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I. Call to Order/Roll-Call/Quorum

Quorum was met and the meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m.

II. Swearing in of Representatives

Representative Phou arrived at 7:06 p.m.

Two representatives were sworn in.

III. Singing of the OSU Alma Mater

Speaker Pro Tempore: I move to change the agenda to place Special Orders after New Business.

Representative Alvarez Second.

Speaker Pro Tempore: I think it would be better for us to get through our bills and resolutions tonight and then take care of the less pressing issues.

Representative Alvarez: I agree with everything he just said.

Representative Van Bossuyt: If the representatives were to leave after pertinent business would their votes be invalid?

Speaker Hatlen: Would their votes be invalid if they were to leave the meeting?

Chris Van Drimmelen: You can’t invalidate anyone. That’s one thing you can’t do in Roberts Rules of Order.

Speaker Hatlen: Is there further discussion on the motion.

A voice vote was taken to move Special Orders after New Business.

Division

A hand vote was taken. 15-4 The motion passed.

All members present sang the Alma Mater.

IV. Approval of Minutes from Wednesday January 18th, 2012

Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to approve the minutes.

Speaker Pro Tempore: Second

A voice vote was taken to approve the minutes. The motion passed.
V. Standing Committee Reports

Ways and Means
Representative Van Bossuyt: We met last week to discuss a couple funding issues that we passed. We’re going to purchase a couple computers that are needed. We also approved reallocating expenses for two staff positions. I can go into more detail if you’d like or you can see me after the meeting.

Educational Activities
Speaker Hatlen: Have we had a chance to meet with educational activities yet?

Appropriations and Budgets
Representative Robb: We will have a meeting from the committee on Friday I believe at 2 in Snell. All members see me afterwards so everyone knows what’s going on.

VI. Special Committee Reports

JB-71.03 “ASOSU & OSA Relationship Findings”
Representative Struthers: I move to amend the agenda. I found a couple errors. We move JB-71.03 to new business and the findings in special business.

Speaker Hatlen: is there any dissention? None, so moved.

Representative Struthers: I was the chair of the investigative committee. I’m going to speak briefly why this was formed during the impeachment process of president Hopoi this was formed to investigate why the executive branch removed from OSA. I’m going to hand it over to the representatives from the committee for the rationale. We unanimously agreed that we shall stay with OSA but shall be graded. I’ll hand it to the representatives. My job was to facilitate that conversation. They wrote the bill and report.

Representative Alvarez we had a lengthy meeting with a lot of various members that were involved in OSA in the past. Ex president of ASOSU and such. That lasted about 4 hours it was pretty beneficial we got a huge packet that representative Struthers has if you want to look at that you can. We had 5 testimonies and a half hour presentation from OSA. The executive branch had a testimony and said they wanted a memorandum from OSA. We basically concluded that would be the best action. OSA is still very vital to ASOSU. They do a lot of various good things for us. They would help on capping tuition hikes. Ours has been less than our neighbors to the North and South. If OSA stopped tuition from being hiked $5 a term it would be worth the $1.15 a term. The bill will be presented in new business. You can talk to me representative Robb, Representative Struthers, Representative Stuart, or Senator Boyd.
Representative Robb: The main thing about OSA is that members of the executive were in agreement with staying with OSA. The best way is the question we brought fourth would it be possible for us to create an organization like OSA as a university by itself. We came to the conclusion that that was impossible with our current setting. That OSA is a permanent lobbying organization in the state and on top of that is the best lobbying organization for students in the nation. It sets the standard for most states in the nation. On top of this if we left this would pretty much devastating to OSA and their ability to lobby. Not just we would lose in the capitol but OSU leaving would be detriment to the students around the state.

Representative Struthers: Like representative Alvarez said there are packets of this every representative on the committee has one also the congressional clerk has one. My packet is thicker and I put a notebook in one. The clerk has it, I have one if you want to read through we can share this with you. I want to thank everyone on the committee they were very attentive, it made my job as chair simple. I counted about 12 hours for them. They wrote the report they wrote the bill my hands are not into this. If you have questions please ask them. Again, thank you.

VII. Joint Committee Reports

Joint Committee of Congressional Correspondence

Representative Robb: The senate actually had a bit yesterday. The current bill we have in front of us passed, the Jacob Vandever and Dan Cushing legislator bill. We do have Brett Deedon who could answer further questions. It passed I believe unanimously not much was really spoken on this. The bill to eliminate suspensions that was brought through first reading and we will hear that. The current bill in first reading Event Attendance act. The main thing was that the idea of having a possible way to increase representation to students but also some members voiced their opinion that this could be adding on extra requirements that didn’t add much to student body or student government.

VIII. Delegate Reports

None

IX. Old Business

HR-03.03 “Reinstate OSA Funding”

Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to remove HR-03.03 from the table.

Representative Struthers: Second

Representative Van Bossuyt: I think we should vote up or down tonight to get it on our agenda.
Representative Struthers: I’m not sure if the committee received a joint bill from the committee. The committee recommended we stay with OSA. I think it would be good for the body to reinstate the funding that we’ll remain members.

Speaker Hatlen: Point of Information. We do need two thirds to override this information to send it to Senate.

Representative Van Bossuyt: This is to bring it back to the floor. A voice vote to remove it from the table. The motion passed.

Representative Van Bossuyt: As Representative Struthers said I think we should pass this to say we do mean business and we’re coming back. It’s important to show we’re the three pillars to ASOSU. We should pass this tonight regardless of what happens elsewhere.

Representative Rakaj: If we approve to return the funds are we going to pay from now on or fall term. Is this going to mean we pay for fall term even though we missed a lot of meetings?

Representative Van Bossuyt: We pay it all back they’ve continued to represent us without the pay. We have been at the meetings we just haven’t been paying them.

Representative Robb: At the meetings we’ve had voting rights and have voted at the meeting with that it would be natural. It would be back pay for our membership into the organization to keep it afloat.

Representative Swalko: How much more is there to pay back?

Speaker Hatlen: It would be the $1.15 per student.

Chris Van Drimmelen: Per term is about $25,000 which ASOSU has.

Representative Robb: I’d like to remind all the funds for OSA have been preallocated last year. This isn’t pulling money from anything its just the pool of membership dues to OSA. We have a line item for OSA that hasn’t been used.

Speaker Hatlen: Point of Clarification. Do we need a motion?

