



Concordia Student Union - Council of Representatives  
CSU Special Council Meeting  
Wednesday, August 26, 2020  
Via Zoom, 18h30

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

The chairperson calls the meeting to order at **18h32**.

---

**We would like to begin by acknowledging that Concordia University is located on unceded Indigenous lands. The Kanien'kehá:ka Nation is recognized as the custodians of the lands and waters on which we gather today. TiohEá:ke/Montreal is historically known as a gathering place for many First Nations. Today, it is home to a diverse population of Indigenous and other peoples. We respect the continued connections with the past, present, and future in our ongoing relationships with Indigenous and other peoples within the Montreal community.**

---

## 2. ROLL CALL

Council Chairperson: Caitlin Robinson  
Council Minutes Keeper: Michelle Lam

**Executives present for the meeting were:** Isaiah Joyner (General Coordinator), Sarah Mazhero (Academic & Advocacy Coordinator), Daniel Amico (Internal Affairs Coordinator), Manuella Simo (Sustainability Coordinator), Holly Mark-Hilton (Finance Coordinator), Eduardo Malorni (Student Life Coordinator), Malcolm Asselin (Loyola Coordinator), Victoria Pesce (External Affairs & Mobilization Coordinator)

**Councilors present for the meeting were:** Tzvi Hersh Filler (Gina Cody School of Engineering), Anais Gagnon (Gina Cody School of Engineering), Paige Beaulieu (Arts & Science), Shaun Sederoff (Arts & Science), Christopher Vaccarella (Arts & Science), Mathew Kaminski (John Molson School of Business), Ahmadou Sakho (Arts & Science), Lauren Perozek (John Molson School of Business), Howard Issley (John Molson School of Business), Matthew Benzrihem (Arts & Science), S Shivaane (Arts & Science), Sarah Bubenheimer (Arts & Science), Danielle Vandolder Beaudin (John Molson School of Business), Christopher

Kalafatidis (Arts & Science), , James Hanna (Gina Cody School of Engineering), , Diana Lukic (Fine Arts), Jeremy Deneault (John Molson School of Business), Harrison Kirshner (John Molson School of Business), Arieh Barak (Independent), Desiree Blizzard (Gina Cody School of Engineering), Margot Berner (Arts & Science), Chelsea Okankwu (John Molson School of Business), Marlena Valenta (Arts & Science), Zachary Williams (Independent),

**Councilors absent for the meeting were:** Natalia Whiteley (Gina Cody School of Engineering), Roman Zelensky (Arts & Science), Jarrad Haas (Fine Arts), Yasmine Yahiaoui (Arts & Science)

### **3. Anti-Holocaust Denial**

**Christopher Jesus Vaccarella** presents the following motion. Seconded by **Harrison Kirshner**. Motion passes.

*WHEREAS* Antisemitic sentiments and culture are present at Concordia University.

*WHEREAS* Holocaust denial is on the rise, and an issue present at Concordia University.

*WHEREAS* Holocaust denial and antisemitism goes against the fundamental mandate of the CSU and the University as an institute for learning

*WHEREAS* Holocaust denial is harmful to LGBTQ+ students, Romani students, Jewish students, and all other groups that were targeted and exterminated during the Holocaust.

*WHEREAS* the CSU was formed to protect and advocate for and protect the interests of students.

*WHEREAS* the CSU bylaws -under section 6.3 “Tasks and Powers” of council, section f)- state that council may “Enact, amend or repeal positions that direct the Union’s political orientations and representation.”

*WHEREAS* in section 2.1 the bylaws state that the objects of the student union are:

- “a. To form a representative Student Union to promote the educational, political, social, recreational and cultural interests of its members;
- ...To co-operate with other organizations having similar interests in promoting student activities and interests;
- ...To consider and support activities which enhance the quality of life for students of Concordia University;
- ...To represent the positions of its membership;
- ...To increase awareness, to educate and to mobilize with a view to promote the quality of the environment and of life, both with regard to the student population and the public in general, the whole subject to the Act Respecting Private Education;
- ...To be the representative of the undergraduate students of Concordia n. University pursuant to the accreditation granted to the Student Union pursuant to the Act Respecting the Accreditation and Financing of Students' Associations.”

*WHEREAS* The “ACT RESPECTING THE ACCREDITATION AND FINANCING OF STUDENTS’ ASSOCIATIONS” states that

27. Every students’ association and students’ association alliance is required, in respect of the students it represents or, as the case may be, in respect of its member associations under section 26, *to fulfill the same obligations as those imposed by the Companies Act (chapter C-38) on a legal person constituted under Part III, in respect of its members, or those imposed on it in respect of its members by its charter and by-laws.*”

*WHEREAS* Council is required to ratify positions taken through referendum.

*BE IT RESOLVED* that the following be adopted into the CSU Positions Book;

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that this position is sent to referendum for ratification during the 2020 CSU by-elections.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT* the budgetary impact is nil.

