it's important to actually know students' opinion. Now, more of a question, considering that FMEQ and CFMS have positioned themselves will the MSS take position and will this position be able to steer away from the position of the FMEQ?

215 - I just wanted to speak about that. The FMEQ's recent position to abolish reference letters has been withdrawn. This furthers the need to have a structured reference letter. The need for us to know what our students would like is very important

017 - Maybe just to clarify what has been said by Dennis. On the FMEQ, they have created a task force mandated to work on these standardized letters of reference. That's why the MSS needs a position sooner rather than later. If you want or not standardized letters.

146 - yea i think that something that is really important when we're talking about the reference letter, I'd like this to be integrated with the recent anti racism mandate bc we know the reference letters are not ideal for individuals who are underrepresented in medicine. I'd like to see this integrated in the strategic plan as well.

*Vote:*

*For: 92*

*Against: 8*

*Abstain: 14*

***Motion carries.***

### **(7.4) Motion to Adopt the Involvement Restriction Policy**

013 - Thank you Mr. Speaker. The involvement restriction policy (IRP) moves to make events safer spaces, including SSMU and undergraduate faculties. How it works is that claimants can report incidents through anonymous forms, which will be investigated by faculty committees (point of information: faculty committees are student committees). There's an investigation that undergoes, but this will not replace the avenues already in place (ex. SACMSS, OSVRSE, gendered violence police reports). It aims to complement these existing channels. The investigator knows the identity of the claimant and the accused. This policy doesn't determine if the person accused is guilty, looking if restricting the accused would make the spaces safer. [missing stuff here].





The faculty of medicine is a small faculty, so the investigation committee would know both individuals. We would use other faculties to avoid conflicts of interest.

*President uses constitutional powers to allow guest speakers (SSMU anti-violence coordinators (SSMU AVC) and previous MSS SSMU Rep) to answer questions*

Question Period

*146 - Q: Could you explain the conflict of interest piece that you have in there?*

013 - So essentially with larger faculties like engineering with 6000 students, the likelihood of the committee knowing the people claiming or responding is unlikely. With the MSS and faculty of 800 we see each other a lot with the same courses so likely that faculty members will know people making the complaints quite well. If people know respondents or complainants well, this may lead to a conflict of interest and bias in the outcome of decisions. To solve this, the MSS committee will decide if this complaint falls under the IRP. If it does it will be sent to another Faculty committee. If there is an appeal another faculty committee will also deal with it to avoid conflict of interest.

*099 - Q: My question is the information acquired from this policy moving forward. How do we ensure that this information doesn't impact the faculty of medicine any further?*

013 - Sure, as I explained previously, all the complaints will be handled internally, and faculty committees must sign a non-disclosure form, to make sure they don't release confidential information. As for the restricted policy list and the people on it, only the anti-violence coords from SSMU have access to this list. We would provide student IDs and these two would cross-check it, and if any students are on this restricted list we would work with the IDs to identify them, as to minimize and reduce the amount of people exposed to that restrictive list.

SSMU AVC - All documents are kept confidential.

*Motion to extend by 5 minutes*

*For: 84*

*Against: 17*

*Motion carries.*

*173 - Q: I had a question to clarify the consequences for the perpetrator of the reported acts. If I understand correctly, they would be banned from MSS events? Correct me if wrong. How would you ensure this while we are doing online events? It is easy for people to get Zoom links. Would this policy be implemented for online events?*

013 - I will answer part of this question then yield my time to Andrew Dixon. Different types of policy: some restrictions would be with activities with alcohol - frosh and internos, while others are more global. So the committee could decide what type of events. Banning people from career promotions or interest groups events may not be positive for their careers, so the faculty committee would discuss what is bannable or not.



070 - Just to add a couple points raised by Benson. Spectrum of reactions from the policy. Banning someone from events is seen as the most extreme form of the policy. Very limited number of cases where it's used. Usually more training like sensitivity training. For online events, there is a provision to cover online events. For the actual implementation of this, we would still need to work out the details but it is in the IRP to reduce access to these events if the perpetrators could make this event unsafe.

