November 26, 2018

To: The Senate Government Oversight and Reform Committee

Re: Senate Joint Resolution 1 (in opposition)

I urge you to vote no on SJR 1 and any other resolutions or bills applying to Congress for a convention of states.

There are so many reasons why.  If you know the Constitution, you know that the federal government has usurped powers that belong to the states.  I do not agree with the Convention of States' Project's premise--that the Founders foresaw the day when the federal government would become so big and bloated and, so, provided the second paragraph of Article V as another way to correct this overreach and limit the federal government.  James Madison kept a journal of the proceedings of the 1787 convention, so we know what was said and who said it.  Not one Founder said that.  George Mason said they were giving us a Constitution that would be found to be defective and were also giving us a way of amending that document to correct any flaws in it.  As legislators you know that some bills introduced, for one reason or another, have flaws.  Therefore, those who perceive such flaws introduce amendments to correct them.  I believe it was Thomas Jefferson who said that amendments are not to control power. You wouldn’t do that in the state legislature, and it shouldn’t be done in the federal government, either.

The way to control unconstitutional laws and regulations is for the sovereign state legislatures to say no--to nullify these laws and regulations.  But very few do it.  We have been conditioned to accept what the Supreme Court says as law, rather than opinion, and to let regulations from federal non-governmental organizations (NGO's) have the weight of law.  Then you want amendments to do what they were never designed to do and to do what you should have been doing.

The amendments I have seen for a balanced budget amendment and term limits will only make Constitutional what is presently unconstitutional.  A balanced budget amendment will grow the government with more bureaucracy and will have no limit on spending, thus having the potential to increase our debt even further.  We have term limits; they are called elections.  The fact that we, the people, don't elect the right people, is not the fault of the Constitution.  And if we are not educated, we will continue to elect the wrong people--only more frequently.  This will cost more money in benefits and pensions; thus, increasing the debt even further.

Then, there are the problems with the convention itself.  Delegates cannot be bound as you may have been told.  The second paragraph of our Declaration of Independence, gives them the right to do whatever they want—changing the method of ratification and even forming a new government.  Delegates would not be representing their states because they are not doing state business; they are doing federal work.  ALEC has held meetings in secret; a convention could do that, also.  Some of the people funding the COSP want a North American Union with a parliament governing it; George Soros reportedly wants a new Constitution in place by 2020.  The way to do these things is to change our Constitution at a convention.  And there are other groups who would not sit idly by.  Congress may see itself as the delegates; if they have the power to call a convention, they also can determine when, where, and how long it would last.  How would that work out?

There are many such considerations when tampering with our Constitution, and there is much that could go wrong at an Article V convention.  We already have a limited government by law; we need to follow it.

Thank you.

Lorrie Gloede

ljog1@yahoo.com

"If Mark Levin had his "liberty amendments" ratified, the Bundy's would still be in jail."     Publius Huldah