**Christopher Vaccarella:** Anti Semitism and antisemitic remarks are on the rise, worldwide and in Concordia. There has been zero action until now. I’ve heard students from various political ideologies say that the Holocaust was made up. The rising antisemitism has made myself and my friends uncomfortable and some have wanted to leave Concordia. This is why I ran a campaign to dismantle antisemitism at Concordia. This is the first step and much more will be done until the end of my mandate. I want Concordia to lead by example for a culture of inclusion.

**James Hanna:** Holocaust denial is trash

**Tzvi Hersh Filler** motions to amend the motion to “send to referendum and then added to the Positions Book”. Motion rescinded.

**Margot Berner:** The intent is to send it to referendum to be ratified.

**James Hanna** calls the question.

#### **4. Budget Comparison**

**Lauren Perozek** presents the following motion. Seconded by **Harrison Kirshner**. Motion passes.

*WHEREAS* Council is accountable for managing students’ money responsibility

*WHEREAS* financial transparency with the student body is a necessity.

*WHEREAS* the budget should be understandable to students at large.

*BE IT RESOLVED* Council task the Finance Committee to compare the budget from the previous year to the current year and identify any variances that exceed \$5,000.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* the Finance Committee provide a brief explanation, two or three sentences, for all variances exceeding \$5,000. The explanations should be understandable to students at large.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* the explanations for variances must be given before Council can approve the budget.

**Lauren Perozek:** I saw a need for this when I was reviewing the budget. It was difficult to understand the budget and why we were making certain changes. If I as a councilor was having trouble understanding the budget, students at large will as well. There's multiple sections in the budget that have a column for descriptions that are not filled out. \$5000 is a lot of money to me and students, so any variances should have an explanation of a few sentences.

**Howard Issley:** I reviewed the budget as well and there were calculation errors and unclear/not filled out descriptions and explanations. We want to make this budget transparent, not so that only the business students can understand.

**Isaiah Joyner:** I like the initiative of making it more digestible and transparent for students. I'm concerned that the variances accounted for before we approve the budget. It's more important that we have a budget that we can agree on between council and executives. Once the budget is ratified and approved we can begin the comparison between last year and this year. I foresee this as the finance coordinator and committee's mandate.

**Lauren Perozek:** I disagree, as a councilor I don't want to approve a budget without understanding the changes. I want to know where \$40,000 is going. There's not that many variances that exceed \$5000. I agree that there is a sense of urgency for completing the budget, but I don't think it's too much to ask this of the finance committee.

## **5. Committee Structure**

**Mathew Kaminski** presents the following motion. Seconded by **Harrison Kirshner**

*WHEREAS* there are no current regulations or strategies to encourage a natural rotation of committee seats,

*WHEREAS* strategies that produce a natural rotation system promote diversity in the workplace,  
*BE IT RESOLVED* that any individual who served one full mandate (which can be measured by one full calendar year) on any committee would have to rotate committees in their reelected mandate unless specifically allowed for by council with a 2/3rds vote,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that any board of director member cannot serve on more than 2 committees at any given moment unless specifically allowed for by council with a 2/3rds vote,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that each committee be represented by at least 3 faculties unless specifically allowed for by council with a 2/3rds vote,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the budgetary impact of this motion is nil,

**Mathew Kaminski:** There's been some tension with how committee structures have been. An appropriate response is to create a mechanism to relieve these tensions. We should follow a system that's been proven to work. We can create a more diverse set of committees. More diversity creates better results.

**Tzvi Hersh Filler** moves to amend the motion to include the following.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT these changes be implemented going forward.* Seconded by **Mathew Kaminski**. Motion passes

**James Hanna:** Would this mean that it applies to all councilors now, which means that there will be an evaluation of which councilors are on what committee.

**Chairperson:** It would not apply to the current composition

**Lauren Perozek:** Is this motion apply to the ADHOC committee or only standing? Can that be specified in this motion? Before we pass this motion, I would like to get a document of the councilors on committees, and if it's possible to limit people to two committees. It might be a good thing to look at the composition of the committees before we pass this motion. Perhaps we should move this to the Policy Committee.

**Mathew Kaminski:** It would make sense to apply this to standing committees as they tend to do a lot of work during the mandate.

**Ahmadou Sakho:** I would not go for this motion as I don't see how it would improve representation or distribution of opinion among councilors. I don't think that councilors should be limited by the number of committees that they're going to be on, as this is primarily a volunteer position and people should get involved as much as they want. I don't see how putting more barriers for the involvement of councilors will help

**Isaiah Joyner:** In the amendment it says that it will be reviewed by the year but it would make more sense to change it to the mandate. In the spirit of not restricting returning councilors with more knowledge and experience, maybe make it no more than two years as a limit.

**Mathew Kaminski:** I meant the calendar year to start from the date of their election. For example, if someone joined at the byelection it would end a calendar year after that. The purpose of this is not to restrict anyone, that's why I said there would be a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote option so that motivated individuals could be on more than two committees.

