

ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Fifty-first Legislature – Second Regular Session

**COMMITTEE ON FEDERALISM
AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY**

Minutes of Meeting
Tuesday, February 4, 2014
House Hearing Room 1 -- 2:00 p.m.

Chairman Olson called the meeting to order at 2:14 p.m. and attendance was noted by the secretary.

Members Present

Mr. Contreras
Mr. Gowan
Mr. Larkin

Mr. Seel
Mr. Wheeler

Mr. Smith, Vice-Chairman
Mr. Olson, Chairman

Members Absent

Mrs. Lesko

Committee Action

HB2104 – DP (4-3-0-1)
HB2305 – DISCUSSED & HELD

HB2397 – DP (4-3-0-1)
HCR2018 – DPA (4-3-0-1)

Chairman Olson apologized for the lack of space to an overflowing audience and announced the order of the bills.

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS

HCR2018 – funding ballot measures; reauthorization – DO PASS AMENDED

Paul Benny, Majority Research Analyst, stated that HCR2018 is similar to HCR2033, introduced during the Fifty-first Legislature, First Regular Session. The resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution and states for any initiative or referendum that authorizes the expenditures of state monies, that authorization is valid for eight years, after which a reauthorization measure shall be referred to the voters and if approved, continues the authorization to expend monies for another eight years. Furthermore, the resolution states that the reauthorization requirement applies retroactively to previously-enacted ballot measures and the ballot measures affected retroactively and enacted more than eight years, would be referred to the voters at the next general election for reauthorization. HCR2018 requires the Auditor General to conduct a special audit every five years, evaluating the costs of each voter-protected measure from the date of

enactment to the present and submit a copy to specified individuals by August 15, of the audit year (Attachment 1). The Olson eight-line amendment dated 02/03/14 to HCR2018, establishes that the reauthorization requirement only applies to measures proposed to voters in the November 2014 general elections and thereafter; additionally, it removes the revisions relating to the retroactivity requirement (Attachment 2).

Mr. Olson clarified Mr. Seel's question on the amendment, stating it does remove the reauthorization of past initiatives and instead focuses on moving forward. He stated it is one step in the process and if HCR2018 passes the ballot, then other issues could be addressed. In response to Mr. Seel's second question, he stated that Mr. Boyer, the sponsor who is ill, supports his amendment.

Eric Emmert, East Valley Chamber of Commerce Alliance, spoke in favor of HCR2018. He stated that reauthorization of initiatives has been discussed in the last four years because Proposition 105, that was passed in 1998, made it impossible to adjust any initiative to current economic times or to advance technologically. It requires three-fourths vote of each chamber from the Legislature and it must further the intent of what was passed at the ballot. HCR2018, with the amendment, looks at the initiative process prospectively instead of retroactively. It puts aside the opponents' arguments that "the people have spoken with their vote" and the proponents' arguments that "if something passed at the ballot before, it will pass again". The East Valley Chamber believes it will empower the public to reconsider their decisions and supports this measure.

Mr. Seel questioned if the amendment to the Constitution was not in the resolution, whether it would have dealt with Proposition 105 and if it could be reconsidered. Mr. Emmert responded that the language states that it is any initiative that has ties to a revenue source and Proposition 105 does not.

Sandy Bahr, Chapter Director, Sierra Club-Grand Canyon Chapter, stated opposition to HCR2018 and any other measures that choose to weaken citizens' rights to initiatives. She explained that it is difficult to initiate a ballot measure, it is expensive, time consuming, and will create a road block if initiatives have to go through the process every eight years. She highlighted that the Legislature can selectively refer any measure to the ballot any time as long as it has the 31 and 16 votes in the respective chambers. It does not have to go to the Governor and an audit can be requested any time. Ms. Bahr suggested using that Legislative power to evaluate individual initiatives and refer them if there are current issues, instead of referring this measure to the ballot.

Discussion ensued between Mr. Olson and Ms. Bahr as to voter restrictions, initiative campaigns, the ballot process and taxpayers' rights.

Vice-Chairman Smith announced the names of those who signed up in support of HCR2018 but did not speak:

F. Thomas Fiedler, representing self

Robert Medler, Tucson Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce

Linda Rizzo, representing self

Susan Leeper, representing self
Gerald Davis, representing self

Vice-Chairman Smith announced the names of those who signed up in opposition to HCR2018 but did not speak:

Josselyn Berry, representing self
Rebekah Friend, representing self
Nick Collins, representing self
Gini McGirr, League of Women Voters of Arizona
Geoff Esposito, Arizona School Boards Association
Barbara Burkholder, representing self
Pat VanMaanen, representing self
Karen Michael, Animal Defense League of Arizona
Kelsie Dunmire, representing self
Elizabeth Birmingham, Arizona Public Health Association
Sam Wercinski, Arizona Advocacy Network
Jonathan Alanis, representing self
Rivko Knox, representing self
Janice Palmer, Arizona School Boards Association

Vice-Chairman Smith moved that HCR2018 do pass.

Vice-Chairman Smith moved that the Olson eight-line amendment to HCR2018 dated 02/03/14 (Attachment 2) be adopted. The motion carried.

Vice-Chairman Smith moved that HCR2018 as amended do pass. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 4-3-0-1 (Attachment 3).

PRESENTATIONS

Compact for a Balanced Budget

Nick Dranias, Director, Joseph and Dorothy Donnelly Moller Center for Constitutional Government, Goldwater Institute, gave a presentation on HB2305: *Compact for a Balanced Budget* (Attachment 4). He emphasized that Article V is not an abstract operation and this country has a national runaway debt with a historic opportunity to fix it (referring to HB2305). He gave examples of other states that are in the process or that have passed this type of legislation and made a comparison of Argentina's financial situation to the fate of the United States (U.S.) thirty years down the road. Mr. Dranis stated that the problem is a system problem not just a political problem. He related facts of the national debt and comparisons to other countries:

- The current U.S. spending is not a sustainable trend.
- The U.S. is at 107 percent of gross domestic product in total national debt; Greece started panicking at this point five years ago.
- The last time the U.S. was in this situation was at the height of World War II and it was the only economy left standing; this time, the U.S. will not be left standing.

- The U.S. cannot grow out of this.
- The future has already been mortgaged.
- There are \$220 trillion in unfunded entitlement programs which did not exist in the 1950-60s.
- Washington does not change its behavior.
- The deficit has shrunk from \$1.2 trillion to \$650 billion but any unbalanced deficit could keep the U.S. on the same path as Argentina and Greece.
- In 1940, Argentina, per capita, was wealthier than the U.S.

