

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE**  
**HOUSE STATE AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE**

April 19, 2018

3:19 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Representative Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins, Chair  
Representative Gabrielle LeDoux, Vice Chair  
Representative Adam Wool  
Representative Chris Birch  
Representative Gary Knopp  
Representative Andy Josephson (alternate)

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Representative Chris Tuck  
Representative DeLena Johnson  
Representative Chuck Kopp (alternate)

**COMMITTEE CALENDAR**

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 30

Urging the United States Congress to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons; urging the United States government to uphold its international leadership role in responding to displacement crises with humanitarian assistance and to work with the international community and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to find solutions to conflicts and protect refugees; and urging the President of the United States to continue to mitigate the burden placed on frontline refugee host countries.

- MOVED HJR 30 OUT OF COMMITTEE

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 11

Supporting action to overturn the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 558 U.S. 310 (2010); and urging the United States Congress to pass legislation overturning the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, thereby restoring free and fair elections in the United States.

- HEARD & HELD

**PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION**

BILL: HJR 30

SHORT TITLE: URGE U.S. SUPPORT OF REFUGEES

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) JOSEPHSON

01/24/18	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/24/18	(H)	CRA, STA
02/13/18	(H)	CRA AT 8:00 AM BARNES 124
02/13/18	(H)	Heard & Held
02/13/18	(H)	MINUTE(CRA)
02/22/18	(H)	CRA AT 8:00 AM BARNES 124
02/22/18	(H)	Moved HJR 30 Out of Committee
02/22/18	(H)	MINUTE(CRA)
02/27/18	(H)	CRA AT 8:00 AM BARNES 124
02/27/18	(H)	Adopted Fiscal Note
02/28/18	(H)	CRA RPT 3DP 1DNP 2NR
02/28/18	(H)	DP: KREISS-TOMKINS, DRUMMOND, PARISH
02/28/18	(H)	DNP: TALERICO
02/28/18	(H)	NR: LINCOLN, SADDLER
04/10/18	(H)	STA AT 3:15 PM GRUENBERG 120
04/10/18	(H)	Heard & Held
04/10/18	(H)	MINUTE(STA)
04/12/18	(H)	STA AT 3:15 PM GRUENBERG 120
04/12/18	(H)	Heard & Held
04/12/18	(H)	MINUTE(STA)
04/19/18	(H)	STA AT 3:15 PM GRUENBERG 120

BILL: HJR 11

SHORT TITLE: CONGRESS: OVERTURN CITIZENS UNITED V. FEC

SPONSOR(S): REPRESENTATIVE(S) TARR

02/22/17	(H)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
02/22/17	(H)	STA, JUD
04/19/18	(H)	STA AT 3:15 PM GRUENBERG 120

**WITNESS REGISTER**

MAGDALENA OLIVERAS, Staff  
Representative Geran Tarr  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** During the hearing of HJR 11, presented HJR 11.

REPRESENTATIVE GERAN TARR  
Alaska State Legislature  
Juneau, Alaska

**POSITION STATEMENT:** During the hearing of CSHJR 11, testified as prime sponsor.

**ACTION NARRATIVE**

[3:19:41 PM](#)

**CHAIR JONATHAN KREISS-TOMKINS** called the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting to order at 3:19 p.m. Representatives Kreiss-Tomkins, Wool, Birch, and Josephson [alternate for Representative Tuck], were present at the call to order. Representatives Knopp and LeDoux arrived as the meeting was in progress.

**HJR 30-URGE U.S. SUPPORT OF REFUGEES**

[3:20:41 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS announced that the first order of business would be HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 30, Urging the United States Congress to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons; urging the United States government to uphold its international leadership role in responding to displacement crises with humanitarian assistance and to work with the international community and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to find solutions to conflicts and protect refugees; and urging the President of the United States to continue to mitigate the burden placed on frontline refugee host countries.