**Chairperson:** The motion may need rewording as we cannot remove someone from a committee, as it violates the standing regulation

**Mathew Kaminski:** Can we bring this to the policy committee?

**Lauren Perozek** motions to send this to the policy committee. Seconded by **Harrison Kirshner**. Motion passes

**Matthew Benzrihem:** Didn't council composition pass in the referendum?

**Christopher Kalafatidis:** Council restructuring question did not pass since we needed a  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority. We had 63% rather than 66.6%.

## **6. Equitable Hiring Practices**

**Mathew Kaminski** presents the following motion. Seconded by **Harrison Kirshner**.

*WHEREAS* several forms of bias are present during hiring and appointing selection processes,  
*WHEREAS* these forms of bias do not allow for the political, gender and cultural equity in one's prospective employment,

*WHEREAS* successful hiring practices are necessary to promote fair and equitable hiring practices while being cognizant of implicit biases,

*WHEREAS*, successful hiring practices encourage marginalized individuals to enter the CSU while ensuring that they feel safe in the space once they are in,

*BE IT RESOLVED* that all incoming appointment committee members and executives be aware of biases observed in society through either a training or mandatory reading/quiz,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the CSU reword job listings to avoid masculine wording such as "ambitious, challenging and demanding" and make sure that the wording is neutral to encourage female and non-gender conforming individuals to apply,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the CSU improves candidate screening by creating a pseudonym system for CV & Cover Letters, incorporating engaging/interactive assessments during the hiring process and implementing blind interviews for prospective workers and volunteers.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the CSU executive be tasked with implementing automated shortlisting software that ranks employees and volunteers based on a culmination of factors such as assessment results, blind interview results, work experience and/or sufficient academic standing,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the CSU release their own results for diversity such as BIPOC, members of the LGBTQAI+ community, those with disabilities and gender minorities to offset any potential assumptions that it is not diverse enough and to comfort members in these communities to apply,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that all elected members of the CSU take a comprehensive internal workforce survey in order to research and identify imbalance and disproportional representation – as well as help better the overall satisfaction of those who work/volunteer their time,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the budgetary impact be decided by the Finance Committee and limited to \$10,000.

**Mathew Kaminski:** I think there needs to be changes made for when we appoint and hire people. We need to be very careful on how we appoint and hire people. By mimicking successful hiring practices of businesses and nonprofits we can achieve this.

**Daniel Amico:** Obviously I'm not against the spirit of this motion but I do wish that the committees and the union was brought to us before council.

**Howard Issley:** We just finished with the interview process. Would this impact finished interviews or will this be for future hires

**Mathew Kaminski:** I know how long this will take to bring into effect. I want to send this to the proper committee for it to be developed. To Howard, this will be implemented after the process was decided by the committee

**Paige Beaulieu:** Equitable hiring practices are necessary and this does have some good points . The psydenous system does have weaknesses as it doesn't keep in mind the systemic barriers that allow more privileged individuals to get an advantage. Software can also have biases as they are programmed by humans. This was written from a single person's perspective. A policy written by a larger and more diverse group, which was brought forward this past May and approved by the previous policy committee, was voted down. Why was a policy that was previously approved by the policy committee abandoned, and now a new one is brought up without the consultation of a diverse group

**Mathew Kaminski:** I consulted various councilors on this. This isn't meant to be implemented and decided on today, this is an idea I want to send to other groups to look at. My research was done to get the most merit based employees in an organization, that was my ambition and these were the strategies given. I guess now it's a matter of opinion whether we agree with the strategies. I wanted to have a starting point so that there is a ball that is already rolling for others to champion other or same motions afterwards

**Lauren Perozek** motions to send this to policy, BIPOC, and the appointments committee for review. Seconded by **Harrison Kirshner**. Opposed. Motion passes.

VOTE:

17 YES

2 NO

1 ABSTAIN

**Lauren Perozek:** I was offended by the line stating that “ambitious, challenging and demanding” were masculine words. If you are admitting that this should be sent to committees, then this should be sent to the committees that it would affect

**Eduardo Malorni:** The policy would be difficult to follow, it would be a lot of work but I do think we should still try. Over the past few months, we’ve been accused of discrimination by councilors and student at large. People have accused that council itself as a root cause of discrimination. I would like to see this policy expanded to address the council as a whole.

**Danielle Vandolder-Beaudin:** This should be dealt with as soon as possible, If we send this to three committees, it could take a long time even though it is in good practice. I would like a timeframe for this. Students want to see change for a non-discriminatory CSU, and this is a good step. I would like to vote on this now, but I would also be okay with adding a timeframe

**Isaiah Joyner:** I would recommend that this start with the BIPOC committee as there was a similar motion brought up by BIPOC, but this motion does not address that. After it can be sent to appointments, and then policy. Not enough people were consulted before council to vote on this now.

**Desiree Blizzard:** There was a policy on appointments and equitable hiring that was worked on by a diverse policy committee but it was voted down. The fact that a new motion is being brought up to talk about equitable hiring when something was brought up before in a previous mandate is disheartening. We should also focus on racial discrimination.

