

Notre Dame Student Senate

MEETING MINUTES

15 April 1998

Notre Dame Room, LaFortune

I. OPENING BUSINESS

- A. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Selak at 6:04 p.m.
- B. Philip Donner led the invocation.
- C. Absent: Jill Esenwein and Susan Roberts
- D. The minutes from the April 08, 1998 meeting were approved with corrections. Kelly Starman was incorrectly marked absent. Under IV. New Business, A. Formal Approval of Positions, 3. Parliamentarian of the Senate, Senator O'Donoghue equals Senator Olejnik. Under IV. New Business, A. Formal Approval of Positions, 3. Parliamentarian of the Senate, Tim Keller, instead of Parliamentarian-designate Mark Higgins, said, "It is pretty much up in the air until he is approved." Under V. Podium, A. Cheryl Iginis was spelled incorrectly; the correct spelling should be Cheryl Iginis.

II. REPORTS

A. Officer Reports

1. Student Body President Peter Cesaro

- On Monday, the Executive Cabinet met for the first time. We discussed what we expected from the Executive Cabinet for the 1998-1999 year: a forum for issues, a clearinghouse for ideas using clubs for co-sponsorship. Also on Monday night, we had an Executive Coordinators meeting in which we defined our office policy and established desks inside the Student Government office. Our first Student Union Team meeting was held later that night where we laid the groundwork for this upcoming year and reintroduced ourselves.

2. Student Body Vice-President Andrea Selak

- On the top of every Senate agenda, we will have a "Would you rather...or" question just for a little fun at these meetings. We will take a poll at the beginning of the meeting and will announce the results later. Another tradition that Senate will continue this year is called "Senate Dirt." Mark and I will gather and publish the interesting pieces of gossip that you or we submit.
- Mark Higgins said, "Be on the lookout for anything interesting."
- Senate advisor Joe Cassidy reminded senators that the official minutes go to archives.
- I would like these pieces of news on a separate sheet of paper in my mailbox. If there is nothing newsworthy, then Mark and I will have to go on a search.
- The parliamentarian said, "If nothing, we make stuff up!"

3. Secretary Michael Palumbo

- No news.

B. Position Nomination

1. Student Union Board Programmers

- Ryan Stecz, SUB Board Manager submitted a letter to the Senate on April 06, 1998 that read:
Dear members of the Notre Dame Student Senate,
After conducting nearly forty interviews for various programming positions within SUB, the Executive Board has chosen ten people to serve on next year's board. The candidates were selected based on the quality of both their applications and interview. The executive board came to a consensus in choosing each and every applicant, and I am confident that

those whom we have chosen will be successful in providing Notre Dame students with quality entertainment and intellectual activities. The 1998-1999 programmers are as follows: Antostal, Tobin Finwall; Campus Entertainment, Neil Hoyt; Collegiate Jazz Festival, Lisa Zimmer; Concerts, Dan Puccini; Cultural Arts, Candis Wilkinson; Ideas and Issues, Adam Rieck; Movies, Amanda Bishop; Services, Katie Leicht; Sophomore Literary Festival, Jim Bilek; and Special Events, Brian Churney.

Thank you in advance for the consideration of the 1998-1999 SUB Programmers, your approval will most definitely be appreciated.

Sincerely,
Ryan Stecz

- The Senate will consider these nominees at the April 15, 1998 meeting.

III. PODIUM

A. Gate Committee

- Beth Nolan, 1997-1998 Senior Class President spoke about the Gate Committee, a committee formed by the Office of University Security to analyze problems of vehicular access to campus.
- A.J. Boyd and I are on the Gate Committee, people voicing our frustrations about not being admitted to campus via the gates. Yet our frustrations are not concrete. Why are we complaining? Not many answers to this question, so the committee is trying to analyze data, is listening to students in trying to identify the real problem or problems, and is coming up with viable solutions. I urge all of you senators to go back to your Hall Councils and talk with your people. Ask them to identify their fears and what they consider problems of the gates. Most importantly, however, ask them their solutions to the problems. The captain of Campus Security is coming in next week to provide more in depth answers to studies, surveys, and polls taken by Campus Security. Notre Dame is categorized as a pedestrian campus. Why? When 3,500 cars are able to drive on campus, I believe that this "pedestrian campus" description is an excuse to turn people away. Why cannot students be let on for the weekends or at nights? The Gate Committee has pledged to make the gates more client-friendly.
- (Senator Doyle): Anyway to look at the bylaws of campus security or cars on campus?
- (Beth Nolan): There is a set of guidelines, but the information is not public. The bylaws contain such things as how to attain a pass and what constitutes a valid excuse. I will suggest to the captain of Campus Security that he bring these bylaws in with him next week.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Amendment S9798-24: Redefinition of Secretarial Position

- This amendment remains on the table.
- Executive Cabinet has placed this addition to this amendment with the Oversight Committee, review the original amendment advocated by former Secretary of the Senate Mark Higgins.
- When the Oversight Committee is done with these additions, they will bring it to the Senate floor.