[3:20:54 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON explained that the resolution is an expression of concern for refugees worldwide, it is sympathy for their plight, and a belief that the national government, as well as the people of Alaska, are concerned and that Alaskans should intervene wherever and whenever possible. He described that refugees "have been a thing" spanning all time and this resolution is an important reflection on this historic moment of crisis, and the legislature should offer this positive comment of concern.

[3:22:19 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL commented that he agreed with the numbers of refugees and noted that Alaska is not geographically located

well to handle millions of people coming across state borders due to the oceans on both sides of the state. He asked what steps Representative Josephson was proposing Alaskans take to try to make the world better so there are not so many refugees. He then referred to page 2, lines 14-16, which read as follows:

**WHEREAS**, according to the National Bureau of Economic Research, during a refugee's first 20 years in the United States, the refugee contributes on average \$21,000 more in taxes than the refugee receives in benefits; and

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL noted that there was no evidence of linking it to crime. He opined that Representative Josephson was not suggesting accepting "X number" of refugees because they would add to the economy and they do not commit crime. He further opined that if refugees come to Alaska, Alaska will take them in, but the resolution is not trying to bring in 65 million people.

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON responded that Representative Wool was correct, the resolution reflects a belief that the Alaska legislature shares the concerns of the international community and supports the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to work with non-profits. He remarked, "We want to do our share, we can define what that is, and we've had that debate, but that we play a role as well." Nothing would change in terms of vetting individuals who might seek refugee status in the United States, he said, nothing in the resolution reflects any change in that sort of protocol.

[3:24:51 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL moved to report HJR 30, labeled 30-LS1177\D, out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being no objection, HJR 30 moved from the House State Affairs Standing Committee.

**HJR 11-CONGRESS: OVERTURN CITIZENS UNITED V. FEC**

[3:25:12 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS announced that the final order of business would be HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 11, Supporting action to overturn the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 558 U.S. 310 (2010); and urging the United States Congress to pass

legislation overturning the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, thereby restoring free and fair elections in the United States.

[3:25:35 PM](#)

MAGDALENA OLIVERAS, Staff, Representative Geran Tarr, Alaska State Legislature, advised that HJR 11 urges the United States Congress to overturn the United States Supreme Court Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, [558 U.S. 310 (2010)], decision which removed restrictions on the amounts of independent political spending. She advised that Citizens United is a 26 U.S.C. 501(c)(4) nonprofit organization founded in 1988. In 2010, the United States Supreme Court ruled in Citizens United that corporations and unions can give an unlimited amount of money to political election campaigns. Thereby overturning the foundation of America's campaign finance laws which, up until that time, prevented the wealthiest individuals and large corporations from undue influence over the American political system. The fact of the matter, she offered, is that large corporations own much of the American economy and wealth. The decision in 2010 allowed large corporations and the wealthiest people in the nation to heavily influence campaigns at all levels of the nation's governments. The Citizens United decision relies on the idea that corporations are people, that money is speech, and that the ability to donate undisclosed amounts of money to politicians is not a form of (indisc.). This [decision] is not the vision our American Founding Fathers had for this country or for its federal government, but rather it is actually the complete opposite. American democracy is where all people, regardless of income, can participate in the political process and run for office because American democracy is one person/one vote and that equal access is essential.

[3:27:37 PM](#)

MS. OLIVERAS stated that returning to a government of, by, and for the people, will not be easy, but a movement has been building all over the country. It is important, she pointed out, that the members of the legislature recognize that this is not a partisan issue, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, all across the country are coming together to say, "enough is enough." She advised that 19 states have gone on record in favor of adopting a United States Constitutional Amendment in order to restore power to the United States Congress and to our 50-states by putting limits on campaign spending. At the local level, more than 700 local governments have demanded

constitutional action to re-instate controls on campaign spending. She then pointed to the letters of support the sponsor's office received from all areas of the state and from people registered with different parties who are coming together for this American cause. She noted that letters of support have been received from most of the community councils in the Anchorage area, together with other parts of the state.

