Call to Order
Chair Crayton called the meeting to order at 8:00 PM.

Attendance
The following members were present: Brittany Clark, Brad Dunnagan, Austin Gilmore, John Guzek, Andrew Lucas, Amber Pace, Nish Patel, Will Stelpflug, Chris Woodward (Chair), Peter McClelland (Vice Chair), Travis Crayton (Chair).

The following members were absent: Laura Brush.

The following persons were also present: Paige Comparato (Speaker), Connor Brady (Speaker Pro Tempore), Brittany Best (Chair), and Representative Root.

New Business
Resolutions

SCR-94-150 A RESOLUTION TO IMPROVE CONDUCT ON THE FLOOR OF CONGRESS BY REGULATING RIGHT OF REPLY

Speaker Comparato introduced the bill. She said she understood the use of the right of reply when it was necessary. She said that they needed to make sure it was being used when appropriate. She said some things had to be clarified. She said guests could say things that offend someone else’s character. She said there was a difference between the argument and the character of the person. She said a representative or guest could say what they want about the argument because it was a difference of opinion and it was debate. She said the last section would encourage people not to offend and criticize other people in speeches. She said the right of reply could be interrupting and that the bill also said that a representative couldn’t yield a right of reply to another person. She said it would be helpful to understand the difference.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said he didn’t mind the regulation. He said he would only want to change section F about only being able to use the right of reply during the debate of legislation. He said that if someone wanted to attack him during public comment, he would deserve a right of reply to that.

Speaker Comparato said that she understood where he was coming from. She said that conduct was always on their mind. She said that this section would set a tone of respect on the floor and that they should expect officers to be professional. She said
that they had other ways to address attacks. She said they had a Sergeant of Arms and points of order.

Speaker Pro Tempore said he agreed with her and that it was a big step to recognize the integrity of the body but that he still had his doubts. He said that it wasn’t an open invitation for people to come in and offend them. He said that if it did happen, they could respond. He said he hoped that receipts and officer’s reports wouldn’t be personal attacks but that they should not limit members to respond just in case it did happen. He moved to strike section F on the bill.

Seconded.

Chair Woodward said he could go either way. He said conduct was the thing to consider and that he didn’t see this happening outside of legislation. He said he couldn’t think of one reason why someone would come during public comment or a report and attack someone’s character. He said it would be his preference to keep the section.

Representative Gilmore said that he was with Chair Woodward. He said if there were personal attacks made, it wouldn’t sway them to their side. He said that keeping it to just legislation would stop the back and forth shoving match that could happen. He said he didn’t think that the public comment and reports section were that important to debate on.

Vice Chair McClelland said that if they were attacked, they should have the right of reply. He said this would not be a precedent to set.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said that he didn’t think that people would come in and attack them. He said they would limit members if they kept this. He said if you were attacked, you had the right to defend yourself. He said that the right of reply was just a response and not a back and forth thing. He said this would be insulation to clear the air after attacks.

Representative Dunnagan said that he was neutral but that he was leaning more towards striking it out just in case someone was attacked.

Representative Guzek said he could go either way because the rest of the bill was the heart of it. He said this wouldn’t make or break the deal but that he also leaned on the side of cutting it out because personal attacks could happen outside legislation. He said everyone should have the ability to reply to an argument.

Speaker Comparato said she understood and wanted to stress that the right of reply was put in last year because of some issues. She said there were 91 Congresses before them and they didn’t have a right of reply. She said having it available for every part of the agenda would create a bad atmosphere. She said that the line encourages people not to say anything bad and makes representative not keep an
eye out to be attacked. She said that people could say things in the heat of debate but that they should expect their representatives and guests to have the same level of respect. She said it would be helpful for future Congresses to know when they should use the right of reply.

Vice Chair McClelland moved to the previous question.

There were some objections.

Vice Chair McClelland withdrew his motion.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said that Speaker Comparato was right and that the person that championed the right of reply last year was the Speaker Pro Tempore AJ Horowitz. He said he contacted him today and asked his opinion on the bill. He said that he thought the right of reply should always be in order because these instances could still happen, even if they were limited. He said that Congress members should be able to defend themselves and doesn’t like the precedent where some standing rules are in effect in some parts of the agenda and not in others. He said it was necessary. He moved to the previous question.