Mr. Dranias expanded on the rationalization of defaulting on the debt like other countries have; Argentina, Venezuela and Mexico, etc., but explained the downfalls of that economic decision. He stated that the federal statute debt limit, which will resume in February, will be at the current level of borrowing which has been a limitless increase since October. Washington has borrowed more money just to ensure the new debt limit would be much higher than necessary. The U.S. Constitution currently allows the debtor to write their own credit limit; it is a system that allows elected officials to buy votes because they can provide the benefits of the spending and shift the cost to non-voting generations, with no impact, to further their careers. He explained that is why 49 states have a debt limit or a balanced budget requirement written into their Constitution, in case law, or in statute.

Mr. Dranias explained that HB2305 is an agreement among the states that would deploy a balanced budget amendment (BBA) to the U.S. Constitution that is pliable and plausible. It was poll tested with a success of a supermajority report. The timeline is three years or less and this year's goal is to secure two states to organize the compact and create an interstate agency that will have the job of finding additional members and moving forward.

Mr. Dranias explained the balanced budget amendment and how it works:

1. Restricts spending to cash flow:
 - a. There is a cash flow volatility.
 - b. Have a revolving line of credit available to tap into to handle the cash flow volatility.
 - c. Would fully predict when spending is beyond means and limits the use of debt by politicians.
 - d. Debt limit is fixed constitutionally.
 - e. The federal government has no power independently or exclusively to raise its own debt limit or eliminate it.
 - f. Any proposal to increase the debt limit requires a referendum of the states; a simple majority of the states would have to approve.
 - g. A built-in credit limit. As soon as borrowing is within 2 percent at 98 percent of the current debt limit, the President will have a mandatory obligation to start delaying spending in anticipation of reaching the debt limit. It is called an impoundment and is an implied power which is still in case law today.
 - h. Congress will have the power to override those impoundments, it will be transparent and it will be known who is responsible for the impoundments, the President or Congress, based on that process.

- i. If neither the President or Congress acts, once the debt limit is reached, there is an automatic sequester and the President could be impeached.
2. Limiting Debt and Increasing Revenue:
 - a. Debt is taxes and restraining debt is limiting taxes.
 - b. Requires two-thirds of each House to approve any new tax or increase in any existing tax with exceptions.
 - c. Replace the income tax with a sales tax which can be done with simple majority and it can be done now and/or have both, an income and sales tax.
 - d. Eliminate income tax deductions, credits and exemptions. That can also be obtained by a simple majority and the estimate is up to \$1 trillion in revenue by flattening out the tax codes.
 - e. Tariffs, fees and revenues are not included; these could be raised.

Mr. Dranias explained the benefits of this change and stated that Article V is not without its problems. He stated it was a difficult process when there were only 13 states and now there are 50. To enact it will take over 100 legislative acts without the compact in place in advance and he explained the difficult process:

1. It requires three-fourths of the state's applications, which is 34 resolutions and in some states, gubernatorial approval is needed.
2. Congress needs to respond with a call that requires a simple majority, which is another piece of legislation.
3. States have to send a delegate to reach a quorum of at least 26 states, which requires 26 pieces of legislation.
4. Assuming the convention meets and if they propose an amendment, it has to go back to Congress to pass another piece of legislation to refer it for ratification.
5. States need to pass either legislative ratifications or if they do not already have laws in place for the ratification process, they have to pass laws for the convention then pass further laws or resolutions to send people to the convention.

Mr. Dranias stated that HB2305 is a compact approach. Representative Mesnard's bill is safer, easier, and it collapses the entire Article V process into two overarching pieces of legislation, one for the states to pass, once and one for congress to pass, once. He explained what the compact contains and outlined the process:

- The pre-drafted proposed amendment.
- It creates a commission, as soon as two states join, to help build membership and handle logistics.
- The application to congress required by Article V.
- It only goes into effect when 38 states have joined the compact because that number is needed to ratify.
- Triggers the call for the convention.
- The call for delegate's appointments.
- Outlines the first order of business at the convention which is to vote into place convention rules that are specific to the compact and requires an up or down vote in a 24-hour convention.

- If the convention approves the amendment that is contemplated, there are further limitations.
- The congressional resolution triggers, with a conditional enactment, the ratification referral.
- The preloaded ratification of the compact is enacted based on the conditional enactment.

Mr. Dranias stated this campaign could be done in twelve months and it cuts the number of legislative enactments down to 39: 38 in states and 1 in Congress. A compact is a way of organizing the states to do something more effectively and quickly. He discussed the powers congress has in relation to Article V and congressional ratifications.

Mr. Dranias discussed the safeguards that are built into the compact, the history of the Philadelphia convention and the process used then, compared to the current compact solution being offered. He expressed that the Constitution was the product of a legitimate process and the fear of using the established Article V is not understandable.

Questions and discussion ensued between Members and Mr. Dranias on solving the problem by the election of congressmen, structural change, non-voting generations, and the government bond market.

Article V Convention

Mr. Pinkerman introduced Mr. Douglas Ardt.

Mr. Douglas Ardt, Arizona Constitutional Advocates, spoke in opposition to HB2305 and presented a powerpoint presentation. He stated that initially there was support for an Article V convention but, after reading the proposed balanced budget amendment (BBA), found that it is in violation of the Tenth Amendment.

Mr. Ardt described what authority and power is given to congress in the Constitution:

- Spending and taxation through Article I, Section 7, Clause 1; Section 8, Clause 2; Section 9, Clause 7
- Amendment XVI – Income Tax
- Article 1, Section 8 last clause
 - To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

He noted that it does not spell out how it may exercise the authority and power but stated that the approval rate of Congress is only 13 percent and only 23 percent approve of how Congress is handling its job. He stated more information is available in govtrack.us.