[3:28:52 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE GERAN TARR, Alaska State Legislature, added that during her time in the legislature, her goal has been looking for opportunities to increase voter participation and increase participation in "our government," such as, same day voter registration and PFD voter registration. Contrary to that goal, she pointed out, so much money is being spent in campaigns that people are tuning out and do not want to participate due to the number of commercials on television, the number of mailers received at their homes, and so forth. Her concern, she remarked, is that if the financial ability and influence of corporations and billionaires is not limited, it will cause people to not participate because they are turned off to the process. There is so much negative campaigning that they feel nothing is true, and those beliefs can damage America's democracy, she described, and this resolution is essential to civic participation.

[3:30:18 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE KNOPP related that the problem with campaigning is that there is no truth in advertising any longer, people do not have any idea whether truth is in any message. He said that he imagines the amounts of money Representative Tarr mentioned probably lean toward that issue. There are truth in advertising laws that are completely ignored and he is hopeful that at some point, pursuing such a resolution will get the nation back to truth in advertising.

[3:30:52 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH stated that he does not support HJR 11. He countered that the issue about too many dollars in campaigns, too many brochures in the mailbox, and too many people showing up at a person's home to talk about issues, is that it is a free country and free speech is a bedrock principle. This principle allows the public an opportunity to hear from everyone, and if the public so chooses to write a check and support someone in

one manner or another, and they have every right. He offered that he could not find any good reason to support this resolution urging the United States Congress to overturn the Citizens United decision.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR, in contrasting Representative Birch's comments, pointed out that Alaska does have campaign finance limitations. To the extent an individual wants to participate, they can donate up to \$500 per year per candidate, and there are limitations on political action committee (PAC) donations. She offered her belief that legislators do not want to limit the ability for that participation, but she questions whether there is value in having unlimited participation or value in allowing those unlimited dollars. Her questions are not so much about whether that activity happens, but rather her questions are whether there are reasonable limits the legislature can place on to make sure there is more truth in advertising. Thereby, she remarked, people receive accurate information and receive the government they want to support.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH commented that he does not see it favorably for the government to intervene in deciding what sort of limits or constraints it may want to put on that level of speech. The fact that it is speech, he opined, the legislature needs to walk carefully in any effort to constrain that level of communication, he said.

[3:34:18 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON commented that he has not yet read the Citizens United decision, but it is his understanding that the decision allows donations to come in from out of the country and strikes him as not particularly uncanny that there was meddling in the 2016 election. The State of Alaska's financial limitation of a \$500 donation was challenged in the United States District of Alaska, and the Honorable Judge Timothy Burgess affirmed Alaska's right to have that limit. He opined that the decision is now headed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. He advised that former Alaska House of Representatives David Finkelstein testified in support of the existing law and was involved in the creation of that law in the late 1980s/early 1990s, he advised. This law has served Alaska well because, although it has plenty of money in politics, the power of the individual has been supreme, and a person's voice cannot be drowned out completely by the sound of corporate money. He remarked that he has grave concerns about the Citizens United decision and finds it appropriate to refer

to Presidents George Washington, James Madison, and The Federalist Papers because he suspects that decision is not what they had in mind or could have even envisioned. He said that he supports CSHJR 11.

[3:36:38 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL asked whether the Citizens United decision meant that corporations could donate any amount of money, and whether this resolution attempts to put a limit on the amount of the donation.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR answered that there has been more than the Citizens United decision, "they have had influence over political spending and campaigns." It is the unlimited nature and the non-disclosure issue which are the two key elements that are problematic. She advised that in 2006, \$286 million was spent on campaigns by Super-PACs, non-profits, unions, and political organizations, and by 2016, that figure had grown to \$1.6 billion spent on campaigns.

[3:37:43 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL commented that he realizes the system is not what it should be and while he knows the Citizens United decision was close, if it had gone the other way there wouldn't be as much spending. He asked, who is doing the spending, PACs do not disclose the individuals, but there is too much spent on the overall game. He would like there to be a one-month election period where everyone receives a set amount. Changes need to be made and if this resolution helps, it is good, he said.

