

Tuesday, April 19th, 2022

6:00PM

Zoom

We would like to respectfully acknowledge that our University and our Students' Union are located on Treaty 6 Territory. We are grateful to be on Cree, Dene, Saulteaux, Métis, Blackfoot, and Nakota Sioux territory; specifically the ancestral space of the Papaschase Cree. These Nations are our family, friends, faculty, staff, students, and peers. As members of the University of Alberta Students' Union we honour the nation-to-nation treaty relationship. We aspire for our learning, research, teaching, and governance to acknowledge and work towards the decolonization of Indigenous knowledges and traditions.

ORDER PAPER (SC-2021-26)

2021-26/1 SPEAKERS BUSINESS

2021-26/1a The Speaker delivers the new land acknowledgement and thanks the Indigenous Students' Union for their contributions.

*My name is Philip Misheso. I am a settler from Kenya, and I am honoured and privileged to live, study and work on Treaty 6 territory. The University of Alberta and the University of Alberta Students' Union occupy Indigenous land in amiskwacîswâskahikan (Beaver Hills House), on Treaty 6 territory. From time immemorial, the banks along the river valley have been known as the Pehonan, a meeting place for the nêhiyawak (Cree), the Niitsítapi (Blackfoot), Métis, Dënesųłíné (Dene), Ojibway/Saulteaux/Anishinaabe, Haudenosaunee and others. The University, the Students' Union and much of the city are located on the unlawfully stolen land of the forcibly removed Papaschase Cree.*

*We acknowledge that sharing this land gives each of us the responsibility to research the historic contexts of Treaty 6, to reflect on our personal relationships to the land, the Nations we've named, and to our roles in upholding justice on this territory. Since they began, the Students' Union and the University have benefited from historic and ongoing dispossession of land and resources from Indigenous Peoples. As a result, it is our responsibility to seek the restitution of this land and its resources. Finally, we seek to do better by working to make our learning, research, and governance align with the histories, languages, teachings, and cultures of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit Peoples in the land presently occupied by the Canadian state.*

*We encourage critical reflection by asking the following question. In relation to the territory on which you are situated, what role do you play in strengthening the resistance and resurgence of Indigenous students within your communities?*

2021-26/2 CONSENT AGENDA

Students' Council, Votes and Proceedings (SC-2021-25), Tuesday, April 5th, 2022

See SC-2021-26.06

APPROVED with amendments.

2021-26/2a **KIMANI/ALI MOVED TO** suspend committee reports in 2021-26/5 due to the length of the agenda.

CARRIED

2021-26/3 PRESENTATION

2021-26/3a **THAKUR MOVED TO** approve presentation on Campus Safety and Security Policy.

See SC-2021-26.24 & 38

**SINGH/ALI MOVED TO** suspend Section 7: Subsection 5 of Students' Council Standing Orders to Allow Presentation on Campus Safety and Security.

ALI: Under this subsection, the presentation would keep us from voting on the policy. People here know my stance on campus policing, but we should suspend the subsection to allow the last-minute presentation, giving the ISA room to explain their concerns.

DIXON: Everyone should be able to share their opinions on policy we're about to pass; we should suspend the subsection.

LEY: Approval of the policy is time-sensitive, so we should suspend the subsection and allow the ISA's presentation.

CARRIED

BID (Incoming ISA President): ISA and UASU survey data show that international students are more likely than other students to trust law enforcement. Last year, the ISA was contacted by three international students who were assaulted or harassed on transit or in the city. International students request faster response times and a larger security presence. They fear reporting due to legal complications. We want international students to feel safe on transit. We are not against the entire proposed policy, which has many good points, and we support harm reduction and community policing approaches. However, we also feel it should be done in collaboration with transit police officers. We call for the UASU to table the policy. If that is not possible, remove resolution 13. If that is not possible, include mention of more transit peace officers.

SINGH (Current ISA President, proxy for Councilor KALRA): By no means are we against Indigenous students or the Indigenous Students' Union. We are not opposing

the proposed policy because of Indigenous students. We are simply doing what is in the best interest of our membership. I would insist that we don't make it Indigenous students versus international students. It's simply about how we see law enforcement differently.

ALI: Would it have been helpful if the UASU ran a town hall?

DIXON: Policy Committee developed this policy over the course of a year and consulted multiple times with Student Representative Associations, including the International Students' Association.

KORFEH: The presentation's chart only represented about 3% of international students.

BID (ISA): We ran the survey last summer, when the ISA did not have much reach. However, we also refer to the UASU survey, which was significantly larger, and which also says that most international students support law enforcement. We also sent out an email to our mailing list, and several students reached out today to share their experiences.

SINGH (ISA): Corrects Korfeh's numbers in ways that indicate the chart represents around 5% of international students. At the start of this meeting, we had 92 people online, most of them international students here to oppose the proposed policy. We have heard what our membership wants.

DHILLON: The Bylaws allow a Student Representative Association to request approval to deviate from an element of a UASU Political Policy. Is that a course of action you could take rather than challenging the entire policy, which you largely agree with?

SINGH (ISA): That is an option, but we would need to come back to the Students' Council to say that we disagree with these policy elements, and keep coming back every year. Why would the UASU have a policy that does not meet the needs of its constituents?

DHILLON: That's why we have this section of Bylaw: it allows you to do your advocacy while still respecting the consultation that Policy Committee did as well.

DIXON: Point of information. As stated in writing, point 13 does not prevent us from working with the ISA to pursue the kind of transit safety measures they want. Through all of our consultations, every group has preferred a different approach to transit security, which is why point 13 is stated so broadly. The proposed policy does not preclude that kind of advocacy on transit. What it says is that we need to work with the community to find durable solutions. For that reason, and to address the ISA's concerns, we left point 13 very general.

SINGH (ISA): Going for an exemption is not a viable solution because we would need

to do it every year.

2021-26/3b **VILLOSO/KAUR MOVED TO** allow a presentation from the Elections Office regarding Election results.

See SC-2021-26.25 & 39 & 40

CARRIED

**MARQUES (Chief Returning Officer):** Two major areas of focus this year were supporting a positive return to campus and increasing diversity (both in elections staff and in candidate pools). The elections office worked extensively with the LEAD Centre to support a highly diverse candidate pool. For example, three of the incoming five Executives are women, and all five are people of colour. This year, the elections office had an open-door policy that worked well. Key issues: slow bylaw and procedure amendment processes, low voter turnout, SRAs misinforming their constituents, very high level of discrimination against some candidates. Extends his deepest apologies and admiration to the candidates who suffered the most: Councilors Morris and Ali. Recommends that, in the future, candidates should sign MOUs about standards of behavior in line with the new Code of Conduct. Recommends that the UASU complete its review of election-related policies and processes, especially with an eye to making a more accessible and welcoming space for Indigenous students.

**FOTANG:** Do you have any recommendations for candidate workshops?

**MARQUES (CRO):** Has been working with LEAD Centre staff. Workshop participation has been low during COVID-19, and staff are working to adapt material and delivery.

**FOTANG:** What are your thoughts on the size of ballots as a barrier to participation?

**MARQUES (CRO):** We're exploring options to keep ballots to a manageable size whenever possible. Over 1100 voters simply stopped halfway through voting.

**ALI:** What are your thoughts on raising voter engagement?

**MARQUES (CRO):** That's the million-dollar question. Student leaders have a responsibility to show students why they should care. Recommendation for returning members of Council: figure out more ways to engage with your constituency.

**AVILA:** How are we addressing sustainability, e.g. election banners as waste?

**MARQUES (CRO):** When the elections are online, they don't produce waste. Perhaps allowing candidates to pursue more sustainable printing options.

**ALI:** Would expanding the election office's budget be helpful?

MARQUES (CRO):The current issues are happening regardless of how much money the elections office has. Budget hasn't been an issue this year.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

2021-26/4

Talia DIXON,Vice-President, (Student Life) - Report  
Emily KIMANI,Vice-President, (Operation and Finance) - Report  
Christian FOTANG,Vice-President, (External) - Report  
Abner MONTEIRO,Vice-President (Academic) - Report  
Rowan LEY, President - Report

#### BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORT

2021-26/5

SUSPENDED

2021-26/6

#### OPEN FORUM

Shannon CORNSELSEN (Incoming VP Consultation and Engagement, Indigenous Students' Union (ISU)): In the spirit of reconciliation, the ISU invite the ISA to learn the history regarding the long and complicated relationships that the First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people of Canada have with policing. The proposed changes to the Campus Safety and Security Policy reflect our own safeguards that we feel are necessary on our own traditional lands. I feel that the ISA would benefit from learning more and educating themselves regarding our aversion to an increased police presence on campus. The Faculty of Native Studies has a great course available called Indigenous Canada, and you can find the link online.

Cindy EISMAN (Incoming VP Finance, ISU): I have lived my entire life in Canada, and I have lived as an Indigenous woman in a country founded on colonialism. We are all impacted by colonialism, whether we are Canadians, Indigenous Peoples in Canada, or visitors to these lands. As an Indigenous woman I have lived my life having others speak for me and tell me what is best for me without bothering to listen to what I have to say. I am here to speak in favor of the Campus Safety and Security Policy. Indigenous Peoples in Canada have a complicated and problematic history with police. While I share the concerns that many, including international students, have about safety on campus, transit, and Edmonton in general, supporting more policing and security is not the way forward, and will disproportionately impact marginalized communities, including Black, Indigenous, and POC community members, people with disabilities, and gender and sexual minorities. Given that the SU's agenda is to represent and advocate for University of Alberta students, I ask that the Council vote in favour of the Campus Safety and Security Policy, as it will represent the majority of student wishes. I would ask that members of the ISA, the SU, or the student body at large reach out to the ISU or come to an ISU meeting to further discuss issues that affect us all. I would like to thank the SU for listening to all of us students regardless of what portion of the student body they represent. Hai hai.

Gurbani BAWEJA (VP External, ISA): I would like to clarify that ISA's stand on the SU's policing policy is not Indigenous students versus international students. We all respect the Indigenous community, and we do not wish to make anyone feel uncomfortable or unsafe through the SU's policy. We are just here to seek some middle ground between the ISA and the SU. Throughout my term, I believe that the ISA have been respectful enough to the SU, but today I won't stand by apologizing to the SU because I feel like my concerns, along with my colleagues' concerns, on the policing policy have long been ignored. The SU is favoring some students' safety over others, which I fail to understand why. Security presence, as I said, has been repeatedly addressed by myself and many other ISA members to the SU. However, I blatantly, unfortunately feel that the majority of you are living

\_\_\_\_\_ [line struck from record after point of privilege] with impractical ideologies. We do not leave our homes to come to Canada and be stabbed, punched, and even shot while our student leaders simply sit back and watch. This policy is motivated to simply make some people happy, which I do not appreciate, along with other international students. We come here to make our lives better and support our family. We do not hope that our family lose their kids, or see them being stabbed miles away from their home. We do not wish our families to lose their faith in developed countries. If this is truly a Students' Union for all students and not just some, then I really request the Council to table this motion and transparently consult those who they are leaving behind to be stabbed. Again, some people on Council have shown their support toward the No Cops On Campus Collective, and one of them has even been a member in the past, so I really request the Council to be not biased towards this, and really favour every student and not just some students.