**Sarah Mazhero:** We need proper procedure but that wasn’t followed. The computerized system is irrelevant and can enforce more discrimination to BIPOC. Why is it now being brought back up by a white person when it was voted down when a diverse BIPOC brought it forward before? What’s the difference between then and now? It’s insulting to be honest.

**Mathew Kaminski:** I consulted Margot, Ama, and Shivaane. I received and incorporated feedback before bringing it to council.

**Ahmadou Sakho:** Mathew has been working on this motion since his mandate. The intention was to improve the recruitment process and bring an objective means to diversify the appointments made by the CSU. I had reservations about the software, at the time I didn’t know how it accounts for discrimination or if the software had data to adjust. I also made requests such as consulting with CSU IT and Camille on how much it will cost to have this software. We could also have better means on the way we recruit, but doing this way may also be difficult for a smaller organization for the CSU as Mathew, your inspiration was bigger corporations.

**Mathew Kaminski:** The hesitations were brought forward, which is why I stated that the CSU executive should be the ones to overlook as I have a lot of faith in the executives.

**Daniel Amico:** We just finished interviews yesterday, after that there wouldn't be a rush to have this done. We could just bring this to the policy committee and have BIPOC chairs attend. This shouldn't be passed today without talking to the executives that have to implement this. It would be irresponsible to vote on this now.

**Jeremy Deneault:** What about “ambitious, challenging and demanding” makes these words masculine?

**Mathew Kaminski:** My personal opinion is irrelevant, this is wording coming from the bigger corporations from my research

**Margot Berner:** It was said that I was consulted but I did not read the documents that were sent to me until the council docs were sent out. I then reached out and recommended that this motion be sent to policy committee

**Howard Issley:** How much would the software cost to implement?

**Mathew Kaminski:** It can be between hundreds to thousands, but I will leave it up to the finance committee to decide what is reasonable.

**Lauren Perozek** calls the question.

## **7. Extremist Condemnation**

**Mathew Kaminski** presents the following motions. Seconded by **Harrison Kirshner**.

*WHEREAS*, the ‘KKK’ (Ku Klux Klan) and ‘Unite the Right’ are examples of alt - right groups inspired by white supremacy, hate and physical violence – perpetuated by restricting free speech and freedom on general,

*WHEREAS*, the Concordia Student Union must protect student rights by creating a safe space for all its members as well as denounce all forms of hate speech and avoid any instances of discrimination,

*BE IT RESOLVED*, the Concordia Student Union condemn the KKK and Unite the Right for racial inspired violence and hate speech through a public statement,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that all associated activism groups with identical goals and ideologies be condemned by the Concordia Student Union,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED*, the budgetary impact of this motion is nil.

**Mathew Kaminski:** This is the time to call out every group, these two groups are evil and have no place on our campus. Even if one student shared a similar ideology then we should condemn them. The time is now.

**Isaiah Joyner:** I would be more comfortable if we took a broader stance on the issue, as there is no general stance in the positions book on antiracism. Rather than pinpointing organizations, the CSU should denounce the practice of antiracism, hate speech, etc. As this stands, this is just a motion but I think it should be more towards a referendum to take a solid position on the issue. In my opinion this should start as a position.

**Nicole Leblanc** (Campaigns Coordinator): I appreciate this motion but I agree that it should be broader, especially considering that at Concordia that the KKK hasn't been the far-right group we've had a problem with. I agree with Isaiah that there are a lot of other groups, and it would be better to condemn the far-right and racist ideologies. The far-right is also very specific, and we should condemn them. They are oppressive in many ways and are a threat of violence. I would support that motion.

**Lauren Perozek:** The CSU doesn't have a religious affiliation and we shouldn't have a political one as well. We don't want to alienate students that support these things as we are supposed to be neutral. We can still say we're against racism and hate speech. We should neutral this position and send it to policy committee

**Danielle Vandolder-Beaudin:** There is still a position in the position book about racism

**Christopher Kalafatidis:** I never thought I would ever live to see the day where the CSU can't condemn the KKK. This is probably the most ridiculous thing I've ever seen. I just witnessed the General Coordinator refuse to condemn the KKK because there's something else we could be doing. This is insane. I have a feeling that the issue is with the person presenting this motion rather than the content of the motion itself.

**Margot Berner:** I don't think Isaiah was refusing to condemn the KKK and that's really messed up for you to say. We should have a specific antiracism position in the books passed through referendum.

**Harrison Kirshner:** At the first RCM there was an anti racism position that was passed by Chelsea, myself, and Shivaane. I'm not opposed to adding and expanding on that in a future meeting

**Margot Berner** motions to amend the motion to the following. Seconded by **Harrison Kirshner**. Motion passes.

*WHEREAS*, the ‘KKK’ (Ku Klux Klan) and ‘Unite the Right’ are examples of alt-right, white supremacist groups which inflict hate and physical violence – perpetuated by restricting free speech

and freedom in general,

*WHEREAS*, the Concordia Student Union must protect student rights by creating a safe space for all its members as well as denounce all forms of hate speech, white supremacy, racism, and stand against discrimination,

*BE IT RESOLVED*, the Concordia Student Union condemn the KKK, Unite the Right and all alt-right and white-supremacist groups for white supremacist violence and hate speech through a public statement,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that all alt-right and white supremacist groups be condemned by the Concordia Student Union,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED*, the budgetary impact of this motion is nil.