B. Formal Approval of Positions

1. Chief of Staff

- (Chairperson Selak) I need a motion to approve this nomination, a second, and then the nomination is open to debate. Peter and Deannette can answer any questions that you may have.
- (Senator Mamak): If there are no objections, I move to unanimously approve the Chief of Staff, Academic Delegate, Controller, and Executive Coordinators.
- Seconded.

- (Chairperson Selak): With no objections, the positions are unanimously approved. Now that they are formally approved let us meet the Executive Coordinators. Please say your name and your position in the Office of the President.
 - (Brett Smith): Hello, my name is Brett Smith, and I am the Student Resources Executive Coordinator.
 - (Alicia Coronas): Hello, my name is Alicia Coronas, and I am the Student Life Executive Coordinator.
 - (Carrie Hedin): Hello, my name is Carrie Hedin, and I am the Relations Executive Coordinator.
 - (Kim Gibson): Hello, my name is Kim Gibson, and I am the Gender Relation Executive Coordinator.
 - (Todd Callais): Hello, my name is Todd Callais, and I am the Transportation Executive Coordinator.
 - (Jackie Feherty): Hello, my name is Jackie Feherty, and I am the Student Computing Executive Coordinator.
 - (Frank Law): Hello, my name is Frank Law, and I am the Academic Delegate.
 - (Deanette Weiss): Hello, my name is Deanette Weiss, and I am the Chief of Staff.
 - (Andrea Kavooosi): Hello, my name is Andrea Kavooosi, and I am the Administration Relations Executive Coordinator.
 - (Maria Alevras): Hello, my name is Maria Alevras, and I am the Diversity Executive Coordinator.
4. Judicial Council Vice-President of Elections
- (Senator Olejnik): I move to approve Nicole Borda for Judicial Council Vice-President of Elections.
 - Seconded.
 - Unanimous approval
5. Judicial Council Vice-President of Peer Advocacy
- (Chairperson Selak): O.K. we need a motion to approve Brain Meihaus for Judicial Council Vice-President of Peer Advocacy.
 - (Senator Doyle): I move to approve Brian Meihaus for Judicial Council Vice-President of Peer Advocacy.
 - (Senator Olejnik): I second that motion.
 - Unanimous approval

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Introduction of New Committee Chairpersons

- (Chairperson Selak): I would like to introduce the new Senate chairpersons for the six standing committees. Sophie Fortin will chair the Gender Relations Committee. Karen Boselli and Stephany Foster will co-chair the Multicultural Affairs Committee. Ryan Costantini and Drew Olejnik will co-chair the Academic Affairs Committee. Matt Mamak will serve as chair and Jill Esenwein will function as vice-chair of the Residence Life Committee. Jason Linster and Kevin Shannon will co-chair the Ethics Committee. Finally, Brian O'Donoghue will chair the Oversight Committee.
- (Senator Olejnik): Point of order...My address is 344 Knott Hall, not 305 Keough Hall as was incorrectly noted in the Residence Life Committee membership.
- (Senator Gloss): Point of order...My address is 312 Pasquerilla West, not 213 Pasquerilla West as was incorrectly noted in the Residence Life Committee membership.