DIXON: [Raises a point of privilege about a specific line] impugning the motives of the members and it's also just very offensive. So I'm wondering if that can be struck from the record or at least acknowledged. Again, we have consulted extensively with folks. I understand that people have different opinions, but that doesn't give us the right to [refers to the line].

MIHESO orders the line struck from the minutes and asks all speakers to refrain from such behaviour.

MARQUES: I'll be speaking as an international student, not as Chief Returning Officer. Four years ago when I arrived to Canada, I was extremely unaware of what Indigenous students had to go through. It was not until my first blanket exercise that I got educated about how Indigenous folks in Canada were treated. I was aware that I was not only an international student, I was a settler, so I believe that whoever wants to come and talk about this kind of policy as an international student, we also have to know our context, we also have to know where we come from, and we also have to know where we are. So I would like the ISA as well, please respect the Indigenous peoples of Canada. I do think some statements, especially the last one, do not do justice to all international students, they do not represent what we are trying to say. I support and appreciate all the hard work the ISA has been doing, but please be

careful when you make statements like that. International students do support Indigenous students. I would like my voice to be heard *[inaudible]* as I support all the Indigenous students visiting this campus. Thank you.

Patricia RICKETT (Indigenous graduate student): As many of the other individuals that are here today have mentioned, Indigenous people have been exposed to severe harm at the hands of police officers, which has been documented by the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls National Inquiry as well as the TRC [Truth and Reconciliation Commission], which the University of Alberta is supposed to be adhering to. I see an issue with moving forward to increase police force at this University, especially when there is a chance that this could cause further harm to Indigenous people in academia and in Canada. I find it's not only unethical but violates the fundamental principles of the TRC as well. In 2016, in a recent landmark human rights case, the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal held that all services and supports delivered to Indigenous Peoples, and the provision of services and supports — in this case, education — must include Indigenous Peoples as, in this case, these services and supports must promote a substantive approach to equality, which is a legal principle recognized by Canadian and international law. This principle focuses on needs- and culturally-based services and supports to the actual needs of Indigenous people and communities. Furthermore, last year Bill C-15 was implemented into law in Canada. This bill calls on the Canadian and provincial governments to implement the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) into Canadian law and into its policies and practices, in all areas involving Indigenous Peoples in the provision of public services and supports. My question is, how does what's happening today — and how does the University of Alberta, and how does the Students' Union — ensure that your decisions reflect a substantive approach to equality under human rights law for the actual needs of Indigenous Peoples and students? How do you promote this, and what is the plan to address Bill C-15 when making decisions at this University that impact students, including Indigenous students? *[When asked to summarize:]* How do these non-Indigenous Student Unions plan to promote a substantive approach to equality, which is a legal principle recognized in Canadian and international law, when making decisions that involve Indigenous people? This principle must ensure that all decisions that impact the lives of Indigenous people promote needs- and culturally-based services and supports in any decision-making for the provision of services and supports under human rights law. That's my first question. My second question: In your decision-making process, have you considered Bill C-15, which has been recognized by law — is a piece of law in Canada — that ensures that all government bodies must promote UNDRIP when making decisions in the provision of public services — in this case, education — for all decisions involving Indigenous Peoples, including Indigenous students? Are you aware of Bill C-15 or UNDRIP, or the principles of substantive equality?

LEY: Thank you, Patricia, for the question. Just to address how the Students' Union worked to address the legal precedents that you talked about: in all our work toward reconciliation and support for Indigenous students, we are guided by the Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation Committee Recommendations. I'll post a link to those in the chat once I'm done speaking, so you'll get a chance to see those for yourself.

Those were developed in collaboration with the ISU several years back. We're guided on ongoing issues by our collaboration and discussions with the ISU, who are very important partners to us, and by our Political Policy on Indigenous students, which I'd be happy to put in the chat and link to as well. There's a lot of specific issues we work on, and I can't quite list all of them but I can give you a couple of examples. So, for example, talking about culturally relevant support services for Indigenous students, including the Maskwa House of Learning in the University's capital plan. While they have not yet released the 2022 capital plan, I can tell you that it is going to be in the 2022 capital plan, once that capital plan is published. We are also continuing to work to ensure that Indigenous students have access to appropriate, culturally sensitive advising, and if you like I'm certainly happy to reach out to give you a more comprehensive list; there's a number of other things. I'll also make sure you have access to the ARRC Recommendations and our policies, so you can go through those for yourself.

RICKETT: Thanks Ley for his answers.

Lionel LIU (Incoming VP Finance, ISA): I think the notion of a recent divide between international students and Indigenous students, I want to express that it does not exist. There's no such division. It's being made for whatever reason. The points that both sides have been making are very valid. International students, the reason we wanted to be here, to help them out if they are being stabbed or any kind of dangerous situations, we should be expecting someone there to help them *[inaudible]* we don't have anyone to run to, we don't have anyone to go seek help. We don't have any family here, we are here purely by ourselves, and we are by ourselves in those critical situations. Essentially, all we ask for is that we have someone there to help us out if we get stabbed, if we get assaulted, if we feel there is a dangerous situation on transit or on campus or anywhere in Edmonton. That's all we're asking for. The other thing that we do acknowledge, very much, is the history of Indigenous Peoples and their relationship with the Government of Canada. Actually, at this year's FURCA [Festival of Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities], I did a project as part of a class last semester on political party platforms, with Indigenous recognition, and I was able to present it *[inaudible]*. So that's why I'm saying that the points are both very valid. Just one last comment I would like to address to the board, because some of you were in the campus safety committee that we were in since last summer: we haven't been meeting — at least, I haven't been in a meeting — since February, and then you came out with this policy platform *[inaudible]* between February, or maybe even earlier, and now, so I was not there for that *[inaudible]*.

MIHESO: Just before you respond to that question, I want to be clear here. Open Forum is to discuss or ask questions related to things that this body is doing. The comments that have been made, they are as they have been made, and this isn't the forum for us to debate those comments. I do understand that some of these comments are polarizing, but Open Forum is for us to discuss matters that have been brought to the floor previously or were done by the SU. So as much as I do recognize that there is beginning to be a polarizing sense to what we're discussing, this is not the space for us to discuss those definitions. What I would like us all as members to



understand is we want people to be able to ask questions in this space and speak to Council directly, for us to be able to then work towards your concerns. I hope that's as clear as I can be.

DIXON: I think these are really good points, and I think something I mentioned to the ISU is that the last thing I ever wanted was for there to be division in this Council, particularly between these groups, because I respect both groups and I think there's a lot of solidarity to be found between Indigenous and international students. So to answer, I think, the first question, again, nothing in our policy precludes advocacy — for advocating for someone who is there for you. And that was done because, initially, our policy was worded in such a way — and after speaking with the ISA, in the group we spoke about, in bigger consultation meetings, after sending it to all their members, that was the feedback that we got. And so we shifted it so that it could be something that, in the future — because right now, like I said, there are so many reflected perspectives that it's hard to encompass that in a written policy. So we want to advocate for that, right? So it doesn't preclude any of that, and a lot of that is because of your hard work, and you continuously bringing that up every single meeting to me, that I included that in the policy, to make it clear that we aren't advocating against police, right? We're advocating for more community-based supports to help address the roots of crime within our city and on our campus. So I totally agree with you, we need somebody to be there, but what does that look like? It's been very hard to parse out, and this policy allows us to continue to have those conversations on campus and in our community. Nothing precludes that from happening, just to be super clear. Speaking to consultation, and I was going to save this for the actual conversation about the policy, but it keeps coming up so, Mr. Speaker, I just want to address this here: this policy had the most consultation of any policy this year. It is the only policy that we made a consultation committee for that met regularly after like eight months. We met all of the groups in the summer and discussed 'what do you want to see reflected in this policy?' and tried to incorporate that. All groups were emailed multiple times to have these conversations. And I understand that second principles were a little late in the year, but that's because we're getting so much information. But it is well informed. It's based on the survey — yeah, we'd like it to be bigger, I'll admit, but it's there, and it does show some really consistent trends. I booked consultation with different groups, including the groups that are here today but also CORA [the Council of Residence Associations], COFA [the Council of Faculty Associations], etc. And in these groups, we took that feedback, we really did. If you look at the edit history of our document, we changed six-plus points within the last week alone just to suit the feedback that the ISA had given us. The only two points that remain are points that we feel we cannot change and still walk the path of reconciliation, and so that is why we are in this conflict. It's because we are trying our best to find a compromise, but we all need to just give a little, in my opinion. I just wanted to address that conversation about consultation because I think it's been made out that there was none, but there's been extensive consultation for almost an entire year — actually more than that, because this policy started with Katie (Kidd, the previous VP Student Life).

Daniela CARBAJAL VELEZ (Incoming Students' Councillor): I'm not on Council this

year; I'm incoming and was here last year. I just wanted to chip in as someone who's both. I'm not FNMI [First Nations, Métis, or Inuit], but I am Indigenous, but I'm also a settler on this land, and like a lot of international students, I came here with nothing. I literally arrived to Canada with a backpack. But I do want to emphasize that as long as people choose to come to this land that is Indigenous land, it is our responsibility to ensure that we are doing the best to not harm them. Because the whole ability for someone to come from another country to get a better education is at the cost of the Indigenous Peoples of this land, and they continue to be exploited, and the policing system has been shown to be nothing but discriminatory to them. And if they don't feel safe on their own land, then it is not our place as settlers, international students, whatnot — if you're not Indigenous to this land you cannot say that you need increased policing, because increased policing does not solve any of the issues. There are root issues as to why policing seems needed. Increasing those numbers isn't going to solve anything. If you really want those things to stop then you need to advocate to the city. Why do people even need to sleep in train stations? Those are the issues you need to be addressing. So I just want to say, as someone with both perspectives, if you're an international student who thinks you should increase policing, maybe take a moment to reflect that you stand on Indigenous land. And if Indigenous people are saying 'we don't want this,' you need to listen because it's your duty, and the privilege that you have being on this land comes with having to listen to that. So I just wanted to, I don't know, pitch in from both sides.

SINGH (ISA): Point of procedure: Can guests give advice to other guests? Because that's exactly what was done here. I think it was meant to be a statement rather than advice to other guests.

