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                                    [8:05 a.m.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I see we have a few more people finding their way in, so we'll wait.
If we could have Linda Herren and John Hammond come down to the podium, please.
All right, ladies and gentlemen, welcome back to the Rules Committee. We're going to begin this morning with John Hammond, from Indiana, the National Committeeman and Delegate, giving us an invocation.
MR. HAMMOND: Members of the Committee, join with me in prayer. [Invocation.] CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, John. Next, Linda Herren, the National Committeewoman and Delegate from the State of Georgia, will lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.
MS. HERREN: Please join me in this pledge. And, when we do, let's remember our men and women in uniform that, every day, are allowing us to do this.
```

[Pledge of Allegiance.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Linda.
Now, we're going to start with an
introduction of the head table. I know we did this yesterday, but some of you weren't able to join us yesterday, and we want to make certain that all of you know who to go to for help or information.

So, let me begin with the introduction of
the head table. To my immediate right is Ron Kauffman. He is the Co-Chairman of the Convention Committee on Rules and Order of Business, and National Committeeman and Delegate from Massachusetts.

Next to Ron will be, when he gets back, John Phillippe, who is the chief counsel of the Republican National Committee.

To my immediate left is Kerry Dickson and Al Gage, who are the two parliamentarians for the Committee on Rules and Order of Business.

Also with us is Alec Poitevant and David Norcross, who are serving as counsel to the Committee on Rules and Order of Business.

Our staff is being led by Cooper Hawley.
Cooper, you want to raise -- he's back here, in case you need to ask any questions of Cooper. Cooper is the -- is associate counsel with the RNC Counsel's Office.

And, since we will be conducting business today that will need to be timed, over here to my far left, gentlemen, if you'll wave your hands so everyone knows where you are, we have Dana Dickson and Charlie Tuggle, who will be the timekeepers.

And, Dana, if you would show them what they can expect, there you have 1 minute remaining, 30 seconds remaining, and stop. If you don't stop, we might start singing God Bless America until you sit down. Or Ron suggests Happy Birthday, since we're all up on that from yesterday.

All right. At this time, $I$ would like to call on Co-Chairman Ron Kauffman to act as Secretary for purposes of calling the roll.

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, all.
[The roll was called.]

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: We have a quorum. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Ron. Now, let me just go through a quick process review for those of you who were unable to join us yesterday, and a few housekeeping matters. First of all, $I$ know some of you were having a very difficult time reading in the glare of the lights. We have had the lights adjusted, as requested, so hopefully you won't get such a glare. You won't be quite as clear for the television cameras, but I think you'll be able to read better. Are all of the monitors on? And can all of you see? Wonderful.

All right. We also had a little bit of confusion this morning as you tried to find your places. Our seating chart had originally begun with Alabama in the back corner and then serpentined back and forth, across the front and back up. The reason for that is, the lovely designers who designed this room, if you look around, did not realize that delegations were seated two by two, and we have oddnumbered seats on either side of the aisle. So, in
the Platform Committee, we had members from each State who sometimes were divided by the entire length of a row. So, if you look around, even if you are not sitting right next to your delegation seatmate, you should be right in front or in back of each other. We did that so you'd be able to communicate.

The other thing that happened this morning is that Gordon James, which is the company that put all of this together and came in last night and made sure the lights were right and the monitors were right, in cleaning up, apparently flipped the front table. And I don't know if any of the rest of you are in a different order. We apologize for that. We know it was probably a little confusing this morning. But, that's what happened. And hopefully all of you have found your seat, obviously, and we're ready to proceed.

All right. Let me just go through a few procedural issues to remind you of how we're going to proceed this morning.

The first thing that we will do is, I will
read through the rule numbers and their titles. I
will ask if anyone has an amendment to that rule.
And, if you do, please say yes and raise your hand.
We will set that rule aside until we have gone
through that first section of rules, Rules 1 through
12.
When it is time to consider your
amendment, please rise, be recognized by the Chair,
and please say your name and State, which has been
reemphasized to me again by the court reporter, who
wants to be able to keep an accurate record of our
proceedings.

Your motion will need a second to debate it and vote on it. Please don't begin to present your amendment until it has been seconded.

As for the order of debate, the person moving the amendment has the first opportunity to speak. Each person may speak for up to 2 minutes per member, per amendment. And each member may speak no more than twice on any single amendment.

On conclusion of the debate, the Chair will restate the motion. We will put it to a voice
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vote. And, on simple amendments, a majority is
needed to adopt the amendment. If it is too close
to call or a member requests a standing vote, the
member should declare "Division," and then we will
conduct a standing vote. We will also do that if
the Chair is in doubt as to the correct ruling.
    The staff tells me that our goal is to
finish considering all amendments today. Hope
springs eternal in the young. And I want you to
know that, while we will do our best to expedite
things, we will go over to tomorrow if anyone has
concern that their amendment has not yet been heard.
    So, I know that they are anxious, but we're going
to make sure that you have all the time necessary to
bring forth all the amendments that you desire.
    Next, amending motions. Amendments are
made by offering an amendment to the motion. They
must be seconded, and we will have debate about the
amendment. Only the language of the amendment may
be debated. So, if you have a particular issue that
you wish to address, don't do it unless it is
pertinent to that single amendment. You'll get a
```
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chance at another time.
    The vote on amendments is conducted just
like the main motion, and require a majority to
pass. And we will vote on every amendment, even
including the so-called "friendly amendments." We
do that so that we have a complete record of the
proceedings.
    Members may make a point of order to call
on other Chairman for a ruling or for clarification
on the rules of order. Points of order take
precedence over any pending question. However,
points of order are not a time to make an additional
speech. So, please raise your point of order.
We'll act up on it, as appropriate.
    Point of information. A member may make a
point of information. If you are unsure of exactly
where we are in the vote or what the effect of the
vote would be, once again, a point of information
allows you to ask for information, not to provide
it.
    Next, a motion for the previous question.
    The motion will end debate immediately. It
```

requires a second and then a two-thirds affirmative
vote to adopt it. It is nondebatable. And if the
motion for previous question passes, it brings the
Committee to an immediate vote.
I will simply remind our guests -- we
waved yesterday, hello guests -- we're thrilled to
have you here. You are welcome to sit through all
of our proceedings. The only caveat is that if you
do decide to be disruptive or try to obstruct our
business, we will invite you to leave. If you
choose not to, you will be persuaded to leave by
people who have the authority to remove you. I am
sure that will not become necessary. We're glad to
have you here with us this morning.
All right. Let's begin the business that
we have come here to do.
In front of you today you will find two
copies of the Rules of the Republican Party. One is
a final blacklined working copy of the rules, which
means that recent changes are shown underlined and
with information struck out where it has been
removed. That illustrates all of the changes that
the Republic National Committee adopted yesterday, based on the work of the Republic National Committee's Standing Rules Committee, the committee that has been working on these rules since the last Convention, made up of one Republican National Committee member from each State and territory. The other copy is a clean version of the rules that has line numbers down the left side. So, we will be working off the clean version today. If there is any language in the clean version that you wish to have -- or see amended, regardless of what the blackline says, you will need to offer an amendment to change that language.

Now, when you refer to a certain passage in the rules, please refer to the page number and the line number in order to allow us an easier understanding of the discussion and know exactly where your proposed amendment falls. Are there any questions on our procedure?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we'll now proceed to reading through the Rules of the
Republican Party, rule by rule, starting with the
first section. We will consider all of the
amendments at the end of the initial readthrough of
each section.
So, if you wish to submit an amendment,
use the amendment proposal form at your desk, list
the rule number, line number, page number, and
proposed text, and bring it to Counsel's Office
staff, to your left. Can we get someone from the
Submissions Desk to raise your hand? All right.
So, you can see this is where you need to come to
submit your amendments, and they will walk you
through the procedure.

A unique amendment number will be assigned to your amendment. Counsel's Office will give you a version with that number, and it is that number that will let you know the order in which we will debate your amendments.

Changes to amendments. If someone offers an amendment to the amendment, that will be displayed upon your screen as quickly as our staff can type it in. And we ask you to use the four
microphones situated throughout the room to address the Committee.

If someone during -- if, during the course of our proceedings, you realize that someone else has submitted an amendment that makes the same change as an amendment that you have submitted, would you please approach the sponsor of that amendment and work with them to try to combine your efforts? Otherwise, please go see the Counsel Office's Help Desk and withdraw your amendment, in keeping with the procedural rule that we adopted not to allow duplicative amendments.

All right. With all of that as preamble, let's move forward.

We are now going -- and let me remind you that we voted, yesterday, to dispense with the reading of the full text of the rule.

All right. We'll begin with Section 1, Rules Pertaining to the Republican National Committee. As I said yesterday, the first section of the rules, Rules 1 through 12, relates to the governance of the Republican National Committee.
So, let's begin.

Rule number 1, Organization of the Republican National Committee. Are there any amendments to Rule number 1 ?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No amendments to Rule number 1.

Rule number 2, Method of Election for the National Committeeman and National Committeewoman. Are there any amendments to number 2? Any amendments to number 2 ?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Rule number 3, Term of Office for National Committee Members. Are there any amendments to Rule number 3?

Yes, ma'am.
VOICE: Chair, $I$ have an amendment to Rule number 3.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. We will set aside Rule number 3 and come back to it.

Rule number 4, Vacancies of Members and Officers. Are there any amendments to Rule number
4? Any amendments to Rule number 4?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, Rule
number 5, Officers of the Republican National
Committee. Are there any amendments to Rule number
5?
Yes.
VOICE: I have an amendment.
VOICE: I have an amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Two
amendments have been offered. We will set aside
Rule number 5. Are there any others? I'm sorry?
VOICE: I will have one.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you very
much. All right. We've set aside Rule number 5.
Rule number 6, Executive Committee of the
Republican National Committee. Are there any
amendments to Rule number 6?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we
will move forward.
Rule number -- oh, excuse me. Is there
one at the back? All right. We will set aside Rule number 6 .

I'm sorry, folks, it's a little hard for me to see, because of the lights, so I would invite you, if you have an amendment, to stand and call out so that I don't miss you.

All right, we have set aside Rule number 6.

Moving on to -- yes, ma'am.
MS. KINNEY: I'll come to the mic. I'm MaryAnne Kinney, from Maine, and -- this went so fast. I do have an amendment to Rule number 1 that I would like to pass the amendment -- pass on the amendment for now and set it aside at the end of the section.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will do that, without objection.

MS. KINNEY: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
All right. We are back to Rule number 7, I believe, the Rules of Order.

Yes, sir, at the microphone.

MR. ASH: Madam Chairman, Bruce Ash, State
of Arizona.
If $I$ could -- we're moving a little fast -
- on Rule 4, I do have an amendment to offer on Rule
4 -- $4(d)$.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We will
set that aside.
MR. ASH: Thank you, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Sorry, folks. If
I'm going a little too fast, I apologize.
All right. Back to Rule number 7, to make
sure I haven't missed anybody.
Yes.
MS. AMBROSE: Nicolee Ambrose, Maryland.
I have an amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Ms.
Ambrose, we'll set aside Rule number 7.
You'll notice I'm going a little slower.
All right. Rule number 9 -- excuse me --
Rule number 8, Meetings of the Republican National
Committee.
MS. AMBROSE: Nicolee Ambrose, Maryland.

I have an amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will set aside
Rule number 8.
Rule number 9, Filling of Vacancies in
Nominations. Are there any amendments to Rule number 9?

MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman, Ross Little, Junior, Louisiana.

I'd like you to set aside Rule number 5. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. We will set aside Rule number 5, without objection.

We're working on number 9, Filling

```
Vacancies in Nominations. Any additional amendments
```

-- or any amendments to Rule number 9?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
We will move forward to Rule number 10, Committees of the Republican National Committee.

VOICE: Madam Chair, I have an amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will set aside Rule number 10.

It -- if you have an amendment to Rule
number 10, it's not necessary, once we've set aside
Rule number 10 , for you to list additional
amendments. We will get to your amendments when we
get to the proper time to debate Rule number 10.
Rule number 11, Candidate Support. Are
there any amendments to Rule number 11 regarding
Candidate Support?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Next, Rule number
12, Nominations. Are there any amendments to Rule
number 12? Any amendments to Rule number 12? I see
someone heading toward the microphone.
MS. BOWEN: Gwen Bowen, Louisiana.
I have an amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We will
set number 12 aside.
Any further amendments to Rules 1 through
12 on rules that have not already been set aside?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. In this
case, we will now recess for only 15 minutes.
That's to allow the staff for drafting, uploading,
making copies, et cetera. So, we will stand at east
for 15 minutes and then resume.
Thank you.
[Recess.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Our wonderful staff
is trying diligently to catch up with the
amendments, but they need a little bit more time.
Let me share with you the rules that have
been set aside, so that you can start to circle
them, or however you'd like to mark them, so that
you know what we have coming up.
The rules in Sections 1 through 12 that we
will be taking up are as follows: Rule 1, Rule 3,
Rule 4, Rule 5, Rule 6, Rule 7, Rule 8, Rule 10, and
Rule 12.

We will take them up in that order, but we're going to give the staff a few more minutes to be able to catch up.

If you have an amendment to either the preamble or a proposal for a new rule that does not come in the form of an amendment to one of the existing rules, you can also presubmit that at this
time.
In addition, you don't have to wait until we bring up Sections 2 and 3 to presubmit your amendments. The reason I'm giving you this now is because our staff has had a number of amendments that just now came in, and they are working very, very diligently to try to get them loaded into the system and also print out copies of those rules that will not fit on the video screens.

So, please continue to just stand at ease. And, as soon as the staff has got us caught up to the point where we can move forward in order, we'll let you know.
[Recess.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right, ladies and gentlemen, I have an idea on how we can proceed and get some other work done while we're waiting for the staff, if this is how you would like to proceed. It would take things out of order just a little bit. And so, I'm going to ask for unanimous consent to do the following. We're simply going to read through the Rules numbers, 13 through 25, just as we
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just did through 1 -- for 1 through 4, and simply
    find out which rules we have amendments to.
    Is there anyone who objects to doing that?
    Anyone who objects?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Well,
then let's go ahead and simply call out Rules 12 --
excuse me -- 13 through 25, and see which ones we
will have amendments on.
    All right. Rule number 13, Call of the
Next Convention. Rule number 13, Call of the Next
Convention.
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I see no
amendments.
    Rule number 14, Membership in the
Convention.
    MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman, I'd like to
reserve that.
    Ross Little, Junior, Louisiana.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Little. We will set aside Rule number 14.
```

Rule number 15, Participation in the
Delegate Selection Process. Are there any
amendments to Rule number 15?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. I see
none.
Rule number 16, Election, Selection, Allocation, or Binding of Delegates and Alternate Delegates.

Yes, ma'am.
VOICE: I have an amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We will
set aside number 16.
Rule number 17, Enforcement of Rules.
Rule number 17, Enforcement of Rules.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I see no changes -or, rather, no amendments to be offered to Rule 17.

Rule number 18, Vacancies in a State Delegation. Vacancies in a State Delegation.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I see none.

Rule number 19, Excess Delegates and

```
Alternate Delegates. Excess Delegates and Alternate
```

Delegates.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I see no amendments
to be offered on Rule 19.
Rule number 20, Certification of Election
or Selection of Delegates. Certification of
Election or Selection of Delegates.

Mr. Ryder.
MR. RYDER: I have an amendment to Rule 20.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Rule number 20 will be set aside. And, because there is a command -- companion amendment, Rule number 18 will be set aside, as well.

Rule number 21, Contests, Resolution by States.

VOICE: I have an amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We will set aside Rule number 21.

Rule number 22, Temporary Role of the

```
Republican National Convention.
    Mr. Ryder.
    MR. RYDER: I have an amendment.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will set aside
number 22.
```

    Rule number 23, Contest Filing. Rule
    number 23 --
Mr. Ryder.
MR. RYDER: I have an amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will set aside
number 23.
Rule number 24, Contest Procedure.
Mr. Ryder.
MR. RYDER: I have an amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will set aside
Rule number 24.
Having just been through the contest
procedure, I have a feeling that our General Counsel
has some suggestions to make.
All right. Rule number 25, Convention
Committee on Credentials. Convention Committee on
Credentials.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I see no amendments to be offered on Rule number 25.

All right. That completes that section.
Let me encourage you -- because, as you
see, we're having a little bit of a logjam, as we have all of these particular amendments coming in just this morning. You're welcome to submit the amendments, if you already know what you'd like your amendment to be, or you're welcome to go to the Help Desk for drafting for amendments to any rule -- you do not have to wait for Section 2 or for Section 3 to be able to submit them -- so that they can be preloaded into the system or to go and ask for help to get them drafted.

All right, ladies and gentlemen, we are ready to proceed.

The first rule that we will take up -- or amendment that we will take up is Amendment number 1.1. Have you all received it at the table? No, you have not received it.
Staff, are we getting -- or is this one
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that will fit on the -- all right, this one is going
to fit on the screen. Ah, there it is. All right.
    Yes, Miriam.
    MS. HELLREICH: Madam Chair, I'm unable to
read it. Oh, okay. Better. Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is that better?
Okay.
    All right. Can everyone read the text on
the screen? It's not -- your monitor's not on.
    All right. At the risk of angering the
press, we're going to move forward while I ask the
audiovisual people to fix their monitor. Can we
have someone come over and fix the press monitor?
Okay.
All right. This has been submitted by MaryAnne Kinney and Cindy Pugh. Is there a motion?
Okay, we need to have you come to the microphone, identify your name and State, and make it in the form of a motion.
MS. BOWEN: I'd like a motion to second.
Gwen Bowen, Louisiana.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. All right.
```

First, we need to have her make the motion. MS. BOWEN: Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That's all right.
This is the first one of the day. We'll all get into a rhythm, here, in just a minute.

All right. We're going to take this motion, and then I'm told we need a recess. I don't know if it's technical problems. And I apologize.

But, the gentlelady is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MS. KINNEY: Thank you. MaryAnne Kinney, from Maine.

I'd like to pass on this until the end of Section 1. But, do I motion it now and then pass? How would you like that done?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That would require a suspension of the rules and a two-thirds vote in affirmative.

MS. KINNEY: Because we've already -we've gone through Section 1, is that correct?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, we are -- we've gone through and set aside those rules that will
require discussion.
MS. KINNEY: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: So, now we're
beginning on any amendment to Rule 1 .
MS. KINNEY: Okay. My motion is to
propose language to add, after line 15, to be
determined, "A person who is registered with any
governmental entity as a paid lobbyist for an entity
other than a nonprofit organization or who is
employed by any entity whose Primary purpose is
providing lobbying services to others shall be
ineligible to serve as a member of the Republican
National Committee or as a proxy for a member to the
Republican National Committee."
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The
motion has been made. Is there a second?
MR. BOWEN: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Motion has been
made and seconded.
I'm told that we need to recess
temporarily. Ladies and gentlemen, I apologize. We
will come back as soon as we possibly can. I
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understand we have some technical issues.
    We will stand at recess.
    [Recess.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Ladies and
gentlemen, I understand that the problem is one that
most of you have probably experienced, and that is
that the printer jammed.
    [Laughter.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And so, they will
remedy the problem as quickly as possible. This is
why we tried to move to screens. All right.
    [Recess.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Ladies and
gentlemen, rather than have you wait while we see if
it's the next 5 minutes or the next 5 minutes, we
are going to recess until 10:00 a.m., at which point
I promise you we will move forward expeditiously.
    We will stand in recess until 10:00 a.m.
    [Recess.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Ladies and
gentlemen, you've been incredibly patient, and I
appreciate your goodwill as we deal with these
```



```
    issues.
```
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    I have been conferring with our staff and
    with officers of the Convention, and we have come to
    the conclusion that it would be best if we recess
    until 1:00 o'clock, at which point -- I know, I'm
    not happy either -- but, we will recess until 1:00
    O'clock, and, at that point, we will come back and
        be able to move through things without these
        constant interruptions.
    So, we will stand at recess until 1:00
    o'clock.
            [Recess.]
```

A F T ERNOONSESSION
[1:05 p.m.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. If you would please take your seats. Thank you for your cooperation today.

Obviously, we did not stand adjourned for 3 hours because of a jammed copier. We did stand adjourned, initially, for about 10 minutes from an overloaded copier. And, during the pause, as we were trying to get all of these things taken care of, we had -- we were approached by a number of members, from different groups proposing different amendments, who asked if they could have a period of time to try to work out their differences, in hopes that we could them expedite the work of the committee. I don't know what they have or have not decided at -- I did say that, deal or no deal, as the phrase goes, we were going to move forward at 1:00 o'clock. And you have my word that we will continue to move forward and get the work of the Committee done from this point forward.
[Applause.]
seconded, dealing with Rule number 1. The Chair
recognizes the Gentleman from New York.
MR. DeVITO: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd
like to move to postpone this motion until after
consideration of --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Name and State,
please.
MR. DeVITO: Oh, Vincent DeVito,
Massachusetts.
I'd like to move to -- excuse me -- to
postpone this motion until after consideration of
Rule 12, and to make the motion a general order. I
do believe the Gentlelady, when she introduced this
motion, also asked it to be postponed later.
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I believe she --
there is a motion and a second to postpone this
until after consideration of the other items in
Rules -- well, 1 through 12 . Is there any debate?
[No response.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Hearing none, all

```
those in favor, say aye.
```

[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The motion has been tabled. Excuse me, postponed. That's why I have parliamentarians.

All right. Next, because we had no additional amendments to Rule 1 and no amendments to Rule 2, we will move forward to the amendments to Rule 3.

We have two amendments that have been submitted regarding Rule 3. The first is Amendment 3.1. Do we have a motion?

VOICE: Yes, Madam Chair. I would like to make a motion.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Name and State, please. We'll get used to it.

MS. HUDSON: Susie Hudson, from Vermont.
I'd like to make a motion to amend Rule number $3(a)$, which you'll find on page number 4,

```
line 17. I would like to strike "and until their
successors shall have been elected and ratified,"
and insert the following at the beginning of the
second sentence, "while newly elected members may be
ratified simultaneously," and insert the word
"considered" immediately before the word "ratified."
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We have a motion.
Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We have a second.
    Would you like to speak to your motion?
    MS. HUDSON: Yes, Madam Chair, thank you.
    Basically, this is a -- this is just a
simple cleanup amendment. It get rids -- gets rid
of some confusing and unnecessary language, and
clarifies that ratification for multiple members can
happen at the same time. But, for seniority
purposes, they are considered ratified when elected.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Right. Is there
anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to this
amendment? Anyone who likes to speak in opposition?
    [No response.]
```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we
will move to a vote on the amendment to strike "and until their successors shall have been elected and ratified," and insert at the beginning of the second sentence, "while newly elected members may be ratified simultaneously," and insert the word "considered" immediately before the word "ratified."

All those in favor, say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The motion carries.
We just did our first amendment.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The
next amendment to come before the body is Amendment 3.2 .

I see the Gentleman approaching the microphone. Would the Gentleman like to make a motion?

MR. JONES: Yes. Gary Jones, from
Oklahoma.

And what I proposed is striking the language that says "shall serve from adjournment of the National Convention until adjournment of the following National Convention until their successors have been elected and ratified," and substitute "shall serve from July of the year prior to the National Convention until July of the year of the prior following Convention."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. There has been a motion. Is there a second?

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Motion has been seconded.

Sir, would you like to speak to your amendment?

MR. JONES: Yes. You know, all the RNC members are very much involved in campaigns. And so, basically, what we have is, an RNC member serves up until this Convention and then now the new people come on board. It's changing horses in the middle of the stream at the worst possible time.

What I propose is, this would allow them
to be on the Committee to understand and move forward through the election cycle, so we have seamless leadership within the State parties during this time, also that, when you bring people in at the time you're bringing them in, they're fairly new to the process when we elect a new National Chairman. This would allow individuals to be on the Committee for a while to understand what's going on before they pick the next Chairman for the next 2 years.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to this motion? Anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to this motion.

I see the Gentleman from Virginia moving toward the microphone. Mr. Blackwell, would you like to speak in opposition?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes, I would. I happen to have on good authority that part of the negotiations that are going on are in respect of starting and stopping terms of members of the National Committee. And I believe that it is premature to consider this
until those negotiations which we have already waited a good while to be complete -- until they be complete. So, I move that we postpone the -postpone indefinitely this proposal. I'm -- I know that a specific item relating to this is subject to the negotiations going on elsewhere.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. There has been a motion to postpone indefinitely. Is there a second?

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Hearing a second, is there any debate?

MR. LITTLE: Well, Madam Chairman, Ross Little, Louisiana.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes. Mr. Little. MR. LITTLE: I would like to ask Mr. Blackwell if he intended to have a motion indefinitely or a motion to a definite time after consideration of Rule 12.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Blackwell?
MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
A motion to postpone indefinitely could be

```
reconsidered, could it not?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That is correct.
    MR. BLACKWELL: Then I think it's -- I
made the proper motion, because a motion to a time
specific seems to me to indicate somebody has a
greater sense than I do as to when those
negotiations will be completed. So, I'd -- I would
ask you that -- to support my motion to postpone
indefinitely.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Blackwell, I
would have been stunned had you made a procedural
error.
    [Laughter.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Mr.
Blackwell stands by his motion, and there has been a
second. Is there any additional discussion on the
motion?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Hearing none, we
will move --
    Mr. Ryder, from Tennessee.
    MR. RYDER: Madam Chairman, I think Mr.
```

Little's inquiry was quite appropriate. It seems to
me that if what Mr. Blackwell suggests is correct
and there are continuing discussions, it would be
more appropriate to postpone consideration of this
amendment until a definite time, as we did with
Amendment 1.1 on Rule number 1. And so, I would
urge opposition, voting no on Mr. Blackwell's
motion, and then we'll take -- then I will make a
motion to postpone until we get to the end of Rule
12.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right, Mr.
Ryder.
Mr. Ryder urges opposition. He's
explained to you why. I see the Gentleman from
Georgia approaching the microphone.
MR. EVANS: Madam Chair, Randy Evans, from
Georgia.
I would like to echo Mr. Ryder's comments,
only because if we don't create these speed-breaks
where we put things to bed at the -- for example,
the end of Rules 1 through 12, then we could
literally be here indefinitely. And so, much like

```
the very first motion to postpone, it set a very
clear, definitive deadline.
    Now, if we reach that and Mr. Blackwell
says, "I'd like to now move to postpone again," we
can take that up. But, it does set very clear
targets for us to get our work done. And we're
already pretty far behind schedule. And so, I think
it's critically important that we keep these
deadlines in place. And I thought the Chair did a
great job of saying, "One way to do that is
eliminate that which is not in dispute, break it
into three groups, and then, at the end of the first
group, once we're finished with that, let's push
that aside so that we don't then tie the rest of the
meeting up with other words."
    So, I would urge everyone to vote against
Mr. Blackwell, vote no to Mr. Blackwell's motion, so
that we can hear Mr. Ryder's motion.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Ash, from
Arizona.
    MR. ASH: Madam Chairman, Bruce Ash,
Arizona.
```

Mr. Blackwell's motion was completely in
order. I think you concurred. Irrespective of Mr. Little's concern and the others, this is unnecessary blather. Let's have the vote on this. We ought to vote for it in the affirmative. And when the
negotiations, if they're still going on, are
completed, we'll take care of this at that point in
time. This isn't any kind of a dilatory delay at
all.

Thank you, ma'am. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.

```
Although I suppose that "unnecessary blather" is in
```

the eye of the beholder.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We have had a motion made.

VOICE: I have a question. Parliamentary inquiry.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Parliamentary inquiry.

MR. DUPREY: Madam Chairman, Steve Duprey, from New Hampshire.

Do I understand that a motion to

```
indefinitely postpone, if passed, would mean that
```

we're done with debate on this? Indefinite --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That is correct.
MR. DUPREY: So, if we, in fact, vote in
favor of indefinite postponement, we won't be
dealing with this amendment anymore.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That is correct.
MR. DUPREY: Okay. So, if $I$ want to be done with this amendment, $I$ would vote in favor of indefinite postponement.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That is correct.
MR. DUPREY: Thank you. I'm getting --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
Mr. Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: Madam Chairman, as I think we established when $I$ was up here earlier, the -- a motion to reconsider the motion to -- that I have made would be in order, so we would not necessarily be quit of this motion. It's subject to a motion to reconsider. Is that correct?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It is, Mr.

Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: It's still correct. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It is still correct.

All right. The Chair senses that we have exhausted debate on this issue. And so, we will move to a vote on Mr. Blackwell's motion to postpone indefinitely consideration of Amendment 3.2. As Mr. Blackwell said, it will still be subject to reconsideration, should the body wishes to do so.

All of those in favor --
Mr. Ryder, you almost missed your chance, but please go ahead.

MR. RYDER: Madam Chair, I move to amend the motion before the body to postpone definitely until the conclusion of the business under Rule 12.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Mr. Ryder, the parliamentarians have advised me that your motion is not in order because you cannot revise Mr. Blackwell's motion. However, you may bring a motion, should -- after the vote on this

```
particular matter. Oh, you may do it now, I
understand.
    MR. RYDER: I so move.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded to postpone indefinitely -- excuse me -- to
postpone to a definite time at the end of the
amendments that we take up from Rule 1 through 12.
And it would be considered at that time. That is
the motion before the body. Is there anyone who is
confused about it, besides me?
    [Laughter.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. If you
vote in favor of Mr. Ryder's motion, we will be
postponing consideration of this item until after we
have finished the other amendments to Rule 1 through
12. All those in favor, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
```

Thank you, Mr. Ryder.
At this point, we will move forward to
amendments to Rule 4. Rule 4 deals with vacancies of members and officers of the Republican National Committee. The first amendment that we will take up is Amendment number 4.1.

I see Mr. Ash approaching the microphone.
Mr. Ash, do you have a motion?
MR. ASH: No, ma'am. I got a little ahead of myself. I'm -- I made an amendment on $4(d)$ and 4(c), so I'll just stand by the mic.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, we are taking
up Amendment 4.1, which is your amendment on 4 (d).
MR. ASH: Okay. So -- I can't really see
the board from here -- so, this is on 4(d)?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. ASH: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: If you look down in the bottom left-hand corner, you should see --

MR. ASH: Right. Right.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- Amendment 4.1.
MR. ASH: Perfect. Now I understand your

```
coding. Thank you very much.
    Bruce Ash, Arizona.
    Madam Chairman, if I can make an inquiry
at this time. With the changes that are still in
limbo on Rule number 1, these two amendments really
don't make any sense to take up at this time,
because they deal with the other amendment under
Rule 1. Is it possible to defer discussion on this
until we're through with Rule 12?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes. Let me
suggest that you may wish to make a motion to
postpone until a definite time following the time
that we have taken up Rules 1 through 12.
    MR. ASH: So moved.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any discussion?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those in favor
of postponing consideration of this motion to amend
until after we have taken up Rules 1 through 12,
please say aye.
```

[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
MR. ASH: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We're going to be
busy at the end of 12 , aren't we?
All right. The next item that we will
take up is Amendment 4.2. Mr. Ash, I believe that is also your amendment. It impacts Rule 4(c) and is designated Amendment 4.2.

MR. ASH: Right. My apologies, Madam
Chairman. I thought we were handling both at the same time.

I'd like to make a motion to postpone indefinitely until we are finished with our Rule 12, in the same fashion we did on the last amendment request.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Somehow I suspected as much.

MR. ASH: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been moved
and seconded. Is there any discussion?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Hearing none, we will move -- we will vote on Mr. Ash's motion to delay consideration until after we have completed Rule 12. All those in favor, say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, say nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
Next --
VOICE: Madam Chairman?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, ma'am.
MS. UNRUH: Kendal Unruh, from Colorado.
I have a parliamentary inquiry. Under Rule $41(\mathrm{c})$, what is going to be the procedure to demonstrate that 20 percent of the Committee members demand a recorded vote? What is that going to look like?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: If there is a call
for a recorded vote, $I$ will ask all those in favor of a recorded vote to stand, at which point we will count the standing members.

MS. UNRUH: Thank you, Madam Chairman. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.

Next, we move to Amendment number 4.3.
This impacts Rule number $4(\mathrm{~b})$. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Maine.

VOICE: Point of inquiry, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Oh, pardon me, sir.
Yes, of course.
MR. PROTO: Benjamin Proto, from
Connecticut.
You may have dealt with this yesterday, and I apologize if you did, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's all right.
MR. PROTO: Rule 4 is the first rule we come upon where there is a change proposed by the RNC Standing Rules Committee. How are we dealing with those changes, or proposed changes?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Sir, that is

```
something we discussed yesterday. I'm not trying to
say that you can't bring it up again. But, just so
that everyone understands, the changes that were
recommended by the RNC Standing Committee on Rules
are included in your rules that are currently before
you. If you wish to change any of the language
included in the rules before you, including those
changes recommended by the Standing Rules Committee
of the RNC, you need to offer an amendment to do so.
    All right. Now, Amendment number 4.3,
submitted by Alex Willette, from Maine.
    MR. WILLETTE: Madam Chair, I make a
motion to postpone indefinitely until after the
consideration of Rule 12, as a general rule of
order.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There has been a
motion. Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded. Is there any discussion?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. You all
```

```
know what this motion means by this time. All those
in favor, say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Motion passes.
    That takes care of all of the amendments
that we have to Rule 4. So, now we will move on to
Rule 5, Officers of the Republican National
Committee. We have five different amendments that
have been submitted on this.
    The first one that we will take up is Rule
-- is Amendment number 5.3. Amendment number 5.3.
And the reason that's -- occasionally, we'll skip
5.1 or 5.2, is that you'll find out that sometimes
when there have been duplicative amendments
submitted, some of those will have been withdrawn.
So, we're not skipping out of order, we're simply
going to the first one that is still in for
consideration.
    All right. The Chair recognizes the Lady
from Montana.
``` MS. MILANOVICH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Anita Milanovich, Montana. I move to insert the sentence, quote, "The
Co-Chairman shall perform such duties as are
assigned by the Chairman," end quote, and to strike
the term "entire" and replace with, quote, "member
of the," end quote, so that the entire paragraph
shall read, "The Chairman shall be the chief
executive officer of the Republican National
Committee. The Co-Chair shall perform such duties
as are assigned by the Chairman. The Chairman or
Co-Chairman may be removed from office only by a
two-thirds vote of the members of the Republican
National Committee."
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. There
has been a motion. Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded. Would you like to address the substance
of your motion?
    MS. MILANOVICH: Thank you, Madam Chair.
        The purpose of this amendment is just to
```

make explicit the rule -- the role and duties of the
Co-Chair. The Co-Chair -- Chairman position is a
paid position, and it seems appropriate that the
position should be expressly delineated in the
rules. And as regards to the change from "entire"
to "members of the," is just a -- to make clear that
it's two-thirds of the voting membership that is
required for this -- for that vote.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank
you.
Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
opposition? Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
opposition?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Are there any
members who would like to speak in support?
Mr. Evans, I see you approaching the
microphone.
MR. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Randy Evans, from Georgia.
I rise in support of this amendment. I
think it accurately reflects, in fact, how the RNC

```
has operated, but also it clarifies it in such a way
so that we can eliminate any overlap that might
otherwise exist. In other words, by having a
Delegated power, you can then segregate out and say,
"This is what the Chair will do. These are the
assigned responsibilities that I'd like the Co-Chair
to do." And it just clarifies the lines of
authority, which makes the operation move a lot more
efficiently and operate better.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Little.
    MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman, Ross Little,
Junior, Louisiana.
    We attempted to do something like this in
the Standing Committee on Rules of the RNC for the
last couple of years. I think this effectively
solves the problem that we were thinking of. And
I'm in support of it.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Mr. Ash.
    MR. ASH: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
    Bruce Ash, Arizona.
    This is an elegant solution to something
we've talked about a lot of times at Standing
Committee. Without going into some of the glass-
ceiling issues that we seem to have constantly
gotten bogged down in, I completely endorse this
solution.
    Thank you, ma'am.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
    Is there anyone else who wishes to speak
to this amendment? Anyone else?
    Yes, sir.
    MR. ROSS: Jordan Ross, Nevada.
    This is a -- was new to me, but I want to
point out that part and parcel of the rules process,
in general, at the National, State, or county level,
is one of, many times, not so much great, radical
change and reform, but a fine-tuning, a lot of what
I call housekeeping elements. This is precisely the
type of thing that we're talking about. And it's --
these kind of things, they don't sound interesting,
they sound dull sometimes, but these are frequently
the really important things that need to be done
when you're working with rules. You need to
```

maintain the machine. It's like changing the oil
and getting tuneups. I stand in support of the
amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
VOICE: Call the question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The --
I assume you meant previous question.
VOICE: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. Previous
question has been called. All those in favor of
closing debate on this matter, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It is unanimous.
We now move to a vote on this proposed
amendment to insert the sentence "The Co-Chairman
shall perform such duties as are assigned by the
Chairman," to strike the term "entire" and replace
with "members of the." In this language, "The
Chairman shall be the chief executive officer of the
Republican National Committee. The Co-Chairman

```
shall perform such duties as are assigned by the Chairman. The Chairman or Co-Chairman may be removed from office only by a two-thirds vote of the members of the Republican National Committee."

All those in favor of this amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, please say nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
Next, we will move to Amendment 5.4. 5.4 impacts Rule number 5(a)(2). And the Chair recognizes the Lady from Montana.

MS. MILANOVICH: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Anita Milanovich, Montana.
I move to add the sentence, quote, "The Vice-Chairmen shall preside at all meetings of their region and shall serve as chief executive officers for any activities of the region," end quote. So that in its entirety it shall read, "The election of Vice Chairmen shall not require confirmation by the
```

Republican National Committee. The Vice Chairmen
shall preside at all meetings of their region and
shall serve as chief executive officers for any
activity of the region. The Vice Chairmen shall be
comprised of one man and one woman from each of the
following regions."
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Could
we stop you there? My copy seems to have slightly
different language.
Can you check that for me, please?
We'll just stand at ease just for a
moment. We're going to make certain that I've got
the correct language, or the incorrect language, as
may be, but we'll get the same language between us.
[Pause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. I
understand that we have the correct language up on
the monitors. Is that correct? Would you please
look at that and see if that's what you intended?
MS. MILANOVICH: That is, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And now I have the
same language. So, thank you.

```

Would you -- we've -- you've made the
motion. Do we have a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We have a second. Now, would you like to address your
```

motion?

```

MS. MILANOVICH: Thank you, Madam Chair. The purpose of the -- this amendment is much like the prior amendment that \(I\) just offered. The Vice Chairmen hold position -- a position created under the rules that ought to have specific duties delineated so that expectations for the position are known.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Are there any who would like to speak in opposition to this amendment? Any who would like to speak in opposition?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I see no members
who would like to speak in opposition.
Mr. Evans, I see you approaching the microphone.

MR. EVANS: Actually, I was, first, going to raise just a question, which is the word "activities," which is the one thing that concerns me a little bit.

The way the regions actually operate is that we have -- each region meets, and we take -conduct business within the context of the region. I'm a little bit concerned that the word "activities" here seems to expand the powers of the vice chairman beyond the region, or beyond that region, acting beyond what its limited powers are under the RNC rules.

So, I'm a little bit torn, because, on the one hand, I agree with "The Vice Chairman shall preside at all sessions of the region and serve as the chief executive officer for the region." I'm not so sure that I can agree with the "activities." So, with the word "activities" in there, I would have to vote no.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Can you tell he's a lawyer?

Mr. Barbour, you're approaching. The

Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Mississippi.
MR. BARBOUR: Yes, ma'am.
Henry Barbour, from Mississippi.
I appreciate this amendment. However, I believe that the idea of -- that the volunteer Vice Chairmen of the regions really -- to say that they would be serving as a chief executive officer, I don't think it's accurate, as far as what they actually do in normal RNC activities. And I think, being from the Southern region, we have the Southern Regional Political Conference every few years, and, you know, normally -- you know, that is certainly an activity in our region, but never have we had our Vice Chair be the head of it, because that is normally led by a State Party Chairman in the State Party where that might be, if it's in Tennessee or South Carolina, or wherever.

So, while I think the intent of this is good, I believe it, in the details, fails what is the practical reality.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We've had members speak in opposition. Is there an
```

additional member who would like to speak in favor?
The Gentleman from Idaho.
MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, Norm Semanko,
from Idaho.
I rise in favor of this amendment. As a
past member of the Republican National Committee, I
understand, from the Western Region, the importance
of autonomy amongst the regions when we have those
States meet. And this is, in my view, nothing more
than a recognition that, as to the activities of the
region -- not the RNC as a whole, but in the region
-- that the Vice Chairman is our number-one
officer. And we need that. Whether it's organizing
a luncheon or whatever activity there is in that
region, this is a needed clarification and gives
greater autonomy -- recognizes greater autonomy in
the region. So, I am very strongly in support of
this amendment.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there another member who wishes to
speak in opposition?
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Gentlelady from Hawaii.
MS. HELLREICH: Madam Chair, I am Miriam
Hellreich.
I am the Vice Chairman of the Western
Region. And I agree with Mr. Barbour's comments. While we do serve these roles, I think to call us the chief executive officers and to imply activities that are really not well defined -- they're pretty well defined in our -- we do reports from our regions, we do some training -- but, it's pretty prescribed stuff. So, I think that to go beyond those borders is a little bit disingenuous, in terms of what the job is really about. So, I would, for that reason, speak in opposition to it.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there any other members who wish to
speak in favor of the motion?
Mr. Ash.
MR. ASH: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Bruce Ash, Arizona.
You know, perhaps we're getting a little
bit sidetracked by the word "activities." I've been
in the Western Region. The officers of that region conduct elections. They conduct different talks during our meetings. From time to time, they've even been in charge of, you know, handling member activities for the region. I don't think it's unusual. There's no appropriations that are made into any of the regions. It's just sort of recognizing their autonomy and the traditions and the practices that are taken care of in each of the four regions that are part of the RNC.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Are there other members who wish to rise in opposition? MR. HAMMOND: Madam Chair? CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes. Mr. Hammond. MR. HAMMOND: John Hammond, National Committeeman for Indiana. I would just add one quick comment, which is that, to me, besides creating an additional layer of something in a chief executive officer for activities, a CEO of sorts, to me it potentially usurps the State authority, meaning our State Party
leadership, those that assemble in a region, that
vote. You know, we do have a treasury in each of
these regions. It's not much. But, I'm not sure
what this implies, in terms of control over such
things. I urge your opposition.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    Are there any other members who wish to
speak in support?
    Mr. Little.
    MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman, I'd like to
offer an amendment for this to strike out the
language dealing with "chief executive officer and
those activities," that it was -- it would end at --
where the "presiding over the meetings."
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. There
has been a motion made to strike "and shall serve as
chief executive officers for any activities of the
region," so that the inserted language would simply
be "The Vice Chairmen shall preside at all meetings
of their region," period. Is that correct?
    MR. LITTLE: Yes, Madam Chair.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.

That has been moved. Is there a second? VOICE: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a second
from Mr. Ryder, of Tennessee.
Any discussion? Mr. Little, would you
like to speak to your amendment?
MR. LITTLE: Is it possible that I could
request the sponsor accept this as a friendly amendment?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is really no such thing. We would have to take a vote on it, regardless of her acceptance or rejection of it.

MR. LITTLE: Thank you, Madam -- I'll -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.

MR. LITTLE: -- Madam Chair. I think it's
self-explanatory.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay.
Are there any other members who wish to speak to Mr. Little's amendment? Anyone who wishes to speak to Mr. Little's amendment?

I see Mr. Ryder, from Tennessee.
MR. RYDER: John Ryder, Tennessee.

I think that's a great idea. I appreciate
Mr. Little clarifying that. And, you know, the -one of the points is, all of these people who serve as the Vice Chairmen are volunteers. And you don't want to impose a lot of things on them that they have to do. You know, they serve at their own expense. So, adding the other duties, if there were any other duties, if there were any activities, would be an undue burden on people who are serving their Party and their country.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Ryder.

Is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition? Is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to Mr. Little's motion?