B. Amendment S9899-01 Standing Committees

- (Senator O'Donoghue): Therefore be it resolved the Constitution of the Undergraduate body be amended as follows: Change Article III, Section V, part 5 to read: Each Senator shall serve on at least two standing committees of the Senate, but may serve on no more than three standing committees. Basically the rationale for this bill is to prevent confusion in the Senate. I really don't think that someone should vote on a committee that they are not involved in. Some sign up for a committee but then do not donate the proper amount of time needed to fulfill their duties on this committee. I feel that this bill would require senators to give proper time to all committees that they serve on. I am now open for questions.
- (Chairperson Selak): Brian, we need a motion to consider this bill on the floor.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): I move that this bill be considered on the floor.
- (Senator Mamak): I second this motion.
- (Chairperson Selak): This bill is now open to debate.
- (Senator Penton): Don't we have to wait a week before considering this new bill?
- (Chairperson Selak): No, this bill was presented, and copies were handed out during the retreat on Sunday.
- (Senator Mendoza): Are any senators currently serving on three committees?
- (Senator O'Donoghue): No.
- (Senator DuWors): I just don't feel that you can tell a person who has the time, he or she cannot serve on four committees. It just isn't good.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): It's a fail safe against fraud in the committees. I would love to serve on four committees, but there is a conflict in meeting times. Furthermore, I simply don't have the time to serve on all committees equally.
- (Chairperson Selak): Is this a problem that has hurt the Senate in the past?
(Senator O'Donoghue): No, this bill is being proposed this year to alleviate this year's possible problems. There was no previous problem. This is to prevent future problems.
- (Senator Olejnik): The Constitution was passed just a few years ago. There is not much precedence for this action.
- (Chairperson Selak): This was not a previous problem.
- (Senator Ernst): If there was no previous problem, I think we should continue with precedence and serve and participate, as fully as each senator wants to.
- (Senator Fortin): If the logic is to prevent fraud in committees, then why don't we just go on two or three committees and bump out the people who serve on more than that.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): I will respond to the three committees' question. Nothing is perfect; right now it is optional if a senator would like to serve on more than two committees. He or she can serve on as many as he or she wants, but three just seems like the maximum number of committees that one can handle responsibly.
- (Senator Starman): My main concern is that senators will sign up for a committee and then drop out after so long.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): Committees are not just voting bodies. You join a committee to get ideas passed also discussed.
- (Senator Starman): Then why don't we prevent the number of people who can drop a committee: not allow senators to drop a committee after a certain time.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): I don't know the time commitments of all the senators. But I do know that on the Campus Life Council, committee meetings are not set yet. Don't know how time will restrict my participation. On those committees, each member is invaluable. For instance, the Senate Ethics Committee needs every member to participate fully.

- (Senator Olejnik): This bill is logical. Senators shouldn't have so much time as to devote enough time for four committees. Each senator should focus on their committee, devote the time necessary for full participation. Also, this bill will keep committees coherent groups. Keep the number of senators from dropping. Last year, senators dropped off the Multicultural Affairs Committee, which hurt its numbers and prevented this committee from doing much. If people sign up for a committee, I think we should make them stick with it.
- (Senator Doyle): You yourself are on two Senate committees, and three Campus Life Council committees. How can you say that other senators should not get involved when you are on five committees?
- (Senator O'Donoghue): I signed up for the Alcohol Committee because no one had signed up for it and I wanted a student voice on it. I really don't have a counter for that question. What this bill is trying to do is limit fraud in the Senate. The CLC is different. Without a limit or fail safe, I believe that four committees are dangerous.
- (Senator Guzic): I am not objecting to preventing the number of committees in the Senate. But I am going along with Sophie and saying can we bump out people just for one extra committee. This prevents fraud only in certain, specific states. This should not be the bill's sole purpose.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): Whereas clauses are not necessary for amendments. I don't want to limit...
- (Parliamentarian Mark Higgins): Two standing committees instead of...
- (Senator O'Donoghue): That change does affect the bill.
- (Senator Linster): Can you sign up for committees in mid-year?
- (Parliamentarian Higgins): Last year, we did allow some senators to come on to new committees who felt that their present committees were not doing that much. They felt they had the time to give to this new committee since the others were not taking up too much time.
- (Senator Linster): If the purpose of this bill is to prevent fraud, then could I jump from one committee to another if I feel that the committees I originally joined were not taking up too much of my time.
- (Chairperson Selak): All committee meetings are open.
- (Senator Linster): I just don't think that fraud is a big issue on committees. Maybe if it does become a problem, then we could discuss a resolution. But we should do that later on, not now
- (Senator Mamak): Let me respond to what you said. Senators on the Senate Ethics Committee were placed on the Residence Life Committee because they was not a lot to do, not meeting often. It is not fraudulent to change committees. I call to previous question.
- (Senator Olejnik): I second it.
- (Chairperson Selak): O.K. we will vote on the motion to previous question. The vote was 24 yeas, 1 nay, and 1 abstention.
- (Senator Olejnik): I recommend for abstentions, that we say "oie."
- (Chairperson Selak): For an amendment to pass we need a two-thirds approval.
- (Parliamentarian Higgins): According to Robert's Rules of Order, when one abstains, he or she says, "abstain."
- (Chairperson Selak): Let's make this a hand vote. All those in favor of S9899-01 raise your hands...all those opposed...any abstentions. The vote was 6 to 20 to 2.

