



## 74<sup>th</sup> Student Senate

### Rules and Calendar Committee

04/20/2022 at 5:30pm | Zoom Meeting ID: 568 902 4475

#### Call to Order:

**Members Present:** Pro-Tempore Nemeth, Chair(s) Myers, Diaz, Bettley, Garner, Duchene, Turkomer, Rider

#### Members Tardy:

**Members Absent (Excused):**

**Members Absent (Unexcused):**

**Guests:**

#### Announcements:

- Pro-Tempore:
  - Land Acknowledgement
- Judiciary:
  - Met on April 19<sup>th</sup> at 7pm and passed Bill 37, Bill 39 withdrawn by sponsor, Constitutional Amendment 2 passed and amended, passed Resolution 34
- Budget:
  - Met Monday at 6pm, passed Bill 35, Budget Orientation, and adopted Rules of Procedure
- Finance:
  - Finance met on Monday at 6:30 and passed both CRs unamended
- Internal Affairs:
  - Passed Constitutional Amendment 2 amended
- Student Life:
  - Met last Thursday and passed Bill 35 and Resolution 35, Bill 47 fails

- PAC:
  - Met Monday at 4pm and heard Student PIRGs
- RTAC:
  - Consent Resolution 20

**Committee Business:**

- Resolution 29 Sponsored by Senator Diaz (P) Stewart, Russell, Roy, Barrett, Pfeuffer-Ferguson(Co): Amending Rule 12 of the Senate Rules of Procedure to discourage Senators from indicating or implying that individuals or entities support or oppose legislation without their explicit consent.
- Resolution 34 Sponsored by Senator Wang (P): Rule change outlining the process of voting on additional absences once a Senator is unsuspended in an impeachment hearing held by the Judiciary Committee.

**Old Business:**

- None

**New Business:**

- Resolution 29 Sponsored by Senator Diaz (P) Stewart, Russell, Roy, Barrett, Pfeuffer-Ferguson(Co):
  - Opening Statement:
    - Chair Diaz: This resolution adds a rule to a senate that says people cannot imply or indicate that somebody supports or opposes any piece of legislation without prior explicit consent. Because it's a change to the rules, anyone could make a Point of Order if they feel that something said is inaccurate. Senate President could ask for evidence to determine if the statement is out of order. I'm open to any questions or potential amendments.
  - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
    - Chair Bettley: Would the explicit consent be written or verbal?
    - Chair Diaz: Written
    - **Chair Myers moves to enter round-table; Chair Rider seconds**
  - Round-Table Discussion:

- POI Chair DuChêne: Will there be a Point of Order anytime a person is mentioned?
- Chair Diaz: People can be mentioned when talking about a piece of legislation, but a Senator cannot say if that person or entity supports the legislation without explicit consent.
- POI Chair DuChêne: So if I say that I spoke to someone and they support it, but I have receipts that show their explicit consent, will I still be Point of Ordered? And where is the line between consulting with and supporting?
- Chair Diaz: I do not suspect that this will be used often, unless a Senator knows that a statement is not true.
- POI Chair DuChêne: What is the line that makes it out of order?
- Chair Diaz: You have to indicate or imply that a person supports it.
- POI Chair Bettley: Could we not already just do a Point of Clarification to fix this problem?
- Chair Diaz: Correct, but I still think it should be written into the rules.
- POI Chair Bettley: If someone is speaking about their legislation and explicates another person's position, and the position is current will they still be Point of Ordered?
- Chair Diaz: No, because this is only intended to be used when rules are being broken.
- Chair Myers: I do not dislike the intentions of this bill, but the way that its written leaves room for this to be used arbitrarily. I would like to amend it to make it clearer, and I would also like to see some rephrasing so that it cannot be used so arbitrarily.
- POI Chair DuChêne: Would you be friendly to amending it so that mentioning collaboration will not be considered out of order? And does this still align with the intentions of the bill because someone may be mentioned, but they may also hate it.
- Chair Diaz: I understand your concerns, but I think that the wording could be adapted if you want to introduce an amendment.
- Chair Bettley: I have some concerns about how this will be used, and how often it Point of Order will be used. Especially within Budget, money is moved around a lot and you have to speak with people to do so. I am worried that Points of Order will be mishandled.