MIHESO: From the way I heard it, I felt that that was a statement to Council.

Jashan MAHAL (Incoming Co-VP External, ISA): I just want to express how my experience has been on transit. I'm a woman of colour, I'm an international student. I just want to address the systemic challenges that I as an international student face. Almost daily, I spend three hours on transit. Due to my appearance, I'm an easy target for racism. My status here is temporary, my health insurance is limited. I don't have the support here for anyone to take care of me in case anything happens. I used to wear a head covering; I stopped because it invited stares and harassment. I'm constantly on call with someone while I'm on transit just to feel safe. I don't think that is normal. I don't appreciate the Council's ignorance of the intersectionality of the matters at play here, and just general attitude of acting as if these issues are any less important and do not need to be addressed. On ground, if someone is about to assault me or stab me, I don't trust anyone to intervene and risk their safety for me, except for the law enforcement who, by the way, are mandated by law to intervene. I would like to propose that this conversation about the policy is not over yet, and we should definitely do more consultations before reaching a conclusion about it, just to make sure that everyone is on the same page and everyone feels safe on this campus. And just another thing: not all international students are coming to Canada out of privilege. A lot of people are facing socioeconomic crises back home and this is our last resort. I am a minority in my home country, and there has been a lot of violence

going on for us as well. This is not a choice that we have made; this is pretty much a necessity. So I just want everyone to keep that in mind, that not all of us are coming from blingy, privileged families. We are working a lot here just to pay our tuition. And another thing: I think we have the right to be here. We are paying double or triple or actually four times the tuition that everyone else is. I think we can expect the Students' Union and the University to keep our interests in their mind when making policies like this. If something happens on the ground, do I trust a community worker to risk their safety for me? I don't think that they'll do that, because in every job — and I am in the mental health profession — in every job we are told to prioritize our safety before anything else.

DIXON: I don't think that what this policy suggests is that anybody should be harmed because of the way they appear. For many women, and women of colour, this is a concern that we hear consistently about riding transit. I don't believe the policy ignores that; if a Councilor does, they can motion and we can maybe add something in. But we do reflect that transit is scary for folks

MAHAL (ISA): I'm sorry to interrupt, but that wasn't a question.

MIHESO: On matters of speaking towards policy brought to the floor, the floor is allowed to respond. So, Vice President Dixon, it is your very right to speak based on the rules we follow. To the guests, you're not allowed.

DIXON: I think the policy allows for us to still do that kind of work and protection. I think once this policy is potentially implemented, it would be great if you could reach out with your ideas of what [inaudible]. And again, the policy is being kept intentionally general so we can continue to have these conversations, so that all folks who are on transit in our city, wherever they may be, can be safe. None of this precludes us from doing that kind of work. We can still definitely work on that issue, and we will continue to find nuanced solutions to addressing all of these concerns in an intersectional way that helps meet the various concerns of all of our student members.

MIHESO: I'd just like to address the guest that was speaking. Once again, members of the floor are allowed to respond to comments that are made to the floor. That being said, it is, once again, not in your right with a speaking turn to interrupt a response. I think it is only fair to allow the person that is responding to finish their response, and then follow up with a question as is allowed by the floor and by the Speaker. Next I see is a point of parliamentary inquiry.

SINGH (ISA): Mr. Speaker, I'm just trying to learn the procedure as a proxy, so can you just point out the procedure in the standing orders allowing a statement on a statement by the members of the Council?

MIHESO: It's not a statement on a statement, it's a response to the statement. Any statement that's brought to the floor can be responded to by a member of the floor.

SINGH (ISA): Which point is it exactly?

MIHESO: I'll send that to you during the break, if that's OK, just so we can keep going with our motion. Is that OK, Councilor Singh?

SINGH (ISA): Yup, that works, thank you.

Mohit SINHA (VP Communications, ISA): I have personally taken three courses on Indigenous culture after coming to Canada. I support Indigenous people wholeheartedly and stand with them. However, the fact is the majority of international students feel unsafe in the LRT, and they feel safer if more peace officers and more police officers are present, and that's the data from our survey, and this is also true for most international students you talk to. It's not about somehow changing our views, hence more consultation is required to reach a middle ground as the policy stands for everyone. A solution can be better training for police officers, but we can't simply remove police officers on campus who are supposed to be hired and paid for the role to protect us.

ALL: Can I just propose that we take a fifteen-minute break now, just so we can [inaudible].

MIHESO: If you guys want to go, that's no problem. If you'd like to break your fast now, please go ahead. Go through this, get it done, and then take the break is how I would see it, but once again, if you guys would like to take a break now, no problem.

There is a quick discussion about whether to take a break.

MIHESO: So we'll keep going, if that's OK. Alright, Gurbani, I think since you've already been on the speakers list, I'm going to give an opportunity for the members who have not to speak first, and then go back to you, which is typically what we would do. Is that OK?

BAWEJA: Yes, that's fine.

Abigail QUAYE (VP Academic, ISA): I think I expressed in the chat that I find it a little problematic when we're still engaging in debates like tagging Indigenous students as international students, and then for me it sends like — always engaging in idle chatter or perhaps centering peripheral issues, when we have barely scratched the surface of major issues or major debates. And it's all so very awkward when we are always delving into battles about statistics, when we very much know that it is almost impossible to get a huge number of students casting votes on specific issues of concern, so always getting to the main point and then devoid of all peripheral issues that just stretches matters. Now, I came into Canada — this is a follow-up to Jashan's statement — I came into Canada in 2019, September, and then by March 2020 everything was down. Stay at home for over a year, and now it is a concern when I have to go out at night and go on the LRT. Immediately it goes beyond the University; I am filled with anxiety because I feel I could get attacked and all that. I am so very

much updated about all the debates about policing and then police brutality and abolitionist theories and all that. But I think we cannot delve into the major concern of cutting it when we haven't really interrogated the issues of international students who have travelled miles and miles away into a country, hoping to study and then perhaps go back to their home country. Nobody wants to spend hours and hours on studying, and then that brief moment of wanting to go out, and then you feel threatened or you feel like you're not protected enough. And so just like Jashan I, as a woman of colour, whenever I have to go out and I meet people at the LRT, I feel very attacked. It doesn't motivate me to step out. It becomes a problem if I have to get stuck at home because I feel unprotected. So I think it would be an abrupt decision to just indicate that it is of prime importance to consider the concerns of Indigenous people — absolutely, this is their land, we are merely patching on it — but let's interrogate matters on a broader level, the intersections of it, and then consider what international students — I am not separating men from women; we are all in that same boat together when you go out there and then you are alone and you feel like anything at all could happen to you. So yes, I am of the view that we cannot just sweep away some major concerns of international students studying in Canada, studying in Edmonton, just because we feel that we need to abide by certain principles.

Charvi DHAMIJA (Incoming Co-VP External, ISA): As a person of colour who recently moved to Canada, I want to address the major barriers that have personally been faced by me. For example, when taking transit, I've often found myself in unsafe situations. I've received racist comments and inappropriate stares because of my identity, and I don't know what can happen next. I cannot predict anyone's move, right? Adding to that, recently a 21-year-old international student from India was shot and killed outside a downtown Toronto subway station earlier this week. Things like this scare me, and it's only getting worse day by day. I don't want myself in a situation where I get harmed physically, and that's why I want the UASU to take into account everyone's opinions, whether it's Indigenous people, people with disabilities, people of colour, or anyone, and develop a middle ground framework that works for everyone.

DIXON: I don't know if this is appropriate, and I truly do want to hear everyone's opinions; however, I do feel like a lot of the things that have been said have already been shared by other members, and are being taken into account or responded to. I just want to remind folks again to be very careful with word choice, because I do think that some of the things that have been shared — and again, I'm not attacking anybody with this, I just want to be very conscientious — I do think that some of the statements can be somewhat triggering, particularly to Indigenous students. From my perspective, something to note is that a lot of the things being described are being experienced by Indigenous and Black folks at the hands of the police. So it's not as though violence is not a huge concern. Again, we really need to work collaboratively to address this in a nuanced and intersectional way. The policy leaves room for that. I don't want to cut anybody off, yes, it's break the fast happening soon, happy to hear all the comments, just I know sometimes, even us as Council, we get repetitive and go in circles, so I just wanted to flag that.

MIHESO: I understand that and, as you know and have probably experienced a couple of times, I am also of the idea that we shouldn't be going around in circles. But since this is Open Forum, I don't know what people are going to say before they say it, and this isn't a space that they are very often a part of, so I think it's important to give everybody a chance.

DIXON: Oh, I wasn't saying cut them off—

MIHESO: Oh, don't worry, don't worry. I think we have one more — I am so sorry, Gurbani and Daniela, if you would kindly allow me once again to give the latest entrance to our speakers list the chance to speak, and then you would go ahead if that's OK. OK, thumbs up.

Tahmid AL HAFIZ (University of Alberta Senate; Engineering Students' Society): In my three years at the U of A, I've never experienced a more hostile, a more unsafe situation in Edmonton's transit system than what I'm seeing right now. I actually just got a bit cut off from this meeting in the middle, because I had to travel from my place to a friend's place here in HUB Mall, and this is where I'm currently at. So I travelled from Central Station all the way to here at University Station, and when I was taking the stairs, I was asked by a random person whether I had cigarettes on me. When I politely declined, that person became really hostile and threw some really racist comments at me. My question is, if the current situation on transit is like this — not just in our LRT station but pretty much everywhere in Edmonton — is this actually the right time to remove UAPS and peace officers from our LRT station?

LEY: Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question. I would just point out two things. First of all, in the situation you're describing, a police officer would only be able to respond after the incident has happened, unless you're going to have someone literally on every stairwell, on every landing, on every corner of the station. Someone would be able to perhaps respond many minutes later, but could not have prevented the incident that you just described experiencing. Which is why our priority is finding structural solutions to try to reduce the prevalence of those incidents in the first place. But I do also think that there has been some misinformation that has circulated about this policy. This policy does not call for the abolition of UAPS; this policy does not call for the complete withdrawal of the law enforcement presence from the transit system; it says that we need to work to find community-based approaches to address safety and security issues on campus. I think that it's important that we be accurate and precise in the information that we're sharing, and I'd encourage folks to read the full copy of the policy.

AL HAFIZ (Senate, ESS): Can I give a follow-up?

MIHESO: Yes, go ahead.

AL HAFIZ (Senate, ESS): So, let's say I'm going to go back home at around 11 PM today. So what if something happens to me at like 11 PM, the transit at the LRT station at the University is pretty much empty. What if something were to happen to

me? Who would be there to save me at the LRT station? What if something were to happen to me? There would not be any student there at 11 PM. So we really need UAPS and peace officers right there to ensure, not only that there's proper safety, but also the fact that if something were to happen, they are right there to respond immediately and take immediate action.

