

US Constitution. The Raise Revenue Directive.

Kevin A. Sensenig

Version Name: Draft 002

Version Date: 2012-12-30

CITED LAW FRAMEWORK THEORY

Types of Law

Defense

Economy

Revenue and Taxation

Agency

Rights

Process (Justice)

Regulation (Trade)

ARTICLE 1. SECTION 7. THE RAISE REVENUE DIRECTIVE.

Text, From The Constitution

All Bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.

The Interlocked Read

It seems clear that ObamaCare is unconstitutional, since it is a tax and revenue bill, originated in the Senate.

Procedure 1.

The House writes a bill of integrated function and revenue. The House approves the bill and sends it to the Senate which approves the bill.

Procedure 2.

The Senate writes a function bill. The House passes the function bill. The Senate passes the function bill. The House writes the revenue bill for the function bill. The House passes the revenue bill. The Senate passes the revenue bill.

Procedure 3.

The Senate cannot write a bill of integrated function and revenue.

Procedure 4.

Is the House able to deny existing and prior function and revenue law? That is, to deny revenue for prior law of function and revenue?

I don't think so. I think that the type of law to end a project of integrated function and revenue has to be a type of law itself. It involves 1) an existing entity, involving function and revenue, so it is no longer strictly a revenue; 2) it denies to prior clear intent of the American We The People type law; and again it is integrated function and revenue, not just revenue; 3) it is not the type of law that raises revenue for existing function.

Types of function and revenue law

function and revenue

function

revenue

end a project of function and revenue

The Raise n1 Revenue Then Define Function Read

It is possible to read the revenue clause of Article 1. Section 7. to mean, the House of Representatives can set to raise a defined specific amount of revenue, and then write with the Senate the function bills.

This is likely a parallel read, with the interlocked read above. It is likely not meant to be used as the directed, "typical" read.

It could be used, with a certain clarity thought. Note here the order — a projected, defined, specific amount of revenue, then to fit the federal function and so forth _within_.

The Set Tax Rate And Allocate Revenue Read

It is possible to read the revenue clause to read to raise revenue by the House of Representatives defining a given tax rate and recording the resultant revenue, and then to write the function bills, the House and the Senate.

The order here is important, in this read. It is to obtain the fit revenue, to the (private, free market) commerce, then to put in place within that context.

This is the “closest” to what has been done in 2010-2012, to keep it to recent history. It is likely at least a 40 year pattern. But that’s not even the way it’s been done. It simply does not apply, and cannot be cited, to defend the “recent history” pattern of federal revenue and expenditure — except as another straightforward read that was not put in place.

Historical In Fact Paragraph. However, what has happened is that the function bills have been written with projected revenue in place, or allocating such. Then to obtain or adapt the revenue to function bills. Then to write and implement more function bills. Then to obtain or adapt the revenue, or not, to function bills. This read then has not been used, and cannot be cited for these bills of the last 2 years or 40 years (the type of bills, the specific bills, others can identify). The set revenue on one given social and economic theory, then to project the revenue obtained, then to write the function bills, then to implement the program, then to see the revenue obtained, then in ensuing years to identify further function bills for which there may or may not be revenue, then to write and implement function bills, based on projections and not precisely the clarity of the first read above. Then to debt. Then to demand revenue of a specific form and function bill, the entire federal revenue and expenditure bill, meaning to obtain all of this activity, in one bill, at one time, of the House Of Representatives, December 2012, is uh unConstitutional.

(The prior paragraph is not the way that ObamaCare was written. If the ObamaCare individual mandate is enforced with a tax, and I think there may be other taxes in it, specified in the bill itself, then the bill should have originated in the House of Representatives. There may be other substantial revenue and expenditure features of ObamaCare implied by the of necessity part of the law of and rules from the vehicle, that one could look into.)

(As on www.nxmvc.com, the tools used by the Department Of Justice, from ObamaCare, may be workable for the process (justice) and regulation (trade) categories of type of law.)

The interlocked design solves the semantic “slip” that negates even the simplicity and clarity of the paragraphs 1 and 2 above. Then there’s the type of activity implied by the clearly enunciated template in the Constitution, of enumerated powers and responsibilities of the US Senate, and the US House Of Representatives, and the President, and the uh directed nature of the uh noticeable “rights”, “people”, and “states” type “noticeable” words. But that seems to indicate to me the interlocked design. This read would be applicable in theory, but not in reality, or as a working premise, except with a Congress of clarity. There may be evidence that this read, the most “simple” way to go about its business, the President and the Congress, was to be noticed at least for its simplicity. It also takes as a given an internally cooperative Senate and House of Representatives, and it takes as a given the direct understanding by all parties involved, of the goal, to write function bills pertaining to the Constitution, and the general welfare of the United States. A direct and generally understood understanding. But this is negated by, this ties to the “Historical In Fact Paragraph” above. Which indicates that the read here is not the state of things — and so

this read, paragraphs 1 and 2, simply does not apply. The “Historical In Fact Paragraph” seems to apply.