***Tom Fredricks -Full Answers Question 1 and 16. Tom Fredricks Attachment to Legislative Questionnaire responses.***

1.  Agree, though the only pledge I have pledged to make is to not make pledges.  Programs to cut/limit:
                a)  I don’t see a need for ABC to be in retail.  It is a conflict of interest with a free market.
                b)  State retirement program for future hires.  A transition to portable, matched employee contributions with employee input similar to the transition on the Federal level from CSRS to FERS in 1987 could be implemented.
                c)  Earmarking.  In general,  constraining the legislature and tying specific revenues to specific expenditure allocations is inefficient and improper.

2.  I generally agree with this premise.  The latter portion containing the words “all” and “any” are akin to a pledge…  I will generally oppose federal grants or legislation seeking control or involvement from the federal government.

3.  Article V is currently a “hail mary”.  It exists for an extreme situation, and should not be tossed around in an unrestricted manner.  I disagree that “Congress would set the rules”.  I submit that contravenes the intent of a constitutional convention whereby the states tell the Congress that they have something to discuss, and if 2/3 of them submit application, the Congress must in fact comply. I submit that petitions from the states to Congress must be consistent in scope, to be tallied as such.  If 1/3 of the states petitioned for “issue A”, and 1/3 for “issue B”, the 2/3 threshold should not be recognized.

4.  I agree that “An unborn child has a fundamental right to life which cannot be infringed.”  After that, you ask for a pledge.  See my pledge on pledges.

5.  I agree that “Gambling corrupts government, adds no product to the economy, is no a dependable source of government revenue, and is addictive and detrimental to family and community life.”  Remove the rest of the statement, as it is improper in the sense that support of the first would translate into “oppose all efforts to allow gambling”, not just “expand”.  In general, I don’t adhere to big brother intrusion in my adult behavior insofar as my choices do not infringe on the rights of others.

6.  Scope is too narrow.  “Kids prosper best in consistent, loving care.”  Beyond that, you are asking for a pledge.  See my pledge on pledges.

9.  I support local/state control of education curriculum.  No further conclusion or pledge required.

10.  I am comfortable with this statement if we remove the “unless it is directly used for a legitimate academic purpose with consent.”  Simply, “I oppose the collection of PII.”

11.  “I fully support this law” is a problem.  This law does not permit a parent to opt a child out of this “program or curriculum”, and I believe it should.  The law may be well intentioned, but “fully support” is a broad brush.

13.  Agree with stipulation.  “Eminent domain abuse” is not defined.

14.  Agree with intent.  Wording flawed.  I will oppose all increases in the net tax burden on the average Alabamian as it relates to a national average by percentage or other standard.

15.  Generally agree. However, cooperative agreements between states must exist to level that playing field when vying for large industry, and economic development zones and similar efforts can has positive effects.

16.  If we submit that “many occupational licenses interfere with a private citizen’s right to work”, we may have to submit that “ALL occupational licenses have the potential to interfere with a private citizen’s right to work…”

19.  Remove “religious”.  No business owner should be forced to violate a belief, insofar as he operates within the law.

20.  Remove “on college campuses”.  Speech should be free everywhere.

***Tom Fredricks***