Mr. Ardt spoke about the Budget Control Act of 2011: the purpose, result and the political cost. He questioned that if the Constitution is amended, will Congress start adhering to it since it currently does not. He expressed that a BBA:

- Will increase taxes

- Is not a reduction in spending bill
- Will cut Medicare and Social Security
- Will make it impossible to cut taxes
- Will throw the economy into recession
- Is not enforceable
- Will cheapen the Constitution
- Will provoke litigation
- The courts will end up fighting the final law
- Will eliminate tax expenditures
- Will let the Bush tax cuts expire

Mr. Ardt stated that HB2305 is the wrong solution for the stated reasons:

- It does not suggest cutting back on spending
- Never refers to the constitution or the enumerated powers
- Section 1:
 - States that government will not overspend unless it agrees to overspend and incur debt
- Section 2:
 - Legitimizes all past and present borrowing
 - Increases the debt ceiling
- Section 3:
 - Specifies increases of the debt ceiling tied to a “single subject” and that 51 percent of the states will have to approve it
- Section 4:
 - Gives general spending power to the President
 - Power over what will or will not be paid
 - Power to close the National parks, the White House and not pay soldiers, government contracts, taxpayer refunds or social security
- Section 5:
 - Raise income tax rates with a two-third vote or with a simple majority vote
 - Eliminates tax exemptions, deductions and credits
 - Congress can replace the income tax with a national sales tax, via a simple majority vote
- Section 6:
 - Vary narrow definition of debt and what about other kinds of financing

He stated that adding a sunset date of seven years in the bill was an improvement and gave suggestions of other options for constitutional solutions. He pointed out that the public keeps voting in the same politicians, gives the federal government more money and state legislators keep taking money from the federal government. Arizona receives 47 percent of its budget from the federal government; he suggested that Arizona keep its money and not send it to Washington, only to have it returned with strings attached.

Mr. Ardt promoted the reversal of the Seventeenth Amendment and the enforcement of the Tenth Amendment holding Congress to the 20 enumerated powers. Article V has lost its potency, has

no enforcement, and Congress does not obey it anyway. He stated the responsibility of change rests with the voters and questioned if a convention is called to promote a BBA, if it would do more damage than good. Arizona is focusing on the wrong things and he urged the Committee to vote against HB2305.

Vice-Chairman Smith assumed the Chair

Discussion ensued on other solutions, leasing of Arizona's public buildings, and balancing the debt.

Chairman Olson resumed the chair

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS (CONTINUED)

HB2104 – United States Constitution; amendments; ratification – DO PASS

Vice-Chairman Smith moved that HB2104 do pass.

Jordan Willette, Majority Research Intern, explained that HB2104 amends current statute that governs delegates who are elected to the state ratification convention pursuant to Article V of the United States (U.S.) Constitution. This bill increases the penalty for a delegate who intentionally fails to vote in accordance to their pre-election statement to a class six felony. Additionally the bill increases the compensation of travel to 44.5 cents per mile and it repeals the section of law which relates to congressional superseding authority over how a state ratification convention shall be constituted (Attachment 5).

Representative Kelly Townsend, sponsor, explained the history of HB2104 and spoke about her experience of when she attended the Mt. Vernon assembly in December 2013 to discuss a convention. She wanted to understand how and why an Article V convention could happen and the whole process. Ms. Townsend referred to a pocket Constitution (Attachment 6) and a handout stating the rules of how to hold a ratifying convention in the states once there is an amendment (Attachment 7). These rules were based on a previous convention held which repealed the Eighteenth Amendment and the reason for this convention, instead of sending it back to the Legislature, was that legislators did not want to go on record for their vote on repealing prohibition. She reiterated the provisions in HB2104:

- Makes it a felony for a delegate who fails to vote with the agreed manner in which they were sent and incurs the loss of voting rights
- Changes the travel compensation for mileage
- Repeals a statute that would allow Arizona to choose their delegates instead of Congress

Representative Bob Thorpe, Legislative District 6, spoke in favor of HB2104. He stated that unlike 49 of the states, the federal government does not have a balanced budget requirement and borrows over 40 cents per every dollar it spends. The national debt, which is approaching \$18 trillion, equals \$192,000 in debt for every citizen. The Federal Reserve continues to run the printing presses, devaluing the dollar. Mr. Thorpe cited that Article V provides both Congress and the states with the same authority to propose new amendments which needs to be ratified by

two-thirds of the states. In over 200 years, the states have never fully exercised their Article V authority to propose amendments, only Congress has proposed the constitutional amendments. He questioned that if the states cannot be trusted to use their constitutional authority to propose amendments, what other parts of the Constitution should be ignored.

F. Thomas Fiedler, representing self, spoke in opposition to HB2104 and stated that Article V authorizes Congress to call the convention and any amendment would not cut federal spending.

Vice-Chairman Smith announced the names of those who signed up in support of HB2104 but did not speak:

Vince Leach, representing self
David G. Leeper, representing self
Ann Heins, representing self
Gerald Davis, representing self
Linda Rizzo, representing self
Susan Leeper, representing self

Vice-Chairman Smith announced the names of those who signed up in opposition to HB2104 but did not speak:

John Reynolds, representing self
Jennifer Reynolds, representing self

Question was called on the motion that HB2104 do pass. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 4-3-0-1 (Attachment 8).

HB2397 – U.S. constitution; convention; delegates – DO PASS

Jordan Willette, Majority Research Intern, explained that HB2397 establishes rules and policies for delegates appointed to an Article V convention. The bill directs the Legislature to appoint delegates and provide instruction on the scope of matters in which the delegates can vote. It gives the Legislature the authority to recall the delegate and change the instruction at any given point. The delegates are required to take an oath to abide by the instructions given by the Legislature. A delegate who knowingly violates any rule or policy will be subject to a class six felony and any unauthorized vote will be immediately nullified by the Legislature and the delegate will be recalled (Attachment 9).

Representative Jeff Dial, sponsor, explained that responsible delegates need to attend the convention and reiterated the provisions of HB2397.

Representative Bob Thorpe, Legislative District 6, spoke in support of HB2397.

F. Thomas Fiedler, representing self, spoke in opposition to HB2397. Congress has the authority to call a convention and these other points will be mute.

Vice-Chairman Smith announced the names of those who signed up in support of HB2397 but did not speak:

Onita Davis, representing self
Ed Davis, representing self
Ann Heins, representing self
Gerald Davis, representing self
Linda Rizzo, representing self
Susan Leeper, representing self
David G. Leeper, representing self

Vice-Chairman Smith announced the names of those who signed up in opposition to HB2397 but did not speak:

Jennifer Reynolds, representing self
Leonard Clark, representing self

Vice-Chairman Smith moved that HB2397 do pass. The motion carried by a roll call vote of 4-3-0-1 (Attachment 10).