Chris Van Drimmelen: Its been taken from the table and the motion is the resolution itself. You don’t need a further motion.

Speaker Hatlen: We’ll move to a roll call vote.

A roll call vote was taken. 17-0-2. HR-03.03 passed.

JB-71.01 “Bill to Eliminate Suspensions during impeachment Trial”

Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to table it.

Representative Alvarez: The changes are very immaterial I fixed some wording and added a couple whereases.

Representative Van Bossuyt: My motion still stands.
Speaker Pro Tempore: Second

Representative Van Bossuyt: I understand it was just a few things but I’d like to take a look at it some more if any intent did change. I’d like to look it over.

Representative Alvarez: The amendments are extraordinarily simple. The intent did not change at all. I got rid of a whereas and there was nothing material that changed what it would do if it was enacted by us.

Speaker Hatlen: We’ll vote to table this until next week.

A voice vote was taken to table JB-71.01. The motion failed.

Speaker Hatlen: I already did the gavel.

Representative Van Bossuyt: So the amended version here we have to vote to bring that in and that would make our version different than the senators version.

Speaker Hatlen: Senate had first reading yesterday any revisions can be given to the senate as for adoption for readings next week.

Representative Alvarez: I wrote this bill because during the impeachment trial president Hopoi, after we impeached her, she got suspended for about three weeks. That wasn’t helpful at all. We could’ve been working together but there was large disagreements going on and didn’t help in the continuity of the issue. I didn’t think it was fair that someone got suspended for accusations and not proven guilty yet. The current statutes goes against the OSU policy, the person impeached by the House that goes against OSU policy they would not take away their pay. They haven’t been convicted of anything I found that out after I talked to Larry Roper they told me that part of the statutes goes against OSU policy anytime in the future they would still get paid even though they were out of their office by the House. I felt it was unnecessary for the suspension to occur it should only occur on a conviction of the House.

Representative Struthers: Can you speak to the changes you have?

Representative Alvarez: The changes I did I got rid of the fourth whereas that’s the one that comes from the US federal government, I felt it was unnecessary. If they don’t do it shouldn’t be necessary. I added two whereas and in the be it hereby enacted the first one I got rid of the end where it says the executive director of finance because there were not financial implications there’s no reason to get them involved. I just added an and for judicial council chair for grammatical error. There was a couple sponsors added, Asian Cultural Center, Speaker Hatlen and Brett Deedon as co sponsors.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I believe we talked about maybe adding something to this bill to add the potential of suspension with a high enough majority for
extreme cases. I was wondering why that hadn’t appeared obviously this case didn’t warrant it but I could see to an arrestable attempt but ongoing and deeds to be stopped. I think that should be added in here and maybe that’s a good thing for a joint committee to take care of.

Representative Stuart: That’s a valid point I can see issues of conduct that might not go to the police but might require removal. Its plausible in the modern world that conduct would lead us to removal in high rankings.

Representative Alvarez: I did consider that I almost did amend the bill to include that after talking to Larry Roper. If something serious enough happened, the university would act to suspend that person from the school. I also can see where it’s coming from but it goes from the point of due process. Its still an accusation there should be a form of reprimand a suspension from the house would be without a trial from the senate. We can wait until the senate trial occurs and it doesn’t do any good to go above what the senate trial is. If they believe they’re guilty that’s almost finding the house guilty when its not the houses job to do so.

Representative Rakaj: When you mention majority did you mean the house?

Representative Van Bossuyt: The house or maybe judicial. Certainly not just the bare majority substantially more now to impeach.

Representative Rakaj: It would be unnecessary seeing that the university policies override the rules of ASOSU. I don’t think we want to get involved in the politics of having students deciding this. Nobody knows if it’s the case it’s an accusation it could be true and convicted later. If not proven then why get involved in the big politics and disrupt the every day of student government. Everyday they’re out of the office there’s something undone.

Representative Struthers: I’d like to agree with keeping it out if the university suspends the student that goes against the constitution because it already says that once that student is suspended they’re not eligible for holding office. I think the process we have with out constitution, our bases should be covered. I think for the most extreme academic policies we’re covered with that with how the university system is setup.

Representative Robb: In most cases that would be understandable with the actual police dishonestly would be far beyond what an impeachment would be. The idea is act within the duty of the president or any office that the person is being impeached against. The main thing is that for something quite repetitive not duration of duty. Just say a member of the executive keeps failing after congress tries to pass something gets an override and it’s constant or if it has to
do with money holding funds. If its constant having a super majority of some form that would then go to the JC and after the JC rules with withholding them they would be suspended it wouldn’t be that night its important innocent until proven guilty. It would be a quick thing if the materials brought fourth prove the type of guilty which then they would rule on and have the possibility of removal from office for the time being and then have the full impeachment trial. If we didn't have this clause it would be mandatory to have the JC and rule upon it and once upon the ruling they be suspended or not.

Representative Struthers: I understand where we’re going from but my concern is if we suspend them they’ll still receive their pay. I don’t see a benefit from the student body but to still pay them. We can’t overrule OSU policy if someone can show that to me and get it fixed I don’t see it working.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Three points of why we should add something. One while the OSU is here to help us out if something bad happens at the same time its important for ASOSU to have some degree of plutonomoy. It might be symbolic but we still want to have a voice and be independent from the administration. If were to get someone that ASOSU isn’t friends with we might need this and to show we think for ourselves. Second to future proof this bill it would make sure we don’t have to touch it for a long time that’s something I’ve been big on so we don’t have to come back in 2-3 years to amend it and fix what happened. We don’t have to worry about it. The third point the reason for suspension after house impeaches and judicial review would be if there is immediate harm that’s ongoing so we can stop that. If there’s another organization on campus where a relationship has been harmed. That’s why we should I believe this would be a good thing to put to the joint committee so house and senate can bring it back. This isn’t a pressing issue. We should address it this term but a little more thought could go into it even more than now.

Representative Alvarez I move to amend the bill as I stated earlier

Representative Van Bossuyt: Second

Representative Alvarez I think we can get to the point where we can discuss more on it and vote afterward.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I think we need to advance forward.

Representative Rakaj: I don’t see why we let this go out of hand it isn’t applicable. The house has limited power and we’re making it to satisfy our ego. The OSU overrides us and what we’re doing isn’t going against the ASOSU administration if they’re getting paid. If this is such a big issue I don’t think its in the hands of us.
We’re elected just like the president is elected and they’re already representing the student body. Who are we to judge that they’re guilty of this until they’re proven it’s unreasonable to me.

