

e

ais(h) -7 () -4 .0 -4 () -4 S.0 -9 (u) -7 (i) -3 (t) -4 (e) -7 () -4 1a ont0 - (r) -4 1.0 1m(a) -7 l.0 -3 ,.0 -4 () -4 Q.0 -10 (u) -7 1.0 1rmb.0 1rmeac 2.0 1rm() -4 .0 -4 ()-



as a club. This does not show good faith bargaining or respect the negotiation process we are currently undergoing.

Choose Life expressed their discontent in the lack of expediency the process is taking. However, the equity committee feels that in order to get the most out of this process, it is not the point of the committee to draft a document to just restrict Choose Life so that they can move on and come as close to breaking the restrictions as possible without receiving infractions. We have to create an understanding of all areas of equity before this process ends.

During the last meeting, one item that came up is the contradictory nature of Choose Life's last written agreement:

1. "Not showing images of violence without prior warning to viewers.
2. Clearly repudiating hate speech and all forms of violence."

Choose Life felt that these statements were not contradictory. Their argument is that they are repudiating the violence that takes place when Women abort their children. They also stated that just because they repudiate violence, doesn't mean they can't show the realities of violence that takes place in the world.

The equity committee is very worried with this statement. Safe spaces are not created through combating violence with other means of violence, physical or otherwise. We are also quite uneasy with the notion that they refer to the images they show as "images of violence." The equity committee ultimately wants to ensure that all future images will be behind closed doors with a viewer discretion warning before entering.

The mandate of Choose Life is very positive. However, it is not good enough to be an active club without completing parts of their mandate. Part of their mandate is to help Women faced with this difficult decision, and so far there has been no evidence that Choose Life has reached out to these Women. The equity committee suggested that if students saw that they were proactive in their mandate, fundraising and reaching out to help Women, instead of just taking a moral standpoint on the issue, the perception of their club would be changed for the better. Choose Life stated that they do not want to be told how to run their club and they thank us for the advice, but they do not care how they are perceived by students. They want a document drafted saying what they can and cannot do, not advice on how to run their club. Equity committee is not confident in the degree to which a bare bones "dos and don'ts" document would be effective without attempting to foster an understanding of equity with Choose Life.

There is concern on the part of the equity committee that Choose Life is disrespecting this process and the committee. They are taking an extremely defensive position on every issue we bring up and it is very hard at this point to find mutual ground. Hopefully, this will change in future meetings.



Students' Society of McGill University
Association étudiante de l'Université McGill

Office of the Vice-President (University Affairs)

Bureau du Vice-présidente (affaires universitaires)

**One Man's Struggle against Ableism and Immigration Controls in Canada. A Talk by
Refugee Abdelkader Belaouni and his lawyer Jared Will.**

Hosted by the Human Rights Working Group - Immigration and Refugee portfolio, in
collaboration with Radical Law Students' Association, Community Law, Pro Bono
Students Canada and HRWG

