



**72nd Student Senate
Rules & Calendar
Date: February 5th, 2020**

Call to Order: 6:07 p.m.

Members Present: President Pro Tempore Harmon, Chair(s) Baxter, Cohen, Gnanam, Leckie, Murcia

Members Tardy: Chair(s) Dean

Members Absent: Chair(s) Daraldik

Guests: Vice-Chair Villacorta, Porter; Senator(s) Sojos, England

Announcements:

- President Pro Tempore - Attendance is handled by me. If you have concerns please come directly to me during office hours. Due to organizational purposes and my commitment to my studies I cannot micromanage the attendance for every second that a senator misses a meeting. I do it Monday and that is how I can keep all my work organized, please respect the process that I go through. Other than that y'all are doing great work and hope to see it continue!
- Judiciary - None
- Internal Affairs - Come to Bureau review next Tuesday!
- Budget - None
- Finance - None
- Student Life & Academic Affairs - None
- Guests - None

Committee Business:

- Bills 15, 17, 23
- Resolutions 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19

Old Business:

- **Bill 15 - Sponsored by Senators Gerdts & Blakthorne (P), Dean & Diaz (C):** Amending Student Body Statutes Chapter 607.1 D regarding graduate students and COGS legislation.
 - Sponsor withdraws bill in committee.
 - Bill is **WITHDRAWN**.
- **Resolution 9 - Sponsored by Senator Sojos (P):** Amending Senate Rules of Procedures 10.12 regarding amendments.
 - Opening: So the purpose of this is to change the rules so that if someone proposes an amendment in committee and it fails in committee, that amendment

cannot be re-heard on the bill or resolution. I wrote this because if a bill/resolution fails in committee it never reaches the floor and I feel the same should happen to an amendment

- Technical & Non-Debatable Questions: None
- Murcia moves to enter roundtable
- Porter seconds
- Roundtable:
- Leckie: Who keeps track of this?
- Sojos: Either the chair or the Senate President
- Dean: Controversial because sometimes a bill fails in committee. There's also the aspect that if someone wants their amendment to be heard by the Senate, are they not allowed to?
- Porter: I get where the sponsor is coming from but I can see circumstances where amendments may need to be heard on the floor of the Senate. I proposed an amendment where an amendment can be introduced on the Senate floor but it requires a supermajority to pass as opposed to a simple majority.
- Murcia: I like this piece of legislation and I think this is a good idea. I can foresee people not coming to committee anymore to avoid amending or discussing because they want it to be heard on the floor. I.e. They want it to have a better chance on the Senate floor.
- Baxter: I agree with Chair Murcia, but people come to committees because they're required to so I wouldn't say it prohibits people from coming to committee or would work to counter people attending. I do think this is ingenious because people have to think ahead of time about amendments.
- *Point of Clarification* - Murcia: I was specifically talking about Senators not in a particular committee
- Sojos: If something fails in committee there's a reason it failed
- Porter moves to allow a non-committee member to speak
- Dean seconds
- Villacorta: My main concern is I'm not 100% it's theoretically enforceable. People could literally change one word from "must" to "shall" and it wouldn't be the same.
- Baxter: For the sake of that issue, can we add something about the same meaning?
- Leckie: There's something in legislation called spirit of the law. Which is basically the meaning of the law, not necessarily the explicit meaning. Theoretically it could still be enforced by the Senate President in that every situation doesn't need to be accounted for.
- Villacorta: There's a clear distinction between legislation and amendments though
- Porter: Who would decide if intent is the same?
- Sojos: It's not the same and I think that last week proved that.
- Gnanam: I see an issue less with the wording and amendments to the consent resolutions. So when changing numbers, what is considered a major difference in terms of finances?
- Leckie: At the end of the day, the Senate President is the one who interprets and enforces this. So the answer to many of our questions is up to the Senate President as it's currently written.
- Villacorta: If it's up to the President, a Senator could submit the amendment to the court for an advisory opinion on whether or not it's the same meaning. That'd then mean the Senate President made the wrong call and at that point the legislation could have already passed.

- Baxter moves to call the question
- Motion fails due to no second
- Porter: My amendment would mean that we wouldn't have these problems
- Dean: What's your amendment?
- Porter: It would allow the reintroduction of amendments onto the Senate floor and they would require a 2/3rds vote. You could still hear it as normally, but if found not friendly it'd go to a vote that'd require a 2/3rds vote.
- Dean: What about an amendment that says for consideration during the second hearing of a bill or a resolution, 10% of Senators would need to stand up to hear the amendment.
- Leckie moves to call the question
- Baxer seconds
- Dean objects
- Leckie withdraws
- Dean moves to amend to add "unless 1/10th of Senators present rise in support of the amendment." onto the end of (f).
- Sponsor finds the amendment unfriendly.
 - Murica moves to enter roundtable debate
 - Gnanam seconds
 - Roundtable:
 - Murcia: I like this because it lets an amendment be heard on the floor if necessary
 - Porter: I'm in favour of this because the intent is similar to what I was proposing. Some amendments deserve a second chance whereas some don't. I know the situation this is trying to prevent.
 - Gnanam: I also like this amendment because it gets the speculative-ness out of it and I think leaving it up to one person is not great and leaving it up to the entirety of the Senate is a good idea.
 - Leckie: Someone still needs to determine if it's the same or the different and to decide if the 1/10th is triggered.
 - Murcia: I'm sure the Chair could give their input if the President missed something
 - Leckie: But what if someone changes one word or something?
 - Gnanam: I retract that part of my statement
 - Porter: This still lets amendment be heard which is good
 - Villacorta: I think that this clears up a lot of the issue of one person interpreting an amendment.
 - Dean: I did propose this because I knew if it reached the Senate floor after failing, someone has to gather support and can still be heard. I hope you vote this amendment through!
 - Leckie moves to call the question
 - Porter seconds
 - Vote:
 - Baxter: Yes
 - Dean: Yes
 - Gnanam: Yes
 - Leckie: Yes
 - Murcia: Yes
 - Porter: Yes
 - Passes **6-0-0**. Resolution is **AMENDED**.
- Dean moves to call the question.