I see two other Gentlemen at the microphone. Mr. --

MR. EVANS: Evans.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- Evans. I'm just trying to see which one of you decided to speak. Yes. Mr. Evans, you're --

MR. EVANS: We were --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- recognized.
MR. EVANS: We were flipping a coin, and I
lost. So -- and I rise to speak in support of the motion to amend, and to note that it addresses the concerns that I have. I do think that it is
important that our Southern Region vice president -or Vice Chairmen have power, because we are the one region that insists that grits be served at each regional breakfast.
[Laughter.]
MR. EVANS: And this is of critical
importance to us. And we do not want anything that would undermine that ability to regulate the Southern Region. And I think the rule, as amended, would preserve both.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
Is there anyone else who wishes to speak
to this amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we
```

will move to the question.
The motion has been made that we strike
the language "and shall serve as chief executive
officers for any activities of the region." All of
those in favor of striking this language, please say
aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
Now we move back to the main motion. The
main motion would allow us to insert the language
"The Vice Chairmen shall preside at all meetings of
their region," period.
Is there anyone else who wishes to speak
to this amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we'll
move to a vote on the amendment.
All those in favor of adopting this
amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
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CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The amendment is passed, as amended.

Next, we will move to Amendment number
5.5. This amendment deals with Rule number 5 (b) and has been submitted by the Gentleman from Arizona. Please proceed for the purpose of a motion.

MR. ASH: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Bruce Ash, Arizona.
This is not going to be controversial.
And I'm very happy that Miriam has been our Western Region Chair for years. We also get grits in the Western Region. I'm very happy with that, because I get to continue my grits breakfasts even if I'm here at the RNC meetings.

All this would do was add the words "Vice Chairman" after the word "Co-Chairman," so that, if adopted, the subsection would read, "The Chairmen, Co-Chairmen, and Vice Chairmen and all other officers shall be elected in January of the oddnumber year." All this is is cleanup to make sure
that the regional officers are elected at that same
January meeting.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. There
has been a motion. Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a second.
    Mr. Ash -- well, I let you go out of order
to make your point. My apologies. It was my
mistake.
    So, we have now had one person speak in
favor of the motion. Is there anyone who would like
to speak in opposition?
    Mr. Ryder.
    MR. RYDER: Madam Chairman, John Ryder, of
Tennessee.
    And if you look at Rule 5(a)(2), it says,
"eight Vice Chairmen, who shall be elected at
regional Caucuses by the Republican National
Committee members of the four regions, and shall be
residents," so on. "The election shall take place
in January of each odd-numbered year." So, what
would be the point of inserting this language again
in Section 5(b)? I guess it's really an inquiry as
much as it is a statement. But, if there's no good
reason to do it, why do we want to add words to the
rules? So, unless there -- unless Mr. Ash can give
us a good reason, I would say vote no on the
proposed amendment.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    Mr. Ash, would you like to address that?
    MR. ASH: Madam Chairman, Bruce Ash,
Arizona.
    That's a great point, Mr. Ryder. And we -
- I think we overlooked that. And I apologize for
taking the time of the -- on the Committee. It was
merely to make sure that those officers were elected
at the same time. We just missed it. Okay?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Would
you --
    MR. ASH: A little over- --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- like to withdraw
it? All right.
    MR. ASH: And I'd like to withdraw the
    motion at this time.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Ash. The amendment is withdrawn.

Next, we will go to Amendment number 5.6. This deals with Rule number 5(a)(2) and has been submitted by the Gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Little.

MR. LITTLE: Well, Madam Chairman, we refer to our groupings not as associations, but as regions, as we've already been discussing. So, I'm proposing that we delete the word "association" and insert the word "region" in those areas set forth. That would be my motion.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right, Mr. Little.

Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There's been a motion and a second.

Would you like to address if further, Mr. Little?

MR. LITTLE: I believe it's selfexplanatory.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank
you.
Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard on this amendment? Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard on this amendment?

Mr. Evans.
MR. EVANS: Madam Chair, I rise in support of the amendment. I think it's a good clarification. We do refer to them as regions, and we treat them as regions.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard on this amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we'll move directly to a vote.

All those in favor of adopting Mr. Little's amendment that will strike the word "association" and insert the word "region" in the four instances you see on your screen, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay. [No response.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The motion passes.
Next, we will move to Amendment 5.7.
Amendment 5.7 deals with the language of Rule 5(c) and has been submitted by the Gentleman from Idaho.

Sir, please proceed.
MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, Norm Semanko, from Idaho.

I understand and believe that this
particular amendment is directly implicated by the negotiations that are going on. So, I would like to move to table Amendment 5.7 to a time certain, that time being upon the conclusion of consideration of Rules 1 through 12.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. You have heard the motion. Is there a second?

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Second. Is there any discussion?
[No response.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Hearing none, we'll
move to a vote.
All those in favor, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The amendment
passes. Excuse me. The motion passes to postpone until after we have deal with Rules 1 through 12.

All right, ladies and Gentlemen, that
completes our work on Rule 5.
So, now we move to Rule 6. The first amendment that we will deal with on Rule 6 is Amendment 6.1, dealing with Rule number 6(a). It's been submitted by the Gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. Barnett.
MR. BARNETT: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Jonathan Barnett, from Arkansas, not Tom Lundstrum, as the roll call indicated.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And we apologize for that, Mr. Barnett. I do know the difference. And we'll try to make certain it's correct on the
roll in the morning.

MR. BARNETT: He did serve 4 years ago,
though, so -- just a matter of information.
    I propose that immediately after words
"Republican State Chairman's Advisory Committee"
that we insert the following language, and that is,
"the Chairman of the Standing Committee on
Presidential Primary Debates." And I'll proceed
with the logic if you -- whenever you're ready.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay.
    Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There has been a
second.
    Now please proceed, Mr. Barnett.
    MR. BARNETT: Okay. As you all know that
the RNC has created a Standing Committee on
Presidential Primary Debates, and this is to help
take back control over the Party's debates. It --
we had about 22 debates, 4 years ago. And this
time, you know we had 12, and we had much more
control on it, not just any network commentator
could make any comments that they wanted. And, obviously, this Committee was a huge success. And it's kind of -- really kind of become part of the RNC now.

So, presently, the Chairman of the Rules Committee, the Resolutions Committee, the Budget Committee, and the State Chairman's Advisory Committee, they're already members of the Executive Committee. So, this amendment just simply adds the Chairman of that Committee to the Executive Committee. And the Chairman that we had this last time probably would appreciate it if he got a little more recognition anyhow. I think he was from New Hampshire, or something like that.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Barnett.

There has been a motion and a second, and we have had someone speak in favor of the motion. Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the motion? Anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the motion?

Well, Jonathan, you must have been very,
very persuasive.
    VOICE: One second. One second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I see they're
working out some kind of textural --
    MR. MOORE: Yes. Madam Chair, Matt Moore,
from South Carolina.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
    MR. MOORE: I believe this motion needs an
additional amendment, which would be to change, on
line 8, Rule 6, to -- from "29 officers" to "30
officers." So, I would offer that as an amendment
to the amendment.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded. Is there someone who would like to speak
in favor of Mr. Moore's amendment?
    Randy Evans.
    MR. EVANS: Madam Chair, basically, this
just makes the proposed language consistent with the
numbering of the number of officers of the RNC. So,
if we add an officer -- even though I graduated from
```

a team -- a college with a great football team, we
can still add. And 29 plus 1 equals 30. So, then
we put 30 in. That solves the problem.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: You have to get how
many football players together to add that high, Mr.
Evans?
[Laughter.]
MR. EVANS: Well, it depends on how many
national championships you have.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Okay.
You have heard the motion, and it has been
seconded. Is there any further debate?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those in favor,
please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The
motion passes.
So, now we are back to the main motion,
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which is to insert the following language, "the
Chairman of the Standing Committee on Presidential
Primary Debates," and further in the rule we have
already amended to include "30" rather than "29."
Is there anyone else who wishes to speak regarding
this motion?
Mr. Evans.
MR. EVANS: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm not going to
try anymore football jokes.
[Laughter.]
MR. EVANS: Well, first of all, my hat's
off to Steve Duprey, who did a phenomenal job with
our Debates Committee. For those who don't
remember, when we were last up, in 2012, it was just
a disaster. We had, you know, Candy Crowley, Steve
-- George Stephanopoulos asking questions that are
out of left field that had nothing to do -- and it
became clear in our -- today's media world, that
debates are an integral part of the process. And,
being an integral part of the process, we took the
advantages of Rule 12 to create a Debate Committee

```
that permitted us to have a lot more control over the debates, themselves, both in terms of the number, the location, and even, to some degree, the panelists.

Many of you may remember that, when MSNBC misbehaved, the reaction was swift, and the reaction was severe. And that illustrated to us just how important the Debate Committee had become in today's media world. And it seemed appropriate that the person in charge of that Committee needed to report directly and as an officer on equal footing with other officers to make sure that the full complement of the Executive Committee at -- of the RNC, as well, would get a -- the benefit of exactly what was being done, why it was being done, and how it was being done. And the best way to do that would be to pass this amendment.
So, I rise in support of the amendment, in recognition that we don't live in the 1900s anymore, we live in a new millennia. And in the new millennia, we have to deal with media, and we have to deal with cable news, and exercise that control
through an officer who, in fact, is an officer of
the RNC.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Evans.
    Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
opposition? Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
opposition?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Are there
additional members who would like to speak in
support?
    Mr. Little.
    MR. LITTLE: Well, one thing Mr. Evans
didn't mention is that the viewership of these
debates was huge. And the effect on them was
enormous. And certainly, it's appropriate to put
the Chairman of this Committee on the Executive
Committee.
                    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Little.
            Is there any further debate on this
        motion?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we
will move directly to a vote.
All of those in favor of inserting the
language "the Chairman of the Standing Committee on
Presidential Primary Debates," along with changing
numeral "29" to numeral "30" in the body of the rule, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Are there any opposed?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
All right. As I understand it, there are no further amendments on Rule 6. And so, we will move to Rule 7.

Rule 7 deals with the Rules of Order. We have one amendment, Amendment 7.1, that impacts Rule 7 (b), that has been submitted by the Lady from Maryland, Mrs. Ambrose.

MS. AMBROSE: Good afternoon.
Nicolee Ambrose, Maryland.

Madam Chair, I am moving to reinsert the language which was -- came out pretty recently from our documents. Essentially, I think, as you have very ably demonstrated today, there's a lovely benefit to have registered parliamentarians ready to assist at all meetings. It certainly aids with our credibility and our transparency to have that extra layer of attention.

And I also firmly believe the RNC should be setting the gold standard for State and local GOP organizations, and also for our auxiliaries, that we really do need to look to the guidance of registered parliamentarians.

On a personal note, I have to say, I used to be Chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, and it was a -- as you were, Madam Chair -- and it made --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: In the Dark Ages, yes.

MS. AMBROSE: -- there -- oh, you're -nonsense -- it made a night-and-day difference when we moved to having that requirement of increasing
our credibility, and just the general operations of
the organization in our General Sessions.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. There
has been a motion. Is there a second?

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to
this motion? And it certainly won't be me today, as
they're sitting right next to me.
    All right. Mr. Evans.
    MR. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
    I recall when this particular issue came
up and we had a lively debate. The real question
was whether or not at every single General Session
we needed to have a registered parliamentarian, with
the accompanying expense that went with that. And
what we discovered was -- is that, at virtually
every meeting, we had people -- more people in the
room that knew the parliamentary rules than most
parliamentarians do. No offense to my colleagues on
the stage, who I'm assuming are quite the best. And
so, the conclusion was that certainly the Party
makes available as a resource a registered
parliamentarian, which, at any time, any Committee
or session can call upon. It's not necessary, in
every single session, to have a registered
parliamentarian available there to render on-the-
spot opinions, because it is, (a) so infrequent, and
(b) because we have so many people on the Committee
that already know the rules so well.

And so, as a matter of just efficiency, we adopted this rule as both a matter of expense, but also a matter of convenience of trying to make sure that we could keep our meetings moving when there are no real issues at play.

And so, I would urge a vote of no to the repeal -- what it would be, which is the repeal of an amendment that had already been adopted at -- by the Republican National Committee.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Evans.

Is there anyone else who would speak -like to speak in support of the amendment? Support.

Mr. Ash.

MR. ASH: Good morning, Madam -- or, good afternoon, Madam Chairman. Bruce Ash, Arizona.

As somebody who has worked with the aid of parliamentarians, chairing the Standing Committee on Rules, and being a knucklehead myself, and having done stupid things from time to time, I found having a parliamentarian to be very helpful. I realize we're talking about General Session.

If this is a matter of expense, they're
there already. I've utilized Mr. Gage, Mr.
Handshaw, and a number of other registered parliamentarians, Sharon Giese, who's a -- who's been a member of the RNC for many years, served as a kind of an ex officio parliamentarian at the General Sessions for many, many years. It does give us, as Nicolee pointed out, a greater sense of fairness and propriety. I don't believe that we've had much of a problem at General Session, but there's no additional expense. It doesn't cost us anything to look like a more professional organization and be able to handle parliamentary inquiries when they do
```

come up.
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    I thank you for your consideration.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
opposition?
    Mr. Ryder.
    MR. RYDER: John Ryder, Tennessee.
    Over the past 3 years, I've had the
privilege of serving as General Counsel for the
Republican National Committee. And during those 3
years, we -- the Counsel's Office has provided a
registered parliamentarian at every General Session.
    During those 3 years, \(I\) cannot recall but maybe two
occasions where there has been a request for a
ruling made from -- by the Chairman to the
parliamentarian.
    But, more importantly, the question is, Is
this the kind of thing you put in a rule and say you
have to do it, or should this be left to the
judgment of the Chairman and the Counsel's Office?
We ordinarily furnish both lawyers and
parliamentarians for all the meetings and make those
services available through the chief counsel and his
staff.
    So, my question is, Do we want to burn
this into the rules and have a requirement you've
got to have these people on the platform at every
meeting, or is this something that can be a judgment
call, as it is at the Committee level, and we
furnish those services?
    I don't think this is a necessary
amendment, and I would urge that you vote against
it.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    If there are any other individuals who
rise to speak in support --
    Gentleman from Idaho. Oh, I'm sorry --
the Gentleman from Nevada.
    MR. ROSS: Jordan Ross, Nevada.
    I move to amend the proposal to insert the
-- after the word "registered," to insert the words
"or certified." The reason I'm doing this, if we
can expand the base of parliamentarians who are
available -- and the difference between registered
and certified simply has to deal with the certifying
authority -- Mr. Gage could address that, if you
wish, but -- you know, there's the American
Institute of Parliamentarians, the National
Association of Parliamentarians -- it increases the
likelihood of being able to get a volunteer. And I
would also point out that many attorneys are
certified, but not registered, parliamentarians.
And that could have perhaps saved some money, allow
some double duty and a little more flexibility.
    If this is to be adopted, I urge the
adoption of this amendment.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    There has been a motion. Is there a
second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. It has
been moved and seconded.
    Are there others who wish to speak with
regard to this amendment? Are there others who wish
to speak with regard to this amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we
will move to a vote on this amendment to insert the
words "or certified" following the word "registered"
parliamentarian.

All those in favor of this amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, say nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Chair's in
doubt. All of those in favor, please raise your hand.
[A show of hands.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All of those
opposed, please raise your hand.
[A show of hands.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm sorry, we're
going to have to call for a standing vote.
All of those in favor, please stand. And could we have the legal staff count, please?
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Please remain
standing until they tell me that they've gotten the count. You can see, they're still doing this.

All right. If we completed the count -no, no, they're still going. All right, please be seated.

All of those who are opposed, please rise.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Would you please be seated. Thank you.

The vote tally is as follows: in favor of the amendment, 39 votes; against the amendment, 58 votes. The amendment fails.

Now we are back to the main motion. And
are there any members who wish to speak on this particular amendment?

The Gentleman from Idaho.
MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, Norm Semanko, from Idaho.

I rise in support of the -- this particular amendment. As a former General Counsel
```

of the RNC, myself -- I think Mr. Philippe fully
recognizes it -- not all of us have been as fully
capable as Mr. Ryder, or have had, perhaps, as much
training. And I guess what I'd like to say is that,
regardless of who the officer -- the presiding
person is at a meeting, there are certain
institutional safeguards that you want to have in
place. And it's not just for the benefit of the
Chairman, it's for the benefit of the organization,
as a whole. And a parliamentarian is one of those.
That's why we have parliamentarians required at our
proceedings in the State of Idaho at our Central
Committee meetings and why I think it's a great idea
for us to ingrain that in the rule here. It is
still the responsibility of the presiding officer to
make a decision that is then subject to appeal by
the group. But, to have this advice of a
professional is very important.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Semanko.
Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
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opposition? In opposition?
I'm going to get your State right before
we do this. The Gentleman from Massachusetts.
MR. DeVITO: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Vincent DeVito, from Massachusetts.
I rise in opposition to this particular
amendment. It's based on my experience, having been
involved in many of these meetings, as well, that
this particular language just simply reeks of
overkill. A parliamentarian is not required at
every single meeting. In fact, it could lend itself
to a less cooperative meeting, in terms of folks
always turning to a parliamentarian to resolve any
simple disagreement. But, not all meetings do have
contentious issues to resolve, so a parliamentarian
should be reserved for those that are chairing the
meeting, as their option.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
support of the motion?
Yes. This Gentleman.
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MR. ASP: David Asp, from Minnesota. I'd like to offer an outsider's perspective on this. I understand that, and believe that, there are many issues that don't require a registered parliamentarian at these meetings, but, as a matter of perception for other Republicans who are not in the RNC, it is important for them to be able to have assurance that these matters are handled appropriately, according to the Rules of Order. So, I think, as a matter of perception, it makes sense to adopt this amendment. And I plan to support it.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in support of the amendment? Anyone else who wishes to speak in support of the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment?

MR. BLACKWELL: I would like to speak in support of the amendment. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Oh, certainly, Mr. Blackwell. Please go ahead.

MR. BLACKWELL: Morton Blackwell,
```

Virginia.

```

Fellow members of the Committee, we have heard debate from, among others, two General Counsels of the Republican National Committee. One of them says he doesn't think that this is necessary. Another distinguished former General Counsel says he thinks it is necessary. It would seem to me that it would be the appropriate and prudent thing for us to have a rule that a General Counsel could reasonably think is a good rule. And we have a former General Counsel who says it -- says that he favors it. So, therefore, the prudent thing for us to do is to provide this as a safeguard, since we know that there are distinguished people who are experts in these matters who think that it is a good idea. Let's be safe and vote yes.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Blackwell.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak
in opposition?
Mr. Evans.
MR. EVANS: I offer a motion to amend which I think will address, actually, Mr. Blackwell's concerns, as well as some of the other concerns.

At the -- as you all know, as we all know, not every meeting is a full-blown meeting.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Evans, we first need to have the amendment moved and seconded.

MR. EVANS: Absolutely. And so, my proposed amendment is "a registered parliamentarian available, upon the request of the Chair" so that --

VOICE: Voice.
MR. EVANS: So that what would do is, if you're having a real meeting, not -- no offense to those perfunctory meetings, where we're simply ratifying Delegates or we're ratifying something, and literally the meeting lasts a grand total of 7 minutes -- rather than requiring a parliamentarian for every single meeting, anytime a Chair felt as though having a parliamentarian would be helpful or
would add to the perception or anything else, that would certainly be in the discretion of the Chair to do that. And I have great confidence in our Chairs. We've had great Chairs, including Mr. Nash, who fully appreciate the significance.

So, I would urge that we simply add to that, "upon the request of the Chair," and if that request is made, then it's automatic and you have a parliamentarian.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. It has been moved and seconded that we insert, after the word "available," "upon the request of the Chair." Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to this motion?

Sir.
MR. WILLHOIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Janssen Willhoit, Vermont.
Actually, it's neither, if I may. I have a -- I just have a question for clarification, to the presenter of the amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Certainly.
MR. WILLHOIT: Is that in order?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That is in order. MR. WILLHOIT: My question is, with respect to being the "upon the request of the Chair" -- I'm just -- I'm thinking of -- if you are in a meeting, then, without one available, and then there is the request made, just procedurally, is that going to pose a difficulty? I mean, unlike -- are they going to have to hold the meeting for a day to find one and bring him there? I'm just wondering, practically speaking, is this going to be a difficult fix?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Mr.
Evans, I'll let you respond to that directly. MR. EVANS: Thank you so much. Well, as a practical matter, any Chair, when they're going to have a full-blown meeting, is going to have a parliamentarian. What they don't want to do is have a parliamentarian whenever it's a perfunctory matter of ratification of a new member. It really doesn't involve any points of order. And so, the way it gets solve is, we have Chairmen with -- who have enormous knowledge and expertise,
they're really talented. Most of them have been Chairs before. And, as a result, we are relying on the people who we have put our confidence in to know when they need a parliamentarian. And when they do, they ask for it in advance, and they're there.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone who would like to speak in opposition?

VOICE: Yes.
MS. AMBROSE: I would like to speak in opposition to the kind Gentlemen from Georgia.

Nicolee Ambrose, from Maryland.
Let's be clear. When we say "all General Sessions," we have three General Sessions a year. We are looking to employ a registered parliamentarian for 1 to 2 hours three times a year. The RNC, as you can tell, has a phenomenal fundraising operation. We can afford 6 hours of a registered parliamentarian in the course of 1 year.

Moreover, I cannot put a pricetag on the value of our credibility and our integrity. Registered parliamentarians have to go through
tremendous training. They have certification. They
are unbiased. We are Republicans. We believe in
rule of law. They are calling it like it is.
    So, I'm happy -- happy for the Budget
Committee to authorize 6 hours of a registered
parliamentarian for our three General Sessions a
year.
    Thank you.
    VOICE: Call the question.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There has been call
for the question. We'll move directly to a vote on
previous question.
    All of those in favor of closing debate on
this issue, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, please
say nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
        We will move directly to a vote on this amendment to
        the amendment.
    The current amendment to this amendment
would insert the words "upon the request of the
Chair." All of those in favor of adopting this
change, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, say
nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
    Now we will move back to the main motion.
    The main motion -- is there anyone else who wishes
to speak to this motion?
    The Gentleman from New Hampshire.
    MR. DUPREY: Steve Duprey, from New
Hampshire.
    With all due respect -- and I understand
the intent -- I think the Republican National
Committee, in every one if its meetings that \(I\) have
been the privilege of attending since 1992, our
Chairman has done a fine job. We -- they put
together a team. And I just think this is
tremendous -- while I understand the spirit of
openness and everything else, I think we have a long
```

history of doing it well, and that this is
overmanagement of our Chairman and completely
unnecessary. Chairs who don't feel experienced in
parliamentary procedure call on parliamentarians.
But, this is a complete overdoing, and it's
unnecessary. And I hope we oppose this.
VOICE: Call the question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There's been
previous question called, in the back. We will move
to a vote on the previous question.
All those in favor, say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, say
nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will move to a
vote.
All of those in favor of adoption of the
amendment sponsored by the Lady from Maryland,
please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, say

```
nay.
```

            [A chorus of nays.]
            CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays clearly
        have it.
        I'm -- believe that that is the only
    amendment that we have on Rule number 7.
MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes. Mr. Little.
MR. LITTLE: I guess I have a
parliamentary inquiry. We've had a couple of
instances of someone calls for the question, but it
was my impression that, to be -- you should -- the
person should be recognized to call the question,
not just shouting it out. I'd like to know how
we're going to handle that --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Little, you are
correct, and I stand corrected. And, from now on,
when -- if you want to seek previous question, you
need to approach the microphone and be recognized by
the Chair.
Thank you for reminding me.
All right. Now we will move to Amendment

```

Pardon me. We have a Gentleman who is seeking recognition.

MR. STUART: No, I was just simply going to apologize for calling the question.

Mike Stuart, West Virginia.
And I will certainly recognize that, moving forward.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
All right. Amendment 8.1 deals with Rule number 8. Rule number 8 deals with meetings of the Republican National Committee. So, Rule number 8.1 -- Rule number 8.1 has been submitted by the Lady from Maryland.

MS. AMBROSE: Good afternoon. Nicolee Ambrose, from Maryland.

Since we're on such a streak. Okay, let's -- I am proposing, based on my experience as an RNC Committee member for the past 4 years, we have this incredibly weighty, fantastic honor that we are entrusted with. We have the rules that will --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Nicolee, I'm sorry.

I'm reminded that you need to make a motion first and have it seconded before --

MS. AMBROSE: My motion is that -- to add a new section under 8, Section C, "Any item for consideration at a meeting of the Republican National Committee shall be presented to the membership no less than 24 hours prior to a vote."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a motion.
Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a second.
Now please proceed to make your argument.
MS. AMBROSE: So, the reason for this is, we have this -- we are entrusted to alter, under the current rules, the rules we conduct ourselves by affecting things like how we are nominating, hopefully, the next President of the United States. And there have been times, occasionally -everyone's very busy working -- where our General Session will start at 10:00 a.m., and we have had new rules, that you can read almost for the first time at 10:00 a.m., on our chairs. And I would just
suggest -- I'd like a little more time to review it,
because this -- we are the world's superpower, this
impacts a whole lot of stuff. And I think we should
all have 24 hours of consideration before we
consider altering our process as RNC Committee
members.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to
this motion?
    MR. DUPREY: Madam Chair, I do.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We'll
start over here with Mr. Duprey.
    MR. DUPREY: I'm Steve Duprey, from New
Hampshire.
    I rise in opposition, for the same reasons
on the previous matter. This is completely
unnecessary. Sometimes there are votes and matters
that come up that we couldn't honor that 24 -hour
rule. I think, when we elect our Chairmen, we have
to give them some wide latitude to do the best they
can. So, I rise in opposition to this motion.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who wishes to speak in support of this proposal? Anyone else who wishes to speak in support?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who wishes to speak in opposition?
Mr. Ryder.
MR. RYDER: John Ryder, Tennessee. I am opposed to this motion. As a practical matter, it would be impossible to implement, given the schedule that we normally follow at RNC meetings. We usually have Committee meetings the day before we have the General Session, so that the report of the Rules Committee, the report of the Committee on Resolutions, the report of the Budget Committee, and other items that might require action at the General Session are not completed until less than 24 hours prior to the General Session.
So, it's an impractical rule, and I would urge the members to vote against the proposed
amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in support?

Mr. Frias.
MR. FRIAS: How're you doing, there?
Steve Frias, Rhode Island.
I don't usually speak, and I won't be speaking very much at these things, but, when I do speak, I'll tell you why.

Basically, this is -- in my home State, we have these legislators who get together and they just pass everything at the last minute. Nobody has any notice of what's going on. And when -- I think we do a good job here at the RNC letting everybody know what's going on. But, I see there's no real problem with letting people know ahead of time what they're going to vote on.

Now, Mr. Ryder, General Counsel, says 24 hours is impractical. Okay, it's impractical. Then give me something that's practical. Twelve hours? Fourteen? Something. I see no problem with giving notice to people, before they vote on something,
before the meeting. I don't see why we're so afraid
of doing that. And, in my opinion, I am always
going to err on the side of transparency. And, you
know, it's nothing about the Chairman, our current
Chairman. We will have a different Chairman
someday. And when I make rules, I make rules based
on what could happen and based on what may happen.
    So, with that, thank you. Vote to give
notice to the RNC members before they vote on
something. There's nothing wrong with it. It won't
hurt anybody.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Frias.
    Is there a member that wishes to speak in
support -- excuse me -- in opposition? Is there
anyone who wishes to speak in opposition?
    The Gentlemen at this microphone.
    MR. DeVITO: Vincent DeVito,
Massachusetts.
    I rise in opposition to this particular
amendment. It's difficult to get into the minutia
```

of trying to anticipate every single action that's
going to happen at a meeting preceding another
meeting. So, the folks that are running the
preceding meeting need the flexibility to do what
they have to do. They cannot be under artificial
time constraints.
So, this motion, it's not only impractical
and also, to respond to the prior Gentleman that
just spoke, it does not say "no notice." So, I'm in
opposition to this.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone who would like to speak in support? Is
there anyone who would like to speak in support?
This Gentleman at the front microphone.
MR. CRAWFORD: Yes. My name's Jim
Crawford, from Maryland.
I'd like to make a motion that we amend
this to -- a period from "24 hours" to "12 hours."
I think it's -- none of us -- all of us have been at
a meeting at some time or other when you get handed
something instantly, and you're supposed to vote on
it without any real time to consider it. So, if we

```
```

just change it to "12 hours," perhaps that would
satisfy Mr. Ryder's concern.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. There's been
a motion. Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There's been a
motion and a second to change this from "24 hours"
to "12 hours." Is there anyone who would like to
speak in opposition?
Mr. Evans.
MR. EVANS: Madam Chair. Yes. So, I
think maybe it would just be helpful to talk a
little bit about how our RNC meetings work, because
I think there are many who aren't on the RNC. It is
the most open process you could possibly imagine.
We have meetings constantly. We have a members-only
breakfast, where we talk about any issue that's
going to come up. All of the various resolutions
and rules meetings are open. The Rules Committee
meets the Thursday before the Friday morning
session. And, as you can see just how long it took

```
us this morning to get all of our ducks in a row on
getting rules together, it's not the kind of thing
that you can just snap your finger and make it
happen.

Now, fortunately, technology has enabled us to make sure that, when folks come in on Friday morning -- remember, the meeting -- the RNC meeting starts, typically, at 10:00 a.m. -- when folks come in on Friday morning, there's a stack that's put right there in front of them, and they have the opportunity to take a look at them. We -- there's only 168 of us, and we know each other. And so, literally if \(I\) have a question about resolutions, I'll go over to Carolyn, or if I've got a question about rules, I'll go over to Bruce. It's a very collegial, collaborative process.

And so, the idea that you would try to analogize this to the U.S. Congress, which is that you must vote for it before you receive it, we are a far different creature than that. We are a creature where we talk it to death, everybody knows well in advance, and then you get a copy when you walk in,
```

    long before you're asked to vote for it.
    And then, on top of that, we now have
    these beautiful devices called iPhones and Androids,
which permit us to then send it out, as well. So,
all of that happens.
Now, to -- if we then impose an hour limit
or a minute limit, all we've done is introduce a
whole nother layer of bureaucracy, which is the one
thing that we need less of. We actually need more
of what we do. We talk to each other. And we need
less of what this is, which is rules saying, "You
must do this by then." As long as everybody's
comfortable -- and I've never heard anyone say they
were asked to vote at an RNC meeting on something
that they were completely blind-sided by. And the
reason is because the meetings are so open.
Thank -- so, I would urge opposition to
both the motion to amend and the main motion.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone who would like to speak in support of
the motion to amend?
Mr. Ash.

```

MR. ASH: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Bruce Ash, Arizona, speaking in support of
the amendment, because it is a reasonable variation on the original proposal. There seems to be some concern -- let me restate that.

There seems to be some chatter that this is somehow tied to our current Chairman. Our current Chairman is doing a great job. The staff does a great job. They work hard. This is a members Chairman. And we all recognize that.

But, I think those of you who have been around for a few years remember, it wasn't always so. In fact, we had to pass a motion for a resolution for good governance -- and it wasn't that long ago, it was 2012 -- when things weren't going so well, when things weren't being presented to members of the Committee, and when things were happening that blind-sided our members.

This is not about the current Chairman, because the current Chairman may or may not be the Chairman in the future. We need to protect the members of the RNC. This is a membership
protection. And, for my fellow members of the RNC who are here today, just think back about 2011, and think about the constant problems that we had with the Chairman's office and getting the information and the tirades that we received. This is meant to be as good governance for our Committee, to keep us running the right way.

And I am thankful that we have the great Chairman that we've enjoyed now for almost 6 years. I want to make sure that all Chairmen live up to that same standard. Thank you very much for your
```

consideration.

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who rises to speak in opposition?

Mr. Duprey.
MR. DUPREY: Madam Chair, Steve Duprey, from New Hampshire.

Just as with the underlying fundamental motion, I don't think we need 12 hours or 24 hours. We elect our Chairman. I urge everyone to vote no.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who wishes to be heard?
VOICE: Madam Chairman --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: You have not moved to a microphone and gotten recognition.

Mr. Hammond.
MR. HAMMOND: Madam Chair, John Hammond, National Committeeman from Indiana. I call for the previous question. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There has been a call for the previous question, and we will move directly to a vote.

All of those in favor of closing debate on this amendment to the amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
We will now move toward -- move to voting
on this amendment to the amendment to alter the words -- the numerals "24" and insert "12."

All of those in favor of this, please say
aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone opposed, please say nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Now we are back to the main motion. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in recognition -- be recognized to speak on this amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we will move to the vote.

All of those in favor of adoption of Amendment 8.1, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone opposed, please say no.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The noes have it.
All right. Do we have an additional amendment on Rule 8? No, we do not have any additional amendments on Rule 8.

We have no amendments that have been submitted on Rule 9.

But, this is the stack for Rule 10. So, let's get to work.

All right. The first amendment that we will consider is Amendment number 10.1. Rule number 10 deals with Committees of the Republican National Committee.

The Chair will recognize Mr. Munisteri for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. MUNISTERI: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I'd like to propose adding a new rule, which would be labeled \(10(\mathrm{a})(11)\). The substance of that rule would be as follows, "There shall be a temporary Committee on the Presidential Nominating Process to review the rules governing the nomination of the Republican Party's presidential nominee. The Chairman of the Republican National Committee shall appoint all temporary members of the Committee on the Presidential Nominating Process, not to exceed 11 members, and shall appoint one as Chairman. And the Chairman of the Republican National Committee
shall serve as an ex officio member. The Chairman of the Republican National Committee shall convene the Committee on the Presidential Nominating Process at his discretion" -- or I -- could be "her" discretion, but we didn't put that in there -- "but not later than June 30th, 2017. The Committee on the Presidential Nominating Process shall make any recommendations it deems appropriate and report such recommendations to the Republican National Committee no later than May 31st, 2018. The Committee on the Presidential Nominating Process shall disband following the transmittal of its report. Necessary and proper resources of the Republican National Committee shall be made available to fund the efforts of the -- of this Committee."

Madam Chairman, I would move the adoption of this as a new rule.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a motion.
Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Moved and seconded.

Mr. Munisteri, would you like to address the merits of your amendment?

MR. MUNISTERI: Yes, Madam Chair, I would. Thank you.

For those of you that don't know me, I was the three-time elected Chairman of the Texas Republican Party. During that time, I probably received more questions and comments and concerns from our grassroots members regarding the presidential nominating process, the timelines, how we pick our nominee, et cetera, than any other subject. Unfortunately, there has never been a consensus as to how to fix or improve the system. I would think that almost everybody here would agree that there are ways that we can improve the way we pick our presidential nominee. But, I think, to get consensus, it's going to take a longtime effort to get input from all the stakeholders -- our grassroots, our elected officials -- and give a great deal of thought and consideration to this. So, my motion is designed to allow a process and the discussion to continue and proceed,
and hopefully reach recommendations so that we can improve our process in the future.

I would point out that this commission does not have the power to adopt any changes. It's merely to get a discussion going so that, hopefully, it would culminate, eventually, in an improved process.

Thank you for your time, Madam Chairman. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Munisteri.

Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to this amendment? Anyone who would like to speak in opposition?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone else who would like to speak in support?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We will move immediately to a vote on the amendment.

All of those in favor of adding the proposed language that you see in front of you on a temporary Committee on the Presidential Nominating
```

    Process, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed?
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
    Next, we will move to Amendment 10.2.
    Rule 10 -- excuse me -- Amendment 10.2, which
    impacts the language in Rule number 10(b) -- 10(b).
    It has been submitted by the Gentleman from
    Arizona, Mr. Ash.
Mr. Ash, would you like to make a motion?
MR. ASH: Good afternoon, Madam Chairman.
Bruce Ash, from Arizona.
This would be to Rule 10(b), page 20, line
22. It would add a new section that would just
merely say -- and I hope you'll consider this for
cleanup -- "All members of the Standing Committee
shall be members of the Republican National
Committee."
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. It's --
MR. ASH: That is my motion.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- been moved. Is

```
```

there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Second. It's been
moved and seconded.
Would you like to address the merits, Mr.
Ash?
MR. ASH: Sure, just very quickly.
Just as -- this is just clarifying
language. It's probably self-evident, but doesn't
hurt to be there.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone else who wishes to speak in opposition
to the motion? Anyone who wishes to speak in
opposition?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone else who
wishes to speak in support?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we'll
move directly to a vote.
All of those in favor of adopting the
language in 10(b) to read "All members of the

```

Standing Committees shall be members of the Republican National Committee," please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
Next, we move to Rule 10.3.
Mr. Ash, I have this down as being submitted by Mr. Blackwell, of Virginia.

MR. ASH: You're right, sorry. I got
```

ahead of --

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That's all right.
MR. ASH: -- myself again. Pardon me.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That's all right.
Is Mr. Blackwell here? Oh, here he comes.
Chair recognizes Mr. Blackwell for the purpose of a motion. He's just coming back to the top of the seating area.

Mr. Blackwell? Mr. Blackwell? I believe it is your turn to submit a motion. This is Amendment 10.3 to Rule number \(10(a)(2)(i i)\).

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I apologize for not being at my seat when my amendment came up.

The National Convention in 1992 passed this provision that allows members of the Republican National Committee, notwithstanding whatever action the Resolutions Committee might make, to make a resolution in order to be considered on the floor of the National Committee. The provision, as written, says that such a process requires the written support of one member from at least 10 States. That has been part of our rules since 1992. It has caused no serious problems. It has been a means by which grassroots people from 10 States who are members of the National Committee could, if they wished, make a matter in -- a resolution in order to be considered.

The Standing Committee on Rules put this amendment into the rules, and so it is before us today, that would require two members of the National Committee from at least 10 States. That's doubling the number of members required, but it is orders of magnitude more difficult to obtain.

This has been a very useful provision for conservatives over the years, and it has angered some people, for that reason. It is not a good idea to produce this amendment, which is essentially a gag rule, against grassroots members being able to bring a matter up for discussion. And there no danger whatsoever that there will be some extended debate that would be embarrassing because a resolution, once it becomes on -- for discussion is always subject to a motion to table, which is not debatable. And a matter can be tabled. But, there -- but, it would be very wrong to make it virtually impossible for a grassroots resolution to come before the National Committee unless the Resolutions Committee approved it.

So, I strongly urge everyone to vote for this. It restores what has been the rule here since 1992, and it's a good rule, and we don't need to centralize power further in our national rules.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Blackwell.

Is there someone who wishes to speak in
```

opposition to the amendment?
Mr. Feaman, from Florida.
MR. FEAMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Peter Feaman, the State of Florida.
Certainly, Mr. Blackwell overstates his
case when he says this would amount to a "gag rule."
That kind of overheated rhetoric is certainly not
necessary in this particular instance.
Simply adding one extra person per State,
which would be two out of the three, and then only
having 10 States out of the 50 to present a
resolution, is certainly not an unconstitutional
burden or any kind of other burden in prohibiting a
resolution to come before our body.
We've done a lot of resolutions in my
years here. They're all pretty good. And, because
they're all pretty good, they will all get support
of two people from at least 10 States.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thanks, Mr. Feaman.
Is there anyone who wishes to speak in

```
support?
    Mr. Yue, from Oregon.
    MR. YUE: Thank you.
    Solomon Yue, from Oregon.
    I support Morton's resolution, for one
simple reason. It is a good-governance resolution.
    Actually, I'm the only one on this Committee used.
    If you remember Chairman Steele spent \(\$ 1\) million of
our line of credit for Tampa 2000 Convention and
without supervision of the RNC Executive Committee.
    I got 10 signatures and passed that resolution,
because Chairman controlled the RNC Resolution
Committee, and that is a bypass resolution -- a
bypass procedure and allow us to take this one
directly to 168 members. With member support, I led
RNC executive efforts to investigate and report the
results to the entire Committee. For that reason,
Chairman Steele could only get a 45 votes for his
reelection, and Reince Priebus got elected.
    So, I am supporting this resolution for
good-governance purpose.
    Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Yue. Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
```

opposition?

```

Gentlelady from Illinois.
MS. DeMONTE: Demetra DeMonte, National
Committee Women, Illinois.
I would actually like to offer an
amendment to Mr. Blackwell's amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That's in order. MS. DemONTE: I understand what Mr.
```

Blackwell is talking about --

```
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Pardon -- excuse me
-- Demetra, I need you to make the motion --
    MS. DeMONTE: Yes.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- and then we'll
get --

MS. DeMONTE: Excuse me.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- a second. And then I'd love to have you speak to it.

MS. DeMONTE: Yes. My motion would be that we would ask that one member from 20 States would be the bar to be presented directly to the
floor.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a second.
All right. Now if the Lady --
MS. DeMONTE: Now --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- would like to continue.

MS. DeMONTE: Thank you. Now, my reasoning for this -- I understand what Mr. Blackwell and Mr. Yue are talking about. Getting two members from 10 States is truly difficult -very, very difficult. We do represent the grassroots. Now, my recommendation would be to make the bar more difficult. And I do understand that. That is why my recommendation is one member from 20 States. That is a heck of a high bar, but, if it is a truly good resolution, you will be able to get enough members to sign off on that.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who would like to speak in
```

opposition to the amendment to the amendment?
MR. YUE: Yes, Madam Chairman.
Solomon Yue, Oregon.
I would like to speak in opposition.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Please proceed.
MR. YUE: Again, I was the one tried to
get those 10 signatures. It was very, very
difficult. The reasoning is, it's election year.
Chairman got absolute power. He can decide which
State he's going to open Victory Office, how much
money he's going to spend. You think, when you have
2 0 States, all want RNC money to open Victory Office
and field staff members. And any member were there
to stand up for a good-governance resolution, again,
answer is no. But, I have no problem Chairman
Priebus, the way he run this Committee. However,
whatever we do, we need to think about
institutionalize what we do. Not for this
Committee, not for this administration. For future
Committee. There also is a concept for a checks and
balance within our Committee.
Thank you.

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who would like to speak in support of the amendment to the amendment? Anyone who wishes to speak in support of the amendment to the amendment.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing no one else who wishes to speak, we will move forward to a vote.

Mr. Ryder?
MR. RYDER: I wish to speak against the amendment to the amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, I thought
```

that's what I said, but perhaps --

```

MR. RYDER: I thought you said for. I'm sorry, I may have misheard.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. My apologies.

MR. RYDER: John Ryder, Tennessee.
I oppose the amendment to the amendment.
In all of these matters, what we're dealing with, we've got a Committee that is elected by region, not appointed by the Chairman, not controlled by the
Chairman -- elected by the regions of the RNC. And
that Committee is empowered to review the
resolutions and report them out. So, when you're
talking about the procedure that's being debated
here, it's a procedure that involves bypassing and
defrocking the Committee. And we simply don't need
to do that.
    I oppose the amendment. And I -- I oppose
the amendment to the amendment, and I oppose the
amendment.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank
you, Mr. Ryder.
    Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
support of the amendment to the amendment?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who wishes to speak in opposition to the
amendment to the amendment?
    Mr. Duprey.
    MR. DUPREY: Madam Chairman, Steve Duprey,
from New Hampshire.
    I rise in opposition to the amendment to
the amendment, and to the underlying amendment. The current rules work fine.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in support of the amendment to the amendment?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: -- Madam Chairman.
The previous speaker said that the current rules work fine. The fact of the matter is that the -- that what we are proposing here is not currently part of the rules of the Republican Party. So, how can one say that the rule really works fine?

The truth of the matter is, this original proposal is a solution for something that no one will admit what the problem is. The real problem is that, occasionally, conservatives want to raise some issue on the floor of the National Committee, and the Chairman and the Resolutions Committee won't pass it out. And if 10 members from 10 different States sign on to a resolution, it can come up.

No one has identified what the real
problem is. What damages has -- have -- has this rule that's been in there since 1992 done? The only damage is that, occasionally, conservative resolutions or, in the case of what Solomon Yue did, an important investigation into what was generally understood to be an abuse, was made possible. I oppose the amendment, because 20 is way more than twice as difficult to get as 10. And my friend, Ms. DeMonte, \(I\) think, is mistaken in this.

I urge that the amendment be defeated -the amendment to my amendment -- that my amendment be passed. This is fundamental for the representation of conservative principles on a National Committee that is not always sympathetic with discussion of conservative issues.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is there anyone else who's -- wishes to speak in support of the amendment to the amendment? Anyone who wishes to speak in support of the amendment to the amendment?
[No response.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone else who wishes to speak against the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. Barbour.

MR. BARBOUR: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Henry Barbour, from Mississippi.

I do oppose this amendment that would change this to 20 States. Couple of points.

One, there's 168 members of the RNC, so to get 20 people to do something is a very low threshold. And one point -- the Gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Blackwell, mentioned -- talked about conservatives, and then he talked about the Chairman as if he's not a conservative. And \(I\) just want to clarify that we know our Chairman, and all the members of the RNC, are conservatives. We don't agree on every particular issue, but what we do agree on is that we want to win elections, and we want to win elections with conservatives.

Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Barbour.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak regarding the amendment to the amendment?

Yes, sir.
MR. DeVITO: Vincent DeVito,
Massachusetts.
I'm rising against the amendment to the amendment, and I am rising also against to -- the amendment. The reason is, it seems to me that, regardless of everything that was said, there's also a procedural element here, which is, as this has already been discussed in Standing Committee, this Committee -- and has been thoughtfully discussed, reasoned, and voted upon for a whole bunch of thoughts that we do not need to repeat today. But -- however, folks come to this Committee for another bite at the apple.

I would go -- I'm against the amendment to the amendment, and I oppose the amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
MR. DeVITO: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone else who wishes to be recognized with respect to the
```

amendment to the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we
will move to a vote.
This first vote will be on the amendment
to the amendment. The amendment to the amendment
would replace the word "two" with "one," but insert
"from 20 States."
All of those in favor of adopting the
amendment to the amendment, please say aye.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All of those
opposed, please say nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
We are back to the main motion. Is there
anyone else who wishes to speak in support of Mr.
Blackwell's amendment?
Mr. Semanko.
MR. SEMANKO: There's no previous
question? Okay. Going for three in a row, there.
Madam Chair, Norm Semanko, from Idaho.

```

I support this amendment. And I'm afraid I just -- was dangerously close to hearing, a moment ago, that this Convention Committee on Rules has no role in reviewing what the Standing Committee did. I hope I heard that wrong. But, I traveled here, I spent my resources to be here. I'm representing the State of Idaho here. And I know a lot of other people who are in that position. And we have the right and the obligation to review all of these rules. And if we think, as on this one, some of us, that the RNC Standing Committee got it wrong, that they're raising the bar too high, that they're making it too difficult -- and that's the word I heard a little while ago, we do want to make this more difficult -- that we have the opportunity to argue the other way.

And we started this proceeding by hearing about the rights of the minority to be heard but the majority to make a decision. That's what this rule is about.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who wishes to speak to the amendment?
    The Lady from the District of Columbia.
    MS. HOMAN: Would it be in order if I
    called the previous question?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It would --
    MS. HOMAN: Jill Homan, from Washington,
    D.C.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It would be in
    order, Mrs. Homan.
    MS. HOMAN: Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    Previous question has been called. We
    will now vote on closing debate on the Blackwell
    amendment.
    All of those in favor of closing debate,
    please say aye.
        [A chorus of ayes.]
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
        [A chorus of nays.]
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
        VOICE: Madam Chairwoman?
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We --

VOICE: Can I have a point of order? CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.

VOICE: A point of information. The previous question was just called -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Name and State, please.

MR. SHORT: Oh, I'm sorry. Guy Short, Colorado.

The previous question was just called. You had two individuals at the mic, standing, before the Gentlelady from D.C. walked up. They were in -clearly in line. She walked up. She was recognized first. Is there any type of order? Or how is that going to be run, so that folks who are standing at the mic before others who get up here have a chance to speak?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, I did not know for what purpose the Gentlelady arose. I thought she was intending to speak on the amendment. But, she does have the right to move for previous question once I have recognized her. I will try to do my best to make certain that everyone gets a
```

chance to be heard. But, if a member is recognized
-- and I don't always know why they're standing --
and they make previous question, that will be in
order.
MR. SHORT: Right. And I understand that.
The Gentlelady from Iowa was standing, and so was
the Gentleman from Arizona. And they were standing
for a while. And certainly she has every right to
stand and call the previous question, but she just
immediately rose. So, if there's -- if there can be
any equity of folks who have been standing for a
while and wish to address it, that would be
appreciated.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I will try to do
that.
MR. SHORT: Thank you very much.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
All right. We now will vote on the
amendment.
All of those in favor of adopting the
Blackwell amendment to replace the number "two" with
the number "one," please say aye.

```
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed?
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Chair is in
doubt, and we will move to a standing vote, because that hand thing did absolutely nothing to clarify the situation.

All of those in favor of adopting Mr. Blackwell's amendment, please stand. And I will ask the staff to count.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. You may be seated.

All of those opposed, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. You may be seated.

The vote tally is as follows: those in favor, 44; those against, 63. The motion fails.

Next, we will move to Amendment 10.4 -Amendment 10.4 that has been submitted by the Gentlelady from Maryland, Ms. Ambrose.

MS. AMBROSE: Good afternoon. Nicolee
Ambrose, from Maryland.
I am proposing language under \(10(\mathrm{a})(8)\),
"There shall be a State Chairman's Advisory Committee composed of the State Chairmen of each of the States, the Chair of which shall be elected annually by its members from among its members at each Republican National Committee Winter Meeting." CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. There has been a motion. Is there a second?

VOICE: Voice.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded.

Please proceed, Ms. Ambrose.
MS. AMBROSE: So, essentially, we are just changing words from this being an appointment to having it be a -- the Chairman of the State Chairs is elected from amongst that group. I'm really pulling this out of the playbook of an organization that I mentioned before. I used to be chairman of the Young Republican National Federation. We had a very similar structure of State Chairman's
```

Association. And this was just a phenomenal
leadership development tool. It was a great way for
people to prove they could interact and lead at the
national level, not just at their States. And I'm
all for anything that helps develop leadership so we
might know who to look at when we're considering
future chairmen. And it gives a nice opportunity
for people to rotate, as there's a new election
every single year.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Ms. Ambrose, I think your experience in
the Young Republicans must have been a little
different from mine. I'm not sure I would always
use it as the gold standard by which to run the
organization.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Former Young
Republicans are laughing at the moment, I'm sorry.
It's nothing about the merits of your particular
item. I simply don't think we'd use the Young
Republicans as the gold standard.

```

All right. Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to this amendment? Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Madam Chair, thank you so much.

I rise in opposition. I urge my colleagues to vote no. And the reason is because part of the success that we've experienced has been the very change that this resolution -- or this rules change seeks to undo, which is to permit a Chair with the full access of all of the resources and the strengths and the weaknesses of every State, taking into account what they can and can't achieve, and then fitting the person to the job. Because CEOs and presidents and chairman's job it is is to field out a team that can work together.

So, you know I have to go back to college football. We don't elect a quarterback. We don't elect a right offensive lineman. We don't elect any of those. We allow the coach, the manager of the team, to put the team together, recognizing the strengths and the weaknesses to put together a
winning team.

And I think I echo what Mr. Duprey said, which is, I don't think we've ever had a Chairman who has been so adept in actually taking the various talents and molding them into a team, the team capable of winning rather than a team put together by popularity or by election or by whatever. And we don't want to change that, because we want to continue to win. We've been winning. We want to continue to win. And so, there's no reason to change the rules that are helping us win the way we're winning now.

So, I urge everyone to vote no.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Evans.
I'm getting tempted to start using
quilting analogies.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: But, I will refrain, since \(I\) don't think everybody would know what they mean.

All right. Is there anyone who would like
to speak in support of this amendment?
    MS. GROSSMAN: No, I'm speaking in
opposition to the amendment.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there any -- we've just had someone who spoke in
opposition. Is there someone who'd like to speak in
support?
    Yes.
    MS. BOWEN: Sorry. Gwen Bowen, Louisiana.
    I just heard the Gentleman say we had a
winning team with our -- with this. Well, the last
two times, we didn't win. So, perhaps we need a
little more variety. And so, I would encourage
everyone to consider that before you vote.
    And I am in support of this amendment.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    The lady here, you wanted to rise --
    MS. GROSSMAN: My name is -- yes -- my
name is Eileen Grossman. I represent Rhode Island.
    And it's an honor and a privilege to serve with you
        all.

I don't know a thing about football. And I was never a Young Republican.
[Laughter.]
MS. GROSSMAN: But, let me just say, the way Rhode Island operates, it appears that, when we have the Chair and his Committee, and then we have the Chairman's Caucus -- and this is exactly, I believe, what she is presenting -- they were -- they did not work together. They have never worked together. And it just seems that this -- it's a power struggle. It really turns out to be a power struggle.

So, I would urge everyone to vote no.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who would like to speak in support?

MR. ASH: I would, Madam Chairman. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Ash. MR. ASH: Bruce Ash, from Arizona. This isn't a football team. It is a political organization. And, as such, we have State Chairmen around the country who have -- this is the
```

cream of the crop. They've been voted by their
peers, by Party leaders in their various States. We
have many, many great State Chairmen. And we see it
by the results in all the various States where they
are red States.
I have no qualms with the way that this
Committee has been run in the past, but I'd
personally like to see men and women within that
organization create their own leadership, one that
comes from them, a leader that inspires the others,
and not one that's imposed upon the group. The
leadership that we've had has been very good. I'd
like to try something different. I don't think it's
a dangerous experiment. And it will only, I think,
inspire more activity within this group if it is a
leader that comes from amongst that group.
Thank you very much for your
consideration.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Ash.
Is there anyone else who'd like to rise in
opposition? Is there anyone else who'd like to rise
in opposition?

```
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
```

else who would like to rise in support?

```

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. CRAWFORD: This is Jim --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Oh. No --

MR. CRAWFORD: -- Crawford, from --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Ma'am? Ma'am?
Have you been trying to seek recognition? I'm sorry. You've been there so long, I thought you were stretching.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I am -- I
apologize, and I'm happy to recognize you, and then I will go to you, sir.

MS. POPMA: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I'm Marlys Popma, from Iowa.
This last election cycle, the one thing we have seen is, the people want their power back. And that has just been a theme throughout the entire election cycle. Our presumptive nominee has brought
that out. The people want their power back. And I think it only behooves us, here at the RNC, to empower those people who are closest to the grassroots. And when you're electing your Chairman -- you elect your central Committee members, they elect their Chairman -- that's from the grassroots. And to allow those individuals, who are elected by their grassroots, to pick the person they want to lead them gives great credibility to the new leader, it makes them feel a buy-in to the new leader. I don't understand why we wouldn't want to bring the power as close to the people as we can.

Thank you very much. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. And let me just say, so we don't have this situation again, you were being so polite and standing about 4 or 5 feet back from the microphone, that \(I\) didn't think you were seeking recognition. So, if you would like to be recognized, let me invite you to step right up to the microphone, as close as this Gentleman is. Otherwise, I may think you're resting your back. All right?

All right. I said I would recognize this Gentleman next, and then we'll go to Mr. Hammond. MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, Madam Chair. Jim Crawford, from Maryland. And this seems like a good idea. And I
just wanted to remind the -- as a professional
sports official, I wanted to remind the Gentleman
from Georgia that the coach is hired, but the team
elects its own captain.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Hammond.
MR. HAMMOND: Madam Chair, John Hammond, from Indiana.

Very sympathetic to the notion that the grassroots voices need to be heard. And we can talk through that quite a bit. And we'll have an opportunity to talk through that even more throughout the rest of this day and probably tomorrow. But, I don't see this amendment really to be the place where that discussion should be had at the moment. And here's why.

I would oppose the amendment. The Chairman -- the State Chairman's Advisory Committee
is for the CEO our -- that is our National Chair --
to use for advice. And in any organization, we've
got to have some verticality in that -- in choosing
leadership on that team that Mr. Evans spoke about.
    And I really think that this is an entity
that's there to provide counsel. If, for some
reason, the State Chairs want to do their own thing
on their own, they can do that. The grassroots,
anyone can organize in this country any way they
want, and associate anyhow they want. In this case,
this will tend to weaken the Chair's role, and it
will not address the concerns related to the
grassroots. And I would urge opposition.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who seeks recognition with respect to this
amendment?
    VOICE: Madam Chair?
    VOICE: Madam Chair?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Right over --
    MR. SCHANFARBER: Robert --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: This Gentleman
first, and then we'll come over here.

MR. SCHANFARBER: Robert Schanfarber, Virgin Islands. I'd like to call the previous question.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
is in order. We will move to a vote on ending debate.

MR. LITTLE: Aren't we -- I thought we were going to let people at the mic talk.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, if they get recognized, they have every right to raise the previous question. I did not know for what purpose the Gentleman was rising. I will keep trying to make certain, but if someone stands at the microphone -- and he had been there for some time -he has every right to make the motion for previous question.

MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman, I would suggest that you requested recognition for the purpose of speaking for or against, but not for the purpose of making a previous --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, the Gentleman was recognized in accordance with the rules, and has
```

every right to move for previous question.
All right. We will move to a vote on
ending debate. All of those in favor of ending
debate, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Clearly, the ayes
have it.
We will now move directly to a vote on the
amendment.
All of those in favor of adopting the
amendment that reads that "There shall be a State
Chairman's Advisory Committee composed of the State
Chairmen of each of the States, the Chairman of
which shall be elected annually by its members from
among its members at each Republican National
Committee Winter Meeting."
All in favor, say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, say
nay.

```
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Next, we will move to Amendment number 10.5, impacting Rule number 10 (c). It has been submitted by Mr. Ash.