Chris Van Drimmelen: What’s the proposed amendment?

Speaker Hatlen: Stated in the copies.

A voice vote to amend the original bill was taken. The motion passed.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to send this to JCCC.

Speaker Pro Tempore: Second

Representative Van Bossuyt: As I stated it would be good to send it there for further review to get further input. To get one finalized bill that hopefully has the provisions I discussed.

Representative Struthers: I was going to ask if we could table it and invite Larry Roper and see how this body can work with the body. I’d like if you would accept that or ask JCCC to talk to Larry Roper.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Let’s have JCCC talk to Larry Roper about the issues I stated.

Representative Stuart: Can I ask that Alvarez, Struthers, and Van Bossuyt play a role in that as they’re the main speakers on this?

Representative Struthers: If we can schedule a time.

Representative Van Bossuyt: It’ll have to be over email only.

Representative Robb: As chair of JCCC, if some of the members show up that contribute too I see no problems with that to have extra people show up and add to the conversation.

Representative Alvarez: I would like to state my opposition to the motion this doesn’t need to go to the JCCC that would support a bill that would suspend a person they just impeached. The point is all the house is basing the article for impeachment on accusations not proof. They’re hearing accusations without basis behind that. Everything they would be doing that’s why the senate is here to hear the proof and act afterward the immediate harm that is based on accusations that they’re doing something. I’d like to defeat this motion and move into a vote.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Even if suspension clause wasn’t included its valid to have senate’s input before we vote on it.

A voice vote to send it to JCCC was taken.

Division.

Speaker Pro Tempore: Request a standing vote.
Speaker Hatlen: No
Speaker Pro Tempore: I move for a standing vote
Representative Struthers: Second
A voice vote was taken to have a standing vote.
Division
Chris Van Drimmelen: Just do a countable vote. You’re the chair.
A hand vote to have a standing vote was taken. The motion failed.
A hand vote was taken to send bill to JCCC. 9-9-0.
Speaker Hatlen voted against to fail the motion.
Representative Struthers: I move to table to have Larry Roper sepeak on this.
Representative Van Bossuyt: Second
Representative Alvarez I don’t think that’s necessary. I did talk to him its against OSU policies to get rid of someones pay if its just accusations. I do not see any point in trying to talk to him.
Speaker Pro Tempore: We could suspend them from their duties without suspending their pay.
Representative Van Bossuyt: Discussion of tabling I’d like to hear from Dr Roper on this matter to make sure that from all of us is the correct thing that we’re doing.
Speaker Pro Tempore: I move previous question
Representative Struthers: Second
A voice vote to end discussion was taken. The motion passed.
Speaker Hatlen: Oh thank god.
A standing vote was taken to table this until Larry Roper can come in to talk to us. The motion failed 8-9-0
Representative Alvarez Call to question.
Speaker Hatlen: We will vote on this joint bill.
Representative Phou: Is there discussion?
Representative Alvarez When I moved it does that mean I get discussion?
Speaker Hatlen: Then we closed discussion I asked for dissention and no one dissented.
Representative Phou: Dissention.
Speaker Hatlen: We’ll return to discussion.
Representative Phou: I appreciate the work everyone has been doing. I do have a problem with the bill. If we impeach somebody we’ve gone through a lengthy discuッション on it it’s not a random accusation. This bill is protecting a single student we should be protecting the student population that’s unfair. The purpose of this
is to protect the body of the students but we’re just protecting a single individual. We’re supposed to be proven you’re innocent until proven guilty. I think we’re trying to protect one individual when we should protect the student body. **Representative Alvarez** I see your point but as we’re doing this we’re protecting the student body and the student. Then you could run into the possibility of the house suspending someone and senate not convicting them and that would be embarrassing and not helping the student body it would be us sending the person without proof. The student body needs the body of proof where senate can discuss where they have real evidence. We just have accusations that haven’t been proven.

**Chris Van Drimmelen:** Right now we’re in discussion if we should call the question. Discussion on the bill is not germane right now if you want to discuss you should vote down the call to question.

**Speaker Hatlen:** Further discussion? Hearing none we will close discussion and have a vote on whether or not we’re going to vote.

A hand vote to close discussion was taken. The motion **passed**, 12-4-0

**Speaker Hatlen:** Now we’re moving into a vote on the bill itself.

A roll call vote was taken on JB-71.01. The motion **passed**.

X. **New Business & First Readings**

**JB-71.02 “Event Attendance”**

**Clerk Wolff:**

**WHEREAS** Members of the ASOSU Congress are elected by the OSU student body in order to address the needs of the students.

**WHEREAS** Attending student created/sponsored events will allow ASOSU legislators to work directly with students to better recognize issues on campus.

**WHEREAS** Attending student created/sponsored events will allow ASOSU Senators and Representatives to become more involved on campus, as well as allow students to meet their representatives.

**WHEREAS** Greater involvement with the Oregon State student body enables ASOSU legislators to better draft legislation that will positively affect the student body.

**BE IT HEREBY ENACTED BY THE ASOSU THAT:**
The ASOSU Statutes Title II, Section 2, subsection B will be changed to include:

“5. Representatives shall attend three student created/sponsored events each term. Reports shall be given during regular meetings detailing events attended.”

**BE IT FURTHER ENACTED BY THE ASOSU THAT:**

The ASOSU Statutes Title II, Section 3, subsection B will be changed to include:

“4. Senators shall attend three student created/sponsored events each term. Reports shall be given during regular meetings detailing events attended.”

**BE IT FURTHER ENACTED BY THE ASOSU THAT:**

This resolution shall take effect upon passage.

**Representative Sandberg:** Basically I wrote this resolution because there are a lot of students on campus that think we’re not representing them efficiently. I think if we go to three events a term there are a ton of events on campus every day there are a lot of events. Going to these events we can go to get to know our students. We might be able to on top of that write resolutions because of it.

**Representative Struthers:** My question is I don’t see what happens if the senate or representatives dont go.

**Representative Sandberg:** Its like our office hours it basically on you but we’re hoping that you would email Brandi and say hey I went to this event and she’ll write them down.