LEY: The one thing that I'd add is that I completely understand the need and want to have someone there to support you in a frightening situation. But specific to your situation, the reality is that it would not be practical to put a police officer every 50 feet on the transit system, which is what we would need to do that. Which is why we need to find a structural solution, rather than our solution being more police, more police, more police at all times, because we do know that in the solution you're describing there will never be enough. And that is why we need to find structural solutions, which also have the added advantage of not making folks feel unsafe who justifiably may be afraid of a greater police presence. So I hope that answers your question. I understand the fear that you're saying you have on transit: while I don't have your experiences as an international student, I will say growing up in Edmonton, I personally know some people who have been stabbed on transit. One of them died, and one of them barely survived. So I understand the concern that you feel. What we're trying to find are evidence-based solutions that will actually protect us and, unfortunately, adding more peace officers at this point, from the conversations we've had, is just not that solution. But we do want you to be protected.

FOTANG: I just wanted to add to that, too, Mr. Speaker, that in regard to the whole idea of response, that's what we advocated. It's also why the City of Edmonton has provided over \$3 million in creating the Community Outreach Transit Team that will handle the situation with a combination of peace officers, social workers, and Bent Arrow Society that are supposed to help transit riders, as well as people with mental health illnesses or addiction illnesses that are living on transit.

SINGH (ISA): Can I respond to guest Hafiz from the floor?

MIHESO: Go ahead.

SINGH (ISA): Guest Hafiz, I just wanted to say thanks a lot for sharing your concerns with the Council. However, unfortunately, you're banging your head on a wall. People here have beliefs, and they are here for themselves, not for you.

Mobashhir KHAN (Incoming ISA VP Internal): I just want to make a small statement. I think, while it is necessary to keep in mind the wants of Indigenous students, it is equally important that we look after the interests and needs of international students as well. It is important that we reach a middle ground and not ignore or dismiss what Indigenous students are asking. I'm just proposing a middle ground. If we are not reaching a middle ground, then we are basically dismissing or ignoring what international students, which is not correct. I think we just need to reach a middle ground.

DIXON: Again, just to be very clear, we consulted with all groups. Numerous changes have been made within the last week, and in the last year, to this policy and its ideas, based on the ISA's concerns. We have been in conversation with the ISA since — actually, one of the first things that Christian and I ever did was attend an ISA board meeting about policing on campus in May of 2021. These are concerns that we have heard repeatedly and have tried our best to reflect in the policy. However, when it comes to compromise, compromise does not mean that one group gets to veto the issues that are held by another group. Now, when we considered the policy, we've sent it to CORA, all the other SRAs, and these concerns have not been raised; in fact, most of them said 'looks good, great.' Again, like Simran brought up about an hour ago, if this is an immovable issue, then the ISA can come to Council and try to not have to follow this policy, and that's something they are more than welcome to do next year. However, I think something that's being framed as a compromise is something that we have made clear — through our consultation, work with the ISU, et cetera — there's just two points. The first one is the transit thing: again, all the issues that have been brought up are very valid and are addressed within the policy; we'll be able to advocate for it. The other concern is something that is [inaudible] from our consultation. Again, I don't want us to just continue to repeat the same thing. We've very much heard the concerns. I think we have compromised. If Council does not think we have compromised they will vote against it; they're very good at seeing when we have done good consultation and when we haven't. That's all I wanted to say, and I hope that helps address some of your concerns. I think a lot of this is based off of a misunderstanding about what really happened or what's really reflected in the policy, so I hope that helps [inaudible] that."

FOTANG: I just want to add on [inaudible] just rejecting the premise that we have not tried to reach middle ground or that this policy is not reflective of all perspectives. There's some who would argue that this policy does not even go far enough to address what so many members of our community believe to be the issue of safety when it comes to interactions with police, RCMP, UAPS. And there's some who also say 'screw the whole harm reduction, mental health approach; let's just militarize and police our transit stations and LRT stations.' So what we have here in this policy is actually a well-thought-out and, like President Ley said, an evidence-based approach to attacking the root problems that have caused transit safety issues in our LRT stations and in our transit stations. The people who are coming, seeking safety in transit stations, what students think are harassing, might be people who [inaudible] safe injection sites in Edmonton [inaudible]. So really, what we have here is a well-thought-out policy that has tried its best to reflect the policy positions of all parties on campus, not just one group or just another group.

Daxton DION-HOFFMAN (Indigenous Engineering Students' Association President): I'm from Kehewin Cree Nation in northeastern Alberta and I've been living here for the last, I'd say, 15-20 years permanently in Edmonton. A lot of the discussion is about making sure Indigenous perspectives are heard on this and, just going to the Open Forum, there's a lot of international perspective, and I'm not seeing a lot of Indigenous perspective. There's a lot of interjections by the SU to be on our behalf. It's kind of discouraging to hear how the stories and experiences are the same. A lot



of them are from out of town, they're not from Edmonton, they come from rural communities where police violence — in history, it's been an ongoing thing in these rural communities with the RCMP. We come from similar experiences, we come from out of town, we're in the city, we've paid for all of our tuition, competitive scholarships, all these things, so we have a very hard experience just like the international students. But our fears arise from the police. It's not only being scared on ETS from civilian threats, it's police threats as well. So it's discouraging to hear all these speakers talk about common ground, but the underlying tone that I'm hearing is that more police is better, and we're not getting our perspective as Indigenous people through: more police is a fear for us. Examples that I can think of off the top of my head: I know students that are followed on campus by police services. There's also students I know who've been studying for finals during December when it's minus thirty outside, they're in the Students' Union Building, open 24/7, police services are asking them to leave because they're sleeping. They're doing all-nighters in the Students' Union Building but they're asked — so it's kind of an antagonistic viewpoint that we're coming from here, where the police are not on our side. So we're not totally sold on the idea that more police is going to be a good thing. I'm not too much of a fan of seeing more police: it makes me uncomfortable. Even seeing police come to my door for whatever reason makes my heart rate rise and makes me very uncomfortable.

KORFEH: As someone who is studying criminology, I've spent the last four years studying crime and solutions to reducing it, and never has a sociology professor proposed that flooding spaces with law enforcement would reduce crime. More effective solutions — that have already been said several times — is confronting things that cause crime, such as poverty, houselessness, low education, and confronting addiction, which are things that need to be confronted first instead of putting more police officers in transit areas. Because the current structure of our policing system, our law enforcement system in Canada, and especially in Edmonton, is that they are reactive. They can only step in when crime has already been committed. We need to be proactive in solving crime. So if you were in the train station and someone was arguing with you, a law enforcement officer cannot intervene. They can only intervene once your life has been threatened, such as a verbal threat or a physical threat. That's the only time they can intervene. They cannot intervene before that. So police are reactive, so there's no point in flooding them into spaces because they're not even going to solve the crime problem.

BAWEJA (ISA): I wanted to make a statement just to clarify some of the misinterpretation of facts. I already mentioned, in my previous statement at the beginning, that this is not ISA versus the Indigenous students. We definitely respect Indigenous students and all this while, speakers from the ISA and international students in general have been asking for a middle ground, and not to favor international students over any other community. So that's definitely not the point. We are just requesting that this policy goes back to consultation. Clearly, Indigenous students also have a lot of opinion to put forward, same as international students, so we are just proposing that this goes back to consultation without having to rush the policy, and again take the input from both international students and Indigenous

students as what has been requested for. I think a lot of people have made the comments about international students going out and learning about the history of Indigenous students. Yes, we are new to the country, and a lot of us may not be aware of the struggles, but having to have the minimum information that we do about Indigenous students we are still requesting for a common ground. I have already in the past shared concerns with VP Fotang and Councilor Chris [Beasley] during the election period that I myself have taken the LRT at six in the morning for work sometimes. And when I look at someone who I feel can harm me, and go to the LRT station and see a security officer, I do feel safe, but at the same time I understand that Indigenous students might not feel safe with the same approach. So why can't we just pair up community workers with peace officers, which Councilor Haruun (Ali) has told me is proven to work in the United States. Why can't we just come to a middle ground? Why can't we just take this policy back to consultation and come on a common ground? Get this approved by Indigenous students and international students so both of them agree and come on a common ground, rather than just one community being — feel left out, and their concerns not being heard?

DIXON: Again, I just want to say that the assertion that this policy is being rushed is simply untrue. We have been consulting on this policy for an entire year. Every single group that we could have thought of has had a meeting with us, been sent an email, given feedback, and we have integrated that into this policy. Again, yes, we're coming to the end of our year. This is our last meeting, and we do need to finish passing policies; otherwise, they die. Bringing this policy back for more consultation, I do not believe will help to solve this disagreement, and that's the fundamental thing that we're discussing here today. Continuing to restate these concerns, which we have explained are a) either addressed in our transit points — are integrated into this policy, we will continue to have those conversations about how to protect folks, right? The other point, the other one point that is disagreed with is un-removeable if we are continuing to take steps toward reconciliation and represent the rest of our student body. I'm sorry, but I can't address these points again, so again, I just want everyone in Council and in this meeting to hear me, and understand that that is my last time I'm going to state this very clearly, because that is the truth.

FOTANG: One of the things I don't get to flex often in this job is that I'm chair of the Edmonton Student Alliance, and I'd like to give the perspective that in all of our advocacy meetings with almost every city councilor, including the Mayor of the City of Edmonton, all of the experiences that member of the public Gurbani talked about and shared in this meeting, we brought all those experiences forward to city councilors and the Mayor. The former VP External of the Graduate Students' Association, who is also an international student, Mohammed Tahsin, also brought forward the experiences of international students on the LRT, as well as the experiences of Muslim women and hijab-wearing women whose hijabs have been pulled by an attacker while using transit. Everything you're talking about there, we've brought it forward to Edmonton city councilors. You also have to remember, it's not just students who use the LRT, it's not just international students, it's Edmontonians, it's parents, it's other women, it's children, and they also have those perspectives. So when we're talking about reaching a middle ground, this city has already reached a

middle ground. That's why we created the Community Outreach Transit Team; that's why there's peace officers, social workers, Bent Arrow program, working together to meet all these different concerns within our city. So again, as has been said before, the whole notion that no-one is meeting on a middle ground here is absurd. This policy does just that. And I'd really like to ask respectfully, Mr. Speaker, that right now this point we [inaudible] this policy so we can just talk about going on and approving it, because the idea that it needs more consultation, again, is absurd. We've been consulting on this policy over two years.