MR. ASH: Good afternoon, Madam Chairman.
Bruce Ash, from the State of Arizona.
Again, just a cleanup and perhaps --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Excuse me. Mr.
Ash, I need you to make the motion, and --
MR. ASH: Right on.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- we'll get a second.

MR. ASH: Right on. This is to Rule 10(c), page 20, lines 4 and 5. And it would strike the words "with approval of the Republican National Committee" and insert "with a vote of the majority of the members of the Republican National Committee," and striking the words "and assistants." Again, I think, just cleanup and clarifying what the rule was intended to be. This is a rule we didn't get to on Standing Committee.

Thanks for your consideration.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Ash.

Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to this amendment?

Excuse me, Mr. Yue? Okay, he is -- yes, we had a motion and second.

Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition?

Mr. Ryder, from Tennessee.
MR. RYDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
I oppose this amendment, and I urge a no vote on it. This is a further attempt to curb the powers of the Chair, who may need the ability to appoint temporary committees. There is already a rule in the rules of the Republican Party that requires that the composition of any such Committee at least be half drawn from the RNC. I think we have adequate protections there. And I urge a no vote.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor
```

of the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who
would like to speak in opposition to the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we'll
proceed to a vote.
All of those in favor of the amendment,
please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Next, we will move to Amendment number
10.6. Amendment 10.6 impacts the language of Rule
number 10(a)(5) and has been submitted by the
Gentleman from Oregon.
Mr. Yue, you are recognized for the
purpose of making a motion.
MR. YUE: Thank you.
National Committeeman for Oregon.

```

And I move to delete the period at the end
```

of the sentence after the word "Convention" and
insert the following, "on behalf of and under the
supervision, direction, and control of the
Republican National Committee."
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Mr. Yue
has made his motion. Is there a second? Is there a
second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I see a second.
Mr. Yue, would you like to address your
motion?
MR. YUE: Certainly. Thank you.
This is, again, a good-governance proposal
and to put a checks and balance within our system.
If you remember, I share with you Chairman Steele
spent 1 million our line credit and put RNC 26
million in debt. And Chairman Priebus shared that
with you during the orientation yesterday. And that
was -- the main reason that happened during my
investigation was very, very clear. There is no
supervision from RNC Executive Committee. There is

```
```

no supervision from 168 RNC members. So, for good
governance and transparency and -- I urge you,
support this amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Yue.
Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to this amendment?
Mr. Ryder.
MR. RYDER: Madam Chairman, John Ryder, Tennessee.
This amendment is unnecessary, redundant, and superfluous. Rule $10(f)$ already provides, "All Committees appointed or elected pursuant to any of these rules, whether separately incorporated and whether a separate reporting entity, shall be under the supervision, direction, and control of the Republican National Committee and its officers and staff, and shall be subject to and comply with the rules, policies, and procedures of the Republican National Committee, including its budgetary review and approval process, financial controls, legal compliance and review process, and employee policies and manual."

```

That language was added to deal with the concerns that Mr . Yue has expressed. His amendment is unnecessary, superfluous, and redundant. I urge that you vote no on the Yue amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Ryder.
Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the Yue amendment? Anyone else to speak in favor of the Yue amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the Yue amendment.

Gentleman from Massachusetts.
MR. DeVITO: Tom Brady, Massachusetts. I couldn't resist the football.
[Laughter.]
MR. DeVITO: Vincent DeVito --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I must need new glasses.

MR. DeVITO: Vincent DeVito -- thank you -- Vincent DeVito, Massachusetts.

I rise in opposition to this amendment.
    It is clearly redundant, unnecessary, and
    bureaucratic.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. I
didn't mean to say you looked worse than Tom Brady.
    Just different.
    [Laughter.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. All
right. Is there anyone else who wishes to seek
recognition to speak regarding this amendment?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing no one, we
will move to a vote.
    All of those in favor of adopting Mr.
Yue's amendment, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone opposed.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
    Next, we will move to Amendment number
10.7 -- number 10.7. This amendment impacts the
        language of Rule \(10(a)(3)\) and has been submitted by
the Gentleman from Idaho, who is hereby recognized
for the purpose of a motion.
    MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, Norm Semanko,
    from Idaho.
    After submitting this particular amendment
and reviewing it further, I've identified a drafting
error. So, I would like, at this time, to move to
table consideration of Amendment 10.7 to a time
certain, that time being after conclusion of
consideration of Rules 1 through 12.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The
Gentleman is in order. The parliamentarian tells me
that you wish to make your motion one to postpone.
We will assume that that's the correct --
    MR. SEMANKO: Yes.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- verbiage.
    MR. SEMANKO: Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes.
    Is there a second? Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those in favor,
please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will take up -the ayes have it, and we will take this up at the end of Rules 1 through 12.

All right. The next one that we will bring up is Rule 10.8 -- Rule 10.8 , impacting Rule number \(10(\mathrm{a})(2)\). It has been submitted by the Gentleman from -- excuse me -- from Idaho, who's recognized for the purpose of an amendment.

MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, Norm Semanko, from Idaho.

I would like to move that Rule \(10(\mathrm{a})(2)\) be amended by striking the word "Chairman" and inserting the word "member" after the words, quote, "region and a," unquote, and striking the words, quote, "of the Republican National Committee," unquote, after the words, quote, "among the members of the," and inserting the sentence, quote, "The Chairman of the Standing Committee on Resolutions shall be elected by its members from among the
```

members thereof," unquote, and insert the sentence,
quote, "The election of the Standing Committee on
Resolutions shall take place at the Quadrennial
Winter Meeting of the Republican National
Committee," unquote.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. It's
been moved. Has it been seconded? Is there a
second? Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been moved
and seconded.
Mr. Semanko, would you like to address the
merits, please?
MR. SEMANKO: Yes. Madam Chair, as those
that are familiar with the rules will no doubt note,
this proposed change to the Resolutions Committee
subsection of this rule would comport it to be
consistent with the Standing Committee on Rules,
under (a)(1), where "The Chairman of the Standing
Committee on Rules shall be elected by the Committee
from amongst its members." This would make the
Resolutions Committee consistent with the Rules

```
Committee, in terms of the election of the Chairman.
    And that is the purpose for the amendment.
    Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Semanko.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in opposition? Are you rising in opposition, Mr. Little?

MR. LITTLE: Yes, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Little, you are recognized.

MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman, I believe the Resolutions Committee is fundamentally different from the Rules Committee and should be appointed by the Chair. We have resolutions that actually are out there every day, and, at the end of every meeting, they will affect the position of the Republican National Committee. Whereas, the Committee on Rules does not report, except once every 4 years. So, the -- this deals with our positions on the issues of the day, day in and day out. We have a Chairman of the Republican National

Committee. We rise and fall on our Chairman. And I believe our Chairman should have the ability to appoint the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Little. Is there anyone else who rises to support the amendment? Anyone else who wishes to rise in support of the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone who wishes to speak in opposition to the amendment? Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I will try to avoid all references to college football. I can recognize the sensitivities, being from the Southeastern Conference, by the rest of the group.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: You may not have helped yourself just now, Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: But, I do agree with Mr.
Little, which is that we are trying to put together
a team, and we do have a leader, and that leader is
the Chairman. And the Chairman does need to have
the discretion to help pick the team that helps win.
    This isn't just a political exercise,
where we all get together and exchange ideas. In
the end, we want to win elections. And Chairman
Priebus helped us do exceptionally well in the last
election. And I think we will do exceptionally well
in the coming election, when we elect President
Trump. But, for right now, the key -- the key for
us all is to make sure that we don't interfere with
the ability to put those very effective teams in
place, drawing upon the strengths of everybody to
build a unit that is capable of winning, as opposed
to just a group of outstanding individuals.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Is there anyone else who would like to
rise in support of the amendment?
    Ms. Ambrose.
    MS. AMBROSE: Nicolee Ambrose, Maryland.
    I would really like us all to consider how
important it is for the RNC not -- to not be one
person. It's fantastic we have a great Chairman, but this is about a 168-member body that's supposed to carry on the work of the Convention body in the 4 years in between. Last I saw, we were Republicans who believe in individual rights and our own freedom and liberty.

So, I would just encourage us all to think and respect the fact that we need to have a few more people in power to make decisions, to have the ability to at least vote for the person who's leading your Committee. Just a concept. I encourage you all to think about that. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Is there anyone else who rises in opposition?

Mr. Duprey.
MR. DUPREY: Madam Chairman, Steve Duprey, from New Hampshire.

Ross Little said it best, this is fundamentally different from the Rules Committee, which reports out once a year. This -- the

Resolutions Committee puts resolutions out there all
the time. It's important that the Chairman be in
charge of this so that we're in sync with our
congressional leaders.
    So, I urge members to vote no on this
proposed amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
The Gentleman is the only one standing at the microphone. And so, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Hawaii.

MR. PAIKAI: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Nathan Paikai, from the State of Hawaii.
I rise in opposition. I am -- I'm overwhelmed. This is my first time here. And to be a part of the RNC and who I believe will be the next nominee from the Republican Party. I believe in the leadership of the RNC and what they have done and what we will continue to do. And so, I rise in opposition on this amendment, because it now brings even more division. When \(I\) heard the Chairman now speak about unity, that's what \(I\) came for.

And so, I ask you to vote no on this
amendment.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Paikai. And since it's your first time here --
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- welcome. We're
glad you're here.
All right. Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard on this amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing no one, we'll move directly to a vote on the amendment.

All of those in favor of adopting the amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone opposed?
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
We'll move now to Amendment 10.9.
Amendment 10.9 impacts the language of Rule \(10(a)(4)\), and it has also been submitted by Mr. Semanko, of Idaho, who is hereby recognized for the
purpose of making a motion.
MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, thank you.
And I hope everyone agrees with me that
this is a healthy discussion to have about the relative balance within the Republican National Committee between the Chairman and the members. And obviously, there is a -- somewhat of a tension between the Rules and the Resolutions Committee. And I appreciate the discussion that was had.

This is a similar amendment with regard to the Standing Committee on Site Selection of the Republican National Convention. And I just put before you again the idea that it may be better, as it is in the case of rules, to have that determined by the members themselves as to the Chairman of that Committee.

And, with that, happy to yield to others to debate.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Semanko.
It's been moved. Is there a second? Is
there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a second.
    Mr. Semanko, because I was the appointed
Chairman of the Site Selection Committed for this
Convention, would you prefer that Mr. Kauffman take
the Chair, or are you all right with me continuing
to preside?
    MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, having
disclosed that, I have no problem. I don't know if
anyone else does. But, thank you for that.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Semanko.
    Is there anyone who rises in opposition?
    The Lady from California.
    MS. DHILLON: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
    I'm opposed to this amendment, for the
same reasons that I opposed the prior couple that
we've heard. And they seem to be implying that
there's something wrong with the leadership of --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm sorry. We
didn't get your name and State. My fault.

MS. DHILLON: California, you said. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes.

MS. DHILLON: My name is Harmeet Dhillon, from the great State of California.

I oppose this amendment because I believe the Chair is doing a fine job. And, speaking from my experience as the Vice Chairman in the California Republican Party, a large Party, I think it's important for the Chairman to have the freedom to pick the people that he works with. And that's part of the Chairman's satisfaction in his job, as well. And I think that we need to have Chairs who are empowered to get things does with people they get along with and people they have confidence in, as opposed to creating multiple power centers in the Party, which is not conducive to unity.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who rises in support?
Anyone who rises in support of this amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who
would like to recognized in opposition?

Ms. Homan.
MS. HOMAN: Jill Homan, from Washington, D.C.

I'm opposed to this amendment. And I served on the Site Selection Committee with the Chairman, Enid Mickelsen. And I think folks should know how difficult of a job it is. I think Cleveland Host Committee can attest to how much is involved, in terms of the negotiation with all the different parties, not to mention, when you have the election, you're only electing eight people, and so, you do need, you know, a ninth. But, I think it's important that we allow the Chairman to appoint someone with the right skillset and someone who is able to negotiate and represent us well. And so, I think it's critically important that we enable the Chairman to appoint this position.

Thanks.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mrs.
Homan.
Is there anyone else who would like to be
```

recognized in support of the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who would like to be recognized in opposition
to the amendment?
Mr. Barnett, of Arkansas.
MR. BARNETT: Jonathan Barnett, from
Arkansas. Thank you, Madam Chairman.
I, too, was privileged to be on the Site
Selection Committee. And so, those of you that are
here from Cleveland, you can thank people like me
and Jill and some others.
[Laughter.]
MR. BARNETT: I guess we'll find out on
the back side if, you know, they get criticized on
the back side was -- whether it was a good choice or
not.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm sure Cleveland
will do a great job. It's some of the --
MR. BARNETT: I'm sure they will.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- outside visitors
I'm a little concerned about.

```

MR. BARNETT: You know, I may have been a little concerned about our Chairwoman on the front side, but, after the first meeting or two, I had full confidence and faith, and thought she was very capable and very competent. And --

But, anyhow, I just -- there's eight members on the Site Selection Committee, and we worked very well together. You know, the eight members actually make the choice. It's not the Chairwoman or the Chairperson of that Committee. It's actually the eight Committee members. And I think we all kind of worked very independently, as far as our thought process was concerned, but we collaborated together very well, and came together and made the very best decision possible.

I don't -- this is not a sword that we need to die on. It's, again, obviously, trying to take more powers away. But, anyhow, I'd just -- I do rise in opposition.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Barnett.

Is there anyone else who rises in support?
Mr. Ash, do you rise in support?
MR. ASH: No, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Oh, all right.
Mr. Duprey, do you rise in opposition?
MR. DUPREY: I rise in opposition. The
California Delegate expressed it well. We have to
have faith in our chief executive officer, our
Chairman. And I would like to move the previous question.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question is in order.

All of those who are -- who would like to end debate on this issue, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, say
no.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous -- the ayes have it.

We will now move directly to a vote on the amendment.

All of those in favor of Mr. Semanko's amendment, which reads that, "The Chairman of the Standing Committee on Site Selection of the Republican National Convention shall be elected by its members from among the members thereof."

All those in favor, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay. [A chorus of nays.] CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it. I believe that completes our work on Rule 12 -- excuse me -- Rule 10. And now we move to Rule 12. I'm getting ahead of myself. All right. So, that completes our work on Rule 10.

We'll now move to Rule 12, and then I need to remind you that we set aside a number of other amendments to be taken up at the end of Rule 12. So that you don't give up all hope of ever getting a little bit of a break, after we have finished all of the amendments to Rules 1 through 12, we will take a 30 -minute break to allow you to get some afternoon refreshments that we've provided for you, and to
allow the staff to get all of the amendments for the
next section loaded up.
    All right. Let's move to Amendment 12.1.
    This is Rule 12, and this is an amendment submitted
by Mr. Blackwell, of Virginia.
    Mr. Blackwell, you are recognized for the
purpose of making a motion.
    MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
    My motion is to strike Rule 12 in its
entirety.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Blackwell.
    Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded that Rule 12 be stricken in its entirety.
    Mr. Blackwell, would you like to address
        the merits of your amendment?
    MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
    I have communicated to the members of this
Committee on this topic prior to this meeting. It
went by email. And if you are like me, fellow
members, I didn't open all the emails for the past period of time. I want to read what I said to this members of this Committee into the record:
"This rule permits the RNC to change the rules between our National Conventions. It's the worst of the 2012 power grabs by the Romney Campaign. It is the worst rules change ever inserted into our National Party rules. It should be deleted entirely. For generations, conservatives praised as the greatest advantage of the Rules of the Republican Party over the National Democratic Party rules the fact that no RNC Chairman could change the National Party rules between Conventions. The Democrats' National Committee has been free to change the rules between Conventions, and they often do so. They couch proposed rules changes in goodgovernment terms, but they all know, and the public knows, that most often their proposed rules changes are designed to help this or that candidate or this or that faction of their Party. This generates constant ugly battles for power between the Conventions.
"Now, of necessity, the RNC Chairman has very great powers. For all practical purposes, the RNC Chairman controls the RNC funds, including how much RNC money, if any, goes to any State Party and how much RNC money, if any, goes to any Republican nominee of any State Party. The RNC Chairman controls the RNC's hiring decisions. The RNC Chairman decides which RNC members are appointed to many powerful positions in the National Party structure. Every RNC National Chairman, if that Chairman wishes, can get the votes at an RNC meeting of a majority of RNC members." And I know that. I've been on the Committee a long time. You've -members of the Committee know that. "Usually, it's a supermajority."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Blackwell, your time is expired. I'm sorry, sir. You can seek unanimous consent to extend your remarks for 2 more minutes, but that would require unanimous consent of the body.

MR. BLACKWELL: Well, I -- all right. I would ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes.
objection?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Hearing none,
please --
    There is an objection, I'm sorry, Mr.
Blackwell.
    All right. Is there anyone who would like
to rise in opposition?
    VOICE: Yes.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Duprey.
    MR. DUPREY: Steve Duprey, from New
        Hampshire.
    I rise in strenuous opposition to this
    proposal, notwithstanding my good friend Morton
    Blackwell. I think this was one of the most
    important rules changes we have made. And let me
    give you the example.
    We had 23 debates in 2008, 21 in 2012, and
        we wanted to make sure that didn't happen and that
        we didn't give the media a chance to embarrass our
        candidates. But for the fact had we not had this
rule, the -- we would not have had the ability to pass the rule that said any candidate who shows up at an unsanctioned debate will be ineligible for later debates. That immediately gave us the control over the debate process, which allowed us to cut the number in half, to spread them out, to have input on who the panels look like, and to make sure they were on a calendar that our candidates could accept. If we pass the Blackwell amendment, it would limit the ability of the Republican National Committee to deal with emerging situations that need attention between Conventions. I think the best proof that there is no abuse of power has been how rarely it was used. I believe that was the only change we made.

This rule works. It gives us a great ability to adapt to changing situations. And it would be a terrible mistake to strike this rule.

So, I urge members to vote no on this proposed amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Duprey.

Is there anyone who rises in support? Is there anyone who rises in support?

Yes. Right here.
MS. BOWEN: Gwen Bowen, Louisiana.
And, although I thought the Republican
debates were wonderful, and thank you all so much, I don't -- I think there's other places that that can be done, besides in Rule 12. In 2012 -- the only difference between, maybe, my opinion and Delegate Morton Blackwell's is, he thought it was the biggest power grab, and I thought it was the second-biggest power grab of 2012. I thought 16, which actually was 15 at the time, disavowing -- a candidate being able to disavow a Delegate duly elected -- I thought that was the biggest power grab. But, I think that this body -- this body, these -- this is the grassroots, the people have elected this body to make the decisions for the rules for the next Convention. And although -- and not the RNC, although I think the RNC certainly has its place, and they've done good jobs many times, but not always.

And so, I'd encourage you to vote to
delete Rule 12, which there was a lot of people not wanting to support Rule 12, almost to the point we had a Minority Report, but we didn't. We did it on Rule 15, which turned 16 instead.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who likes -- would rise to
speak in support -- excuse me -- in opposition? In opposition.

The Gentleman from Nevada.
MR. ROSS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Jordan Ross, from Nevada.
I have great empathy with what Mr.
Blackwell is talking about. As a grassroots Republican who's worked hard to bring greater transparency and checks and balances to the Republican Party in Nevada, I have a great deal of empathy for what he's expressing here.

The problem is that, in a 21 st century political environment, we cannot have our Primary governing documents locked up and unable to change,
except once every 4 years. There needs to be some flexibility. We've dealt with this problem in Nevada by coming up with a hierarchical system. We've got bylaws, we've got standing rules for our State Central Committee, and standing rules for our Executive Committee. We're not going to have the time to come up with a solution that complex. I urge a solution to come up with that.

But, in the meantime, we have got to preserve some minimal flexibility. And I have looked at this carefully. The power that's being presented, that currently -- that the RNC exercises for rulemaking authority is limited. And I think it's safe enough to say that it'll be safe for another 4 years. We do need to make changes. Mr. Blackwell is right. But, this, unfortunately -regrettably, I have to say this, because I've worked so hard for transparency and for checks and balances in our own State Party -- this, unfortunately, is throwing the baby out with the bath water. Just can't do it in this day and age. I mean, I'm a 59-year-old grandfather, and I'm walking around not
with one, but with two cell phones, you know, and it
-- you know, constantly, 24 hours a day. The ground
game in politics changes constantly.
    I stand in opposition to the amendment. I
ask you that we have to think like a 21 st century
Party.
    Thank you. Please vote no.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Is there someone who wishes to rise in
support? Is there any --
    MS. HAGEMAN: Yes. Harriet Hageman, from
Wyoming.
    I'm going to continue to provide the
information for Mr. Blackwell. I rise in support of
this amendment.
    As Mr. Blackwell stated, "The most
effective check on the power of the RNC Chairman was
that the National Chairman was bound by the rules
adopted by the most recent National Convention and
that only the next National Convention could change
those rules. Rule 12 destroys that safeguard.
Generations of serious Party activists and leaders
```

at National Conventions have written into our
national rules some important protections against
abuse of power in the RNC. For example, Rule 11
prevents the RNC from contributing money or in-kind
aid to a candidate in any State who is not yet the
Republican nominee, unless all three of the State's
RNC members file with the RNC prior written approval
of that RNC intervention. This rule tends to
protect conservative candidates.
"In living memory, many very different
people have served as Chairman of the RNC. Some
have proved to be skilled, honorable, and
productive. Others have quite capriciously thrown
their weight around. Some have been pawns of
consultants who helped elect them or of other
cronies who were enriched by their proximity to the
seat of power in the Party. Some national Chairmen
have left the RNC in a sound financial position,
others have left the RNC broke and deep in debt.
Nevertheless, over the years, our Party has had
national Chairmen who served our Party much better
than the Democrat's Party Chairmen served their

```
```

Party.

```
```

    "One aspect of human nature is that people
    who have power tend to use that power to stay in
power and to increase their power. That's why our
Constitution set up a system of checks and balances
and separation of powers in government. There may
be no practical alternative to our National Party
Chairman having many great powers. We could not
operate effectively if the RNC membership had to
vote on how much RNC financial support goes to which
candidate in which States. Until now, however, all
RNC Chairmen, regardless of their motives and
probity, have been bound by the rules in effect when
they were elected. That's a healthy check, which
limits even the temptation to abuse power or to
centralize it too much. Rule 12 must be repealed."
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there others who wish to speak in
opposition?
VOICE: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm going to go

```

1 first to Mrs. Costa, because she hasn't spoken yet
today.

MS. COSTA: Cindy Costa, from South Carolina.

I rise in opposition of this amendment, for the very fact that Mr. Blackwell spoke a while ago. He said that it was very difficult to get two people from one State. Now we're asking that we get a three-fourths vote from the entire body to change a rule, which \(I\) think is a much higher bar than what he was talking about earlier. So, I think, because we would not change a rule unless it was a very serious rule that had to be changed, we would never get to that three-fourths if we were tinkering around and playing with our rules and trying to, you know, do something for, you know, one State's benefit.

So, I would say this is a protective rule that we need in our rules, and that, with that high bar, there won't be any gamesmanship. Everybody on this Committee is pretty smart. And so, they don't really allow for that kind of thing.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there others who wish to speak in
support?
Ms. Ambrose.
MS. AMBROSE: Nicolee Ambrose, Maryland.
I just want to remind everyone that this came about in 2012, and it was the brainchild of Ben Ginsberg. This outraged people in my home State of Maryland, so much so that we had a leadership sweep. And I encourage you to realize that a lot of what we've seen in the past 4 years -- we've talked about power going back to the people, and people wanting to actually have a direct vote and direct influence in their -- how the affairs of our Party. I am encouraging you to think about what this means in your home State. People were upset in 2012, and they will remain upset unless we fix the things that upset them.

So, with that said, I love giving power to Convention bodies. They're the ultimate authority. That is why we are here, to get things right so we
```

can propose great, fantastic rules that everyone
will be happy with.
Thank you very much.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who wishes to speak in opposition?
MR. ASH: Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Ash.
MR. ASH: Madam Chairman, Bruce Ash, from
Arizona.

```
    For those of you who know me, you know me
as being a traditionalist. When \(I\) first heard of
the Rule 12 concept at the last Convention Rules
Committee, it struck me dumfounded. I wasn't sure
what to think, at first. It didn't take long for me
to realize, though, it was providential.
    And, as it turned out, some of the rules
that were imposed upon the RNC at the last Rules
Convention, we used Rule 12 to get rid of nearly all
of those, to give back Delegate empowerment, to give
back activist empowerment. This has been used as a
tool for good.
    I respect and admire, and I have to admit
openly, Morton Blackwell is one of my heroes. And I question my own judgment anytime he and I aren't on the same wavelength. But, for the very reasons that Mr. Blackwell supports eliminating Rule 12, I think those are the reasons why we want to continue Rule 12, to make changes in rules that didn't work, that created problems with grassroots empowerment, but also, as some of the others have maintained, to make sure that our Party remains active and able to react to anything that happens in the political landscape between now and 2020.

Steve Duprey, Madam Chairman, said that we only changed the Debate Committee. We -- or created the Debate Committee -- we did lots of different things under Rule 12. Some of them weren't quite appreciated or understood back home in Arizona, but I am proud of every single change that we made under Rule 12. And it had to meet the very highest possible threshold, at 75 percent. In fact, most of the times, we were at 80 or 85 percent.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Ash. Is there anyone else who rises in support? Anyone who rises in support? Mr. Ross.

MR. ROSS: Madam Chairman, I support the
deletion of Rule 12. I've studied the Democrat
Party as they began to do this. And when they gave
their committee the ability to change rules, it was
for things that were fairly innocuous on their side
in the beginning, but it got worse and worse and
worse. I think this is a very dangerous road that
we go down. I think it was great, in fact, that we
got the debates in. I thought that was a wonderful
thing. I think it was an unusual thing. But, I
believe we should keep it as it was prior to all the
things that happened in the last 8 years, and revert
to having the Convention being the ultimate arbiter
of the rules.
    Thank you, Madam Chair.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Is there someone who would wish to speak
in opposition?

MR. MUNISTERI: Yes, Madam Chairman. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Munisteri. MR. MUNISTERI: Thank you, Madam Chairman. If you don't have a mechanism for dealing with an extraordinary circumstance, what would you do? Just use common sense. For example, if you had a court order that made you change the way you operated, but your rules did not allow you to adjust, what would you do?

This is not a hypothetical situation.
When I was State Chairman of the Texas Republican Party, we were sued a number of times. We had to get permission by the Department of Justice, and we had to comply with court orders that required us to change our rules, and we had a mechanism.

What would the Republican Party do if it faced an extraordinary circumstance and you don't have a chance to adjust? It's just common sense. Now, we were talking about the grassroots. It requires 75 percent to get agreement. Who comprises that 75? They're RNC members, such as Toni Dashiell, from our State, and Tom Meckler and
Robin Armstrong. They're elected by 9,000
Delegates. If they did something that was untoward,
when they got back, they wouldn't be reelected.
    And something else that hasn't been
mentioned. We allow our body to get rid of our
Chairman or Chairwoman, if we don't like them or
overstep, by two-thirds vote. If you don't think
your Chairman is doing the right thing, or
Chairwoman, you think they're abusing power, we have
a mechanism to get rid of the Chairman. People are
acting as if the Chairman has all the leverage. I
can't think of greater leverage than the ability, as
our presumptive nominee would say, "You're fired."
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Munisteri.
    Is there anyone else who rises to speak in
support?
    The Gentleman from Utah, Mr. Lee.
    SENATOR LEE: Mike Lee, from Utah. Thank
you.
    I'm always concerned about any proposal or
any existing rule that seems to tend to allow one group of people, or one person, to accumulate too much power. I think we can spot a certain trend that's evolved today, a trend toward not passing those amendments that tend to disperse power, rejecting those amendments that tend to disperse power and leave them in the hands of the Delegates. Now, it is certainly true that, under Rule 12, you've got to have a supermajority, or a superduper majority, you might call it, in order to exercise this rule, but that doesn't mean that that will serve as a significant check. What if, in fact, you see the RNC seeing things overwhelmingly the same way that the Chairman sees them, over and over and over again? So, in many respects, this could disempower Delegates, as a whole. This could disempower the power -- the Party at large, members of the grassroots. And so, I think we've got to be very skeptical of things that help facilitate the accumulation of power in the hands of the few, especially given that we aspire to be a Party that is more inclusive, a Party that brings people in,
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that encourages grassroots activity. That is, after
all, where our vitality as a Party is found.
Lastly, I will say, I was a little bit
surprised by the fact that, when the sponsor of this
amendment asked what I thought was a very modest
request, that he be given 2 additional minutes to
complete his very short remarks, we saw multiple
objections. I work in a body where unanimous
consent is constantly given, where someone just
needs another minute or two. The fact that people
are so upset at the -- even the suggestion that we
consider getting rid of Rule 12 gives me additional
reason to support this amendment and to encourage
each member of this committee to strongly consider
doing the same.
Thank you.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Are there others
who wish to speak in opposition?
Mr. DeVito.
MR. DeVITO: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Vincent DeVito, Massachusetts.
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I urge a no vote for this particular amendment. I had the privilege of speaking to this rule two Conventions in a row. This is not a rule that gave carte blanche, it was a rule that was negotiated thoughtfully among many smart people, 4 years ago. And the super-duper-majority reference, prior to me, is exactly right, that is a very high threshold and restriction.

I want to emphasize also the other restriction on this particular rule as it stands. It is a 2-year window of operation. It not carte blanche, and it is not a grab of any type of power; it is simply a thoughtful process to be used for exigent circumstances.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to this rule again this year.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
Is there anyone else who wishes to rise in support? Anyone who wishes to rise in support?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone who wishes to rise in opposition?

Mr. Paikai.

MR. PAIKAI: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I'm in strong opposition. This is a
safety valve for the people. This is a safety valve
for the RNC, for this Committee, for anything that
comes together to bring unity. It brings an
opportunity for everyone to speak. If you get rid of this, you give no one an opportunity to voice their concerns.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Paikai.
Are there others who wish to speak -someone who wishes to speak in support?

Mr. Frias.

MR. FRIAS: People have made some very good points on both sides. I respect my colleagues on the RNC. I'm a member of the RNC. This is a great power the RNC's been given. But, I hear what Senator Lee stated. And to me, I'm always concerned about concentration of power. This isn't about who appoints what to Committee, this is about who
decides what the rules are.

In the end, when \(I\) have to make a decision about who has the ultimate authority over this rules, is it 1,237 Delegates on Monday or 126 RNC members? I prefer a larger group than a smaller group.

In response to some of the comments that have been made, that we're in the 21st century, we need to make changes as events occur, I recognize that. In the past, we would create a carve-out and say, "In regards to rules in the presidential Primary for this, the RNC can make a change later on." You do not grant this level of power to a smaller group. If you're going to give that level of power to a smaller group, you make it as narrow as possible.

This is my opinion. The -- Rule 12 has worked fine, by the way. So everybody knows that I'm not making any insults or attacking anybody. Rule 12 has worked fine these last couple of years. I do not worry about how things have worked under Chairman Priebus. I worry about the future. When I
vote for a rule or a law or anything, I think not
just about the best-case scenarios, but the worst-
case scenarios.
    I apologize to my colleagues on the RNC
for voting against Rule 12, but that's just my view.
    I'd -- and I know everyone's going to start
attacking and whatever, but have a nice day.
    [Laughter.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: You, too, Mr.
Frias.
    The Chair recognizes Mr. Ryder.
    MR. RYDER: John Ryder, from Tennessee.
    And no apology is necessary from the
Gentleman from Rhode Island. These are legitimate
points. This is a very important debate.
    We had this debate 4 years ago. We had
the debate 4 years prior to that, when we adopted a
similar rule regarding amendments to Rule 15(c), as
it then existed, concerning the Primary calendar,
not some of the other elements of 15.
    And the issue is this. The -- first, can
we give the Party some limited flexibility to deal
with emergency situations and changing circumstances as they evolve over the next couple of years? And second, can we give the Republican Party the ability to debate and deliberate over issues that it is not possible for this Committee to adequately address in the 2 or 2 and a half days that we have? And we just addressed that last when we passed the amendment to Rule 10, which created a Commission to Examine the Presidential Primary System. And we modeled this on Rule \(10(d)\), from 8 years ago, which created the Temporary Delegate Selection Commission, whose purpose was to examine how the calendar works. And these are extraordinarily complex issues, because they involve a large number of rules, a multiplicity of the rules, and require some lengthy deliberations. And that Commission took testimony, conducted hearings, and conducted deliberations over many days, something this Committee does not have the luxury of doing.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I would urge that we oppose this amendment, we retain Rule 12, we retain the ability to have limited flexibility for a
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limited period of time, upon limited circumstances,
and that we give the Republican Party, through its
National Committee, the ability to deliberate
carefully over some of the more complex issues
before us.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Ryder.
The Chair sees Mr. Duprey at the
microphone.
MR. DUPREY: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Duprey, you're
recognized.
MR. DUPREY: Madam Chairman, Steve Duprey,
from New Hampshire.
I would like to move the previous
question. I would respectfully request a division
vote on this important issue. And I urge members to
vote no on this amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Duprey.
We've moved previous question.

```

All those in favor of previous question, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will move to a vote on the amendment.

The amendment from Mr. Blackwell would strike Rule 12 in its entirety. We will move directly to a standing vote.

All those in favor of adopting Mr. Blackwell's amendment and striking Rule 12, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. You may be seated.

All those against adopting Rule 12, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: You're standing so long? Just stay there. I still see them doing
this. We have to make sure that all of the tallies
match.

Thank you. You can be seated.
The vote is as follows: those in favor, 23; those opposed, 86. The amendment fails.

Now we will go back and take up those amendments, all of which we had postponed to a definite time, to be taken up after Rule 12. So, we are going to be moving quickly. We will take them in order. Again, Rules 1 through 12. But, I'm going to -- just going to ask you to pay attention so that, when your amendment comes up, you're prepared to address the group. We will start with Amendment 1.1. This is an amendment to Rule \(1(c)\), dealing with lobbyists. And it has been submitted by Ms. MaryAnne Kinney, of Maine, and Ms. Cindy Pugh, of Minnesota.

MR. EVANS: Madam Chair?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Evans.
MR. EVANS: Just a point of parliamentary inquiry, please.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.

MR. EVANS: Would it be in order to make a motion to refer these rules that we have deferred for consideration by -- pursuant to Rule 12, since none operate to affect the operation -- or none have any impact on the operation of the Convention?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The
parliamentarians inform me that we would have to do each one individually --

MR. EVANS: But --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- but that it would be in order to do so.

MR. EVANS: Okay. I would so move on the first motion.

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. It's
been moved and seconded that consideration of this amendment be -- and what was the language that you used, sir? -- referred to the committee established under Rule 12. Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: For consideration --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: For consideration under Rule 12, thank you.

It's been moved and seconded. Is there any debate?

MR. BLACKWELL: Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: Am I to understand, then, that, now that we have Rule 12 saved, that matters which routinely were decided by the Convention Rules Committee and the Convention are now to be handed over to the Republican National Committee to be determined by the use of Rule 12? I mean, this -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Sir, that will be up --

MR. BLACKWELL: -- is an abandonment of the grassroots power. Power in this Party should flow from the bottom up. This is truly an outrage. Truly an outrage. We've seen -- if this passes, it's a wholesale abandonment of the rights of the people who are going to vote on the adoption of the Rules Committee and to turn it over to a body where the National Chairman routinely has a supermajority of Delegates who vote where he wants. This is an outrage for the conservative grassroots.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: This will be up to
this body to decide. And I will leave it simply at
that, that it is up to this body to make that
determination.
    With that, I will recognize Mr. Barbour.
    MR. BARBOUR: Henry Barbour, from
Mississippi.
    I will just say, as a lobbyist, I'm fine
with this Committee deciding this issue.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone who rises to support Mr. Evans' motion?
    MR. EVANS: Madam Chair, may I just
withdraw my motion?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes.
    MR. EVANS: Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Evans.
    [Applause.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. All right.
We still have a motion to postpone indefinitely that
was on the floor. And I advise the body that, if
you want to be able to take up this amendment, which
I believe is now -- Mr. Evans will, as well -- we
need to take a vote to lift the postponing to a --
indefinitely. How would we phrase it?
    VOICE: [Inaudible.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. So, all
those in favor of lifting the postponement, which
would, in effect, allow us to consider this
amendment, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
no.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
    All right. Now we will move, Ms. Kinney,
    to consideration of your amendment. It has been --
    did we get back to the motion? We are now to the
        motion.
    MS. KINNEY: Great, thank you. I never
    got a chance to give my reason for proposing it in
    the first place.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, now you'll
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get that opportunity.
MS. KINNEY: I know.
So, as a State Representative, I can see
differences in lobbyists. There -- this amendment
is meant to keep those with a financial stake in
being on the RNC. We are the Party led by the
common man -- I, for one -- for example, I'm a
farmer in Maine -- not those with ulterior motives.
Let's reduce the influence peddling without
appearance of impropriety. Should have picked a
different word. Nonprofit lobbyists are exempt,
which include, but not limited to, the NRA, of which
I am a lifetime member, the National Right to Life,
or other nonprofit lobbyists. And this amendment is
brought forth to slow down the purchase of the RNC
by the for-profit influences.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are those who wish to be recognized in
opposition to this amendment?
Gentlelady from California.
MS. DHILLON: Madam Chairman, Harmeet
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Dhillon, from California.
I speak as a member of this body and as a First Amendment lawyer from California. I believe that banning people from participating in politics because of their chosen profession is both unAmerican and conflicts with the fundamental right to earn a living, which is part of our freedom guaranteed by the Constitution. This amendment would not only ban anybody who works for any entity that does lobbying, with the alleged exception of nonprofit -- we don't have time, in 2 minutes, to get into the distinctions between 501 (c) (3) and \(501(\mathrm{c})(4)\)-- but, in addition, is unlimited as to duration. So, anybody who had ever worked as a lobbyist at any point in their careers would be banned, according to this rule, from ever serving as a member. And I think that is excessive, as well. With registered lobbyists, which is the case both at the Federal level and in most of our States, there is total transparency. There isn't backroom dealing. Once we single out lobbyists, we're looking at singling out other potential
```

disfavored professions, such as plaintiffs' lawyers,
such as used-car salesmen, such as insurance agents,
perhaps, such as farmers who people don't like. As
the preamble to our rules say, Republicans believe
in bringing people together and in freedom of
speech, not carving them into separate groups and
casting them out.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there those -- is there anyone who
wishes to rise in support? Anyone who wishes to
rise in support?
Yes. Thank you.
MS. PUGH: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.
Cindy Pugh, from Minnesota.
And, as a State Representative, I've
witnessed firsthand the influence of paid lobbyists
focused on spending hard-earned taxpayer dollars
versus advocating for everyday hardworking citizens.
I strongly encourage support of this pro-grassroots
rule. Our Republican Party should be giving voice
to everyday hardworking citizens, and not giving in
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to the voices of insider lobbyists employed by
government and for-profit corporations.
This rule wouldn't affect, as my colleague
and the author of this amendment mentioned -- it
wouldn't affect, for example, registered paid
lobbyists for the Right to Life, Inc., because
that's a nonprofit organization, or a gun activist,
for example, who voluntarily lobbies on behalf of
the NRA ILA, the NRA's lobbying arm. But, it would
affect John, for example, an employee for the
Podesta Group, one of D.C.'s lobbyists -- largest
D.C. lobbyist firms, who would be affected.
So, I encourage a favorable vote for this
amendment so that this rule that no RNC member has a
financial stake in being on the RNC. And this kind
of insider politics has been heavily permeated
within the DNC. And we all know that. Republican
voters have overwhelmingly rejected insider politics
this election cycle. And our presumptive nominee
has clearly campaigned against special interests,
too. Republicans need to make a bold statement that
we stand in strong contrast and have higher
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standards than the Democrat Party. We make American
great again when we empower the everyday American
instead of insider lobbyists with ulterior motives.
    So, I urge the Committee to support this
amendment.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Is there someone who wishes to speak in
opposition? Some --
    MR. STUART: Madam --
    MS. DeMONTE: Go ahead.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mrs. DeMonte.
    MR. STUART: Madam Chairwoman, Mike
Stuart, West Virginia.
    I stand in opposition to this. I truly
believe that every State should be able to determine
its representatives to the RNC, whether that be
three priests, three pastors, three lobbyists, three
coalminers, or three flood victims from southern
West Virginia. I think it's important, ultimately,
at the end of the day -- it's a States-rights issue
-- that each State gets to determine who we send to
this important body, the Republican National

Committee.
I'd also point out that, if we pass this, the lobbyist industry is not going to go away. They're still going to be there. But, the Republican National Committee will be viewed as an exclusionary, potentially hostile group to this group that plays an important role in the way our government functions.

And so, with that, I'd just urge you to oppose this amendment. While it's appealing on its surface -- trust me, it's appealing on its surface, right? Who loves the lobbyists? It's like the car -- a used-car salesman, right? And I'm a lawyer. At what point do we decide who can be members of the RNC? Let's leave that to the people in our districts and our States, and let's proudly vote against this amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Are there others who wish to speak in support of the amendment? Others who wish to speak --
Yes, the Gentlelady from Louisiana.

MS. BOWEN: I just wanted -- Gwen Bowen, Louisiana -- I just wanted to make one thing clear. I understood our fellow Delegate who was opposed to this said that this would eliminate anyone who is, or ever has been, a lobbyist. And that's not what this says. This says, "if you are a paid lobbyist," not "if you have been." I just want to make that clear.

And another thing that seemed to be conflicting, this would exempt nonprofits, such as Right to Life, exempt the NRA lobbyist. So, actually, it's just -- you know, there's -- it's -the grassroots people would actually not be -- you know, they would be exempt from this.

And there's a lot of lobbyists on this Committee right now. And, you know, we have media watching. And so, we have an opportunity to say the Republican Party is the grassroots Party, and it's the grassroots people that's going to make the decisions for the rules, and not the lobbyist, the paid lobbyist.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Chair recognizes

Mrs. DeMonte.
MS. DeMONTE: Demetra DeMonte, National
Committeewoman for Illinois.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. I
have to say, when \(I\) first heard about this
amendment, \(I\) thought it might be a good deal -- a good idea. Let's face it, lobbyists at -- in some circles, it's not exactly the nicest term. But, after reflection, \(I\) started thinking, okay, if we start with lobbyists, where do we go from there? Do we go to lawyers, do we go to consultants, political operators, campaign managers, even elected officials?

So, it is now my belief that this amended -- amendment, although well intended -- and I do think it is well intended -- is not practical. And I think it's going to open up a Pandora's box.

So, therefore, \(I\) respectfully ask you in joining me in voting no on this amendment.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mrs.
DeMonte.
Are there others who wish to speak in
support? Support?
Mr. Yue.
MR. YUE: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Actually, this is a philosophical debate.
Do we want limited government, more spending, and
we want small government -- or, we want big
government, and also we want lobbyists to dictate
and curry favors for the big industry at a
disadvantage of small business? We have conflict of
interest here. If our goal is reduce size of
government and government spending, and we are --
meanwhile you have paid lobbyists. They are paid to
lobbying for a third party for profit and for
favorable regulations. That is crony capitalism.
Either we believe in small government or we
shouldn't be in this business as a Party. This is a
political party, after all. And do we want politics
as usual? of course not.
Donald Trump's message, how he got where he is Donald Trump's message, how he got where he is
today.
            So, I am supporting this measure.
            Thank you.
            CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Yue.
    Does the gentleman rise in support or in
opposition?
    VOICE: In opposition, Madam Chair.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. And let
me just say at this junction, I apologize that I
don't know all of your names and all of your States,
but if you look at how small the type print is,
you'll understand why I can't always see where
you're from.
    So, this Gentleman is recognized. If you
could give us your name and State, please.
    MR. WILLETTE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
    Alex Willette, from the State of Maine.
    It was my honor to serve as the Assistant
House Republican Leader in the Maine Legislature.
And in Maine, we passed some very great reforms
limiting the impact of lobbying on the Maine
Legislature. But, in doing that, Maine has some
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great laws involving registration of lobbyists.
But, some other States don't. And my concern with
this amendment is that it would create an unfair
patchwork of different definitions of lobbyists
throughout the different States. So, where someone
may be able to serve on the RNC in the State of
California or Colorado, would not be able to because
they have to register as a lobbyist in Maine. I
think it's -- it should be up to the individual
States, when electing their National Committee
folks, to make that decision whether they want a
registered lobbyist or not.
And so, I oppose this amendment.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
All right. Are there those who wish to
speak in support?
Mr. Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: We have seen, over a long
period of time, a process by which power in our
Party has been centralized. The trend of what we
have voted today has been to defeat efforts to
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decentralize and to pass efforts to centralize.
There is a real problem with lobbyists, as described
in the resolution, who benefit from their membership
on the Republican National Committee and make their
living, sometimes really good livings, by lobbying,
and the influence that they have as part of our
National Committee. Such people tend to favor
centralizing power, because, if you're a lobbyist,
all you've got to do is lobby the person who has the
power. It's a lot harder to get the Committee to
pass something if you've got to convince everybody
at the grassroots. And it's a problem that needs to
be solved.

And I would like to run a little
experiment. The words are, "A person who is
registered with any government entity as a paid
lobbyist for an entity other than a nonprofit
organization or who is employed by an entity whose
Primary purpose is providing lobbying services to
others." I would like to ask for a show of hands.
How many people on this Committee or in this room
are, in fact, registered lobbyists with a government
entity?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Blackwell, I'm sorry, but such a demonstration is not appropriate in this body.

MR. BLACKWELL: Under what grounds is it not?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, I'll refer to
the --

MR. BLACKWELL: Cannot a speaker make a request?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I will refer to the parliamentarians, who just so advised me. They advise me that, under Robert's, that is designated a straw poll and is therefore inappropriate for this body. I'm sorry, sir.

MR. BLACKWELL: Gee, it would have been fun.

Thank you.
[Laughter and applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm sure it would have been. However, if I start bending Robert's for one, we open the floodgates, and I just can't do
that.
The Chair recognizes Ms. Hudson, and then we're just going to back and forth between these microphones until everyone who's had a chance to speak gets their opportunity.

MS. HUDSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Susie Hudson, from Vermont.
I rise in opposition to this amendment, for the reason that -- it's been stated that this amendment empowers the grassroots. But, by telling them who they can or cannot vote for, how exactly are we empowering them? We're actually taking away a candidate that they can consider voting for.

And so, I would encourage you to vote against this amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Duprey.
MR. DUPREY: Steve Duprey, from New Hampshire.

Some of these points have been made before, but let's start with the basic one. We are elected by our States. In New Hampshire, there are 550 people who get to vote. We're home to Sturm

Ruger. We're home to Sig. We're home to a lot of gun manufacturers. Are we going to say that, because somebody works in the Government Relations Department in the State capital in New Hampshire, they're ineligible to serve? You know, some States have considered that. Virginia has a law. I believe Indiana does. But, that doesn't mean we, here, should impose that on everyone else.

It's also important to keep in mind that, in some States, if you are an employee in a firm -let's say it's a law firm, and there's one lobbyist who's a lobbyist, and you're a trusts and estates lawyer -- you're deemed a lobbyist because you're a member of the firm, and you'd be disqualified.

I also want to think about the fallacy of saying we're solving this problem with a not-forprofit exemption. Under this rule, someone who is a registered lobbyist for Planned Parenthood, who many of you would find not, perhaps, a good fit on this Committee, could run for office, but somebody who's a lobbyist in the State capital for Sig or Sturm Ruger could not. It's manifestly unfair.

The other thing to keep in mind is that, if we are going to start accusing people who are engaged in the honorable profession of lobbying of being ineligible, we should look at the pernicious influence of people who do business with our
Committee, vendors or people who are paid by some of
our entities, like the Senatorial Committee, the
NRCC, the RNCC, the Governors' Association,
Republicans Overseas. There are members here who
have had contracts with them, and vendors. And
that's the slope -- that's -- would be, arguably to
some, much more offensive than being a lobbyist.
    I urge everyone to vote no on this
amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who rises in support?
    MR. ASH: Madam Chairman?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Ash.
    MR. ASH: Bruce Ash, from Arizona.
    I speak in support, but I would like to
offer an amendment for consideration.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That is in order.

MR. ASH: And, if I could, I want to go
with the microphone over -- because my eyes are so
bad, I can't see this --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Please. We want
you to --
    MR. ASH: -- unless I'm --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- be able to see
what you'd like to do.