C. S9899-02: Proxy Votes

- (Senator O'Donoghue): Reads S9899-02:
- Whereas the current Undergraduate Body Constitution grants to the chairperson the power to deem a proxy invalid if significant alterations are made to the measure.
Whereas the term "significantly" is vague and ambiguous.
Whereas the alterations made to a measure on the floor of the Senate are often unpredictable, and a proxy will become invalid unless stipulations were made on the proxy for the alterations.
Therefore be it resolved that the Constitution of the Undergraduate Body be amended as follows: Add to Article III, Section III, part 16: f. An absent member may designate a Senator with whom his or her proxy vote will coincide regardless of alterations to the measure. This proxy may not be ruled invalid.
- The logic behind this bill is that a proxy cannot be ruled invalid. Although many friendly amendments are offered to many bills in the Senate, a senator's vote is official as long as it is done according to procedure. If Drew voted in my place...oh I motion to open debate.
- Seconded
- (Senator Boselli): Significant is a big term. What if there are major changes to a bill and the senator is not aware of these changes, but votes on the bill that changes as a result of amendments? What happens?
- (Senator O'Donoghue): The proxy vote is up to the senator. He or she must trust the senator who will vote for him or her in absence. Furthermore, the senator must carefully state under what conditions the proxy is valid. Something undoubtedly will be changed, but if the goals are the same.
- (Senator DuWors): Who determines the intentions of the senator?
- (Senator O'Donoghue): The chairperson I think.
- (Senator Linster): What if the proxy is designed by the person considering a bill. If the chair says one thing, who will know if the intentions of the senator have changed?
- (Senator O'Donoghue): That is the power of the proxy, chair rule.
- (Senator McCall): If you let loose 300 voices, and they say something that you had not intended, how do you protect that?
- (Senator Penton): There is already a section in the Constitution for the proxy rule. I don't believe what we are trying to do now is important since the Constitution already covers this.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): Whereas the alterations made to a measure on the floor of the Senate are often unpredictable, and a proxy will become invalid unless stipulations were made on the proxy for the alterations. It would be great if the person could be made aware of all the friendly amendments on a particular bill.
- (Senator Penton): Point of Inquiry...what do you do when there is a specific state of alterations?
- (Parliamentarian Higgins): The Constitution is vague about this subject. If this amendment passes, o.k. If the friendly amendment is valid, then the senator's proxy is valid regardless of the alterations or meaning changes if this amendment passes. If not, then the proxy can be ruled invalid by the chair.
- (Senator Penton): Could he or she vote regardless of friendly amendments offered?
- (Senator Mendoza): I move to previous question.
- Seconded by a few senators.
- (Chairperson Selak): O.K. we will vote whether to vote on this amendment. All those in favor of previous question say, "aye," any "nays," any abstentions. The vote was 23 to 1 to 2. Now let us vote on S9899-02, this will be a hand vote. All those in favor of this amendment raise your hands,...all those opposed,...any abstentions. The vote was 4 to 20 to 4.

D. Resolution S9899-03: Protesting the Choice of Indiana Lieutenant Governor Joe Kernan as the University of Notre Dame's 1998 Commencement Speaker