SINGH (ISA): This time, I would want to give a whole picture on the consultation. I would say, as the ISA President for the last two years, the consultation is a lie. Now let me please finish my whole statement on what exactly happened from the ISA point of view. In June and July, for the first time we were informed that such a policy was being made in our Board from VP Fotang. And that's where we got to know that a working group is needed, without an international student — by having an Indigenous student, by having other campus students, by having a second-year association rep and everyone. We had to raise our concern and we had to get the seat. We had to tell them that we need a seat in this working group so international students' prospects could be heard on this policing policy, which it was back then. Finally, we were given a seat. The appointed first person to which the response was given: 'Other members do not feel comfortable; can you please appoint somebody else?' These are the two suggestions for our side. So we as the ISA were given suggestions about who we should appoint to the Students' Union working group as a representative of the ISA. That's the reality. Now let's fast-forward to this year. We finally appointed a representative who sat on that committee for a whole year, and that representative was never ever shown the resolutions. On April 6th, the ISA was emailed by VP Dixon about the resolutions. On April 6th, the last week of classes this semester. That's where we as the ISA, for the first time, saw the policy. Now, it's easy to say that consultation was happening for a whole year, for two years we were in consultation, but we were shown the policy on April 6th. I asked our representative: 'You sat on the working committee for a whole year, now the resolutions are ready for consultation, why didn't you share them before with us?' Our representative, Lionel Liu, he told us that he was himself never shown any resolution. So our member who was appointed to this working group committee, either the individual was never invited to the meeting or, otherwise, the working group [inaudible] that ISA's to be here, let's make the resolutions under the table, then email them on April 6th. This is exactly what happened. On April 6th we said this is exam season. Now after the Students' Union election you are bringing up this policy when we are busy, when we are not able to consult, we are not able to discuss, and we are not able to have our meetings. We were told 'April 19th is our deadline, you should participate in our consultation, everyone else is doing it.' We had 15 email exchanges, and out of those email exchanges minor things were accommodated, but the main point of transit safety was never. So it's easy to say that all the recommendations were accommodated, with the exception of one or two, but the main one was that one, the transit safety element, was the main one and the biggest one that you ignored. At the end we were told 'we will take this under advisement.' After two weeks we were told 'well, here is the finalized policy; if you don't agree with it, go ahead and apply for

an exemption.' So you heard us from April 6th onward, not a year, not two years, and then at the end told us 'this is what we are going ahead with.' The consultation was so condescending that at one point we were told 'we are going to have this in our policy.' So the terminology of using that 'our' — it's not your own personal policy or your own personal problem, it's the Students' Union policy and you're consulting with us, and then in isolation you're coming with the language where you're saying 'yeah, we're going to have this in our policy, we're going to keep it [inaudible] the whole consultation.' That is not the consultation. [inaudible] saying we were not consulted, we were not: we were shown the policy on April 6th. Our representative was never, ever shown the policy even though the person was on the working group. So please don't tell me that we were consulted. We wouldn't be here, we are not enjoying this, we don't like coming here during exams, when tomorrow I have an exam. Many of the VPs who are speaking here, they have exams. We are not coming here out of joy. We are coming here because it pains us. Every single vote that you all will be casting today, will be a stab on the same student who was stabbed last year on transit. We are the ones who are hearing students crying and calling us and pleading 'help us, do something on this.' For you all to sit on this council, vote yes, and say we consulted, say we are doing it for one whole year, [inaudible] is not the solution. When we say a middle ground, let me tell you what middle ground we propose. Even yesterday night we proposed this. But please, we don't want to go ahead and release a press statement, we don't want to call the students: just do one thing. There's a COTT [Community Outreach Transit Team] program recently implemented by the City of Edmonton. It is a program where transit peace officers, along with community workers, together go on a patrol to help the most vulnerable and, at the same time, for peace officers to help address any violent incidents. That's the middle ground that we are talking about over here. We're talking about a middle ground where you have your community workers, where you have your transit peace officers, and then together you go and address the transit situation on the ground. But you all don't want to listen, and that's the sad reality. And we can come here, we can talk, we can scream, and beg you on our feet, because that's the position where you have sent us all. So all I will say is: you want to pass this policy, go ahead and pass it, but don't lie that the consultation was happening for two years, consultation was happening for one year: that's not the reality. I can show you the email chain where we got the first email on April 6th.

KORFEH: There was a proposal that we pair more peace officers with community workers. I want to remind you that peace officers cannot confront crime. They are bylaw officers. They can't arrest people. They will be just like community workers, so putting more of them in spaces still will not reduce crime. That is not a solution. And also, peace officers are worse than police officers in the sense that they have 'blue light syndrome.' That means they're constantly looking for people to ticket. So if you put more peace officers in a space, I guarantee this will happen: more students are going to build up fines, and they're going to just have to be paying the City a lot, because they're going to get tickets for parking incorrectly, jaywalking, and a whole bunch of nonsense. So I don't think putting more peace officers in the space will reduce any crime.

MOTOSKA: Before I speak I'd like to collectively have everyone in this meeting take three deep breaths. We start with one...and another...and the last. [Sounds of breathing.] Alright, I am responding as Policy Committee Chair. I want to mention that I did not work specifically on this policy; however, I have reviewed it several times extensively. Now, none of what anyone from the SU has said minimizes the experiences that have been shared today. I want to say that clearly, full stop. I also want to say that I am speaking as a cisgendered white woman who does not experience the same rate of discrimination as those who have spoken today, and thank you for sharing your concerns about public safety and transit. That said, there are a lot of issues that are being raised that are addressed in this policy, and I would encourage you all, if you have not already read the policy, to read through it extensively and ask questions if you need clarification on what has been written in the policy. Consultation has been done extensively. This policy, in its initial stages, was brought last year, and consultation has been done since then. That is not a lie: that is a fact, and if proof is required of that, we can get that. I understand that this is a contentious issue and that safety is the main concern. However, like I stated, a lot of the issues that were brought and addressed are stated in the policy. If you would like to further speak about this policy, please do so with reference to a specific point. If you have a suggestion for how to reword or include something, a friendly amendment can be made. With that said, I would like to motion on the floor to vote on this policy, not to prolong our break, but since we have already discussed this at length, to bring the policy to a vote now and address any questions to a specific point in the policy or concern, or to bring a friendly amendment to adjust it.

Brief discussion about potential motions. MOTOSKA clarifies that she wishes to advance the agenda to formally begin the Council discussion on this motion, leading to a vote. MIHESO decides that it would be fairer to continue Open Forum to allow all guests a full chance to speak.

ALL: Respectfully, I noticed an important item for discussion, but at the same time too, we've been at this for about three hours now. This is somewhat becoming toxic, I think, and we can see that tensions — and I'm not blaming anyone, this is a highly sensitive topic [inaudible] vital work in the community. But at this time I would heavily, heavily suggest we take a break. So I move to take a fifteen minute break, so we can all take a moment to re-collect our thoughts, and come back here remembering the oath that we took, and to ensure that we're all [inaudible]. It's exams, people are leaving, let's just have a last good Council meeting before we leave.

MIHESO agrees, but decides that it would be fairer to continue Open Forum.

BEASLEY: My motion was going to be, and still is, that we finish the discussion [inaudible], and then we move up the policy passing to right after that, and then we minimize the amount of time that those who have come up here and shared incredibly heartbreaking, emotional stories have to wait. We allow them to watch our discussion and to watch their representatives debate and discuss the information we've all heard and had a little chance to process.

DHILLON: I was going to propose the same thing Chris proposed, but only Daniela is left in Open Forum, so we just get through Daniela, then Open Forum is closed, then we get to our discussion.

Seeing no objections to DHILLON's proposal, MIHESO continues Open Forum.

CARBAJAL VELEZ: First of all, I just want to reiterate what was said earlier by Daxton: there's been a lot of disrespectful language towards Indigenous students tonight, and I think that's not OK in this space. Like I mentioned before, international students, domestic students who are not Indigenous, all need to remind ourselves that this conversation is taking place on Indigenous land, and we need to respect those voices. We can't — it is emotional, mental, and physical labour to be here and to be standing up for this, for Indigenous students, and for people to be coming with this disrespectful demeanor is not OK. And also, this whole thing with meeting on this middle ground — Indigenous students have already spoken, students from marginalized communities have already spoken, and this just goes to show it's borderline anti-Indigenous sentiment, because it's this continual erasure of Indigenous voices that have been advocating for decades, but no-one's listening to them. Saying we need further consultation when the consultation has already been done. This whole conversation is revolved around nitpicking one singular thing about the policy. I think people need to realize that — those who are opposing the policy, saying that it's going to make an unsafe environment, need to realize that a lot of the policy focuses more on harm reduction and advocating to the City and government to have a safer transit system. So passing this won't just completely make it unsafe. If anything, it makes it safer. It addresses the root issues. And I'm going to say it one last time: as people who are not indigenous to this land, it's not up to us to say what Indigenous people should compromise to. And I know a lot of people come here because it's their last option, because maybe in their country, their education is not the best: I come from that same situation. That still does not give us the right to override and speak over the Indigenous people of this land. I know everyone struggles, and a lot of people may face racism and targeted attacks and such, but this whole policy goes to address that. It goes to address, to make it safer for everyone, including international students. You having more police there, you're still going to continue to be targeted by attacks, you're still going to continue to be feeling unsafe. The unsafeness does not go away. But with harm reduction, with advocating for safer transit, it does. So I just wanted to point that out, because I think people were focusing too much on one tiny little piece of the policy and not on the entirety and goal of the policy, which is just to make it safer, not just to remove policing. People need to look at the whole thing, not just one tiny thing that they were told to focus on.

**MOTOSKA/BEASLEY MOVED TO** vote on the Campus Safety and Security Policy before moving to Question Period

CARRIED

2021-26/7

QUESTION PERIOD

ALI: Can the Students' Union run a deficit?

LEY: Yes, we can run a deficit. We try not to, because it's not a good idea to fund a service in a way that's going to be unsustainable. So yes, we can run a deficit for a year; we can't run a deficit forever. Any service that we want to fund, we need to have a sustainable funding model for, otherwise we're just setting up future students for failure.

2021-26/8 BOARD AND COMMITTEE BUSINESS

2021-26/8a **MONTEIRO/LEY MOVED** to formally approve the Student Group Committee Recommendations to improve the relationship between Students' Council and the International Students' Association.

MONTEIRO speaks in favour of the motion and explains how the forthcoming MOU is being drafted in collaboration with the ISA.

See SC-2021-26.02

2021-26/8b **MONTEIRO/LEY MOVED** that the Bylaw Committee clearly defines the delegated authority of Student Representative Associations under Bylaw 8100.

See SC-2021-26.03

2021-26/8c **MONTEIRO/LEY MOVED** that the Executive Committee develop - in alignment with the Student Group Committee Recommendations - a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the International Students' Association (ISA) for the 2022/2023 academic year and share the MOU with the Students' Council and the ISA.