SSMU AVC - nothing to add

*122 - Q: I understand the process is different from other faculties. How would the investigation be conducted and who would decide about the nature of the event?*

SSMU AVC - So the investigation is done by the Faculty committee, team of 4-6 members and they would do things such as gathering evidence, doing interviews, gathering witness statements, to determine if the event took place and confirm if the complaint is warranted, then determine steps to take. Investigators are trained prior to investigations

*223- Q: Does the IRP ban extend across the entire university career or does it renew every year?*

013 - It stays with them.

SSMU AVC: The scope of the ban - including length of the ban - is determined by the investigating committee: could be for one year or 4.

*146 - Q: My question is regarding confidentiality. This procedure is adopted by other faculties, it isn't new. There is a lawsuit by someone labelled through this - immediately their name was released, speaking to the lack of confidentiality. Considering we're training to be doctors, it is a career-ending move if names are leaked. NDAs are good in concept but if their name is leaked it does nothing for them. It has large consequences on it. I support supporting victims, but we have to look carefully before we implement something that parallels the law.*

070 - Thank you for the question, definitely an important one that has been raised with the two articles in the Gazette and Le Devoir.

1. It is important to clarify that this policy does not move on guilt. The water gets muddy but the scope of the policy is very limited. It does not state that someone is guilty of a crime. It states that the presence of the person could lead to the environment being unsafe.
2. Lawsuit is interesting and unique because:
  - a. There is a loss of property insofar as a loss of a job for the person; he lost the position of SSMU exec and this could happen in our case as well but it's a particularity.
  - b. I wanted to stress the wording of the NDA and how it's been improved. In this case in the situation stated by Le Devoir we don't know where the info came out, but it's possible that it was the survivor of the case. This is challenging because you don't want to stop the survivor from expressing themselves but





we can assure that the actual ruling remains confidential. Still working on the wording but it is important to keep that in mind.

Last thing to add: there is always a possibility of getting a 2nd opinion. As it said in the article in this case, from a lawyer. In this case the lawyer overturned the ruling of the IRP. In her opinion there was no evidence that substantiated the complaint, which led to a mediatic circus. Important elements that need to be modified from the original policy are being scrutinized and I want to stress this for our members.

SSMU AVC - I think that there are concerns. I understand why they are being raised. The current case in the media is not a reflection of how cases typically go. It is not a reflection of the current policy, which took place in the administration before it was revised. To my knowledge, at no point has information been shared publicly by the EUS. This case didn't arise due to a breach of confidentiality due to members in the confidentiality in the committee. The policy does take confidentiality concerns into consideration. With any policy that relates to conduct or improper behaviour, there are people who can share information when they aren't allowed to, which is a risk of having policies like that. It is important to acknowledge the risks and we have to ensure confidentiality. I don't think this policy has an outsized risk of sharing confidential, damaging information compared to other university policies.

*070 - Motion to extend by 5 minutes*

*213 - seconded*

*For: 66*

*Against: 36*

*Motion carries.*

*213 - Q: My question is with regards to implementation and enforcement. Benson described if someone is found on the list, it will be forwarded to VP Social. Who ensures that the banned person isn't at the events? Will this place that student in harm's way?*

013 - These are issues that we have discussed. In the spirit of the IRP, only the students' ID numbers are exchanged. Only one person in charge of the event would have access to this list and liaise with MSS members. So I believe that it is up to the faculty committee to decide on that. I think this is more of a collective decision, the onus of the decision should not be on one member.

SSMU AVC - The list is provided to the most limited number of people to ensure confidentiality, but it can be provided to event organizers to enforce the restriction at the event. This is how it would be implemented through the event organizers. The restrictions and harm aren't necessarily situations that we would need to put event organizers in risk of harm's way. Depending on the enforcement and type of event (ticketed), someone on the list wouldn't have the availability to go using a ticket and their registration would be removed. Other events might be more complicated, and this still has to be determined.



