



74th Student Senate Judiciary Committee

September 20th, 2022 | <https://fsu.zoom.us/j/91514428003>

Call to Order: 6:02 PM

Members Present: Senators Tucker, Boisvert, Drackley, Casiple, Vice Chair Maglin, Chair Kariher

Members Tardy: None

Members Absent: Senator Rivers (excused), Senator Fermin

Guests: Chair Diaz

Land Acknowledgement read by Chair Kariher: The Student Government of Florida State University acknowledges that it is located on land that is the ancestral and traditional territory of the Apalachee Nation, the Miccosukee Tribe of Florida, the Muscogee Creek Nation, and the Seminole Tribe of Florida. We pay respect to their Elders past and present and extend that respect to their descendants and to all Indigenous people. We recognize this land remains scarred by the histories and ongoing legacies of settler colonial violence, dispossession, and removal. Despite all this, and with tremendous resilience, these Indigenous Nations have remained deeply connected to this territory, to their families, to their communities, and to their cultural ways of life. We recognize the ongoing relationships of care that these Indigenous Nations maintain with this land and extend our gratitude as we live and work as humble and respectful guests upon their territory. We encourage all to learn about and educate others on the contemporary work of the Indigenous Nations whose land we are on and to endeavor to support Indigenous sovereignty in all the ways that we can.

Announcements:

- None

Committee Business:

- **Bill 74:** Diaz (P)
 - Creating a Judicial Oath of Office for candidates to the Student Supreme Court.
- **Resolution 59:** Diaz (P); Folwell, Hockett, Kariher, Nemeth, Turkomer, Wyatt (Co);
 - An amendment to the Senate Rules of Procedure to replace technical non-debatable questions with a round of general questions when debating legislation or motions on the floor.

New Business:

- **Bill 74 - Sponsored by Chair Diaz (P)**

- Opening Statement:
 - Chair Diaz: So, I learned some trivia while watching Supreme Court Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson's confirmation. Judges on the Supreme Court must take two oaths of office while being confirmed. That is very similar to what I wrote in this bill—I looked it up. Why not introduce that here into our system of government. Not necessarily two separate oaths but just creating one specific oath that each member of the Supreme Court Justice has to take before they get confirmed. **Yields with 1:20s**
- Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - None
- **Casiple moves to enter round-table discussion; Vice Chair Maglin seconds**
- Round-Table Discussion:
 - Senator Tucker: **POI** to sponsor – What do you see is the benefit of this bill if it goes into effect?
 - Chair Diaz: I'll be honest with you it's kind of unnecessary but it's something to add a little more pizzazz to what it takes to be a Supreme Court Justice. The justices should be expected to uphold the standards and what I wrote in there "to administer justice without respect to people, do equal right, equal justice to everyone"—I just think that's something that all Supreme Court Justices should swear by.
 - Senator Tucker: I just want to say with that being said, I like this bill, the verbiage is great, and I agree with the sponsor. I think we should get this in front of senate.
 - Senator Casiple: Yeah, I agree. I think it's a pretty simple thing.
 - Senator Casiple: **POI** to the sponsor: You said there were two oaths that they take. What aspects did you combine into this one that you thought were really important?
 - Chair Diaz: I didn't really combine them—the Standard Oath is something that all U.S. political officeholders take. I mostly just looked at the Judicial Oath—I literally Googled it, you can Google it as well—it looks very similar to what is in this bill. It was more taking inspiration from federal law and applying it to FSU.
 - Vice Chair Maglin: Yeah, I mean I'm just reading it and I like it. I think it adds an extra layer of accountability for the judicial branch—which I think of all branches, it really needs that. Especially when dealing with issues that may involve some bias or something that affects the student body, so I like it. It doesn't really, as the sponsor said, change anything, but I think it's something else to give the judicial branch some "oomph".
- **Casiple moves to call the question; Vice Chair Maglin seconds**
- Closing Statement:
 - **WAIVED**
- Vote:
 - Yes: 5, Senator(s) Casiple, Tucker, Boisvert, Drackley, Vice Chair Maglin
 - No: 0
 - Abstain: 0
- **RESULT: BILL 74 PASSES**

- **Resolution 59 - Sponsored by Chair Diaz (P); Folwell, Hockett, Kariher, Nemeth, Turkomer, Wyatt**
 - Opening Statement:
 - Chair Diaz: This resolution replaces technical non-debatable questioning period with a general round of questions. This may seem like a radical change, but it is not. In a year from now people will not think twice about the way things were. There will be a five-minute opening statement, and then we will go to general questions, the presiding officer can direct questions to non-Senators, I also struck out language prohibiting motions to make motions: we can now make motions to amend and motions for allowing non-Senators to answer questions. Questions in pro-con can also be asked in pro-con, but we should be able to ask questions before determining a side to take in pro con and I think its ridiculous we cannot ask points. I am happy to answer any questions. **Yields with 34s**
 - Technical Non-Debatable Questions:
 - None
 - **Senator Tucker moves to enter round-table discussion; Vice Chair Maglin seconds**
 - Round-Table Discussion:
 - Senator Tucker: Think about how much time we waste in Senate people asking technical non-debatable questions that don't really have no relevance at all that could easily be pointed out through clarification. When we are in technical non-debatable, we can't make those points.
 - Senator Tucker: **POI** to the sponsor: Why is this through a resolution, is this not in Statutes?
 - Chair Diaz: No, it is not in Statutes.
 - VC Maglin: **POI** to the sponsor: Really just for clarification, would this immediately enter us into a period of roundtable discussion or is this purely just questioning?
 - Chair Diaz: It is not round-table, it is just questions. The you can ask any question related to the bill we are debating, then in pro-con you can make a point of information.
 - VS Maglin: This will save time and will get all thew questions we need out of the way in the beginning, so we are not stuck with a bunch of points of information in pro-con debate.
 - **Vice Chair Maglin moves to pass by unanimous consent, Senator Tucker seconds, no objections**
 - Closing Statement:
 - **WAIVED**
 - Vote:
 - Yes: 5 (all)
 - No: 0
 - Abstain: 0
 - **RESULT: RESOLUTION 59 PASSES BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT**

Unfinished Business:

- None

Closing Announcements:

- Vice Chair Maglin: I'm getting my wisdom teeth removed on Friday, so I won't really be able to speak much during next week's committee meeting, but just know I'll still be there, and I'll try my best.
- Senator Tucker: Thank you Senator Folwell for coming, and great efficiency today.

Next Meeting: September 27th, 2022, at 6:00 p.m.

Adjourned: 6:22 p.m.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cole Kariher". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Signature of Chair Kariher