Seconded.

Consent was called and line F was struck out.

Vice Chair McClelland said he wanted to add an amendment to B: or previous statement with criticism to the very end.

Seconded.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said he understood but that it was contradictory to part C. He said they could disagree all day long but not personally attack each other. He said it had to be a personal attack for the sake of the right of reply and that he didn’t think this part was necessary.

Vice Chair McClelland said he wanted this in so if someone said that his or her argument was stupid.

Chair Woodward said that it was a position and redundant. He said the right of reply was for an attack on character.

Representative Gilmore said that this was too broad and that it would open it up to a wide range of arguments.

Speaker Comparato said the other representatives said what she wanted to say.

Representative Dunnagan moved to the previous question.
Seconded.

The majority opposed the amendment and it was not adopted.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady moved to report favorably.

Seconded.

Consent was called and the bill was reported favorably.

**Bills**

**SCB-94-149 A BILL TO ENSURE PARTICPATION BY STUDENT CONGRESS REPRESENTATIVES AT STUDENT CONGRESS EVENTS**

Speaker Comparato said that this was another thing to uphold the integrity of their body. She said they have had events that have been great to get feedback and get communication but that attendance has been low by members of Congress. She said that putting the label of mandatory was making the event just as important as a meeting. She said these events make their group more inclusive. She said that a lot of people showed up to the RHA event and that community governors were required to be there by RHA but only six members of Congress were there. She said making events mandatory was not just encouraging participation but also showing respect for the people who arranged the events. She said that not every event would be mandatory, just the major ones. She said the two events so far that would have been mandatory were the Congress retreat and the RHA event. She said they weren’t a huge time commitment and that people could get excused absences if they needed it. She said it would help out their Congress and the future Congresses.

Representative Dunnagan corrected a clerical thing and said that it would be very important to meet with their constituents. He said this would be a great way to encourage students to meet with their representatives.

Chair Woodward said he liked the bill but he questioned the need for checks and balances. He said they do need to have this in place for proper attendance because it was sad to hear that it didn’t go as planned. He said he agreed with the absence rules.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady yielded to Chair Best.

Chair Best said she didn’t like the specific districts part.

**Vice Chair McClelland** said the reason for that was for something like the RHA event.

Chair Best asked if there was a way to ensure that.
Chair Woodward said it was the difference between the undergraduates and the graduates and that it needs to be in there.

Representative Guzek said he was fully in support of the bill and that it was pushing them to be active with their constituents. He said this was an excellent step and was in support of the district. He said his one concern was with the checks and balance under the discretion of the Speaker. He said he wasn’t opposed to it but that he would just want to hear how that would work.

Representative Stelpflug said giving discretion to the Speaker would be appropriate and that he doesn’t see why the Speaker would abuse that power. He said if they wanted to abuse their power, they had other more effective ways to do that.

Chair Woodward agreed and said it wasn’t a simple decision. He said they should have some feedback.

Speaker Comparato said that she understood and that it was common for things to be up to the discretion of the Speaker. She said the person who was directly involved with planning events and working with other people would be most knowledgeable about whether everyone should be in attendance or not. She said she doesn’t think a Speaker would be like that.

Representative Gilmore yielded his time.

Representative Dunnagan said his concern was the check over the speaker.

Chair Woodward said that the Speaker could consult the Chairs.

Speaker Comparato said that not everyone in leadership should be involved because it would make it more complicated and people wouldn’t always agree. She said that the Speaker wouldn’t make all the decisions by themselves.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady agreed with Speaker Comparato. He said they would realistically be at a stalemate. He said it should be between the Speaker and the Ethics Chair. He yielded his time to Chair Best.

Chair Best said that the Speaker and the Ethics Chair should be the team of people that deem whether an event is mandatory or not.

Chair Woodward said that was a reasonable idea. He said that they could put it through the Oversight Committee but that he didn’t know if that would be feasible.

Vice Chair McClelland said that he wanted to add one amendment at the end of A about notifying 72 hours in advance.
Representative Pace said they should make it two weeks in advance. She said that people have to work or have prior events should be notified at least two weeks in advance.

Speaker Comparato said she completely agreed and that it was important because everyone was super busy.