MR. ASH: Okay.
What I propose is, where it says "providing lobbying services to other," and then where it says "shall be ineligible to serve as a member of the Republican National Committee or as a proxy for any member of the Republican National Committee," that that be struck and simply say -and don't put anything up just yet -- but, my concept is just to provide disclosure. Okay? A simple disclosure statement, which is not unusual --

VOICE: [Inaudible.]
MR. ASH: Okay. Well, that's great -which is not unusual for almost any organization that many of us belong to back in our respective
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communities. I just --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. Mr. Ash, I'm
going to ask you to come to the Counsel's table --
MR. ASH: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- and work out the
specific language while we allow others who have
already been standing in line for quite some time,
some of them, to be able to express their opinions.
And then, when you have that drafted, we'll come
back to your motion.
MR. ASH: I would just ask that we not
call for the previous question and get cut off in
the meantime. I will go as fast as I can.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The
Chair would ask individuals not to move for previous
question until Mr. Ash has had an opportunity to
present his amendment.
The Chair will recognize Mrs. Davidson,
from Ohio.
MS. DAVIDSON: Jo Ann Davidson, from the
State of Ohio.
You know, earlier in this week, at the

```
```

Republican National Committee, we adopted a
resolution. And that resolution stated what I think
many of us believe very strongly, and -- that
Federal regulations on businesses and other entities
are hurting our economy. And we felt that that was
unfair.
Now, if you are not permitting people to serve on the Republican National Committee that maybe have represented some of these interests, like the National Federation of Independents or a Chamber of Commerce, where the local businesses depend upon them to represent them, obviously, or the farmers or our agriculture community to testify why those regulations are not needed and try to protect themselves so that they can continue to profit and provide the jobs and give the strong economy that we want. I'm not quite sure what we're trying to do. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mrs. Davidson.
Is there anybody else who would like to speak in support?
All right, the Lady over here, you've

```
```

already spoken once, and so we need to allow
everyone else an opportunity to speak before we can
give you a second opportunity to speak.
Mr. Yue, have you already spoken to this
particular amendment?
MR. YUE: Yes. But, this --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, you have.
MR. YUE: -- is based on personal
privilege.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And what is your
point of personal privilege?
MR. YUE: The National Committeeman New
Hampshire mentioned somebody could be paid, got a
contract --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Excuse me, sir,
this is not a point of personal privilege.
MR. YUE: No -- may I?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No. I'm sorry.
It's not a --
MR. YUE: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- point of
personal --

```

MR. YUE: All right.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- privilege. If
you have a point of personal privilege, you may bring it, but you cannot use a point of personal privilege to make arguments.

All right. We'll recognize the Lady standing at this microphone.

MS. THOMAS: Madam Chairman, Pat Thomas, from Missouri.

I'd like everyone of my colleagues -- and thank you for serving on this Committee -- to realize that, Why are we differentiating between for-profit and not-for-profit? We've had many people here today talk about money grabs and big government and all these issues. Many not-forprofits take much more administrative dollars from our tax dollars, and, to many of us, we would actually say they misuse them to a larger degree.

So, for that reason, I would urge you to vote no on this amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who has not spoken
```

previously who rises to speak in support?
You -- the Gentleman here.
MR. SHORT: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Guy Short, from Colorado.
First, I want to thank you for allowing
this debate to happen.
And I'd like to also thank Mr. Evans, from
Georgia, for his graciousness of withdrawing his
amendment and allowing this debate to happen.
I have a question. I would love to hear
from perhaps some of those folks who oppose this or
maybe -- I know there are some folks on the
campaign, the Gentleman from Massachusetts, I think
-- I would love to hear what our presumptive nominee
Donald Trump's position on this is. I've heard him
speak about lobbyists more than I can count. And I
tend to agree. I would love to hear -- if anybody
here knows what his position would be on this
resolution or this rule, I would love to hear it.
Thank you, Madam Chairman.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. I am
not certain that it is in order to have someone else

```
speak for someone who is not a member of the Committee and is not present. If anyone wants to cross that bridge, I guess we'll try it when we get there.

The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Nevada.

MR. ROSS: Thank you, Madam Chair. Where on earth do I begin? I'm a constable in Nevada. I have to testify in front of the Legislature on legislation that affects constables. I represent all of the rural constables in southern Nevada. I have to register as a lobbyist to speak on bills that affect my own agency. So -- and I do get paid. Am I a paid lobbyist? Well, they say, well, no, it's not for nonprofits. Governments don't count. Well, I shoved through legislation last year that made constables of Nevada competitive. I get a paid a token salary, about 1700 bucks a year, and then I get to retain the profits from my office, which are not bad, because I went out and then -- I went into a township of a Democratic constable, beat him over

1 the head, and stole \(\$ 150,000\) a year worth of
business from him, and now I'm -- trust me, I'm
profitmaking.

Nonpaid, nonprofit paid, paid lobbyists, I could drive a truck through this stuff. It's so vague, it makes no sense at all.

Now, don't get me wrong. I mean, the last 3 days, I've been doing nothing but -- to everybody from the media in here badmouthing the consultant industrial complex. Okay? I understand the problem. But, this is just like what we were trying to do with, you know, throwing out Rule 12. You know, it's a crude instrument, it doesn't address the problems, and it -- don't even get me started on where this is with State rights. You know, if somebody's a lobbyist and the -- their State Party wants to elect them, whose business is it?

Now, I -- it's off the hook, it's outrageous, it's, I'm sure, well intentioned. You know, this -- but, you know, what's a nonprofit? For crying out -- hey, you know what? The president of Common Core pays more in income taxes than \(I\) take
home. So, let's -- you know, again, what does even
nonprofit mean? It's over the top.
    I urge everyone to vote no.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. I see
that there are two more people at the microphones
who have not yet spoken. I'd like to give them the
opportunity to speak, and then we will return to Mr .
Ash's amendment, if there are no objections.
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Wonderful.
    I'd like to recognize this Lady. I'm not
sure what State from -- you're from, but you're
about to tell me.
    MS. FRISBIE: I'm Nell Frisbie, from
Mississippi, and have been a worker in the
Republican Party for my youth. And you can tell I'm
not youth anymore.
[Laughter.]
MS. FRISBIE: But, my -- have always felt that we start at the grassroots. I believe in the grassroots. And, when we elect our people, we start in our county. And I'm a member of the Hancock

County Republican Executive Committee. We go to our State Convention. We elect our representatives to go the state. That is about as grassroot as you can get. We go to our State, and we represent them. And, before -- as a Delegate to the State Convention, I could ask my county who do they want to support for our National Committeeman and our National Committeewoman, as well as the other elected people that we do.

So, I think it is grassroots. I think it's States' rights. And I think that's where it ought to stay.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
The Chair recognizes the Gentleman at this back microphone.

MR. FORSTON: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Richard Forston, from the State of Delaware.

Among other things, I am the Party attorney in Delaware, and, as a result, I work with our legislators quite a bit in the General Assembly.
```

    And so, I'm very familiar with the legislative
    process. And one thing that I'll say troubles me a
little bit about the way the RNC conducts its
business -- this Rules Committee meets once every 4
years, we come together, people have ideas, but, a
lot of times, the legislative process is
strengthened by reflection, collaboration, and
looking at things more carefully. Because one of
the things we all have to avoid is the law of
unintended consequences. And, for example, in
Delaware, you're a lobbyist if you go down to the
General Assembly -- you work for a company, and your
company -- your boss says to you, "I need you to go
down and testify about this bill." Congratulations.
You're paid. You're speaking on behalf of
legislation. In theory, you have to register as a
lobbyist. If a client of mine asks me to go down to
the General Assembly, I'm a lawyer, but suddenly
I've got to register as a lobbyist, even though I
might do it for one client with -- once every 2 or 3
years.
And we heard the Gentleman from Maine,

```
they have a different definition. And I don't know what the definition or requirements are in West Virginia or Nevada. They're a patchwork. But, people may get caught in this innocently enough, and suddenly they are -- they're off the RNC.

More importantly, though, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. And I don't wonder if this rule isn't a solution in search of a problem. Nobody has pointed out to me any problems that the RNC has had. Nobody has pointed out to me any problem that a State has had in electing its members of the RNC. And, I think, as long as the States know who they're electing, they're free to send to the RNC whoever they want.

So, I oppose this amendment, on a lot of grounds, not the least of which is that, in a 1-hour or half-hour debate that's being held with no prior warning, I don't think we should be doing something like this, because \(I\) think it could come back to bite us.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Ash for purposes of his amendment.

MR. ASH: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Bruce Ash, from Arizona.
Sorry about the dustup trying to get this put together.

On page 3, line 17, after the word -- or
after the words "services to others," we would delete everything after that and add -- and hopefully this is going up on the board -- "and is elected to the Republican National Committee shall disclose to the Secretary of the Republican National
Committee his or her status as a lobbyist in a
manner to be established by the Secretary."
    While it might be a great grassroots idea
    --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Just a moment, Mr.
Ash. You've made a motion.
    MR. ASH: Oh. Sorry. Sorry.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We need a second.
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a second.

MR. ASH: Okay, thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. Now, I'd
like to let the staff catch up first, so that everybody is not looking at the screen instead of listening to you. So, let's let them catch up. MR. ASH: Thank you.
[Pause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Mr. Ash, is that -- let's see -- okay, now they're fixing it. Let's give them just a moment.
[Pause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Ash, if you'd like to proceed.
MR. ASH: All right. Thank you very much, Madam Secretary.

There have been some wonderful arguments for both sides on this issue. And I admire the Delegates who filed this amendment, to begin with. We may not get to the place that you want to be, and perhaps a lot of people want to be, with respect to how this is going to be handled. But, one thing I
think all of us well know from other volunteer work
we do and other paid work we do is that we have to
disclose other organizations that we might do work
for, other conflicts of interest that we may
potentially have. We're used to disclosure. And,
although not a lawyer, \(I\) know that disclosure is a
very important thing when trying to avoid
difficulties in various matters that we have public
discourse with.
    This idea, which would come after
"services to other and is elected to the Republican
National Committee shall disclose to the Secretary
of the Republican National Committee his or her
status as a lobbyist in a manner to be established
by the Secretary." I think this is a fairly
straightforward manner. We have a great Counsel's
Office. I'm sure that they would work with the
Secretary of the RNC in order to put this together.
    We would keep a file at the RNC, and it would be
available for public access to members, perhaps, at
-- and this would all be at the discretion of the
Secretary, of course.

But, the idea would be, is that we would begin disclosure process. That doesn't mean that anybody's disqualified, that doesn't mean that we're taking anybody's ability to earn money, and it doesn't mean that we don't want them to be advocating for either issues, candidates, or any other political means. But, it is a start with disclosure.

And I urge consideration and adoption. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Ash. Is there someone who would like to speak in opposition?

The Gentleman here.
MR. PEARCE: Steve Pearce, New Mexico. I mostly want to speak to the one phrase that stands now and is in the original amendment, too, and that is the bias in favor of nonprofits. Now, if the attempt is to stop people from increasing the size of the Federal budget, which has been the dominant commitment -- or dominant comment, then \(I\) think that understanding that the lobbyists who approach our office in Congress, my office, many
times are nonprofits, and they never have asked for
us to decrease the budget, because many times they
are, in fact, the beneficiaries of money that is
coming through the budget. So, this bias that
suddenly nonprofits are more holy than anyone else
is something that I think that we would like to
closely look at.
    And then, again, the underlying -- the
comments about "all lobbyists are bad." Some
lobbyists are extraordinarily good and very
knowledgeable. I do not -- I would not want to
approach the idea of nuclear arms proliferation
without a paid lobbyist. My deal is, you tell me
both sides of the argument. So, again, it's this
idea that we've got to treat lobbyists separate.
Self-governance requires that we understand who is
involved in the self-governance, and clear them out
if they're no good. Self-governance requires that
we have more liberty and more freedom, not choking
ourself down with rules.
    So, with my -- with all respect to the
sponsor of the amendment, I would urge no on both
```

the amendment to the amendment and the underlying
amendment.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
support of the amendment to the amendment? In
support of the amendment to the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who
would like to speak in opposition?
Gentleman from West Virginia.
MR. STUART: Mike Stuart, West Virginia.
I stand in opposition to the amendment. I
guess I say, To what point is this registration or
declaration with the RNC? I go back to the point
that every State should have the right to determine
who its representatives are to the RNC. If West
Virginia wants to elect three coalminers or three
lobbyists or three insurance salesmen, I say that's
the right of West Virginia. And who is the RNC to
determine that?
And so, I say let's leave this to the

```

States. Let's let the States determine who their representatives are. And I oppose the amendment, and I oppose the motion.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor of the amendment to the amendment?

VOICE: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Lady from Minnesota.

MS. PUGH: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Cindy Pugh, from Minnesota.
I am very supportive of this amendment.
In fact, I'm very grateful for it. I think that it definitely enhances transparency. I think that all of our constituency and Americans appreciate transparency. Perception, as all know, becomes people's reality. And I do believe that it would be right for this body to pass this amendment to the amendment. I'm hopeful for support for the amendment, as well. But, I do believe that this would be supportive of the will of the people. And I'm grateful.

So, thank you very much, to Committeeman Ash.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone else who would like to speak in opposition?

The Lady at the microphone over here. MS. SERRANO-GLASSNER: Thank you.

Christine Serrano-Glassner, from New Jersey.

What I don't understand, and what's not clear in the new amendment to the amendment, is, What will be done eventually with this Scarlet Letter file of people that have had to disclose? And, without that clarification here, I don't see why people would have to disclose. I mean, they should know, eventually, what's going to be done with that information and how it's going to be used against them.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the amendment to the amendment? In favor?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
who's like to speak in opposition to the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. Evans.
MR. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
So, my niece goes in for -- to see her doctor, and one of the questions on the questionnaire is whether there is a firearm owned in the house. Anybody familiar with this regulation, where it's now collected? The bottom line is, it's all about this created collection of disclosured information under the rubric that somehow we have a reason to know.

Now, I personally have complete confidence in each of the 50 States, five territories, and the District of Columbia to fully vet their Committeeman, their Committeewoman, and their Chair, find out every piece of information, whether they're a lobbyist or not. And if they make the decision that they want to have a lobbyist, then more power to them, because that -- there are certain States
that actually would benefit from having a
Committeeman or a Chair or a Committeewoman who is a
lobbyist. But, there's no reason why we should be
the ones that collect all of this information, put
it in a secret file, be able to access it later, for
whatever purpose. It starts to eliminate the
distinction between us and them.
    And so, I oppose the amendment to the
amendment, because I think there comes a point where
we actually have to trust our fellow colleagues in
the other States to pick the people that represent
them best, not who we would want them to pick.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    The Chair would like to recognize anyone
who is still in support of the amendment to the
amendment. Would anyone like to speak in support of
the amendment to the amendment?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Would anyone like
to speak in opposition to the amendment to the
amendment?
    The Lady at this microphone right here.

MS. SCHWALBACH: Thank you, Madam Chair. My name is Judi Schwalbach, and I'm from Michigan.

In Michigan, we elect our RNC person through the grassroots effort. We do -- as Nell said, we elect our precinct Delegates, and then they elect, and then they elect, and eventually it comes down to our Convention. And that person is elected by the people.

Now, I take great exception to the fact that, as a body, we may be saying to Mississippi that their representative that they've asked to have sit on the RNC be eliminated strictly because of his profession. Now, I would expect that the RNC members would take into consideration if anybody is lobbying them. And we know the difference. We know when we're having some smoke blown where it's not supposed to be.
So, it is up to us, as individuals on the RNC, to understand the difference and stand up for the rights of the people, but not for this body to eliminate the rights of the people to elect their
```

people.

```

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who would like to speak on the amendment to the amendment?

MR. OSE: Madam Chairman?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. OSE: Doug Ose, the People's Republic of California.
[Laughter.]
MR. OSE: I have interests in a number of States, and I'm trying to figure out, under the proposed amendment and the underlying amendment, in which of those States am I going to be judged eligible or ineligible. Those of you who are in business today have operated, during the past 7 or 8 years, whether purposefully or otherwise, as nonprofit corporations. It's one of the things we're here to try to change. But, I question the advisability of moving forward, asking me to pick between the States that \(I\) wish to be ruled eligible under, or my representatives. And I certainly don't
want to give the government or any pseudo-government organization any of my private information that I so zealously guard in the first place.

So, I would speak -- I am speaking against the amendment that's on the screen, as well as the underlying amendment.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
The Chair would recognize the Gentlelady from New Mexico.

MS. TRIPP: Rosie Tripp, from New Mexico.
Madam Chairman, I call for the question on the amendment to the amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We've heard -- I assume you meant "previous question."

MS. TRIPP: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. All those in favor of closing debate on the amendment to the amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
We'll now move to consideration of the
amendment to the amendment.
All those in favor of including the
information that you currently see in green on your
screen -- if you are in favor of adding that
language, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
We'll now move to a vote on the main
motion. If we can get it back up on the screen. Do we have other people who would like to be heard on the main motion?

VOICE: For the purpose of an amendment to the amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We can't do --
amend -- wait, yes, you can. That's still -- I was thinking it was an amendment to the amendment to the amendment. So, I apologize.

VOICE: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, the Gentleman
is recognized for the purpose of an amendment to the amendment.

MR. JONES: Gary Jones, from Oklahoma.
And what I propose is deleting the
language that says "shall be ineligible to serve as a member of the Republican National Committee or as a proxy as a member of the National Committee" and insert the language that is "and is elected to the Republican National Committee shall disclose such to the Secretary for the Republican National Committee his or her status as a lobbyist in the manner that is established to the Secretary." It basically -well, I move to adopt that.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a motion.
Is there a second? Is there a second?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Dies for lack of a second.

To what point does the Gentleman rise?
MR. HUNT: Madam Chair, this is Graham
Hunt, from Washington State.
    And I would like to move to amend the
document as we see now to further define and clarify
the paid lobbyist as that as which is defined by a
lobbyist for the FEC.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Have
you submitted this amendment? Do you have language
that we can put up on the board?
    MR. HUNT: I have not. I can run down
there.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: If you would do
that, I would appreciate it.
    MR. HUNT: Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who wishes to make an amendment to the
amendment?
    VOICE: Request for information, Madam
Chair.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
    VOICE: With an active amendment on the
floor, is it out of order for me to move the
previous question on the Primary amendment?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, he did not have an actual motion. It has not been moved and seconded, so there is not a motion on the floor. So, previous question would be in order.

VOICE: Madam Chair, I move the previous question.

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded that we move to previous question.

All those in favor of closing debate on Amendment 1.1, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed -
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- nay, all right.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
We will now move directly to a vote on
Amendment 1.1. All those in favor of adopting
Amendment 1.1, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, please say nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
All right. I'm going to --
VOICE: Madam Chair, a point of personal privilege.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
VOICE: I rise to raise a question of privileging affecting the assembly.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
VOICE: I cannot --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Name and State, please.

MR. ROSS: Jordan Ross, Nevada.
I cannot be the only person in this room needing a powder-room break.
[Laughter.]
MR. ROSS: I ask for a 10 -minute recess. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The -before you say 10 -minute recess, let me suggest this. All right? We're going to continue tonight
after this, because of the time that we lost this
morning, which is none of your faults, and I'm sorry
that we have to do this, but we are nowhere close to
completing our task to be done before 5:00 a.m. on
Saturday morning.

So, here's my suggestion. We do have the sandwiches and the other items that were available that we will now call dinner. It will be an early dinner. But, I think it would be appropriate for us to take a 30 -minute recess for you to be able to go and get your food. You can bring it back in here, I believe -- or, we -- there's no restrictions on bringing it back. We trust you to clean up after yourself.

VOICE: One question. I have a point of information that I'd like to ask.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes.
VOICE: Will -- can Minority Reports be submitted in advance of Monday?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes. Minority reports will be required -- excuse me. Yes, the only opening for Minority Reports to be submitted to
this body, under the current RNC rules, is 1 hour -within 1 hour after we have completed our final votes -- not on Monday, but when we have completed our work -- it is Monday? I apologize. That's why we have so many people up here to help me. There will be a 1-hour window after we vote on Monday. There will not be an opportunity to presubmit them. Correct, Mr. Phillippe? It's -- it -- because the Minority Reports are not possible to be in order until we've actually voted to pass the package as the permanent committee.

All right.
MS. BOWEN: Point of information, Madam Chairman.

Gwen Bowen.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes.
MS. BOWEN: And you might have said this, but I didn't understand --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay.
MS. BOWEN: -- if you said it. We can submit Minority Reports before Monday? Is that -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, ma'am.

MS. BOWEN: -- correct? Okay. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, ma'am. They -MS. BOWEN: I didn't -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- will not be in order --

MS. BOWEN: Will not be -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- until we have taken our final vote on Monday. And then you will have 1 hour as the opening in which to submit a Minority Report.

MS. BOWEN: Thank you, Mrs. Chairman. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. One other thing I've been asked to announce is, the staff is continuing to make amendments -- or to accept amendments to any of the rules from this point forward. So, if you have an amendment that you know you're going to want to make, I would encourage you to come up -- you can see how well it's gone on the ones who have been presubmitted. And so, we're going to try to continue to be able to do that.

The Lady from Hawaii.

MS. HELLREICH: Madam Chairman, just a point of information. Many of the RNC members have invited guests here for dinner tonight at the banquet, and they actually have paid and bought tickets to those particular events. I don't know if there's any consideration for that. But, I'm -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm -MS. HELLREICH: -- I'm just -- I don't know --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm in the same boat as you -MS. HELLREICH: Yeah. Yeah. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- Mrs. Hellreich.
    And I --

MS. HELLREICH: I have invited guests who have spent money on dinner, so I feel a little -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, hopefully -MS. HELLREICH: -- bad about it. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- they can still attend and tell you what a wonderful time was had -MS. HELLREICH: Well, they're -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- by all.

MS. HELLREICH: No, they're here in this meeting. They're here in this meeting.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Oh, they're here in
this meeting. I'm sorry. We are going to have to continue our work. And --

MS. HELLREICH: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- I would
encourage all of the members to stay and complete your work. Any guests, you'll have to make that call on your own.

All right. Are there any other questions?
Hearing --
MS. GROSSMAN: I --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes.
MS. GROSSMAN: Eileen Grossman, from Rhode Island.

I am a guest -- even though I'm on the Rules Committee, a guest of Steve Frias, and I did pay to go to this event tonight. So, I am leaving.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And that is your choice to make.

MS. GROSSMAN: I just --
    stand in recess for 30 minutes.
    [Recess.]

> E V E N I N G S E S S I O N
[5:35 p.m.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, if I could get you, those of you who are still standing, to take your seats.

We are going to pick up where we left off, with the amendments that had been set aside to be taken up again after we'd finished Rules 1 through 12.

A number of you have asked me how late we're going to stay. And -- excuse me? Yeah, we're -- here's what I'm going to suggest, ladies and gentlemen. We aren't in a position to leave anytime really soon. We've got so much more to do. So, I'm going to make this suggestion. We want to hear from everybody. We want all of you to feel like you've had a chance to be heard. But, if someone has already made the point that you wanted to make, I hope that you'll decide that you don't need to make it, too. And not that I'm saying that we've had a lot of that. I'm just saying, I think we need to start moving a little bit faster, if we can. Now, if
there's an issue that comes up, where there's a lot
of passionate feeling that we need to do some
additional debate, we'll do that. But, let's see if
we can't knock some of these off tonight so that we
don't have such a long day tomorrow.

All right. We are now going to take up
Amendment 3.2 -- Amendment 3.2, which impacts Rule
3 (a).

We need quiet, folks. Thank you. Rule 3.2, which affects Rule number 3(a) has been submitted by Mr. Jones, of Oklahoma, who is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Gary Jones, from Oklahoma.
And for the -- to help preserve time, I ask to withdraw my amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I bet you'll get a standing ovation for that.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We'll move on to Rule 4.1 -- Rule 4.1 , which impacts Rule 4(d). Does anyone see Mr. Ash in the room? This is
his amendment. Oh, here he is. Rule -- Amendment 4.1, your amendment on Rule 4(d). We'll give him just a moment.

MR. ASH: Madam Chairman, thank you very much.

That amendment is withdrawn at this time. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Another ovation. [Applause.] CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. I'm told I'm supposed to ask for unanimous consent on withdrawals. I assume you all agree with those last two.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Okay. Amendment number 4.2, which also deals with Rule \(4(c)\). Again, Mr. Ash?

MR. ASH: That would be withdrawn at this time, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there any objection?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Hearing none, it is
withdrawn.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We are rolling.
All right. Amendment number 5.7, which impacts Rule 5(c). That has been introduced by Mr. Semanko, of Idaho.

Mr. Semanko, you are recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. SEMANKO: Thank you, Madam Chair.
My proposed amendment would add language on line 19, pages 8 and 9, of Rule 5(c), where the Chairman appoints the General Counsel. Language would be added to state that, "The General Counsel shall render objective, impartial, professional written legal advice to officers, chairmen of committees, and members of the Republican National Committee, upon their request, regarding these rules. Parliamentary procedure is applicable to the Republican National Committee, its committees, and the Republican National Convention, and other applicable laws. The General Counsel shall supervise and direct the activities of the Legal

Counsel's Office. In addition, the General Counsel shall perform any other legal activities, as directed by the Chairman." It also revises the existing paragraph to make clear that the Chairman of the Republican Finance Committee shall serve at the will of the Chairman," which is current, and that "the General Counsel may only be removed by a majority vote of the Republican National Committee." That's my motion.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a motion. Is there a second? VOICE: Second. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I've heard a second. Mr. Semanko, would you like to address the merits of your proposal? MR. SEMANKO: Yes, Madam Chair, this comes during the time \(I\) was fortunate enough to be General Counsel, in 2010 and 2011. And, of course, General Counsel probably means different things to different people. The rules simply provide that the Chairman will appoint a General Counsel for the Republican

National Committee who will also be counsel to the various committees and subcommittees of the Republican National Committee.

Not a lot of folks understand that this is not the personal attorney for the Chairman. Sometimes it feels like that, because the Chairman appoints that person and that person serves, under the current rule, at the will of the Chairman.

But, a General Counsel is the chief attorney for a company or an entity or an organization, for the entire body, for the Republican National Committee -- not just for the CEO or the Chairman, but for the entire body. And I don't think there's any disagreement about that. What this amendment would do is simply clarify what some of those responsibilities are, number one, to provide the objective, impartial, professional, written legal advice to the officers, the Chairmen of the Committees, the members of the National Committee, upon their request, regarding the applicability of these rules, not just to the Chairman. And I think that's what most National
```

Committee General Counsel do. Supervising the
direct activities of the Legal Counsel's Office,
working with John and his staff -- it's a great
privilege to have done that -- and also performing
whatever legal activities are requested by the
Chairman.
And then, finally -- and I think this is
really important -- the Treasurer, the Secretary,
the Chairman, the Co-Chairman, all of those elected
officials, officers of the Party, can only be
removed by a two-thirds vote. The General Counsel,
to my way of thinking, is the highest-ranking
appointed officer and, a lot of times, by default,
is the only one that can run anything, because
they're not up for election. And there's no
protection for that. It's at the will of the
Chairman.
So, I'm simply suggesting that removal
should be by a majority -- not two-thirds, like the
elected officers, but by a majority of the RNC.
Thank you, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.

```

Is there someone who wishes to be recognized in opposition?

The Lady from California.
MS. DHILLON: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
I am a member of this esteemed profession
of the law. And I use "esteemed" farcically,
because I know that people don't have a high respect for our profession. But, actually, I think this amendment is not necessary, because we are a heavily regulated profession. So, all of the additional text in the second paragraph there regarding the duties of the General Counsel are all obligations that any lawyer is already under in any attorneyclient relationship to objectively serve their client, their client being the Republican National Committee. So, being superfluous, I'm opposed to it, because it's bureaucratic and adds regulations that are not necessary.

Secondly, it's my learned colleague's suggestion, and analogy to a corporate general counsel, I think, is very instructive. A corporate general counsel is not answerable to a vote of the
shareholders of the corporation. A corporate
general counsel is generally answerable to a very
small number of people, or sometimes just the
chairman of the corporation, because it is not
practical to have that type of a attorney-client
professional relationship be regulated by a popular
vote, nor would it be seemly for a General Counsel
to be lobbying for his job to the members of the --
this larger body of their Republican National
Committee, where the Chairman, who is the person who
has to receive his advice and implement the advice
given by the General Counsel, is really the
decisionmaker in that regard. And I just think that
it's setting up a whole can of worms to have this
type of a broadbased amendment. And I think it is a
solution without a problem.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you,
    Is there anyone else who wishes to speak
in support of the amendment? Anyone who wishes to
speak in support of the amendment?
    [No response.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition? All the lawyers are coming to line up.

MR. MOORE: Madam Chair, Matt Moore, from South Carolina.

I'd point out that it already takes a twothirds vote to remove the Chair of the Committee. And therefore, the General Counsel serves at the pleasure of the Chair, so therefore, there is a check in that already. So, that -- I believe this amendment to be unnecessary.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who would like to speak in support?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, Mr. Feaman, I believe you are in opposition.

MR. FEAMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Peter Feaman, the State of Florida.
I rise in opposition, mostly because I sense an undertone or a premise with this motion and
with a lot of the other proposed amendments that we've heard today, that, in this motion particularly, there seems to be a premise that the General Counsel has somehow not been forming -performing his duties in the way he should. And there's been no hint of that, at least in the 4 years that I've seen John Ryder as our General Counsel.

As with a lot of these other amendments that we've seen, Madam Chair, there is an underlying premise, which, in my experience at the RNC, I don't accept, and my observations have been just the opposite. For example, the RNC is a grassroots organization. The RNC performance by our Chair in the last 4 years has been exemporily -- has been pretty good.
[Laughter.]
MR. FEAMAN: So, as with the other motions of similar faulty premises, I also will oppose this motion.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. That
was pretty good.
All right. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in support?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone else who
```

wishes to speak in opposition?

```

Mr. Evans.
MR. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
In my spare time, I have written eight books on lawyers law, published three bestsellers. They deal exclusively with the legal obligations of attorneys. And I want to echo the comments of my learned colleague from California, who was dead-on, in two very important respects.

The first change that is proposed there is actually inconsistent with existing law in every State in the country, which is, contrary to what it says, lawyers -- there's a thing called -- I'm not going to bore you, don't worry -- but, it's called the entity role, which is that a lawyer for an entity represents the entity, not the Chair, not the shareholders, et cetera. And those obligations are

1 far greater than that would be owed to any 2 individual. So, that first sentence is just 3 inaccurate as a statement of law. And I'm not sure 4 how that would work, because it would constitute a 5 bar grievance in all 50 States and the five territories and the District of Columbia.

The second paragraph actually is a lower standard than is imposed on lawyers under the bar roles. So, if we were to adopt this, we would actually be saying that we expect less of our Counsel than is what is already imposed under the bar roles. And so, you would literally be lowering the standard, saying, "John Ryder has been acting at too high a level. We need to lower the bar." Now, I'm not going to say anything about the University of Tennessee or football, I promise, but lowering the bar is not the way to go.

And so, in this context, \(I\) urge all of my colleagues to vote no. Vote no because, one, it is in direct conflict with existing law, and, number two, because it lowers the threshold of what the obligation would already be.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. The Chair recognizes the Gentlewoman from
```

Vermont.

```

MS. HUDSON: Thank you.
Susie Hudson, from Vermont.
Madam Chair, I'd like to call the previous
question.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question is in order, so we will move to an immediate vote on closing debate.

All those in favor of closing debate on this proposal, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The motion carries.

We will now move directly to a vote on
Amendment number 5.7. All those in favor of
adoption of Amendment 5.7, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Next, we will go to Amendment number 10.7.
This is amendment that impacts Rule number
\(10(a)(3)\), and it has been submitted by the Gentleman from Idaho. Mr. Semanko, who will be recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. SEMANKO: Thank you, Madam Chair.
And if I could take a personal liberty
just to say that, with regard to my previous amendment, there was no intent to criticize anyone's performance. I have too much respect for folks that have -- are in the position that \(I\) have been in. I'm sorry that people took it that way.

With regard to \(10(a)(3)\), we're proposing, and my amendment is, to strike the word "eleven" and substitute the word "nine" after the words "composed of," to strike the word "three" and insert the word "one" after the words "Republican National Committee," to strike the sentence that reads, "The Chairman of the Republican National Committee shall appoint the Chairman of the Standing Budget
```

Committee from among the members thereof," and
substitute the following language, "The Chairman of
the Standing Budget Committee shall be elected by
its members." That's my motion.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there a second? Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Second. The motion
has been made and seconded.
Mr. Semanko, we'll let you address your
proposal.
MR. SEMANKO: Thank you, Madam Chair.
So, first thing this would do is reduce
the number of appointments to the Budget Committee
by the Chairman from three to one. The relative
strength of the folks that are elected in their
regions, those two people from each of the four
regions, is diluted because of those three
appointments. One is enough. This would,
therefore, reduce the overall number from eleven to
nine on the Committee.
The second thing this would do is -- the

```
```

Resolutions Committee is different than the Rules
Committee is different than the Budget Committee.
The Budget Committee allocates the expenditure of
tens of millions of dollars, oversight of those
monies. It is wholly appropriate, in my view, to
allow the Chairman of that Committee to be appointed
from amongst the other members of the Committee who
are performing that same solemn obligation of
safeguarding the finances and allocating the budget
of the RNC.
And that's the entirety of my motion.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Semanko.
Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
opposition? Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
opposition?
Mr. Duprey.
MR. DUPREY: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Steve Duprey, from New Hampshire. Again, this is similar to other amendments we've seen proposed. First, the Chairman -- the

```

1 ironic thing about the Republican National Committee is that the Chairman does the hardest work raising all the money we spend. Everybody on the Committee helps, but, let's face it, the Chairman is the one who makes 2 and 3 hours of calls a day, jumps on the plane, and raises all of the money. To suggest that we don't trust that person to then appoint the Chairman of the Budget Committee rather than having them elected, \(I\) think is completely inappropriate. And he should have a number of appointments on it. He's the guy who's got to raise the money. So, this amendment really is intended to dilute the authority of the Chairman, and I urge all the members to vote no.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Duprey.
Is there anyone else who would like to speak in support of the amendment? Support of the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone else who would like to speak opposed to the

Mrs. Costa.
MS. COSTA: Yes. Cindy Costa, from South Carolina.

I would be opposed to this amendment, in view of the fact that our Chairman, who raises hundreds of millions of dollars for the Republican National Committee and is very careful about the way it is expended, also should have the right to pick the people who help him, because many of these people are people that are very wealthy, that support the RNC and have friends that are very wealthy that give to the RNC. And so, if we made it just among the members, who, yes, we support the RNC and give some money, but it's not like we give, you know, hundreds of thousands of dollars, you know, individually. And so, I just think if we pass this rule, we would really hamstring our Chairman, and I think it would be a very foolish thing.

So, I would ask you all to vote against this amendment.

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition?

Mrs. Herron, from Georgia.
MS. HERRON: Linda Herron, from Georgia.
I've served on the Budget Committee for 12
years. And I've served under three different
Chairmen. I do know that the Chairman that's
appointed by the RNC Chairman spends a tremendous amount of time. The last -- or current, I suppose, Chairman is Mr. Ron Kauffman. And I know, from my perspective, as a member of the Budget Committee living in Atlanta, Georgia, I could not afford to fly up to D.C. and go through the budget and so forth and so on once a month. Okay? So, I think that the Chairman of Budget should be appointed, because it's someone that has the ability to be there or to get there.

And so, therefore, I oppose this
```

amendment.

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mrs.
Herron.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the motion?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the motion?

The Chair recognizes the Gentlelady from Texas.

MS. DASHIELL: Why, thank you, Madam Chairman.

Toni Anne Dashiell, from Texas.
And I am opposed to this. I feel that, as we look at the numbers right now, we have a total of eleven, eight of those coming from the grassroots, who were the people that are elected by the members of their region. That is -- that gives us a number of -- that's in control. The Chairman only has 27 percent of the control in that committee. And any chairman, if you've been a president -- a chairman of any organization, you have to have people that
you trust, that you can contact, that you can have dialogue with, but you don't have to have -- you should not have complete control.

Ladies and gentlemen, he does -- our Chairman, now or in the future, will never have complete control, because we are strong individuals on the RNC, and we are ones that want us to be able to have a dialogue and build trust.

I urge you to vote no on this.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the motion. Mr. Semanko.

MR. SEMANKO: Just to take a second to say this is my last amendment. I'm really glad.

And I want to tell you how much I appreciate the discussion. As I said earlier today, I really think it's important to examine our rules every once in a while. And, as Senator Lee pointed out, this issue of decentralization of power -- and I think it's been a very good debate and a good discussion. I've heard good points on both sides. I think the case is a little stronger on some of
```

these committees than on others, but I certainly can
abide by the decision. And I just want to take the
opportunity to say how much I appreciate everybody
that's participating in the debate and, again,
emphasize -- I served on the Budget Committee with
Linda. I was the elected Budget Committee member
for the West. It's not about criticizing what
anybody's doing. It's examining our institutions
and how we're organized, and challenging us to
think. And I appreciate the opportunity.
Thanks.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
The Chair believes that we have reached
the limit of number of people who would like to
comment on this matter. So, without objection,
we'll move to an immediate vote on the matter.
All those in favor of Amendment 10.7,
please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.

```

That gets us through everything that has been submitted thus far for Amendments 1 through 12.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We've got one done.
All right. Let's move on to Section 2.
As you will recall, we already decided --
we went through the numbers and decided on those
that would be set aside for subsequent
consideration.
So, there were no amendments applied to
Rule number 13.
So, we'll now go to Rule number 14. And I'm trying to see if they have my amendments ready.

I'm trying not to have to take a recess. Here they come. All right.

All right. On Rule number 14, Membership in the Convention, we have five amendments. We'll start with Amendment 14.1, which has been suggested -- or, rather, submitted by the Gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Little.

Mr. Little, would you like to make a motion?

MR. LITTLE: Yes, Madam Chairman.
This is 14. This, you can see, is -- I'd like to move the amendment that's on the -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Little.

There is a motion. Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There's -- been moved and seconded.

Mr. Little, would you like to address your amendment?

MR. LITTLE: This would increase the total Delegates to the Republican National Convention, at our next Convention, by adding one at-large Delegate for every Republican Congressman. So, each State, for however many Congressmen you have, would have an additional Delegate. This is to provide more representation in the Convention, more Delegates. And, in those districts that have a Republican Representative.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Little.

Is there anyone who would like to speak in
opposition? Is there anyone who would like to speak
in opposition?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who
would like --
    Yes, Mr. DeVito.
    MR. DeVITO: Vincent DeVito,
Massachusetts.
    I oppose this particular amendment.
Speaking for myself, our delegation is large enough.
    [Laughter.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Would it -- what a
    refreshingly honest point of view. Thank you for
    sharing it with us, Mr. DeVito.
    Is there anyone else who would like to
    speak in favor? Anyone else in favor?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
opposed who would like to speak?
    All right, we'll start with the Gentleman
        from West Virginia.

MR. STUART: Yeah, Mike Stuart, West
```

Virginia.

```

I stand opposed to the amendment. As I
hear the amendment and read the amendment, it
appears to strengthen large States, in terms of
their delegations. And so, for States like West
Virginia and Idaho and all those other great places
out there, \(I\) think this is not good for us. And so,
I'd urge some reconsideration of this and vote no.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who'd like to speak in favor? Any --
    Yes. The Lady from Louisiana.
    MS. BOWEN: Gwen Bowen, Louisiana.
    The way I see this and the intent is to do
the Republican thing, reward hard work, reward
performance. And so, I strongly support it. And
it's hard for me to imagine any Republican not
wanting to encourage and reward performance. This
is for Republican's districts -- are going to be
rewarded.
    And it's easy to make our delegation
overall numbers the same. If we could -- if we
wanted to do an amendment to it, if that was the concern of the Gentleman, was that we're too big, we could just make those that are rewarded -- we could offset it with less alternates and would have the same number of people here for our Convention. We would just be rewarding States that are out there, hardworking, to get Republican Congressional Districts. And I thought that was a good thing. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Are there others who wish to speak in opposition?

MS. GROSSMAN: Yes. Eileen Grossman, Rhode Island.

We do this in Rhode Island. Every elected Republican official is on -- at our State Central Committee. Their attendance is nil. They don't come, they don't vote, they don't participate. If a Republican Representative or Senator wants to be a Delegate to the RNC, they have that opportunity to run as a Delegate in their State. I don't think that, you know, a reward system is in order here. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in support?

Mr. Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: Yes. Morton Blackwell, of Virginia.

I think what the Lady said does not apply to this proposal. The Lady was referring to elected people who became automatic members and then didn't show up. This proposal adds to the number of atlarge Delegates that a State has. And the State sets its own rules as to how to elect its at-large Delegates.

So, this is a completely different set of circumstances. At-large Delegates do not notoriously refuse to come to the Republican National Convention. So, it really -- what she said does not apply.

The principle of awarding States bonus Delegates or at-large Delegates is well established in the rules of the Republican Party. The current rules, if you have a majority or at least half of the members of the House of Representatives from
your State, you get one bonus Delegate. It would
seem to me that States that elect a large number of
Republicans to the House of Representatives deserve
a bonus.
    This is a fair bonus, and it's awarded.
And in those places where Republicans have elected a
lot of U.S. Representatives, they should have some
recognition of that. And awarding extra at-large
Delegates to the States, under those circumstances,
makes sense.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Blackwell.
    Is there anyone else who would like to
speak in opposition? In opposition.
    Yes. The Gentleman from Maine.
    MR. WILLETTE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Alex Willette, from Maine.
    I stand in opposition to this. You know,
Maine, we're lucky. We're really proud of our
Republican Congressman. But, it's the first time
we've had a Republican Congressman in two decades.

And we're very proud of Representative Bruce Poliquin. But, I do believe this is one way to take power away from the little States, by giving more Delegates to the bigger States. And don't think this would be good for us in Maine. So, I stand in opposition.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
Is there anyone else who'd like to speak in support? Anyone to speak in support?

The Lady from Wyoming.
MS. HAGEMAN: Yes. Harriet Hageman, from Wyoming.

I speak in support of this amendment. I believe that it's very clearly a Republican performance-based-type system. It would get more people involved in this. And coming from the leastpopulated State in the Nation, I don't believe that it does punish the small States. But, it does reward those States that consistently vote Republican and work hard to elect Republicans. I think that this is exactly the type of thing that we should be doing. It doesn't take away from other

States. It doesn't decrease Delegates for other folks. But, it does reward those States that consistently vote Republican. And I think that's important. I speak in support of the amendment. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone else who would like to speak in opposition?

MS. SERRANO-GLASSNER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Christine Serrano-Glassner, from New Jersey.

Just a logistical matter. This doesn't really specify how many more people. But, with that many more people, assuming we're talking about increasing the numbers, then you need that much more staff. And I think one of the challenges that the Site Committee has had in the past is finding locations that have enough hotel rooms. So, I think, before we pass something without, really, full consideration of what the numbers would do and what that means overall for the Convention, I think that has to be taken into consideration. So, I'm in opposition.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else would like to speak in support? Anyone who would like to speak in support?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone who would like to speak in opposition?

Chair recognizes the Gentleman from New Mexico.

MR. PEARCE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Coming from the State of New Mexico, the last member of the Federal Delegation from New Mexico, I would like to speak in opposition to the amendment.

Now, keep in mind that the district that I represent is 34 percent registered Republicans. It is 60 percent minority, 52 percent Hispanic, 60 percent overall minority. We're one of the poorest districts in the United States. And to say that the -- winning a seat there doesn't have the same value, that the big States are going to dominate, is one
that, frankly, I wonder how we're going to get the voice of those of us who will be out there slugging to win in districts that are very difficult. I've got several 85-percent Democrat counties. And I go in there, where people hate to see Republicans, and some say, "We've never talked to a Republican before in our life." I go places I'm not wanted, and I get -- and I'm well enough liked that they invite me back. That's my job. Some conversations have lasted 10 years. And to say we're going to reward performance, I will tell you that it just flies in the idea that we must be broadening our base, here, that we've got to not just win elections, but win hearts. That's what we should be about, as a Party. And so, this idea that we're going to segregate out --
Now, finally, many things in Washington are not Democrat versus Republican. They are big versus small. And if we take on the tone in this Convention that we are going to favor the big States over the small States, we will lose the small States. We are the ones that keep the glue together
for \(u\) in the U.S., for \(u s\) in the Congress. Now,
the Senate, those guys, they're equal. That's the
power of the Senate. Small States have the same
power as a big State. In the House of
Representatives, we fight this every day.
    God bless you all, but stand opposed to
the amendment.
    [Applause.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Is there anyone else who would like to
speak in favor of the amendment?
    Gentlelady here.
    MS. POPMA: Thank you, Madam Chair.
    Marlys Popma, from Iowa.
    I am in favor of this amendment, but
that's not necessarily what \(I\) want to speak to. I
want to speak to the comment that was made earlier
about whether we could deal with more people. The
Democrats have way more people at their Conventions
than we do. And they find space. So, I don't think
we should make this based on space.
    I do think that, if you reward people --
we've got a district in Iowa that was Democrat for many, many years. And we just took it for Republicans. To be able to tell the people of that district, "You will get another Delegate because of your hard work," is a great thing. That's a great thing. And any one of you, in your States, if you could tell your people, "If you win this district, you get one more Delegate," that's a great thing. And so, I hope that you would consider voting for this. I think this is a -- this is a great amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who'd like to speak in opposition? In opposition?

The Gentleman from California rises, to what point?

> MR. OSE: To voice my opposition, Madam Chair.

Doug Ose, California.
With great respect to my friend Mr.
Pearce, having served with him, I will validate that small States versus large States in Congress, on the
floor, are at a disadvantage. That's not why I rose to speak against this.

When I read that up there, it reminds me of what Debbie Wasserman-Schultz has implemented on the Democratic side in which, on a constant theme in this entire campaign has been, "No more instructions from Washington." That smells like a rigging to me. And I'm opposed to it.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, sir.

Anyone else who'd like to rise in support?
Is there anyone to rise in support?
Seeing -- Mr. Little, do you rise in support?

MR. LITTLE: Yes, Madam Chairman. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

MR. LITTLE: This is not something simply in support of large States. This is not simply a directive. This is something that's in support of the flyover country of this Nation that supports Republicans, year in and year out. The States that
have Republicans are the States that have been providing the votes in Congress. And we're not a large State. We're a relatively small State. We only have five Republicans in our State. But, we support the Republican Party. We have a high percentage of Republicans in our State. And the five extra Delegates from our State would make a huge difference.

Secondly, the more Delegates you have -and this is not that many more; it's really less than 247, because we already get one for majority -the more Delegates you have, the most grassroots people you have in attendance, the more supporters for the Republican Party you have in attendance, and the more we're going to tend to grow. This is going to grow our Party, get the support of flyover country, and make America great again. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Little. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Arkansas.

MR. BARNETT: Jonathan Barnett, from
```

Arkansas.

```

I move the previous question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Barnett.
Previous question has been moved, and is
in order.

All those in favor of ending debate on
Amendment 14.1 , please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
We'll now move to an immediate vote on
Amendment 14.1. All those in favor of adopting this amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
We will now move to Amendment number 14.2, which has also been submitted by the Gentleman from
Louisiana, who's recognized for the purpose of
making a motion.
    MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman, I'd like to
move the amendment on the board.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved.
Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded.
    Mr. Little, would you like to address your
amendment?
    MR. LITTLE: Similar to the prior
proposal, which has gone down in flames --
    [Laughter.]
    MR. LITTLE: -- I would request this
august body to consider increasing the Delegates,
the at-large Delegates, from States that have
Governors that are Republicans.
    Madam Chairman, I believe the Office of
Governor is the most significant political office in
a State. It often controls the Legislature, deals
with reapportionment, budgeting. We are finding, in
```

our own State, with a Democrat Governor, we are
groaning under a Democrat Governor after having a
Republican for many terms. Just a single Delegate
for having a Republican Governor, I believe, is not
enough. And, in keeping with my concept of the idea
of increasing the total number of Delegates -- we
have, I believe, 31 Republican Governors, we already
get one Delegate for that, so it would be four more.
It would be 124 more Delegates. I urge adoption of
this amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who speaks in opposition? Is there anyone who speaks in opposition?
The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Indiana.
MR. HAMMOND: Madam Chair, John Hammond, from Indiana.
I recognize the Gentleman from Louisiana's point. And we have a Republican Governor we're very proud of, and we'll have a chance to see more of him later. But, you've got to think about what this means. We've -- we're looking at this one at a

```
time, one amendment at a time. This is the kind of thing that needs to be looked at. I'm glad we're trying to deal with it here, but I think, as we look at it, we're skewing numbers, we're skewing balance. We've got this big-State -- large-State issue. We don't know exactly what this means, in terms of the exact States.
I recognize what was said earlier by our
friend from New Mexico, that we have an obligation
also to grow this Party everywhere we can, not just
the places where we're successful today, but where
we need to be tomorrow. And I just think there's an
awful lot going on, here, that we don't understand
the implications. Changing it here requires us to
understand where it pops up in changes in some other
place.

So, for those reasons -- and really this is something in need of further study -- I oppose this amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Hammond.

Is there anyone who's like to speak in

The Gentleman at the back microphone.
MR. WILLHOIT: Thank you.
Janssen Willhoit, from Vermont.
Speaking from a blue State, a small State, I am in favor of this. And, to the Gentleman's point, actually, in our small, blue State, we nearly won the Governor's seat, 2 years ago, lost by under 2,000 votes. And I feel very confident this year we are going to gain a Republican Governor in the State of Vermont. And to encourage --
[Applause.]
MR. WILLHOIT: -- Vermonters to get out there and vote for a Republican to be our -- to be our Governor, I would applaud this effort, so that way in 4 years we'll have five more strong Vermont Republicans here at the Convention.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
The Chair recognizes Mr. Duprey.
MR. DUPREY: Madam Chair, Steve Duprey, from New Hampshire.

I rise in opposition to this amendment,
for the very eloquent reasons spoken by Congressman
Pearce on the previous one.

And I'd like to move the previous
question.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
is in order. We will move directly to a vote on
ending debate.
    All those in favor of ending debate on
this matter, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
    nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
We will move directly now to voting on the amendment itself. All of those in favor of adopting Amendment 4.2, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it. We can have a division of the house. The

Chair's not in doubt, but you're certainly entitled to have division.

So, will all of those who are in favor of adopting Amendment 14.2 please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Please be seated.

All those against, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Please be seated.

The vote is as follows: those in favor, 32; and those against, 71. The motion fails.

Let's move on now to Amendment number 4.3. This is an amendment to Rule \(14(a)(6)(i i) . ~ I t ~ h a s ~\) been submitted by Mr. Ash, of Arizona.

Mr. Ash is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. ASH: Madam Chairman, we've had a little bit of a -- of an issue. I've submitted a
number of different amendments at the same time, and they got a bit reversed in order. If I could come back to these, perhaps at the end of this particular section, and redirect?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Let's make certain we know which ones you're referring to, Mr. Ash. It looks like --

MR. ASH: 14.3, 14.4, 14.5, and there's a final one that actually, on my copies, hasn't even been numbered yet.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We -you still have a number of other amendments. And so, I'm trying to see if it's -- you want to set aside 14.3, 14.4, 14.5, and then which additional ones?

MR. ASH: Well, the amendment was on 14(a)(6)(iv). And I don't have a copy with a number on it yet.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Mr. Ash, I'm informed by the staff that you have six remaining. May I suggest that, unless you feel otherwise, we set them all aside while you sort out
```

which ones you'd like to take in what order?
MR. ASH: Yeah, that'd be great. Thank
you, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank
you.
Without objection, so ordered.
All right. Now we will move on -- we do
not have any amendments to Rule number 15, but we do
have amendments to Rule 16.
Rule 16 deals with the election,
selection, allocation, or binding of Delegates and
alternate Delegates.
We'll begin with Amendment number 16.2.
This amendment impacts Rule number 16(c)(1). It has
been submitted by Mr. Wheeler, of South Dakota, who
is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.
MR. WHEELER: Madam Chairman, I move
Amendment 16.2.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been moved

```
and seconded that we adopt Amendment 16.2.
Mr. Wheeler, would you like to address the substance of your amendment?

MR. WHEELER: Thank you.
The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that, in our Primary calendar, we have consistency and fairness when we divide up States between States that are required to be proportional and States that are not required to be proportional. Right now, we have in our rules that, after March 15th, you can be winner-take-all, but, before then, you must be proportional. But, there is a carve-out for the first four States -- Iowa and New Hampshire and Nevada and South Carolina -- and that -- so, that language that they're bringing up now, the whole section, would require those first four States to also follow those same proportionality rules that any other State has to follow prior to March 15th.

So, I think this is a reasonable amendment that ensures that those States that go early in the process are proportional and that the winner-takeall States can come later in the process.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Wheeler.
Is there someone who rises in opposition
to the rule?
Mr. Moore, of South Carolina.
MR. MOORE: Thank you, Madam Chair, Matt Moore, from South Carolina.