**Speaker Hatlen:** The actual speaking to the events you went to would be recorded in the minutes and looked back on.

**Representative Struthers:** In the standing rules you can declare the seat vacant if they aren't in office hours.

**Speaker Hatlen:** In the standing rules, ye.s

**Representative Sandberg:** We’ve been basically talking about getting its our first term doing it. So right now we don’t have for sure accountability it would be like our office hours. You would be expected to do it you would be emailing Brandi and you would be saying to the house that I went to this event.

**Representative Bhatt:** So what defines an event like a sport event?
Representative Sandberg: It can be anything like cultural events sporting events. I work at the black cultural center and in February we have about 12 events you can go to.

Representative Stuart: I think it’s fabulous. The first term doing it it would be an experiment. It would be nice to have representatives representing a specific population I think it’s wonderful.

Representative Struthers: You said sporting events. Are we talking about athletic events?

Representative Sandberg: It’s about your discretion. If anything you like at the last minute you went to a basketball game maybe you can talk to people at the game and ask if there’s anything going on. I would like you to go to student events because those are the issues on campus.

Representative Struthers: I heard athletic events and those aren’t put on by students.

Representative Sandberg: It would be student sponsored.

Representative Van Bossuyt: How much more time would this take and it may overwhelm this body especially with how many members we have. Suddenly we have 20 reports and is that a good use of time?

Representative Sandberg: Its three a term so you’re thinking a three month period it’s not like all of us are going to the same event. Maybe Andrew says hey I went to this environmental group. It won’t take much time its not a speech about it.

Representative Van Bossuyt: What size of event counts? Does it have to be really large or something small like a chess club?

Representative Sandberg: It can be anything because we’re representing all students. Maybe there’s a speaker maybe a cultural event maybe there’s a sorority or frat event. It doesn’t matter how long it is.

Representative Van Bossuyt: And what if it’s semi closed event. Would that be acceptable?

Representative Sandberg: It would be an actual event.

Representative Van Bossuyt: If it was a Sunday dinner with alumni it would be put on by the house and student.

Representative Sandberg: If it’s a student even you can go to it. It’s just to get our names out there through this whole situation with Tonga and stuff a lot of people have and negative feelings towards us that we’re not representing them.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I support what’s going on. I wonder if we could write in somewhere and get more funding to have nametags like certain parts of
executive has had. I know in organizations going in the public its more approachable.

Representative Sandberg: I like that idea
Representative Swalko: Clarification, for the events is IM sports is that student run so we could go to those? What about plays?
Representative Sandberg: If it's a student event and you can talk about what's going on its at your discretion. See I work at a cultural center so maybe that would be my focus and Andrew would focus on some other group and that would be his events.

Representative Struthers: I have two questions. You sort of touched on it, would representatives and senators go to their events or something they’re not involved in?
Representative Sandberg: I would love for you to go into something you’re really not involved in. Go out of your boundaries and different events meet new people. You might meet someone you never met before and you’ll help them with representing them.

Representative Struthers: There are some that have cost associated with them would there be any way to compensate them? The luai and bigger events have cost associated how would that be managed?

Representative Sandberg: They would be expected to pay for that there are a lot of free event on campus. If you could find an event that’s free its not like you have money to pay to go to that event if you go onto the website for January, February, March you wont need to go to the expensive ones.

Representative Bhatt: If there's an event not on the website can we still go to that?

Representative Sandberg: There are a lot not on the calendar but as long as it’s a student event its fine.

Representative Bhatt: You just have to notify Brandi?

Representative Sandberg: Say hey Brandi we went to so and so event you want to say what you learned.

Speaker Hatlen: That would probably be apart of the reporting.

Senator Vandever: I have a question if say for some reason or another everyone went to the same event would it still count for everyone if they went to the same event? Or even two or three that were the same. I don’t see how that would better the student body anymore than we already are.
Representative Sandberg: I understand what you’re looking at but I don’t think that will happen there are so many events on campus. I don’t think we’ll all have the same one.

Speaker Pro Tempore: Yield to Anderson

Anderson Duboise: I love the bill you’ve been working on. I like the idea of bridging that connect with the students and house members. It sounds like the idea is just to get out and meet as many people. The idea of going to student events, closed events, sports games, it sounds like we’re focusing on student run events. How do you make sure that that’s happening?

Representative Sandberg: Right now the first term will be getting into the groove of things basically it would be your own accountability. You’ll email Brandi and talk about it in house comments I hope its not too much to ask you. I know you all know about three events one term. Most events don’t run longer than an hour. My main focus is to get representation. It falls on you guys. Maybe you’re not missing the purpose but it’s to get to know people so why wouldn’t we want to go to ther events.

Senator Vandever: A follow up question is there a way to make it so all the representatives are better aware of all the events going on and if there’s a big event make sure there’s a representative going to it so we have representation present?

Representative Sandberg: That’s something I could do. Maybe we could get the list from Brandi or forward her a list of events.

Representative Alvarez I like this bill something to add may be you can’t go to three events that are the same. So three sports events.

Representative Stuart: This is to you Speaker. Is there a way to accept the bill as it stands as probation as this term and rediscuss it at the beginning of next term before we make changes?

Chris Van Drimmelen: The way you would do that is to pass the bill and if people had changes you would write another bill and bring it up at the beginning of spring term.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Are you planning if things go well would you plan to do a follow up bill to do this?

Representative Sandberg: Definitely that’s what Drew and I discussed.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Is this a reasonable thing to ask of representatives because of how precious our time is?
Representative Sandberg: It’s over a whole term three events maybe you would go to a major event but that major event is representing those students. Students were coming up to me saying we don’t know who you are you don’t come to our events. Maybe you’ll get something out of it. Maybe you’ll meet someone maybe it’ll benefit you in the end but if you pick an event that you would want to go to on your own time.

Speaker Hatlen: It could be a speaker. We’ll be discussing this next week.

Representative Swalko: Nevermind

Representative Phou: I wanted to add a friendly amendment we can talk about that next week.

Robby: If you’re representing students in general there should be time to talk to the students you’re representing. I know there are a lot that take time to go to different events to meet the student they’re here to help and learn from most of them talk about it and learn new things about cultures, life it’s not like this bill it trying to weigh you down its trying to expand your experience.

Representative Sandberg: I know the task force you always see them at events. Amelia is always here Patricia was here they take time out of their day. It’s probably really benefited them, I know it can benefit you too.