Representative Lucas said they should announce it at full Congress.

Speaker Comparato said that full Congress might not be two weeks before the event.

Representative Stelpflug said that they should remember that there are conventions and norms that they use and that the Speaker would consult other leadership positions. He said the Ethics Chair might be useful but that any more would just be putting existing norms into the code.

Representative Clark said she agreed and said that the district part would be on a case-by-case basis.

Representative Pace added a friendly amendment that said at least two weeks.

Chair Woodward said that adding the two weeks would alleviate the case about discretion.

Speaker Comparato said that would be reasonable.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady expressed concerns about the three hours before the event part and asked about emergencies.

Speaker Comparato said that it would excuse emergencies because it would be under the Ethics laws.

Representative Guzek said it wouldn't be that big of an imposition for the Speaker and moved to amend the bill to add the Ethics Chair. He said it was a small step to make events that are legitimate mandatory.

Representative Dunnagan asked if it should be consensus.

Representative Guzek said he doesn't foresee the Ethics Chair denying the Speaker.

Chair Woodward asked if he would add friendly amendment that says “and counsel by the Ethics Chair.”

Seconded.

Representative Dunnagan moved to report favorably.
Seconded.

Consent was called and the bill was reported favorably.

**SCB-94-151 A BILL TO CLARIFY THE DUTIES OF THE STUDENT BODY VICE PRESIDENT DURING THE SUMMER MONTHS**

Representative Gilmore said since there was controversy over the Vice President not having official duties over the summer, he thought it made sense to put it in the code that they do have duties. He said he heard concerns from the Executive Branch members and that they should codify the duties that alleviate the concerns on the spending money. He said that in conjunction with the stipend bill, it would help ensure that if the Vice President didn’t need the money for financial help, it would go back to the student groups.

Chair Woodward said that the bill changed a bit in Finance. He said he doesn’t know how this would correlate with what will happen in Congress next week. He said that should be taken into consideration.

Representative Gilmore asked when the veto would be.

Speaker Comparato said the veto message would go first.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said his issue was with the logistics. He said if the veto was sustained, they could wait to pass it in the first session of January. He said it wasn’t a life or death necessity next week. He said if the veto were overridden, he wouldn’t feel comfortable passing the bill. He asked if Representative Gilmore if he would be open to withdrawing it.

Representative Gilmore said if they did override the veto, he would withdraw his support for the bill. He said he wanted this to come up if the veto was sustained.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said this would open old wounds and that it was back and forth. He said if the veto was sustained, it could wait until January. He said he would support this and leave it to January. He said he didn’t see that as an issue and that he was thinking of Congress as a whole.

Representative Gilmore said it would be opening up old wounds if they waited until January to get it done. He said if they could be done next week and never talk about it again. He said it would make more sense to take care of it.

Representative Stelpflug applauded him for the bill but said that he couldn’t support this bill because of the duties listed. He said that this wasn’t a legitimate reason to give them a stipend for the summer duties. He said they could use their cabinet staff to complete the duties over the summer.
Representative Dunnagan said it would open up a can of worms and that if they overrode the veto, the Vice President shouldn’t have to work over the summer. He said it would be better to wait after the veto.

Representative Guzek said that when that the duties of the Vice President did not extend over the summer. He said he personally thought it was necessary for them to stay over the summer and that their duties were more relevant to the school year. He also said they had quite a staff and could use external appointments.

Representative Pace said she was in full support of the bill. She said the Vice President does have duties over the summer. She said that the agenda could be reordered and that it could come before the veto. She said she couldn’t think of a reason it would be better to wait until after the break.

Speaker Comparato said that it wasn’t reopening the can of worms because the debate wasn’t over. She said the reason outlined the veto was that the duties weren’t codified and that was the problem with it. She said this bill was completely time efficient and addressing those concerns. She said that it wasn’t the wrong time and that delaying it would be irresponsible. She said that people in Congress should see the bill instead of having it confined to the committee. She said that Vice President Myrick did work over the summer and that it has happened previously. She said that it was a bigger position than people were realizing. She said that Vice President Myrick said that she wouldn’t have taken the internship if she were mandated to stay over the summer. She said they could get more work done if they were here over the summer.