**Margot Berner:** We’re not condemning **only** these specific groups, but all white supremacy groups and racism in general.

**Isaiah Joyner:** I don’t appreciate the insinuation that the *Black* general coordinator is refusing to condemn the KKK. As an American person of color, who has had experiences with racism, it turns my stomach. I’m looking from a broad perspective for the organization and it's too finite to pick two out of hundreds of groups that discriminate, attack, and kill Black people. Please, for my sake and for everybody's sake, think about what comes out of your mouth before you say it because it has an affect on people because we are not in a context where we can come together after the meeting and have a debrief. It hurts and it is not okay. If you’re going to make an insinuation based on something so important, to the point where we couldn’t even get on the same page to support a movement to save my people. But the moment I want to think about the organization from a broad perspective --- (CUT OUT)

**Sarah Mazhero:** In a broader perspective of what’s going on, this is very disappointing and it makes me uncomfortable that someone called a Black person a supporter of the KKK, and it should be taken to the judicial board. This is so shocking and this makes me as Academic & Advocacy Coordinator think what's the point? What do you want Black people to do, do you want us to start picking cotton again because this makes no sense. It is so heartbreaking that this is the cycle that we have to repeat over and over again. It is so upsetting, all of you who have been denouncing all of these things starting in May, think about the actions that you have done, it’s similar to what’s happening in the States. This is Canada, we have a Charter that is made to represent people and you have to do this to someone who’s a minority? Really think about it for

yourself. It is so disappointing that even our own university is doing this, what are we going to do to make the students more better? What are we going to do as a Council to make things better? We should be focused on that rather than Equity Seats. This is so disappointing and this is not a Union that I want to work for if this is going to keep happening. It is deteriorating my soul if I have to do this for a year and be treated this way. I am not proud of this Council. For some of you, this is not correct. Shame on most of you for doing these things, and you know who you are. Maybe reevaluate the situation while you're here, because for those of you the consequences will come and nip you at the bud sometime soon. Get ready when someone's your boss and black. What are you going to do --- (INTERRUPTED)

**Danielle Vandolder-Beaudin:** Can we keep this on track please?

**Chairperson:** I'm not going to interrupt a Black woman when they're talking about discrimination. I'm not gonna do that

**Danielle Vandolder-Beaudin:** I don't want to sound rude

**Chairperson:** This is a good reminder that we need to think before we speak. Some things that we might not think have emotion and connotation attached to them do to others

**Howard Issley:** When it says "*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that all associated activism groups with identical goals and ideologies be condemned by the Concordia Student Union" Do you mean the CSU would vote to condemn? What would the process be?

**Mathew Kaminski:** I meant what Margot added in the amendment, that all groups with white supremacy ideologies be condemned. I apologize if it came off as too finite, but I tried to cover all the bases by saying all associated activism groups and ideologies.

**Ahmadou Sakho:** Isaiah and Sarah's reaction hasn't been emotional, it is the appropriate one given the other misplacement of the statement. Please think of your words as they clearly have an affect on people. I don't know if these statements are made for fun or to make a point but they do not make sense. You are clearly affecting people who have been traumatized by real facts. This is not the game, we are not here on these calls for people to say whatever they want on camera. If you're a decent human being, you should apologize to both of them because what you said is hurtful and not funny

**Eduardo Malorni:** People message our social media often for us to condemn things and to support certain things. It's hard for us to pick out things to condemn, because when we do people will say that we've chosen to condemn X and by default have to condemn Y. I've always taken

motions and movements and supported that instead. In this example, instead of condemning the KKK we would condemn racism in general. That is easier to manage as the Communications Department. It's easier for us to condemn racism in general. I previously mentioned that discrimination was something that came up often in the summer where students have said that council was being discriminatory. This is proof of what I said in the previous motion. There is quite a bit of discrimination on council from some councilors

**Matthew Benzrihem** motions to add *national and racial supremacy* following lines that include alt-right and white supremacy. Seconded by **Jeremy Deneault**. Motion passes.

**Matthew Benzrihem:** We have a lot of foreign students here. For example, Tibetan and Chinese students have a history of problems with each other at the university. By default we should encompass this in the motion.

**Harrison Kirshner:** I would like to express my support to Margot's amendment. The amendment is positive and necessary. What just happened regarding specific individuals shouldn't be tolerated. This motion is being brought forward in good spirit. I want to apologize to the General Coordinator on behalf of the council.