SB-71.03 “Jacob Vandever and Dan Cushing Legislator Accountability Bill”

Clerk Wolff:

WHEREAS ASOSU Senators and Members of the House of Representatives are required by the statutes to hold at least one hour of office hours per week;

WHEREAS All candidates for legislative office agreed to these standards when choosing to run for election;

WHEREAS There is currently no way to hold legislators accountable for holding their office hours;

WHEREAS The ASOSU Congress should be a professional organization that holds its members to set standards;
WHEREAS  Students at OSU should have the opportunity to discuss issues with their legislators during office hours;

BE IT HEREBY ENACTED BY THE CONGRESS THAT:

Title II Section 2 A Part 5 shall be added to the ASOSU Statutes to say:

Office hours of Representatives shall be mandatory. Any Representative who fails to hold office hours for three consecutive weeks or for four weeks in a single term (excluding week ten and finals week) shall have their seat declared vacant by the Speaker of the House.

BE IT FURTHER ENACTED BY THE CONGRESS THAT:

Title II Section 3 A Part 5 shall be added to the ASOSU Statutes to say:

Office hours of Senators shall be mandatory. Any Senator who fails to hold office hours for three consecutive weeks or for four weeks in a single term (excluding week ten and finals week) shall have their seat declared vacant by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate.

BE IT FURTHER ENACTED BY THE CONGRESS THAT:

Title II Section 3 B part 3 shall be amended to say:

Each Senator shall submit their office hours for the term to the President Pro Tempore and the Congressional Clerk by the first Friday of the term. The office hours for each Senator shall be posted by the clerk.

BE IT FURTHER ENACTED BY THE CONGRESS THAT:

Title II Section 2 B part 4 shall be amended to say:

Each Representative shall submit their office hours for the term to the Speaker of the House and the Congressional Clerk by the first Friday of the term. The office hours for each Representative shall be posted by the clerk.

BE IT FURTHER ENACTED BY THE CONGRESS THAT:

Title II Section 4, A part 4 shall be added to the ASOSU Statues to say
The Congressional Clerk shall report all absences from office hours of Senators and Representatives at their corresponding meetings.

**BE IT HEREBY ENACTED BY THE CONGRESS THAT:**

“Office hours” shall be defined as time spent in the ASOSU office distinct from time spent in committee meetings or other business of the ASOSU. It shall be time during which members of the ASOSU may meet with legislators to discuss ASOSU-related issues.

**ENACTED BY THE ASOSU Congress**

Representative Struthers: It’s the duty of the chair of the JCCC to speak on this.  
Speaker Hatlen: I was under the impression that Deedon was the cosponsor.  
Representative Robb: From my talks with Vandever the original author and witnessing the discussion we do have senators here that can answer questions further. Really the way that this is being brought forth is to add our requirements of office hours as they currently say in the standing rules. Really it was meant to be quite flexible you can send in changes of time to Brandi and as members of both houses that are quite busy as we have graduate students and other students that have full class loads it can be held on campus as long as its sent out if you have an hour lunch break between classes. That could be your office hour be there and enjoy your coffee and sandwich. Any one that would like to come they can go there.  
Representative Stuart: Do you have an idea where our congressional clerk would post these things? Would it be online in addition to the website?  
Senator Deedon: Are you talking the office hours? Yes it would be online. That would be a table onside of it. It would be available online to further our communication with students.  
Representative Van Bossuyt: In terms of holding it at the e café, can we hold it at the bar?  
Representative Robb: I checked that but sadly no because I would love to have it at bombs away.  
Chris Van Drimmelen: As a point of clarification office hours are in the statutes there are no provisions if you miss, in fact office hours aren’t in the rules.
Speaker Pro Tempore: These office hours are so lenient, the congressional clerk has to report on all absences how can we post a time if we meet at different times?

Chris Van Drimmelen: Office hours can’t be in a meeting.

Speaker Hatlen: Office hours wouldn’t be a part of the meeting.

Robby: Is there a limit on the locations on campus because what if you’ll be doing it at the library or study rooms would you put that up in a week in advance so the day of it you put it an hour before your changing it its hard for students.

Representative Robb: Currently they don’t have anything in there. It would be beneficial to have that added. Brett can you speak to the original intent along those lines?

President Prot Tempore: The original bill said submitted the first Friday of the term that for the initial hours in can see the hours change based on if a house or senator submits those hours and students can look those up online. Let’s put in it in here so senators and representatives can have this time and students reach out to their representatives.

Representative Thomas: How will this look spring term since the new representatives with take oath of office and immediately serve office hours?

Representative Robb: With that when someone is sworn in to office the end of the term that'll be right before finals week or dead week and during that time you don't have to hold office hours.

Chris Van Drimmelen: You do not need to hold office hours during dead week.

New officers take office on June 1 that’s the day before dead week so there wouldn’t be any requirements.

Representative Bhatt: It doesn’t seem like the accountability. We can’t hold people accountable unless it’s a specific location if its held in Snell 149 and go in and check with the front desk that might be a better idea. So there’s a track record of when someone was there instead of oh its in the library in the study room.

Representative Robb: Currently how we have office hours you go to Snell and there’s a cubicle there and that’s the congressional office and you sign in and you sign off on that. With this I saw the other locations for students that didn’t work out for if they had the ability rather constant location that’s accessible to students and other things like that it would be ok since it would be posted online.

Representative Van Bossuyt: As for grad students we’ve had the privilege to hold our office hours in our research labs and office. That’s what we’ve fought for.
Anderson: I like this idea as well. It sounds like this is similar to the last bill we talked about. It's an idea to make it more effective as far as appearance. Have a shirt of nametag or button that let people know who you are so it's not I'm going to java and people don't know who it is.

Representative Robb: Pretty much it's up to the representative if someone decided they're going to a undisclosed study room in the bottom corner of the library that would be most likely asked to find a different location. It's really up to the representative it would be a location best accessible to all students.

Representative Alvarez: I almost view this as pretty toothless you're suppose to submit office hours by the first Friday. House doesn't meet until Wednesday night it would be hard the first week. You don’t have to hold it the tenth week and that's eight weeks left that you’re suppose to have it. You don’t get in trouble unless you miss four of the eight it would be fine if we had a distinct place we had to do it. I feel like if you have to have it to keep you accountable four out of eight isn't accountable.

