

**Student Senate Meeting
October 30, 1996**

Meeting called to order by Megan Murray at 4:32 p.m.

I. Opening Prayer by Megan Murray

II. Roll Call

Members Present: Megan Murray, Erin Hoffman, Mike Gaffud, Mark Leen, Mary Gillard, Mike Irvine, Allyson Luck, Mike Tobin, Bill Hammonds, Matt Griffin, Peter Cesaro, Julie Lyzinski, Stacey McNulty, Roy Gallagher, Ryan McInerney, Brendan Kelly, Nerea Arrien, Mary Slatt, Shane Bigelow, Deborah Hellmuth.

III. Approval of minutes
Changes made-approval tabled.

IV. Old Business

A. Student Rights Subcommittee Report

-Ryan McInerney: We drafted a letter to send to Professor O'Hara in the hope that she will respond to us before we decide to take the issue to the CLC. We also thought that it would be more forceful to have each of the members sign it instead of simply signing "student senate." Please take some time to read this letter (see attachment). If there aren't any objections, I would ask for unanimous consent.

-Mark Leen so moves.

-Peter Cesaro seconds.

B. Parliamentary Procedure

-Brendan Kelly: I will hand out, make available in the office, a summary of Parliamentary procedures. We will also be following a Round Robin Discussion.

C. College Democrats Resolution

-Megan: We would like to open the floor for discussion on the resolution you have in front of you (see attachment).

-Ryan Guillen: We are strong proponents of free speech and that's why the resolution is worded as it is.

-Mark Leen: Please explain your role in the demonstration on National Coming Out Day.

- Catherine Mullaly: We were co-sponsors of the demonstration along with GLND-SMC and other groups as listed. There is no rule in du Lac that says that an unrecognized group cannot sponsor an event. The administration's response was not by-the-book but in an attempt to squelch free speech.
- Ryan: The administration is manipulating du Lac to their purposes-they are interpreting the rules.
- Mike Irvine: I disagree with the last clause 6/4 of the resolution because Mr. Kirk states that the reason for denial was because of sponsorship, not content.
- Erin: I agree with both Mike Irvine and the idea that the rules were interpreted by the administration. I would support a friendly amendment.
- Julie: GLND-SMC may not be recognized as members of the community, but the individuals are.
- Ryan: As precedent, Opus Dei, an unrecognized University Group, has co-sponsored things.
- Deborah: also, there were many groups working with GLND-SMC-including HPC.
- Mary Slatt: The issue here is freedom of speech. Don't worry about whether or not we are supporting GLND-SMC-we were supporting free speech.
- Mike Tobin: The College Democrats are outlining what took place. The last part of the resolution is the controversial part. If you stick to it as a student rights issue and not a gay/lesbian issue-maybe include "all Students' in the resolution.
- Ryan Guillen: I'm in favor of amendments so that this passes. But please preserve the spirit of the document.
- Bill: I think the College Democrats were used as a front for GLND-SMC. And the demonstrations took place anyway.
- Matt: I agree with Bill. The demonstration was denied and took place anyway-rules were broken. I just don't support that.
- Ryan McInerney: The rules should be taken as written-not interpreted. The issue is not one about a "front"- du Lac says any student can sponsor an activity.
- Julie: The wording needs to be clear. A rule can't be interpreted.
- Mary Slatt: If students can't interpret a rule, then neither can the administration.
- Mark: Do we want to defend free speech or criticize du Lac? It's two different ways to approach it.
- Megan: We need to add friendship amendments, pass, or defeat this resolution. How do we want to approach this?
- Ryan: The first part of the resolution is not controversial but the second part is because of the semantics. Ignore that and look at the main message-look at the two different resolves.

-Erin: If we cut out the last "whereas" I think it would be more powerful. It seems like we were trying to read into someone's mind.

-Allyson: We need to concentrate on the powerful part-their rights as outlined in du Lac were violated.

-Bill: What if the administration just rewords du Lac and this is all for naught.

-Deborah: They can't just change du Lac like that. There is more that goes into it. And if it does get changed, then we can deal with that later.

-Julie: Maybe if we were to resolve that regardless of who you are and regardless of the content-then we aren't pointing fingers.

-Mike: Maybe include "members of the community and a recognized group were censored."

-Erin: Why don't we vote on amendments now and see how it goes. Where is the evidence that he is denying on the basis of content?

-Peter: I'm afraid that this resolution calls him a liar-and I'm not sure that's the best way to approach the problem.

-Julie: The whole issue stems from content, not from sponsorship-that's evident in the original rejection of GLND-SMC's request.

-Megan: I think we support the College Democrats and that we're never going to agree on the details. So let's vote on it.

-Ryan Guillen: We approach your consideration of the issue and we ask you to maintain the spirit of the resolution. We'll leave for your vote.

-Mark: I move for a role call vote.

-Erin seconds.

-Megan: I call a one minute recess.

-Parliamentary Procedure: No Quorum for Vote.

-We'll meet 4:00 Monday to vote on the issue.

V. Meeting adjourned at 6:04 p.m. by Megan Murray.

Respectfully submitted by,

Stacey McNulty