TESTIMONY OF TOM RICE

Pickerington, Ohio

Ohio House Government Oversight Committee

OPPOSITION to HJR2- March 2026

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

My name is Tom Rice. I am a former American History teacher, now retired, and reside in Pickerington, Ohio. Thank you for this opportunity to testify against House Joint Resolution 2. This piece of legislation calls for the convening of an Article Five Convention for proposing amendments to the Constitution for the " ... purpose of imposing fiscal restraints on the federal government, limiting the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and congressional term limits. "

Concerning the first two parts of this proposal, **the Constitution, as it is currently written, already restrains the federal government, and limits its power and jurisdiction.** According to the supreme law of the land, Congress can only spend taxpayer money to provide for the common defense and general welfare, as is described in Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 through 18 of the Constitution. Additional " handcuffing " of the federal government is also provided in the 10th Amendment, declaring if an item is not indicated in the Constitution, the federal government cannot become involved in this area (such powers are reserved exclusively to the states or to the people). In short, the 10th Amendment is telling the federal government " if we forgot anything, you can't do that either! "

Let us look at the third part of House Joint Resolution 2, which advocates in favor of congressional term limits. Under America's first frame of government, the Articles of Confederation, the U.S. had congressional term limits. Realizing the deficiency of congressional term limits (the lack of electoral accountability of an out-of-control congressman in his final term in office, and the removal of a virtuous congressman from office), the delegates to the 1787 Philadelphia Convention excluded the concept of congressional term limits in the Constitution.

Hypothetically, let us pretend we have congressional term limits, but we do not have an informed electorate. Under this scenario, you have " congressional musical chairs. " Big-spending incumbent " Congressman A " is term limited out of office, only to replaced by big-spending new " Congressman B. " How then does the United States

benefit from congressional term limits? It does not. The solution to what ails America is not congressional term limits, but the creation of an informed electorate. Another question: is the Constitution deficient because it does not have congressional term limits? Let me answer this question by posing to you this analogy: married for twenty years, a husband (who has been notoriously unfaithful) and his loyal wife, are standing before a judge in divorce court. Has this divorce scenario been caused by the deficiency of the institution of marriage, or the cheating husband? The United States does not need congressional term limits. **The deficiency lies not with the Constitution – the deficiency lies with those unfaithful Congressmen, who fail to keep their oath of office to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution, so help me God!** Actually, we already have congressional term limits – they are called ' elections " (every two years in the House of Representatives, and every six years in the Senate).

Finally, I fear the convening of an Article Five Convention for any reason whatsoever, due to the danger of a " runaway convention. " The best example of a runaway convention would be the 1787 Philadelphia Convention, whose job description was for " ... the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation. " Upon the commencement of the convention in May 1787, America's founding fathers boarded up the windows at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, held their deliberations in secret, and proceeded to scrap the Articles of Confederation. The result of this runaway convention was the Constitution – which was very fortunate for the American people! Would we be so lucky with a modern day convention? I fear we would not. President Ronald Reagan also feared this concept of a runaway convention. In the " Public Papers " of President Ronald Reagan dated July 2, 1982 the " Gipper " said the following: " ... Well, Constitutional Conventions are prescribed as a last resort, because once it's open, they could take up any number of things. " **THE CONSTITUTION NEEDS TO BE OBEYED, NOT DANGEROUSLY TINKERED WITH BY MODERN DAY INNOVATORS!**

For the aforementioned reasons, I urge you to vote in opposition to House Joint Resolution 2. Thank you.

Tom Rice
13426 Capetown Avenue
Pickerington, Ohio 43147
Phone: (937) 545-1669
E-mail: tomricetrice@aol.com