**Lauren Perozek** motions to amend the motion to the following. Seconded by **Diana Lukic**. Motion passes.

*BE IT RESOLVED* that this motion be deferred to BIPOC committee

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the BIPOC committee be tasked with developing a position against white supremacy, hate speech, and violence

**Lauren Perozek:** Before we decide anything, anything affecting minorities should be decided by BIPOC. We should have the full backing of the BIPOC committee first.

**Isaiah Joyner:** I want to apologize for any unprofessional behaviour. Thank you for the support that those have shown me. With motions like this, it's important to consult and work with the committees inflicted. The most effective way to take action is by consulting first.

**James Hanna:** A lot of motions presented today are without real teeth behind them. The CSU will make a statement saying what 99.9% of students agree with, but I don't see a lot of practical stuff coming out of it. Condemning just one group would just be like playing whack-a-mole with condemning groups.

## **8. Anti-Sexual Harassment Initiative**

**Mathew Kaminski** presents the following motion. Seconded by **Matthew Benzrihem**

*WHEREAS* Concordia University has had a problem where women and other students have been approached by males who try to use luring tactics or inappropriate language/conduct with students.

*WHEREAS* the CSU has a duty to protect its members to the best of their abilities,

*WHEREAS* some steps have been taken to tackle this issue such as increased security and security walking students to a desired location,

*BE IT RESOLVED* that the CSU will pursue the creation of a new service in the form of a CSU Anti-Sexual Violence Centre that will be independent from the administration. However, the CSU will accept further resources and aid from the administration upon the CSU's request,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that this initiative also be created with the spirit of connecting individuals who share similar views on the state of sexual harassment at Concordia,

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the budgetary impact of this motion be decided by finance committee and limited to a total cost of \$5,000,

**Mathew Kaminski:** I've had to hear from friends that have been approached by males that are saying and asking inappropriate things, things that no student should experience. These problems have gotten worse. Although I've seen some steps taken, I think if there was a student-led initiative it would help students connect better on this issue and be more pragmatic on the issue. Students would be more passionate and we would see better results come from it

**Ahmadou Sakho:** Are we going to train students to do this? It can be tricky on who these students will be, how they will be trained, etc? This is a very sensitive topic and I'm wondering if you've done any research on this?

**Mathew Kaminski:** I called the University to ask if they are working on this but did not get the answer I was looking for. If this initiative stemmed from the student union, it would be done faster and more comprehensively, as well as transparency and accountability. I want to leave it to the CSU to develop this.

**Diana Lukic:** This motion talks about an initiative where students can connect who have similar experiences. Can that part be reworked to involve SARC, they have volunteers and a therapist who help students with these issues and they also have group programs where students can attend. It's usually pretty broad to involve sexual assault and harassment. Instead of creating a new initiative, could we support SARC since they're basically doing this and are doing good work. I know they want to add another therapist and need support

**Lauren Perozek:** This is a really big project to take on. Have you asked or consulted anyone from the executive team on who will take on this project? It seems like a lot of work and we'd be adding to their workload

**Mathew Kaminski:** I want to leave the floor open to whoever wants to pick it up as I am resigning in a few days. I want to make sure this goes into the right hands. I know the people who want to get this done will get this done.

**Isaiah Joyner:** This motion at itself is very operational at its core. If you have something that you want to do, please come to the executive team so that we can point you to the right direction. I would recommend that this go to a committee or an ad hoc committee.

**Tzvi Hersh Filler:** I love the initiative but I would like to call attention to Bill 151. Based on Bill 151 from 2017, this could not be independent from SARC. However, part 5 of that Bill makes it ambiguous but being separate and independent of SARC might be a violation. Regardless, it might be a better idea to work through SARC since they have full time staff and I don't think \$5000 would get us that

**James Hanna:** Giving additional funding to SARC would be much more effective. The budget for us to create this would be much higher than this motion anticipates. As much as I like this initiative, it is just not feasible. We would have to create a whole new fee levy project.

**Sarah Mazhero:** Having worked on projects of sexual violence and assault, even in the university, I wish that those of us that have, like Margot and I, could have been consulted on this to give an opinion. Giving money to the university and SARC will not help. Time and time again, they have not helped students pertaining to sexual violence, they have been disregarded by the university admin so working with them is a big fat no. It would've also been nice to know and help steer the direction of this motion to provide more information on procedure, even if the intentions are good. Education about the university level and how they actually treat survivors of sexual violence is important because they don't care, they only care about their reputation in these situations. I don't support giving \$5000 to SARC.

**Harrison Kirshner:** I support the spirit of this motion and understand the concerns that are being brought up. Maybe if we send this to a committee, we can work and address this.

