

The majority of the Constitutional Review Board interpreted the constitution regarding the amendment process holds that line 41 “2. Requires a two-thirds (2/3) majority for consideration” ought to be interpreted as “Requires a two-thirds (2/3) majority for passage after senate consideration” since in the same document there is a line stating that any student body member may bring a piece of legislation before the student senate for referendum.

Chief Justice Collin Hamilton
Associate Justice Evan Tenenbaum
Nico Wrenn CRB
Jayson Estassi CHB

The minority holds that -as I was the only dissenting opinion at the Constitutional Review Board meeting on Friday afternoon, I think it would be useful to not only explain my opinion but also the point out how much thought and effort went in to our final decision. Although I understand that most of what happened in the amendment section of the constitution was a clerical error, which happens in all areas of student government, I think it is our duty to uphold the written word of the constitution. The wording clearly states that for a bill to be proposed and considered by the senate there needs to be a 2/3 majority. Nowhere in the amendment is it implied or even suggested that the senate has the power to pass an amendment. The only way to pass a bill is through a student referendum. I believe that since the senate has been operating under the assumption that an amendment can be passed with a 2/3 majority, that someone should have looked at the section of the constitution that they were operating under.

The entire student body voted to ratify this version of the constitution, and although most of us are too busy to read a document that is over 20 pages long, someone should have taken the initiative to re read it. Technically speaking, as much as it sucks, every amendment that the senate has passed this academic year is invalid. I know that the senate has worked hard to accomplish what they have this year, and it is doing them a disservice to invalidate all of their hard work. However, I think it is also important to see the constitution as an actual legal document. We have all worked hard to gain legitimacy for ASLC in the administration, and it is important that we continue on that path. I think that it would actually give us more legitimacy to say that we made a mistake and that we are going to honor the letter of the law. We would be sending the administration a signal that we are taking ourselves seriously and that we understand the importance of our actions in student government.

I know that my opinion means nothing in a technical sense because I was entirely overruled by the rest of the committee, but I wanted to express that this is an issue that I care about and take seriously. We all deliberated on a Friday at 4 30 for a long time over the language of a single sentence. We took our job seriously and all debated over the proper course of action. I think that our decision was fair even though I respectfully disagree with our final opinion.

Associate Justice Mary Beck