We have already, in a previous section, established -- to establish a study committee to assess such rule changes. I don't believe that such changes should be taken lightly, and therefore, would urge nonpassage of this amendment.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who would like to rise in support of this amendment? Anyone who would like to rise in support?

Mr. Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: This is a very simple and easy-to-understand amendment. We have in the rules, up to a certain point on the calendar, the
requirement that, if States have Primaries, that
they will have to be proportional under certain
rules. It does not make sense to say that those
Primaries held before the period when proportional
representation is required should have the option to
be winner-take-all.
    Obviously, if this amendment passes, which
I think is imminently fair, and there is a study
which recommends a significant overhaul of our
nomination rules, then they can take into
consideration things which seem appropriate to them
at the time. We don't know what that's going to
come up with.
    Meanwhile, this makes sense in our current
rules, to have the winner-take-all Primaries be
possible before a certain date. Well, it should
apply to all of the Primaries held before that
certain date, which is now in our rules. And we
don't know how it might be changed, but we have the
right, and even the duty, to do here what we think
is the right thing to do.
    So, I favor this amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there someone
who would like to be recognized in opposition?
Mr. Duprey. I think I'm sensing a pattern. We've had South Carolina and now New Hampshire.

MR. DUPREY: Madam Chairman, Steve Duprey, from New Hampshire, the small State next to Vermont. I rise in opposition to this, simply because we earlier agreed, by a very large majority, to have a commission set up to study the Primary process and the role of all the different States, just like we did in 2008 and 2012. And each year, we try and make improvements and recommendations. Ironically, I'll point out, in 2012 the complaint was the carve-out States pick our nominee; we don't like that. This year, we made lots of changes. Thirty-eight different States played a role. And some members came to me and said, "It was too messy and too fussy." Darned if you do, darned if you don't. But, that's why we have that commission. Making this change here precipitously would be a bad idea. All of these suggested
amendments should be going to that commission. That's what we've done in 2008 and 2012.

So, I would urge members to vote no on this amendment and other ones that come up on this topic.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Duprey.
```

    Is there anyone who would like to rise in
    support? Anyone who would like to rise in support?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone --
In support? He's coming from the back.
MR. HENRY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Alabama, Ed Henry.
We moved our Primary this year to March
the 1st. And one of the big wranglings was that we
were not going to be a winner-take-all. And so, as
a what we like to think of as a very conservative
State, we weren't going to be able to put all of our
Delegates behind a conservative candidate. And, as
such, because we decided to go early so that we
could be significant in the race, we had to go

```
proportional.

And I've always thought it was unfair that Iowa, New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Nevada somehow were able to live outside of that rule. And I know many of the people in our State. And so, I'd be disingenuous if \(I\) came to this Convention, to the individuals who make the vote, and I didn't express that dissatisfaction from the people who send us all here to do this.

So, with that, I stand in support of this amendment.

Thank you, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
Is there other -- are there others who wish to stand in opposition? In opposition?

Mr. Ryder.
MR. RYDER: John Ryder, Tennessee.
And I support the intent of this amendment. I think that the early States should be proportional. But, I don't support passing it at this time, for the reasons stated by Mr. Moore and by Mr. Duprey, that we have appointed a commission -
- created a commission to study these issues. And
these issues tend to be interrelated, whether and
which carve-out States we have, how we initiate the
process, and how we go through it, and what
constitutes proportionality.
    The fact of the matter is that none of the
four carve-out States, I believe, are winner-take-
all. Iowa and Nevada are Caucus States, which
apportion their Delegates. South Carolina, I
believe, is winner-take-all by Congressional
District and then winner-take-all for the at-large
Delegates. And I don't believe New Hampshire is
winner-take-all, either. So -- but, their
proportional formulas do not comply with the
proportionality definition in the Rules of the
Republican Party, as presently written.
    So, I think this is precisely the kind of
issue that ought to be referred to the study
commission and allow them to do their work.
    I like the idea. I just think we need to
blend it into the other Rule 16 issues that are
going to come up over the next couple of years.
```

Ryder.

```
    Is there anyone who would like to speak in
support?
    The Gentleman from Oklahoma.
    MR. JONES: Gary Jones, from Oklahoma.
    In addressing the -- what the Gentleman
from Alabama said, we were March 1st prior to the
rule being changed. And we were winner-take-all by
Congressional District and winner-take-all by State
for the at-large. But, the rule changed, and we had
to go to proportional. Trying to get that moved
back, the citizens of Oklahoma and the Legislature
said no. And so, here we now have created a
situation that -- you know, we talked about
everybody being equal, but we've got some more equal
than others.
    And that being said, we've talked about
changing things clear back to 2008, 2012, and now
we've got another commission, we're going to move it
back. I'm in favor of this amendment, and then, if
we -- if the commission comes up with something
```

later, they can change it. But, I'm in favor of
this particular amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
Is there anyone else who wishes to speak
in opposition?
Gentleman from Nevada.
MR. ROSS: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Jordan Ross, Nevada.
Madam Chairman, I'm shocked -- shocked, I
say -- that Mr. Ryder and Mr. Duprey would chew up
three-quarters of my argument.
The fact of the matter is that the -- it
is complex. In Nevada, we are proportional. In
fact, we have a very, very precise and very fair and
neutral mathematical formula for proportionality.
And it does strike me as a little odd that, with
many of the important things we have to consider,
that we would attempt to undertake some changes in
rules that really do require some indepth survey.
This is why we passed the rule providing for a
committee to examine the electoral process in
detail. This is not the sort of thing I -- we can -

```
```

- you can do in 2 days.
Again, the Gentleman is quite right. It
seems to make sense, and three of the four carve-out
States, in fact, are proportional. But, this
strikes me as jumping the gun. And I urge the
members to vote no.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who would like to
speak in support?
MR. SHORT: Yes, Madam Chairman.
Guy Short, from Colorado.
First of all, I'm finding myself in a
great position, agreeing with Mr. Ryder and my
friend Ed Henry, over here, from Alabama. It seems
to me maybe that their only disagreement here is
whether we're going to decide that today or if we're
going to wait for a committee. We have Mr. Ryder
thinking it's a good idea, the Gentleman from Nevada
thinking it's a good idea, my friend Ed Henry
thinking it's a good idea.
I would encourage this body to pass that

```
today. And, as the Gentleman from Oklahoma said, we can revisit this. And if, for some reason, there -it's a bad idea and we want to tinker with it, that will get done with the study committee that we've already passed today.

But, I would just encourage you all, let's not abdicate our responsibility and our duties as the 2016 Rules Committee. That's who we are. That's why we came here. We didn't come here to pass the buck on to a committee. Now, we know a lot of folks do that. With all due respect to my great friend from New Mexico, Congress does that all the time. They just pass the buck. Let's not pass the buck. Let's make decisions here today as the 2016 Rules Committee. If we're going to study it, I guess we'll study it. But, that -- there's no reason why we can't make that decision today, especially for those who think it's a good idea, like my friend Mr. Ryder, and like the Gentleman from Nevada.

Thank you, Mrs. Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.

Are there additional individuals who'd like to be recognized?

Mr. DeVito.
MR. DeVITO: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I'm here to a -- oppose. And I urge
everybody to vote no against this particular amendment. I appreciate the opportunity to speak at this time, because I'm not sure if those that are also opposing this motion actually said it was a good idea. I think what they said -- I don't want to speak for anybody, I'm not speaking for anybody, but what -- I think what they said is that it's a good idea to look at this in the future. And so, let's not be whimsical and vote on anything today. A no vote on this motion is urged -- on this amendment is urged.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. The Gentleman from West Virginia. MR. STUART: Yeah. And I'm in opposition, as well. I don't know if there's anybody else in favor that would need to speak at this point. I speak in opposition, but I speak in opposition and
make some comments. And I support all the points that have been made here, but let me make one point. And I think this is important for places like West Virginia. And I'm here, let's face it, representing my State, a great State. But, the extractive industries, whether it's coal mining, natural gas, other industries that are really critical to this country, when we have these early States -- Iowa, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Nevada -- love all your States, but there's not a State that represents those critically important industries to this country that's early in the process. I think you have to go 13 or 14 States deep before any of those industry-laden States get addressed in the process.

And so, I think it's really important. I've said, for a long time, the subsidies for ethanol that were at least once in place for Iowa, there would be subsidies in place for coal in West Virginia if it were first in the process.

And so, I just bring that point up. I think they're important that we examine this
```

process. The protection of those four States, I
think, ought to be examined. But, I urge no on this
amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Mr. Wheeler,
did you want to speak in support?
MR. WHEELER: Thank you.
I support the study committee. I
supported that proposal. It is important to study
our process. I believe that is more in the timing,
and not so much this particular aspect of it. I
think we, as a body, should communicate to that
study committee that, if we're going to have a time
after which -- or before which proportional rules
must apply, they should apply to everybody. I don't
care how much you study that idea. I don't know
there would be a good reason why a few States get
exempted from that rule so early in the process.
So, I would urge you to support this now
and express why we should have the rules apply to
all States.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.

```
            Is there --

Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Yes. So, I know that we're getting late, and probably don't want to hear too much, but \(I\) thought it was important to understand how we got where we are and why I oppose the amendment. And the reason is because of the doctrine of unintended consequences. And I'll just share with you a little bit about that.

Now, under the -- under Rule 12, we have to have 75 percent of the Committee vote for an amendment. That means that \(I\) can only lose 42 votes. And every time I move a state around, you lose 3 right out of the box. So, the idea, for example, that I would eliminate the four carve-out States means that \(I\) immediately have lost 12 votes, and, on any given vote, there's 20 no votes. So, it becomes very tricky.
Now -- then, if you add to that, we shrunk the calendar from 6 and a half months to 75 days. Now, in 75 days, 4 of those -- 4 weeks of those were for the carve-outs. That left us 55. Now, you --

55 meant we had 7 Tuesdays. Seven Tuesdays to do 50 jurisdictions, which necessarily meant that we would have many regional Primaries, like we did on March 1st, many regional Primaries like we had in the Northeast, or many national Primaries, where we had States from all over the entire country on the same Tuesday. Okay? Are you with me?

Now, if you're not careful, what you have is, you have a runaway nominee, which is somebody that's not been adequately vetted, if you don't have a cooling-off period. Because if you don't have the cooling-off period, then what happens is, the first four States have a huge impact, and then, if you can win on the very first State, the Super Tuesday, in this case, the SEC Primary, you literally could skyrocket a nominee that hasn't been properly and thoroughly vetted all the way through the process.
So, it's complicated. It's calculus, mixing all of these things together. Now, to try to do that right now in this 15 - or 30 -minute period of something that took -- something that took us days, is just too dangerous, because we have no idea what
the ultimate consequences would be.
Thank you, Madam Chair. And it's -- the reason I urge you to vote no and let us study it and come up with a reasoned solution that meets the requirements of the 75 -percent threshold.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And he didn't even say "football."
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Evans.

Is there anyone else who wishes to be recognized in support?

MR. HENRY: Madam Chairman?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. HENRY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Ed Henry, Alabama.
A lot of argument's been made to put this off, to wait, because we don't have enough time to study it. Why are we here? Why did we all come together? Why did we make such an effort to come if we're really not going to deal with some things?

We left Rule 12 in place. So, after this
```

meeting, things can be undone if they are
significantly wrong. It is a high threshold, as the
Gentleman, my colleague, stated. If the commission
comes back and decides that we need to undo this and
we need to remove their privilege, as you stated,
you already have 12 Delegates from those four States
-- I mean, 20 Delegates from those four States who
are not going to be part of your 75 percent. And
so, the threshold has been moved even further from
the possibility of truly dealing with this
amendment.
And I agree with my colleague from
Colorado and several of the colleagues that have
spoken today. Let's deal with it today, let's
remove the privilege that's in place that I've heard
no one give a true and honest reason why it is
there. Let's remove it. And then, if it is
significantly wrong, we can -- the RNC can undo it.
And, with that, Madam Chair, I make a
motion to move the previous question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Previous question has been moved and is in
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order, so we will move directly to a vote on whether
we will end debate.
    All those in favor of ending debate on
Amendment number 16.2 , please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All opposed, nay.
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
    We will then move directly to a vote on
Amendment 16.2.
    All those in favor of adopting Amendment
16.2, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
    VOICE: Division.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. I'm going to
ask you to stand. And it's going to be quite clear
that there are not enough. And so, rather than have
them keep counting, I'm going to ask you to stand,
and, if it's quite obvious, we're not going to worry
about the count.
    Will those of you in favor of Amendment
16.2 please stand?
    [Members standing.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Frias, I
noticed that you counted. What did you get?
    MR. FRIAS: Twenty-eight.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Would
you be seated, please?
    [Laughter.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
please stand.
    [Members standing.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's clearly the
nays have it.

Thank you. You may be seated. The amendment fails.

Next, to Amendment 16.3. This relates to Rule number \(16(e)(5)\) and has been submitted by the Gentlelady from Colorado, who will be recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MS. UNRUH: Madam Chairman, Kendal Unruh, from the State of Colorado.

And I would like to move to the proposed language to strike the words "or the population therein" at the end of this section.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved.
Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded.

Mrs. Unruh, if you'd like to address your amendment, please.

MS. UNRUH: Sure.
This is dealing with the way that the Delegates are apportioned in the Congressional District Conventions and also the State Conventions that we have in our States in order to -- where the Delegates elect, obviously, from the Congressional District Conventions and the State Conventions. And they're apportioned according to the Republicans and the -- it's pursuant to the State law and Party rules within the respective districts. But, it is -
- at the end, when it said "having regarded the
Republican vote or the population therein," I would
just like to strike that, because we are going to
want to focus just on the Republican vote when it's
apportioning for the Delegates to our Congressional
Districts and the State Conventions. And the reason
why I really like this is because it's
noncontroversial.
    [Laughter.]
    MS. UNRUH: But, if we just aren't also
focusing on the population overall, it also is not
including a lot of the illegal immigrants that are
actually right now comprised in the population
therein. So.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    Is there anyone who would like to speak in
opposition to this motion? Anyone speaking in
opposition?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who would like to speak in support?
    [No response.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone else who
```

would like to speak at all?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm seeing some
back-and-forth up here.
The Gentlelady from California.
MS. DHILLON: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.
Harmeet Dhillon, from California.
I'm opposed to this amendment, because,
taken to its logical conclusion, you could see
similar attempts to disenfranchise people in smaller
States, based on small population. Right now, our
founders created a balance between the States that
get apportionment in our national legislature based
on population versus their regional identity. You
know, one could say, Why is it fair that Rhode
Island has the same number of United States Senators
as California? We have 5 million voters in
California. Some of them live in benighted places
like San Francisco, like I do, where I was the
Chairman of the Republican Party of San Francisco
for 4 years. Donors live in those districts. Many

```
```

donors live in my district. And I can tell you
that, if our representation, because we are stuck
with Nancy Pelosi for so many years, were to be
taken away on the basis of an amendment like this,
you guys who come to San Francisco for your
fundraisers would see a decreased amount of interest
there.
But, on a fairness ground, I think, for
keeping all of our Delegates throughout the State of
California engaged and energized, decreasing the
involvement and representation at this National
Convention on the basis of a rule change like this
would have a very significant impact. I don't think
it should be taken lightly. Even though it is
simply striking four words, it's going to be a huge
impact on some of the more populous States.
Thank you for your consideration.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who would like to
speak in support? Anyone who would like to speak in
support?
[No response.]

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who
```

would like to speak in opposition?
MR. RYDER: Madam Chairman, John Ryder,
Tennessee.
I oppose this amendment. We are a
national political party. Our goal should be to
represent and carry our vision to all corners of
this great Nation. And that includes areas that
don't yet vote Republican. We need to bring them
enlightenment.
[Laughter.]
MR. RYDER: And they need to be
represented in our councils so that we can share
with them our vision for this country. So, I urge a
no vote on this amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who wishes to be recognized on this amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none --
Oh. The Gentlelady from Louisiana.
MS. BOWEN: I couldn't get up here fast
enough.

```

Well, I'm one of those -- I'm going to speak in support of it -- Gwen Bowen, Louisiana -for one reason. Let me get it where I can read it.

I can't see that when it's raised.
It seems to me, whenever it's talking about "the population thereof," that the one that's mostly going to be affected are, like, sanctuary cities, where there's illegal immigration there. And I thought that was the biggest point for our presumptive nominee, Trump. I don't understand why there's so much opposition to it. But, I'm speaking in support of it.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
Mr. Munisteri.
MR. MUNISTERI: Yes, Madam Chair. I was -
- hesitated before I came up here, because I wanted to make sure \(I\) understood the implications of this.

As \(I\) read it, it's directing the State Parties and the Congressional Districts' Conventions, the local ones, to only pick Delegates on the basis of Republican vote. Whereas, currently it says you can do it on the basis of Republican
vote or the population therein.
So, when I read that, I said -- it seems
to me what this is doing is taking away from the State Parties the discretion to decide how they pick their Delegates. And, being a Texan, this may come as a surprise, but we don't like Washington telling us how we write our rules or to pick our Delegates. And I would like my State to have the option. Nothing in the current rules prohibit you from basing it on Republican vote. It just gives you the option, and the locale and the State decide.

So, since I'm a Tenth Amendment guy and I think our State should decide how we pick our own Delegates, \(I\) just now decided to vote against this. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Munisteri.

Is there anyone else who would like to be heard?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we're going to go directly to a vote on the amendment.

All of those in favor of adoption of
```

Amendment 16.3, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Next, we will go to Amendment number 16.4.
Amendment number 16.4, which impacts Rule number
16(c)(3)- -- I don't know how you're supposed to say
this, other than "double small I" -- "double small
two." [16(c)(3)(ii)] All right. This has been
submitted by Mr. Ash.
Is Mr. Ash here to make a motion?
Mr. Ash is recognized for the purpose of
making a motion.
MR. ASH: Madam Chairman, Bruce Ash, from
Arizona.
I'd like to submit for consideration the
proposal that's been put up on the board.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved.
Is there a second? Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been

```
seconded.

Mr. Ash, would you like to speak to your amendment?

MR. ASH: Yeah. This is along with the other amendments that have been presented on performance enhancement. And it would strike the word "a" at the beginning of the subsection and insert the following language, "on or after March 31st of a presidential election."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the motion?

Mr. Ryder, are you approaching the microphone? All right. Mr. Ryder is recognized in opposition to the motion.

MR. RYDER: No, I'm -- no, this is a point of inquiry. I was having trouble finding this language in the rule.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I was having the same difficulty.

MR. RYDER: And where does it fit? Could we get some clarification on that?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Do we
have this up on -- if -- yeah, if the staff could
put this up. Is it -- would change -- all right.
16(c)(3)(ii) -- okay, as -- if I understand it
correctly, Mr. Ash, just perhaps to expedite this --
    MR. ASH: Certainly.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. It
    looks like you're proposing that --
    MR. ASH: It would be "proportional up to
    March 31st."
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. And
    that's a current change of 15 days -- or 16 days.
    MR. ASH: Correct.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    Is everyone clear now on what the
    amendment would be?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
    there anyone who would like to speak in opposition?
    We've not yet had someone speak in opposition to
    the motion.
    [No response.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor of the motion?

MR. ASH: Madam Chairman, if I could -- we kind of got a little bit bollixed up there at the beginning.

This is a concept, colleagues, that we have talked about at the RNC. In fact, some of us who were working in this prior presidential cycle seriously believed that going proportional through March 31st was a very good idea. Some of the reasons that Mr. Evans had talked about earlier today, just a few moments ago, with respect to not allowing a well-funded candidate or an early winner to sort of pile up victories, to allow momentum to flow in a number of State Primaries, and not have anybody get too far out in advance in the presidential cycle process.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Ash.

Is there someone who wishes to speak in opposition? Mr. Hammond.

MR. HAMMOND: Madam Chair, John Hammond,
from Indiana.

This is a bad amendment. Now, it doesn't seem that way on its surface, because most everyone here doesn't really understand how it works. And I'm not going to profess to be the person that understands it the best. But, to me, we still should let States decide this question.

And then, secondly, we spent a lot of time, the last couple of years, trying to shorten the calendar. To me -- be argued that, on the back end, we haven't lengthened it at all, but we have, for the proportional portion of it.

I am opposed to this. I just don't think it -- I think it's a mistake to make that move.

Thank you. I would urge your opposition to this.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Hammond.

Is there someone who would like to be recognized in support?

Mr. Blackwell.

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman. As I understand it, the effect of this amendment would be to return to the rules that were in effect with respect to requiring proportionality in 2012. The rules were changed for this year, and States were allowed to start holding winner-take-all Primaries after the 15th of March. What I believe this amendment would do -- and correct me if I am mistaken -- is to say that winner-take-all Primaries could not start before March 31st, which I think is in accord with the thinking of probably most of the people in this room. I think it's a desirable thing to do, to extend the period in which proportional Primaries must be held. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Blackwell.

Is there someone who would like to speak in opposition?

Mr. Evans.
MR. EVANS: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.
So, the amendment tries to take us back to
a world that doesn't exist anymore. It tries to
take us back to a time when we didn't have instant media, the Internet, constant communication. So, what's happened is, when we went to put together the 2012 map, if you shorten from 6 and a half months down to 75 days, you limit the number of available Tuesdays to have Primaries on.

Now, if you expand, then, you then have to similarly contract -- if you contract the overall period, you have to also contract the cooling-off period. Remember, the cooling-off period is proportional, which means that no candidate can, by virtue of a series of winner-take-all, wrap up the nomination by, say, March 10th. And so, that's what that's designed to do.

On the other hand, we've balanced that. There's a counterbalance. And the counterbalance is, we also don't want to have our candidates still cutting each other up 7 months into the process. And so, we moved the Convention date up from August to July, we moved the end date up to the middle of May, we moved the beginning back to February so that
we were to cut down the total period. It's kind of like having a shot chock in the NBA. It would be like saying, "We want to go back to the four corners, but we have a shot clock." So, you can't go back to that world anymore. And that's why the point is, this is -- the doctrine of unintended consequences is so serious -- is, you have, in a proposal like this, which says, "Hey, let's just add the 2 weeks back in to a world that doesn't exist anymore."

Now, I do want to address one thing that came up in the last point, which is, well, we -this Rule 12 Committee can fix that. Well, no, it can't. Let me give you a great example. Imagine me going to the 14 States who were on the SEC Super Tuesday and say, "We're going to now move your day." Well, guess what? They have more Delegates than the 25-percent threshold. I can't then meet the 75percent threshold, because they all have more Delegates than the high standard that we set. And that's why I say it's a Rubik's Cube, and it's a Rubik's Cube that, for us to try to solve here
today, would literally lead to some consequences
that we could never contemplate. And that's why I
strongly oppose trying to do this in the context of
the time period that we have here.
    I agree, we have to do important things,
and we have. I don't think that we should be
tackling anything that's like this. It would be
like me tackling calculus in high school.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Evans.
    Is there anyone else who would like to
speak in support?
    Mr. Little.
    MR. LITTLE: Madam, far be it from the
supporters of this to speak to a land that does not
exist. The opponents speak of history that they
know nothing of. In 1998, the Rules Committee --
the Standing Rules Committee of the RNC met in
Indianapolis to discuss what was called the Delaware
Plan. The problem that we had was the frontloading
of Primaries, and we were going to have a national
Primary, eliminating all but the most wealthy
```

candidates. So, some plans began to be put forth
that would prevent frontloading. That was the
Delaware Plan in 1998.
The proportional versus winner-take-all
was the solution to the problem, but it has not much
of a solution, because starting on March 15th, you
can go winner-take-all. It makes a lot of sense, if
we're going to stop frontloading, to make that date
March 31st.
Let's not be devoid of history. We're not
talking about a land that doesn't exist. We're
talking about the land of common sense.
This Committee should support this
proposal today.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there -- those who would wish to be
recognized in opposition?
The Gentleman at the back microphone.
MR. FORSTEN: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Richard Forsten, from Delaware.
And thank you for that shout-out about the
Delaware Plan. I was one of its authors. Although

```
```

the year was actually 2000. But, that's okay.
I don't think this amendment is necessary,
but certainly, as it's currently drafted, it creates
a huge ambiguity and hole in the rules. And here's
why. If you look at Rule (c)(2) on page 30, the
page before where this one pays, it says, "Any
presidential Primary, Caucus, Convention, or other
process to elect, select, allocate, or bind
Delegates to the National Convention that occurs
prior to March 15 in the year of the National
Convention is held shall be proportional." So, that
says March 15 is the trigger, where you can switch
over to winner-take-all.
This amendment, though, drops down into
(c)(2) and imposes a March 31st date, and it creates
a huge ambiguity. What happens if -- on March 20th?
I mean, I've got one section of the rules now that
says March 15. I've got another section of the
rules that says March 31st. If we're happy with a
March 15 date, then we don't need this amendment at
all. If we want to make the proportional
requirement all the way through to March 31st, the

```
```

only change we have to make is on line 10 of page
30, and change March 15 to March 31st.
So, I don't think this amendment really --
this is not the place to put it, assuming we want to
make a change. I don't want to make a change, but
assuming we do. This amendment won't work. And I
think it needs to be fixed or more closely looked
at.
I also think we should all look at the
Delaware Plan again, that commission. I call the
Delaware Plan to -- I still have many copies. I'll
get them all to you.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there someone who wishes to speak in
support?
VOICE: Madam Chair?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Lady from
Maine.
MS. KINNEY: Thank you. MaryAnne Kinney,
from Maine.
Based on what was just said, that's why I

```
had come up, too, and I would propose an amendment
to have this language be changed into 16(c)(2)
instead, and changing the March 15th date to March
31st to make it in a more consistent location.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. The Chair is
going to observe that there is another amendment,
16.5, that would do exactly that thing. It proposes
to strike "March 15th" and insert "March 31st." And
so, I'm going to suggest that we go ahead and act on
this, and then we can act on that separately. Is
that all right?
    MS. KINNEY: Sure.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay.
    MS. KINNEY: Sure. Yeah.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    All right. Is there anyone who would like
to speak in support?
    MR. ASH: Madam Chairman?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Mr. Ash.
    MR. ASH: Bruce Ash, from Arizona.
    I don't think \(I\) had my entire 2 minutes.
And if \(I\) could just readdress some of the points
made by my colleagues.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Certainly.
MR. ASH: And I address these to you, Madam Chairman.

The same logic that my colleagues used to vote against a prior amendment, they're using also now to not pass this one. We don't want a runaway candidate. The same Gentlemen who have talked about the frontloading problem are also the same people on our Committee, for a number of years, who have talked about making all States matter, making as many States matter as is possible. And this is what's -- this is what happens, Madam Chairman, when we have proportional that goes a little longer than to March 15th. March 31st is a pretty good date. And if that does mean that there are some regional Primaries, that's probably a good thing. It allows campaigns to spend their time in certain areas and not be spread out all over the country.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: I know this is my final chance, so let me just address my friend from Louisiana.

The past isn't -- we have tools now available to solve the problems of the past in a very different way. I agree with him. Listen, I ran the Newt Gingrich campaign. Front-end loading is a problem. But, we have a tool available now to solve that problem in a very different way. And that is the debates. So, what we did was, we had a debate schedule that permitted one debate per week so that each candidate would get a massive infusion of earned media, so that no preordained candidate could front-end-load the system. Now, that's a tool that was not available when the Delaware Plan came along.

But, I say that because it illustrates how intricate all of these various pieces are. There's the debate piece. There's infused earned media. There's the cooling-off period. There's pushing it back so that we have a shorter time period. There's the whole prospect of the way in which different
States calculate proportional delegations. All of
those things are quite tricky. All of those things
require a Rubik's Cube approach. That's way more
than we could probably do here.
    If we tried to do anything, the net effect
would be a massive set of unintended consequences
that we could never contemplate and, to my colleague
from Alabama, that we could never fix, because we,
in the South, always vote as a bloc on the RNC. And
I could never cross the 25 -percent threshold.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Evans.
    I'm going to recognize one more individual
and then I'm going to entertain a motion for
previous question.
    Mr. DeVito.
    MR. DeVITO: I urge a vote -- a no vote.
And I move previous question.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: See how well that
worked? Thank you.
    All right. We're going to move directly
to a vote on closing debate.

All those in favor of closing debate on
```

this item, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
We will now move directly to a vote on the
text of the amendment.
All those in favor of adopting Amendment
16.4, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Next, we will go to Amendment 16.5. This
is the amendment that I directed the Lady from Maine
to. This is -- involves Rule number 16(c)(2), and
it is submitted by Mr. Ash, who is recognized for
the purpose of making a motion.
MR. ASH: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
This is to Rule 16(c) (2), page 30, lines

```
```

10. It would strike "March 15th" and insert "March
31st." I'll make this as painless as possible for
everybody. If you liked the last amendment, you'll
love this one. If you didn't like that so much,
you're probably not going to like this one.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
Oh. All right. There has been a second. I'm
sorry, I think I just lost track there for a moment.
I apologize.
All right. Without objection, the Chair
will recognize only two speakers on each side of
this, if there be some.
Is there anybody who would like to rise in
opposition? Anyone who would like to rise in
opposition?
Mr. Duprey.
MR. DUPREY: Steve Duprey, New Hampshire.
Brevity is the soul of wit. I rise in
opposition, for the exact same reason that we just
debated on the previous rule. And I would move the
previous question.
```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
is in order. We will move to a vote on whether to close debate.

All those in favor of closing debate, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay. [A chorus of nays.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it. We'll now move directly to a vote on the amendment.

All those in favor of adopting Amendment 16.05, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
And I believe that completes Rule 16.
And do we have -- we have no amendments
```

for Rule 17.

```

Do we have any amendments for Rule 18? We had some. Have they been withdrawn? Okay, they
have not been presented.
Rule number 19, we had none.
Rule number 20 had not been presented to Counsel's Office.

So, we will go now to Rule 21.1, dealing with contests and resolution by States.

Rule number 21.1, impacting Rule 21, has been proposed by the Gentlelady from Virginia, Ms. Gentry, who is recognized for the purpose of presenting a motion.

MS. GENTRY: Good evening.
Anne Gentry, from Virginia.
I propose the language that you see on the screens to add the words "after the District Convention in question or" after the word "meet."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded.

Ms. Gentry, would you like to speak to your motion?

MS. GENTRY: Thank you.
This is to address the situation we had
this year in Virginia, where our State Convention
took place in the middle of our District
Conventions. We had District Conventions both after and before our State Convention.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition? Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there any
further discussion to this amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Hearing none, we'll
move directly to a vote.
All those in favor of adopting Amendment number 21.1, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it. VOICE: call for division. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Division is called. All of those in favor of adopting

Amendment 21.1, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I apologize for whispering. We're just discussing that we think we need to bring chocolate tomorrow.

VOICE: Second.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank
```

you. Would you please be seated.

```

All those against, please stand.
[Members standing.]
VOICE: Madam Chair, parliamentary
inquiry, please?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
VOICE: For those of us were distracted initially, how might we register our vote, having missed the standing, earlier?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Are you in favor or
```

against?
VOICE: I am in favor.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Without
objection, I will add one more to the tally.
VOICE: And I was his distraction, talking
to him from California. So, please add me, as well.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Without objection.
Okay, we're starting a flood, here. If we keep
this up, we're going to have to do this again. Let
me see if it's going to make a material difference.
How many? Okay. It does not make a
difference. I am informed that the Chair was in
error. There are 48 for and 34 against. So, I
appreciate the opportunity to get that right. That
amendment passed.
I think some of you are so tired, you're
hoarse, and I'm not hearing it.
All right. Lest you give up hope that you
will get out of here in a reasonable amount of time,
we have two more amendments that impact multiple
rules, and then we need to go back to Mr. Ash's

```
amendments, and then we will have completed our work on the second session -- section, and I will suggest that we adjourn for the night at that point.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The next amendment that we will take up is Amendment M2.1, which stands for "multiple rules, first amendment."

The Chair will recognize the sponsor, Mr. Ryder, of Tennessee, for the purpose --

MR. RYDER: Thank you, Madam --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- of making a -and before you do that, Mr. Ryder, we're taking just a moment to pass these out, because they will not fit in one screen on the video monitors. So, just give us a moment, Mr. Ryder, so everyone can be caught up.
[Pause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Does everyone now have a copy of Amendment M2.1? If you do not, please raise your hand.

All right. Mr. Ryder, you are recognized
for the purpose of making a motion.
    MR. RYDER: Madam Chairman, John Ryder,
Tennessee.
    I move the adoption of the amendments
    shown as M2.1.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
    Ryder.
        Is there a second?
        VOICE: Second.
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
        seconded.
    Mr. Ryder, would you like to address the
    merits of your amendment?
        MR. RYDER: Yes, I would, thank you very
        much.
        And, ladies and gentlemen, thank you.
    These --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Can I ask the staff
    to be just a little more quiet, please? Or whoever
    it is that's back there talking? It's a little
    distracting for the Chair. Thank you.
    MR. RYDER: This is a series of amendments
that arose out of this year's experience with the certification and contest procedures. And there were a number of difficulties, and there are a number of provisions of the existing rules, which appear to be archaic and burdensome. And so, what we have tried to do is come up with a package of amendments that streamline, clarify, and modernize these procedures. And what I would like to do is just very briefly go through the points one by one.

The first item is in Rule 18(d), which requires the -- which prohibits delegations from filling vacancies any later than 12 hours prior to the General Session. I don't -- this gives us time to do things like print the temporary roll. And that 12 hours prior to the General Session, I believe, would fall at 2:00 a.m. on Sunday this year. So, I don't think anybody'll be filling their delegation at 4:00 a.m. on Sunday.

Rule \(20(a)\), we strike the words "date of the meeting of the National Convention" and replace that with "the date on which the National Convention
is scheduled to begin." We have seen situations in
prior Conventions, where we were scheduled to begin
on a Monday, and, because of a weather event, had to
meet at a later time. And so, we -- the trigger
date needs to be when everybody was notified of the
trigger date.
    In Rule \(20(\mathrm{~b})\), we insert the words "by
sending names and addresses in the following
manner," and then, if you'll look through \(20(b)\),
that gives you the various ways in which you can
certify your Delegates to the National Committee,
depending on the method of election or selection of
the Delegates.

In Rule \(20(\mathrm{~b})(1)\), we deleted the reference to the Secretary of the State -- Republican State Committee and replaced it with the words "another authorized officer of the Republican State Committee." There have been circumstances where, for one reason or another, the Secretary was not available to certify. And so, this creates a vehicle for the State Party to authorize someone else to backup the certification from the State

Chairman.
In Rule \(20(\mathrm{~b})(2)\), we add, after the words
"all certificates," "and/or copies of certified
election results," again providing another mechanism
readily available to the State Party for
certification of their Delegates.

20 (b) (2), the same language that we used in \(20(\mathrm{~b})(1)\).

In \(20(\mathrm{~b})(3)\), again, the same language providing for another authorized officer.

In \(20(\mathrm{c})\), again, the same language regarding the date on which the National Convention is scheduled to begin.

In \(20(\mathrm{~d})\), we strike the words "as of the date of the start of the Convention," and, again, put in the language about the date on which the Convention is scheduled to begin.
\(22(a)\), we strike the words "presenting certificates of election from" and replace it with the words "certified by." Again, a clarification. In 23(a), we strike the words "registered mail." We had a real problem in one of the contests
we had, where the contestants had to be noted by -noticed by registered mail. It's expensive, it's cumbersome, it's time-consuming. And we think that can be accomplished with much more efficiency and still provide adequate notice for the procedures to -- it can be "certified mail or other means set forth in the procedural rules adopted by the Committee on Contests."

In \(23(b)\), we strike the entire rule. And it really is a reversal of the wording there to say, instead of "only an alternate or" -- "Delegate or alternate Delegate may file," to start off with "A contest may be filed against the Delegate or alternate Delegate." I think the wording is clear. In 23(c), just delete the "(s)." And in Rule \(24(\mathrm{~b})\), the current procedure requires that the parties file their pleadings on the same day. And that is a very awkward procedure. What this does is, the contestant files 27 days in advance, and then the respondent would have an -- 5 days to file a response.

In \(25(\mathrm{~b})\), we replace the language "6" and
```

-- strike the language "6" and insert "the earlier
of 24 hours after the RNC passes the temporary rule
or }12\mathrm{ hours prior to the commencement of the
Convention."
Madam Chairman, the intent of all of these
amendments is simply to make clearer what the
current rules are and, in some cases, to streamline.
There is no other agenda, other than clarity and
efficiency here. And I would urge adoption of the
amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Ryder.
Is there anyone who would like to speak in
opposition to the amendment?
MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman, I have a
couple of questions of Mr. Ryder.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Generally,
questions are to be addressed to the Chair, but,
without objection, I'm going to allow Mr. Ryder and
Mr. Little to have a discussion that may benefit all
of us.
MR. LITTLE: Mr. Ryder, are -- through

```

Madam Chairman -- you indicated that it would have been 2:00 a.m. as of Sunday, when -- your very first amendment here. But, of course, it refers to the Republican National Committee meeting, session of that.

MR. RYDER: I'm sorry. That was -- that's right. That would be before the -- 12 hours prior to the General Session of the --

MR. LITTLE: So, that would have been this week.

MR. RYDER: That's -- which is when the temporary roll was adopted.

MR. LITTLE: And that's because the RNC is required to adopt the temporary roll.

MR. RYDER: That's correct. Thank you for that clarification, Mr. Little.

I'm sorry, Madam Chairman. I should have directed that to you.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I thought it would be more helpful if you talked to each other for a moment.

All right. Are there any other
```

individuals who wish to be recognized for the
purpose of opposing the motion?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we
will move directly to a vote.
All those in favor of adopting Mr. Ryder's
motion, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The amendment
passes.
We will move now to Amendment M2.2, which
impacts Rule number 14 in a number of aspects. This
has been raised by Mr. Ash, of Arizona, who's
recognized for the purpose of making a motion.
MR. ASH: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Bruce Ash, from the State of Arizona.
You will see before you various citations
within Rule 14. The gist of where this is going is
-- has earlier been discussed by Mr. Little and

```
others. We've rejected those amendments. Perhaps the purpose of still making this motion at the present time is to get this on the docket for when the temporary -- when this temporary committee begins meeting.

The concepts here to be aware of is the change from population-basis electoral votes to Republican performance, which is one Delegate per 50,000 Republican votes cast. This doesn't take into account illegal aliens, and it bases a representation on GOP performance.

This should encourage GOP participation, rewarding productive States with more Delegates and prompting those States with -- that have been underperforming to do better. Approximately 30 percent more Delegates are created by this, with 10 percent more participants.

Now, under this particular plan, 39 States would gain Delegates, one stays the same, and only 11 drop. The territories stay exactly the same for where they are now. And it also moves large numbers of alternates over to being Delegates, getting more
people participating in the process.
    There probably is good reason at this
time, given the past votes that have been taken this
afternoon, Madam Chairman, to refer these ideas to a
committee, but it would be wise for us to at least
look at these currently, to respond to any questions
or any debate that we might have.
    Thank you very much.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Ash.
    The Chair's a little bit confused on what
you'd like to suggest, so let me ask you this. Are
you proposing that we go ahead with a vote on your
amendment, or are you proposing to withdraw it, with
the understanding of the body that this will be
referred to a committee?

MR. ASH: Yeah. Thank you. I would like to have debate and a vote on it. And if the body decided not to adopt these amendments, then, of course, I would hope that some of these ideas, if not all of these ideas, might be the topic of conversation when this Committee begins meeting at a later date.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Ash.

Then we will proceed with debate on the amendment. Are there individuals who wish to be heard in opposition?

Mrs. Homan.
MS. HOMAN: I -- would it be a point of inquiry? I'm trying to understand some of the language on what is stricken. And could I ask a question to clarify?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Certainly.
MS. HOMAN: Am I correct in understanding
```

that this would delete all Delegates from the
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District of Columbia and the territories? Because
it talks about striking 10 through 12.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Mr.
Ash, is that the intent of your motion?
MR. ASH: No, it would not.
MS. HOMAN: So, it would leave all the
Delegates from D.C. and the --

MR. ASH: And the --
MS. HOMAN: -- territories --

MR. ASH: -- territories, correct.
MS. HOMAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, Mrs. Homan.

Is there someone who would like to speak in opposition?

Gentleman -- I've --
MR. FORSTEN: From Delaware.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- forgotten your State, I apologize.

MR. FORSTEN: Delaware. The Delaware Plan.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Of course. Of
course. The Gentleman from Delaware.
MR. FORSTEN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I rise in opposition to this proposed rule. As I see it -- I haven't seen the breakdown, but my guess is, the 10 States that suffer are the smallest States. Just looking at it from Delaware's perspective, where we have the largest Congressional District that is only one Congressman, we would no longer -- we would -- right now, under the current
```

rules, we get three Delegates for each Congressional
District. That's the rule. This rule says, if you
don't have a Republican, you only get one. We only
have 17 Delegates to begin with, so we lose Delegate
s that way. This awards additional Delegates for
every -- I think it's 500,000 -- 50- -- every 50,000
Republican votes cast. Delaware's a pretty small
State. We've only got about 500,000 registered
voters. More than half of them, unfortunately, are
on the other side of the aisle. And yet, a big
State -- New York, California, Illinois -- they're
just going to get a lot more Delegates. And that's
not even in the rules. So, this is going to further
exacerbate the differential in State impact and
State sizes. And I think it should be opposed. I
don't have any problem studying it, but I'm sure
further study will come to that conclusion, as well.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there others who wish to be heard in
support -- in support of the amendment?
[No response.]
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CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Are there others
who wish to be heard in opposition to the amendment? Mr. Tettlebaum.

MR. TETTLEBAUM: Thank you, Ms. -- Madam Chairman.

The first amendment, page 24, lines 2 through 4, I'm not sure what the intent of that actually is, because it seems to me that perhaps what the author wants to do is to strike the word "State" before "Republican Party" in line 3, rather than "State" after the word "each." Because it's not clear what the effect of that is. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Ash, would you like to address that? MR. ASH: Madam Chairman, I don't have a -- an excellent answer for my fellow Delegate. I wish I did. I don't have any answer for you. It's part of -- it was part of our drafting that we did. MR. TETTLEBAUM: Okay. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Right. Are there other -Mr. Tettlebaum, did you have anything
```

else?

```

MR. TETTLEBAUM: No. I would -- I believe this is a confusing amendment, and I would urge that we vote against it.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who would like to speak in favor? Anyone else
who would like to speak in favor?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Are there -- is there anyone else who would like to speak --

I see the Lady --
MR. SCHANFARBER: Madam Chair?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- from Wyoming is still coming.

MR. SCHANFARBER: Madam Chair, I have a -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Who would like to speak in favor?

MR. SCHANFARBER: -- point of information. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.

MR. SCHANFARBER: Yeah. Robert
Schanfarber, the Virgin Islands.
I, too, am confused by the effect of this
```

amendment, specifically for the Virgin Islands. Is
the intention to change the amount of Delegates,
going forward?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Ash?
MR. ASH: Thank you for that question.
The territories are not impacted by this.
They don't lose, they don't gain.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
The Lady from Wyoming is recognized to
speak in support.
MS. HAGEMAN: Yes. Harriet Hageman, from
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Wyoming.
    I speak in support of this amendment,
again because it is based upon the concept of
rewarding those States that are voting Republican,
and that it is rewarding those States that have the
Republican Governors and Senators and
Representatives. It is a benefit to all -- to the
vast majority of the States. And I think that there
was a comment about whether it hurt the smaller
States. Again, coming from the least populated
State in the Nation, looking at the numbers, it
```

actually helps the State of Wyoming, and it will
help other States, as well, in terms of increasing
their Delegates. It is performance-based, based
upon those States that vote Republican.
We're trying to award -- to reward the
people who get out the vote and that have the
Republican Governors, Senators, Representatives, and
those things. It is a performance-based-type
Delegate allocation.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
The Gentleman from Nevada.
MR. ROSS: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Jordan Ross, Nevada.
I will have to echo the earlier comment
from the Gentleman who said that the amendment is
confusing. The language, as I'm reading this here,
striking the word "State," which is currently
defined in our rules to include all of the
territories, not just the District of Columbia, and
to replace it with "the 50 States and the District
of Columbia," I fail to see how this does not

```
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exclude the territories.
And there was another question, just a
moment ago; the author was honest enough to say he
did not have an answer. I -- Easter eggs are
entertaining when they're in video games or in
children's Easter baskets, I don't like them in
rules, Madam Chair. I don't know what else is
lurking in this. We don't have enough time to go
through it.
I urge a no vote.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
The Gentlelady from California.
MS. DHILLON: Madam Chair, I call the
question -- previous question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
has been called. We will now move to a vote on
ending debate on Amendment M2.2.
All those in favor of ending debate,
please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
nay.

```
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
We will immediately move to a vote on Amendment M2. 2.

All those in favor of adoption of this amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Ladies and gentlemen, two more came in
while we were working, the last little while. Let's see if we can't deal with these, as well.

Amendment number 24.1 deals with Rule number \(24(e)\). It has been submitted by the Lady from Maryland, Ms. Ambrose, who is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MS. AMBROSE: Hello. Good evening.
Nicolee Ambrose, Maryland.
This proposal is to simply add a sentence at the end of \(24(e)\), "A copy" -- in -- if \(I\) may, the
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Rule pertains to -- we have an 8-day notice in front
of this, which maybe someone else could assist in,
give is the lead-in to it. But, the addition is "A
copy of such objection shall be provided to all
members of the Republican National Committee within
3 days of receipt, and, in all cases, before" -- oh,
and now I can't read it. Can we enlarge the screen,
please? Sorry.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There we go.
MS. AMBROSE: -- "and, in all cases,
before the start of any meeting of the Republican
National Committee in which the contest is to be
addressed under these rules."
This is simply an --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Just a second. We
can ask for a second. Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a second.
Now please proceed, Ms. Ambrose.
MS. AMBROSE: Thank you.
This is simply a notice issue. Once
again, I'm of the opinion that if we criticize Nancy
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Pelosi for saying, "Lets pass it so we can read it,"
we need to be able to read things before we pass
them or vote on them at the Republican National
Committee.

So, I'm simply requesting that we have notice before we decide weighty issues before us.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition? Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition?

Okay, one of you decide -- all right.
Mr. Ryder is recognized in opposition to Amendment 24.1.

MR. RYDER: If I understand this, the -well, it gets to be a timing issue, in terms of the objections that we receive and when they come to the National Committee. The normal procedure is that, after there is an objection to the initial finding of the Contest Committee, the Contest Committee then either grants a hearing or doesn't grant a hearing. And then -- the initial meeting of the Contest
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Committee is in Washington, and then the hearing is
held in the Convention city. And the Contest
Committee then hears testimony from any Party
seeking a hearing, deliberates, and then gives the
National Committee its results, and the National
Committee then reviews the findings of the
Committee, rather than going behind the Committee
and acting as a trial court in its own right.
So, it seems to me that this is not an
appropriate procedure for us to follow. And I would
urge a no vote on this amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Ryder.
Is there anyone else who would like to
speak in support of the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
else who would like to speak in opposition?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing no one else
who wishes to be recognized, we will move
immediately to a vote on the amendment.

```

All those in favor of adopting Amendment
```

24.1, please say aye.

```
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
The next item that we have is Amendment
number 16.6. This pertains to Rule 16(d)(1). It has been proposed by Ms. Blanchard-Reed, of the State of Washington, who is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MS. BLANCHARD-REED: Thank you, Madam
Chair.
I'd like to make a motion to strike the word "selected" after the word "elected."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Moved and seconded. Ms. Blanchard-Reed, if you'd like to proceed.

MS. BLANCHARD-REED: Thank you.
I propose to do this because systems and
words matter. The word "elect" indicates that
someone is chosen by -- to do a job. "Voting" is
open, fair, and transparent. "Selecting" is
choosing somebody according to a system. And
"selecting" does imply a bias. It prevents the
potential of selling Delegates to the highest donor.
    And "voting" is broad. Anyone could win. And
"selecting" is narrow and closed.
    So, I urge you to vote in favor of
replacing the word "selected" and adding "elected."
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Is there anyone who would like to speak in
opposition to the motion?
    The Gentleman from Nevada.
    MR. ROSS: Madam Chair, I see nothing that
--
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Name and State,
please.
    MR. ROSS: Yes, ma'am. I'm -- bad boy.
        Jordan Ross, Nevada. That's why I have
the name tag, in case \(I\) get lost, they know how to
return me to my wife.
    I'm sorry, Madam Chair, but I see nothing
in this that says, you know, going forward, you
know, starting with, you know, the Convention, 4
years from now. So, I'm looking at this, I'm
thinking anybody who was -- the method by which they
were chosen to be a Delegate to this Convention, if
it doesn't meet the precise interpretation of what
an election is, I mean, does that mean they had to
be elected, you know, at the precinct level, at the
county level, the State level, et cetera? Are we
then going to disenfranchise and revoke the
credentials of a number of people? I don't know,
from various State to State, exactly how all the
Delegates are chosen, and I'm not willing to put my
vote in favor of this without knowing that. And I
would advise that everyone else would do the same.
    Again, surprises buried in rule amendments
that are just too scary to go forward with. I urge
a no vote.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Is there anyone who rises in support? Is
there anyone who rises in support of this amendment?
    Mr. Ash, do you rise in support? Mr. Ash?
    MR. ASH: Oh, yes. I'm sorry, Madam
Chairman.

I do arise in support. And to answer the
Gentleman's question with respect to this
Convention, this rule doesn't impact this
Convention. And really what it does is solidify our
commitment to activist voting in elections in State
Conventions, and so on, and not selecting Delegates
in small rooms, where just a few people have an
opportunity to select Delegates at this time.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Ash.
    Mr. Tettlebaum.
    MR. TETTLEBAUM: I would rise to oppose
this amendment, because what this amendment would do
is negate the provisions of Rule 14(a)(2). And if
you will turn your page to the top of page 32, you
will see that, as part of \(16(d)(1)(v)\) is \(14(a)(2)\),
which is the provision which provides for the
National Committeeman, National Committeewoman, and
the Chair of the State Delegation being Delegates to the National Convention. And by removing the word "selected," since those persons aren't elected as Delegates, they are selected as Delegates because of their positions, and \(I\) believe that may be the purpose, intentionally or unintentionally, of this amendment. So, I move that it be opposed.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Tettlebaum.

Mr. Munisteri.
MR. MUNISTERI: Yes, Madam Chairman. I'm rising in opposition to this.

This particular provision would actually invalidate the Republican Party of Texas rules -- we talked about unintended consequences -- because it applies to alternates and uses the word "selection." We have a process that, if a Delegate can't make it, the alternate moves up, and then we have a selection process for the alternate.

So, I spoke earlier about not having the National Party tell States what to do. This is another example that, if you come in and you try to
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change things in the way that local parties do
things, you'll mess up our local rules.
It wasn't broken. I didn't get 1,000
letters from grassroots activists saying, "Please
change the word 'select' in your rules." So, let's
not fix problems that don't exist and then create
new problems.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Munisteri.
Mr. Ose.
MR. OSE: Madam Chair, Doug Ose, from
California.
I would ask for some clarification. The
amendment proposes to address subparagraph (1),
where the word "selected" is included. But, if you
go down in paragraph (1) to subparagraph (4), the
word "selected" is repeated. So, is it the purpose
of the amendment to delete the word "selected" up
there by -- on line 12, and leave it on line 22?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I would ask the
maker of the amendment to address that. Was it the

```
intention of the maker of the amendment to replace it in only one place, or did you intend to have it replaced in both places?