[3:38:29 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR added that for the members of Congress, it is estimated that they spend 20-30 hours a week on fundraising. When considering some of the gridlock in Washington D.C., and possibly why some things are not getting done, she questioned whether this pressure to raise so much money has changed the context in which everyone is operating, and that is another manner wherein the nation's democracy is impacted.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX questioned whether the opposite could be said, that if Super-PACs allowed under the Citizens United decision were done away with, that the members of Congress might actually have to spend more time fundraising.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR responded that part of the motivation for this is getting to a point where there is less money, whether it be through independent expenditures or Super-PACs, which, she advised, is not quite as important as the overall influence of unlimited dollars.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX re-stated her question and asked that if members of Congress are spending 20-30 hours a week fundraising and the Citizens United decision was overturned, donations from independent expenditures and Super-PACs would not be allowed, how would that affect the amount of time members of Congress spend fundraising.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR responded that if Candidate A had a well-financed opponent in that Candidate B received support from the Super-PACs in the amounts of \$10 million and \$100 million, that would put more pressure on Candidate A to keep up and compete with that level of fundraising. In that regard, Candidate A would have to spend more time fundraising to match Candidate B's time and money because Candidate A did not have donations from a Super-PAC. She acknowledged circumstances where those two things are not the same in terms of knowledge by a candidate versus totally independent money going directly to a campaign versus money spent to influence voters about that particular candidate.

[3:41:59 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE TARR then referred CSHJR 11, labeled 30-LS0274\D, page 2, lines 20-25, which read as follows:

**FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Alaska State Legislature, together with the people of the state, calls upon the United States Congress to prepare and present to the states for ratification an amendment to the United States Constitution clarifying that corporations do not have the rights of individuals, that expenditures of money are not to be protected as speech, and that the authority to regulate campaign finances lies with elected representatives of the people of the United States.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR advised that there is an evolving approach as to how to address this issue in terms of what mechanism to use in overturning the decision. Currently, she explained,

there is a move towards looking at a constitutional amendment process ratified by individual states.

[3:43:21 PM](#)

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS opined that conventional wisdom is that generally, the labor movement donates more to left-of-center candidates, and corporations donate to the right-of-center candidates. He asked whether it is fair to say that were the decision to be reversed, that that would allow for limits placed on the independent expenditures of both unions and corporations.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR replied that Chair Kreiss-Tomkins was correct, and in that sense, the reversal would have equal impact.

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS commented that he shares Representative Birch's concern that if a candidate was coming up against "the buzz saw of a huge amount of unlimited money" it does not necessarily appear fair to either side of the political spectrum.

[3:45:00 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX asked whether the Citizens United decision interprets a federal law, or whether it was strictly based on constitutional grounds. She referred to Version D, page 2, lines 15-19, and noted that it urges the United States Congress to pass legislation overturning the decision. She advised that if the United States Supreme Court ruled that something was unconstitutional, she did not believe the United States Congress could pass a law and decide that it was constitutional, "period." She related that if she is correct, the Further Resolved clause [page 2, lines 20-25] makes sense, but not necessarily the Be It Resolved clause [page 2, lines 15-19].

REPRESENTATIVE TARR responded that there are a couple of different ways people have approached this issue in terms of making positive changes. The constitutional amendment would re-define free speech to be limited to individual human beings and it would not apply to corporations and unions. Absent that, she explained, a person could otherwise look at laws that are about fair campaigns and improving elections.

