

Chairwoman Roegner, Vice Chair Lipps, Ranking Member Leland and members of the Federalism and Interstate Relations Committee, thank you for the opportunity to present some arguments *Against* HJR2 – the joint resolution calling for an Article V Constitutional Convention of the States.

My testimony today will encompass two arguments against HJR2. Primarily, the proposed amendments advocated by convention supporters will likely fail to meet their desired results. Secondly, an Article V Convention is dangerous **at any time** because it places our Constitution in jeopardy; but it is particularly treacherous **at this time** because of the current political climate.

HJR2 seeks to 1) Impose fiscal restraints, 2) Limit the jurisdiction of the federal government and 3) Limit terms of federal officials. These and much that is being bemoaned by good people in this country is already prohibited by the Constitution. Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution clearly defines the 18 enumerated powers of congress. These 18 enumerated powers are the handcuffs the writers placed on Congress in order to prevent them from engaging in run-away spending and over-reach. If it is not on the list, they are not supposed to do it. What makes you think that a Congress who cannot understand and follow a simple list of do's and don'ts will follow an amendment that essentially says the same thing?

There are many other “great” ideas convention proponents are floating around such as Medicare rules and health care regulations; low flow toilets mandated by the EPA; the Food Safety and Modernization Act; Fair Labor Standards Act; and K-12 Education. Again the answer to these problems is largely already found in the Constitution.

I would be negligent if I failed to point out that protection of the people of a state by the over-reach of federal government is the job of state legislators. Many of us here today are personal witnesses to the time when Governor Kasich ignored the Healthcare Freedom Amendment article 1 section 21 of the Ohio Constitution by expanding Medicaid with an unelected special board of “officials.” This was a direct slap in the face to the 65% of the voters and the thousands of petition collectors such as myself who supported the amendment. Personally, I feel like I wasted 2 years of my life for an amendment that is completely discounted by our state government. Why should we risk a Constitutional Convention for federal amendments to the constitution that will suffer the same fate as the Ohio Healthcare Amendment?

**Until the several States stand up to the federal government, new amendments to the Constitution of the United States will likely be ignored and nothing will change.**

My second argument is that an Article V Constitutional Convention of the States is bad anytime and especially dangerous at this time. It is thought that the delegates would be

strictly bound to only consider amendments to the constitution that are defined in HJR2. The testimony last week showed the trouble that will ensue at a convention as the issues presented to this committee covered a greater litany of abuses by the federal government. Do you really think that delegates from all the states will act with restraint and only consider the three issues in HJR2? Consider also the fact that the testimony by the retired out-of-state senator from Oklahoma included many other petitions of grievance against our government! A constitutional convention will be mass confusion as even the proponents cannot say *for sure* what will happen. Congress will still be involved and the process will be ripe for corruption. Today, we see powerful forces, like George Soros, prowling the country stirring unrest, racial divide, and possibly civil war. The deep-state is fueling unrest and a constitutional convention in this environment would be very dangerous.

**It IS very dangerous to have a constitutional convention at this time.**

Let the President drain the swamp and then petition congress to add the necessary restraint to the constitution or, more importantly, actually follow the Constitution. The solution is not necessarily in amending the Constitution but is found in supporting and electing state officials with a backbone who will interpose on behalf of the people and insist that the federal government follow the rules already in place.

Thank you,

Andy Rosenberger