Exhibit 174

in the case of:

People of the Republic of Texas
and the
Sovereign Nation of the Republic of Texas

v.

UNITED NATIONS
(and all it's Political Subdivisions)
and
UNITED STATES
(and all it's Political Subdivisions)

Under Pains and Penalties of perjury and the laws of the Almighty, and being sworn under a vow and oath, I attest that the attached pages are true and correct reprints of the:

U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Ray Thornton - qualifications of membership in Congress - May 22, 1995 - as given to us by a citizen of the Republic of Texas.

This attestation is made on August 18, 1998.

Attest: E. C. Brannon

D. A. West

Witness to source and above signature

Merle Ann West

Witness to above signatures

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Nos. 93–1456 AND 93–1828

U. S. TERM LIMITS, INC., ET AL., PETITIONERS
93–1456
v.
RAY THORNTON ET AL.

WINSTON BRYANT, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ARKANSAS, PETITIONER
93–1828
v.
BOBBIE E. HILL ET AL.

ON WRITS OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS

[May 22, 1995]

JUSTICE STEVENS delivered the opinion of the Court.

The Constitution sets forth qualifications for membership in the Congress of the United States. Article I, §2, cl. 2, which applies to the House of Representatives, provides:

> "No Person shall be a Representative who shall not have attained to the Age of twenty five Years, and been seven Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen."

Article I, §3, cl. 3, which applies to the Senate, similarly provides:

> "No Person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty Years, and been nine Years a Citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an Inhabitant of that State for

make. We disagree for two independent reasons. First, we conclude that the power to add qualifications is not within the "original powers" of the States, and thus is not reserved to the States by the Tenth Amendment. Second, even if States possessed some original power in this area, we conclude that the Framers intended the Constitution to be the exclusive source of qualifications for members of Congress, and that the Framers thereby "divested" States of any power to add qualifications.

The "plan of the convention" as illuminated by the historical materials, our opinions, and the text of the Tenth Amendment, draws a basic distinction between the powers of the newly created Federal Government and the powers retained by the pre-existing sovereign States. As Chief Justice Marshall explained, "it was neither necessary nor proper to define the powers retained by the States. These powers proceed, not from the people of America, but from the people of the several States; and remain, after the adoption of the constitution, what they were before, except so far as they may be abridged by that instrument." *Sturges* v. *Crowninshield*, 4 Wheat. 122, 193 (1819).

This classic statement by the Chief Justice endorsed Hamilton's reasoning in The Federalist No. 32 that the plan of the Constitutional Convention did not contemplate "[a]n entire consolidation of the States into one complete national sovereignty," but only a partial consolidation in which "the State governments would clearly retain all the rights of sovereignty which they before had, and which were not, by that act, *exclusively* delegated to the United States." The Federalist No. 32, at 198. The text of the Tenth Amendment unambiguously confirms this principle:

> "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the