

LWVTO Constitutional Amendment Discussion/Consensus Meeting
November 11, 2015

Attending: Sally and Bill Madden (Hosts); Marie Curtis (Consensus Discussion Chair); Sue Sferas (Consensus Discussion Recorder); Dallas Grove (Business Meeting Chair); Robert Grove; Peggy and Ted Dellinger; Kerry Butch; Janet Ferrante; Anne Freedman; Fran Minor; Wilma Pfeffer

General Business: Dallas Grove

Minutes of 8/18/15 Meeting submitted for approval: Approved
New Member Kerry Butch introduced

Meeting Procedures: Dallas Grove

The meeting notices will be sent by the host of the upcoming meeting.
The host of the previous meeting will develop the agenda and conduct the business portion of the meeting.

Discussions will be led by the topic expert.

The process for selecting the host for the next meeting will be decided at the Dec. 27th Meeting.

Treasurer Report & Membership Update: Robert Grove

We have 27 members, 25 paid. Robert will send reminder notices to the 2 outstanding. Treasurer Report distributed and reviewed and will be filed for audit. Available Funds: \$3865.79

Voter Service Report: Marie Curtis

Voter Registration Booth at OT Fall Fest: no voters registered but voter registration forms distributed.

OTHS did not invite any outside groups to participate.

Gov. Christie vetoed Voting Rights Act. Voter Registration at DMV is already available but Automatic Voter registration at DMV ("opt out" instead of "opt in") is being explored.

Suggestions: campaign to increase voter registration and participation

Observer Corps: Town Council Meeting Cancelled

No rescheduled date set.

Board of Educ. Candidates Forum-Peggy Dellinger

Held October 29th. Very well attended. Thanks to Sue Sferas for an excellent job moderating. Excellent questions from the audience. Video up on LWVTO website (thanks, Ted) viewed over 200 times! And website was visited over 500 times! Thank you letter sent to all participants.

Suggestions for next forums: Sound check; microphone passing rehearsal; ask candidates to speak seated; add video viewing instructions to invite letters; clip similar questions together; put all supplies together in one box.

Meetings and Events:

December 1, 2015: Consensus Results Due to LWVUS

**December 27, 2015: LWVTO Holiday Party/Meeting at Peggy and Ted Dellinger's
4:00 PM to ???**

**January 13, 2016: Money in Politics Consensus Meeting-Marie Curtis Host;
Sally Madden-Business Mtg Chair, Anne Freedman
Consensus Discussion Chair**

**February 10, 2016: Calendar and Program Planning Meeting (Host-Anne
Freedman, Chair-Peggy Dellinger**

Constitutional Amendment Questions and Consensus

Part I - Considerations for Evaluating Constitutional Amendment Proposals

1. Which of these should or should not be a consideration in identifying an appropriate and well-crafted amendment?

a) Whether the public policy objective addresses matters of such acute and abiding importance that the fundamental charter of our nation must be changed.

Should

b) Whether the amendment as written would be effective in achieving its policy objective.

Should

c) Whether the amendment would either make our political system more democratic or protect individual rights.

Should (The amendment should not inhibit or impede democracy or the protection of individual rights and it is not required that these be directly addressed by an amendment-other than making the system more democratic)

(d) Whether the policy objective can be achieved by a legislative or political approach that is less difficult than a constitutional amendment.

Should

e) Whether the public policy objective is more suited to a constitutional and general approach than to a statutory and detailed approach.

Should

Part II - Aspects of an Article V Constitutional Convention

2. What conditions should or should not be in place for an Article V Constitutional Convention initiated by the states?

a) The Convention must be transparent and not conducted in secret.

No consensus (The group felt that holding a convention in the public eye may impede the group from reaching a compromise. However, some members felt it was important to be open)

b) Representation at the Convention must be based on population rather than one state, one vote.

Agree

c) State delegates must be elected rather than appointed.

Disagree (Group felt that the example of how some states have successfully appointed reapportionment bodies should be used)

d) Voting at the Convention must be by delegate, not by state.

Agree (Since the states as a whole would need to approve in the 2nd part of the amendment process, group felt it was important to have individuals vote)

e) The Convention must be limited to a specific topic.

Agree

f) Only state resolutions on a single topic count when determining if a Convention must be called.

Agree

g) The validity of state “calls” for an Article V Constitutional Convention must be determined by the most recent action of the state. If a state has enacted a rescission of its call, that rescission should be respected by Congress.

Agree

3. Should the League oppose an Article V Constitutional Convention to propose amendments to the U.S. Constitution because of unresolved questions about the powers and processes of such a convention?

No consensus (Group felt that the question was difficult to answer without a specific context)

Part III – Balancing Questions

4. Should the League consider supporting a Constitutional amendment that will advance a League position even if:

a) There are significant problems with the actual amendment as proposed?

Should not consider (However, it might depend on the severity of the problems of the amendment)

b. It is being put forward by a procedural process the League would otherwise oppose?

Should consider (Within limits. A moral framework should guide)

Comment Section (max. 500 words)