See SC-2021-26.04

**FOTANG/MONTEIRO MOVED TO** approve Agenda Items 8a - 8c as an Omnibus Motion

CARRIED

2021-26/8d **MOTOSKA/DIXON MOVE TO** approve the Second Principles of the Campus Safety and Security Policy

See SC-26.26

MOTOSKA: This policy outlines advocacy efforts. The purpose of the Students' Union Political Policies, or policy in general, which Policy Committee works on, is to direct the Executive Committee, all FAs, and all SRAs in their advocacy efforts. I just want to make that very clear: that it's advocacy efforts.

DIXON: I think some folks have walked out, so [inaudible]. So I want to go back to the beginning. From my understanding, this policy work started two years ago in

response to the BLM movement, along with calls from Indigenous students for the SU to look into security and policing on our campus, so we can make it safer and more inclusive for everyone, recognizing the harm that security and policing prevent to some members of our community. Following that, I can't speak specifically to what was said before we came in, but from what I understand, there were questions that were stated on our annual general survey. There were also some great conversations: we also created a consultation group at the request of different folks who requested to speak more in depth about this policy, and that group met regularly. So of course [inaudible] to discuss the policy. In addition, we spoke with CORA, COFA, and the SRAs. And in this we were asking for feedback on what people would like to see done to improve safety and security on our campus. This took a really long time. We also conducted another survey this year to see what people outside of student governance would think, and encouraged all those folks who took it to share that survey with their community. This led to multiple edits to the policy, which I think everyone in Policy Committee can attest to. I really changed it from what an initial draft would look like, and then it got cut down, changed in so many ways, including in the last week, to address many of the ISA's concerns. Today some of the outstanding points are about transit. As I've stated numerous times before, I really appreciate that this is a nuanced issue that all of us care about. While I'm a white woman, I'm also a woman who takes transit by herself, and I think everybody, not just women, but anybody of any gender, can attest to the fact that it is pretty scary, and that is why our point is being kept general: to allow for us to advocate for nuanced positions on transit. The reason why not every single position on transit is listed for every single group is we had a lot of different feedback from a lot of different folks. From my perspective, this is a much more nuanced conversation that will change over the years as we learn more about what other cities and groups are doing to make their communities safer. But we always want to make sure, as has been addressed, that there's somebody there for folks, particularly folks who might not have family here; that there is help for those who have mental health and substance abuse issues; and that we are not just depending on those who might make our community members feel unsafe, but that we are working toward a very nuanced solution. That's why I tried to keep it general. Finally, there is a point about the [UAPS/EPS] liaison program. This point is very contentious. As has been stated, there are some serious issues with the liaison program. First of all, we haven't seen any tangible benefits and safety has not increased. This has been pointed out by many of the folks who are concerned with the policy. Multiple people have been stabbed this year close to our campus. Additionally, this project has not been transparent. While I appreciate that the ISA was able to get a quick meeting for more information about the positives of the liaison program, it took us, asking critical questions, five months to receive a response from UAPS. It's a clear lack of transparency. Finally, our surveys showed that even students who are comfortable with an organization like UAPS are dubious about their information being shared with EPS, which is the main thing that this liaison program works to do. So for those reasons, along with the fact that we would like to stand in a place of reconciliation, we believe that we have worked to create a policy that balances this very complex issue and the nuanced concerns that everyone has brought to us. As Emily mentioned, this is a starting point for our advocacy and we have tried to write everything in away that we can meet these complex needs of our



community members. I think we've also heard a lot about this policy today. I don't want to cut off anybody's thoughts but, if things have already been shared, we all heard them here today, and I hope that everybody remembers those concerns and the positives when they vote on this policy today.

BEAULIEU-MERCREDI: I want to preface this by saying that I'll be speaking to you not wearing my many hats — as President of the ISU, NSSA, or as a Councilor — but as an Indigenous student here at the University of Alberta. The conversations here tonight have definitely taken a toll on myself, and doubtless my fellow Execs of the ISU behind me. Regardless, we stand steadfast in the face of this...resistance, I guess. There are a multitude of complex things that come with discussing policing, especially campus policing. As an Indigenous student, I can tell you that any time I see an RCMP officer, UAPS, a peace officer, or any sort of uniformed law enforcement, the hair on the back of my neck stands up. This stems from not only my personal interactions with police in general, but the intergenerational trauma that has been handed down from my relatives. For those who are unaware, my kokum, which is grandmother in Cree, and two of my nimosôms, grandfather, and countless aunts and uncles have been taken away from us to residential schools. My own mother was spared because the school closed just four years before she was born, and she was born in 1978. So the lived realities of these peoples can't be put on the back burner, I don't think, especially here in an institute of learning. Through the comments tonight it is clear to me that, although we are at a university, further education is required. And I'll keep my comments brief, but just going back to our new land acknowledgement and the question it asks: 'In relation to the territory on which you are situated, what role do you play in strengthening the resistance and resurgence of Indigenous students within your communities?' Here at the U of A, I believe that you can all play a part in this by voting yes on this policy.

WATTAMANIUK: I just wanted to begin by recognizing, definitely, the conversation that we are having tonight. And this is coming from the perspective of a cisgendered white man who has not had any of these lived experiences. A number of international students have raised their deeply personal experiences with racism in the city, but they are still new to — and this is not something that can be brushed aside: Indigenous students have come to raise their concerns with the state of policing in Edmonton and Canada more generally, as they've sought to oppress the First Peoples of this land for centuries. They've sat through a very difficult conversation and have expressed their nuanced perspectives and experiences, and I think that's something we should all be extremely grateful for. I think it's really important to remember that, when it comes down to it, we all entered student governance to make lives as best as possible for students and, in this instance, to make our students feel as safe as possible. As Councilor Motoska said, it's important to remember the context that we make this decision in. This is a Political Policy: this is what we're going to be bringing forward as our advocacy for the Students' Union and for its delegated representative associations. It's how we're going to best represent our students going forward. The diversity of experiences in the statements that have been made today, I think really reflects the depth to which this policy goes and to which it affects all of our students. I think if you really read through the policy, like VP Dixon mentioned, you'll notice a

few general themes that certainly popped up to me when I first read it. Reviews [inaudible] and general strategies to go forward with a more holistic approach to campus security to make paths to solving this problem. We're not the ones deciding on that path here, but rather we're deciding what to advocate to the University and the city. Resolution 13 in particular: 'The UASU will advocate to the municipal government for improved safety on transit. This advocacy should focus on harm reduction and community-based strategies to improve safety in transit.' Nothing about this is excluding any option that could be beneficial to helping students feel more safe on transit. And if we look at harm reduction in particular, which is also defined in the policy, it says 'Harm reduction, or harm minimization, refers to a range of public policies designed to lessen the negative social and/or physical consequences associated with various human behaviours, both legal and illegal.' I think that's something we can all get behind, and I don't speak for anyone here, but I do think that's an important principle on which we can base our advocacy on campus, on transit, and in the city more generally. I really feel that this policy paves the way for people — all of us here, including the SRAs — to pursue the solutions that we've talked about so far, to allow a much more balanced approach to these issues. And again, we have to consider how much ambiguity is left in this policy, to allow for Student Representative Associations and for Students' Council and for the Students' Union to represent the plurality of views that we have here. It doesn't in any way preclude the ISA or the other SRAs from advocating for transit safety, as long as their advocacy promotes harm-reduction-based strategies, which I think we can all agree are good principles for all sorts of advocacy around campus security. So those are a few of the reasons that I'll be voting strongly in favour of this policy.

BEASLEY: I want to start by thanking everybody who spoke, and everyone who sat through what's been a really emotional couple of hours. I can only imagine how uncomfortable and painful it's been to hear such stories from members of your communities. I also want to thank the ISA for their work and advocacy for their constituents. It's been some intense emotional labour that we've seen, and there's clearly a need for more safety on campus and on transit. But I don't think that this discussion should be framed as whether members of Council support the safety of students. I think, in reading the policy, it shows the ways that we want to advocate for more safety on campus and for more safety for students. I also want to make it clear that, by omitting peace officers in this policy, as other people have mentioned, we don't prevent people for advocating for it. But having said that, I want to speak in opposition to adding any proposed language about increasing transit peace officers. I was a member of the Safety and Security Policy Committee, and my opinion has always been that having more safety and security on transit is of crucial importance, but my big thing's always been that the method to achieve safety is not transit peace officers or the EPS liaison program. My stance has been that increasing peace officers is not the unique way to increase safety, but it is often uniquely harmful. It's my firm belief that an increase in peace officers will lead to an increase in lateral violence, discrimination, and racial profiling, a lot of things that a lot of the speakers here today spoke about too. Outside of the lateral violence that I think will come if we commit to advocating to increase their presence, I also want to break down some of the legal duties that police officers have. As Councilor Korfeh mentioned earlier, to my

understanding transit police officers can't currently intervene in an ongoing hate attack. To my understanding, while this might change in the future, only the Edmonton Police Service has that authority. That means that the use of these transit police officers is only for deterrence. They are not the unique actors to be able to deter people and increase safety through that. Deterrence is also complicated, because it assumes that people only commit crimes by making choices. A lot of times these crimes are made in passion or in the heat of the moment by people that are just not well or just not making choices actively. And so even with this marginal benefit from deterrence, it's going to lead to the kind of sweeping or huge changes that people want it to. It's my personal belief that if we increase the number of police officers, even if we see an increase in the amount of deterrence, we'll also see increased discrimination, and an increase in discrimination will be shouldered most by Indigenous and Black community members. If we know the value of deterrence and that safety is not uniquely achieved by increasing police presence, then we focus on what this policy asks us to focus on. We focus on community supports; we focus on the ability to have harm reduction procedures; and we focus on the other ways to achieve this deterrence and to reduce crime proactively. And so for this reason I'm going to be voting for the policy as it stands today, and I urge everyone else to do as well. I don't think this needs more consultation: I was there for the consultation and it really impressed me as something where I learned a lot and I know the committee learned a lot. And we really earnestly engaged with what we heard. Ultimately, my take is that the root of increasing community safety, which I think is something we all want, is through community support and harm reduction primarily. I don't think we should amend the language to lock ourselves in to advocating for something that I'm personally uncomfortable with and I know other people are as well.

YEOLA: I do want to acknowledge everyone's insight on this so far. Councilors, thank you so much for sharing your insights on this. I sit on the Policy Committee and am also an international student. I understand the concerns that have been raised by the ISA so far, and I appreciate your work. It breaks my heart to hear about all the incidents that were outlined today. However, having had the opportunity to have discussion on the Campus Safety and Security Policy and work on this committee, I want to emphasize that modifying this resolution in the way that's proposed would substantially harm other vulnerable, marginalized communities on campus. I want to clarify once again that this policy is not limiting current safety measures, but mentions improvement by looking at better training, advocating for better response time, and so on. These are certain resolutions that have been mentioned in this policy, so please, I ask you to take a look at these points mentioned in the policy itself.