**Eduardo Malorni:** This is a good motion and something we should do. It's important for it to be student-led, rather than by administration. It'd be good if we could work on this and take our time. I would like to also update our policy to keep people accountable. Thanks Mathew for thinking of this project

**Margot Berner** moves to table this motion until the September RCM. Seconded by **Jeremy Deneault**. Motion passes.

**Margot Berner:** It was recommended that we create a peer-peer sexual violence support training under the student union. But we had the Center for Gender Advocacy that was actively doing that. However, since they're a fee-levy, it's a bit unstable now especially with the pandemic and they're not sure if they'll have enough funding going forward. It would be a great idea to have a peer-peer sexual violence support group under the CSU that is separate from SARC, specifically because it is run by the administration. When sexual violence charges are being brought up, especially against members of the administration, the university has an interest in shutting it down. Not that they would, but they do have an interest. Don't give money to the administration because we already give them a lot of money for our tuition. I would love to see this happen but let's postpone it until we can all work on it.

**Diana Lukic:** I want to propose a motion to create an ad hoc committee to review this motion and decide what they want to do with it

**Desiree Blizzard:** I think we're all in favor of the sentiment of this motion, but if we could flesh it out more before being brought to council that would be appreciated

**Jeremy Deneault:** SARC is led by the administration, but this motion would be student led?

**Mathew Kaminski:** Yes, this would be a student run centre. We're trying to remove the reliance of the administration and take on the responsibility as students, since we are the one who want to get this done

## **9. Freedom of Speech**

**Mathew Kaminski** presents the following motion. Seconded by **Jeremy Deneault**

*WHEREAS* the Concordia Student Union's Bylaws and Standing Regulations adhere to the laws outlined in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms,

*WHEREAS* everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:

- (a) freedom of conscience and religion.
- (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion, and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication.
- (c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and
- (d) freedom of association.

*WHEREAS* the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights Article 19(3) allows for a restriction of free speech when it violates: respecting of the rights or reputations of others

*BE IT RESOLVED* that the CSU accepts all forms of freedom of expression (as per Section 2(b) of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms) on campus as it relates to Canadian political affiliations.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the CSU denounce any student actions that prohibit students from expressing themselves politically in a Canadian political aspect if they directly violate ones respecting the rights or reputations of others.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the CSU adopt this motion in the spirit of protecting the aforementioned charters for all of its members in order to avoid any potential legal repercussions.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the CSU acknowledge that freedom of speech is not absolute if hate speech can be proven present, “if a reasonable, aware of context and circumstances, would view the expression as likely to expose a person or persons to detestation and vilification on the basis of a prohibited ground of discrimination”.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the budgetary impact of this motion is nil.

**Mathew Kaminski:** I was the former President of Conservative Concordia, and I have been attacked for that personally. I have been respectful in my discord with others, but have felt like less of a person because of my political affiliations. I know this sentiment is shared with other Conservatives on campus and they feel threatened to speak their mind when it comes to Canadian political opinions. Regarding certain aspects of free speech, hate speech can be proven. It's important to mention that free speech isn't absolute, just because you have political opinions doesn't mean you have the right to say anything you want. If one has the ability to communicate themselves respectfully and intelligently regarding certain political topics during debates, I don't think they should ever be attacked on their ideas. That's the spirit of the motion.

**Ahmadou Sakho:** On the first *be it resolved*, what does “as it relates to Canadian political affiliations” mean?

**Mathew Kaminski:** It outlines what freedom of expression is in Canada under the law, as it relates to Canadian political affiliations. As long as a party is established, just because you are affiliated to that party you shouldn't be attacked on your character as long as your opinions are not considered hate speech under the law

**Ahmadou Sakho:** I agree, no one should be attacked on their character. Will this be a statement or a position?

**Mathew Kaminski:** It doesn't have to be a position, just something that should be mentioned in this time of division in society. I think it's great when people are passionate but we should be

respectful of people's political opinions. As long as the views aren't hateful, we should be able to express it in the public.

**Diana Amico:** In the Charter, the reasonable limits clause it says that free speech does have its limits. What would this motion tangibly do for the CSU if it's already in our charter?

**Mathew Kaminski:** Under our charter, this is already done. As someone who has acted as the President of a political club, I can say that people are not respecting the charter in that regard. I've been called a lot of things, including an Anti Semite which is interesting. I want to reinforce to the student body that we are accepting of all Canadian political affiliations and that no one associated should be receiving these reactions or verbal assaults. I agree that there may not be any physical impact from this statement, but I do think it would be reinforcing for those who feel threatened to speak up

**Zachary Williams:** I agree with the spirit of this motion. How would the first *BIFR*, can you speak more on how this would affect other students' right to protest other students if they disagree with their points

**Mathew Kaminski:** I love to debate Canadian federal politics and policies. The difference is that when someone hears that I'm a part of Conservative Concordia that they proceed to point a finger at me and call me an Anti Semite. It's that kind of discourse that I'm trying to limit on campus. Students would have the right to say that they don't like a certain political party, and this would just reinforce what the Charter already says

**James Hanna:** I suggest that we construct a policy around this. A lot of issues arose in the past when legitimate political events had people try to attack the event. It's a good motion that supports people talking it out instead of throwing fists

**Harrison Kirshner:** I was also the leader of a political club on campus, being able to debate freely on issues we may disagree on and have respect for free speech is something we should acknowledge and accept as a university but also denounce hate speech because there is a fine line between the two, which is acknowledged in the motion