- (Senator Costantini): This bill came out of a discussion with the Senior Class and its officers. They were very upset about their choices and the lack of the administration's cooperation. I would like to emphasize that this is not a personal attack on the Lieutenant Governor. He was a prisoner of war for eleven months in Vietnam, the former mayor of South Bend, and a former Notre Dame graduate. The resolution recognizes that a trend is developing, however. Mary Glennan was the commencement speaker in 1996, surrounded by a huge controversy. Notre Dame is a national university with someone from every state and from many international countries. This speaker is obscure to all but to people in Indiana. Ryan reads quotes from the Senior Class.
- (Chairperson Selak): Ryan, you need to motion to open it up for debate.
- (Senator Costantini): I motion to open debate on this resolution.
- (Senator Linster): I second this motion.
- (Senator Costantini): This is not a bashing on Joe Kernan, but just hear whom other universities got for their commencement ceremonies. Emory University got the Dalai Lama; Boston College got Bill Richardson, the United States ambassador to the United Nations.
- (Senator Olejnik): What is Notre Dame saying on how they go about choosing commencement speakers?
- (Senator Costantini): Notre Dame does not publicize their thought process. They always extend an invitation to President Clinton, but he has not taken or accepted an invitation for a long time.
- (Senator Rompf): The senior class submits a list to the administration. Who were they?
- (Senator Costantini): A survey goes around asking seniors whom they would like. I don't know who those people are. Next week, I could provide those speakers.
- (Chairperson Selak): I suggest tabling this resolution. Maybe we could find out whom the senior class suggested. Possibly even get someone in from the senior class to ask them the process. On the other hand, we could try to bring in someone from the administration that made the decision for Joe Kernan.
- (Senator Linster): What exactly is the point of this bill?
- (Senator Costantini): To express the discontent of the senior class. Granted this bill is close to graduation, but this bill has to be kept timely.
- (Senate Advisor Joe Cassidy): If you are trying to make a statement, be researched. Don't send the administration some bill that is not fully researched. If this body is not happy with the process, or you don't agree with how the administration makes their decisions, then research the situation by talking to the people who were involved with the process.
- (Senator Foster): I move to table this resolution.
- (Senator DuWors): I second that.
- (Senator Costantini): Point of order...
- (Parliamentarian Higgins): There can be no point of order on the motion to table.
- (Chairperson Selak): O.K. we are voting to table Resolution S9899-03.
- (Senator Mamak): Is this a debatable motion?
- (Parliamentarian Higgins): No.
- (Senator Mamak): That is terrible.
- (Chairperson Selak): I favor tabling this resolution. So let us vote on this resolution. All those in favor of this motion please say "aye,"...all those opposed say "no,"...any abstentions. The vote was 23 to 2 to 1.

- (Senator Mamak): I would like to make a request. Please, all senators go back to your dorms and talk to the seniors. Ask them questions, see whom they wanted to speak, listen to what they have to say.
 - (Senator Stefko): How do we go about bringing in someone to answer our questions.
 - (Chairperson Selak): I will get someone to speak next week to answer our questions.
- E. S9899-04: Referral of Senate Bills to Committee Bylaw
- (Senator Mamak): There is a lot of wisdom in this bill. This bill would bring bills only to the Senate floor if they had the approval of the standing committee they were assigned by the chairperson. I would also like to note that this is not a resolution but a bylaw, for this is not a call to action, but a rule of the Senate which applies only in here. I would like to make a friendly amendment to Brian. There are five parts to this amendment. First, replacing the term resolution with the word bylaw. Second, in the "Therefore" clause, striking the word "measures" and replacing it with "resolutions." Third, inserting this clause after the word "Senate" in the first line of the "Therefore" clause: "and did not originate in a Senate committee must be referred to the appropriate Senate committee by the chairperson." Fourth, deleting the sentence: "The oversight committee then refers the measure to the committee which is best suited to deal with the issues in the resolution. Finally, deleting the sentence: "In the case of a measure which has no direct correlation to any committee the oversight committee itself deems the bill appropriate.
 - (Senator O'Donoghue): I accept the friendly amendment.
 - (Senator Mamak): I second it.
 - (Student Body President Cesaro): How would you know if a bill originated in a committee from a bill brought to the Senate floor? How would you discern a bill that is brought to the Senate?
 - (Senator Mamak): Senators should go back to their dorms and get ideas. Then they should take those ideas, and file them in committee. In that committee, the members should determine what comes to the floor from their committee. We should present resolutions by committees. A bill proposed by a committee is more likely to be well researched and pass than a bill proposed by one senator.
 - (Advisor Joe Cassidy): This is an operational question, committee reports flow better. Better organization.
 - (President Cesaro): I am just wondering if a resolution did not make it through the committee, can the committee just say that it never saw it?
 - (Senator Foster): I believe that there should be a time limit to decide how long a committee can wait to bring a bill to the Senate floor.
 - (Senator O'Donoghue): Would you like to make a friendly amendment?
 - (Senator Foster): Yes, I would like to set a time limit of within one week...Give me a little time.
 - (Senator O'Donoghue): I will give her a few seconds.
 - (Senator Mamak): The last sentence: For example, a committee's resolution that the committee did not approve within the time frame, the resolution automatically comes back to the floor. Some committees meet regularly.
 - (Chairperson Selak): Except the Ethics Committee. Committees should view this as a priority, at least one meeting every two weeks.
 - (Senator Foster): Within four days, a committee has to make a decision and begin to look at the resolution.
 - (Senator O'Donoghue): I don't accept your friendly amendment because there are breaks that would complicate the four days rule.
 - (Senator Foster): How about four academic days?
 - (Senator O'Donoghue): I agree.