Representative Vanderwall: I was wondering just to clarify our office hours currently do we have to hold them at Snell or if you’re a grad in your office?

Speaker Hatlen: Currently there are no guidelines for that. I've made exceptions for people in the Cultural Centers for students.

Speaker Pro Tempore: There were a lot of points raised what I like about the bill is that its for accountability of maybe having a computer system so we can log in that way for grad students if they want them in their office or if student want to be in Snell or the MU as far as putting regulations on that we do stipulate what we can and can’t do. Let’s get this information on the web. As for week one its not stipulated that you have to hold office hours but the office hours of the term are due for that term. If so on a Monday of that first week you have to hold your office hours by week two you'll be holding those office hours as stipulated in the office hours for that week would be the Friday before week one.

JB-71.03 “OSA & ASOSU Relationship Findings”

Clerk Wolff:

WHEREAS All members of ASOSU/OSA relationship investigative committee agreed to remain a member of OSA, reinstate funding for OSA for the 2011-2012 school year, and create a memorandum of understanding with OSA.

WHEREAS OSA is extremely beneficial to ASOSU and the rationale for our decision is included in Appendix I.
BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE 71st ASOSU CONGRESS THAT:

A Memorandum of Understanding shall be written to define the relationship between OSA and ASOSU and furthermore determine the benefit provided directly to ASOSU by OSA.

This Memorandum of Understanding shall be negotiated and implemented by an executive negotiating team appointed by the ASOSU President, including the Speaker of the House and the President Pro-Tempore of the Senate.

This Memorandum of Understanding shall take into consideration the recommendations of the attached committee report in Appendix I.

This Memorandum of Understanding after being presented by the ASOSU Executive Branch must be approved by both Houses of the ASOSU Congress.

BE IT HEREBY FURTHER ENACTED THIS DAY BY THE ASOSU Congress

A new title with sections and subsections shall be created in the ASOSU Statutes to read and be inserted after Title XI:

Title XII: Internal/External Relationships

Section 1: Definitions

A. Internal Relationships shall be those relationships with entities that are considered part of Oregon State University.

B. External Relationships shall be those relationships with entities that are not considered part of Oregon State University.

Section 2: Internal Relationships

Section 3: External Relationships

A. Oregon Student Association

1. The Oregon Student Association (OSA) is a statewide advocacy and organizing non-profit, that was established in 1975 to represent, serve, and protect the collective interests of students in postsecondary education in Oregon.

2. ASOSU is a member of OSA and is responsible for: sending two (2) delegate members of the ASOSU to serve as members of the OSA Board of Directors as well as providing the standard
funding allocation determined by OSA and approved SIFC and ASOSU Congress, to OSA as funding to support OSA operations.

i. The members are the ASOSU President and ASOSU Executive Director of Government Affairs

3. A Memorandum of Understanding between OSA and ASOSU shall be written as a manifestation of the obligations that OSA and ASOSU will have to one another.

4. The negotiation team for ASOSU shall be made of a team appointed by the ASOSU President, including the Speaker of the House and the President Pro-Tempore of the Senate.

5. This Memorandum of Understanding shall be reviewed each year by OSA and ASOSU and renegotiated and signed by an executive officer of each by the end of July.

Representative Struthers: I’m going to speak on behalf of the committee. I want to speak why they wrote this bill. One is the joint bill and the second is the report that you came up with and our answer to these questions. The second half is the charge. Feel free to look at that. Talk about the bill what it about. The committee agreed that we should remain members of OSA it was more or less opened discussion about what people thought and what they had. The thing was that they wanted to stay member or should we pull out. As discussion to pull out the first be it hereby resolved that for this year for this administration, the reason that there was some discussion around what the terms would look like. The term agreement it would be the president they can appoint who they want to that committee. We wanted the speaker on there because the memorandum would have to come back to the body to understand it and we know what’s going on as a body. If we left the internal relationship blank because we wanted to put down what we saw for the Oregon Student Association and because they’re an external relationship we wanted to define what that tooked like. I’m happy to answer questions since its all relevant and this body set the charge for the committee.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Nice job.

Representative Struthers: Big fat thing if you want to read through it the congressional clerk also has it. It has all the budget line items it very detailed what they do for us.
Speaker Pro Tempore: For the sake of our bladder, minds, and miss wolff’s hands I move to recess.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Second

Speaker Hatlen: How long?

Speaker Pro Tempore: 7 and a half minutes.

Speaker Hatlen: Is there dissention for a 7 and a half minute recess?

The body recessed for 7 and a half minutes beginning at 8:47 p.m.

The meeting began at 8:54 p.m.

Speaker Hatlen: And so we’re back from outerspace. We’re now onto special orders.

Representative Struthers: I move that we invite Dr Eward Ray to come speak to this body or bring terms to the issue that may be pertinent to the student body.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Second

Representative Struthers: I’ve had last year conversations with the president right now that he would be happy to speak to the members of congress I think it woud be beneficial to talk with him.

Representative Van Bossuyt: Exactly what he said.

Paul Aljets: I’d like to say that when I was student I invited him to speak at Avery Lodge and he has his schedule booked six months in advance.

Speaker Hatlen: Hearing now is there any dissention. Hearing none motion passed. We’ll move on with special order we have Paul Aljets the first speaker of the house when this body was created I dont think you need any more introduction.