SINGH (ISA): Mr. Speaker, is there a time limit on this, or can I go as long as I wish?

MIHESO: Go ahead. Obviously I don't want you to take, like, thirty minutes, but go ahead.

SINGH (ISA): Hear me out, Council, for once. You are going to make a decision, and what I'm going to speak — hear my for once, and what I'm going to say is not just me speaking. Me, the ISA Execs, all the international students who spoke here today, after

our discussion this is what I have to say, and it is on behalf of them. First of all, we are deeply disheartened by the way the conversation went. Everybody from the ISA, all the international students, were respectful towards the Indigenous students. We did not speak or say or imply anything against the Indigenous students and their experiences and their histories. We repeatedly said, again and again, 'this is how we all see different on a particular item.' This is not coming from us because there's anything between us and the international students toward the Indigenous students. Now, there were comments made that international students should educate themselves, they come from poor education systems. This is racist. When such comments — now who made this comment, if it was guests or someone, I will not go into that, it's how the debate happened, how the discussion happened — when you say that we need to educate ourselves, that is racist and that needs to be acknowledged. There were many comments which were dismissive toward the international students themselves. We are here to speak for our membership. We are raising our concerns. That's all that we are doing here today. You have been dismissive; others have heard, and we thank those who have sincerely heard, who have sincerely wanted us to put forward our opinions. It is true that this is not our land: we are here as international students to come and study. But at the same time it is true that we as international students come over here and accept all the people who are here, irrespective of their background, of their Indigenous, migrants, from which country, from which religion, and we accept them as our family. We want to be their friends and we want to make new friends. We want to learn more about the cultures and the experiences of the students over here. —————

————— [line struck from record after point of privilege] and we consider you as our family — that is one thing that I want to make very, very clear — for all the time that we are here in this country. While many might say law enforcement might not work; however, it is a deterrent. People act lawful when they see officers, and that is a fact.

LEY: [Raises a point of privilege about a specific line.] What Councilor Singh is saying here is wrongly casting aspersions on the motivations of people who are here at this meeting, particularly Indigenous students who have spoken out about the horrific experiences of racism they have faced in this country, and the work that they want others to do to help prevent those experiences from continuing to [inaudible]. For Councilor Singh to come here and suggest that by doing that they are somehow excluding people from a country that none of us, frankly, have a right to, is just disgusting. Some of the comments that have been made are indefensible. And that Councilor Singh is now trying to defend those comments instead of apologizing is shameful. So Mr. Speaker, on the fact that he has cast these completely unacceptable and definitely false aspersions on what Indigenous students who are here today are trying to say and do, I would ask that those comments be struck from the record and that Councilor Singh refrain from speaking this way about Indigenous students and Councilors in the future.

SINGH (ISA): I wish to continue, so I'll just continue; however, I will be mindful of what's raised.

MIHESO: On the point of privilege that's been raised, I think it's now getting to a point where we're about to lose control. From my understanding of matters that have been discussed—

SINGH (ISA): Mr. Speaker—

MIHESO: Hold on, hold on. I need to make a ruling on the point of privilege that's been raised. When matters are being discussed about the views of others, the intentions of others, it is not in anybody's position to say what and whose intention is right or wrong. The fact of the matter is, and I don't want to seem like I am partisan in this issue even though this is not a partisan issue at all, this land is not ours. For me to be able to speak about the experiences of people on this land is completely and utterly unfair. It's not in my position. Now all the same, this is not to say that what has been raised by international students is not right. While what President Ley has raised is true, I will want us to refrain from speaking and directly going at this in the manner as has been done. Matters of this nature are things that have to be discussed with extreme care. When we continue to attack each other like this, it makes this space very, very, very toxic for all involved. That's not what this Council's going to do going forward. If this is how this discussion is going to continue, I will close time for discussion, and you will vote, and that's going to be it. So I will ask one more time for Council, please, members of our Council, no-one in particular — as you all may know, I don't have any friends here. I am just here to make this conversation as smooth as possible. Please let's not make it difficult. We cannot discount the views of anybody, least of all the people who have been on this land from time immemorial. As an international student myself, a lot of the things that have been discussed affect me directly. That does not mean anybody's view rules over the other. Therefore, while I will allow the point of privilege to continue, this will act as a warning to members of Council to refrain from directly attacking each other, because this is not what this Council is about. If you would like to discuss these matters outside Council, go ahead. But right now we are here to decide on a policy that is going to be affecting our advocacy matters. How you feel individually can be dealt with in an office, with me as your intermediary if you like, but that's not what we're here, right now, to do. I feel it is wrong for me to be sitting here on paid time allowing us to discuss matters that should not be here. Now, Councilor Singh, there are comments you made that are not appropriate at all for this conversation. That is not to say that what you were saying is undermined — which I believe is what you believe is the view of international students — is discounted. But what you are saying cannot, cannot start to tread on the views of others. So one last time, let's not go down this path, because the second I feel like it's going down this path, this conversation shall end. I don't like to do this, but if this is what's going to be the case, that's the way it's going to be to allow us to [inaudible] the respect of our constituents. So, as to the request of President Ley, I think that the request is in order, and we request those comments that you have made be struck from our minutes. And Councilor Singh, as well, we request that you provide an apology to the members who have spoken on this issue, including but not limited to international students, about how you feel they have been brought to — we would like to discuss the policy, and that's what we're here to do.

SINGH (ISA): Mr. Speaker, should I continue with what I had to say, or is there an apology that you want me to speak on?

MIHESO: I'd like you to speak on the point of privilege that's been raised, not in response but on the ruling that I've made.

SINGH (ISA): I actually wish to move a motion to amend. I have nothing to say about the ruling you have said, Mr. Speaker: I respect it, and that's all I have to say about that. The intentions were more presumed in the Council by, OK — let me just speak on that a little bit. What I said just now was exactly what people felt, what they told me that I should speak on, and that's all I did. If it offended, or if it was inappropriate, that's wrong on my part. That's all I will say, and I will respect the ruling that you, Mr. Speaker, have made, so with that I wish to continue speaking on this item. May I?

MIHESO: Go ahead.

SINGH (ISA): The last point was: we are sympathetic and respectful of what has happened before us on these lands, and [inaudible] it's not about us against the Indigenous students or anything, we are just hoping for the struggles that we are facing, and that we have been asking or hearing from our membership. That was the ending message I wanted to give. With that, Students' Council, on behalf of the International Students' Association, I would propose one thing for your consideration: don't take the item as coming from Chanpreet as an individual, but take it as an item coming from the International Students' Association, on whose behalf I am putting forward this item on the table. The policy overall, I think we have discussed it a lot, but there is one important resolution that we see as a huge barrier for international students to see that their interests are being reflected in this policy. And that clause is clause number 13: 'The UASU will advocate to the municipal government for improved safety on transit. This advocacy should focus on harm reduction and community-based strategies to improve safety in transit.' We have asked the Students' Council again and again to add transit peace officers; however, based on the discussion which we have had, I don't see that as something that you all would agree upon. But if you all really want to not be dismissive of the concerns that the ISA has raised, and really, truly accept a middle ground, then on behalf of the International Students' Association I want to move an amendment to remove resolution 13, and we as the ISA will accept the whole policy. The whole policy was great, it was in the consultation, we have no objection to any other clause: it's only one single clause that we are asking you to remove. And we're not saying this is the end of debate. We are saying we want, on this particular item which is transit safety, the discussion to continue. We want for this coming year's new execs of ISA, SU, and new Students' Council members to continue discussion at least on this single clause, which is transit safety. The whole policy we will support, we would accept, there is no exemption that would be needed. All we ask for is this single clause to be removed, and that's all that we are proposing.

VILLOSO: Point of privilege. I think this conversation has been long. It's been four hours since we started, and it's gotten to the point where one of our Councilors, and

our only Indigenous Councilor, had felt so uncomfortable that he had to leave the room. And I don't know what to propose going forward, but I think that's just something to think about. It's become such an unsafe space that marginalized people feel the need to leave. And there's been a lot of things in Council...sorry...it's not the first time that a marginalized person has had to leave this space. It's our responsibility to make sure that everyone is heard, and feels comfortable to say what their arguments are, and I 100% [inaudible] to all the international students that came today. I appreciate all their vulnerability and personal experiences they were saying, because it was hard to do. It was really hard listening to all the stories and my heart goes out to everyone who shared their experiences today. But I agree with Mr. Speaker that this conversation has become harmful. And I guess I'm going to motion to just end the discussion and just vote on this.

MIHESO agrees with the sentiment, rejects the motion, and gives SINGH (ISA) the chance to finish his statements.

FOTANG: Point of order, Mr. Speaker: I believe Councilor Singh made a motion that was making an amendment on behalf of the ISA, but he's here as a proxy, so I don't understand how that's possible.

MIHESO rejects the point of order: SINGH is speaking as a proxy councilor but also as a stakeholder (ISA President). MIHESO asks if there is a seconder for SINGH's motion to strike clause 13 from the policy. Nobody seconds the motion; it fails.

ALL: I know this has been a long conversation, but I also think it's important to hear [inaudible]. From what I can see here, two other people have speaking turns listed here, and I think we should allow people who are on the speaking list to speak, and then we should vote afterward. I know this is something we talk about [inaudible], but I think it's important to listen to student [inaudible].

There is a quick discussion about speaking lists.