MS. AMBROSE: Yes, to have it replaced in both places.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Then we would need to vote on an amendment.

MS. AMBROSE: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Let -= without objection, let's simply vote on an amendment that would reflect that this would be -- the word "selected" would be stricken, and the word "elected" inserted in both of those places.

All those in favor of making that amendment, say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Aye. Excuse me.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I was listening to him.

All of those opposed, please say nay.
[A chorus of nays.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The nays have it.

So, at this point, the text stands, with the substitution in only one place.

MR. OSE: Madam Chair, my further
question. In California, slates of Delegates are submitted to the Secretary of State 30 days before the election. And the names of the candidates are in the ballot. So, like, Senator Cruz, Governor Kasich, Mr. Trump, what have you. Does that mean that Delegates who were selected by the respective campaigns to represent each Congressional District would not be eligible to serve?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It seems to me that that's a legal question that \(I\) would have to refer to our counsel. I don't know if they have an opinion at this point. I'm sorry.

Would you repeat the question, please, Mr. Ose.

MR. OSE: In California, the -- each Congressional District, each campaign submits a slate of Delegates and alternates to serve in the
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event that that candidate prevails in that
Congressional District. The names of the Delegates
are not on the ballot, nor are the names of the
alternates. The only names on the ballot are those
of the candidates. Now, does that mean that
potential Delegates selected to serve on the slate
would not be eligible to serve or to come to the RNC
meeting or the Convention?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Counsel informs me
that his initial view would be that that is correct.
However, he's not --
MR. OSE: So, if I understand Counsel's
answer, California would be totally disenfranchised,
regardless of who prevailed in whichever
Congressional District.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: You would have to
make changes to bring yourself into compliance, so
that you would have to alter the means by which your
Delegates are elected, if this passed.
MR. OSE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anybody else who wishes to be
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recognized?

Mr. DeVito.
MR. DeVITO: Vincent DeVito,
Massachusetts.
    I'm asking this Committee to vote no on
this amendment, but I'm going to steal the Gentleman
from Nevada's idea, because of the Easter-egg
effect.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The
Chair senses that we have exhausted debate on this
matter. And so, we will move directly to a vote.
    All those in favor of adopting Amendment
16.6, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
    We have had one additional amendment come
in. I know, every time I say that, I can tell --
you all just kind of slump. But, in order for us to
be able to complete our work on the second session -
- section, it's necessary for us to take up this
amendment.
It is Amendment number 14.10. It is applicable to Rule number \(14(\mathrm{a})(9)\). It has been submitted by Mr. Hunt, of Washington, and Mr. Short, of Colorado.

And I see Mr. Hunt approaching the microphone, and he will be recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. HUNT: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I would like to make the motion to move this amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a second. Please proceed, Mr. Hunt, to address your amendment.

MR. HUNT: Thank you, Madam
Chair. And I thank you for addressing this. We had thought that this was turned in earlier, so I do apologize for it not being discussed previously.

This amendment is providing a bonus to the States that will perform a closed Primary, thereby
making the Republican Primary even stronger. And it's something that would be welcomed in Washington State, and it's -- I hope that it will be adopted by this body.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Hunt.
Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to Mr. Hunt's amendment? Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition?

Mr. DeVito.
MR. DeVITO: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Vincent DeVito, Massachusetts.
I'm asking this Committee to vote no on this amendment. And we have debated similar amendments already about this, so, rather than go into those points again, please revisit those issues with yourself. I'm asking you to vote no.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone else who likes to -- who would like to be recognized to speak in support of the amendment?

The Gentleman from Colorado.
MR. SHORT: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Our goal of this amendment is obviously to benefit those States that have Republican-only nominating processes. We are the Republican Party, and we ought to select our nominee. We've done our best to respect States' rights. That's why we -there's no penalty if you don't have a closed Primary. And we recognize there are States that have Democratic Legislatures that we can't make any change on. So, we're doing our best here to respect States. We're not trying to dictate from the RNC or the Republican Convention Committee what States have to do. But, if you are closed Primary, we want to incentivize that. That will also help those States that maybe have Republican Legislatures and that can use this as a little bit of an incentive to get this passed. We've talked to -- we've definitely talked to other States who would like to pass this type of thing, and need this incentive. Colorado is certainly one of them, as we deal with a statewide ballot initiative right, trying to open Primaries. So, this would be very beneficial to Colorado. I know, Virginia and Washington and some other States.
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    So, I'd urge you to support this amendment.
    Thank you, Madam Chairman.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Are those -- who would like to be
    recognized in opposition?
Mr. Barbour?
MR. BARBOUR: Thank you, Madam Chairman
Henry Barbour, from Mississippi.
I do oppose this amendment. And, while it
might not, quote, "punish" States if you give other
States a bonus Delegate, obviously, States that have
open Primaries will be punished. So, I would
disagree with that comment.
And certainly, in Mississippi and, I
think, a lot of other States, certainly in the
South, open Primaries have been a good way for the
Party to grow over the last few decades.
So, I think that I am in strong opposition
to this, and I appreciate your time.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Barbour.
Is there someone else who would like to be
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recognized in support? Anyone else who'd like to be
recognized in support?
    Mr. Blackwell.
    MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
    If you've read through the rules -- and
I'm confident that virtually every one of us in this
room has read through the rules as part of our
preparation -- you know that the general philosophy
in the rules is to encourage participation by
Republicans and not let non-Republicans come in and
choose our candidates. This is common.
    This proposed change has the great merit
of not penalizing anybody, but giving a powerful
incentive for closing Primaries. In Virginia, we
have had a problem for decades, because our State
law does not provide for Party registration. And on
Primary day, any registered voter can come in and
vote in either the Democrat or Republican Primary,
as he or she chooses. Always, there are -- and this
is customary in Virginia -- there are many people
who, in the Democrat Party, particularly if they
don't have a contested Democrat nomination, they
```

come in and vote in large numbers in our Primary,
and they do it, not because they prefer one of these
Republican candidates, they try to pick somebody who
Democrats can most easily beat.
The Republican Party of Virginia has
repeatedly asked the Legislature to set up a Party
registration process. And we get the majority of
the Republicans, who are conservative, but there are
some Republicans, whom I might describe as content-
free Republicans, and not all Republicans are
conservative, as someone else said on this
microphone earlier today, and they vote with the
Democrats to avoid having Party nomination, because
those content-free Republicans want to be able to
invite liberal Democrats to come into our Primaries
to help those incumbents get renominated.
If this were passed, it would be a big
argument in favor of setting up registration, which
the Republican Party of Virginia has insisted that
our legislators cooperate on, but a handful of our
legislators still keep voting with the Democrats.
So, it would be great help to the
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Republican Party of Virginia.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Mrs. Herron, did you wish to be recognized?

MS. HERRON: To speak in opposition.
I totally agree with what Mr. Blackwell
said, so just punch rewind and listen to that again, and then I'll pick it up.

The thing is, we have open Primaries in the State of Georgia, because we don't have registration by Party. So, I could go in and say, "I want the blue ballot" or "the white ballot," and I vote, and I go home. It would be to our great, great advantage if we could only have Republicans choosing our candidates. But, the State Party, Georgia Republican Party, has absolutely no control over this. It is controlled by our Legislature and our Secretary of State. We control the House, we control the Senate, we have a Republican. However, we also are under the Voting Rights Act. And if you change one period -- one period in your voting, you have to go to the JOD and get it approved, and it
```

costs two- or three-hundred-thousand dollars for our
State to do that. We change one period, it's going
to cost us money.
So, even though we're Republican-
controlled, we can't control it. The Party would
love to do it, but right now we have no control.
So, if you do that, Georgia would wind up
being penalized, because we cannot control that at
this point.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mrs.
Herron.
Is there anyone else who would like to be
recognized in support --
VOICE: Yes, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- of the
amendment?
Yes, ma'am.
MS. BLANCHARD-REED: Gina Blanchard-Reed,
from Washington State.
I'd like to rise in favor of this
amendment. This puts the onus on the State to

```
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devise a plan to close Primaries, and they can do it
any way they'd like. And I'm in favor, because it
is the carrot approach, versus penalizing.
Now, some States, like Washington, have
State laws that prohibit registering by Party. And
in this current cycle, our Convention results were
vastly different than our Primary votes -- than our
Primary outcome. And there has been some
speculation to the reasoning. And this discouraged
many Republicans.
So, this change would give States a
significant incentive to restrict participation to
deemed Republicans. And again, giving the States
the rights to decide how they can do that.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there others who wish to be recognized
in opposition?
The Gentleman at the front microphone.
MR. WILLHOIT: Janssen Willhoit, from
Vermont.
I'm rising with those States, like

```
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Vermont, again, that also do have -- not
registration by Party, and also, under current
Vermont election law, we cannot have closed
Primaries. And so, again, it would be -- I would
find it unfair for States like my State, that we
have no other option. And so, I would -- I do rise
now in support of small little States, like Vermont
and other States, to not support this.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there others who wish to rise in
support?
VOICE: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. The
Lady from Wyoming.
MS. HAGEMAN: Harriet Hageman, from
Wyoming, yet again.
I rise in support of this amendment. I
believe that it is critically important that
Republicans ought to be picking our Republican
candidates, whether they are for Governor, Senate,
House, the Federal elections or the State elections,
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even the local elections. We are a State that is primarily Republican. We are known as being a Republican State. But, I can assure you, with our small population, by not having a closed Primary, we have Democrats that often pick the candidates. They either pick the weakest candidate or they pick the most moderate or more liberal candidate in many, many, many of our races. And, in Wyoming, it would be very, very helpful to have closed Primaries. We believe strongly in this.

Again, we believe that it ought to be the Republicans picking our nominees, not Democrats. And I support this amendment and encourage all of you to support it, as well.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
The Chair recognizes Mrs. DeMonte.
MS. DeMONTE: Demetra DeMonte, great State of Illinois.

Yes, I'm from the great State of Illinois. I was born in Chicago, raised in a Democrat family, and I'm proud to tell you that my first vote was cast in 1980 for Ronald Reagan as a Reagan Democrat.
```

    So, I tell you, we cannot have closed Primaries. I
    believe that. This is the way of growing our Party.
    So, I as you to join me in voting against this so
        we can grow our Party.
    I ask this question to be called.
        Thank you.
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
        has been called. We will now move to a vote on
        closing debate.
    All those in favor of closing debate,
    please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
    nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
    VOICE: Division.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    VOICE: I was standing to speak, and she
    called the question --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, sir --
VOICE: Division.
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CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Fine, we'll do
division. But, I'll just say, once again, that any member who has been recognized and has the microphone has the right to call for the previous question, regardless of whether other individuals have not yet spoken.

So, we will go a division.
All of those in favor of this amendment -excuse me -- previous -- in favor of calling the question -- all those in favor of ending debate, please rise.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Please
```

be seated.

```

Those against, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Please be seated.

The tellers inform me that the vote is as follows: those in favor, 70; those against, 13. Clearly, we have more than two-thirds. Previous question is adopted.

Sir, for what purpose do you seek to be recognized?

VOICE: I rise on a point of personal privilege.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. CABELLO: Thank you.
John Cabello, from Illinois.
I know we have lots of business going on today, but \(I\) think, in light of the attacks that took place in France, maybe we could do a moment of silence.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Sir, what I was going to suggest, I have been waiting simply until we finish this final amendment. And if you will allow me simply to take this final vote, then \(I\) was going to do exactly that. Thank you.

MS. BOWEN: Point of information, Madam Chairman.

Gwen Bowen, Louisiana.
Did you say 13? Because I just happened to be counting them while they were counting them, and it was --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thirty.
MS. BOWEN: Oh, I'm -- okay, 30. I
misunderstood.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I mis- -- it may
have sounded like 13. I apologize.
MS. BOWEN: Okay, thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thirty.
Okay, my -- just a minute. The tellers seem to be having a disagreement. They're triplechecking.
[Pause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. All
right. Ladies and gentlemen, I apologize and stand corrected. Previous question did fail.

Before we continue that, however, the Gentleman has raised a very important point. You may have seen me scowling for the last 15 minutes or so, and it's not because we are behind in our work or because of anything that's going on in this room.

It is because our brothers and sisters in France have just been victim to yet another act of terrorism.

In the past several weeks, we have all
increasingly been witness to too many acts of senseless violence and loss of life. And, at this point, I would ask that God would continue to guide us in our deliberations, but also to bless our brothers and sisters in France, who have just
suffered another terrible loss. And so, I would
invite you to join me in bowing our heads for a
moment of silence.
    [A moment of silence was observed.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    We will continue debate on Amendment
14.10.
    Mr. Paikai.
    MR. PAIKAI: Madam Chair, I -- on personal
privilege, please, ma'am. I just want to thank you
for a wonderful job that you've been doing. I have
been honored by it.
    [Applause.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Paikai. Thank you.
    And I want to thank all of you for your
help and your cooperation and your good humor during this marathon session today. Hopefully, this will make it so that we don't have quite so much work to do tomorrow.

We are back to debate on Amendment number 14.10. And I can't remember whether we left off those in favor or those opposed. So, I'm going to start here with Mr. Little and then move back to the back microphone.

Mr. Little.
MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman, \(I\) fear we are losing our distinctive -- as Republicans. We have had open Primaries in Louisiana for practically all of my voting life. In our recent Legislature, in our Senate side, we have 25 out of 39 Republicans in our State Senate. Thirteen of those 25, a majority, voted for every single tax that our Governor proposed this year in our first Special Session, a billion-two in taxes. We have Republicans that are acting like Democrats. I believe it is time for us to at least provide an incentive for States in the presidential Primaries and Caucuses and Conventions
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to conduct them by Republicans. It's an incentive,
not a penalty.
Mrs. Chairman, I urge a yes vote on this.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Little.
We've now heard Mr. Little speak in
opposition. Is there some -- pardon me -- in
support. Mr. Little has spoken in support of the
amendment. Is there someone who wishes to be
recognized in opposition to the amendment?
Mrs. Hellreich.
MS. HELLREICH: Yes. Madam Chairman,
coming from one of the bluest States in our country,
Hawaii, and having worked to elect the first
Republican Governor in our State since statehood,
had we had a closed Primary, we would have never
been able to have accomplished that. So, I have
real empathy for the States who are controlled by
the Democrat Legislatures in their election laws and
various other things. And, in our State, we have
our businesses and many others who are intimidated.
If they had to go and request and in any way show
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that they were going to vote a Republican ballot, they would be afraid to do it.

So, as we tried to build our Party in our State, and when I see that we were able to have Republican leadership in our governorship and Lieutenant Governor's Office for 8 years as a result of bringing Democrats in, who are now beginning to vote Republican, but they're not willing to be able to go out -- many of them work for the government, and they're afraid to go out and even say it. But, they are coming around to voting for our people.

But, it's a long process. There's no question about it. But, you need to be sympathetic with those States who don't have control.

So, I would urge our colleagues here to vote no on this.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Mrs. Hellreich has spoken in opposition. Is there anyone else who wishes to be recognized in support of the amendment? Support of the amendment?

The Lady from Colorado. MS. UNRUH: Kendal Unruh, from Colorado. And I want to really stress the importance of this. And I'm in favor of this. Obviously, open Primaries are a huge problem, with the fact that they get integrated with people that do not share Republican values and do not reflect the platform. And we have a horrible situation in Colorado, where we actually even have been subjected to same-day voter laws, to where people can actually go into an area and vote just with the idea, and they -- all they have to do is state that they are intending on moving there, and they are not given a provisional ballot, they're actually given an actual ballot. And it actually is just a problem that we've had to deal with as Republicans, because we don't tend to be the Party that takes advantage of a system like that.

But, anyway, \(I\) just think that a lot of the problems that we have within different election cycles, where, for instance, we lose down-ballot races because of open Primaries, I think that this
will get to the core root of that problem, to where we can just remain strong and unified as a Republican Party by closing down some of these open Primaries.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who wishes to be recognized in opposition?

VOICE: Madam Chair?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: In opposition?
The Gentleman from Delaware.
MR. FORSTEN: Thank you, Madam Chairman
Two points. And I'll be very brief.
But, if we are going to give a bonus -and we give other bonuses for a Republican Governor, for control of the House or control of a State Senate -- we give one Delegate, maybe two Delegates. Here, we're given 20 percent for having a closed Primary. This will have the effect of making smaller States which have a closed Primary, like Delaware, that much less relevant compared to their bigger States, if it only takes a simple majority to
get the nomination. So, a State with 50 Delegates in a closed Primary gets 10 more Delegates. Delaware, we've got 15, that gets us three. So, it's now 60 to 18. And even bigger States get more. Twenty -- we should not be awarding 20 percent. If we're going to do this, \(I\) would say, at most, it should just be one or two Delegates, the way it is with everything else.

On the issue of open Primaries versus closed Primaries, I'll just observe very quickly, all politics are local. In Delaware, if we had open Primaries, Mike Castle would be a Senator today instead of Chris Coons, and we'd have one more Republican in the Senate Caucus.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there someone who would like to be recognized in support?

Ms. Ambrose.
MS. AMBROSE: Nicolee Ambrose, Maryland.
Coming from the Old Line State of Maryland, a small blue State that has elected two Republican Governors in the past 14 years, I am
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tremendously in favor of this. It's a great benefit
to us, even though we're technically in the
Northeast Region.
I'd also like to add that I think this
handles a -- many States' concerns the way it's
worded, where it allows for either you to be
identified as registered as a Republican by your
Party rules or by your State's rules. So, I think
that allows some additional flexibility that takes
care of some people's concerns.
Thus, I urge you to vote for this
amendment.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Ms.
Ambrose.
Are there additional people who wish to be
recognized?
The Gentleman from Maine.
MR. WILLETTE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Alex Willette, from Maine.
I stand opposed to this, for two reasons.
One, Maine, we do have a closed Caucus system, but

```
the State statutes require us to keep the registration open for fewer than 30 days. So, that would impact us. We wouldn't be able to benefit from this. And, as far as changing the law, you know, we've had some luck in past years having a few Republican Legislatures, but it's not necessarily guaranteed in Maine. And getting the Democrats in the Maine House to change this statute, I think, would be nearly impossible.

Secondly, we've -- when \(I\) first got
elected in 2010 to the Maine House, we were the -it was the first time in 40 years that we were elected a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Republican Governor. And that was really exciting. We brought a lot of new people to the table. Fast forward to this year, we had four times as many people participate in our Caucus than we did in 2012. Mainers are excited. Maine is turning into a purple State. And if we start to pass provisions like this, I think that will hurt us and other blue States from turning purple.
So, I stand in opposition to this.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone else who would like to be recognized in support?

Mr. Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: Madam Chairman, I have a point of information.

You did not announce the corrected totals on the vote on the previous question. A lot of us were interested in that. Could you do that for --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. I want to make certain I get it from those who tabulated it. They kept whispering different things back and forth. Can we have the final tabulation? Seventy ayes, 39 nays.

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you. I would like to tell you in advance that \(I\) am going to request a division on the vote on this amendment.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Certainly, Mr. Blackwell.

Is there anyone else who would like to be recognized in opposition?

VOICE: Madam Chair?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Gentleman from South Carolina.

MR. MOORE: Delegate Matt More, from South Carolina.

First and foremost, I am for registration of my Party in closed Primaries, particularly in South Carolina, where this issue is in our platform. But, Delegate Little, from Louisiana, has said that he's been under the open Primary system his whole life. And we should reflect about why that is the case, particularly in the South. And you all should Google this. Many court cases from the 1930s and '40s of the Democratic Party using closed, say, Conventions to discriminate against African American brothers and sisters of ours. So, this is why it's the case in the South. And it's important to remember our history on this issue. And this is a very sensitive issue, as Delegate Barbour alluded to earlier, in the South, of closed Primaries and registration by Party. And then, in -- particularly in South Carolina's Senate, it just takes one vote
to block legislation such as this. And that has
been the case in South Carolina now for now going on
a couple of a decades. And, as you all know, South
Carolina does not take kindly to doing things at the
point of a Federal spear.
    Therefore, \(I\) urge opposition to this
amendment, based on that.
    So, thank you very much.
    MR. LITTLE: A point of order, Madam
Chairman.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Mr. Little.
    MR. LITTLE: If the vote was 78 to 39, it
    would appear to me that the question had been
called. Could --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, it was 70 to
39. And the previous question --
    MR. LITTLE: Oh, I thought you said 78.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- requires two-
thirds.
    MR. LITTLE: Begging your pardon.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: My -- I'm probably
slurring, at this point at night. It's only Diet
Coke, I promise. But --

All right. Are there others who wish to be heard in -- where did we just leave off? He was against. Others who wish to be recognized in support?

Mr. Ash.
MR. ASH: Thank you, Madam Chairman. And I also want to thank you for the way you've conducted the meeting so far today. And I won't speak for very long, because \(I\) know we all want to leave and go back to our hotels.

I live in a pretty red State. I host a radio show most every Saturday afternoon. Probably the most constant question \(I\) get is the complaining about our elected officials, who are Republicans, by Independents. Now, if we had more Senators like Mike Lee and House members like Steve Pearce, and if I lived in those States, perhaps I wouldn't have as many questions as \(I\) do sometimes in the State of Arizona.

I often say to my Republican colleagues in this very red State of Arizona, Where is the
```

Independent Party headquarters located? Where do we
go to complain to the Independent Party Chairman or
National Committee people? In those States that are
blue, in those States that aspire to be purple, in
purple States that aspire to be red States, we need
to elect more Republican elected officials. And,
while we may have more elected Republican officials
in this country today, in large part due to the work
done here at the RNC, than any time since the 1920s,
the best way for us to get more Republican officials
elected is to have closed Primaries, to hold our
Republican officials accountable for the work that
they do to get conservative elected Republicans.
And the way we do it is, we close our Primaries.
Thank you very much.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
The Gentleman from Vermont has been
waiting most patiently. Are you rising to speak in
support or in opposition?
MR. WILLHOIT: Opposition, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Then please
proceed.
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MR. WILLHOIT: Thank you. Again, Janssen Willhoit, from Vermont. I think we've already spoken in detail about States like myself that, by our own very laws, must stay open, but I also want to take this opportunity for those of my friends amongst the grassroots to not be scared or fearful of these open Primaries. Because as I think many of my colleagues in those blue and aspiring-purple States can attest to, we have the message. And I am a part of a group of eight that are -- that got elected as freshmen in our State, last year in the House, that, for the first time in over a decade, the Democrats lost their supermajority. Yes, they still have a majority, but, as we talked about early -- earlier, Madam Chair, once we have that Governor, we're going to be able to sustain that veto and make change.

But, again, I got there by, yes, a lot of very progressives still voting for me, because I went to every door and I gave them the message. We have the message, and we cannot fear that message.

And so, again, I say allow us -- besides
the fact that we have to, by law, stay open, but,
beside that, don't fear us, because we have good
conservatives in our States, and our message will
prevail.
    Thank you, Madam.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you very
much, sir.
    Is there anyone else who's -- rises to
speak in support?
    Mr. Lee.
    SENATOR LEE: What makes us a Party is
that we have differences from the other people who
are not part of our Party. We will cease to be a
Party if we allow others to vote in our elections
and determine our candidates who don't share our
values.
    In any political election, anytime there
is a political consultant involved, you'll always
hear from that political consultant about the need
to draw contrast, to identify a difference between
the candidate that you're supporting, a candidate
that the consultant is advising, and the other
candidate. When we don't have closed Primaries,
when we don't have some system, whether it's a
closed Primary or a Convention or something, that
draws a distinction between us and the other people,
those who are Republicans and those who are not, we
lose.
    One of my favorite movies, "What About
Bob?," contained this great line, where he said
there are people -- two kinds of people in the
world, people who like Neil Diamond and those who
don't.
    [Laughter.]
    SENATOR LEE: There are two kinds of
people who participate in American politics,
Republicans and those who are not. If we want to be
conservatives, and if we want to have a Party that
is conservative, that Party has to be the Republican
Party. There is no other. But, if we allow others
to vote in our contests, if we allow others to
decide for us who is going to run under our banner,
with our logo, with that elephant, we are destining
our own Party and our own cause for extinction.

So, please, please, if you believe in this, if you believe that we've got to draw contrast, we've got to show how we're different from the other people, please support this amendment.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I must remind the guests that any indication of support or opposition is not proper from the gallery.

Thank you.
All right. At this point, do we have others who wish to rise in opposition?

The Gentlelady from California.
MS. DHILLON: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.
I want to start my comments by pointing out that California has a closed Primary for presidential selection for Republicans, and not for the Democrats. So, you can -- you all are sophisticated enough to know what effect that has on our participation. So, this rule would actually benefit California. We would get, in fact, given our 169 current elected Delegates, we'd add 34 additional Delegates.

I'm still opposed to this motion, for the reason of the premise. And I heard Senator Lee make some very impassioned comments. I agree with him. I like having a closed Primary, I like having the ability to differentiate myself, as a Party officer, from the Democrats. But, the premise that a rule like this, even if you made it 100 -percent bonus in the number of Delegates, is going to have any, sort of, incentive impact on a Democratic or a purple mixed Legislature to change the law to help the Republicans out is a fallacy. It's a logical fallacy. It's not going to happen. To the contrary, you're putting a -- you're putting a bulls-eye on our backs. I mean, the Democrats love the fact that California is technically outside the Primary cutoff dates of the RNC. We're only here as Delegates by virtue of a waiver that we got, because the Democrats have no interest in California Republicans being able to vote and affect the impact of these races.

So, it is a perverse incentive that you are delivering by supporting this amendment in
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anything other than a red State.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there others who wish to be heard in
support?
The Lady from Washington.
MS. BLANCHARD-REED: Yes, Madam Chair.
This is Gina Blanchard-Reed, from
Washington State.
And I'd like to address two points. One
is from the Gentlelady from California. This rule
does not require that the State Legislature passes
any laws. This is putting the onus on the State
Party to determine who is deemed Republican. They
can come up with a lot of creative ideas on how to
do that 30 days before the Primary. Could be
sending in a survey or donating \$5. It could be
anything they want. It just -- it needs to be done
3 0 days before, and has nothing to do with the
Legislature or the State laws.
And I also just want to bring up the point
that we should stand for the freedom of association,
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that we have the right to stand together as Republicans, and we should uphold that.

I urge you to vote in favor of this.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Are there others who wish to be heard who do not support the amendment?

The Gentleman from New Hampshire.
MR. DUPREY: Madam Chairman, in addition to not supporting this amendment at this time, I'd like -- we've had 20 minutes more of debate. We have some very well-articulated arguments by Senator Lee and others. I think all of us understand the issue. And I'd like to move the previous question.

VOICE: [Inaudible.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Point of order?
I'm sorry?
VOICE: [Inaudible.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, there is no debate on that motion. Excuse me?

VOICE: [Inaudible.]
MR. DUPREY: No, I spoke against the --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No.
MR. DUPREY: -- the amendment, and then -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And then called previous question.

VOICE: [Inaudible.]
MR. DUPREY: Yeah.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
All right. Previous question has once against been called.

All of those in favor of ending debate on this issue, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yeah, if you'd
please just remain in place. Some of you, as soon as you think you've been counted, you move. And then, when you do that, the counters who are verifying the count from another position get very confused.

All right. Please be seated.
All those opposed to previous question, although I can't imagine why you would be, at this point, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I don't know what we have left to debate about it.

All right. Please be seated.
Can we have the tally, please? It was 98
to 2, previous question passes. Excuse me. Three.
Three. Ninety-eight to three.
All right, we will move directly to a vote on the amendment itself.

All of those in favor of adopting
Amendment 14.10, please stand. All those in favor, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The Chair is no longer in doubt. Please be seated. The motion fails.

We had one more amendment come in. Let me just -- let me suggest this.

VOICE: Vote count?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I didn't have them complete it, because the Chair was no longer in doubt.

VOICE: What's the purpose of a division?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: To -- so that the
Chair can make certain that the Chair rules
correctly. The division is simply a rising vote. It is not a counting vote unless it's called for.

Mr. Blackwell, if you would please approach a microphone if you have a point to make.

MR. BLACKWELL: Madam Chairman, I request a record vote. I move for a record vote.

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. You
need 20 percent to accomplish that. All of those in favor of a record vote, please stand. We'll see if we have 20 percent.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: If I could please have the tellers. I'm informed by the parliamentarians that we need to have 23 members to have a standing vote. Can you tell me how many that
we have? Where's my teller? They all take it over here and then compare. Excuse me? Thirty-one. Please be seated. We will have a standing vote and a counted vote. Excuse me, he called for a rollcall vote? Thank you. It is a record vote. And so, I'm going to ask our Vice-Chairman, Mr. Kauffman, to come and read the roll of the membership. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Alabama, Ed Henry. MR. HENRY: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Laura Payne. MS. PAYNE: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: No. Alaska, Peggy Wilson. MS. WILSON: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: No. Fred Brown. MR. BROWN: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: American Samoa, Abe Malae. MR. MALAE: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Amata Radewagon.

MS. RADEWAGON: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Arizona, Linda
Brickman.
MS. BRICKMAN: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Yes.
Bruce Ash.
MR. ASH: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you.
Arkansas, Reta Hamilton.
MS. HAMILTON: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Jonathan?
MR. BARNETT: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: No.
California, Doug Ose.
MR. OSE: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Harmeet Dhillon.
MS. DHILLON: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: No.
Colorado, Guy Short.
MR. SHORT: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Kendal Unruh.
MS. UNRUH: No.

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: No?
Connecticut, Linda McMahon.
MS. McMAHON: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Ben Proto.
MR. PROTO: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Delaware, Richard
Forsten.
MR. FORSTEN: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Ellen Barrosse. MS. BARROSSE: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: District of

Columbia, Jill Homan.
MS. HOMAN: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you, Jill.
Bob Kabel.
MR. KABEL: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Florida, Peter
Feaman.
MR. FEAMAN: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Susan Wiles.
MS. WILES: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Georgia, Randy

Evans.
MR. EVANS: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Linda Herron.
MS. HERRON: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Speak up a little
bit, folks. Thanks.
Guam, James Rojas.
[No response.]
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Donna Jones. MS. JONES: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Hawaii, Nathan
```

Paikai.

```

MR. PAIKAI: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Miriam Hellreich. MS. HELLREICH: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Idaho, Lora Gervais. MS. GERVAIS: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Yes. Norm Semanko. MR. SEMANKO: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Illinois, John
Cabello.

MR. CABELLO: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Demetra DeMonte.
MS. DeMONTE: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Indiana, John
Hammond.
MR. HAMMOND: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you, John.
Beth Boyce.
MS. BOYCE: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Iowa, Marlys Popma.
MS. POPMA: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Yes.
Steve Scheffler.
MR. SCHEFFLER: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you.
Kansas, Kelly Arnold.
MR. ARNOLD: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Beverly Caley.
MS. CALEY: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Kentucky, Ralph
Alvarado.

MR. ALVARADO: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Kelly Craft. MS. CRAFT: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Louisiana, Gwen Bowen.

MS. BOWEN: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Ross Little. MR. LITTLE: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Maine, Alex

Willette.
MR. WILLETTE: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: MaryAnne Kinney.
MS. KINNEY: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Maryland, Nicolee
Ambrose.
MS. AMBROSE: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Jim Crawford. MR. CRAWFORD: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Massachusetts, Janet Fogarty. MS. FOGARTY: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Vincent DeVito.

MR. DeVITO: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Michigan, Judi
Schwalbach.
MS. SCHWALBACH: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Matt Hall. MR. HALL: Yes.

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Minnesota, Cindy
Pugh.
MS. PUGH: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: David Asp. MR. ASP: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Mississippi, Henry Barbour.

MR. BARBOUR: (Inaudible.) CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Nell Frisbie. MS. FRISBIE: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Missouri, Harvey Tettlebaum. MR. TETTLEBAUM: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Patricia Thomas. MS. THOMAS: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Montana, Anita
Milanovich.
    MS. MILANOVICH: Yes.
    CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Arthur Wittich.
    MR. WITTICH: Yes.
    CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Nebraska, Joyce
Simmons.
    MS. SIMMONS: No.
    CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: J.L. Spray.
    MR. SPRAY: No, for the record.
    CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: No, for the record.
    Nevada, Diana Orrock.
    MS. ORROCK: No.
    CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Jordan Ross.
    MR. ROSS: No.
    CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: New Hampshire,
    Steve Duprey.
    MR. DUPREY: No.
    CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Ellen Suprunowicz.
    MS. SUPRUNOWICZ: No.
    CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you.
    New Jersey, William Palatucci.
    MR. PALATUCCI: No.

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Christine Serrano-
```

Glassner.

```
    MS. SERRANO-GLASSNER: (Inaudible.)
    CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: New Mexico, Steve
Pearce.

MR. PEARCE: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Rosie Tripp. MS. TRIPP: No.

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: New York, Ralph
Mohr.
MR. MOHR: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Jennifer Rich.
MS. RICH: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: North Carolina, Zan
Bunn.
MS. BUNN: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thomas Stark. MR. STARK: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: North Dakota, the very quiet Curly Haugland. Curly?

MR. HAUGLAND: (Inaudible.)
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Sandra Boehler.

MS. BOEHLER: (Inaudible.)
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Northern Marianas,
Ralph Torres.
MR. TORRES: (Inaudible.)
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Vicky Villagomez.
MS. VILLAGOMEZ: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Ohio, Don Thibaut. MR. THIBAUT: Emphatically no.

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you, Don.
Jo Ann Davidson.
MS. DAVIDSON: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Oklahoma, Gary
Jones.
MR. JONES: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Megan Winburn.
MS. WINBURN: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Oregon, Solomon
Yue.
MR. YUE: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Chris Barreto. MR. BARRETO: Yes.

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Pennsylvania, Joyce

Haas.
MS. HAAS: (Inaudible.)
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Lawrence Tabas.
MR. TABAS: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you.
Puerto Rico, John Regis.
MR. REGIS: (Inaudible.)
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Zori Fonalledas.
MS. FONALLEDAS: (Inaudible.)
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you.
Rhode Island, Steve Frias.
MR. FRIAS: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Eileen Grossman.
MS. GROSSMAN: (Inaudible.)
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: South Carolina,
Cindy Costa.
MS. Costa: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Matt Moore.
MR. MOORE: NO.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: South Dakota, David
Wheeler.
MR. WHEELER: No.

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Sandye Kading. [No response.]

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Tennessee, John
Ryder.
MR. RYDER: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Betty Cannon.
MS. CANNON: (Inaudible.)
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Texas, Steve
Munisteri. Steve?
Can't hear? Oh, I'm sorry. Did you get
Texas? Steve Munisteri?
MR. MUNISTERI: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: No? Sorry.
Toni Anne Dashiell.
MS. DASHIELL: (Inaudible.)
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Utah, Mike Lee.
SENATOR LEE: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: I'm sorry? Repeat
the vote. Yes. I'm sorry.
Sharon Lee.
MS. LEE: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Yes.

Vermont, Susan Hudson.
MS. HUDSON: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: No.
Janssen Willhoit.
MR. WILLHOIT: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: No. Thank you.
Virgin Islands, Valerie Stiles.
MS. STILES: Abstain.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Valerie?
MS. STILES: Abstain.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Abstain. Oh, I'm
sorry. Forgot. Sorry.
Virginia, Anne Gentry.
MR. GENTRY: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Yes.
Morton Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Washington, Graham
Hunt.
MR. HUNT: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Yes.
Washington, Gina Blanchard-Reed.

MS. BLANCHARD-REED: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Say again, please?
MS. BLANCHARD-REED: Yes.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Yes. Thank you.
West Virginia, Betsy Andreini.
MS. ANDREINI: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: No.
Mike Stuart.
MR. STUART: No doubt about it, but no. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you.
[Laughter.]
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Wisconsin, Steve
King.
MR. KING: No.
CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Mary Buestrin. MS. BUESTRIN: No. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Wyoming, Matt Micheli.

MR. MICHELI: Yes. CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: And, last but not
least, Harriet Hageman.
MS. HAGEMAN: Yes.

CO-CHAIRMAN KAUFFMAN: Thank you. VOICE: Madam Chairman?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
VOICE: Over here.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Oh. Yes. Mr.
Duprey.
MR. DUPREY: Madam Chair, you're facing
forward, and you said yes, I thought.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, I recognized

Mr. Duprey.
MR. DUPREY: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We don't have a
motion on the floor at the moment.
Mr. Duprey?
MR. DUPREY: Well, I would like to make a motion.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. VOICE: Don't we have to the results of the vote first?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes.
MR. DUPREY: Sorry.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We do need to wait
until we have --
    MR. DUPREY: Sorry.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- the results of
the vote.

Do we have the tally? They're still going through it.
[Pause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Apparently, we did not receive a vote for Sandye Kading.

Sandye, are you here? They could not hear you. Could you tell us what your vote was?

MS. KADING: [Inaudible.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Court Reporter did not hear the vote. It was no. You think you've had a long day. Imagine what he's been through.

VOICE: Madam Chair, in the course of this wait, can we ask a point of information?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Certainly.
VOICE: The question would be what the intent of the Chair would be. We have accommodated multiple extensions of the recess, and so, is it your expectation that you will be asking for a
```

recess, upon the announcement of this vote?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, I have at
least one more that -- I have one more that came in.
VOICE: Well, we've had multiple --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I -- sir --
VOICE: -- instances.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I understand how
you feel. We are trying to finish -- as we'd said
all along, we're trying to finish that second
section. So, let me get the vote announced, and
then we're going to see what the will of the body
is.
VOICE: Thank you.
[Pause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seventy-three nays,
32 yeas.
MR. DUPREY: Madam Chairman.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Duprey.
MR. DUPREY: At the risk of being
remembered as the fellow in the blue blazer who
ruined everyone's Thursday night, but hopefully

```
being, rather, remembered as the person who gave everybody Friday day and night off, I know you were planning to get done after Rule 25, but I would like to move and then take a vote to see the will of the body that we stay in session, keep going, get our work done tonight. VOICE: Second. VOICE: Madam Chair? CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay, it's been moved and seconded. Just a minute, we have a motion on the floor.

What the Chair would like to do is inquire of our legal staff, so that we know what we're voting on, how many amendments we have had submitted for the third section. We have nine amendments.

VOICE: There's more to come -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There's one to finish for the second section. There are nine for the third section. And if any of you plan on making additional amendments, raise your hand. VOICE: I think we --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: How many more? VOICE: At least one here.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay.
Mr. Semanko?
MR. SEMANKO: We're coming back tomorrow. I'm still working on them. Can \(I\) make an inquiry? CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well -- yes. MR. SEMANKO: Is a substitute motion in order?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, we have the order -- excuse me -- we have the motion on the floor. I'm just informing the body exactly what we have at this point.

So, we have nine that we know of for the third section, one that we know of for the second section. And the motion has been made to stay and get it done.

Let's go ahead and take a vote on that. MR. SEMANKO: Is an amended -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: If you want to -MR. SEMANKO: -- motion in order? I move that we adjourn until 8:00 o'clock a.m.

VOICE: And I believe that takes priority. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, we can't
adjourn.
MR. SEMANKO: I asked if a substitute or amended motion is in order.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Semanko, if we adjourn, we're done for the rest of the Convention. MR. SEMANKO: Sorry. Recess until 8:00
o'clock. I'm asking if it's appropriate to make
that motion at this time.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, it is.

MR. SEMANKO: I make that motion, that we
```

recess --

```

VOICE: I'll second.
MR. SEMANKO: -- until 8:00 a.m. tomorrow. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. It's been moved and seconded.

Let's just go ahead and vote on this, either way. No debate.

All of those who are in favor of recessing until 8:00 a.m., please stand.
[Members standing.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Wow. I think I
```

just heard the press go, "Ohhhh."

```
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We're counting.
We're counting. Stay standing. Stay standing.
We're counting.
While they're counting, I'm going to direct the staff. I understand that we have snacks available. We're not going to stop to let people come and get them. So, I'm going to ask the staff to move as quietly as possible through the ranks to give anyone who would like something, something to eat. If we could kind of set it up on stations, I think, on either end, here, and that people could very carefully come down those little goat paths on the side and down the center.

May they sit now? Okay, please be seated.
All those in favor of continuing our work tonight until it's complete, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Excuse me. Those -- yes. Yes, it's -- those are -- these are those
who are opposed -- okay, please stop moving around -- those who are opposed to the motion to recess rather than move forward, you're being counted. This -- yes. These are the people who'd like to stay until we finish our work tonight.

VOICE: Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Rosie, you're going to lead us in calisthenics to wake us all up, seventh-inning stretch.

Okay, do we have a count? I don't think the result is in doubt, but let's get the count. All right. We have 70 in favor and 32 -- no, excuse me -- 32 in favor of recess, 70 opposed. We're just going to stay and get it done, folks. Please be seated.
[Applause.]
MR. WILLHOIT: Your Honor -- Madam Chair, pardon me, \(I\) do have a point of clarification, if \(I\) may. Oh, sorry. Janssen Willhoit, Vermont.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. Yes, sir.
MR. WILLHOIT: My question is this. I'm sorry, because it was -- for some of us, it's hard
```

to get here, Madam Speaker, and I received
information that we were going to meet 8:00 to 8:00
today and tomorrow. So, did I waste my family's
money to stay tonight, then, because I don't need to
be here tomorrow? Is that what just happened?
VOICE: No.
MR. WILLHOIT: So, what are we doing
tomorrow?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, it's up to
the will of the body to meet when they choose to
meet.
MR. WILLHOIT: But, that was what was
sent, so I can make the arrangements to get here.
I'm sorry, that just doesn't seem fair. I'm sorry.
It doesn't.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, sir, I'm
sorry, but you would have had to be here today
anyway.
MR. WILLHOIT: I understand that, but then
I could have driven home and I could have actually
been there for my boy's game tomorrow afternoon.
That's my concern.

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, sir, I -- I'm
sorry. You -- the schedule that you received
indicated that you would be working tomorrow. Now I
suppose --
    MR. WILLHOIT: Yes.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- you could drive
home.

MR. WILLHOIT: Okay. No, I already -- oh, so I'll get refunded the \(\$ 250\) for my room tonight?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay, sir -- okay, I'm just going to give you my philosophy on this. You may not like it. You probably won't like what I'm going to tell you. Okay? Serving on this Committee is a privilege.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We let everybody
know that we would begin meeting on Wednesday afternoon. We said we'd keep meeting as long as was necessary to complete our work. We let you know that it's no longer available on Saturday. It is up to the body as to whether you want to keep working tonight, and you just voted that you're going to.

So, I'm sorry, sir, that you're upset, but, as far as I'm concerned, the obligations of the Rules Committee come before any Party, any travel plan. This is what we signed up for. So, let's just go ahead and get it done.

All right. We have one more amendment in Section 2. It is Amendment 23.1. It has been -- it impacts Rule number 23(b). And it has been submitted by Thomas Stark, of North Carolina.

Mr. Stark, would -- you are recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

Okay, before you start, Mr. Stark, we've got too much of a hum going on back here, and it's making it very difficult for us all to hear. I'm going to ask once again that the staff, as quietly as possible, set up drinks and snacks at two stations on either end so that people can move forward. But, I would ask you to do it as quietly as possible.

Mr. Stark, you're recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. STARK: I make the motion to amend the
new amended 23(b) to insert at the end "or was
eligible to participate in the election in
question."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been moved.
Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Moved and seconded.
Mr. Stark, would you like to speak to your motion?

MR. STARK: We passed an amendment earlier this evening that limited a contest to a Delegate or alternate who was unsuccessful in seeking the position. Prior to that time, we had broader language in this section. It -- what we have faced is, in District Conventions, where there's improper notice, the aggrieved persons are the -- are people that weren't able to attend or didn't know about the Convention. And we also have to comply with State law to apportion our Delegates, which can create a problem that might draw a contest. For those kinds of issues, we felt like we needed broader language that allows us to addressed to -- the election to be
```

contested by any person who was eligible to
participate in the election.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank
you, sir.
Is there anyone who rises in opposition to
this amendment? Anyone who rises in opposition?
Mr. Ryder, of Tennessee.
MR. RYDER: Madam Chairman, the language
we previously adopted reaffirms the position of the
Rules of the Republican Party that limit contests at
the District level to people who actually
participated in the contest and were candidates for
the office and were unsuccessful. The provision
offered by Mr. Stark, for whom I have the greatest
admiration and respect, from my neighboring State of
North Carolina, would open this up to people who
were not participants and were not injured by the
results, at least at a personal level, only at an
institutional level. And I think that it would be
better -- our Party would be better served by
allowing only those who have actually been
candidates and were unsuccessful to file the

```
District-level contest.
    So, I would urge a no vote on this
    amendment.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
    Ryder.
    Is there anyone else who rises to speak in
    support? Anyone else who rises to speak in support?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone
    else who rises to speak in opposition?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we
    will move directly to a vote.
    All those in favor of adopting Amendment
    23.1, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, nay.
        [A chorus of nays.]
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
    Ladies and gentlemen, as far as I know,
    that completes our work on Section 2 of the Rules.
    [Applause.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: So, now what we are going to do is, I'm going to read each of the rules numbers and titles for Section 3, our final section of the Rules of the Republican Party. If you wish
to make an amendment to that rule, please so
indicate, and we will set that rule aside. If there
are no indications that anyone wishes to amend that
rule, that rule will not be up for debate.
    All right. First, Rule number 26, Order
of Business. Are there any amendments to the Order
of Business? Any amendments to the Order of
Business?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we'll
go forward.
    Rule number 27, Committee Reports. Are
there any amendments to the Committee -- the Rule on
Committee Reports? I see one. We will set that
rule aside.

VOICE: I would like to also set aside 26.
    I just didn't get to the microphone in time.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. We will set
aside numbers 26 and number 27.
Rule number 28, Admission to Convention
Hall. Are there any amendments to Rule number 28, Admission to Convention Hall?

VOICE: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I see one hand go up. We'll set that aside.

Number 29, Voting. Are there any amendments to number 29? Mr. Semanko, we will set that aside.

Rule number 30, Rules of Order. Rules of Order. Are there any amendments to Rule number 30?

VOICE: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We'll set that aside.

Rule number 31, Length of Debate. Are there any amendments to Length of Debate?

MS. ORROCK: Madam Chair, Diana Orrock, Nevada. I withdraw my amendment to -- or my amendment to Rule 31.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Are there any other amendments to Rule 31?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we
```

will move --

```

VOICE: Yes, there will be.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. We'll set
that aside.
Rule number 32, Suspension of Rules. Rule
number 32, Suspension of the Rules. Are there any amendments to Rule number 32 ? I see one. We'll set that aside.

We're not batting well so far, folks, but we'll just keep going.

Rule number 33, Platform Resolutions. Rule number 33, Platform Resolutions. Mr. Lee.

Rule number 34, Minority Reports;
Amendments.
VOICE: I'll have an amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We have an amendment.

Rule number 35, Motion to Table. Rule number 35, Motion to Table.

VOICE: Madam Chair, you expected to give us overnight to work on that. I would like to reserve 35.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We will
set it aside, but it will have to be completed tonight, since -VOICE: Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- the body has so voted.

VOICE: Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Rule number 36, Previous Question. Rule number 36, Previous Question.
[No response.] CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none. Rule number 37, Roll Call. MR. ROSS: Madam Chair, Jordan Ross, Nevada.

With the consent of the body, I withdraw Amendment 37.1. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay, we have one that has been withdrawn. Without objection, it is
so ordered.
Are -- do we have another amendment?
Mr. Haugland. Rule 37, we have an amendment. We will set that aside.

Rule number 38, Unit Rule. Rule number 38, Unit Rule. We have -- we will set that aside.

Rule number 39, Record Vote. Rule number 39, Record Vote. Mr. Semanko.

Rule number 40, Nominations. Ms. Unruh, from Colorado.

Rule number 41, Convention Committees. Rule number 41, Convention Committees. Is there anyone who would like to make an amendment to Rule 41?

MR. ROSS: Madam Chair, I apologize. Regarding Rule number 38, with the consent of the body, I withdraw Amendment 38.2.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, to the Gentleman from Nevada. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Are there any other amendments to Rule 38? Other amendments to Rule 38?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none.
Rule number 41, Convention Committees?
VOICE: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We have
amendments to Convention Committees. We will set that aside.

Rule number 42, Temporary Rules. Ms. Unruh.

All right.
MR. TETTLEBAUM: Madam Chairman?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. TETTLEBAUM: I have [inaudible].
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay, we will have
additional rules that are multiple rules and new rules. Mr. Tettlebaum, we note that you have a new Rule 43.

Are there other amendments that will
impact multiple rules? Any other amendments that will impact multiple rules?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none.

Now, let me also ask if we have any amendments that anyone plans to make to the Preamble
of the Rules?
    Sir.
    MR. ROSS: No, ma'am, I do not. With the
    greatest of apologies, after consulting with my
    colleagues, I would like to leave Amendment 37.1 and
    38.2 in the queue. Essentially, I'm reintroducing
    it.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    MR. ROSS: And apologize to the Chair and
    to the body.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Again, are there any amendments to the
    Preamble?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none.
    All right. At this point --
    MR. HAUGLAND: Madam Chairman?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Mr. Haugland,
    for what motion -- for what purpose do you rise?
    MR. HAUGLAND: I rise to ask how to
proceed with entirely new rules.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Tettlebaum just said that he has one. Do you have one, Mr. Haugland?

MR. HAUGLAND: Yes, I plan to have two.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: You have two?
MR. HAUGLAND: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay.
All right, ladies and gentlemen, it looks like the only rule that has not been set aside is Rule number 36.

VOICE: And the Preamble.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And the Preamble.
All right. Are we prepared with the amendments to be able to move forward? Let me check with staff. Stand at ease for just a moment, please.

> All right, ladies and gentlemen, I've been informed that a number of the amendments have not been submitted, even though you asked for the rules to be set aside. And so, I'm going to ask for the sense of the body in setting off a cutoff period for
rules that have already been set aside for those
amendments to be submitted. I understand that you
want to discuss them. We want to give you that
opportunity. But, if you don't submit them, they
can't be loaded into our system. So, if you have an
amendment that you asked to be set aside, clearly
you already have the language that you are
considering.
    So, the Chair will entertain a motion to
cut off amendments no later than -- no later than
9:30 p.m. Is there such a motion?
    VOICE: A point of information. What time
is it now?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It is 5 minutes to
9:00.
    VOICE: So, we'll be in recess until 9:30?
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will not stand
        in recess. We will start in on the rules that have
        already been submitted. But, I'm telling you that
        we need to get these amendments in, and I'm really
        kind of baffled as to why you wouldn't submit them
        ahead of time.

