

(S)State Affairs - Opposition letters received for SJR15 from non-Alaskans, as of 3/18/2015

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email William Nightingale Sr (Virginia) 3-17-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Tom Redfern (Virginia) 3-17-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Sue Long (Virginia) 3-17-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Sue Long (Virginia) 3-16-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Richard Salomon (Virginia) 3-16-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Publius Huldah (Tennessee) 3-16-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Paul Jamerson (Virginia) 3-17-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Patricia Miles (Virginia) 3-18-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Patricia Miles (Virginia) 3-17-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Mary Mann (Virginia) 3-16-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Herb Lux (Virginia) 3-18-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Eric & Ann Robeson (Virginia) 3-16-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Catherine Marshall (Virginia) 3-17-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Brian Evans (Virginia) 3-17-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Bill & Betty Lucas (Virginia) 3-16-15

SJR15 Opposition Document - Email Bill McNally (New Hampshire) 3-16-15

Daniel George

From: Betty Lucas <efi@bettyandbill.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 6:16 PM
To: Betty Lucas
Subject: Urgent: Oppose SJR15, and All Other Article V Resolutions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Honorable Senator:

With all due respect, this is NOT the only way! Oppose SJR15, and All other Article V resolutions.

The U.S. Constitution is NOT broken...our legislators are. Those who vote for *unconstitutional acts* must be replaced.

In 2004, Virginia Delegate Lingamfelter said, after Virginia rescinded all Article V constitutional convention resolutions, “...*the operations of a convention are unknown and the apportionment and selection of delegates, method of voting in convention, and other essential procedural details are not specified in Article V...the prudent course requires the General Assembly to rescind and withdraw all past applications for a convention to amend the Constitution...*”

They understood the dangers of opening up our *U.S. Constitution* “to unelected, special interest, self-serving individuals”.

Article V, also, provides for a method of amending the United States Constitution, whereby 2/3rds vote of both houses of the US Congress propose amendments, which are then

ratified by 3/4ths of the State Legislatures. This method has *safely* served our Nation for over 200 years. You need to adhere to this *safe* method to add amendments.

Please, watch this 36min video to a gain a clear understanding of the serious danger our U.S. Constitution will face if it is opened up to enemies within and outside America... <http://www.jbs.org/videos/mediaitem/406-beware-of-article-v> [Video] You will gain an understand of *why many citizens are OPPOSED* to the Article V constitutional convention method of solving our nation’s many problems.

Respectfully,

Betty and Bill Lucas

Mechanicsville, VA

804-212-1165



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

Daniel George

From: Brian (Conservolist) <brian@conservolist.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 11:01 AM
To: Brian (Conservolist)
Subject: Please vote "NO" on SJR 15 or any other call for a Constitutional Convention

Senator,

Thank you for your service. I'm writing to urge you to vote "No" on HJR 15 or any other similar legislation calling for an Article V Convention. As for Alaska to submit an application to a federal constitutional convention would mean that we all have an invested interest in Alaska. If you oppose a Constitutional Convention, thank you. I'm sure you're getting plenty of emails urging you to support this. If you do support it, please reconsider your position.

What to call it? It is difficult to pin a name to this debate because the verbiage continues to change. To say it is a Convention of States would imply that state legislatures or the people of the states maintained control. A federal Con-Con implies that it would stay within the realm of the U.S. Constitution, so to call it anything other than a federal Constitutional Convention is inappropriate.

It is a federal function of Special Interest. A federal Constitutional Convention is a federal function and representation is through individuals of the state, not the legislatures. Once this convention begins, it will move into a smorgasbord of special interest groups at the expense of the American taxpayer. Special interest groups seek to expand government and place control of these certain trades under federal control.

Upon submitting this application to the federal government, the U.S. Congress will "call" the convention. We will then see what happens to our U.S. Constitution as representatives of "We the People" will conduct the convention. State legislatures, could be entirely removed from the remaining part of the process, even, ratification process. In the past, they federal government has used tactics to bypass state legislatures such as the 21st Amendment (Repeal of Prohibition). They used state conventions to bypass state legislatures.

Thank you again for your service,

Brian Evans

Newport News, Virginia

Daniel George

From: Catherine Marshall <catherineannmarshall@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 7:43 AM
To: Sen. Bill Stoltze
Subject: Please oppose SJR 15, Article V Legislation!
Categories: Bill in Committee

PLEASE DO NOT BELIEVE THE RHETORIC THAT A CONVENTION CAN BE 'LIMITED'. THERE IS ONLY ONE CONVENTION MENTIONED IN THE CONSTITUTION. Black's law dictionary defines a constitutional convention as "A duly constituted assembly of delegates or representatives of the people of a state or nation for the purpose of framing, revising, or amending its [constitution](#)."