146 - So I understand that the idea behind the ruling is not to determine a verdict about if the accused is guilty. But since it's a complement to channels like SACOMSS, I think it would be clear of what the undercurrent of the ruling would mean. It is difficult to rule that somebody cannot be at an event without ruling on their guilt, so how do we prevent it from being a slippery slope?

SSMU AVC: Clarify what you mean by slippery slope?

146 - Q: So basically while there might be categories of offenses that could be put in place by the committee that is ruling this IRP, what is preventing the people making the ruling to wiggle it a bit wider? What is the oversight? This is based on a colloquial ruling that is otherwise trained, in parallel with the realm of legal ruling. It is a pseudo-ruling, but working in the same framework. So I don't understand how we can separate the two: a ruling is a ruling. If somebody cannot access an event this person was not deemed innocent of anything.

SSMU AVC - This policy doesn't only respond to sexual and gender violence, but other forms of harassment, improper conduct, and inappropriate behaviour. Its relationship to law can be conceptualized in that there is a finding of founded violation of standards of behaviour. We can see this in student policies and McGill policies, and they aren't legal processes - they share processes of the law, but they aren't the law. The standards are not legal standards, and our definitions don't align with the criminal code. It includes things that may not be crimes or align in the same way, i.e. cheating on a test. We are not working in a legal framework - the consequences are not those seen in a legal setting. The findings of violations don't have the same findings as being in a court. The legal structures we have in place don't respond to specific community issues. We have to build capacity on what is fair - there has been an expansion in committees having conduct policies, which are complicated procedures. We need to have the training to conduct this in a fair and responsible manner, and this is something that needs to be worked on. You have to decide if this is a model you want to employ - if you don't, you don't have the consequences that result from it. There can be an external conductor - the complexity of it would be difficult to handle, in which cases we can contract it out to external investigators.

146 - Motion to extend by 2 minutes

Seconded

For:48

Against: 56

Motion fails

### Debate

051 - I was wondering if someone could clarify how the alleged perpetrator is involved in the investigation and if they can "justify" what happened?

114 - Hi everyone thank you very much I would like to speak in favor of this motion. I think many of the questions were focused against the consequences against the perpetrator, but it is important to bring our focus back on the victims. This includes lifelong post traumatic



stress. In my opinion, if you want to avoid the consequences of sexual assault, then don't commit sexual assault on someone. Evidence shows very few people lie about sexual assault. It is a common myth that victims lie. I would just like to say I think it's really important as future healthcare professionals to understand the cost that comes with being a victim. With that I'd like to motion to amend the term victim to survivor on the first page.

114 - Motion to amend "victim" to "survivor"

213 - Seconded.

Entering debate on proposed amendment

39 - Point of info: There are other instances where the term "victims" is used, but it's in the name of the sexual assault at the university, so I don't think that this can be amended.

*Amendment completed on the screen.*

013 - I would like to apologize for not using survivor-positive language, and I would like to say this is a friendly amendment.

*Vote on amendment*

*For: 95*

*Against: 4*

*Amendment is adopted. Motion amended.*

146 - I want to speak in favour of survivors of assault, but against this specific motion. I also want to thank the AVCs for coming to explain, as their explanations were very comprehensive. In discussing that these are not specific legal proceedings, yet we are still ruling on such things, I do not want to undermine survivorship, but by making a SUBSTITUTE process, we are not serving them well. We should instead advocate for better legal systems to better serve these populations. [double check recording]

13 - Thank you Mr Speaker. I'd like to go back and address the question by 51. The person who is responding to the complaint. I'd like to yield the rest to the AVCs.

SSMU AVC - I think this is a good question, part of the process is called procedural fairness. This basically means all members have the right to a fair process (Respond, know what is happening, have a fair decision). Thus it is very much a fair process.