- Murcia seconds.
- Closing: I hope everyone is cleared up about this and I'm happy Chair Dean could introduce this to clear up any ambiguity.
- Vote:
 - Baxter: Yes
 - Dean: Yes
 - Gnanam: Yes
 - Leckie: Yes
 - Murcia: Yes
 - Porter: Yes
 - Passes **6-0-0**. Resolution **PASSES**.
- **Resolution 10 - Sponsored by Senator Slimak (P)**: Amending Senate Rules of Procedure 15.3 regarding Senate Officers.
- **Resolution 13 - Sponsored by Senator Leckie (P)**: Amending Senate Rules of Procedure 15.3 regarding subcommittees.
 - Opening: 1. This is modeled off of the US Congress system. 2. This doesn't transfer any power 3. In the real Congress, there are sub committees that review legislation and reports it to the Committees. Right now, the Senate President can make subcommittees and I couldn't argue against it. A sub-committee isn't an ad-hoc, but legislation can be assigned to it much like a standing committee.
 - Technical & None-Debateable:
 - Dean: Would people be assigned or would people ask?
 - A: The chair wouldn't want to assign people against their will, so yeah.
 - Gnanam moves to enter roundtable discussion.
 - Murcia seconds.
 - Roundtable:
 - Dean: I didn't know about this. From my perspective I would never use this because we don't have as much business as something like Judiciary.
 - Porter: With an understanding that a sub-committee is different from an ad-hoc, I feel like the chair of a sub-committee should be an elected position not an appointed position.
 - Gnanam: I have a couple of issues. I don't like how it's strictly limited to members of the standing committee. Ex-officio non-voting members should be allowed to be included. I don't like that the chair is appointed. I also don't like how the President doesn't get a check and balance in that regard.
 - Leckie: Any Senator can attend any Senate meeting and can still contribute. I think this is the opposite and this is a check on the President.
 - Porter moves to amend.
 - Sponsor finds it friendly.
 - Baxter moves to allow a non-committee member to speak.
 - Dean seconds.
 - England: I don't see why you can't ask the Senate President for this. I don't believe we've used one of these and the saying "If it ain't broke, don't fix it" comes to mind. If you're interested in a sub-committee, I implore you to speak to the Senate President. If we find that the existing system doesn't work, that's a time in which we can look to make these changes. I really don't think Chairs need this power, it's really something the President can and should be doing. I don't like the idea of members of

a standing committee simply 'waving' legislation through from a sub-committee. If a Chair, Vice-Chair, or Senator can't be bothered to sit through a couple long bills in a standing committee they should simply resign. Too much am I hearing complaints of how much work people have -- but it's what we signed up to. Host a second committee meeting that week, or keep things organised and moving -- but adding to bureaucracy by doing this is not the answer to our problems.

- Leckie: I did ask Jack for a sub-committee and he said no. So by that extent, I would say the system is broken. As chairs we are responsible for our committees and we're the ones that are held accountable when things go bad, not Jack. We did have two meetings and the way to avoid that is to have something like this. This doesn't create any new powers, it just gives Chairs the power instead of the Senate President.
 - Gnanam: This is what we signed up for and business can built up, and that's the committee's job to do. I still don't like that membership is strictly limited to members of the standing committee. I would just like to make sure the language is more vague. The work is the work and we have to do it. I understand the stress but I agree with Senator England.
 - Baxter: I think this makes things more efficient. We're not avoiding legislation, we're just being more efficient. If one person in the committee says no then we're back to presenting it as per usual.
 - Murcia: People who are in the sub-committee may want to do the extra work, what about the people that don't want to be in the sub-committee? They may not be bothered to want to hear it out. There's an option versus no option. If someone else is doing the work for you, why would you object when the work has been done for you?
 - Dean: Why did Jack say no?
 - Leckie: I wanted to create a sub-committee on elections. He said it was a little early.
 - Dean: It's really hard to coordinate more than one meeting so I feel like this will help if a committee has a lot of business coming through. Being able to designate Senators who have the time to go over bills is a good thing.
 - Leckie: Chair Murcia, I think you had good points but other committees are optional for me. With the sub-committee, it would come to the sub-committee and I think it'll make it more efficient.
 - Leckie moves to table.
 - Gnanam seconds.
 - Resolution is **TABLED**.
- **Resolution 14 - Sponsored by Senators Cohen and Lavender (P):** Recognizing and adopting the majority opinion of the AdHoc Naming Committee.
 - **Resolution 15 - Sponsored by Senator Cohen (P):** Amending the Senate Rules of Procedure regarding the Naming procedure.
 - **Bill 23 - Sponsored by Senator Cohen (P):** Amending Chapter 413.7 with regards to Senator of the Year Award.
 - **Resolution 17 - Sponsored by Senators England (P), Villacorta (C):** Amending Senate Rules of Procedure regarding voting process during Committee of the whole.

New Business:

- **Resolution 19 - Sponsored by Senator Sojos (P):** Amending Senate Rules of Procedure 13.8 regarding absences.

Unfinished Business: None

Final Announcements: None

Date and Time of Next Meeting: Thursday, February 6th, 2020 at 5:00 pm

Adjourned: 7:00 p.m.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Alex Harmon". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Signature of President Pro Tempore