[3:46:40 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX asked that if the Citizens United decision was eliminated from this equation, could an individual make unlimited contributions to an independent expenditure group, such as George Soros on the left, and the Koch brothers on the right.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR related that she wanted to be careful in answering that question because if the entity can do the unlimited spending because corporations are defined as people, to not limit the people's free speech right. Backing up, she said, where the money comes from to support that unlimited spending from a wealthy individual, there are a couple of things that would influence that because there are existing campaign laws. Those laws are why the Super-PACs become so important because those funds are bundled up, wherein people otherwise have to operate under existing contribution limits. She offered that by bundling all of that money together, the unlimited spending would come from the Super-PAC. She stressed that she wanted to double-check and make sure she has a complete understanding of Representative LeDoux's question that if the unlimited money is coming from the entity, how it would otherwise limit the individual person's ability to donate.

[3:48:18 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX remarked that if unlimited money is banned coming from an entity, a wealthy person who wished to make contributions could make those contributions on a personal level.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR answered that currently, there are restrictions about an individual's ability to donate. For example, under Alaska's campaign laws an individual can only donate \$500 per calendar year to each candidate. Under this mechanism, the money is not moving from an individual into a candidate's campaign, the money is moving into this other pot through the Super-PAC and then being distributed through that entity. An individual contributes to a campaign under both federal and state limits, for example, a presidential campaign has a \$4,000 limit per person. She reiterated that there are limits on individuals donating to a candidate's campaigns, but under this other mechanism where the individual is putting the money into the bigger pot of money, the unlimited spending is the problem.

[3:49:55 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON commented that the sponsor is correct, there are limits on an individual person's capacity to donate, which in some respects makes the Citizens United decision even more onerous. He opined that the thinking behind the decision was that as long as there is no coordination between the PAC and the campaign, it somehow cleanses the process.

[3:50:38 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH opined that Michael Bloomberg in New York put as much as \$260 million to \$270 million of his personal money into the unprecedented 3 terms that he ran wherein he started out as a democrat and switched to become a republican. He said, "I don't know that we're going to prohibit that being separate."

REPRESENTATIVE TARR related that that is yet another category of spending where "you have different things that you, as an individual, can do to invest in your own campaign."

[3:51:38 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL, in response to Representative Birch, opined that (audio difficulties) gave Barack Obama's campaign \$1 million of his own dollars, and it seems like he wrote a check "person to candidate for a campaign."

REPRESENTATIVE TARR related that that is yet another challenge in understanding what is going on with campaigns, the presidential campaigns have multiple organizations and she would have to check on that particular donation.

[3:52:57 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL commented that someone had suggested to him that Alaska should only allow contributions from individuals who actually live in Alaska, there would be no corporate or union donations, simply people giving to the candidate at whatever limit is allowed by law. He related that that concept would certainly strip out all of the noise, but he did not know whether it would work on a national level. Corporations do not vote, individuals vote, he said.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR responded that currently, someone is suing to increase Alaska's campaign contribution laws, and when considering a legislator's role and how to ensure that people have equal access, "we are really founded on a one person/one

vote foundation." The perception, she opined, is that when there is too much spending, it erodes one person/one vote because one wealthy voice can drown out so many other smaller and poorer voices. Alaska's limits for out-of-state contributions are fairly low, she offered, (audio difficulties) and it may be double that amount for the others. These days, candidates are spending \$100,000 and \$250,000 on their House of Representatives campaigns, so that influence of a few thousand dollars probably isn't substantial, she opined. In the event a person is from a national group that wants to set a precedent on a policy or have influence, Alaska might be a place to go because their dollars can stretch farther than in other areas. There is reason for concern about the dollars coming in from the Lower-48, maybe not so much on the individual campaigns but more on the initiatives and other efforts. Alaskans do not feel that residents of another state should try to dictate Alaska policy, she said.