XI. Special Orders

Paul Aljet’s- Former Speaker of the House

Mr. Aljets: To start off I hold a bachelors degree in political science and masters in public policy. I was consulted on writing the constitution and wrote the majority of the statutes about 98 percent and I served on I believe five of the six committees that are amongst congress. I sat on four of the budgeting boards in OSU. I was invited by Mr. Hatlen to sepak on the changes from the old regime to the new one. I really don’t have anything prepared so I’ll start of with a timeline, quick introduction why the changes were made that sort of thing to start off. The old system was unicameral. It was a portion by college apportionment of certain organization on campus had a few others in addition to that there was a JC the judicial council however they rarely met and rarely had quorum. ASOSU senate rarely had quorum both years they had to call an emergency session to pass
budget. There were a few things wrong with it. There was a great deal of conflict
with the senate and ASOSU presidency at the time president Ryan Mann and the
senate chair. The last senate chair they constructed the constitution, the draft
that you have with you, I hope you have it with you. A draft of it was proposed
and I was the chair for student government and asked me to look over it and it
went and got passed by a two-thirds vote and was passed onto the general
student body onto general elections and was passed. In the old system to pass it
there wasn’t a requirement on how many people voted on it. It was passed by
majority. I spent the next five months writing the statutes studying the federal
statutes, the Oregon revised statues boiling down what they had to a concise 40
pages. As it stands right now and I’ve tried to keep track what’s going on right
now. Hatlen or Struther or Van Bossuyt will ask for clarification of the statutes or
constitution. There’s been a bill into the body or the senate regarding reversing
many of the changes including returning to a unicameral system and allowing
student organizations to vote. I’ll entertain questions.
Representative Stuart: I wasn’t there last week as far as I was concerned he
brought up going to unicameral and having representatives be representing of a
certain organization so every organization would be represented.
Paul Aljets: Was it representing organizations or a district system where each
would be a portion of a certain college.
Representative Struthers: I ask the Roberts Rules and standing Rules be
suspended.
Representative Robb: Second.
Speaker Hatlen: Is there any dissention? Hearing none we’ll move on.
Paul Aljets: The main reason for it being changed one there were only certain
organizations that we counted a vote there’s the cultural center was one for
example these votes were set up in the constitution in the year 200 and at that
point certain organizations had come, some were more successful than others
and did not have a vote. The first question was what do we define as an
organization that was one discussion we wanted to create a right that every
organization could have. Secondly in my time there every senator that
represented a certain organization rarely attended and since they counted
toward quorum that led to an emergency session being called. It shouldn’t be their
problem if an organization doesn’t send a representative if there was a major
issue to come up the representative would be there. It provides more flexibility if
a representative could show up or not show up. I can’t think of anything else off the top of my head. I’ll get back to you.

Amelia Harris: I’m confused why you’re here we want to represent students today. I’m confused why we’re listening to you.

Paul Aljets: My understanding, I had a discussion over email with Speaker Hatlen. They really wanted me to show up for two reasons I had written the statues which had me pour over the constitution, I have written a number of other government documents, the Oregon state elections committee, and the house and senate standing rules. I wrote that with Struthers. In addition, in student organizations it’s an unfortunate fact that the life expectancy is 4 year there’s a loss of institutional memory. It’s a fate of student organizations. The old people that didn’t know what they were doing, the new people have to figure it out. As far as I know of I’m here to help extend that memory.

Representative Alvarez: Maybe would you see any bad ideas about possibly not having the certain district or student organization delegates but making it a unicameral body and the election process the same combining house and senate.

Paul Aljets: I heard two topics there. One reaching into the apportionment issue. Brad if we didn’t do that and kept the way you get into the body the same.

Paul Aljets: It use to be a unicameral system. The reason it was spread out was to create filter for legislation and I’ll elaborate. You have a number of steps the bill has to go through and it provides that second chance of a resolution or bill to be looked over and studied with more detailed screening. If it came to the house first and then senate. It was important we capture the desire to have fresh blood in student government. The House of Representatives is much larger but have one term. Its easy for newcomers to come in and see how the system works to understand it. If they don’t like it they can leave or if they’re coming in for one term they can serve their term and be done. For those that are older and more experienced, I don’t say older as in this guy, I love you Doug, but older that they have more experience in the organization that they go to the senate its two year term. They’re there longer and hold the institution memory and create the filter between getting fresh ideas. Whereas trying to preserve the understanding and memory and the history of what happened in the senate.

Representative Phou: Did the number of students in the organization count as the number of votes in the house?

Paul Aljets: All the organizations that were present had one vote.
Speaker Hatlen: How were those decided? What groups got votes?
Paul Aljets: It was in the constitution year 2000. If a new cultural center came along they wouldn’t have a vote.
Speaker Hatlen: You’d have to have a constitutional amendment to do that.
Paul Aljets: The college of liberal arts had five senator and the engineering department had one. The reason why that was changed was because you’d have 12 people running for the liberal arts seats and one person running in the college of engineering. You’d have all these people running, real people for liberal arts and only half of them would get in. In engineering they don’t have the time except the one person that is sick enough to try it out.
Representative Robb: With the at large voting did you calculate the idea of having members be like actually sponsored by an organization openly or was that thought of or discouraged?
Paul Aljets: You mean active sponsors saying I’m running for the house to representatives?
Representative Robb: It would be I believe U of O has the parties.
Paul Aljets: I’ll say as my own personal opinion, there were political parties on this campus not democratic or republican just for this organization.
Representative Stuart: What would those look like?
Paul Aljets: You’re asking me to guess.
Representative Stuart: I like the idea of parties but I haven’t seen if work well in our government so I’m hesitant.
Paul Aljets: My prediction is that it will eventually happen. There really weren’t parties in the first ten years of government.
Representative Van Bossuyt: Working on the statutes there was provision for parties what were the reasons to remove that?
Paul Aljets: It was disgust. Unless its been changed since the elections committee organizations can represent students running as candidates running for office. You as a student can get endorsements from a whole slurry of organizations. It’ll put more weight on your brand of campaign.
Representative Van Bossuyt: Is there anything in the constitution and statutes that would encourage the pharmacy club to run a large slate of candidates for house?
Paul Aljets: There’s nothing that prohibits that. If there’s an organization on campus I would say what you need to do is find like minded organizations that agree with
you on an issue and make a slate of candidates. That’s what I would do that makes the representatives accountable; you have someone watching you.

Representative Stuart: I like that idea but I have the same disgust I tried getting ahold of the women’s center and I like them because I like to represent them but I’d hate if I had to speak for them and if on every scenario had to say what they wanted to say.

Paul Aljets: It’s not like you’re a slave to them but if they endorse you it’s a statement that we agree with what you want done to campus and sure you might get a letter once or twice saying we don’t know why you voted for this but the worst they can do is to remove their support from you.

Representative Bhatt: What would be the endorsement they would give you?

Paul Aljets: My understanding is that it appears next to you on the ballot saying who is supporting you. If you run down this ballot list and three names have no one endorsing them and the next name has twenty names endorsing them maybe you want to vote for them unless you don’t like those organizations.

Representative Stuart: Whomever it was that proposed this was having representatives representing something.

Speaker Hatlen: To clarify we’re just doing an informative session about what congress and the constitution used to look like and what it is now. Any proposals we’re trying to set the stage.