- (Senator Foster): I second that.
 - (Senator Mamak): Wait, I am confused. Four academic days to begin to look at a bill?
 - (Senator Foster): No.
 - (Senator Mamak): Each committee has its own agenda. Some committees only meet when necessary, perhaps every two weeks. Won't that be hard to look at a bill within four days; that is too short of notice?
 - (Senator Foster): O.K I will change the requirement that a committee must begin to look at a bill and decide whether to bring it to the floor within a maximum of two weeks.
 - (Senator Rompf): Does that mean that the bill will be automatically brought to the floor?
 - (President Cesaro): What about Christmas break? That break is longer than two weeks?
 - (Senator Foster): O.K. within two academic weeks a committee must decide.
 - (Senator O'Donoghue): I accept that friendly amendment.
 - (Senator Olejnik): We need exact wording before we proceed in consideration of this bill.
 - (Senator Foster): Let me write it down. I need a few seconds.
 - (Senator Stefko): Can we get the first part read as it appears now?
 - (Senator Mamak): Therefore be it resolved that all resolutions that are brought before the Senate and did not originate in a Senate committee must be referred to an appropriate Senate committee by the chairperson. The resolution may only be referred to one committee. This committee then may deem the measure appropriate for review and debate by the full Senate. A simple majority vote of the Senate may bring a resolution to the floor of the full body regardless of committee approval.
 - (Senator Foster): Upon receiving a resolution, a committee must reach a decision within two academic weeks.
 - A senator moves to previous question. Seconded.
 - (Senator Penton): Is it a bylaw or resolution?
 - (Chairperson Selak): This is a bylaw. We will now vote on whether to vote on S9899-04. All those in favor of voting on S9899-04 say "aye,"...all those opposed,...any abstentions. Unanimous consent was reached. The vote on S9899-04 was 26 to 1 to 1.
 - (Senator O'Donoghue): I motion to switch the order of bills: first, S9899-06, then S9899-05.
 - (Chairperson Selak): This requires a second.
 - (Senator Ogorzalek): I second it.
 - (Senator Mamak): What are we doing here?
 - (Chairperson Selak): Brian is asking if we can take up S9899-06, Oversight Committee Referral Powers Bylaw, before S9899-05, Robert's Rules of Order Order. Brian motioned for this, and Tom seconded it. All those in favor of this, please say "aye,"...all those opposed, any abstentions. This motion was passed unanimously.
- F. S98988-06: Oversight Committee Referral Powers Bylaw
- (Senator O'Donoghue): Whereas currently no restrictions are placed on the measures that come before the Senate. Whereas new measures often have minor alterations made to them, thereby protracting debate. Whereas minor alterations to the measure could be made in a review of the resolution previous to presentation before the Senate. Therefore be it resolved that all measures presented before the Senate are immediately referred to the oversight committee. The oversight committee then refers the resolution to the committee which is most concerned with issues found within the measure. A resolution may only be referred to one committee. In the committee the measure is reviewed, studied, and rewritten in a manner in which the committee feels accurately reflects the intentions of the resolution and then reported to the full Senate. If the original Senator who proposed the measure feels that the resolution has been significantly altered, the Senator may bring the unaltered measure to the floor by a simple majority vote of the Senate. I move to consider this bill.

