

Testimony of Elise Hunt in opposition to SJR4

Chairman Peterson, Vice Chairman Cirino, Ranking Member Craig, and members of the committee--Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony regarding this call for a Constitutional Convention. I am a 10 year old from Delaware, Ohio, Senate District 19.

As a student, I am learning to dig into my school books to come up with the correct answers. So, when I was preparing my remarks for today, I was all set to dig in and do all sorts of Constitutional research...but then I found this – a Resolution Analysis by the Ohio Legislative Service Commission. You Senators are so lucky! You have people who do the homework for you! Thank you to Samuel Duling – your research analyst!

This analysis of SJR4 concludes that, QUOTE: “The U.S. Constitution does not specify how a convention to propose amendments to the U.S. Constitution must be conducted or how its delegates are to be chosen. Further, the Constitution does not indicate whether the states that apply for a convention may limit the scope of amendments the convention is to propose. A convention of the states has never been held under Article V.”

Mr. Duling here does not agree with the claims of those who are pushing for a Convention of the States. He concludes, QUOTE: “If Congress called a convention as a result of the resolution and others like it, and the convention proposed amendments outside the scope of the topics listed in the resolution, it is not clear whether a reviewing court would find the proposed amendments valid”. In other words, if we cannot say with absolute certainty that a convention can be limited, it is a huge risk.

Thank you for your attention and I would be happy to try to answer any questions you may have.