Ms. Homan.
MS. HOMAN: [Inaudible.]
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded that we will cut off submission of amendments no later than 9:30 p.m. to allow us to be able to commence our work.

All those in favor, please say aye. VOICE: Madam Chair?
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed?
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No. The ayes
clearly have it in over two-thirds. So, we have now suspended the rules and required that all submissions be in by 9:30 p.m.

All right. Now we will take up
amendments. I assume the body would like to take them up as we have them available. That means we'll be jumping around, but it means that we do not need to stand at ease as that point. Is that agreeable to the body?
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Let's begin.

All right. We are going to start with
Amendment 33.1. Amendment 33.1, which pertains to Rule number 33.

MS. BOWEN: Point of information, Madam Chairman.

Gwen Bowen, Louisiana.
. Do we have a --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes.
MS. BOWEN: -- quorum?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Clearly.
MS. BOWEN: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We will
move forward with Amendment number 33.1, submitted by Mr. Ross, of Nevada.

Mr. Ross, of Nevada, are you prepared to begin with submission of your amendment?

MR. ROSS: Madam Chair, with the permission of the body, I withdraw the amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Without
```

objection -- yes, last chance, Mr. Duprey -- without
objection, it is withdrawn.
All right. The next amendment that we
will consider is Rule 34.1. This impacts Rule 34.
The Lady from New Hampshire? Is the Lady from New -

- there she is.
MS. SUPRUNOWICZ: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Ellen Suprunowicz, from New Hampshire.
I'd like to propose a new section to Rule
34, as follows: "When a temporary committee is
convened as a permanent committee, and if a Minority
Report is presented to the Chairman, the Chairman
shall inquire as to whether any of the signatories
of the Minority Report would like to have their
names removed from the report. Anyone requesting to
have their name removed shall have the signature
removed immediately."
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. There
has been a motion. Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded.

```

Would you like to address the substance of your amendment?

MS. SUPRUNOWICZ: I would. This has to do with -- earlier this week, there were a number of Delegates who were misled into signing a Minority Report at the -- on the Platform Committee. And, upon learning of the deception, they found there was no clear rule which would allow them to have their name removed from that document. And I believe our Party needs a rule to prevent this from occurring in the future. And I ask that my fellow Delegates support this.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Before we proceed to further debate, I'm going to ask the staff and the people over here -it sounds like it's coming from this side -- if you could please lower the level. I keep finding my voice getting louder and louder so that I can hear myself over that hum. Thank you, I appreciate it. All right. The Lady from New Hampshire has made her motion. It has been seconded. Are there any who wish to speak in opposition to this
amendment? Any who wish to speak in opposition to
this amendment? Going once, going twice --
    Mr. DeVito. Mr. DeVito, are you rising in
opposition or support?
    MR. DeVITO: Never mind.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's all right.
    Mr. Blackwell, to what point do you rise?
    MR. BLACKWELL: I rise to support this
amendment.
    Madam Chairman, this has -- this
particular process has been a common problem. When
the Convention Rules Committee meets on the day of
the Convention, after the Convention has been called
to order, time and time again after the generally
perfunctory passage again of the Rules Committee
Report, the rules have specified a time deadline by
which Minority Reports must be handed in to
particular officers. And time and time again, that
has been a problem.
    There are other changes that I think ought
to be made in this. There may well be an amendment
going to be proposed on that particular topic. But,
```

the matter of removing people's names is a very
common occurrence. Generally speaking, the
presumptive nominee has had an interest in avoiding
a floor debate on a Minority Report and has found
who are the signers on the Minority Report, which
has qualified by being 25 percent of the total, and
seek out those people and get them to take their
names off. This has happened many times.
I've never heard of a great difficulty in
people getting their names off of this, although
there have been many Minority Reports filed since
1976, which is the last time we debated a Minority
Report. None of those Minority Reports has survived
the pressure on the signers of it --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Gentleman's
time is expired.
MR. BLACKWELL: -- to get their names --
to get their names off.
So, it's -- this is a good proposal.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We've heard someone
speak in support. Is there anyone who wishes to

```
```

    rise to oppose this amendment? Anyone who wishes to
    oppose this amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Kauffman has
carried a lot of water in his time.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Full-service Vice
Chairman.
All right. Is there anyone else who
wishes to speak in support?
Mr. Ryder.
MR. RYDER: Madam Chairman, I wanted to
take this rare opportunity to agree with Mr.
Blackwell, and --
[Laughter.]
MR. RYDER: -- I urge support for the
amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: In the spirit of
Party unity, I am thrilled, Mr. Ryder. Thank you.
All right. Seeing no further individuals
that wish to be recognized, we will move immediately
to a vote on Amendment 34.1.

```

All in favor of Amendment 34.1 , please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It passes.
Next, will move to Amendment number 34.2 -- 34.2. This impacts Rule number 34(a). It has been submitted by the Lady from Louisiana, Mrs. Bowen, who is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MS. BOWEN: I would just like to make a motion that you accept this amendment. Those of you that were here in --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Please -- if you
want to just make a motion --
MS. BOWEN: Make a motion.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- and we'll get a second.

MS. BOWEN: Make a motion.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Perfect.
Is there a second? Is there a second?

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There -- it's been moved and seconded.

Now please give us your reasons.
MS. BOWEN: Okay, thank you.
And I do want to also take this moment to say I think you've been a great Chairman. And no disrespect to the former Chairmans, this is my fourth time, but I'm -- I appreciate your fairness and your -- and allowing people the time to do what they need to do.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Did you hear that, Mr. Poitevint?
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you very much. I sincerely appreciate that.

MS. BOWEN: Well, I mean it.
I would ask your support for this amendment. If you were here in 2012, we did a Minority Report, and -- because, like I'd said earlier, the only rule that was worse, in my
```

opinion, than Rule 12 was Rule 15, which became Rule
16, which would -- disavowed the elected Delegate at
the whim of the candidate. And so, we did a
Minority Report. And, before we had a chance to
even go say it, another member -- I think Bob
Bennett, from Ohio -- went to the front and said,
"We have 31 signatures." And then, to my surprise,
as soon as it ended, the Chairman and everybody was
gone. And we went to try to find them. And then it
appeared like we had been sent on a wild goose
chase, as we was asking different staff members and
et cetera to tell us where someone was, an officer
we could submit it.
So, just for -- obviously, we have been
minority during this session -- this gathering. So,
if we could pass this, because time goes, people
take -- am I at my stop yet? When you start singing
God Bless America? Okay. Anyway, I'd appreciate
your support on it.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
MS. HELLREICH: Madam Chairman, could you

```
enlarge the print? I can't read it.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Oh, my heavens. No wonder you can't read it. I just looked down. Could we get the print enlarged, please? I think they're having trouble fitting it in the screen. Let's see what they can do. Did that help at all? MS. HELLREICH: It helped, but I still
can't --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Why don't we do this. On this one, unfortunately, rather than go back and get them copied, let's work through the language. We'll read through it together. We'll have to roll it on the screen. Okay, the proposed language, page 54, line 7, strike "Vice Chairman or Secretary." Page 54, line 7, insert "finally and officially" after the words "at which such committee." Page 54, line 11, insert the following -- if we can bring that up, I think that just might fit -- "The Chairman of each such committee shall remain in the meeting room of such committee for at least 1 hour following the final and official vote on its report. Qualifying
```

Minority Reports shall be taken up immediately
following the respective committee report. If there
are multiple Minority Reports, then such reports
shall be taken up in descending order, starting with
the Minority Report that received the most petition
signatures. And, in the event of ties, priority
shall be given to the Minority Report filed earlier.
At the option of a majority of those committee
members signing the Minority Report, such Minority
Report may be taken up, resolution by resolution,
rule by rule, or as a single block report. Such
option shall be identified at the time the Minority
Report is submitted. In the absence of such a
selection, the Minority Report shall be taken up,
resolution by resolution, for Committee on the
Platform, or rule by rule for the Committee on Rules
and Order of Business."
Okay. Is everyone now familiar with the
language? Is there anyone who can't see it or
hasn't heard it?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We've

```
had a motion made and seconded. We have heard an explanation in support. Is there anyone who wishes to be recognized in opposition?

Mr. Evans.
MR. EVANS: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair.
I rise in opposition simply for a couple of reasons. One, it contemplates multiple Minority Reports from a single Committee, which I don't think is consistent with the way we've handled it and certainly would prolong the process to make it virtually impossible to complete in time. And then, second, it adds a number of provisions that implicate other provisions in the rules, which would literally take us backward into this process.

As a result, I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment.

MS. BOWEN: Madam Chairman, \(I\) don't know if I'm in order, but can \(I\) just add, I'll be glad to consider a friendly amendment. I thought I expressed the -- what I wanted. Maybe I didn't write it the way you would like for it to be written. And --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well --
MS. BOWEN: -- you seem to have -- be real good with writing stuff.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Any
member has the ability to propose an amendment to the amendment. And if anyone wishes to do so, all they have to do is seek recognition.

All right. Is there a member who wishes to rise in support?

Mr. Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: Madam Chairman, the past practice is beyond the memory of any person in this room. There have been, in living memory, twice occasions when a single Minority Report was presented: 1972, over a Delegate allocation formula; and 1976, in the Reagan versus Ford nomination contest.

It would be -- it is clear that a Minority Report is presented, debated, and decided upon as an amendment to the Majority Report. To say that all issues on which 25 percent of the Convention Rules Committee have signed a Minority Report -- they all
have to be compiled into one -- is, I think, an outrageous suggestion, because there are likely to be -- there are certainly possible to be a number of very different provisions, the subject of separate Minority Reports, which, by any logic, should be considered independently of each other. Otherwise, the idea of a Minority Report is foolish, because no Minority Report would ever pass if it had a number of different issues on it. A majority of the Convention might support each of the proposed amendments, but if you put many different issues in it, you preclude the possibility of having the majority able to work its will -- the majority of the Convention -- on each of the topics.

I think it's -- I think this clarifies what happens. We --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Gentleman's time is expired.

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The parliamentarian
has informed me, and I will simply pass this along as a point of information for the body, that

Robert's Rules of Order provide for only one Minority Report. However, when we are operating in the Convention, we operate under the Rules of the House, and the Chair is unaware of what the rule is, because, actually, Minority Reports under the Rules of the House generally are not allowed. And yet, we've made specific provision through our rules for that to be allowed.

So, we have a little bit of a conflict there. Robert's Rules of Order only allows for a single combined Minority Report. I just wanted to pass that along to you for your consideration, since the parliamentarian's made it clear to me.

It looks -- Mr. -- we just had a -someone rise in support. Is there someone who would like to rise in opposition? Anyone who'd like to rise in opposition?

The Gentleman from Nevada.
MR. ROSS: Jordan Ross, Nevada.
Madam Chair, I've seen this movie before, you know, with Johnnie Depp and the Pirates of the Caribbean, and the ship is whirling around, and it
```

finally gets sucked down into this whirlpool and
disappears. That is exactly what this looks like to
me. I mean, I spend more of my week every week
dealing with rules, and that's exactly what this
looks like to me. What this looks like is a morass,
a whirlpool that will drag us out for hours, if not
more that a day, trying to conclude the Rules
Committee report.
That's it. It's a whirlpool. Vote no.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I never thought I'd
hear a Pirates of the Caribbean reference in here.
You -- my hat's off to you, sir.
All right. Would someone like to be
recognized in support?
Mr. Little.
MR. LITTLE: Madam Chairman, I have two
things to address.
In the first place, I would like to call
your attention to the heading of Rule 34, which is
part of our rules, which amends and overrides
Robert's Rules of Order. It says "Minority

```
```

Reports." There's an "s" on the middle of that,
which means it's plural, which means --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, there are
multiple committees.
MR. LITTLE: So, I would indicate -- I
would suggest that our rules envision multiple
Minority Reports.
Secondly, what I would like to do for this
is to offer an amendment. At the beginning of the
sentence, "If there are multiple Minority Reports,"
I would suggest to start Subsection (b) -- or
Section (b) there -- this is an amendment to Rule
34(a). I would like that to start Rule 34(b). That
would be my amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: So, your amendment
would simply create a new paragraph.
MR. LITTLE: Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: At which -- exactly
which point, Mr. Little?
MR. LITTLE: At the point where it says,
"If there are multiple Minority Reports."
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.

```

MR. LITTLE: Before the word "if." CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. That's really more in the nature of a technical amendment, but I appreciate you bringing it to us.

Is there a second? VOICE: Second. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been made and seconded. Is there any debate? [No response.] CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, we'll move directly to a vote on the amendment to the amendment. This would require that we put in a new paragraph, labeled (b).

All those in favor, say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay. [A chorus of nays.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it. All right. We are back to debate on the main motion. Would anyone like to be recognized in opposition?

Mr. Hammond.

MR. HAMMOND: Madam Chair, John Hammond, from Indiana.

A couple of points I'd like to make, and I rise in opposition.

This Committee will have fully debated all of these issues, one kind or the other. There are permutations of -- iterations of things that could be thought about between now and Monday, and, no doubt, in a Minority Report -- multiple Minority Reports could be conceived.

Important thing is that we do allow for the minority voice to be heard. And we do allow for that in the current rules. And it will be heard. But, it needs to be heard at once with some efficiency. It would be done with fairness. I'm convinced. Because I think our Delegates, as they convene next week, will want to be fair, if, indeed, there is one presented. But, to have multiple Minority Reports presented will be seen as an attempt to disrupt. And I'm concerned about it. And I raise it only because if it's not that, then it becomes a very inefficient way to begin our
```

process. And I think that, to have multiple
Minority Reports is not a -- is not something that I
feel that will serve our Party well, and certainly
serve us well in this Convention upcoming. If we,
indeed, even have some.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there others who wish to speak in
support? Are there others who wish to speak in
support?
The Gentleman from Colorado.
MR. SHORT: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman,
Can I just ask a point of order or a point
of information? On this amendment, part of this
amendment is the hour requirement for the Chair to
stay in the room. If the full amendment were to
fail, would it be in order to offer that amendment,
or would that be seen as it's already been offered?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, a piece of that
would be in order, since you are -- if the main
motion fails, then you have taken off -- excuse me.
Let me start that again. Because you need to do it

```
```

before we vote on the main motion. So, you would
have to offer an amendment before we vote on the
main motion.
MR. SHORT: But, I don't want to strike
everything. I want that to still be voted on. I
just -- I just want to make sure, if the whole thing
goes down, that we can still just vote on having the
chairperson stay in the room for an hour. I think
that's a reasonable --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Parliamentarians
tell me that we can do that.
MR. SHORT: We can do that, so that would
be in order.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We can do that.
MR. SHORT: And how would I go about doing
that? Go up to the --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: You'd need to
submit an amendment.
MR. SHORT: Okay. Thank you very much.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right?
Let me remind you -- that is -- would be
an amendment to an amendment -- let me remind you

```
that main motions must be filed with the Counsel's Office no later than 9:30. That leaves you about 14 minutes.

All right. Mr. DeVito.
MR. DeVITO: Thank you, Madam Chair. Vincent DeVito, Massachusetts.

I respectfully ask this Committee to vote no against this particular amendment. I have read Rule 34 multiple times, just a moment ago. It's perfectly fine.

I move the previous question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question has been raised. It is nondebatable. It is in order. We will immediately move to vote on the question of closing debate.

All those in favor of closing debate on Amendment 34.2 , please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes clearly have it. We will now vote on the main motion.

All those in favor of adoption of
```

Amendment 34.2, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
VOICE: Madam Chair, may I ask a unanimous
consent to revise and extend my remarks just to
include all of the prior citations to Minority
Reports that have been considered before. Mr.
Blackwell indicated there had only been two.
Because I'm not as old as him, I had somebody
actually go back and do the research. So, I would
like permission to revise and extend to include this
in my remarks.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Without objection, you may attach that to your remarks.
All right. Let's move now to Amendment number 37.1, number 37.1 This impacts Rule 37, and it has been proposed by Mr. Ross, of Nevada, who is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.
MR. ROSS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

```

I introduce Amendment 37.1, as presented. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second? VOICE: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is -- I hear a second.

All right. Mr. Ross, would you like to address your amendment?

MR. ROSS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I'm going to use the "b" word: binding. I think it's fair. I think it's what millions of voters expect.

Now, while I have enjoyed, up to this point, the many and varied theological discussions on how many parliamentary angels can dance on the head of a parliamentary pin, it's time to put an end to those discussions and to clarify once and for all. This amendment and one for the following rule that is -- inserts the identical language into that rule is meant to do just that. It's to address arguments that have been going on for years about whether or not the rules of our Party permit binding, or not. This amendment and a companion
amendment for Rule 38 will do just that. In this particular case, the arguments that the rights of certain Delegates to demand roll call somehow allow them to invalidate their binding would be put to rest.

I'm a politician. The voters in my constituency, at the caucuses in our constituency, voted overwhelmingly for Mr. Donald Trump. I have no intention of returning to those people who I rely on to keep me in office by telling them I had some part in shredding their votes. It's time, after all these years, to put an end to this. Let's give the people what they expect, that their votes count. I don't mean to be bitter about this. I don't mean to be confrontational. But, for heaven's sake, the argument needs to be settled, one way or the other. Thank you, Madam Chair. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir. I have been asked to remind you, by counsel, that the 9:30 deadline is rapidly approaching. And if you are in line at the Help Desk at the stroke of 9:30, they will help you
finish your amendment. If you walk up at 9:30 and 10 seconds, you will not have the opportunity to have your amendment drafted. Is everyone clear on that procedure? Excellent.

All right, we have had a motion made and seconded. Is there anyone who rises in opposition to the amendment? Is there anyone who rises in opposition to the amendment?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, is there anyone else who rises in support of the amendment?

Mr. Ash.
MR. ASH: Madam Chairman, members of our Committee, in 56 contests across the country, into the Caribbean, and out into the Pacific, Donald Trump won almost 14 million votes. He nearly doubled the vote total of his nearest competitor. He surpassed the number of Delegates required by over 300 Delegates. And yet, among some, there seem to be some sort of question whether or not he is the presumptive nominee.

There has been a lot of battling back and forth. There's been a lot of emails that we get, and constant harassment from various people across the country. In Arizona, we had a presidential preference election, where Donald Trump received over 50 percent of the votes cast in that election -- contest. By State law, all 58 Delegates in Arizona are required to vote for Donald Trump on the first ballot. Donald Trump is the presumptive nominee. There should be absolutely no question as to who we are going to cast our votes for.

As Republicans, we oftentimes give our elected officials a hard time about campaigning one way and governing another. As Delegates, we were selected, elected by our State Conventions, in whatever manner in which we arrived here. We only had to have -- we only had to perform one function, and that was to vote for the candidate that we were bound to.

I urge all of us to vote for this amendment and for the following, and to get this matter finally understood across the country.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Ash.
Is there anyone who would like to rise in opposition? Is there anyone who'd like to rise in opposition?

Mr. Haugland.
MR. HAUGLAND: Yes, Madam Chairman.
I rise in opposition to this, because -primarily because it seeks to link a pre-Convention rule to a Convention rule. And soon -- I just
submitted a -- an amendment to this very same topic
that provides satisfaction within Rule 37 , within
the Convention rules completely and without mixing
pre-Convention rules with Convention rules. So,
therefore, \(I\) would urge the defeat of this one, in
anticipation of the complete, proper way to do this,
which I'm sure all of you guys will embrace.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm sure they will embrace them and debate what is the proper way to do this. Thank you, Mr. Haugland.

Are there others who wish to rise in
support of this amendment?

Mr. Blackwell.
MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
This matter has obviously been the subject of more pre-Convention publicity than any rules matter ever in living memory. It is obviously an important issue. People have changed sides on the issue. There were people like me who wished to repeal the requirements in the rules that were passed by the Romney Campaign, which prevented legitimate Delegates' votes being counted if they cast their vote for somebody who hadn't met the greatly increased threshold. That position -- I attempted, in April of 2013, to pass an omnibus repeal of the -- all the amendments that the Romney people passed that were -- that we could repeal. But, circumstances changed.

I moved, at our meeting in April, it's -a rifleshot amendment to the rules, focused just on that disenfranchisement of Delegates, which caused hundreds of Delegates to not have their votes counted at the Tampa Convention. As the Primaries
progressed, it became clear that the operation of
the rules was going to have both -- have two
candidates who would qualify: Trump and Cruz. And
suddenly, from the establishment forces, came the
idea: there are no rules to be changed, the
Convention writes its own rules. And that lasted
until it was perceived that the Cruz and Trump
people might have a majority of this Convention.
And the establishment's positions changed. And
Chairman Priebus said, "We should not amend the
rules. We should not amend the rules."
    In my judgment, we can -- these rules, for
the nominating process at the Convention, can be
amended in only one of two ways. One if there is --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Gentleman's
time is expired.
    MR. BLACKWELL: -- a consensus or, second,
after a battle, which could split this Party. And I
think --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Blackwell --
    MR. BLACKWELL: -- we need to avoid that.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- I'm sorry, but -

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
```

Blackwell.

```

The staff has just handed me the following "sticky." Two minutes to the 9:30 deadline. We are going to strictly enforce this. Two minutes.

Thank you, Mr. Blackwell.
Is there someone who wishes to rise in opposition? Anyone wish to rise in opposition?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, are there those who would wish to speak in support?

Mr. Sheffler.
MR. SHEFFLER: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
Steve Sheffler, from Iowa.
I, too, like Mr. Blackwell, was initially opposed to binding. But, based on the fact that 22 of the 28 Delegates to the National Convention in 2012 from Iowa voted for a candidate who came in third place, even though they did everything legally by the book -- it was an embarrassment, and I don't
want to see that happen again.
    In my State -- it's a purple State --
there was a new poll that came out, I think, just a
couple of days ago, that Donald Trump is leading by
2 points. And I understand that we had these
candidates all vetted. But, I want to remind
everybody what Phyllis Schlafly, who's as
conservative as anybody, or more so than anybody in
this room. Is -- she said, "If you're looking for a
perfect candidate, you won't find Jesus Christ's
name on the ballot on November 8th.
    And the people that have been sending
these emails, it's over, folks. We need to get
behind our candidate. And I guess it all came --
all the birds came to roost when \(I\) was informed by
the Wall Street Journal, about 3 weeks ago, they
were going to run a negative ad against me on one of
these unbinding of the Delegates. And, no offense
to anybody that lives on the East Coast or the West
Coast that your dialect is different than mine, but,
for Pete's sakes, why would you have somebody come
into my State who understand how people's talk in a
```

Midwestern accent and bring somebody from New Jersey
with a distinctive, harsh New Jersey accent to beat
up on me? And it isn't like I wasn't transparent
from day one. I told people, when this binding took
into effect, where I was at. People in my State
support me overwhelmingly. And I just have to tell
you, it's an insult. It's over. Let's get behind
our nominee right now.
Thank you.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Scheffler.
Are there others who wish to speak in
opposition? Opposition?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none, are
there those who wish to speak in support?
The Lady in the -- right here.
MS. GROSSMAN: Yes.
Eileen Grossman --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Eileen.
MS. GROSSMAN: -- Rhode Island.

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes.
MS. GROSSMAN: As many of these people --
fine people have received, I personally have received 440 emails to vote my conscience, to unbind, et cetera. I want you to know that I answered every single one of them. And the responses back weren't nice. I was very respectful. Let me just say this. I will not turn my back on 14.1 million people that voted for Donald Trump. I will not. I was elected to be a Trump Delegate by our State law. I cannot do anything to unbind. And my constituency, at least 300 texted me and emailed me. I mean, my -- from my State -- that voted for Donald Trump and said, "You'd better not vote against Donald Trump."

So, I strongly urge us to begin going --
hugging the person next to us, do a kumbaya, be unified, be happy. We have a better nominee than the Democrats.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Are there any people who wish to speak in
```

support -- or, excuse me -- in opposition? Is there
anyone who wishes to speak in opposition?
Did the Gentleman rise to support this --
MR. HALL: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes. All right.
The Gentleman is recognized.
MR. HALL: Thank you.
My name is Matt Hall. I'm from Michigan.
It's an honor to be here.
And I wanted to speak in favor of this
motion. Donald Trump won Michigan overwhelmingly.
Under -- and we had rules, as a Convention body,
that -- and a Party -- that those voters came to
the polls in reliance on those rules. That included
binding. And so, our voters, our State Party, when
we made rules, our State, when we had a taxpayer-
funded Primary, and all the candidates and their
strategies, relied upon these rules, which included
binding. And so, what -- you know, when I was
elected as a Delegate, what was clear to me is that
we have a responsibility to honor that commitment
that we made to our voters and the rules that we

```
```

will honor their vote, and their vote will count.
And therefore, I fully intend to support Mr. Trump
and support the binding under the current rules.
And I call the previous question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
Previous question is in order. We will
immediately move to a vote on closing debate.
All those in favor of closing debate on
Amendment number 37.1, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes clearly
have it.
We will now vote --
VOICE: Division.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: On that one? I'm
going to call for a standing vote on this. Will --
won't that suffice, Mr. Blackwell?
VOICE: That is division.
MR. BLACKWELL: I called for division. We
do standing vote, Madam Chair.

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, on the
previous question?

MR. BLACKWELL: [Inaudible.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. We will
hold a standing vote.
We are moving to a vote on the main
motion.
All those in favor of adopting Amendment 37.1, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Please be seated.
All those opposed, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Please be seated.

The tally of the vote is as follows: the ayes are 87, the nays are 12. The motion passes.
[Applause.]
VOICE: Madam Chairman? Parliamentary --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir. Yes.
VOICE: Name and State.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Name and State,
please.
MR. OSE: Doug Ose, California.
I'd like to move to lay on the table a motion to reconsider.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The
parliamentarians are telling me the form of the motion is incorrect. What is it you'd like to achieve?

MR. OSE: I want to end discussion on this thing we just voted on. I do not want to have a motion to reconsider, 10 minutes or 10 hours from now.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: So, you'd like to make a motion to reconsider at this time.

MR. OSE: I'd like to lay it on the table. I don't care to have a vote.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm afraid we can't do that. If you want to end it, you'd have to make a motion to reconsider, and we would vote again.

MR. OSE: Would that end any further discussion of this --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, it would.

VOICE: Parliamentary inquiry. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Mr. -VOICE: So, I understand that if the
Gentleman were to make a motion to reconsider, and
then you had voted with the majority, and you
decided to vote no on reconsideration, that would
end things once and for all.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Correct.
    VOICE: Okay. I'm a slow learner, but I -
-
```

    MR. ROSS: Request for information.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
    MR. ROSS: Am I not correct, Madam Chair,
    that, in a motion to reconsider, only those persons
who voted against it can vote to vote for it? Or do
I have that backwards?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, the --
VOICE: You have it backwards.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- the motion must
be made by those who voted on the prevailing side.
MR. ROSS: Right.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: So, if Mr. Ose

```
voted in favor, he is eligible to make a motion to
reconsider.

MR. ROSS: Right. And so, only the people who voted -- all those people who voted against the motion cannot vote for this motion to reconsider.
Do I have that right?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: They cannot move to
reconsider.
    MR. ROSS: Oh, cannot move. Oh. Thank
you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    Mr. Ose, did you wish to make a motion to
reconsider?
    MR. OSE: I move to reconsider.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved.
    Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded. We will move directly to a motion to
reconsider.
    VOICE: So, as a point of information,
when we say that this discussion is over, what does
    that mean?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. Name and
    State, please.
    MR. BROWN: This is Fred Brown, from
    Alaska.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It means that we
    cannot reconsider this particular amendment.
    MR. BROWN: All right. Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
    All of those in favor of reconsidering
    this amendment, please --
    Okay, Mr. Ose, you have another point to
    make?
    MR. OSE: Madam Chairman, just for
    everybody's edification, an aye vote on this means -
    -
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That we --
    MR. OSE: -- that we take it up again.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Correct.
    MR. OSE: A no vote means we don't take it
    up again.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That is correct.

MR. OSE: Thank you for the clarification. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.

So, all those in favor of the motion to reconsider, meaning an aye vote means that you want to reconsider and reopen debate, all of those people, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Not at all close.
The noes have it.
All right. All right. Just for
everyone's information, we have passed our 9:30
deadline. My understanding is that very few amendments came in at that point. Okay, there are still a few coming through the process. We'll just continue to move forward.

Amendment number 38.1 -- 38.1 is an amendment to Rule number 38. It has been submitted by the Lady from Colorado, Ms. Unruh, who is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

Ms. Unruh? Is Ms. Unruh here? Oh.

MS. UNRUH: I'm Kendal Unruh, from the State of Colorado.

And I would like to move the -- I can't read it anywhere here -- okay. I would like to add the language to Rule number 38 to add that -- let's just read it, to insert the following as a new sentence at the end of Rule 38, "Notwithstanding any other provision of these rules or any rule of the U.S. House of Representatives, the right of each Delegate and alternate Delegate to vote their conscience on all matters shall not be infringed or impaired by any State Party rule, State law, ruling by the National Convention Chair or any other method."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved. Is there a second?

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded.

Ms. Unruh, would you like to address your amendment?

MS. UNRUH: I would. Does anybody need any information about the conscience clause? Obviously, this is a very important topic to the hearts of many Americans, because we have all been inundated with all of the emails that have flooded our email boxes about very heartfelt convictions from Americans and patriots and people from all walks of life who truly believe in the right to conscience. And the right to conscience is not just something that we've decided is a cool idea, but it's something that is the very basis of our Nation. It is why the Pilgrims came here and founded our Nation. It is a God-given right. It's why we have the Bill of Rights. It is why you cannot force a doctor to perform abortions when it's against his right to conscience. You cannot force the Mennonites to go into the draft. It is systemically the core of every single American.

And what this does is, it allows people to exercise that right and not be bound by state law, that the Supreme Court has actually ruled cannot happen within a private organization. But, beyond
```

that, this is a process, and this is literally how
our founding fathers set up the rule of law, the way
that our government operates. And the Party,
itself, is modeling what has been established as the
right to Delegates, who take it extraordinarily
seriously the sanctity of their votes.
And all I am asking is that you regard
this as the sanctity of the vote, that it is
reflected in the duty and the obligation of each
Delegate to cast a ballot according to their
conscience.
That is a God-given right that should not
be taken away by the RNC, by any Party, or by the
State. And it has been ruled that -- even with the
recent court ruling in Virginia, that the State
cannot actually overstep a boundary and determine
the outcome of a vote that to be left to a Delegate,
alone.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Unruh.
Are there any who wish to rise in
opposition?

```

The Gentleman from -- is it -- Michigan. MR. HALL: Correct. Yes. Thank you,
Madam Chairman.
    Again, my name is Matt Hall, from
Michigan.

Donald Trump can win this election and be our next President of the United States, but, in order to do that, we need to allow our -- the record number of Republican voters who voted for Donald Trump in our Primary to have their voice heard. And that means honoring the rules and the commitment of our Party to bind the Delegates and make their vote count.

And, accordingly, I move to call the previous question.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question is in order. We will move immediately to a vote on the previous question.

All of those in favor of previous question ending debate on this matter, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, no.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Chair is in
doubt, and we will have a standing vote. Previous question does require a two-thirds majority to pass.

All of those in favor of ending debate on this matter, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Please be seated.

All those opposed to previous question, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. You may be seated.

The votes are as follows: in favor of previous question, 77; those opposed, 21. It's clear two-thirds majority. Previous question passes. And we will now move to an immediate vote on the amendment.

All those in favor of adopting Amendment 38.1, as submitted by Ms. Unruh, of Colorado, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Clearly, the nays have it.

VOICE: Division.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay, we will take a standing vote. Oh, they tell me I don't have to, because I've already declared it and it's clear.

All right. We've been counted, we've stood. We're going to move forward.

All right. Amendment --
VOICE: Madam Chairman?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- 38.2 --
VOICE: Madam Chairman?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Mr. Ose.
MR. OSE: I move to reconsider. I was on the prevailing side. I move to reconsider.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Mr. Ose
has moved to reconsider. Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. There
has been motion and second.
All those in favor of reconsideration,
which means an aye vote means that we can reopen and continue to discuss this amendment. A nay vote means that we have finally concluded any debate on this amendment permanently. All those in favor of reconsideration, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays clearly have it. There is no further reconsideration of this particular amendment.

All right. Let's move forward now to Amendment 38.2. This impacts, again, Rule number 38. It has been proposed by Mr. Ross, of Nevada, who is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. ROSS: Yes, Madam Chairman, thank you.
I have decided to introduce a logo.
[Laughter.]
MR. ROSS: I'm just waiting for the amendment to come up. By the way, if anybody's asking, I despise this logo, and I have since I was 13. I apologize, that was out of order.
[Laughter.]
MR. ROSS: Let's get a new one. Big, tough, mean-looking elephant, with tusks.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: You need to check out Liberty, which is the elephant on the Cleveland 2016 logo. He's not mean-looking, but, you know, he's standing on a guitar.

MR. ROSS: It's -- that's an improvement, but, you know, my job title is State Whip, so I like mean.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Can we get the staff to bring this up?

MR. ROSS: Yeah, the sooner they get it up, the sooner I will shutup.
[Laughter.]
MR. ROSS: There you go, okay.
Madam Chair, I introduce Rule 38.2, as
presented.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. Is
```

there a second?

```

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded.

Mr. Ross, would you like to speak to your amendment?

MR. ROSS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
The language in this is precisely the same as in the amendment on Rule 37 I introduced. For those of you who voted in favor of that, I thank you, and I ask that you vote again. For those who chose not to support it, I just want to go on the record saying I understand your concerns, and I feel that, when this is all over, there is no more division on this. We're all Republicans, and Republicans are very individual. That's a fact of life. We can have honest differences. When we walk out of here, we all walk out of here together.

I'm asking to have this to clarify on the issue we did -- clarified the issue on the roll
```

call. This clarifies the issue on the unit rules.
See, I had to cheat back there, put my glasses back
on. There has been some contention for some time
that the unit rule inherently prohibits binding. I
have said for years it does not, but there have been
arguments on both sides. Again, as I said before
with Rule 37, it's time to put this to a rest.
Let's go ahead and simply settle the question once
and for all.
I need to know that my constituents, when
they walk in -- and they don't -- I understand --
the millions of people who vote, they're not like
rules nerds like me, okay? And a couple of other
people in this room. They're not playing the inside
baseball. They go in, they vote for Bill Jones. If
he wins all -- the majority of the votes, they
expect him to be the candidate. They vote for a
Mary Smith, she gets the most, they expect her to
win. That's all I'm asking here.
I ask your -- for a yes vote.
Thank you very much.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.

```

Ross.
Would anyone like to rise in opposition?
Mr. Haugland.
MR. HAUGLAND: Madam Chairman, I'd like to move an amendment to this rule -- motion.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Please statement your amendment.

MR. HAUGLAND: I would like to move to amend the entire Rule 38, to repeal it.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That is not germane to this particular amendment. You would need to move to strike the entire clause after we have dealt with this particular item.

MR. HAUGLAND: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
All right. Is there anyone else who wishes to rise in opposition or support for this amendment?

Mr. Lee.
SENATOR LEE: I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think it's important for us to remember that, as members of this Committee, we can
make any change to any rule that we want. As
Delegates, we can choose to vote for whomever we
choose on the floor, ultimately, assuming the rules
allow that.
    A lot of the focus today has been,
understandably, on expanding our Party, making its
appeal broader, making those who have felt excluded
from it feel more included. And that's important.
We sent the opposite signal every time we take our
rules and we clamp down on our rules further. We
make it less possible for Delegates to exercise
their right to have a voice in this process.
    Now, I think our elections are absolutely
important. They're essential. They're fundamental.
    Delegates traditionally, historically, have been
considered honorbound to follow the outcome of their
States' Primary election. And they overwhelmingly
have done so. But, historically, it has also been
the case that Delegates have retained some option,
some choice on their own to make their own
decisions, in the unusual event that they find some
conscience-binding reason why they can't do that.

At the end of the day, we have to remember that it's important for our presidential nominees to win at two levels. First, to win the Primaries, and then to win over the Delegates. It almost always happens. I hope that whoever our nominee is going to be this time will, in fact, win over the Delegates. But, rules like this are not going to help that. This problem, this angst, as we will see in a few days, isn't just going to go away just because we paper over it with rules.

So, I say to Mr. Trump and those aligned with him, make the case. Make the case to those Delegates who want to have a voice. Make the case that they should use their voice to support him. Don't make the case that their voices should be silenced. That's not going to help. It's not going to help elect him President. It's not going to help our Party in the long run. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. [Applause.] CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone who
wishes --

Guests, please. Thank you.
Is there anyone who wishes to rise in support of the amendment?

Mr. Munisteri?
MR. MUNISTERI: I have great respect for Senator Lee, as we all do, for representing our conservative values. But, sir, I have to take issue with you on something.

My understanding is that you represent the grassroots. And yet, what I don't understand about your logic is, you want to ignore what are really the grassroots, which are millions and millions and millions of voters who voted for Donald Trump, and instead transfer the opinion and the expression of that opinion through a vote to a couple of thousand Delegates.

Now, to me, if we're really representing the grassroots and we're really representing conservatism, we listen to those voices, and we exercise our responsibility, but, more importantly, we advance the conservative cause. The only way to
advance the conservative cause is through a strong
Republican Party that is united to defeat Hillary
Clinton and the Democrats this fall. That's the
only way to do it.
    [Applause.]
    MR. MUNISTERI: Sir, there is nobody else
running for President in this Party right now than
Donald Trump. No other person has said, "I am
running. I will accept your nomination." Nobody is
vetting Vice Presidents. Nobody is raising money
with the Republican National Committee to prepare
for the battle, which begins in 2 months with early
voting. I have been involved in the conservative
movement since 1972, 44 years -- a precinct chair, a
doorknocker, a member of the Reagan Youth Brigade up
here at the last Convention. And I will tell you
that the most important thing to me is, we don't let
the left wing take over our country this fall. And
the only thing that's standing between that
happening is our victory with our nominee and our
ticket.
                                It is time, sir, for you and everyone else
to come together to say this Party will be united,
and we will defeat the Democrats. And these motions
are a way to do it.
    Thank you. And I do applaud you for your
    service.
    [Applause.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Munisteri.
    Is there anyone who rises in opposition?
In opposition?
    Mr. Semanko, are you rising in opposition?
    MR. SEMANKO: Yes, Madam Chair.
    Norm Semanko, from Idaho.
    And, as a matter of decorum, I'd like to
    request that future comments by speakers be directed
        to the Chair.
            I have a question, if the sponsor would
        yield.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Would the sponsor
        yield to question?
    MR. SEMANKO: It's a clarifying question.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yeah, it -- ask it
```

through the Chair, Mr. Semanko, as you correctly --
VOICE: That's appropriate, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- pointed out.
Ask it through the Chair, and then I'll
direct it to him.
MR. SEMANKO: With regard -- the question
is, "With regard to the language in the amendment,
nothing in this rule shall be construed or prohibit
the binding of Delegates pursuant to Rule 16(a)."
Am I reading Rule 16(a) correctly that that binding
could be either through State law, State rule, or
just the result of the Primary? Absent any State
law or State rule, you're still bound by the result
of the Primary? Are those all three ways that you
can be bound under 16(a) that we're enshrining with
this amendment?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That seems to me to be requiring a legal opinion.
Mr. Phillippe, would you like to address
that?
The Gentleman is correct, because the National Party Rules always serve as Primary. The

```
```

National Party Rules incorporate the Primary -- the
National Rules incorporate the Primary results.
National Rules always supersede any State law to the
contrary or, in this case, where there's a contrary
rule, any State Party Rules to the contrary.
MR. SEMANKO: So, irregardless if there's
no State law and no State rule that binds Delegates
from that State to the outcome of their Primary,
they would nonetheless be bound to the result of the
Primary, pursuant to the National Rule.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That is what the --
MR. SEMANKO: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- National Rules
provide.
MR. SEMANKO: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Are
there -- anyone who would like to rise in support?
Mr. Paikai, are you rising in support or
opposition?
MR. PAIKAI: I am in support.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Would you like to
say anything else, sir?

```

MR. PAIKAI: No, ma'am. Yes, I would. A house divided against itself shall not stand. When I came into this, I was asked by one that was helping Mr. Cruz [inaudible] -- "If Mr. Cruz or Senator Cruz win, would you vote for him?" And I said, "Absolutely, yes." Then I said, "When Mr. Trump wins, would you?" Because I know the binding -- we're only as good as our word. And she said, "I would."

I need to ask all of you -- excuse me, because I'm very emotional about this -- I need to ask you, Are we going to do this together? Are we going to be divided? For the law says, the rule says that you are legally bound to whom -- your candidate of whom you were standing with, for whom you were walking with. I'm only as good as my word. And I ask you to be good as your word. A house divided against itself shall not stand. He is the nominee, because he won 1543 Delegates votes and 14 million people came, and they voted for him. So, why cannot we, as a body, come together with the RNC and everyone else, and get together and show the
whole world and the universe that we are a Party, not divided, but we are a Party of one.

Thank you, Madam --
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Paikai.
MS. BLANCHARD-REED: Thank you, Madam
Chair.
I'll try to be more respectful with my speech.

I'd like to rise --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm sorry? What's the issue?

MS. BLANCHARD-REED: Well, I thought I heard a profanity, and I --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, I don't believe that's the case.

MS. BLANCHARD-REED: Well, good, that kind of concerned me, that that wasn't addressed. Sorry.

Okay, thank you.
Well, I -- I'm a little bit surprised, a
little earlier -- my name is Gina Blanchard-Reed,
```

I'm from Washington State -- that there wasn't
allowed to be a little bit more of a debate on this
issue on the previous, because I think that we all,
as we stated earlier, that there were so many
emails. And I think that, when we talk about the
word "vote," we need to think about how it
represents our voice. So, I'd like to make an
amendment to the amendment that's currently up to
change the word "vote" to say "count." Because I
think that that is more accurate, because we're not
actually -- if we don't have a voice, and if people,
as Delegates, don't have a voice, then maybe we just
need to change it to a count, and maybe that might
simplify some things.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I'm sorry, but your
amendment is not in order, because it is not an
amendment to the amendment that is before us. It
would be a separate amendment to the rule. And so,
your amendment is not in order at this time.
MS. BLANCHARD-REED. Okay, thank you.
But, I would like to speak out against the part that
is being considered.

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Certainly. MS. BLANCHARD-REED: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone else who would like to rise to speak in support of the amendment? Support of the amendment?

Mr. Palatucci.
MR. PALATUCCI: Madam Chair -- Madam
Chairwoman, thank you.
Bill Palatucci, from New Jersey.
You know, I've sat here quietly all day, and the -- listened to a lot of good arguments on a lot of different questions. But, I felt this one was important enough to speak up and speak my mind briefly on this one.

You know, in New Jersey, our State Party, nobody's told us how to vote. It wasn't State law, it wasn't the RNC. Our Party last year, last summer, got together. We met. We deliberated. We debated. We voted. And we determined what our Party rules were going to be for our Primary and our Delegates. And, based upon that Party decision, we conducted our Primary, we elected our Delegates, and
we, last summer, as a Party -- okay? -- not by State
law or not by the RNC -- we, as a group, ourselves,
made our decision. And we decided to bind
ourselves. And then we conducted a Primary. And
obviously, back then, you know, we had a different
candidate in mind. And -- but, Donald Trump, then,
won 80 percent of New Jersey Primary vote, nearly
356,000 votes, as a result of that Primary. And so,
that's why, you know, I support this amendment,
based on the decisions that we made, ourselves at
our State Party.
    And, with that, Madam Chairman, I call for
the previous question.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
is in order. We will move directly to a vote on
closing debate.
    All those in favor of closing debate on
Amendment 38.2 , please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes clearly
```

have it. It's over two-thirds. And we move
directly to a vote on the main motion.
All those in favor of adopting Amendment
number 38.2, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, no.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes clearly
have it.
Next, we will go to an amendment that has
been --
VOICE: Madam Chair?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. OSE: Doug Ose, California.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I have a --
MR. OSE: I was in the affirmative.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I know what you're
going to do.
MR. OSE: I'm going to ask for
reconsideration. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there a second for reconsideration?

```

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a second
for reconsideration. We will now vote on reconsideration.

In the vote on reconsideration, if you
vote aye, you are voting to keep debate open, if you vote nay, you are voting to close debate on this amendment permanently.

All those in favor of reconsideration, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays clearly have it.

All right. Now we're going to consider an amendment that has been proposed by Mr. Steve King, of Wisconsin. And, as he is approaching the microphone, \(I\) simply need to take this point of personal privilege to say: Mr. King has devoted the last year and a half of his life to being the Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, which is
the Committee that puts on this Convention. And he has done an incredible job, as you will all see next week, and I just want to let you know, Steve, of my personal appreciation for the work that you have put in on this Convention. It has been extraordinary. [Applause.] MR. KING: Thank you, Madam Chairman. All right. Ladies and gentlemen, this is Amendment 40.2. It applies to Rule number \(40(b)\). Mr. King, you are recognized for the purpose of a motion.

MR. KING: Well, I think you -- can you all read it? This replaces the existing \(40(\mathrm{~b})\). It reads as follows, "Beginning with the 2020 National Convention and each Convention thereafter, each candidate for nomination for the President of the United States and Vice President of the United States shall demonstrate the support of a plurality of the Delegates from each of five or more States severally prior to the presentation of the name of that candidate for nomination, notwithstanding any other provisions of these rules or any rule of the

House of Representatives. To demonstrate the support required by this paragraph, a certificate evidencing a plurality with the affirmative written support of the required number of permanently seated Delegates from each of the five or more States shall have submitted to the Secretary of the Convention not later than 1 hour prior to the placing of the names of candidates for nomination pursuant to this rule and established order of business."

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been moved and seconded.

Mr. King, would you like to speak to your amendment?

MR. KING: We were all -- many of us, anyway, were obviously present at the 2012 Convention in Tampa. Several of us were on that Rules Committee. We adopted a rule at that time, obviously, that went to the floor and was adopted, was passed by the delegation, but not without, obviously, some concerns.

That was then, this is now. Let's move
forward. What this amendment proposes, obviously, is that we return to the traditional five States instead of the eight, and the plurality instead of a majority. We've had five States as the marker for being nominated for many, many decades. We changed that 4 years ago. And we moved from a majority to a plurality, I think it was in 2008 or something like that.

I'd like to think that this kind of amendment serves that which we heard from the Gentleman from Hawaii's purpose. It can bring us together. I hope it's something that we can all agree to.

And, beyond that, Madam Chairman, I'd like to make sure that we get through this before we entertain any amendments.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, Mr. King.

All right. Is there anyone who would like to rise in opposition? In opposition?

Mr. Semanko, are you rising in opposition?
MR. SEMANKO: I would like to move to
amend the motion.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Oh, that's --
    MR. SEMANKO: Am I not in order?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, you are in
    order. I'm sorry, Mr. King, but the Gentleman is in
    order.
    MR. SEMANKO: And if it's no good, it'll
    go down. I appreciate the opportunity.
    I move to amend this amendment to add,
after the word "certificate" "upon" -- comma, "upon
forms" -- "upon a form provided by the Secretary,"
comma.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
    Is there a second?
        VOICE: Second.
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been seconded.
        Moved and seconded.
    Mr. Semanko, would you like to speak to
        your amendment?
                            MR. SEMANKO: Just briefly. And if this
is proven not to be necessary, I'll be happy to be
corrected. But, this question has come up during
this Convention, about why certain States who have a majority for a certain candidate haven't provided a certificate. And I don't know if there is a form, or should be a form, that's available to provide that on. Now certainly is moot, but, in the future, for this five-person -- five-State -- and perhaps Mr. King knows the answer to this, but I'm just curious what form the certificate is to take if it is in a form prepared -- provided by the Secretary. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is there anyone who rises in opposition to the amendment? Is there anyone who rises in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. Blackwell, are you rising in opposition?

MR. BLACKWELL: No, I'm going -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No. MR. BLACKWELL: I want to speak in favor. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The Gentleman from West Virginia, are you rising in opposition?

MR. STUART: Yeah, Mike Stuart, West
```

Virginia.

```

I do rise in opposition. I think the rule
-- the proposed amendment, as written, is
sufficient. It serves our purposes. It's been well
written and well studied.

I'd ask that we call the question at this moment, on the previous question --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous --
MR. STUART: -- on the amendment to the amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question is in order. And so, we will immediately move to a vote on cutting off debate on the amendment to the amendment.

All of those in favor of cutting off debate, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The motion passes.
We are now moving directly to a vote on
```

the motion, itself. The motion is that we insert,
following the word "certificate" "upon a form
provided by the Secretary."
All those in favor of adoption of this
amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Next, we will move to Amendment number --
Oh, excuse me. I'm sorry. Now we're back
to the main motion. I'm sorry. It's 10:15. Give
me one.
All right. We are now voting on the main
motion. All those in favor --
MR. LITTLE: I thought we would -- debate
was still on the main motion.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We called --
MR. LITTLE: I think it just closed --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I -- okay, yes.
I've just made two mistakes, because we just voted
on previous question for the amendment to the

```
amendment. So, we will continue to debate the main
motion. My apologies.
    Mr. King?
    MR. KING: I just wanted to say one other
thing. As noted, I'm from Wisconsin. This
amendment has the support of my friend, the Chairman
of our National Committee, his wholehearted support.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
King.
    Is there anyone else who would like to
rise in opposition? In opposition?
    MR. LITTLE: Thank you, Madam Chairman,
can I ask a question?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Mr. Little.
    MR. LITTLE: I believe we talked about
this in the Standing Committee on Rules. Let's say
you had a delegation of 30, and it was signed by 10
as a plurality, and then someone other -- 11
Delegates from the same State would then file a
petition signed by 11, which -- okay, I'll -- how --
when -- how do you know that it's a plurality? How
are we going to know that?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, the plurality -- you simply have to have the requisite number of signatures from that State. So, you have to have more than any other. So, if two different petitions came in, and one had 10 signatures, and one had 11 signatures, the one with the 11 signatures would control. Because it -- you do not have to have a majority, but you have to have more votes than any other entity in your delegation.

MR. LITTLE: So, any State could submit a petition or certificate, and it would be considered valid unless some other group with a larger plurality would then offer a second petition with more Delegates.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, I believe if there was any question as to the validity of the plurality, that the Chairman of the Convention would have the opportunity to check with the delegation, not necessarily from the podium, but that is certainly something that would be researched to make certain that it was valid.

MR. LITTLE: Thank you, Madam Chairman CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
```