- (Senators): Second
- (Senator O'Donoghue): The rationale behind this bylaw is to give the Oversight Committee the power to rewrite the bill, fixing all minor spelling errors, grammatical errors, etc. This would save valuable time on the Senate floor.
- (President Cesaro): I don't understand the logic.
- (Senator Herlihy): What if you submit a resolution, but don't accept the changes made by the Oversight Committee?
- (Senator O'Donoghue): I believe that is covered in the last sentence.
- (Senator Penton): I feel that there is the chance that the author of a bill will not be represented on the Oversight Committee. Yes, this greatly speeds up the process, but the authoring senator should be present to assist in any alterations.
- (Senator Mamak): I offer a friendly amendment. On the second whereas clause, strike "altercations" and replace with "alterations." On the third whereas clause, strike "altercations" and replace with "alterations." Strike the first therefore clause and replace with "Therefore be it resolved that all resolutions that are brought before the Senate and did not originate in Senate committee be referred by the chair to the oversight committee." Strike the second sentence in the therefore clause. Strike the third sentence in the therefore clause and replace it with "In the committee the measure is reviewed, studied, and rewritten in a manner in which the committee feels accurately reflects the intentions of the resolution and then is reported back to the full Senate within two academic weeks." After the fourth sentence in the therefore clause, add this sentence: "If the committee does not report back within two academic weeks, the original is brought back to the floor.
- (Chairperson Selak): Brian, do you accept the friendly amendment?
- (Senator O'Donoghue): Yes.
- (Senator Gertken): I second the friendly amendment.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): I suggest opening all committee meetings, except Ethics, so that the author of a bill can witness the changes, if any, being made to his or her bill.
- (Senator Penton): Does the author have a vote?
- (Senator O'Donoghue): No.
- (Senator Mamak): Addressing rare circumstances, maybe the committee and the author will not agree. But for the most part, both will probably come to an agreement.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): Can the author of the bill be a voting member of a committee that he or she does not serve on?
- (Senator Mamak): Depends.
- (Chairperson Selak): Sure.
- (Senator Mendoza): I side with having both parts: the author being present at the committee hearing and the author having a vote on any alteration made to his or her bill.
- (Senator Mamak): Yes.
- (Parliamentarian Higgins): The wording of the bill is redundant. I make a friendly amendment.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): I am not sure of your reasoning...I accept.
- (Senator Gertken): I second the friendly amendment.
- (Senator Penton): Say you are not on the committee, the author should be notified of the alteration process taking place.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): Are you offering a friendly amendment?
- (Senator Penton): If a person is not on the committee, he or she does not know the agenda. It is a matter of information. The committee chair knows tentatively the agenda, so possibly he or she could notify the authoring senator. It goes without saying that the chair or the committee will probably look in to it.

- (Senator Costantini): The sponsors disagree about what committees does this allowing the author into the meeting takes place and what constitutes a committee bill.
 - (Senator O'Donoghue): Are we allowed to vote on an order of the chair?
 - (Parliamentarian Higgins): You can appeal it.
 - A move to previous question.
 - Point of order: This is not a resolution; it is a bylaw which requires two-thirds majority.
 - (Parliamentarian Higgins): Since it is a bylaw. You decide if it takes a two-thirds majority or not. This bylaw applies only to the Senate.
 - (Senator Mendoza): I second the motion.
 - (Chairperson Selak): All those in favor of the motion to previous question, say "aye,"...all those opposed, any abstentions? The motion passes unanimously. O.K. now we will vote on S9899-06, all those in favor of this bylaw, raise you hand, all those opposed, any abstentions? The bylaw passes unanimously, 28 to 0 to 0.
 - (Advisor Cassidy): Point of information: Then the next bill should go to committee unless the Senate decides to suspend the rules.
 - (Parliamentarian Higgins): If the Senate wants to suspend the rules, it requires a two-thirds majority.
 - (Chairperson Selak): We need a motion if you want to suspend the rules.
 - (Senator Mamak): A resolution is a call to action, which would require us suspending the rules, but an order, and that is what S9899-05 is, only deals with the Senate's powers and does not requires suspension of the rules.
- G. S9899-05: Robert's Rules of Order Order
- (Senator O'Donoghue): Whereas the Senate adheres to Robert's Rules of Order as the official rules of procedure governing the operation of the Senate. Whereas parliamentary procedure can often be used to either help in passage or the death of a measure. Whereas Senators currently only receive particular portions of these rules of procedure governing the operation of the Senate. Therefore be it resolved that copies of Robert's Rules of Order are purchased for each member of the Senate's personal review for the time of one year. At the beginning of the term the Secretary of the Senate will issue one copy to each Senator. After the end of a Senator's term, the Senator must return his/her copy of the work to the Secretary of the Senate. The Secretary of the Senate will then issue the copies to the new incoming Senators. Replacement of copies of Robert's Rules of Order that are lost or damaged beyond use (as deemed by the Secretary of the Senate) is the personal financial responsibility of the Senator who was issued the work. I motion to consider this bill.
 - (Senators): Second
 - (Senator Doyle): Do we have the funds to consider this order?
 - (Parliamentarian Higgins): You basically tell the Treasurer to allocate the funds.
 - (Chairperson Selak): Would they?
 - (Parliamentarian Higgins): They would have to allocate the money from other sources then, but they have to come up with the money, if this order passes.
 - (Senator Dittmar): I don't want to see money taken from some clubs. This is a great idea, but copies of Robert's Rules of Order are available in the library.
 - (Chairperson Selak): I could place the request in the Senate budget since I have not made it up yet.
 - (Senator Herlihy): How much more information do we need?
 - (Senator O'Donoghue): I can count at least three instances of procedural problems that occurred tonight.
 - (Chairperson Selak): In these instances, do you feel that the Senate's business was seriously disrupted?