[3:55:49 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX offered concern about overturning the Citizens United decision. Alaska's current campaign contribution laws makes it more difficult, to a certain extent, for people to raise money for campaigns. It is more expensive to get a candidate's name out there if they are not an incumbent. For example, the United States Congress incumbents have the ability to send out mail, "the privilege of the Frank, which I never knew how important that could be until I started sending out legislative newsletters and figured out how expensive it was." Incumbents can send out mail to their constituents without being charged whereas someone challenging an incumbent will spend many, many dollars on those sorts of things. When discussing the United States Congress, and the United States Senate, there are many very, very wealthy people who could easily write out multi-million-dollar checks to their own campaigns. Therefore, "you" make it more difficult for people to raise money from other sources, "those people and Congress and the U.S. Supreme Court, I think, has said, you know, clearly and emphatically that you can't, you know, that it's one thing to put a campaign expenditure or a contribution limit on the outside or a contributor but you can't do it on the candidate themselves. That that is inherent to free speech. So, when a multi-millionaire, like John Kerry, I can't think of too many right now, but I know, you go and you list, you take a look and you see what the net worth of our U.S. Senators are in this country and most of them are folks who could actually write a couple of \$1 million checks. So, the minute you make it more

difficult for people to raise money, then the folks who could simply write a check are at a huge advantage, even more of an advantage than normal."

REPRESENTATIVE TARR acknowledged that Representative LeDoux made some good points, some points related to CSHJR 11, but some of her points speak to other issues that should probably be addressed in the state's overall governance in terms of access to being a candidate. She noted that some people support publically financed campaigns for that reason, for example, everyone has equal access to the same number of dollars and media. Interestingly, she offered, when comparing the scenarios, in Alaska if someone donates \$51 to a candidate, the candidate must declare their name, employer, and profession. Except here, the discussion is about people being able to donate millions and millions of dollars in an undisclosed manner. She described that that is a such a contrast because if there is such concern about the \$51 donations due to the potential perception of influence, shouldn't there be real concern about the people who are spending millions, and millions, and millions of dollars to have some sort of influence. She surmised that if this money had to be disclosed, people might respond differently, which is why it is described as "dark money."

[4:00:23 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX commented that she would be more comfortable with a law or a resolution requiring disclosure of the names of the people who donate to ballot initiatives or to the independent expenditure campaigns. She said she would like to see transparency and she is not necessarily all that concerned with the dollar figure itself.

[4:00:57 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHSON referred to Version D, page 2, lines 11-14, and noted that it refers to a state election to affirm contribution limits in some manner and asked the date.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR answered that she believes it was the work of former Representative David Finkelstein in the early 1990s, but she would research its exact date.

CHAIR KREISS-TOMKINS commented that he has a vague recollection there was an initiative in 1998 or 2000.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX recalled that there was an initiative in the same election year Sarah Palin became the governor.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR, in response to Representative Josephson, offered her belief that it references the earlier campaign finance laws, but she would perform research and get back to the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE LEDOUX remarked that the campaign finance laws changed in 2006 wherein everything was halved. Prior to 2006, PACs could give \$2,000 and individuals could give \$1,000, to a voter initiative. She opined that was spearheaded by former Representative Eric Croft and it went down to \$1,500.

[4:02:33 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH objected to a previous comment that a candidate would respond to communications that would favor those who are contributors. On a personal note, he said, he literally responds to every email and phone call that comes across the threshold. He related that he does not know anyone in this building that is put together such that they would screen their communications in a manner that favors those who are contributors or supporters, and he did not think that was a fair characterization.

REPRESENTATIVE TARR related that she appreciates Representative Birch's comments in being careful in how issues are stated, and she agrees 100 percent. Unfortunately, she opined, it is the public perception that candidates are up against and not the reality of "actually how we operate."

[4:03:58 PM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE WOOL moved to adopt CSHJR 11, labeled 30-LS0274\D, as the working document.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRCH objected. He said, "I just don't think this is a good idea."

[4:04:31 PM](#)

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Josephson, Knopp, Wool, LeDoux and Kreiss-Tomkins voted in favor of the adoption of CSHJR 11, Version D. Representative Birch voted against it. Therefore, CSHJR 11, Version D, was adopted by a vote of 5-1.

[HJR 11 was held over.]

[4:05:42 PM](#)

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the committee, the House State Affairs Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 4:06 p.m.