ALL: I do a lot of anti-racism work in Edmonton, I'm actively part of [inaudible] here in Edmonton. This has been an interesting [inaudible] to City Council, and I know that VP Fotang has also as well, and I know that VP Dixon as well has worked with [inaudible] capacity piece as well. This is going to be a crucial step for the Students' Union, but I'll also remind the ISA that, to my knowledge, it isn't the [inaudible] VP Fotang for example, to City Council, need peace officers. This bylaw, nowhere does it say that we cannot have peace officers. [inaudible] point of contention, and I think that we had voiced it, to speak frankly. I think all of us could have spent the time much better; from my analysis, and my feeling here is that we should allow for international students to have a say, that's crucially important, and I don't think anyone here's against that. But at the same time let's just be mindful of the history that police have here in Canada, even with RCMP and government legitimately designed to target Indigenous children and take them to residential schools, or when there've been police officers who have a history of murdering Black men. Just during the SU elections, I went down to Calgary because a father was murdered by Calgary

police over a mental health crisis, and I have seen this time and time and time again. When a Black person goes to the police, they don't get the support. When we have violence in our community, we don't get the support, and how can we trust the police if, when we go to them, they don't help us? That's the fundamental issue here. And I don't think anyone here is against transit safety. I fully support transit safety, but we're not going to achieve that by having more cops. Even security now, the security that we have present on transit, physically cannot touch you according to their contract with the City of Edmonton. They do nothing. They haven't helped. We have an issue here, and how we solve the issue is really crucially important, and I don't think we're going to be able to solve that with having police come. [inaudible] policy position, for example. Police come every single morning, 10 AM, take every single person that's unhoused living in a transit station, and take them out to [inaudible]. It's a cycle. This is not going to do anything. What we need to do here — and this is the unfortunate truth, something you may not want to hear — but this is long-term work. We need to address safe injection sites. We need to address [inaudible] housing. That's how we're going to keep public transit safe, and we're not going to manage that with more police. This is something that research and data has backed up. So I respect the ISA's position, but at the same time, too, this Political Policy does not in any terms tell VP Fotang or any future VPX that we don't want any more police officers. It just simply states that the Students' Union, at this point, will — alright, I'm done repeating myself. I know this is a long debate, and I really do appreciate everyone's input on this, and I'm sure that President-Elect Monteiro, VP Fotang, and the next Students' Council will also work on this.

SINGH (ISA): Point of procedure, Mr. Speaker. My seconder had internet issues and he was out of the room because of internet issues, but he is joined back. Can we come back on the amendment for the seconding, because of a technical difficulty, but his intentions were to second before? However, the seconder has joined now. He's allowed the motion and please to be debated as we put it forward. That's the least the Students' Council could do for the ISA today.

MIHESO: Unfortunately, the motion had already failed. That wasn't made aware to me at the time, so I can't make adjustments for that. I uphold it. So we're going to move ahead with the way things are right now.

SINGH (ISA), seconded by THAKUR, requests a vote by roll call. BATYCKI raises a point of privilege to note that there is precedent for the Speaker to overrule a roll call request in highly charged discussions.

SINGH (ISA): This decision needs to be transparent, and the students who voted for you all need to know what you decided. Nobody's going to hate anyone for this. Nobody's going to take any revenge on this. It's for the transparency that Council should work for your constituents to know what you decided for your own constituents.

DIXON and MONTEIRO request a decision from the Speaker on the roll call vote, one way or the other, due to remaining agenda items, the time (10:30PM), and



quorum being jeopardized by Councilors leaving due to the time.

SINGH (ISA): VP Monteiro, I voted for you as an undergraduate student, as my VPA and as my President, and I wish to know your decision on this item, because you're making a policy that will reflect my wishes at municipal and federal levels. So I wish to know what you decide on this. It's going to take five minutes, but it will be transparent. And I voted for you and I'm saying this here.

MIHESO explains that the decision is coming.

**VILLOSO/FOTANG MOVED TO** end discussion and vote on the Second Principles of the Campus Safety and Security Policy

CARRIED

MIHESO: So the motion is passed 93% in favour with 6% against.

SINGH (ISA): I call international students to do a walkout at this very moment [inaudible] prevent me — a walkout of the international students.

There is some laughter.

2021-26/8e **YEOLA/MOTOSKA MOVED TO** approve Second Principles of the International Student Policy.

See SC-26.27

YEOLA speaks in favour of the policy and notes that it was drafted in consultation with the ISA. MOTOSKA commends YEOLA for her thorough consultation with the ISA throughout the creation of this policy.

CARRIED

2021-26/8f **DIXON/VILLOSO MOVED TO** approve the Health and Dental Plan Committee Fee Recommendations for the 2022/2023 school year.

See SC-26.28

DIXON explains that the fee is being returned to its pre-pandemic levels due to increased access to services.

ALL: How much will the fee be?

DIXON: \$315.

CARRIED

2021-26/8g **MONTEIRO/MOTOSKA MOVED TO** approve Second Principles of the Student Engagement Policy.

See SC-26.29

CARRIED

2021-26/8h **DHILLON/VILLOSO MOVED TO** approve the EDI Policy

See SC-26.30

CARRIED

2021-26/8i **DHILLON/ALI MOVED TO** approve the Food Security Policy

See SC-26.31

DHILLON speaks in favour of the policy.

CARRIED

2021-26/8j **MOTOSKA/WATTAMANIUK MOVED TO** approve the Second Principles of the Campus Saint-Jean Policy

See SC-26.32

BEASLEY speaks in favour of the policy.

CARRIED

2021-26/8k **DHILLON/VILLOSO MOVED TO** approve the second principles of the revised Bylaw 8000 Series

See SC-26.33

BEASLEY praises DHILLON's extensive work on this item and asks for a round of applause. Applause ensues.

CARRIED

2021-26/8l **MONTEIRO/BARAZESH MOVED TO** approve the Second Reading of Bylaw 100 Schedule C: The Student Governance Code of Conduct.

See SC-26-.34

MONTEIRO: I'll try to keep this engaging so that all of you are ready to talk about this, because it's late. I'm very proud to bring this Code of Conduct today, most recently especially in light of the conversations that have been happening at this meeting today. I think it speaks very much to why this Code of Conduct is necessary. This document has been ten months in the making, and was designed with extensive feedback and considerations of all the SRAs, in order to create a document that will help lead us in new and better directions in student governance. The Code of Conduct serves as a resource for understanding Councilor and SRA roles and responsibilities, and to create and protect equitable practices and spaces within UASU governance. It outlines when representatives are representing the UASU, conflict of interest, conflict of duty, respectful conduct, and the importance of confidentiality. Finally, I want to touch on the most important part of this Code of Conduct, which is the compliance section, which will guide our process for resolving disputes. It included general principles that outlined the rights of the accuser and the accused when going through the complaint process in the two forms of resolution. When a complaint requires action, we will always start with an informal resolution process that is built on a restorative justice approach. Our goal is to ensure that we can resolve disputes in a way that is not punitive and involves all of the parties. We also recognize that this may not always work if someone refuses to admit the harm that they have caused and continues to act in a way that creates unsafe spaces for student representatives to express themselves. This is why we also created a formal resolution process: to address the event of parties not addressing this in informal resolution. I think the most important thing to understand with this Code of Conduct is that it incorporates a lot of the processes that are already in our UASU Bylaws. What we have done is create processes to deal with disputes in less punitive ways, but also, if punitive action is required, provide some guidance for less punitive action and probation and derecognition, as it's currently worded in our Bylaws.

BARAZESH: As Abner said, we have been working on this document for the past ten months, and it has gone through an extensive consultation process with all Student Representative Associations that includes all fourteen Faculty Associations, the International Students' Association, and the Indigenous Students' Union. We've done all this work to ensure that student governance is a safe and welcoming environment in which student representatives can successfully do the work they have set out to do and promised their constituents. We have worked very hard to implement and address all of these concerns as we've worked on this document and ensure that we are acknowledging and implementing different perspectives. It should be noted that this Code of Conduct is not just applicable to Councilors or Students' Council: rather, to all those involved with the Students' Union as student representatives. Speaking of my personal experience with governance, I have witnessed numerous friends, peers, and colleagues experience discrimination, harassment, and bullying that has not only been significantly harmful, but has limited their ability to continue their work, as this space has become increasingly unsafe. Above all, the goal of this Code of Conduct is to protect everyone in this governance space and ensure an accessible, inclusive, and professional work environment. The Code of Conduct is consistent with our Bylaws and outlines principles and responsibilities, but also processes in cases of conflict and general compliance. Therefore these are not new ideas or

principles, it's just that they have been scattered across many Bylaws, and it's become increasingly challenging for people to understand their rights and processes, and address issues regarding compliance. The ideas presented in the Student Governance Code of Conduct have existed for quite some time, and the applicable principles and processes have been included in this one document to better outline everyone's rights and responsibilities in this governance space.

MONTEIRO notes that, as this is the first Code of Conduct, there will certainly be amendments going forward based on the needs of Council and SRAs.

VILLOSO speaks in support of the Code of Conduct and notes that today was a good example of why it is important.

WATTAMANIUK speaks in support of the Code of Conduct's importance to making Council a safe and respectful space. Speaking from an SRA perspective, he appreciates the balance of the Code and its inclusion of SRA viewpoints throughout.

MOTOSKA speaks in support of the Code of Conduct as it sets a standard for incoming Councilors.

OUELLETTE asks whether the Code of Conduct is meant for incoming Councilors in particular. MONTEIRO clarifies that the Code of Conduct applies to a wide range of student representatives.

SIVAKUMARAN speaks in support of the Code of Conduct in the context of the issues that the Student Group Committee has faced this year.

ALI speaks in support of the Code of Conduct in the context of Councilors' safety and ability to feel comfortable speaking up, especially as an expectation for incoming Councilors.

CARRIED

2021-26/8m **MONTEIRO/BARAZESH MOVED TO** approve the Second Reading of Bylaw 100.

See SC-26.35

MONTEIRO explains the need for a temporary replenishment process, onboarding, and other changes that should help new Councilors take office and participate easily. He thanks MIHESO for his help in the drafting process.

CARRIED

2021-26/8n **MOTOSKA/FOTANG MOVE TO** approve the second Principles of the Capital Projects Policy

FOTANG speaks in favour of the policy and offers a quick review of its stances. He thanks WATTAMANIUK for his contributions.

LEY notes that the policy will need to be amended based on the University's upcoming Capital Plan, which — he has been repeatedly assured — will finally include the long-advocated-for Maskwa House of Learning.

CARRIED

ALL retracts a scheduled discussion item, to loud applause.

2021-26/9 GENERAL ORDERS

2021-26/9c **VILLOSO/KAUR MOVED TO** approve the distribution of the final Council Scholarship

Councilors DHILLON and MORRIS are the recipients of the final Council Scholarship.

CARRIED

**WATTAMANIUK/SIVAKUMARAN MOVED TO** approve the awarding of the Gateway Awards

Areeha MAHAL (The Gateway) gives a short humorous presentation recognizing several members of Council.

LEY suggests a round of applause for MIHESO and GRAHAM. Loud applause ensues. Meeting adjourns at 11:44 PM.

2021-26/10 INFORMATION ITEMS

2021-26/10a Executive Committee Reports

See SC-2021-26.01

2021-26/10b Council Submissions

See SC-2021-26.02-04

2021-26/10c Students' Council Attendance

See SC-2021-26.05

2021-26/10d Students' Council, Votes and Proceedings (SC-2021-25), Tuesday, April 5th, 2022

See SC-2021-26.06

2021-26/10e Executive Committee Reports

See SC-2021-26.07-13

2021-26/10f Board of Governors' Report

See SC-2021-26.14

2021-25/10g Council Submissions

See SC-2021-26.15-37

2021-26/10h Presentations

See SC-2021-26.38-40