HB2305 – compact; balanced budget; convention – DISCUSSED & HELD

Jordan Willette, Majority Research Intern, explained that HB2305 establishes a Compact for a Balanced Budget amongst the several states for the purpose of proposing a balanced budget amendment (BBA) under Article V of the Constitution. The compact outlines the powers, duties and responsibilities for the formation of a commission and a commission administrator and further describes the appointment, duties, authority, term limits and replacement and forfeiture of the state delegate appointed to the convention. Each delegate is entitled to the reimbursement of expenses for attending the convention for their states and once three-fourths of states are members, a resolution will be sent to congress calling for an Article V convention. HB2305 limits the convention's actions to introducing, debating, voting upon, and rejecting or proposing for ratification the BBA and the bill further delineates the language of the BBA (Attachment 11).

Representative J.D. Mesnard, sponsor, explained that HB2305 is about using states' rights as delegated in the Constitution. Addressing Mr. Seel's comment about the Seventeenth Amendment and its effects, Mr. Mesnard stated that 1913 was the worst year. The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Amendments were ratified and the Federal Reserve board was created. The Seventeenth Amendment exacerbated the debt problem, took away states' voice in the Senate and states no longer confirmed judges that serve as arbitrators between the states and the federal government. Congress is not going to give up their power and in two hundred years, Article V has not been utilized; it is time to take a stand.

Jeff Utsch, representing self, spoke in support of HB2305 and stated that he has formed a group called States United Balanced Budget Initiative Arizona to help get the word out and educate others about the Constitution, Article V and the Compact for America.

Barney Brenner, representing self, spoke in support for HB2305 and explained protections in place against the possibility of a runaway convention.

Mark Fichem, representing self, spoke in support of HB2305 and stated that past performance is the best predictor of future success. Congress has not proven successful and it is now up to the people of the states.

Jarrett Reidhead, representing self, spoke in support of HB2305 and asked the Committee to pass this bill.

Chairman Olson, Mr. Smith and Mr. Wheeler thanked the participants for attending the meeting and for their time.

PJ O'Malley, representing self, spoke in opposition to HB2305 stating that the amendments are unknown, the convention is a "free for all", and we should demand our leaders to obey the law.

James Pinkerman, representing self, spoke in opposition of HB2305 stating that until currency is backed by gold or silver, money is not worth anything and the budget cannot be balanced. This bill does not solve the problem.

Miles Lester, representing self, spoke in opposition to HB2305 and stated it is a transfer of control of the purse, from Congress' enumerated powers, to the President. The sword and the purse should not be held by the same person. This amendment provides for an increase in taxes and creates a government of broad and general powers.

William Blewster, representing self, spoke in opposition to HB2305 and quoted Article V stating that Congress calls the convention. He referred to information in a packet he handed out to members (Attachment 12),

Barbara Blewster, representing self, spoke in opposition to HB2305 and stated that the balanced budget amendment is a trap and part of the steps to a one world government. She quoted that if people do not learn from history, it is repeated. She referenced opinions in a packet handed out by Mr. Blewster (Attachment 12). Mrs. Blewster expressed that to balance the budget and return to the Constitution, gold and silver must be used as legal tender, use the Tenth Amendment, say "no" to federal money, and hold Congress' feet to the fire.

Bonnie Rogde, representing self, spoke in opposition to HB2305 stating it is a danger to the Constitution. She read a few quotes and referenced information she handed out to the Committee on *The Newstates of America Constitution* (Attachment 13).

Ann Hines, representing self, spoke in support for HB2305 and addressed the opposition's statements.

Ms. Clara Jean Davis, representing self, spoke in opposition to HB2305, read some famous quotes and urged Members to vote no.

Names of those who signed up in opposition to HB2305 but did not speak:

F. Thomas Fiedler, representing self

Jennifer Reynolds, representing self

Leonard Clark, representing self
John Reynolds, representing self

Names of those who signed up in support to HB2305 but did not speak:

Bob Thorpe, Representative District 6
David Livingston, Representative District 22
Victor Riches, Goldwater Institute
Antoinette Lane, representing self
Sanford Hopkins Jr., representing self
Marvin Minton, representing self
Sandra Haymon, representing self
Wilson Leggett, representing self
Brad Richards, representing self
Onita Davis, representing self
Byron Schlomach, representing self
Edward Davis, representing self
Dave Burns, representing self
Gwena Burns, representing self
Diana Wood, representing self
Richard Egolf, representing self
Russ Pearson, representing self
Lauri Pearson, representing self
Barbara Bartels, representing self
Nancy Luter, representing self
Larry Luter, representing self
Kenneth Wright, representing self
Dixie Wright, representing self
Vince Leach, representing self
John Spitler, representing self
Joan Campel, representing self
Clarence Stevens, representing self
Katherine Stevens, representing self
Sharon Brenner, representing self
Linda Jesionka, representing self
Steve Grischow, representing self
Joseph Wilcox, representing self
Diana Rey McGrew, representing self
Priscilla Armstrong, representing self
Dwayne Koval, representing self
Sanford Hopkins Sr, representing self
Richard Kampa, representing self
William Armstrong, representing self
Jeffery Krongaard, representing self
Joe Richards, representing self
Thomas Krieger, representing self
Dianna Lebrecht, representing self

Judy Eighmey, representing self
Ray Sweeneny, representing self
Linda Rizzo, representing self
Susan Leeper, representing self
David Leeper, representing self
Gerald Davis, representing self

Names of those who signed up neutral to HB2305 but did not speak:
Susan Fowler, representing self

Mr. Larkin asked Representative Mesnard that since the Governor vetoed this bill last session, if the problems have been resolved in HB2305. He answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Dranias returned to the podium and answered a series of questions from Mr. Seel relating to the current process, the difference if HB2305 were enacted, and the 29 states that have joined Compact. Mr. Dranias referred to his handout (Attachment 4) for a sheet on frequently asked questions (FAQs).

Chairman Olson announced there would be no vote on HB2305 due to lack of a quorum. He addressed the audience stating that a vote would be taken in the next meeting.

Discussion continued and Mr. Dranias explained the process of impoundments and expanded value added taxes (EVAT).

Mr. Wheeler called for the question and Chairman Olson stated the bill had not been moved. Chairman Olson conferred with the Rules attorney.

Mr. Wheeler moved that HB2305 do pass.

Chairman Olson explained that discussion and questions were still in order.

Discussion continued between Mr. Seel and Mr. Dranias about types of debt, leasing of public buildings, and the bond market.

Mr. Wheeler called a point of order and asked if there was a quorum. Chairman Olson stated there was not and adjourned the meeting at 6:41 p.m.

