

I'm sure you've all received this document from the Council of State Governments and here's a bunch of questions that they were answering on the Council of State Governments because they've arisen in states now that they've started discussing this, and the question, first of all one that alarmed me was, some legislative bylaws may require slight changes in the wording of the resolution. Are such changes permissible? And the answer is yes. The resolutions passed by the states must be substantially identical but slight changes to comply with rules are permissible, and I said why? Why if, as Senator Chambers said, if we're just putting in a resolution from the State of Nebraska that we want to go to the Conference of States, why does it have to be substantially identical to all the other resolutions? And the next question is, what kind of resolution should we pass? And the answer is, the Conference of States resolution should be the same type required by a state to pass a proposed amendment to the United States Constitution. I am not finding, you know, monsters behind doorways here. I am reading what they are telling me their intentions are with the Conference of States. The reason this has to be substantially the same, while they don't want to amend it beyond what slight changes comply with legislative rules, is because they intend to have...they must have these states ratifying the same type of resolution required to pass a proposed amendment to the United States Constitution which is why it is not far-fetched. My amendment was talking about trying to get you to understand that they couldn't do this, they couldn't have a proposed amendment to the United States Constitution in this document. Senator Kristensen's proposal in his amendment is talking about, hey, we're not going to call for a constitutional convention. First of all, this is a resolution and it is nonbinding, I suppose, except it's much deeper and more detailed than anything, but so what? So we put in this thing that says that adoption of this resolution does not constitute an application for the calling of a federal constitutional convention within the meaning of Article V. So if this resolution doesn't call for a convention, but they're not calling for a convention with this resolution. What I'm saying is that after they get together with the Conference of States and put together this document that they're talking about, then they come back to the state, and if Congress fails to, as Governor Nelson said, if they're going to hold them to this, if they fail to enact this, then they're going to call for a conference, or a constitutional convention and they'll have everybody that was at this Conference of States together saying, if this doesn't do anything, we're going to call for a