Arthur Goldberg , Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court: “As we look forward to celebrate the bicentennial of the constitution, a few people have asked, why not another constitutional convention. I would respond that one of the most serious problems Article 5 poses is a runaway convention. There is no enforceable mechanism to prevent a convention from reporting wholesale changes to our constitution and Bill of Rights. Moreover, the absence of any mechanism to ensure representative selection of delegates could put a runaway convention in the hands of single issue groups whose self-interest may be contrary to our national well-being.”

Former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Warren Burger: “I have also repeatedly given my opinion that there is no way to limit or muzzle the actions of a constitutional convention. The convention could make its own rules and set its own agenda. Congress might try to limit the convention to one amendment or one issue, but there is no way to assure that the convention would obey. After a Convention begins it will be too late to stop the convention if we do not like its agenda.”

“Whatever gain might be hoped for from a new constitutional convention could not be worth the risk involved. A new convention could plunge our nation into constitutional confusion and confrontation at every turn with no focus on the subject needing attention. I have discouraged the idea of a Constitutional convention. And I am glad to see states rescinding their previous resolutions requesting a convention. In these bicentennial years we should be celebrating its long life, not challenging its very existence.”

Rex E. Lee , former Law School Professor, later President of Brigham Young University:

“In short, if the question is whether a runaway convention is assured, the answer is no, but if the question is whether it is a real and serious possibility, the answer is yes. In our history we have only one experience with a constitutional convention, and while the end result was good, the convention itself was a definite runaway.”

“This is in response to your letter of December 12 in which you asked for my opinion concerning whether under Article 5 of the U.S. Constitution, a constitutional convention called to consider a particular issue could be limited either by congressional directive or otherwise to that single issue. The only safe statement that could be made on this issue is that no one knows, but the only relative precedent would indicate that the convention could not be so limited. Anyone who purports to express a definitive view on this subject is either deluded or deluding.”

Charles Allen Wright: Professor of Law at the University of Texas at Austin:

“I feel quite certain that even opening the door to the possibility of a constitutional convention would be a tragedy for the country.”

Christopher Brown, Professor of Law, at the University of Maryland School of Law:

“In my view, the plurality of ‘amendments’ opens the door to constitutional change far beyond merely requiring a balanced federal budget.”

Gerald Guenther – Professor of Law at Stanford University:

“There is no denying the fact, that if the present balanced budget campaign succeeds in eliciting the necessary applications from 34 state legislatures, the convention call will be triggered by inadequately considered state applications for the vast preponderance of the legislative applications rest on an entire absence of consideration of the risk of a convention route. In my view that constitutes a palpable misuse of the Article 5 convention process. The convention route, as I have said, is legitimate when it is deliberately and knowingly invoked. The ongoing campaign, by contrast, has produced a situation whereby inattentive, ignorant, at times cynically manipulated state legislative action threatens to trigger a congressional convention call. I cannot support so irresponsible an invocation of constitutional processes.”

“The fear that a constitutional convention could become a runaway convention and propose wholesale changes in our constitution is by no means unfounded. Rather this broad view of authority of a convention reflects the consensus of most constitutional scholars who have commented on the issue.”

“A convention once called would be in the same position of the only other convention we have had in our history - the 1787 constitutional convention that proposed the constitution that we live under today and whose bicentennial we celebrated so recently. The Philadelphia Convention too was in effect a runaway convention.”

Richard B. Morris, Author, :

“The delegates at the convention were sober realists. They knew the greatest battles lay ahead. The Convention had overstepped its instructions. It had scrapped the articles instead of amending them. Having defied Congress the convention decided to pursue what amounted to a revolutionary course by declaring the ratification by nine states sufficient ‘for the ratification of the constitution between the states so ratifying the same.’ In other words the constitution was being submitted directly to the people through ratifying conventions. Not even Congress, which had summoned the convention, would be asked to approve its work. Still, Congress, after acrimonious debate, and without endorsement or disavowal, did submit the constitution to the state legislatures, to be submitted in turn to conventions in accordance with Article 7 of the constitution, providing that once 9 states had ratified the constitution, it would go into effect between the affirming states.

SC Justice Antonin Scalia:

“I certainly would not want a constitutional convention. Whoa! Who knows what would come out of it?”

Some Legal Scholars who agree no one can mandate a limited issue Convention under Article V:

Warren E. Burger, Chief Justice of the US Supreme Court

Arthur J. Goldberg, Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court

Bruce Van Sickle, U.S. District Judge, North Dakota

Robert Bork, Judge, United States Court of Appeal, Washington DC, SC Justice nominee

Alexander Alienkoff, University of Michigan Law School

Florian Bartosic, University of California at Davis

Charles L. Black, Yale Law School

C. Christopher Brown, University of Maryland Law School

Neil Cogan, Southern Methodist University Law School

Walter E. Dellinger, Duke University Law School

Thomas Emerson, Yale Law School

Jefferson B. Fordham, University of Utah Law School

Gerald Gunther, Stanford University Law School

Rex E. Lee, Brigham Young University Law School, President of Brigham Young University