039 - I would like to speak in favour of this motion. I understand as future healthcare professionals we should encourage other measures of support, and I do not believe this motion prevents us from taking positions on other points of advocacy in the legal system. I would also add that this motion acts as a form of prevention, whereas there is currently no policy, so this can potentially act as a form of deterrent [check recording]

111- Hi, I also want to speak in favour of this motion and I guess to address the previously made comment. I do think this is a concrete way to take the burden off the survivor. I think



that normally the decision is purely out on the person who experienced harm to go or not go to an event. I also think, I know this was said over and over, as we all know, a lot of sexual assault is not reported and even less than that, it's really difficult to prove those kinds of thing. Thus to come up with a system where we preserve confidentiality but also prioritize the people who experienced harm is a really good thing.

075 - I also speak in favour of this motion. We've been working on this for a year now and a lot of things have come forth to solidify it. That being said, one of my concerns is the legitimacy of the decision being made and the competency of the people carrying it out. I would like to propose an amendment to the motion; With regards to having a lawyer review the decision, I think this adds some rigor to the process.

075 - *Request to amend the motion: require a subsequent review by a lawyer to confirm/ratify the decision.*

070 - *Second*

#### Entering debate on proposed amendment

SSMU AVC - Point of information: I hope I used that in the correct fashion. I would like to clarify, to me, this resolution would require the amendment of the policy. While faculties can have differences from the all-faculty IRP, they cannot conflict directly with the all-faculty IRP. This ensures a degree of uniformity to the procedures and sharing of information. I see this as a substantial change to the policy put in place. I don't think we will be able to amend the policy in this way.

President of the Assembly - the GA of the MSS still has the authority to enact this amendment if they so desire. Whether or not it stops the IRP from being adopted then becomes an MSS problem.

075 - So there are many reasons why such an amendment is important, I think either way there can be a call to a lawyer for an external review. As we saw in the articles, it created friction after the deed was done, but having a legitimacy done throughout the policy would allow it to not fall through a pitfall. Now, the other concern that comes out of this, is that there is a cost of having a lawyer for every decision that comes out of the IRP. There's currently the Engineering and Arts Faculties that have an IRP (I forgot the other faculties). There have been huge costs to having lawyers added to the process. This allows us to have this extra step without a big burden. Training students would allow the process to be proper, and again, I'm one of the medical students that has been working to push this process through. I want the process to survive and be protected against criticism. I think if it has this extra process, it would solidify it.

114 - I would like to speak against this amendment. I think it defeats the entire purpose of the IRP. In my many years of experience working with survivors, many wish to pursue a non-legal route, because at the end of the day, that's what they want. I think having a lawyer involved just prolongs the process and creates a greater burden on the survivor. Our role is to join the policy or not and not to amend it. It is about peers protecting peers, and a lawyer



should only be sought outside one's expertise. At the end of the day, I think this is the most protective policy.

*006 - Motion to extend time by 5 minutes*

*146 - Seconded*

*For: 63*

*Against: 38*

*Motion carries.*

070 - This is a very complicated policy, and I think we're using language that can be very scary, in terms of getting lawyers involved and things like that. I actually speak in favour of the amendment and I'll explain my logic: The lawyer is not ruling on the legality of the act of the crime that was committed. The lawyer's role in this is to make sure that the policy, as written, is substantive and respected in its process. So it gives a seal of approval that the process carried out by the students is good. I know it adds a layer of complication with respect to the IRP as a whole, but I am in favour of the GA voting for or against the amendment and then having the MSS/SSMU iron out the kinks in the future as needed.

217 - I would like to speak against this amendment. I do not think adding a legal process adds to the legitimacy. If a legal element is needed in subsequent years, the SSMU or MSS can propose an amendment to the whole policy at that time. Otherwise the policy will never move forward.

136 - So speaking only on this amendment, I speak in support of this amendment. It is important that nevertheless there will be liability on the people making this decision. Knowing that someone who has an understanding there's protection for students who will be making this decision. I support this.

025 - I am a bit confused as to what we're debating. At the end of the day when the decision is made, any individual is free to seek legal advice, whether or not it's on a motion. Why are we debating this?

122 - I'd like to speak against this amendment. The fees of a lawyer are not minimal. And additionally for the lawyer to give a decision, they would have to be involved from the beginning. The amendment would ask for a lawyer to be involved, which is complicated. We must consider the monetary burden and the logistical problem for a lawyer to be involved.