Vice Chair McClelland said that that this Vice President went above her duties but when actually looking at what they are, he said he couldn’t see what would be absolutely necessary over the summer.

Chair Woodward said that if the veto were sustained, they would have to accept this bill because they would be breaking the code. He said that this had to go to Congress. He said the question was whether to delay it of not. He said if they sustained the veto, they would have to pass this.

Representative Clark said that was a very strong point.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said that the Vice Presidents have gone above and beyond but that the codified duties for them could easily be done on the computer. He said that if they sustained the veto, they would have to pass the bill. He moved to report unfavorably.

Seconded.

There was an objection.
Chair Woodward asked if they could table it.

The parliamentarian said they couldn’t table in the committee.

Speaker Pro Tempore did not withdraw and said that he supported the bill but it was just the issue of timing.

There was a majority to make a vote.

Representatives Pace, Lucas, Clark, Gilmore, and Chair Woodward voted against reporting the bill unfavorably to Congress.

Representatives Stelpflug, Patel, Guzek, Dunnagan, and Vice Chair McClelland voted for reporting the bill unfavorably to Congress.

There was a tie that Chair Crayton had to break. He voted for reporting the bill to Congress unfavorably. The bill was reported unfavorably to Congress.

**SCB-94-154 A BILL TO CLARIFY SENIOR CLASS ELECTIONS**

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said this was procedural and that his advisor brought this to his attention. He said it was just an election law and would add that the positions were concurrent.

Speaker Comparato said that it would be helpful and let people know who the Senior Class President was.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said he talked to the Board of Elections and that it was procedural.

Vice Chair McClelland motioned to report favorably.

Seconded.

Consent was called and the bill was reported favorably.

**SCB-94-155 A BILL TO IMPROVE THE CONSISTENCY OF TITLE II**

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said that this bill was procedural. He said the powers of the Speaker and Finance Chair were in numbers and made the Speaker Pro Tempore’s powers the same and more consistent. He said he also added that the Speaker Pro Tempore could have the power to call Congress to order.

Representative Dunnagan motioned to report favorably.
Seconded.

Consent was called and the bill was reported favorably.

**SCB-94-156 A BILL TO IMPROVE CONGRESSIONAL OUTREACH**

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said that the code now says that the Speaker Pro Tempore should arrange the public forum by the second legislative cycle. He said this bill would give them more time to do this. He said it would put it in the fall and give them more leeway.

Chair Woodward said he was thinking about changing it to say after fall semester starts.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady accepted a friendly amendment to change it to three full legislative cycles after the first day of classes of the fall semester.

Speaker Comparato said she doesn’t like three cycles because it’s six weeks and that would be too late in the semester. She said they should make it their priority to do it right they get back because more people would be more likely to go to the forum. She said she would be more in favor to change it back to two.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady agreed and accepted a friendly amendment to change it to two full legislative cycles.

Representative Guzek corrected a clerical error and said that it was a great idea and that it would be better to do it right after the semester began.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said he was up in the air about what the forum was. He said he hasn’t done it yet because he wasn’t sure. He said the public forum was a good and that he was sorry that he hasn’t done this yet. He said that they have had other ways to meet with constituents.

Speaker Comparato said that it needed to clarify that the Speaker Pro Tempore was responsible for this.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady accepted a friendly amendment to add it was organized by the Speaker Pro Tempore.

Speaker Comparato said they do it once a semester.

Speaker Pro Tempore Brady said each was totally fine and accepted a friendly amendment to add the spring semester.

Representative Stelpflug motioned to report favorably.
Seconded.

Consent was called and the bill was reported favorably.

**SCB-94-153 A BILL TO INCREASE STIPEND ACCOUNTABILITY**

Representative Root introduced the bill. He said it passed favorably through Finance Committee and that they changed section six because of redundancy. He said they added a new section and came to a consensus because of the lump sum. He said the amount of money an officer may need could change.

Speaker Comparato said that this addressed problems that people have brought up and would create a way for the money to go back into subsequent appropriations. She said the wording was good and moved to report favorably.

Seconded.

Consent was called and the bill was reported favorably.

**Adjournment**

There was a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded.

Consent was called.

Chair Crayton adjourned the meeting at 9:27 PM.