Tracey Gardner, Committee Secretary
March 21, 2014

(Original minutes, attachments and audio on file in the Office of the Chief Clerk; video archives available at <http://www.azleg.gov>)

COMMITTEE ON FEDERALISM
AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY
February 4, 2014

HCR2018

Mr. Seel asked the amendment removes the going back requirement. Mr. Olson stated that was correct. The reason for the amendment explained the reason for the amendment. Gave example of people who were not in this state when amendments were voted on in the past and a lot of people have moved here and the initiatives that have voter protection, but the best way to go forward is to make it beginning in November 14 instead of making it retroactive. If it passes at the ballot, then we can address other issues.

Mr. Seel stated that answered his question. My opinion would be would like to see us go backyard and fix those costly initiatives. Is Mr. Boyer okay with the amendment?

Mr. Olson, stated he agreed and it is a step process and this would be the first and he stated that Mr. boyer supports the amendment.

the ebb and flow of a dynamic economy to change things for,

I think the voters will reject it, like others from the legislature. Asking voters to restrict their own constitutional rights to initiatives, clearly the initiative was put into the Az constitution to provide a check on your power and understand why you have has issues with it. Encourage you to refrain from moving with this measure and use the powers you do have to evaluate individual measures and refer them if they need another look.

Mr. Olson, you characterized this as a restriction on the voter's initiative authority or power. How is this measure a restriction?

Ms. Bahr, responded automatically puts things back on the ballot that the voters had a say on eight years before and requires another campaign again, it may be for a... Mr. Olson asked if it requires anything other than the voters have a question before them, of yes or no do not support this measure....Ms. Bahr stated she think it does require a campaign. If there is a no campaign we have seen the result. Mr. Olson, there are a lot of measures that have or not a campaign, the point I am making is the voters have the authority to pass any measure by initiative, they have authority to set budget priorities by initiative, from the founders that wrote a clause into the constitution, they states shall have a republican form of government and they perhaps saw some concerns with voting on budget priorities based on a 30 second sound bite at that time. Whether is an appropriate process to set budget priorities at the ballot box rather than through a process that requires individuals to take a prospective of the entire budget at once when making the decisions? We are not doing away with that, if you are going to use the initiative the process to budget your obligating an az resident who moves here in 30 years, you are spending their tax dollars. That tax payer should be able to weigh in on that decision that now impacts them. It does not restrict the initiative process in any way and crates some protections for taxpayers who may not have had a voice. Ms Bahr respectfully disagree, being involved in the ballot process it really is impediment to ballot measures, had every 8 years. Legislatures pass measures that obligate funding, you do budget every years, but they past. It might have been a legislative twenty years ago... Mr Wheeler point of order, 3rd time you have interrupted this person speaking and there are other citizens here that would like to have their voices heard. Mr. Olson stated we have a right to refute the objection and the point of order is not valid Mr. Wheeler.

Ms. Bahr continued encouraged them to think, you don't want to be referring a few thousand dollars, it states any expenditures any, second, something is working why automatically have to spend time and money to re-address. Referring measures selectively nad not infringe on the people's right to initiatives.

This measure does not infringe on power of the voter, on the citizens right to circulate a petition on the ballot, support a measure that the legislature referrer to the ballot, not restrictive in any way. It gives a voice to all current Arizona tax payers it does not give the ability of higher voters to tax someone years in the future.

HB2305

Mr. Dranis expanded the rationalization of defaulting on the debt like other countries have; Argentina, Venezuela and Mexico, etc. but explained the downfalls of that economic decision.

Too many international agreements

Boxed out of international trade

Economic nightmare

401k Swaped out people's real money investments for worthless governments bonds.

1940 Od not have a protection of a statutory debt in Washington

Washington is not the solutiin It is the unchecked concentrated power to occur limitless debt in Washington. It is a bankrupt debtor, constitution allows that debtor to write the credit limit which is an insane concentration of power.

- f. Not an EVIT
- g. Restraint debt too hard, if we repay our debt that is taxes, restraining debt is limiting not taxes is not true. If we don't limit debt we tax future generation for our policy choices we would rather have taxation without representation. You are denying the voice.. debt is taxes and could have really bad tax choices, 2/3 of each would have to approve any new tax or increase in any existing tax with exception
- h. Some say this not enough protection from taxes. If you want a super majority on anything

Can have a nongamable definition of balance.

You need a plan, a campaign and specific polictical prodcuts and processes. It keeps the whole convention on target. We have built in the compact 16 safeguards. There are multiple kill switches and it does nothing. A sunset was an example which takes effect in 7 years. Congress is its own constitutional convergent with total control over its own rules, it can propose amendments on 2/3 of a quarom, amendments to rewrite the constitution why are we feeling so comfortable about that than we are about changing this?

The phipla convention was illegal, if you look at the document that organized the phipadephia convention were incredibly broad which this compact is clearer. The articles

He discussed the history of the Philadelphia convention and the process that happened compared to current process of a convention. Our constitution was the product of a legitmate process that was fully legal and addressed real problems just like this compact.

Article V it is absurd to argue that the founder thought it should never be used, read the federalist papers

Challenges for Article V, unknown in an unknown process, the amen

There is no question, this is doable in twelve months and gives you a pathway.

At least 60 percent., poll tested the compact is a What about Congress, it is a problem of article V, founding fathers gave congress power.

I call the convention and to refer out the ratification. Congress won't do that. We have two or three bills that have been introduced to fully structure any eventual convention under article V and make it a mini congress operating with lower threshold for proposing amendments

When is article V going to be ratified, it could be three months or 202 years. You should instigate the process.

Looking at the states origination under article 5. False arguments after me. Article 5. Article 5. If you wanted to describe it, in the text the idea of a convention is a super entity that can override all powers. The contradictions of stating of being a constitutionalist but not supporting the use of this tool that is in the constitution. Claiming we should morally legitimate that we should enforce and saying it was a product of a lawless runaway convention in Philadelphia convention. Article 5 was meant to be used, not a red button of destruction. Not perfect, the Goldwater institute supports all uses of article 5. How difficult about how article 5 is how powerful Patrick Henry's statement is.

, if it was difficult with only 13 states look at what we have now. It is fair and just to recognize the problems of article 5. We are forty years into the process and we are still 14 short, that is just the beginning, don't know what the amendment is.

Most challenging part is when is it going to get ratified, you cannot predict. Legitimate questions, a powerful movement can overcome these problems.