*013 - Motion to extend time by 5 minutes*

*222 - Seconded*

*For: 41*

*Against: 64*

*Motion fails.*





**MEDICAL STUDENTS' SOCIETY** of McGill University  
**L'ASSOCIATION des ÉTUDIANT(E)S en MÉDECINE** de l'Université McGill

*Vote on the amendment to include a lawyer to ratify the decision if the event is determined to create an unsafe environment.*

*For: 45*

*Against: 50*

*017 - point de privilège pour traduction.*

*Amendment is not adopted.*

Return to main debate on the motion

*025 - Motion to call the question*

*217 - Seconded*

*006 - Point of information - how much time is left?*

*2 minutes*

*Speaker's list exhausted, call for question not recognized, proceeding to vote.*

*Vote on the motion*

*For: 70*

*Against: 31*

*Abstain: 18*

***Motion carries.***

**(7.5) Résolution visant à approuver les positions de la FMEQ dans le cadre de la Journée d'action politique - Motion to Endorse the FMEQ Positions for the Provincial Lobby Day**

017 - This is a short motion. Every year the FMEQ organizes the Journée d'action politique (JAP). The goal of this day is to defend/advocate two different briefs; one on public health and one on medical education/medical student condition. Two subjects this year to be presented: telemedicine and seniors health, donc télémédecine et santé des aînés. These are made to be presented to elected officials at the National Assembly of Quebec. These two subjects were selected because of the momentum with the COVID-19 pandemic. According to FMEQ bylaws we need GA approval to move forward with the writing of these two briefs.. I don't have anything to add; it is self-explanatory; you can read the motion and if you have questions please ask now.

*Point of parliamentary inquiry - what is required for quorum?*

*10% of members in addition to two members of each cohort.*

Question Period

*213 - How were these topics selected? Was there a referendum where students asked?*

017 - 2 subjects were selected by 4 student associations by the general council of the FMEQ in September. Each council had to present 2 subjects that they wanted the FMEQ to



advocate for. The MSS brought 2 subjects as well as other universities (Université de Laval, Université de Sherbrooke, Université de Montréal), and these two subjects were selected.

#### Debate

213 - Question to the MSS. How are the two topics presented to the MSS selected?

17 - Thank you for the question. I made a murmur post and FB post asking students to send suggestions and to defend those suggestions to the FMEQ. Based on the suggestions, the MSS presented these to the FMEQ. These suggestions were not chosen but the 2 subjects were chosen by the MSS delegation at the first FMEQ GC, and anyone had the right to participate in this delegation as it was advertised.

213 - I understand now how this was chosen at the level of the MSS and faculty. How is this chosen at the level of FMEQ?

17 - Yes, there was a vote. So all subjects were presented and the MSS had to vote on 2 subjects and the subjects you see are the ones that were voted for and approved by the MSS delegation

#### *Vote on the motion*

*For: 79*

*Against: 6*

*Abstain: 14*

#### ***Motion carries.***

#### **(7.6) Motion to Implement the MSS Policy on General Council Positions and Press Releases - Motion visant l'implantation de la Politique de la MSS sur les prises de position par le Conseil général et les communiqués de presse**

137 - Thank you Mr. Speaker. If I could summarize this motion in 3 minutes I would say that in the past year there were many instances that the General Council of the MSS had asked whether it should position itself on issues that are of public debate and what that position should be and how it could find out what the opinion of its members are on these issues. There is currently no formal process on this. This year, there was a lot of public debate on issues including BLM and Justice for Joyce and hence a lot of pressure for the GC to take a position rapidly on behalf of the MSS. The only way for the MSS GC to decide whether a position should be taken would be to look at previous decisions by GA referenda and how the precedence set could inform current decisions. For this reason, and for interest in having more democratic involvement amongst all MSS members, a survey was carried out in Summer 2020/Fall 2020 to ask members about these issues. It is part of appendix 1 of this motion in english and french. There were different categories of issues which MSS should always position itself on either via formal methods like a GA or referendum or [recording] and from these categories a policy emerged and this policy is mentioned in Appendix 2 and at this time.



