

**Testimony of Susan K. Dunn in Support of SJR 3 – March 11, 2025**  
**General Government Committee of the Ohio Senate, Columbus, Ohio**

Committee Chair Roegner, Vice Chair Gavarone, Ranking Member Blackshear, and committee members. My name is Susan Dunn. I am an SJR3 proponent, from Senate District 4. This testimony is out of concern for the misleading and untruthful statements you will likely hear as opponents try to create fear, doubt and uncertainty about SJR3. Here are only 6 of them:

- 1) Opponents refer to an Article V Convention of the States to propose amendments to the Constitution as a “constitutional convention”. It is not. As clearly stated in Article V, it is “a Convention for proposing Amendments”. Legal dictionaries (like Black’s Law Dictionary) and encyclopedias are not definitive legal sources and no competent attorney treats them as such.
- 2) You may hear it stated that the term convention of states is not in the Constitution yet Article V states, “...two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention...” Therefore, it is a convention of what? Of states!
- 3) Similar to item 1 above, opponents use the term “con-con”. Con-Con did not come into common use until the 1970s when establishment liberals were writing opinion pieces to oppose the Balanced Budget Amendment. They favored the growing federal government and activist Supreme Court justices and wanted no corrective or restrictive amendments on their power. So, they began a campaign to effectively disable the convention process for proposing amendments. Using the confusing and fearful term “con-con” was part of their campaign and it’s been used to confuse people ever since.
- 4) Opponents claim an Article V Convention has no safeguards and will be a “runaway convention”. Commissioners to the convention are chosen by the legislators of each state, likely making state legislators a large part of the convention. Bills like SB112 in each state will define responsibilities of the commissioners chosen to attend, how they must represent the will of the state's legislature and even specifying the recall of and penalties levied on any commissioner that does not comply. Add to that the required ratification of 38 state legislatures and “runaway” is mute.
- 5) Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia stated in 2014, “I certainly would not want a Constitutional Convention, I mean whoa, who knows what would come out of that. But, if there were a targeted amendment that were adopted by the States, I think the only provision I would amend is the amendment provision.” In 1979 he stated, “I suggest that if the only way to clarify the law, if the only way to remove us from utter bondage to the Congress is to take what I think to be a minimal risk on this limited convention, then let's take it.” Yet, opponents say he was against an Article V Convention!
- 6) Opponents refuse to give credit to leaders and scholars of Convention of States, like Michael Farris and Robert G. Natelson, both well published attorneys that have been cited by U.S. Supreme Court justices in multiple cases. Have opponent “experts” even published in peer reviewed journals?

Thank you for your service to Ohio and for this opportunity to address the committee.