- (Senator O'Donoghue): No, but in the future these procedural problems could kill a bill.
- (Senator Dittmar): Matt, is an old hand at this, we new senators will get the hang of it too.
- (Senator Costantini): I propose a friendly amendment. We get two or three copies of Robert's Rules of Order and make them easily accessible in the Student Government office. It also saves money, from buying 28 to 30 copies.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): Need to have that amendment in proper wording.
- (Senator Tomes): I say we save the funds, and we learn as we go.
- (Senator Stefko): I move to table this order.
- (Senator Balchunas): I second that motion.
- (Chairperson Selak): Alright, we will vote on whether to table this order. All those in favor of tabling S9899-05 say "aye," ...all those opposed, any abstentions? The motion passes 17 to 9 to 0. The bill is tabled.
- (Chairperson Selak): We can either suspend the rules we just passed or go on with business?
- (Senator Mamak): What we are discussing are bylaws, not resolutions. So we do not need to suspend the rules for these matters.
- (Senator Tomes): What is the difference between a bylaw and a resolution?
- (Senator Mamak): A bylaw is a rule that the Senate establishes for itself in governance. A resolution is any call to action.
- (Senator Penton): Do we have to suspend the rules to bring it up, S9899-07?
- (Parliamentarian Higgins): We can either suspend the rules, or send it to committee for consideration.
- (Senator Gertken): I move that we suspend the rule.
- (Chairperson Selak): I move that we bring this resolution to the floor and consider it.
- (Senator Foy): I second the motion.
- A majority of senators concur and the bill comes under consideration on the Senate floor.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): Whereas measures are often debated and reviewed by the Senate many times before coming to a vote. Whereas this debate is often circular and achieves little or no alteration to the measure. Whereas the tabling of such measures often occurs to suspend discussion of the topic and increases the number of Senate meetings in which a measure is debated. Therefore be it resolved that after being tabled or postponed a total of three times, a measure must come to a vote of passage or rejection. In the event of continuous significant changes to the resolution, the vote of passage may be delayed by a motion to suspend the vote by a simple majority vote of the Senate. I move that we consider this resolution.
- (Senator Ogorzalek): I second the motion.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): The rationale behind this is that we don't debate things tabled three times or more.
- (Senator Mamak): I make a friendly amendment that we call S9899-07 a bylaw and not a resolution.
- (Senator O'Donoghue): I accept.
- (Senator Ogorzalek): I second it.
- Point of Order: If no debate, can Andrea call previous question?
- (Parliamentarian Higgins): Yes.
- (Chairperson Selak): I call to previous question. All those in favor of previous question say "aye," ...all those opposed, any abstentions. The motion passes unanimously. Now we will vote on S9899-07. All in favor say "aye," ...all opposed, any abstentions. This bill passes unanimously, 28 to 0 to 0.
- (Senator McCall): I ask the Senate to review making the Hall Presidents' Council co-chairs non-voting members on the Residence Life committee.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (Senator Mamak): I encourage all senators to look over the Senate Transition Bylaws and the Proposed Bylaw, which was passed on March 25, 1998, for procedural direction. Also, please all senators go back to your Hall Councils and bring in a list of concerns to the Senate. Give the list to the chair, and when we meet at 7:00pm we can go over the list. What did we say the 19th? We have meetings on the 15th, 22nd, and the 29th. They should be submitted by the 19th.
- (President Cesaro): After gaining the input of the Executive Cabinet, I would like to know if you think having the State on the Student Union address in a place like Washington Hall, where we can invite other organizations including SUB to watch, would be a good idea? There is a general consensus amongst senators that this is a great idea.
- (Chairperson Selak): Committee chairs, there will be no meeting this Sunday due to the Easter break, but at 7:00 p.m. on April 19th there will be one.
- (Senator Stefko): When are the lists of ideas due?
- (Chairperson Selak): By the 17th.
- (Senator Mamak): Please don't get discouraged. Committees this year will have sustenance and a lot of work will be done there.
- (Chairperson Selak): Any more announcements...O.K. we need a motion to adjourn. Many senators shout a motion. Seconded.
- The Student senate adjourned at 7:52 p.m. on Wednesday, April 08, 1998. Its next meeting is Wednesday, April 15, 1998.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Palumbo
Student Senate Secretary