



**Sponsor Testimony House Joint Resolution 3
House Government Oversight Committee
April 29th, 2025**

Chairman Hall, Vice Chair Ferguson, Ranking Member Humphrey, and members of the committee—thank you for the opportunity to provide sponsor testimony on House Joint Resolution 3.

HJR 3 is a resolution calling for an Article V convention of the states, limited to the proposal of a single constitutional amendment: term limits on members of the United States Congress.

As you all know, the concept of congressional term limits is not new. It is a reform that enjoys overwhelming, bipartisan support from voters across the country—and especially here in Ohio. According to a January 2025 survey conducted by RMG Research, 78% of Ohio voters support placing term limits on Congress. In that same poll, 77% favor Ohio calling for an amendment-proposing convention to enact those limits. This is not a partisan issue—it is a people issue. A clear majority of Republicans, Democrats, and independents alike support this change.

The purpose of this resolution is simple: to apply meaningful pressure on Washington by joining the growing number of states demanding accountability and reform. Eleven states have already passed this identical resolution, including Florida, Alabama, West Virginia, and Tennessee. Once 34 states pass the resolution, it triggers a convention of states, strictly limited to the subject of congressional term limits.

Let me be clear—this is not an open-ended constitutional convention. This resolution is single-subject, meaning it cannot veer off into unrelated amendments or risk a so-called "runaway convention." In fact, history shows that such a convention has never occurred. Instead, Congress has historically acted preemptively when states get close to the required number. This happened with the 17th Amendment, the 21st, and the 22nd. We expect the same outcome here. Once Congress feels the pressure, they will act to protect their own seats by proposing a term limits amendment themselves.



Some may ask: “Why do we need term limits when we already have elections?” The answer is that the deck is stacked. Incumbents benefit from massive fundraising advantages, nearly insurmountable name recognition, and the backing of entrenched interests. Federal PACs give 90% of their funding to incumbents. As a result, 95% of incumbents are re-elected, and only 1 in 10 congressional races are truly competitive.

This resolution is not about punishing experience. It is about restoring opportunity. Term limits would open the door for everyday citizens, small business owners, and policy innovators—especially from the states—to serve for a limited time, then return home to live under the laws they helped create. Public service should be a season of contribution, not a lifetime career.

Another common concern is that term limits would empower lobbyists and bureaucrats. But the truth is quite the opposite. According to former lobbyist Jack Abramoff, lobbyists oppose term limits because they don't want to “repurchase” new members of Congress every few years. With term limits, members would be less beholden to special interests, and more focused on doing the job they were elected to do.

Currently, members of the Ohio General Assembly—ourselves included—are term-limited. And most Ohioans believe it's only fair to hold Congress to the same standard. In the same January poll, 72% of voters said they would be more likely to vote for a state legislator who supports congressional term limits. This resolution sends a clear message: Ohio is ready to lead on reform.

Let me close by saying that this is not a symbolic gesture. It is a constitutional tool, provided by our founders, for moments exactly like this. When Washington refuses to reform itself, it is up to the states to act. I respectfully ask for your support on HJR 3 and for Ohio to join the growing national movement demanding congressional term limits.

Thank you, and I'm happy to take any questions from the committee.