

June 15, 2025

Chair Roegner, Vice Chair Gavarone, Ranking Member Blackshear and members of the Senate General Government Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in opposition to S.J.R. 3 “Apply to Congress: Constitutional Convention for certain purposes.”

I’m writing not as a constitutional scholar, but as a citizen who believes deeply in our democracy, and in the quiet, steady work of protecting it. I understand the frustration many people feel with the state of our government—gridlock, partisanship, inaction—but calling a convention to rewrite our nation’s foundational document feels less like a solution and more like lighting a match in a dry forest.

My concern is simple: there are no guardrails here. The U.S. Constitution does not lay out any rules for how a convention would operate—who the delegates would be, how decisions would be made, or even how the agenda would be enforced. We might go in asking one question and come out with answers to ten we didn’t mean to ask. Once the door is open, there’s no telling what could come through.

It’s easy to imagine a convention being driven more by politics and power than by public interest. In today’s polarized environment, the risk of a runaway convention is not a theoretical fear—it’s a very real possibility. And the stakes are enormous. We’re talking about the very structure that safeguards civil liberties, voting rights, the separation of powers, and the rule of law. Once those protections are on the table, we can’t guarantee we’ll get them back in the same form—or at all.

Some will argue that a convention is the only way to address pressing problems. But, that’s not true. We’ve made changes to the U.S. Constitution using the amendment process 27 times. Yes, it’s slow. Careful. Often frustrating. But that’s *by design*. It forces conversation. It requires broad consensus. It protects us from impulsive decisions that could unravel the very freedoms we’re trying to preserve. I know it can feel like we need bold action right now. However, sometimes boldness means restraint. It means trusting that the system can evolve without needing to be torn down. It means choosing the steady, deliberate path even when the quicker one looks tempting.

I ask this committee to consider the long view. Let’s not risk the integrity of our Constitution on a process with no guardrails. Please vote no on S.J.R. 3.

Thank you for your time and your service.

Warmly,

Sharlyn Katzner

Bowling Green, OH

sdkatzner@gmail.com