New way of doing, Mr Mesnard is doing, compact approach, this is safer and easier and more certain. You collapse the entire article 5 process into 2 overarching pieces of legislation. One for states to pass and one for congress to pass.

Georgia judiciary committee just passed the counterpart bill by voice without opposition; it is heading the floor in Georgia. No problems foreseen, Alaska is coming out to provide testimony, Arkansas will be dropping the bill next bill. This bill is gathering momentum a historic opportunity to fix the national debt. Well being of our future. Look back 30 years from now, Argentina type collapse and we could have prevented it.. Explain the compact, article 5 presenting at the GWI about 4 years. This committee has supported it every time. This effort is safer, more certain and easier than previous. Slide presentation, our national debt is out of control, it is a system problem not just a political problem

California distinguishes between revisions, and amendments tweak. The use of revision. James Madison could fan of nullification, you could rely on the state legislators. 1830 in death bed James Madison.

George Washington was the chairman of the phil convention. Denied the role of king. 1788 9 states was 2/3.

One quote opposition uses against article V.

The documents that organized that convention were incredibly bold and this compact

were addressed from Members by Mr Wheeler asked why can't we elect a congress to take care of the very problem you are talking about. Obviously something needs to be done, when we follow the constitution. Why are you replacing the congress people.

Mr Dranis stated the debtor sets their own limit, why would they stop. The problem is the structural one, if they have the power to vote against the generations. No structural incentives for them to restrain the use of debt all the instructional incentives favor the unlimited use of debt. The flaw. The growth pattern, a structure problem, must change the constitution.

Mr. Wheeler commented we do have the power to solve a problem of unsustainable debt, 1817 controversy of erie canal. Statement of Government must run like a business, well business need loans to run. have the power to borrow responsibility, the government would not be able do its job, people wouldn't provide for their families and businesses not able to go. This goes way to far in trying to resolve a problem that exists. Get back to your right to vote and change the congress.

Mr. Smith asked about page 2, section 2 & 3. Congress may authorize increase in debt over the 105%. It automatically gets to the state legislatures. The states have to have approval in 60 days. Are the states compelled to actually hear and debate the request of congress.

Mr. Dranis, the default, the states approve any increase. Congress will wait till the states are in session and yes the states can ignore the request. Have to be a referendum of the states, outside intervention, will of the people

Mr. Smith, my concern if there is an amendment, congress they will just use article 1, use the necessary and proper clause.

Mr. Dranis stated the bond market is the ultimate back stop. Clear marker that government cannot secure its own debt. If it disregards.. look at model...bond markets are jumpy. Coyaotes issues, a letter from moodys to create some interest in the issue. Deter the behavior by raising the interest rates.

Mr. Seel 30000 ft view, us view without the 17th amendment. Would we be running into these problems..

Mr Dranis stated probably so, excessive spending. The structure of unlimited borrowing, shifting costs to future generations. People are not being represented in our current system. Our kids are not being represented, they don't vote. It cannot be resolved by voting out or in new Congressmen. (1:18:53:9)

Mr. Seel asked about the 15 other options of a solution. A super committee was not responded, they did not respond to me. To deal with debt.

Mr. Olson, stated that Mr. Ardt went over other options and requested specific questions.

Mr. Ardt, a number of other solutions it will be listed on their website noconcon.wordpress.com. Stated outlined as an elector can do and apply it. Can email steps.

Mr. Sell asked the lease back of our buildings, we have to balance our budget. You don't want to enshrine debt in the constitution article 2 section 8. It is talking about debt in the constitution, those debts in the ten amendment, were designed to be handled by the states. We have gotten far away from the model

Mr. Wheeler, every state but Vermont has a balanced budget requirement. What gives anyone the argument that if everyone has a balanced budget, this building no longer belongs to the banks not the people. Where is the idea that a convention will solve the problem, where is the enforcement? The track records speak, in 2006 -7-8 we overspent, yes a democrat, we 250 million first things first 450 against the state lottery. We didn't balance the budget we borrowed and we are still paying this off. That is a problem, overspending, the problem is in ourselves. This is a gimmick.

Mr. Ardt stated that the buildings are not own the buildings it is a consortium, banks cannot hold non performing assets (funny). The point is elector fault not the government.

. [Mr. Ardt stated Article V has legal aspects but the Balanced Budget Amendment does not and HB2305 has people looking at the Constitution again.](#)

[There are over 140 Balanced Budget Bill that have been introduced in Congress and lawsuits that have come about to balance the budget and force them into fiscal responsibility.](#)

He stated that Arizona if we join is required to fund that commission with the other member states and to defend the litigation. If one state steps out of line the other states won't sue it?

I have grandchildren that will be in this room fighting the bba.

He agreed that we can we cannot sustain this level, 100 percent of federal income pays the income taxes on the federal debt, do you think. You will be hit April 15 and every time at the grocery store to pay the national debt.

Difficult to make congress obeying the constitution. The fed gave up long ago the constitution, claiming the constitution if false. War and catastrophes, were extreme situations. The understanding was much different then than today. Congress refuses to obey the 10th amendment with 20 specific empowerments. There is a lot of speculation in this process, they have to defend the balanced budget amendment. The past has backfired and it shouldn't be an experiment.

Public opinion has taken a nose dive, this is a contrived situation. Create a problem, get public interest and show up with a solution. A lot of balanced budget amendments showing up. It looks like 140 bills in Congress for a balanced budget amendment, some close attempts. National debt, how does the gov spend its money, public don't know. Sudden quick fix and through money at it. 31% of voters support the republican policy of only cutting spending. If there were a government shut down, the republicans would be blamed and not the President. Just putting an amendment in the constitution is going to make a difference.

2104- Rep Townsend I was barraged by groups wanting to give me their information. Studied the process and then make my decision in the best interest. Why do we do an article V amendment and the whole process. Not afraid of a runaway convention, worried about the good amendment being knocked down. She handed out a pocket constitution (Attachment) she explained, the ratification process and read from pg 15 Article V. congress has sent it back to the states, 1 legislature like a resolution or 2 congress decides delegates need to be sent. Looked at both method. One time have we gone the ratifying convention, it was proposed by Congress, it was the 21st amendment when we were realping the 18th amendment. Which was prohibition, reason to going ot a convention, because they couldn't get the legislatures to vote yes on reapppleing because they didn't want to go on record from their vote. She referred to a handout on the rules for how to hold a ratifying convention in the states once there is already an amendment (Attachment). She summarized the rules. If someone changes what they had stated it is a changes their vote, it is a misdemeanor. For the future, I there is an amendment and they defraud, they should lose their voiting rights. It puts more teeth and it is a class 6 felony, so will lose voting rights. 2 each section in title 16, article 14 and then the 700 section to see what needed to be updated. The perdiem and gas mileage needed to update. The other attachment she referenced was what was going to be stricken in the article, congressional provisions as superseding article (Attachment) Arizona should have the right to vote the delegates it chooses not congress, striking the last section, 16-711 giving congress the powers.