Question Period

146 - Thank you for putting this forward. Where it says trial for 12 months, can you confirm what measures you will take after the 12 months to determine if you want to use this method; will it be throughout the 12 months or at the end?

137 - Absolutely, this is a policy that was drafted by the GAAC in collaboration with the GC of the MSS. Its appropriateness was evaluated by the GC core elected members, who are members elected by the MSS. The reason I mention this is because in 12 months this advocacy offer will be over and it will be the responsibility of the next person to implement this policy and it is in the motion that by the end of the 12 months the question is brought up again and whether this policy should be adopted and if it should be brought up in the same form or in a moderated form using the experience of the GC in that 12 months. And by also using the same survey that was done last April to inform the policy.

006 - Thank you for presenting the motion. It is very well written. Regarding the motion append 2, section 3, guidelines clause 4: in what way would the issue be deemed to be directly related to previous motions and deemed by whom?

137 - There are 10 seconds remaining and I will answer this question. I want the General Assembly to know that this is on page 11. This would be deemed by the GC for instance tonight we voted on an MSS position on the decentralization of the health care system to take a position like this motion. It was deemed that the GC would be responsible for taking care of the press release of this motion.

Debate

No debate.

Vote on the Motion

For: 73

Against: 4

Abstain: 21

**Motion carries.**

**(7.7) Motion to Implement MSS Guidelines for Sustainable Events - Motion visant l'implantation de Lignes directrices en matière de durabilité pour les événements organisés par la MSS**

137 - I am once again presenting a motion to the floor. Essentially this motion builds on a motion from the previous GA one year ago, whereby we implemented the guidelines for sustainable vents in a trial period which was supposed to last 6 months and brought to the subsequent GA. In these guidelines for sustainable events we want to ensure that events that are hosted in the purview of the MSS respect basic levels of sustainability that are widely adopted by McGill's office of sustainability. Essentially we want to implement these guidelines permanently and I would add that there were small changes following the trial period to reflect the new online situation. We added additional resources: restaurants that



could be used to provide food for events and we added questions to reflect the situation, available in Appendix II I believe.

If we go to Appendix II, this is the checklist that clubs will fill when organizing such events. The MSS wants to implement guidelines for sustainable events outlined in Appendix I. It will be added to the current equity form and reflect changes that were brought about to reflect the online situation. All people working under the MSS in organizing events are bound by these guidelines. For funding, clubs that do not follow these guidelines in a reasonable way will have a 10% penalty of their yearly funding and those clubs will be identified using one of 2 criteria. Either the bottom 20% of clubs in terms of scores on the sustainable events checklist, or clubs scoring below 90%. Will choose the option that impacts the fewest clubs.

#### Question Period

106 - *We were supposed to have representatives from all clubs. Do we have a plan for where that 10% of club funds will go? Into more sustainable measures? Will the funding be kept aside?*

137 - Yes, so this is specified in a subsequent clause. Essentially, any money set aside will be progressively used to implement sustainability initiatives that the MSS GC deems necessary for clubs and committees to further respect the guidelines. For instance, plastic plates being thrown out: the MSS could deem that re-usable plates should be used. If not used, it will be used at the end of the year to purchase carbon offsets to compensate for the clubs who did not respect the guidelines.

#### Debate

172 - I would like to move to amend the motion. Currently, it is suggested that all food provided by the MSS is vegetarian. I would like to amend by saying all MSS food provided is vegan.

177 - Seconded

#### Entering debate on proposed amendment

172 - In terms of sustainability, the goals of these guidelines is to make those events more sustainable. Dairy products have been shown by evidence to be detrimental to the environment. There are many plant-based options around campus. It is also simpler because it fits with more dietary restrictions: lactose intolerance, kosher for instance.