Paul Aljets: I’d like a disclaimer I have no dog in this fight anymore. This is your student government, you do with it as you wish. I was speaking to Drew’s class today about Ohio State. What they have in student representation they still on the eighth floor of their administration building and have a room with 10 people one of them the president of the university and two students that’s their representation. What every you choose to do it’s a hell of a lot better than what they have in other states. I’ll you clarity of what’s happened in the past I really don’t care one way or the other.

Amelia: And you talk about how it looks in theory and how it goes into practice. I wish I could be a part of this conversation well I guess I am because I’m talking but you’re looking at what you want it to look like and what it looks like on paper.

Paul Aljets: I’d need some specific I could write a book of what it looks like.

Amelia: I think just a short summary if you wrote it this way. If we’re looking at what we want to change what it looked like when you were here.

Paul Aljets: I think that I’d start of by the difference between the constitution and statutes. The constitution is what we want our student government to look like here
what we want it to be. The statutes are much more detailed that’s where you look to see how we execute what the wants. How does it all work together, that’s what in the statutes. Most of the time question related to wrinkling out problems and issues is a statutory thing.

Ameliea: In practice like person to person are people showing up to meetings in practice when we physically play out the law.

Paul Aljets: So the before and after what it looked like in the old government compare and contrast?

Ameliea: Yes.

Paul Aljets: In terms of I’ll go to each branch. I’ve seen a lot more communication with government but I’ve seen more conflict. There are reasons for that. There’s a significant amount of activity in the legislative branch more than there was in the old senate and Van Bossuyt can correct me on that or support me. When I got there I went to pack a resume and almost every one did in the old senate oh you want someone new go to the senate.

Ameliea: Please only talk about when you were there. Its separate when you were actively involved and when you left.

Paul Aljets: I’ve only heard in correspondence what has happened here. The change has happened by rebooting the whole system in civic organization and activism on campus it was complete 180 apart of that was related to the professional behavior in the first few months from the legislative branch executive branch and judicial branch. It was basically non-existent in the old system. All of the change came from the demeanor of the students involved. You’d see everyone yawning and falling asleep in both houses everyone is more acting. In the two years I was there I saw three pieces of legislation and two were proposed by Van Drimmelen. It almost didn’t represent anyone and yet students were paying for it. It’s a better change the demeanor or itself had changed. In terms of the executive branch I’d say its about the demeanor and behavior. There’s more communication between the branches. They were always very active in the time the legislation came and JC didn’t operate there was voicing that had to be filled. Senate that was making decisions to speak of the executive got use to making decisions. They couldn’t say your the representative what do the students think. That’s one of the reasons why there are so many task forces over the years. In addition to the student there were people with extra special needs. So in the absence of the senate or judicial branch the executive took over more control. President Mann understood that role that they had filled and understood it had to
change. He pushed for that change for the legislative branch to take over some of the decision-making ability for eight years or more. In terms of judicial branch first off they didn’t keep case records there were no way of overuling. They rarely had their seats filled there were 5 JC members I think and they hadn’t heard a case for a very long time. They basically did nothing and that was one thing we wanted to change. Looking specifically at issues of constitution we knew we would need them. It was a new document and there would be a lot of wrinkles there would be conflicts and that’s what the JC was for when I was speaker being the first year of this in practice. A few things went to the JC and there would be some decisions on the book that would be a conflict in the future.

Representative Stuart: Thank you.
Speaker Hatlen: Does anyone have more questions for Paul? He drove down here from Portland.
Paul Aljets: Thank you.
Representative Struthers: I move we reinstate Roberts Rules in the body.
Speaker Pro Tempore: Second
Speaker Hatlen: Any dissention? None

Amelia Harris - International Lawyer Proposal
Amelia: I apologize I have homework to do for tomorrow morning. I’m here to talk about the lawyer I have a revised proposal that you’ll like better than the last one I have some Q and A on the last page. Let me know if your questions weren’t covered, I think it would be best to send me all your feedback in email or come meet with me now that you have this information come talk to me unless you have immediate comments right now. I was expecting more time and less tired people. Sounds good emailing me?

Representative Swalko: Will you be here next week?
Amelia: I wont be presenting next week but I’ll be here in attendance.
Speaker Hatlen: Can you send me an electronic copy of this?
Amelia: Yeah I can do that.

Lobby Training
Speaker Pro Tempore: I move to table lobby training until next week.
Representative Swalko: Second
Representative Van Bossuyt: Has someone been waiting to give us that training?
Speaker Hatlen: No he’s quite comfortable with giving it next week.
Representative Head: What’s lobby training?
Speaker Hatlen: There's a short session for congress there was some expressed interest in doing lobby training. There is a task force director that trains for advocates of lobbying there's some interest from legislators to be apart of that training. Its in our best interest as representatives and senators to have that training brought to us. We'll have a large resource to pull from also you could go up and meet an actual legislator to get practical hands on knowledge since you're all apart of congress it might be nice to see how it looks like. Robby will come in and meet with us for three weeks.

Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to amend to tabling to thank you presenting for being so flexible.

Speaker Hatlen: I'll pass on that information. Is there dissent for tabling this? Hearing none I will table this and extend the gratitude.

XII. Speaker’s Announcements

Speaker Hatlen: Who’s excited for the longest meeting of the term thus far.
Representative Vanderwall: I am really excited.

Speaker Hatlen: I want to commend you all and for staying on topic thank you for being so vigilant. Vigilant? I think it’s vigilant. Diligent! That’s the word I’m looking for. I think that’s it.

XIII. House Comments

Representative Bhatt: This on the record right now, thank you for the opportunity and bitchin.
Representative Van Bossuyt: I move to strike the offensive word.
Speaker Pro Tempore: No
Representative Alvarez: There’s a government affairs team meeting Friday at three they will do lobby simulation and I encourage you to attend.

Speaker Hatlen: There’s an OSA student body alliance meeting 3-5 that I would encourage you to go to. And I need one representative. Yes, Michael, thank you.

XIV. Gallery Comments

Senator Diabat: I said yesterday in the senate our many open hearing happening for the entities that are asking for budget from us and as you know the house and senate will approve that after SIFC. I encourage you to be in the hearings they’ll be published in the speaker of the house will send these as well. Please do attend.

XV. Adjournment

Speaker Pro Tempore: I move to adjourn.
Representative Van Bossuyt: Second.
The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.