J.D- 2305-He addressed, if we undid the 17th amendment would it solve this issue. Love to undo the 17th amendment, who oppose this bill agree with that. Congress would never do it , states would have to do it.. Mr. Danis pointed out that is Debt in 1913, the way #16 \$ 17 and the federal reserve board, worst year ever. It takes out after that and times of year it went up. It wouldn't come from congress. This bill is standing up as states we have already lost.

The 17th amendment a huge blow for states, voice in the senate, no longer in confirming judges that are serving as abritoitor between the federal government and the states. The one remaining tool is in article V. promoting the constitution why are they afraid, it was put there for this reason. The house is on fire and acting out of fear, states to stand up. This is an in-between in order to appease those that are afraid of a runaway convention. The intention of the philedip[hia convention, alter was used not just tinkering or overthrowing. The end of the day, it was passed by every state, all 13. Two hundred years later hasn't been utilized. Gave time to those in the audience.

Jen Sweeney Marson, Executive Director, Arizona Association of Counties, spoke against the bill. She displayed a Navajo ballot (Attachment 2), and stated that most counties do not separate the Spanish and English versions so all information is combined on one ballot The provisions of HB2014 could add a second page to the ballot which is very costly.

Discussion ensued as to the location of information on the ballot, cost of extra ballot paper and alternatives of distributing the necessary information to voters via the mail or polling places.

Representative Michelle Ugenti, sponsor, stated that the intent of HB2014 is to fully inform voters of the implications and ramifications of their voting decisions. It empowers the voters and

helps them understand how their vote impacts the state. She elaborated that Proposition 105 is a law and questioned why voters would not want to be informed. HB2014 is a disclosure of information; it does not sway the voter but simply informs them. Representative Ugenti spoke about the opposition to the bill last year and reviewed the changes made of condensing language and saving space. She was under the impression that HB2014 is the engrossed version of last year's bill and was unaware of the counties' concerns.

Discussion ensued as to the placing and condensing of the language in the voter information packet, location of the information; polling place versus ballot, and a language change from "*can never be*" to "*may only be*".

spoke against HB2014 stating that there are some language problems and it is not accurate to say *never* in this bill. There are many things the voters should know but the ballot is not a proper place to print them. Ms. Bahr stated that there currently is no case law cited that if the voters repeal something that the Legislature has passed, they are protected by the Voter Protection Act. She added that putting all the information in front of the measures could be misleading and discourage the voters from voting.

Discussion ensued as to a location of posting information, the benefits of the information on the ballot and public explanation of funding sources. Ms. Bahr clarified that HB2014 requires the information to be printed in three places: the publicity pamphlet, the ballot, and in advertising which is currently not required.

Johnathan Roes, Elections Director, Navajo County, President, Election Officials of Arizona, spoke against HB2014 because of the concerns stated earlier by Mrs. Marson. The ballot is valuable real estate and the space is kept open in case there are other election measures. He stated that the printing cost would increase as well as the postage. The ballot is printed on different paper, which is more expensive, and with the return envelopes and pamphlet information, the postage would be more. Mr. Roes acknowledged Mr. Larkin's question about providing the information in another place and stated that the information materials are already sent with the sample ballots.

Discussion ensued as to the cost of ballot paper and postage, who pays for the printing, consolidated elections savings, and the price of changing the template or style of the ballot since it is currently a set template.

HB2305

Nick Dranis, Director, Joseph and Dorothy Donnelly Moller Center for Constitutional Government, Goldwater Institute, came back to the podium and stated that in the blue packet there are answers to commonly asked questions.

Mr. Seel in Article 1 it states in the bill, the outlay of the government and asks for consent of the states is that different from now. DO you think is an unlawful delegation of authority? To which he replied no stating it is a constitutional amendment, no conflict because there is no separation of powers consistent with the spirit of the constitution. Section II standing debt the allowing the increase of that debt to 105% of the previous debt.

Mr. Dranins, states it builds in a 5% cushion on top of the existing outstanding debt, the cushion allows for a 1 -2 year period in order to figure out and not use for more debt.

Mr Seel, asked about the available debt could go up, could you explain Section III of the bill.

Mr. Dranins explained, would be more difficult because you need to get simple majority approval from several legislators to prove any increase in the federal debt limit takes the power of setting the credit limit out of the hands of Washington and distributes it to the hands of the people.

Mr. Seel, asked about impoundment in historical contents and the provision.

Mr Dranins, the impoundment, implied and executive power existed without any limit until president Nixon, the impoundment power can be used to delay payments as needed to apply fund this amendment does nothing to change this case law. It would enable the president 6 months before hitting the debt limit, to plan out the delay of the expenditures so everything is on the table to have a meaningful debate and not delayed in case the debt is not lifted.

Mr. Seel, what is happening now in practice in case of impoundment.

Mr. Dranins stated that they are screams until 11:59 am until the debt limit day, and lifting the debt limit because the sky might fall. There is no debate or transparency.

Mr. Seel, how does this language would hold the president accountable in that way and not be delegating more power?

Mr. Dranins directed Mr. Seel to the FAQ in the packet provided. There are twelve questions, one is a control process to arrive at the balance budget amendment, the compact will protect against a runaway convention, and will safeguard it in seven different ways. It will be a deliberative process and have communication between states.

Mr seel section IV is in place now and create this amendment wouldn't it codify the practice of impoundments. Regulate in the potential abuses in the future

Mr. Dranins, the impoundment is already in the constitution, used when a shortage of funds. The case law. That exists with or without this amendment. Current system, with this amendment the president can use the impoundment power when the debt limit hits 98%, he gave an example.

98% debt limit

President makes a proposal 6 months before the debt limit takes place

Here is the proposal to stay until the debt limit.