- POI Chair DuChêne: Regarding the vagueness of the wording, especially when senators are talking about something that they are doing with support from their constituents in their colleges, would this be out of order?
  - Chair Diaz: I do not think so, because the entire college is not the entity.
  - POI Chair Bettley: Is the word entity not up to interpretation?
  - Chair Diaz: Yes, but this regards a particular group or a specific person.
  - POI Chair Garner: Is there any current rule that deals with misrepresentation on the senate floor?
  - Pro-Tempore Nemeth: Not in our rules, maybe in our Code of Conduct.
  - Chair Myers: I am worried that this is written vaguely and possible amendements may cancel eachother out. I am struggling to find an amendment that aligns with the intentions of this bill.
  - POI Chair Turkomer: Is there a definition of the word entity?
  - Pro-Tempore Nemeth: I do not believe there is a definition, it is up for interpretation.
  - Chair Garner: To me, the purpose of this is to persuade senators away from lying on the senate floor. I think there may be better solutions.
  - POC Chair Bettley: There are certain entities outlined in statutes.
  - Chair Turkomer: If this is to pass, there needs to be amendements to ensure that there are definitions to limit confusions.
  - **Chair DuChêne moves to call to question; Chair Bettley seconds**
- Closing:
  - I appreciate all of the debate, and I hope that we can work on a bill in the future that addresses all of these concerns but still fixes the issues at hand. Thank you all for your time.
- Vote:
  - Yes: 0
  - No: 6 Myers, Bettley, Garner, DuChêne, Turkomer, Rider
  - Abstain: 1 Diaz
  - **RESULT: RESOLUTION 29 DOES NOT PASS**
- Resolution 34 Sponsored by Senator Wang and DuChêne(P):
  - Opening Statement:

- When we forward someone for suspension, it is unclear how to determine how many more absences they get. This allows Rules to figure out the number of absences.
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
  - **Chair Myers moves to enter round-table; Chair Bettley seconds**
- Round-Table Discussion:
  - Chair Myers: This happened in Judiciary, and a lot of Senators did not want to forward someone to impeachment because they did not know if they would get all of their absences back. We ended up tabling a senator's impeachment because we were unsure of the rules, and this outlines a process and puts into statutes what works.
  - POI Chair Diaz: This is for people that have accumulated a lot of absences, and this bill sends them back to Rules?
  - Chair DuChêne: Correct, but Judiciary still handles impeachment, Rules just determines how many additional absences they get.
  - POC Chair Myers: This is focused on suspensions due to absences and forwarding for impeachment because of those absences. If Judiciary decides not to impeach a senator, they will go back to Rules where the committee would vote on how many more absences they are allowed.
  - Chair Diaz: I am in support, I am always in favor of clarifying the rules.
  - POI Chair Turkomer: What is the current procedure?
  - Chair Myers: There is no current formal process, so they would regain all of their absences back.
  - **Chair Garner moves to call to question; Myers seconds**
- Closing:
  - Sponsor waives
- Vote:
  - Yes: 7 Myers, Diaz, Bettley, Garner, DuChêne, Rider, Turkomer
  - No: 0
  - Abstain: 0
  - **RESULT: RESOLUTION 34 DOES PASS**

**Unfinished Business:**

- None

**Closing Announcements:**

- Nemeth:
  - Great first meeting! Send me your emails in the groupme. Everyone is expected to participate in the rotation of taking minutes. In the Fall, I'm going to try and meet in person some weeks and I want to work a lot more with you guys to expand our outreach.

**Next Meeting:** TBD

Adjourned at 6:19pm

*Sarah Nemeth*

---

**Signature of Pro-Tempore Nemeth**