Little.

```

Let's go to Mr. Blackwell first. MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I support this proposal. I've had a conversation with Mr. King about it. This amendment will, essentially, restore the circumstances that were passed into our rules in 2008 with a threshold of a plurality of the delegates in at least five States. In the years when that five-State threshold was a majority and was employed, the purpose of it, of course, was to reduce the number of favorite-son candidates so the Convention could proceed with its business. And it was generally understood. But, in those Conventions, notwithstanding the threshold, votes that were cast by legitimate Delegates who were acting in accord with their State Party rules had their votes counted, which they weren't, in Tampa, because the rules had been changed, and had their votes included in the final tally.

I asked Mr. King if he agreed that his
proposal restores that previous set of circumstances and would not disenfranchise duly-elected delegates who -- for voting for somebody whom they may have been even bound for, and still their votes would be counted in the final tally. And he agreed with my understanding on that. And that's one reason why I'm enthusiastically supporting his amendment. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Blackwell.

Mr. DeVito.
MR. DeVITO: Madam Chair, thank you.
I urge the Committee to vote yes on this amendment. I'm urging a yes vote on this amendment. We are hours away from nominating the next President and Vice President of the United States, and it feels like a win.

I call the question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
has been called and is in order. So, we will immediately move to a vote to conclude debate on this amendment.

All those in favor of concluding debate, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes clearly have it.

We will now move to an immediate vote on this particular amendment.

All those in favor of adopting Mr. King's amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, no.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it. As a matter of fact, \(I\) believe it was unanimous.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And now that the -oh, I see Mr. Ose rising.

MR. OSE: Madam Chair --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Mr. Ose.

MR. OSE: -- Doug Ose, California.
Despite the unanimity of the panel, I move for reconsideration.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Reconsideration has
been moved and seconded.
Once again, I'll remind you that if you
vote for reconsideration, you are voting to continue debate. If you vote against reconsideration, you are voting to foreclose any further debate on this amendment.

All of those in favor of continuing debate through reconsideration, please say aye.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Hearing none, all
those opposed to reconsideration, please say no.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No.
Now that this matter is finally disposed of, and my personal opinion will not sway -- not that it would have, anyway -- but, I'm very glad,
and I want to express my appreciation that this
thorn that has been in our flesh for over 4 -- well,
for 4 years now, that caused so much disappointment
and so much trouble, has finally been removed.
    Thank you, Mr. King.
    All right.
    [Applause.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will now move to
Ms. Unruh's motion on Rule number \(40(b)\).
    Ms. Unruh, if you would like to -- let's
see, where is she? Here she comes. Ms. Unruh, you
are recognized for the purpose of making a motion.
    MS. UNRUH: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
    Kendal Unruh, from Colorado.
    I would like to move the proposed language
that, in the first sentence, you strike the word
"majority" and substitute the word "plurality,"
strike the word "eight" and substitute the word
"five" in both places those words appear in the
subsection, and, in the second sentence, strike the
words "or any rule of the House of Representative."
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. The
Chair is going to point out to the body that we have
just passed the first two items of this particular
amendment. We have changed the word "majority" to
"plurality," and we have stricken the word "eight"
and substituted the word "five," so the only things
that would be remaining in this amendment would be
the final sentence.
    Is there a second? Is there a second?
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Hearing none, it
dies for lack of a second.
    MS. UNRUH: Okay, thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Next, we go to
Amendment number 42.1, also proposed by Mrs. Unruh.
    This impacts Rule number 42.
    Mrs. Unruh, if you would like to approach
the microphone, and we will -- the Chair will
recognize you for the purpose of making a motion.
    MS. UNRUH: Okay.
    Madam Chairman, I would like to propose --
move to propose the language -- strike the existing
language in its entirety, insert in lieu thereof the
following, "Rules 1 to 25 herein shall apply upon the adjournment of the 2016 Convention, and Rules 26 to 42 herein shall constitute the Standing Rules for this Convention and the Temporary Rules of the 2020 Convention."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded.

Mrs. Unruh, if you'd like to address the body with regard to your amendment.

MS. UNRUH: Well, I just think it's explanatory. It's just setting into order exactly what we've done here today and tonight, and just codifying, I guess, just what are the Standing Rules and what are the Temporary Rules.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right, Mrs. Unruh.

Is there someone who would rise in opposition to the motion?

Mr. Ryder, of Tennessee.
MR. RYDER: John Ryder, Tennessee.

I rise in opposition and urge a no vote on this amendment. I believe it to be unnecessary, in that Rules 1 through 25 remain in effect when they are adopted, and they remain in effect going into the next Convention, as found by the Court last week in Correll versus Herring. The Temporary Rules are exactly that, temporary rules. So, you've got a set of Rules 1 through 25, which have no practical effect, since they deal with the matters of the Republican National Committee and the Delegate selection process. They have no practical effect until after this Convention goes out, back into the world, and the new RNC convenes on Friday morning. The Convention Rules take effect at the Convention, as adopted by the Convention.

It's an unnecessary rule, and I would urge a no vote.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there anyone else who wishes to rise in support?

Mr. Haugland.
MR. HAUGLAND: Madam Chair, I would -Curly Haugland, North Dakota -- I would certainly
rise in support of this. It clarifies an area that
evidently many people are confused about in this
body, because we have a lot of people that are under
the impression that a rule in the 1 through 25 apply
to this Convention, that mainly being Rule 16. And
I don't quite get the reference to a court case that
had nothing to do, at this point, by the previous
speaker. But, this is very clear and distinct
language that identifies the difference between the
Convention Rules and the rules that do not pertain
to the Convention. And therefore, it would be wise
to vote yes.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

MR. STUART: Mike Stuart, West Virginia.
I stand in opposition. I believe this rule is insufficient -- or unnecessary, let me put it that way. And I move the previous question.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question is in order. We will now move immediately to a vote on closing debate.

All of those in favor of closing debate on
```

this amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, no.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The motion carries.
Ladies and gentlemen, before we move to a
vote, I just want to let you know, I can see we've
got some carpet pulling away here. If there is
anyone left in the room, we'd like to get that
repaired before somebody falls and hurts themselves.
Thank you, Mr. Barnett, for trying to fix
it, but here comes Gordon, the Magic Man who fixes
everything in this room. I just don't want to see
any of us take a tumble when we've done so well so
far today.
All right. As they work on that, we will
move to a vote on the main motion.
All those in favor of adopting Mrs.
Unruh's motion, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
nay.

```
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays clearly
```

have it.

```

Next, we will proceed to an amendment --
MR. OSE: Madam Chairman.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Mr. Ose.
MR. OSE: It's delightful to see you again.
[Laughter.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And you, sir.
MR. OSE: I move reconsideration.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We will vote on reconsideration. By now, you know what it means.

All those in favor of leaving debate open on this issue and in favor of reconsideration, please vote aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it. Reconsideration is now proscribed.

Now, we are going to move -- we have one, two, three, four amendments to go. And, since we've already passed out of the presubmitted and we have many more to go. All right, guys. We'll just keep plugging along.

All right. Next, we go to an amendment by Mr. Blackwell. It is MA2.1, or Multiple Amendments 2.1. It impacts Rule \(16(\mathrm{a})(2)\) and Rule \(40(\mathrm{~d})\).

And, Mr. Blackwell, if you would like to approach the microphone, you will be recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
It -- this amendment is not designed to change the rules in any way, but it moves that portion in -- of Rule 16, which has to do with the operation of the Convention, from Rule 16 to Rule 40, which is where it ought to be, I believe. So, I'm not suggesting that we change this, but we put that rule where it belongs, because it has to do with the conduct of the Convention.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Blackwell.
Is there anyone who rises in opposition to this motion? Anyone who rises in opposition?

I see -- are you rising in opposition or in support?

MS. DHILLON: I'm rising in opposition. And I wish to move the question.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Previous question is in order.

All those in favor of closing debate --
VOICE: Madam Chair?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. BROWN: Point of information.
We've indulged the practice of arguing and then moving the question, but \(I\) would like a ruling from the parliamentarian whether that's actually correct or not.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, the parliamentarians are not allowed to make a ruling. I need to make a ruling. The Gentleman is correct. We've been letting it be lax, simply because that
seemed to be the will of the body. However, it is -
- it -- if it is the body's will, I'll certainly be
more strict in applying that rule.
    MR. BROWN: Is there any opportunity to
revisit earlier instances in which that occurred?
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, sir.
    MR. BROWN: Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there -- so, we do not have a valid previous
question on the floor.
    Mr. Evans.
    MR. EVANS: That is my motion.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
has been made -- or has been called for, and is
appropriate and nondebatable.
    So, all of those in favor of closing
debate on this item, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
We will now move to a vote on the main motion.

All those in favor of adopting Mr.
```

Blackwell's amendment, MA2.1, please say aye.

```
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Nays clearly have
it.

Mr. Ose.
MR. OSE: Madam Chairman.
Doug Ose, California.
I move to reconsider. I was on the
prevailing side.
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been moved and seconded for reconsideration.

All those in favor of reconsideration and leaving debate open, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.

Next, we have Amendment number 43.1 that
has been submitted by Mr. Tettlebaum, of Missouri,
who is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. TETTLEBAUM: Thank you, Madam
Chairman.
We have all been -- I will move the
adoption of Amendment 43.1.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there a second? Is there a second?
MR. TETTLEBAUM: I don't think they know
what the amendment is.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Oh, I'm sorry.
Okay. It's --
MR. TETTLEBAUM: Let me read the
amendment, since we have the famous logo up.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: 43.1 --
MR. TETTLEBAUM: "The" --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Would you bring
that up?
MR. TETTLEBAUM; I can read it.
"The names and contact information of

Delegate members of the Convention Rules Committee shall be confidential. The RNC shall create a system by which the public may contact the designated Committeeman or Committeewoman by State that permits the Delegate members to retrieve those messages."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The motion has been
made. Is there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been
seconded.

There we have it.
Mr. Tettlebaum, would you like to address your motion?

MR. TETTLEBAUM: Yes. We -- thank you, Madam Chairman -- we have all been subjected to hundreds and hundreds, if not thousands, of messages from people who have wanted to voice their concerns mainly about one issue. But, in the process, I'm sure a number of us have been frustrated in trying to figure out which of the messages that we have received were messages that contained information
about the Rules Committee, the operation of the Rules Committee, and the Convention, as opposed to the opinions of people who wanted to voice their views on especially the -- what I'll call the conscience amendment. The -- this is as a result of the fact that the current RNC Rules, not Convention Rules, make public all of the information -- all of our contact information as Delegates.

I think it's time to bring us into the 21st century. The technology currently exists where the RNC could set up something like a drop box, where people could send their comments in, because the messages that have been sent out have been virtually identical to all of us, as Delegate members of the Rules Committee. And we could then -- as some of us do in our current occupations or professions, could then access that drop box, or whatever system the RNC decided they wanted to use, to be able to retrieve those messages and review them so that what would be accomplished is that members of the public, Republicans, other Delegates would have the opportunity to express their views to
us as Delegate members of the Rules Committee, and
we would have the opportunity to review that
information without being inundated with information
that might obscure and prevent us from retrieving
more official communications.
    So, I move the adoption of Rule 43.1.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Tettlebaum.
    I am advised by Counsel that there is a
potential conflict. And so, what I would like to
do, without objection, is to set your motion aside
to allow you to approach Counsel table and figure
out just exactly what language you would need to
include to do away with the conflict.
    MR. TETTLEBAUM: Thank you, Madam
Chairman.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Would that be
agreeable?
    MR. TETTLEBAUM: I'll be happy to do that.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Tettlebaum. We will set that aside while we get
that question resolved.

Next, we will go to Amendment number 43.2. Amendment 43.2 has been submitted by Mr. Ross, of Nevada. It would create a new rule.

And you are recognized, Mr. Ross, for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. ROSS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I ask the consent of the Committee to withdraw the motion.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Without objection, so ordered.

All right. All right. If \(I\) could get Counsel to give me some additional amendments. Okay, there are some right here.

All right. Next, you'll see that these new amendments are going to be numbered "Final"-point-whatever-number-it-is. And that's because of the cutoff date that we established. So, all of these amendments came in from the time we voted to suspend the rules and our 9:30 cutoff. So, that's why they're numbered differently.

We are now going to take up Final.9. And they're just giving these to me in whatever order
they come, as they are able to get them into the
system.

All right. So, Final.9 is -- has been submitted by Mr. Haugland, of North Dakota.

Mr. Haugland, if you would approach the microphone, you'll be recognized for the purpose of making an amendment -- or, excuse me, making a motion.

MR. HAUGLAND: Make a motion. Madam Chair, thank you.

Curly Haugland, from North Dakota.
I intended to make a motion to introduce the concept of a midterm National Convention, but, in light of the interest of getting out of here, I think maybe somebody else can bring that on at the next Convention. So, I withdraw the motion.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Without objection, it is withdrawn.

I thought I heard Mr. King have a sharp intake of breath at the idea of having one in 2 years.

All right. We'll now go to Final.2. This
```

has been submitted by Mrs. Unruh, of Colorado.
If Mrs. Unruh would like to approach the
microphone, you will be recognized for the purpose
of making a motion.
MS. UNRUH: Madam Chairman, Kendal Unruh,
from Colorado. I'll withdraw my amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Without objection,
the amendment is withdrawn.
Next is Final.11. It has been proposed by
Mr. Semanko --
MR. OSE Madam Chairman? Parliamentary
inquiry.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. OSE: To the extent that we are
dealing with these Final -- the F-whatevers -- and
they are withdrawn, are they able to be tendered
downstream at some future point?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Not if they don't
want the Chairman to throw my gavel at them.
[Laughter.]
MR. OSE: Well, what about under
parliamentary rules?

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Once they have been withdrawn without objection, they are no longer viable.

MR. OSE: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, they -- it
would have to -- yeah, well, they would have to bring them to the body again before we adjourn.

MR. OSE: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
My comment about the gavel stands,
however.
[Laughter.]
VOICE: Parliamentary inquiry.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
VOICE: If they're withdrawn, then they
tried to bring them in again, they would be after your 9:30 deadline.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That is correct. The Gentleman is correct. Once they have been withdrawn, they would have to start all over again, and we've already voted to suspend the rules and not allow any submissions after 9:30. So, I thank the
```

Gentleman for his point of order.
All right. Mr. Semanko's amendment,
Final.11.
Mr. Semanko, you are recognized for the
purpose of making a motion.
MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, I move to amend
Rule 28(b) to insert the word "guests" following the
word "press," with a comma inserted.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been seconded.
Mr. Semanko, if you'd like to address the

```
body.
    MR. SEMANKO: So, Madam Chair, I may
preface this by saying there may be a difference of
opinion on receiving emails and phone calls and text
messages and Facebook messages. I don't consider it
being "subjected to." I appreciate the input. And
we've certainly solicited that from folks in Idaho.
    And I had some input with regard to amendments.
And this is one of those that \(I\) had a conversation
with someone who happens to be a guest of the Idaho Delegation, and they mentioned that, while in Subsection (c) it makes clear that each member -- or each alternate Delegate is entitled to a guest pass, and, in Subsection (d), that there are additional guest passes that are provided to the State Parties, there is actually no provision in (a) or (b) or (c) or (d) that designates that there's a place for the guest to be housed. So, certainly Subsection (a) gets to the issue of who's allowed to go on the Convention floor, and then (b) talks about press and staff being admitted to the section or sections of the hall authorized for them, and there is nothing specific in Rule 28 with regard to guests. And, of course, guests have, as I recall, their own section where they are seated, separate from the Delegates, the alternates, the press, the staff, the incumbent Governors, the incumbent Senators, incumbent Congressmen, and the other folks, as well. So, that's the purpose for this amendment, and appreciate it being brought to my attention by one of our guests from Idaho.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Semanko.
MR. ROSS: Madam Chair, a privilege
question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. ROSS: I move the previous question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No. No. You can't make a privilege and then --

MR. ROSS: A privileged motion. I
```

apologize.

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. But, you
stated -- it's not a privilege motion. I understand
your intent, but I'm going to recognize Mr. DeVito.

MR. DeVITO: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I oppose this amendment, and I urge the Committee to oppose this amendment. Excuse me.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone else who wishes to be recognized in support of the amendment? In support of the amendment?
[No response.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Anyone opposed to
```

the amendment?
Sir.
MR. ROSS: I move the previous question,
Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Previous question is appropriate. We will now move
to a vote on closing debate.
All those in favor of closing debate on
this item, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
nay.
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
We will move to a -- directly to a vote on the main
motion.
All of those in favor of adopting Mr.
Semanko's motion, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it. We'll now go to Mr. Semanko's Final.12.

This amends Rule number 33.
And Mr. Semanko is recognized.
MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, I move that
Rule 33, with regard to platform resolutions, be amended by, after "in writing," inserting the words "or in electronic format which is capable of being displayed at the Committee meeting."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is a motion.
```

Is there a second?

```

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been moved and seconded.

Mr. Semanko, if you'd like to address the body.

MR. SEMANKO: So, Madam Chair, actually this was a suggestion that was made to me today by one of our Delegates watching the proceedings here today and enjoying the fact that we had everything up on the dais. And I'm not sure -- on the screens -- I'm not sure they understood the difference
between the Resolutions and the Rules Committee, but it occurs to me that, if things can be submitted in a format that can be displayed at the Committee meeting, and that is what is provided to staff, that it wouldn't be necessary for it to be submitted in writing. So, I forward that as a proposed amendment to Rule 33.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is there someone who rises in opposition?

MR. STUART: Madam Chairwoman?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. STUART: Mike Stuart, West Virginia.
I stand in opposition to this rule. I just believe it's unnecessary. And I call the question.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Question has been called.

All those in favor of end -- excuse -- ah, yes. I'm afraid we did it again. You argued and then made a motion.
```

    Mr. Evans?
    ```

Ah, the parliamentarians are letting me
know that that is in order. I stand corrected. I
apologize to the Gentleman from West Virginia, and
we will move directly to previous question.
    All of those in favor, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
    nay.
        [A chorus of nays.]
        CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I need you to be a
little louder.
    All of those in favor of ending debate,
please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. All
those opposed, say nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I know you're
tired. The ayes have it. Now we will vote on the
main motion.
    All those in favor of adopting Final. 12 by
Mr. Semanko, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Next, we go to Mr. Semanko's Final. 22
amendment to Rule 33.
Mr. Semanko, if you would like to approach the microphone, you'll be recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, this is a
duplicate of the Amendment that was just fondly rejected by the group, and \(I\) think it should be withdrawn.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Without objection, so ordered. Thank you, Mr. Semanko.

All right. Do we have some more? Oh, we have more. All right. Thank you.

Mr. Semanko, Final.13. This amends Rule number \(34(\mathrm{a})\).

Mr. Semanko, you're recognized.
MR. SEMANKO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would move that Rule \(34(\mathrm{a})\) be amended by striking "1 hour" and inserting in lieu thereof -good job, guys; \(I\) didn't write it that way -- "2 hours."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. It's
been moved. Is there a second?

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded.

Mr. Semanko?
MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, compliments of
the broadcast on C-SPAN today, I received a text message from one of our alternates, actually, suggesting that 1 hour is an impossible timeframe. I don't know if that's true or not, but it occurred to me that extending that to "not later than 2 hours after the time at which such Committee votes on its report at the Convention and shall have been accompanied by a petition evidencing the affirmative written support of a minimum of 25 percent of the membership of such Committee" is more than reasonable for a Minority Report. Perhaps someone
knows the history of that or why it's -- why it is 1
hour. But, when that point was made earlier today,
I drafted this amendment, and appreciate the
opportunity to provide it.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Semanko.
    Is there anyone who would like to rise in
opposition? In opposition?
    The Gentleman from Alabama.
    MR. HENRY: Thank you.
    Ed Henry, from Alabama.
    I appreciate all the amendments that we've
    seen and dealt with tonight. We've gone through
    quite a few things. I think this is probably very
    self-explanatory, and we probably, as a group, know
    where we're going to be on it. So, with that, I'd
    like to move the previous question.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
    Previous question has been moved. Is
    there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Moved and seconded.

All those in favor of ending debate on
this item, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it. We'll move to a vote on the main motion.

All those in favor of adopting Amendment Final.13, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
All right. Mr. Tettlebaum has worked with Counsel, and we --

MR. OSE: Madam Chair? Parliamentary inquiry?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, Mr. Ose.
MR. OSE: I'd like to move -- Doug Ose, California -- I'd like to remove -- I'd like to move
```

reconsideration of the item just dispensed with.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is

```
there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded.
    All those in favor of reconsideration,
please say aye.
    [No response.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: You've all caught
up now. I don't have to say the whole thing.
    All those opposed to reconsideration,
please say nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
    All right. Mr. Tettlebaum, you're
    recognized, sir, for the purpose of -- we'll just
        call it your newly amended motion.
    MR. TETTLEBAUM: Thank you, Madam
        Chairman.
    With the able assistance of the Counsel's
        Office, and especially Mr. Tarcyaski and Matt Moore,
we have gone back to the RNC rule itself and made an amendment. I think you can see it now displayed. But, I will move the following amendment and read it, because the hour is late and everybody's eyes are blurred.

This would amend the RNC rule, and it would read, as amended, as follows: "No later than 25 days prior to the National Convention, all members of each of the various Convention Committees shall be provided the most current listing of their fellow Committee member -- members' names." And this would then -- would take out the additional "with complete contact information."
"The" -- then this would be the additional amendment -- "The contact information of Delegate members of the Convention Rules Committee shall be confidential. The RNC shall create a system by which the public may contact the designated Rules Committeeman or Committeewoman, by State, that permits the Delegate members to retrieve those messages."

I'll move the adoption of that amendment.

\section*{Tettlebaum.}

Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded.

Mr. Tettlebaum, would you like to further address this?

MR. TETTLEBAUM: Yes. As I was saying earlier, \(I\) believe that coming into the 21st century, with the technology that we have, we can avoid the situation that we all experienced with respect to this particular Rules Committee and the number of messages we received, on perhaps a single issue, which prevented us from easily accessing those messages of a more official nature, but, at the same time, giving individual Delegates and others the opportunity to exercise their right to contact members of the Rules Committee with their views and information they want to present in a centralized database which can be then accessed by the Delegates when they want and at the times that
```

they want and still allow the official
communications to come directly to the contact
information of those Delegates.
So, I will move the adoption of this
amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, Mr.
Tettlebaum.
Is there anyone who rises in opposition?
Is there any --
The Lady from Wyoming. The Lady from
Wyoming is recognized to rise in opposition.
MS. HAGEMAN: Yes. I rise in opposition
to this. We believe in a representative form of
government. We are a republic. People ought to be
able to contact us. We are here doing the business,
attempting to have a nominee for President of the
United States. Bringing us into the 21st century,
where people can send us emails and contact us, if
you don't want the emails, you can delete them.
But, I can assure you -- or I guess I believe that
if they're put into a separate space, I don't think
that the vast majority of us would go to those

```
```

emails and look at them and study them and see what
our fellow citizens are saying to us. I think it's
very important for people to be able to contact us
directly.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who wishes to speak in
support?
MS. THOMAS: Madam Chairman?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, ma'am.
MS. THOMAS: Patricia Thomas, from the
State of Missouri.
And I rise to support this amendment. I
think it's important that we are here to represent
the grassroots and the people that have sent us
here. I think it's important that they be able to
contact us. But, I also think it's important that,
as we are volunteers, we able -- be able to continue
to conduct our daily business. And I think having
the ability to go out and retrieve those messages at
a time when we can take the time and dedicate it to
answering and responding to those would put things
in a much better light.

```

And with that support, I move the previous question.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
The previous question is in order. We will direct -- move directly to a vote on ending debate.

All of those in favor of ending debate, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Well, the Chair's not in doubt. The ayes have it.

MR. WILLHOIT: Madam Chair, is a point of information in order, though?

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. WILLHOIT: Thank you. I'm -- because I'm just curious.

So, does this rule -- I don't understand -- is this rule then -- do we still get, as just a group, privately, confidentially, the contact information so we can talk, or does that no longer
```

happen if this is passed?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The way I read it,
it would be confidential, but there would be a drop-
box system created whereby if each member agreed to
talk with each other and share their information
with each other, that would certainly be up to that
member.
MR. WILLHOIT: Okay, thank you.
MR. LITTLE: Madam -- I'd like to ask for
division on the --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: On the previous
question?
Although -- all right, we'll go to
division on the previous question.
All those in --
MR. BROWN: For a point -- wait -- for a
point of information --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.
MR. BROWN: Since you're ruling on
parliamentary procedures, can you also rule on the
question of whether there have to be two vote in
favor -- or two speak in favor and two speak against

```
```

before you can call the question?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, that is not --
that is not a parliamentary requirement.
All right. So, now we will move to
division on the question -- on the previous
question.
All of those in favor of ending debate on
this item, please rise.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. Please be
seated.
We're not -- we're not going to have them
count when it's so obvious.
All those opposed, please rise.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. Clearly, we
have two-thirds. Please be seated.
We're not going to keep counting when it's
obvious, folks. Not when it's 11:00 o'clock at
night. All right?
Okay. We are back to a vote on the main
motion.

```

All those in favor of adopting Mr.
Tettlebaum's amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Chair is in
doubt. All of those in favor of adopting Mr.
Tettlebaum's amendment, please rise.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay, I'd like to have the tellers count on this one.

All right. Thank you. You may be seated.
All those opposed to Mr. Tettlebaum's amendment, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you. You may be seated.

The vote is as follows: ayes, 55; nays 46. The amendment is adopted.

And considering the language on some of the things \(I\) got on my phone 4 years ago, Mr. Tettlebaum, I understand why you made it.

All right. Let's move now to Final number 1.8, from Mr. Semanko, of Idaho.

Mr. Semanko, if you'd like to approach the microphone. This amends Rule number 35. Rule number 35 .

All right. Mr. Semanko, you are recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, I move that Rule 35 be amended to add the following after "original measure," "The motion to lay on the table may not be considered unless it is supported by a majority of the Delegates from five separate States" -- I'm sorry -- "The motion to lay on the table may not be considered unless it's supported by a majority of the Delegates from five separate States at the time the motion to lay on the table is made." CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. There is a motion. Is there a second? Is there a second? VOICE: Second. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been seconded.

Mr. Semanko, if you'd like to address it.

MR. SEMANKO: Yes, Madam Chair.
Rule 35 simply reads, now, "It shall be order to lay on the table a proposed amendment to a pending measure, and such motion, if adopted, shall not carry with it or prejudice such original measure." And if you compare this to several of the other rules in here, which we'll discuss in a little while, with regard to suspension of rules and the like, there is no minimum number of State requirement like there is for other kinds of motions. So, the suggestion is that a modest number of States, five separate States, Delegates, a majority of those Delegates, make that motion in order for something that, otherwise, has been validly presented onto the floor to be -- for discussion, that it would be tabled and not allowed to be considered further. I believe this is consistent with some of the other rules that already exist. And I'm not sure why there is no threshold in the rule now for a motion to table.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Semanko.
    Is there anyone who rises in opposition?
    Mr. DeVito.
    MR. DeVITO: Vincent DeVito,
Massachusetts.
    I urge the Committee to vote no on this
amendment. And I move previous question.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
    has been moved and seconded.
    All those in favor of ending debate,
    please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
    nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
    passes.
    We will now move to a vote on the
        amendment.
    All those in favor of adopting Final
    number 1.8, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed?
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Next, we will go to -- oh, now, this one -
- I'm trying to see -- yes, it does have Final.1 --

Final.1. That has been suggested by the Gentleman from Montana, Mr. Wittich. Yes, sir.

MR. WITTICH: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to move Amendment -- I can't read
    it --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay, let's -MR. WITTICH: What's on the screen. It's --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Oh, yes, that is very small.

MR. WITTICH: It's an amendment to Rule 37 (b) .

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.
Is -- can you read it now?
MR. WITTICH: Madam Chair, my colleague from Nevada talked about the "b" word --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Just a minute, sir.
```

    I need to -- you to have a motion, and then we'll
    ```
get it seconded.

MR. WITTICH: I thought I did. I'd like
to move my amendment --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I apologize.
    MR. WITTICH: Would you like me to repeat
the --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
    MR. WITTICH: Oh.
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay, moved and
    seconded.
    Please proceed, sir.
    MR. WITTICH: Thank you, Madam Chair.
    My colleague from Nevada talked about the
    "b" word, and he proposed some solutions. And I
    think my solution is better. I think that his
    solution, from a syntax standpoint, was essentially
    a double negative.
    This is a positive way to say that we're
        going to honor the vote of the people of the United
```

States. It makes it explicit that we are bound.
It's not implicit. It's also -- it's my
understanding that this language is -- brings us
back to the language that we had in 1976.
And so, I think it's time to resolve this
open issue. And I think this is the best way to do
it.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who rises in opposition?
Anyone who rises in opposition?
Mr. DeVito.
MR. DeVITO: Vincent DeVito,
Massachusetts.
I urge the Committee to oppose this
amendment. And I move to call the previous
question.
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Been moved and
seconded.
All those in favor of ending debate,
please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]

```

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
All those in favor of adopting Final.1, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Next, we go to Final. 3 that has been submitted by Mr. Haugland, of North Dakota.

Mr. Haugland, if you would like to approach the microphone for the purpose of being recognized to make a motion.

MR. HAUGLAND: Madam Chair, Curly Haugland, from North Dakota.

I approach with trepidation. I intended to come tomorrow, in grateful anticipation of the opportunity to suggest some unity to the Party by introducing the -- essentially, the same amendment
that just didn't get much support. But, anyway, I
can't read this here yet, so if -- put my glasses
on, I'll --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Certainly.
    MR. HAUGLAND: -- indulge it.
    Let me just summarize it. This is the --
this is what was known as the Justice Amendment in
1976, when the Ford Campaign was nervous about
Reagan. And they had the horsepower to do it, so
they got the Convention Delegates to vote to bind
the Delegates to the results of Primaries. And it
worked for Mr. Ford in that particular case.
    But, in this case, the proposal you've
just defeated is -- and the one that I would have
happily explained in detail tomorrow, that would
have fixed the rules for a long time, to allow
binding in the Convention Rules, it doesn't sound
like you have an appetite for it, so I'll withdraw
this, Madam Chair.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Without objection,
it is so ordered.
    Next, we go to Final.6, an amendment by
```

Mrs. Unruh, of Colorado. Mrs. Unruh's motion -- or
amendment, rather, would change the language of Rule
number 37(b).
Mrs. Unruh.
MS. UNRUH: Madam Chairman, I'll just
withdraw my amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Without objection,
so ordered.
Next, we go to Final.23, submitted by Mr.
Semanko, of Idaho. It would change the language in
Rule number 37(d).
Mr. Semanko, you're recognized.
MR. SEMANKO: Madam Chair, Norm Semanko,
from Idaho.
You know, I've been around for a little
while. I've been doing Republican stuff since I was
chairman of College Republicans at the University of
Idaho and voted for Ronald Reagan. And my first
salaried job was at the Republican National
Committee for the George Herbert Walker Bush
Campaign against Michael Dukakis, and had the good
favor of serving as the chairman of the Idaho

```
```

Republican Party and on this -- on the RNC and as
general counsel, and in a number of other positions.
And, you know, I know when my proposals are being
considered and when they're being ignored. There
are some good proposals, I think, and I'm glad that
I've had the chance to bring them. And maybe
someone else will have the opportunity to bring them
at later date.
But, at this time, I would like to
withdraw amendments that I have proposed numbered 14
-- Final.14, .15, .19, .20, .21, and .23.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right, Mr.
Semanko. Without objection, it is so ordered.
Next, we go to Final.16. This amendment
has been submitted by Mr. Willhoit, of Vermont, who
is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.
MR. WILLHOIT: Thank you, Madam Speaker.
I would like permission for leave for both
this amendment and my second amendment, Amendment
17, with gratitude to Member King and his amendment
that was supported by Mr. Priebus, which basically
did what I was hoping we could do. So, thank you.

```

And I also -- I'm sorry to belabor, but I
also want to personally apologize to you for my
upsetness for being here so late.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Sir, you do not need to apologize.

MR. WILLHOIT: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There's nothing that brings our emotions more to the fore than our children.

MR. WILLHOIT: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: So, I appreciate that. Thank you.

All right. Without objection, it is so ordered that this is withdrawn.

Now I -- let's see, is this -- all right.
We have some more.
Okay. Mr. Willhoit, just so that I'm clear, you also withdrew number \(17 ?\)

MR. WILLHOIT: Yes, please, with permission to leave.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you very
much.
All right. All right. We now move to
Final.5. This is a rule that would amend Rule 40 (b). It has been suggested by Mrs. Unruh, of Colorado.

Mrs. Unruh, if you'd approach the microphone.

MS. UNRUH: I'm going to make everybody happy, Madam Chairman. I'm going to withdraw my amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Without
objection, so ordered.
Next, we have Final. 7 that has been submitted by Fred Brown, of Alaska. Mr. Brown's amendment would change Rule number \(41(\mathrm{a})\).

And he is recognized.
MR. BROWN: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Fred Brown, from Alaska.
This is on page 59 of 61, and it relates to Rule 41, lines 17 and 18. It basically would accommodate those of us who travel from afar in the event that, for whatever reason, we're not able to -
```

- or unwilling to travel and incur the expense, for
whatever reason, it would clarify the fact that,
even though we may be able to travel a distance, if,
for whatever reason, we're unwilling to travel, that
the delegation Chairman could then fill the
described slots.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. There's
a motion. Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded.
Would you like to address this, Mr. Brown?
MR. BROWN: And I apologize. I was out of
order. But, in any case, I've already described the
intent, and I would appreciate support.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is there anyone who wishes to rise in
opposition? Anybody rising in opposition?
MR. DUPREY: I am.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Mr. Duprey.
MR. DUPREY: I am.

```

Steve Duprey, from New Hampshire.
If you don't think you can make the
commitment to come to the Convention, you should not
run for the spot of Delegate. The alternates are
there in case there's an exigent emergency of some
kind, and they're able to step in. I urge us to
vote no on this proposed amendment.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone else who wishes to speak in favor of
the amendment? In favor of the amendment?
    The Gentlewoman --
    VOICE: Gwen --
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- from Louisiana.
    MS. BOWEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, Gwen
Bowen, Louisiana.
    I speak in favor of it. I mean, Hawaii
and Alaska are pretty far away. And so, sometimes
things come up, you know, not that you're planning
on it. Just things come up. So, I support it.
    Thank you.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
    Is there anyone else who rises in
```

opposition? Anyone else who rises in opposition?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing no further
members who wish to speak, we'll move directly to a
vote on the amendment.
All those in favor of adoption of the
amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it.
Next, we move to Final.8, also proposed by
Mrs. Unruh, of Colorado. This would be a change to
Rule number 42.
Mrs. Unruh, if you would approach the
microphone, please.
MS. UNRUH: Madam Chairman, is there a way
to withdraw any amendment --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: There is, yes.
Without objection, it's so ordered. Thank you.
Next is Rule number 43, submitted by Mr.

```

Ross, of Nevada. Mr. Ross, of Nevada, has proposed an amendment that would create Rule number 43.

MR. ROSS: Beg your pardon, Madam Chair.
```

I believe I asked the consent of the body to

```
withdraw the --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: My apologies.
Without objection, so ordered.
    MR. ROSS: Thank you, ma'am.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I only have one
left in the pile. And I'm almost afraid to ask our
Counsel if this is -- is this the last one? It's
the last one we've received? Well, we asked about
the Preamble, and there was nothing there. So, this
is the last amendment.
    [Applause.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. This is
Final.4. It has been submitted by MaryAnne Kinney,
of Maine. It would propose an amendment to Rule 31.
    And, Ms. Kinney, you are recognized.
    MS. KINNEY: Thank you. It's not up. I
guess I'm waiting for it to come up on the screens.
    Do you want me to read it or --

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. Can we get
that up on the monitors, please? Do we have it? Yes, we do.

Ms. Kinney, if you'd like to proceed.
MS. KINNEY: I move this amendment to Rule 31.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is there a second?
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and seconded.

Ms. Kinney, if you'd like to address the body.

MS. KINNEY: Would. Thank you, Madam Chair.

The National Committee, at the request of Chairman Priebus, passed a resolution in January of 2015 titled Resolution for Reasonable Access to a Live Microphone. This resolution read, in part, "Resolved, that the Republican National Committee requests that the Standing Committee on Arrangements and the Temporary Convention Chair ensure there is an active microphone available to each State

Delegation Chair so that he or she may allow its use by individual Delegates who wish to speak in debate or make motions as allowed by rules." At yesterday's General Session meeting, Chairman Priebus confirmed that the Committee on Arrangements has taken measurements, as directed, to ensure that each Delegation will have a live microphone available for its use.

This rule simply puts into writing the wishes of the Republican National Committee, Chairman Priebus, and the Committee on Arrangements so that Delegates to the National Convention can set their expectations and know what is required of them to seek recognition and ensure an efficient use of time and a successful Convention.

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
Is -- we had a motion and a second. Is -does anyone rise in opposition?

The Lady from California.
MS. DHILLON: Harmeet Dhillon, member from California.

I rise in opposition to this motion,
because I believe it is unnecessary to add this
level of detail and, I would even say,
micromanagement into our rules. I think our
Committee on Arrangements is more than capable of
making the right choices as technology evolves,
rather than marking ourselves as dinosaurs, mentioning specific types of technology.

And I urge opposition to this motion. And I -- as well, I'd like to move the previous question.

VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. It's been moved and seconded for the previous question. We will move immediately to a vote on closing debate.

All those in favor of closing debate on this amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it. We will now move to a vote on the amendment.

All those in favor of adopting this amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.] CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Those opposed, nay. [A chorus of nays.] CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The nays have it. All right. The Gentleman from Nevada, for what purpose do you seek the microphone?

MR. ROSS: Madam Chair, after consulting with some of my colleagues, I would like to ask the grace of this Committee to reconsider a previous amendment that was withdrawn.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: And which amendment is that?

MR. ROSS: That would be, ma'am, Rule -Amendment number Final.1, with some changes that, if the Committee is willing to reconsider, I will present the staff to retype and -- oh, I apologize. No, that's right, this was not withdrawn. This was
```

defeated. And so, I'm asking for reconsideration
for the amendment, with some modified language.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Okay. And did you
vote against?
MR. ROSS: Yes, ma'am, I did.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. So, the
MR. ROSS: With the modified language --
I'm asking the consent of the Committee to
reconsider this, with modified language.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. So, the
Gentleman is asking for reconsideration of his
motion, which would be to reopen debate. It is
debatable. Is there anyone who wishes to be heard
on this item?
Mr. DeVito.
MR. DeVITO: Vincent DeVito,
Massachusetts.
I support the constable's motion for
reconsideration. I urge us to vote yes.
MR. ROSS: Thank you, sir.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is

```
```

there anyone else who would like to vote -- excuse
me -- who would like to speak in opposition? In
opposition?
The Gentlelady from Iowa.
MS. POPMA: Yeah, I just want to have a
clarification that the sponsor of the amendment
originally voted no on the amendment. Because he
would have had to vote with the prevailing. And so,
I just want to have absolute clarification that the
person who is calling for this motion to reconsider
actually did vote against his own motion.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That's what the
Gentleman has represented.
MR. ROSS: Yeah, I'm not -- I am not the
original author of the motion. I'm asking for
reconsideration. I voted against this, and I would
like to have it reconsidered.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. This is
-- all right. It's Final.1. It was brought up by
Mr. Wittich, of Montana. And it's my understanding
that we would have to vote with a majority vote to
reconsider, to reopen debate. It is debatable.

```

Does anyone else wish to speak on the question of whether we should reopen the debate?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Seeing none -- oh, Mr. Little.

MR. LITTLE: Is it in order for me to indicate that it appears that this is redundant, that this -- practically this precise wording is in Rule 16?

MR. ROSS: I will be asking -- making an amendment to it. If the Committee indulges me and allows it to be reconsidered, \(I\) will be making a small -- two small amendments.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: So, it would not be redundant. All right. Thank you, Mr. Little.

I think we're ready to vote on whether to reopen.

All those in favor of reconsideration to reopen debate on Amendment Final.1, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
All right. At this point, the Gentleman from Nevada is recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

MR. ROSS: Yes, ma'am.
I'd ask that staff please make a change, down toward the end, where the new language had said "any binding presidential primary," please replace the word "primary" with the word "preference vote."

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Is that the only change that the Gentleman would like to make?

MR. ROSS: No, ma'am. I would also like to -- the -- where it says "State law," to add to that "State Party rule, these rule" -- excuse me -"these rules, State Party rules, or State law." I'm sorry. This should be inserted before that. So, let me start over again. My apologies.
"Pursuant to" -- after that should insert
"these rules, State Party rules, or."
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right.

MR. ROSS: I think that this really -CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Let's let staff -let's just let staff catch up for just a minute -MR. ROSS: Okay, very good. CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- please. Yeah. MR. ROSS: I would be more than happy to. The first change is the change where -- in the phrase, "with the results of any binding
presidential primary," to change the word "primary"
to the words "preference vote." And, at the end of
that sentence, where it says "bound or pledged
pursuant to," to insert the words, before the words
"State law," "these rules, State Party rules, or."
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is the
language now correct on the monitor as you'd like to
--
    MR. ROSS: Yes, ma'am, thank you, Madam
Chair.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there a second?
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It's been moved and
seconded.

Would you like to address this?
MR. ROSS: Just briefly.
This was rejected at first, because, to a certain extent, you know, it really was redundant. I think that with -- and a lot of times, you know, the detail's in the devils of the rules. I'm -- you know, you've heard the phrase "rules nerds." Well, you know, I'm one of them. And a lot times, it just takes a small tweak to make a significant difference.

What this does is, it plugs up several holes that were inadequate, in addition to which the fact that, without these holes being plugged, it was also largely redundant.
"Preference vote" will cover the fact -whether -- because both a Primary or a Caucus could be considered a preference vote. And we have also covered the base, in terms of being -- making sure that we refer to, not just simply State law, but the Party rules and any State Party rules.

And so, therefore, I would ask the
```

Committee to reconsider and to please vote yes.
Thank you very much. And I appreciate
your time, and I appreciate everyone extending out
for a few moments.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
Let me just walk you through where we are
procedurally. He has made -- he has proposed an
amendment to something we have already voted to
reconsider. So, we have to vote separately on the
amendment, and then on the main motion.
So, is there anyone who would like to rise
in opposition to the amendment? Is there opposition
to the amendment?
Mr. Little.
MR. LITTLE: I rise in opposition both to
the amendment and the main motion. If you read Rule
16(a)(2) on page 30 of your blacklined copy, it
reads, "The Secretary of the Convention shall
faithfully announce and record each Delegate's vote
in accordance with the Delegate's obligation under
Rule 16(a)(1), State law, or Party rules."
If you turn to 16(a)(1), it reads, "Any

```
```

statewide presidential preference vote that permits
a choice among candidates for the Republican
nomination for the President of the United States in
a Primary, Caucuses, or State Convention must be
used to allocate and bind the States to -- the
State's delegation to the National Convention in
either a proportional or a winner-take-all manner,
except for Delegates and alternates who [inaudible]
in statewide election and are elected directly by
Primary voters."
I believe this would lead to confusion.
And, to my way of thinking, it's clearly redundant,
and would oppose both this amendment and the full
amendment.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. Is
there anyone who rises in support?
The Gentleman from Maine.
MR. WILLETTE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I stand in support of this. This helps
with the amendment to the amendment. It helps
clarify and helps really confirm the results of our
local Primaries and Caucuses, and allows those

```
voters' voices to be heard.
So, I urge the Committee to support the amendment to the amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
Is there anyone who rises in opposition -opposition to the amendment?

The Lady from Wyoming.
MS. HAGEMAN: Yes, Harriet Hageman, from Wyoming.

It's 11:30 at night, and \(I\) believe some of the criticisms that we've had with previous proposals is that they're too complicated to be taking up -- to be taken up at this time or by this body. I think that it is a little too late to be able to -- to be bringing an amendment like this. And as complicated as this is, I think you're going to be creating all kinds of ambiguities and problems with other rules. And I think that it's simply too late. I think that it -- I oppose both the amendment as well as the reconsideration. I don't think that we ought to be addressing this, this late at night. It doesn't seem like it's right. It
seems like it's kind of a strange thing to be
bringing up at this time.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Chair
recognizes the Lady from Vermont, Ms. Hudson.
    MS. HUDSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.
    Susie Hudson, from Vermont.
    I'd like to move the previous question.
    VOICE: Second.
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
has been moved and seconded. We will move to a vote
on --
    What section is it? We are looking at
7 (b) -- excuse me -- 37 (b).
    All right. We will move to a vote on
    previous question.
    All those in favor of ending debate on the
    amendment to the amendment, please say aye.
    [A chorus of ayes.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
    nay.
    [A chorus of nays.]
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes clearly
have it.

We'll now move to a vote on the amendment to the amendment.

All those in favor of adopting the amendment to the amendment, please say aye.
[A Chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Chair is in doubt.

All those in favor of adopting the amendment to the amendment, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The Chair is no longer in doubt. Please be seated.

All those opposed, please stand.
[Members standing.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All right. I think it's quite clear. Please be seated. Thank you.

The amendment to the amendment passes.
Now we are back on debate to the main
```

motion. Is there anyone who would like to speak in
opposition or in support of the main motion? Let's
start with support of the main motion.
Mr. Wittich, I believe you started this in
the first place.
MR. WITTICH: Thank you, Madam Chair.
I'd just like to say that I would have
considered this a friendly amendment, and I'll
support the motion, as amended.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
Anyone rising in opposition?
MR. LITTLE: Yes, Madam Chairman.
I'm very concerned about the legal
ramifications of this. What about the situation of
Delegates who appear on a ballot in statewide
election and are elected directly by Primary voters?
So, you have real too similarly worded provisions
in completely different sections that are slightly
different, a clause different. I would like to know
if Counsel has reviewed this and feels comfortable
with this.

```
    CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: That calls for a
```

legal conclusion. At this point, Counsel has not
raised any particular objection to it. And at this
point, Counsel sees no issue with it. And we should
simply allow the body to work its will.
All right. Is --
The Gentleman from --
MR. HALL: Michigan.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- Michigan. Thank
you, sir. I knew it was an "M."
MR. HALL: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
My name is Matt Hall, from Michigan.
I support this amendment. It's clear that
it clarifies the intent of the rules to bind the
Delegates.
And I call the previous question.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Previous question
has been called and is in order. And so, we will
vote on closing debate.
All those in favor of previous question,
please say --
VOICE: Madam Chair, a point of order.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Yes, sir.

```

VOICE: We had -- the good Lady from
```

Washington --
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Name and State,
please.
MR. HUNT: Graham Hunt, with Washington
State.
We had the good Lady from Washington State
that had requested to change the word "vote" to
"count." And this body stated that that was out of
order and that it was too late, and an amendment
would have had to have been made, but it was past
the hour in order to do so. Is that not what this
body is doing now?
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: No, because this
body has voted to reconsider something that was
already considered by the body. So, this amendment
was to another section, and it is perfectly in
order, and we should continue with the vote.
MR. HUNT: Thank you, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you, sir.
All those in --
Where were we? We were on previous

```
```

question or the main motion? All right. Vote on
previous question.
All those in favor of ending debate on
this item, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: All those opposed,
nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
We'll now move to a vote on the main
motion.
All those in favor of adoption of this
amendment, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
Ladies and gentlemen, believe it or not,
that is the last amendment that has been submitted.
Before you all bolt, let me say thank you
for all of your hard work. You have been truly
magnificent. Give yourselves a hand.

```
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: I also want to
thank the audience, who has been with us all day
long, and who --
Oh, before you leave, we have one more
vote. Don't anybody move. A really important vote. This is why I have these lovely parliamentarians. We now have to vote on the entire package of the amendments, as we -- on the rules, as we have amended them today. Is there a motion to adopt the entire rules package?

MR. RYDER: So move.
MR. TETTLEBAUM: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: It has been moved by Ryder and seconded by Mr. Tettlebaum.

All those in favor of adopting the package, as it stands at this point, please say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed, nay.
[A chorus of nays.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: The ayes have it.
All right. As \(I\) was saying, I want to
thank the audience. You've been wonderful, not only
not disruptive, but attentive. Yes, we're still
waving at each other. And we appreciate your being
here and participating in this process.
    Now -- excuse me -- now that we have
passed these rules, it's -- will be necessary to
adopt them once the Convention ratifies our
Committee as a Permanent Convention Committee in
order for our report to be considered by the full
Convention. So, here are a few important logistical
points.
            This Committee will reconvene on Monday,
July 20- -- excuse me -- July 18th during the
opening session of the Convention, which begins on
Monday at 2:00 o'clock p.m. -- 2:00 o'clock p.m., at
Quicken Loans Arena. The Committee will meet in a
section of the concourse or a room close by. So,
the Chairman of the Convention will state, from the
chair, exactly where our Committee is to meet. It
is absolutely imperative that we have a quorum for
this meeting. And if you are not present to help
provide a quorum, it could, frankly, delay the
entire Convention. And we will list you by name, if necessary.

Now, thanks to the motion made by John Hammond at our Wednesday meeting, we only needed to take that one final vote to confirm the work that we have done. So, therefore, the meeting will be extremely short, but it is absolutely critical that you attend.

All right. We have already taken the final vote.

Gentleman --
MR. HALL: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: -- from Michigan.
MR. HALL: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
I just wanted to make a point of personal privilege. I'm the Delegate, Matt Hall, from Michigan, and, as the Delegate from Grand Rapids, I'd be remiss if I did not wish one of our great Nation's Presidents, President Gerald R. Ford, a Happy Birthday. Today is his 103rd Birthday. I couldn't think of a better way to honor his legacy than the great work this Committee has done. So, I
```

just wanted to make that point.
[Applause.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Thank you.
All right. I'm just going to say it one
more time. The Committee will reconvene on Monday
at 2:00 p.m. at Quicken Loans Arena. The Convention
Committees will convene on the floor. The Chairman
will announce it, and you will receive instructions
at that time regarding the exact location of our
meeting. The staff at the Quicken Loans Arena will
be there with signs to assist you to make sure you
make it to the correct room.
Ladies and gentlemen, you have been
nothing short of magnificent. I want to say thank
you to all of you, to our staff, to our
parliamentarians, to our special counsel, and
everyone who has made this meeting run so smoothly.
At this point, I would like to entertain a
motion to adjourn.
VOICE: Motion to adjourn.
VOICE: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: So moved and

```

All those in favor, say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We stand adjourned.
Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.
[Whereupon, at 11:30 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.]
```

seconded.
All those in favor, say aye.
[A chorus of ayes.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: Any opposed?
[No response.]
CHAIRWOMAN MICKELSEN: We stand adjourned.
Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.
[Whereupon, at 11:30 p.m., the meeting was

```
```