He is mandated to enforce the debt limit

Could be a sequester, 45% is borrowed

Congress would have 30 days to override it

Line item veto powers

Simple majorities propose alternatives with equal or greater amount

Now 5 months before hitting the debt limit

Now a real transparent discussion can happen

The states have a referendum

President and Congress have to make their case in a 5 month period

Don't make the hard calls or reduce debt

The Balance amendment will impose a 45% sequester

The goal is to provide a long enough time frame

Proposal from president, congress override it, congress have impoundments and have to avoid the impoundments with spending cuts or some combination of a debt limit increase. Congress doesn't control its own debt limit.

Jerry Brown wouldn't be backing..A strong incentive for congress to put on the table the cutting and a budget for increase. Wouldn't be a midnight hours, or the stress.

MR Dranis, take a practice that already exists and make it more effective. Maximized deliberation, transparency, lines of accountability. Who is to blame for the impoundments if they take place, time to make the case for more debt, outside intervention bring the debate to the people, all features to promote more fiscal responsibility than we have right now. October have a fight, get rid of the debt limit, have no debt limit until February. Both parties, then reimpose it place it at the total amount of debt creating a gigantic incentive to borrow all the money possible, there will be a maximum limit. Treasury website the revenue they are not applying them, borrowing unnecessarily, highest possible debt limit, 6-9 months of additional borrowing space. Use the taxes they didn't spend and now have a cushion into the elections. Not the interest of the people.

Mr. Dranis stated that is no one can secure 26 approval or prevent 26 veto, automatically cannot spend more than they can take in taxes. States to agree, medicare expansion 29 states approved. Qikc por qyo only did a 27 states, 26 state margin, short margin. Could not debt limit increases.

Mr. Seel, what protections do you have against that.

Mr. Dranis, gave an example. If this amendment was in place, write a letter to the bonding. All it would take is one educated representative to write and angry letter about the bond issue.

Continued to take testimony and Mr Seel had more questions.

Mr. Seel, stated it was offensive that the democratic members left instead of investing the time.

Mr. Seel, wanted to get comments into the public testimony and properly vetted out. Sometimes we pass bills out with no testimony. This should be given attention.

Discussion about the bond market quip pro quo... creation of debt, leasing the building how would that debt be treated.

Mr. Dranis, we (named a bunch of doctors) looked at every balance budget and it this wasn't addressed. Selling buildings and leasing them, congress concocts a balance budget amendment

not tight enough and not controlling the purse. We used definition of debts, total outlay, total receipts, to prevent that kind of behavior.. Section I of the balanced budget amendment states cannot have total expenditures that exceed total receipts. At any point in time, do have a revolving line of credit as stated above, if you don't define tax receipts, they could call up the federal reserve and print a trillion dollar coin. Lease out the Washington monument. Definition of total receipts that precludes that kind of behaviors, only consists of taxes, and other income qualifying clause that states; other income does not include proceeds from the issuance of debt. Proceed from the occurrence of liabilities.

Mr. Seel like the capitol.

The funds are proceeds of the incurrance of the liability, money is an instrument that is a liability. Once represented gold was somewhere. Or leasing back is a , it is excluded from the definition of total receipts, which limits what spending you can have. Doesn't stop that behavior doesn't lift the spending cap

Mr. seel, value added tax. How your language doesn't allow that to happen.

Mr. Dranis, there is not incentive to create a EVAT, they are evil, less distracutive than income tax. He discussed the tax structure and different types. No political liability if you don't even know there is a tax. When drafted this amendment didn't want a Evat, which is authorized constitutional. In peril of a EVAT being inacted at any time. Hidden tax, who is to blame. The balanced budget amendment make that risk worse? It does not..

PJ Omalley- what amendments Article V is main goal of the bill, the, what is the one proposed. Free from all convention, runaway convention. Would have already introduced the amendment in the legislatures. Would have used both. Relying exclusively the convention the last one was done in one month and eight days. Demand our leaders obey the law.

James Pinkerman, nullification of the states and congresses enumerated powers. This won't do it. Return to constitutional only and gold and silver money SB1096. A system that creates money out of nothing, and it is not borrowing since 1914 first federal reserve note, lost 100%, gold and silver it buys the same thing as 1914 roughly. No hope of balancing the budget fantasy. District 26

Lester Miles-This power over the purse is the most complete and effectual weapon with any constitution can arm the. Will lead to a totalitarian dictatorship, section 4 line 32, the president shall enforce said limit. 1921 budget act, which is unconstitutional, the balanced budget amendment would legalize what is now unconstitutional and unlawful. This misnamed all the above article 1 section 8 , creates a government of board and general powers. A no vote is to preserve the blessings for ourselves and posterity. This disregards the enumerated power, unlimited powers.

William Brewster who when how why. This is in the hands of congress. Bar the doors, happened in 1787. He referred to a packet he handed out (Attachment), the constitution is not out of date. By lawyer, runaway convention is possible.

Bonnie Rogde offered 3 quotes from scholars from our founding fathers. James Madison, Warren burger, Edwin beran. Intregarding the treasury into the plan. Globalist hate our constitution, it is a not an instrument for the government it is an instrument for the people ot control the government. She handed out a packet, she explained the handout. Delegation different than those in office today, vote no on.

Blewster She, john birch society meeting. World world government spending, raise taxes, unbalanced budget, 4. wild inflation. 5 government controls prices wages, materials, SB1010 through exectutive order. James McGregor writes, the framers of the constitution outwitted us, must confront the

This has been carefully planned and we are on the way to a one world government, the bancor converting to one currency, the plan is to turn the constitution upside down. One world rulers the opportunity, gold and silver as legal tender use the 10th amendment. Say no to federal money, hold congresses feet to the first refered to a hand out (Attachment).

Mr. Seel asked in the packet Robert borck opoinon, what he is talking about a convention, a constitutuional.

Rephrased the names all under article 5 convention.

Mr. Seel, haven't we amended our consitution. Why are you objectional to this approach.

Ms blewster stated it wouldn't be able to control it. Special interest groups, could go astray. Opinons are in your packet. Created for us so we are desperate and it is a desperate time. It is not the constistution lets up hold it

Mr. Seel, the other amendments were runaway?

Ms Blewster quoted that the congress made the other amendments not a convention. A

Ann Hines. She stated that this bill is a compact, new world order, raising taxes and sending jobs overseas. Preserve the constitution, is this not part of the constistitution, enforcement, it is stated in the bill. We can't get McCain out, impossible to get them out. The opposition is all over the map. Its toothless, so we should just give up. Use a compact for silver and gold. Another trillion in debt. This has the support of the goldwater institutute, kado, Gosar and swchiert, a book has its support. Only way to talk the power back to the people. The 17th amendment, Edward burke statement.