RECLAIMING STATES SOVEREIGNITY

It is without a doubt that several amendments, most notably the doubtful ratification of the 17th Amendment, basically destroyed the Constitution established by our founding fathers; a constitution that effectively worked prior to 1913.

History tells us it was Roger Sherman, from New Milford Connecticut, whose unyielding and adamant position during the drafting of the U.S. Constitution led to each state legislature selecting their Senators. The purpose for them to represent their state to protect its Sovereignty while following the parameters of duties set forth in the Constitution. Unfortunately, the 17th Amendment totally transformed Mr. Sherman's successful efforts into an uncontrolled nightmare and took away any semblance of state sovereignty. It changed the original method by which the Senators from their State where chosen by their legislatures, to selection of them by a popular vote, a choice by voter contest resultant from 51% of the vote. The elected winner is the majority's selection for Senator, one over half of all those who showed up to vote. Commonly referred to as mob rule.

If the current method of popular voting for U.S. Senators was to revert back to the original method, whereby each legislature selected their U.S. Senators, the people who did vote could feel disenfranchised, having lost their suffrage. (Right to Vote) I believe, we could have a method whereby the voters would still have an opportunity to vote for Senate candidates with selection made by their legislatures.

 This is the method:

1) Every State County/Parish would vote for a candidate from its own citizens. Candidates would make ballot application by petition as they currently do now.
2) On Election Day every County/Parish open their polls to their registered voters.
3) The names of each winner will be sent to their respective State House Legislature. (Example: A state having 14 counties, will have 14 winning names to forwarded to its State Legislature.)
4) The Speaker of the House/or President of the State Senate will then draw the names at random
5) These people selected will then be their States Representative to the District of Columbia. (U.S. Senator) and serve the six-year term, after being sworn into office.
6) Whereas the new U.S. Senators would now be employees of their State, as its agent, they will receive all remuneration directly from their State.
7) The Senators will need a small staff, possibly six people. They too would be State employees. All of these positions would be temporary and terminate in six years. They will not be eligible for continuance of employment after the contracted period and will be discharged after a transition team is in place to replace them.

8) Senators would not be eligible for a second term, and any failure to properly represent their states sovereignty could result in an immediate recall with another name drawn to fulfill the unexpired term.
9) This election procedure cycle would repeat every six years. Each time resulting in a new Senator.

The Pro's, and Con's.

<u>Pro</u>

1. The U.S. Senator's allegiance would be restricted to protecting their states rights deflecting offensive federal government rules and mandates.
2. The State Legislatures would directly instruct and control how their (Agent ambassadors) U.S. Senator vote on all matters brought to the floor of the U.S. Senate.
3. Lobbyist interests would possibly diminish as the Senators will get their instructions directly from their Governor
4. Political influence would no longer rule upon decisions.
5. The need for Senatorial candidates to raise money for mega campaigns would be eliminated, thus reducing potential corruption.
6. Senators would not have the power of seniority. All would be freshman.
7. Term limits are automatic.
8. Pensions would be a thing of the past.
9. Professional staffs would not have enough longevity to become corrupted by the perks they acquire by their longevity.
10. Major Multinational and National Corporation would immediately lose control of their favored Senators.
11. All proposed legislation would be closely securitized by their state who would instruct their Senator as how to vote and what to promote to benefit their state.
12. Senate operates on an up or down unanimous vote on all matters, similar to the Articles of Confederation. No democracy of 51% of who shows wins.
13. Senators can be immediately recalled by their legislature for failing to protect their State Constitution and the people therein.
14. The people would retain their suffrage.
15. PACs would no longer be necessary in the Senate
16. Elimination of political party politics and leadership in the Senate
17. Complete control and leadership of the Senate falls back into the hands of the U.S. Vice-President the elected employee of the union.

These are but a few of the pros, I am confident there are more that I might have failed to recognize and include.

Cons
1. The position is not designed to be career with a pension for life.
2. Many PAC's will have substantial layoffs
3. Free flight junkets would be eliminated.

4. Many staff perks will be lost and it will no longer be necessary to have college students trained in political science "leadership skills".
5. Bridges, roads, buildings would no longer be named after Senators who got boatloads of the publics money for their pet project.

There might be other drawbacks, however, I believe this approach is a first positive step in the right direction to restore our Republic without opening, "Pandora's Box" by changing the constitution.

To achieve this plan would necessitate eternal vigilance, starting with fifty (one person from each state) dedicated souls willing to make non-political presentations to educate the populace of every State. This would never work without the non-partisan backing of the people.

This is not an appeal; it is a suggested first step solution, which could possibly restore our States Sovereignty. Once State Sovereignty has been regained then adjustments could and should be made to restore a more positive people's legislation representation, as 700,000 people per one representative is unconscionable.

Last but not least the Judicial System needs a major overhaul and several groups are addressing this issue.

Stewart Skrill Author 11 Nov. 2009 revised 13 OCT 2015