**Desiree Blizzard:** Would you want this to be an official position?

**Mathew Kaminski:** Actually no because it's already in our charter and it should be known by Canadian citizens. I do think it should serve as a reinforcement to students during this politically divisive climate that it is okay to debate ideas but not okay to attack the person. If they are saying things that are proven to be hateful under the law then by all means go for that person if they're a

hateful person. If they're just trying to debate policies from a Canadian political parties standpoint then I don't think anyone's character should ever be attacked

**Desiree Blizzard:** I want to point out that often when people speak about free speech its often from a position where they were allowed to say certain things in the past. It's often that when people who say that their freedom of speech is being taken away, they speak from a place where they were allowed to say very problematic things in the past but can't anymore. If it's a position I feel like it would be a good idea to send it to referendum to reinforce to students. It would be good for the council to discuss whether we should send this to the referendum just so that we follow the same procedure as the other motions brought forward.

**Isaiah Joyner:** I understand the intention is to protect your political affiliation and no one deserves to be denounced for their beliefs. I'm not sure what your resolution is after this statement. If it goes to referendum then this would echo that the CSU is a politically diverse place where people shouldn't be discriminated against based on their beliefs. After that we can develop the proper policies.

**Hadassah Alencar (The Concordian):** Is one of the intentions to not allow hate speech because what has been said by some members of the PPE can be considered so?

**Mathew Kaminski:** I do myself have issues with some of the rhetoric from the leader and other members of the PPE. If things were said that were truly hate speech, I have full confidence in the legal process that the people that want to bring this forward in terms of a legal battle will do so and do it successfully.

**Nicole Leblanc:** I support free speech, but it is a more complex issue than what it is made out to be. I'm concerned how this would play out tangibly, there are a lot of situations where free speech is used to say that people can't protest against a certain group. I'm concerned with some of the language used in this motion, I encounter a lot of people who do not feel that their political ideas are represented by the Canadian political system such as Indigenous students or left-of-center on the political spectrum. By having this motion relate to Canadian political system, we may exclude some students who do not share political views from a Canadian political party

**Lauren Perozek:** What do you want council to do? What action do you want to come out of this?

**Mathew Kaminski:** I want this to pass and that the CSU list the main political parties, and maybe other groups and ideas that don't fall under hate speech, and endorse that the CSU

promotes free speech. As long as it isn't hate speech, I want students to know that they are free to express their views.

**Lauren Perozek:** Do you want this on our website, social media? Because then we need to defer this to communications. Can we have an executive speak on this?

**Mathew Kaminski** motions to amend the motion to include the following. Seconded by **Matthew Benzrihem**. Motion passes.

*BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED* that the communications department be tasked with drafting this statement.

**Mathew Kaminski:** The comms department is the most effective department to communicate with students.

**Margot Berner** moves to table this to the September RCM. Seconded by **Ahmadou Sakho**. Opposed. Motion passes.

VOTE:

16 YES

2 NO

4 ABSTAIN

**Margot Berner:** This is an important conversation and we should come back to it with fresh eyes

**Isaiah Joyner:** I know you're resigning soon Matthew but we would still like your input. It would be more appropriate for this to go to referendum. There is a position going to referendum soon that addresses free speech, perhaps this could be combined with it to include a section on political beliefs so that people trying to get their political views across won't be attacked for it.

**Ahmadou Sakho:** I would like to encourage my colleagues to enforce this as a referendum position, or a Code of Conduct policy

## 11. ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Isaiah Joyner:** Please get access to your councilor email

**Tzvi Hersh Filler:** For appointments, we will probably call an SCM

**S Shivaane:** The folks I was going to address this to aren't here anymore and that absence is disappointing. I think for this meeting especially, many instances highlighted the disconnect this council has between what we can achieve with respect to representing student concerns and issues. Council is not a place for intellectual stimuli when there is a potential and a duty to take solid, actionable, plans. We're here to advocate for students, and we're students ourselves. Time and time again there's always someone who will choose to favor proper procedure when there's a capacity to address hurt caused by internal strife and improve the union. There is also usually an effort to arbitrarily curate the CSU to one individual's personal fancy with no impact beyond that or no thinking for students. I ask that as we proceed into the fall that we understand that as representatives we're dealing with a lot of complexities that not any one of us can hope to deal with alone. The CSU is capable of much more than what we've seen this summer.

**Daniel Amico:** Thank you for attending the trainings! I will probably call an SCM next Wednesday to ratify the appointments minutes

**James Hanna:** Summer is over but we're going back to school, and there's a SKEET event happening if anyone would like to go. More info on CUSSA page

**Mathew Kaminski:** Thank you for coming to the meeting. It's been a pleasure serving with all of you. Have a good rest of your summer!

## **12. ADJOURNMENT**

**Margot Berner** motions to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by **Isaiah Joyner**. Motion carries.

Meeting adjourned at 21h35.