146 - I think that the idea of pushing this to be vegan is interesting, but we have to consider allergies. Many of these restaurants providing vegan options deal with tree nuts and nuts, and they can't assure that there isn't cross contamination. I think saying vegan food only does come with complications.

104 - Just a point to consider when we will vote on this amendment. I was VP Social last year and I can tell that when you organize big events such as Grad Ball or Internos, options offered by venues are not as sustainable as we would like them to be. It was very difficult to find vegetarian options last year, so it would really restrain the possibilities of venues if we



went for vegan options only. Also, just to underline that it's not true that vegan options are all kosher.

229 - I wrote the guidelines last year. We kept vegetarian and not vegan because we spoke to the people who organized events, wanted to keep it realistic. If you modify this part of the guidelines, you would have to look to the addition to the form to be filled out. It seems extreme to be funding to be taken away from clubs because their food isn't vegan. Although there are a lot more plant-based options, vegetarian options like Boustan or pizza with just cheese are still cheaper and good for clubs with a tight budget.

137 - I just wanted to say that I think providing only vegan food would be ideal in terms of sustainability but I understand the concerns that I have been raised for money and allergies. Clubs would still have the option to purchase vegetarian/vegan food with the initial idea.

*146 - Motion to extend debate by 1 minute*

*137 - Seconded*

*Favour: 56*

*Against: 42*

*Motion carries.*

146 - I just wanted to confirm the amendment for vegan food. Would there be an exception for students that would need a different diet? For Kosher, or nut allergies for instance. Just wanting to know how it would be managed for these students.

172 - I wasn't involved in writing the guidelines. Moving from vegetarian to vegan wouldn't be a big step - you're removing dairy and eggs. If there are exceptions to vegetarian options, they should be tolerated.

*137 - Motion to extend by 3 minutes*

*172 - Seconded*

*For: 21*

*Against: 69*

*Motion fails.*

*Vote on amendment:*

*For 31*

*Against: 75*

*Amendment is not adopted.*

Return to main debate on the motion

*Vote on the motion*

*For: 78*

*Against: 12*

*Abstain: 14*

***Motion carries.***





**(7.8) Motion to Include the Role of Sustainability Representative in the VP Global Health Junior Position**

209 - To give a little context, there is increased interest in terms of environment and planetary health at the levels of MSS, IFMSA, and CFMS. The CFMS is transitioning into nationally-focused projects to local-focused projects and has created a sustainability network this year in partnership with IFMSA. We are looking for a leadership role in terms of sustainability and to carry out planetary health projects in the future. VP Global Health Jr is the only position that starts its mandate in September, and is often a Med-1, so it is difficult to integrate and to have a clear direction. So it is ideal to have a clear mandate that is ready to start in September and carry it throughout the year. If this motion is passed, the MSS formally endorses that an elected student is in the leadership role for sustainability and planetary health.

Question Period

No questions.

Debate

073 - Hi thank you so much. I wanted to endorse this proposal. I think it's very important that at McGill we have a local representative for planetary health and also translate national efforts back into McGill. I really encourage everyone to listen and vote in favour for this proposal.

*Vote on the motion:*

*For: 92*

*Against: 2*

*Abstain: 10*

**Motion carries.**

**(8) Question Period**

13 - question for VP socials: *What are you planning for the next few months?*

210 - Just a general note, we are currently brainstorming a few ideas for the next few months. We are also cautious because of the evolving restrictions that are changing very often. We are considering pushing events to spring or summer to take advantage of throwing events outdoors.

*[Resumed Confidential Session]*

*[Exited Confidential Session]*



**(9) Report of the Executive Council**

[Presented from:

<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1CwcT1N6W76uvLRkEDC7F4xL1B30GmBNr/edit#slide=id.p1>]

013 - Motion to extend by UP TO 1500 seconds

137 - Seconded

For: 72

Against: 27

Motion carries.

[Presentation continues]

Question Period

No questions.

**(10) Adjournment**

026 - Motion to adjourn

006 - Seconded

Vote for adjournment

For: 104

Against: 8

**The 2020 Fall General Assembly of the MSS is adjourned at 10:17 PM.**