Betsy Levin (Dean), University of Colorado Law School

Forrest McDonald, Scholar, National Endowment for the Humanities

Arval A. Morris, University of Washington Law School

Charles E. Rice, Notre Dame Law School

Terrance Sandalow, (Dean) University of Michigan Law School

Robert L. Schwartz, University of New Mexico Law School

Lawrence H. Tribe, Harvard Law School

Charles Alan Wright, University of Texas at Austin Law School

Daniel George

From: Ann <raggedyann62@verizon.net>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 12:59 PM
To: Sen. Bill Stoltze; Sen. John Coghill; Sen. Charlie Huggins; Sen. Lesil McGuire; Sen. Bill Wielechowski
Cc: Eric Robeson
Subject: SJR 15

Dear Senators,

We respectfully request that you vote NO to SJR 15. We are not in your state, but this is very important to our entire country. Thank You.

Sincerely We Are,

Eric and Ann Robeson
Yorktown, Virginia
757-886-2052



This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

Daniel George

From: hlux@americanpatriotscommittee.com
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2015 7:15 AM
To: Rep. Bob Lynn; Sen. Bill Stoltze
Subject: Con Con

Dear Legislators,

Please stand strong in the face of adversity. That's what Statesman does.

A vote for Con Con puts our very freedoms at stake.

If there are the votes throughout the Country to amend the Constitution that supports the principles of our Country as defined in the three main principles of the Declaration of Independence then make the amendment through congress where we don't risk destroying our Constitution completely.

The fact is unless an amendment to the Constitution supports the three main principles as defined in the Declaration it is unjust and improper and would undermine our rights with which we are endowed.

The three principles we must recognize if we are to protect our liberty and freedoms:

1. "We are endowed by our Creator...." We are born with our rights. Men do not give them to us.
2. "To secure these rights governments are instituted among men"...
3."deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed" Knowing that you can only delegate to another the authority you possess and nothing more or your asking your representative to become a tyrant. The reasons our government was to always be limited that we may remain free.

Please protect our liberty and freedom. Vote no to all requests for a Con Con.

Sincerely,
Herb Lux
President

www.AmericanPatriotsCommittee.com

540-846-8212

Daniel George

From: Mary W. Mann <mary.w.mann@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 7:48 PM
Subject: Please DON'T open a can of worms! Vote no on SJR 15

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Categories: Bill in Committee

Dear Senator,

While I certainly agree that DC is out of control in their spending, I do NOT believe that a COS is the right answer.

In 1967, Senator Sam Ervin was so intrigued by Article V that he thoroughly researched the subject and came to the conclusion:

[A]s We the People are the true de jure sovereign of these states, We the People cannot be held by anyone to any single issue once we convene our convention. If we so choose, the entire Constitution could be rewritten.
—Los Angeles Times, 1-15-92

http://www.freedomfirstsociety.org/home/images/Con-Con_Special_Action_Report-Final-Ir.pdf

There are so many reasons not to!

TWENTY QUESTIONS ABOUT A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

1. How would Delegates be selected or elected to a Constitutional Convention?
2. What authority would be responsible for determining the number of Delegates from each state?
3. What authority would be responsible for electing the Delegates to the convention?
4. Would Delegates be selected based on Population, number of Registered Voters, or along Party lines?
5. Would Delegates be selected based on race, ethnicity or gender?
6. What authority would be responsible for organizing the convention, such as committee selection, committee chairs and members, etc.?

7. How would the number of Delegates serving on any committee be selected and limited?

(how would the race, ethnicity, age, religion, etc. of delegates be decided?

I don't think we will get any more the equal in education and God-fearing to our Founding Fathers!)

8. How would the Chair of the Convention be selected or elected?
9. What authority will establish the Rules of the Convention, such as setting a quorum, how to proceed if a state wishes to withdraw its delegation, etc?
10. What authority would be responsible for selecting the venue for the Convention?
11. Would proposed amendments require a two-thirds majority vote for passage?
12. How would the number of votes required to pass a Constitutional Amendment be determined?
13. What would happen if the Con Con decided to write its own rules so that 2/3 of the states need not be present to get amendments passed?
14. Could a state delegation be recalled by its legislature and its call for a convention be rescinded during the convention?
15. Would non-Delegates be permitted inside the convention hall?
16. Will demonstrators be allowed and/or controlled outside the convention hall?

17. Would congress decide to submit Con Con amendments for ratification to the state legislatures or to a state constitutional convention as permitted under Article V of the constitution?

18. Where would the Convention be held?

19. Who will fund this Convention?

--this is a big one!

20. If these questions cannot be answered (and they CANNOT!), then why would any state legislator even consider voting for such an uncertain event as an Article V Constitutional Convention?

VOTE NO ON ANY BILLS TO CALL A CON CON AND VOTE TO RESCIND ANY PREVIOUS CALL(S).

Vote no on SJR 15

!

<http://www.eagleforum.org/topics/concon/>

--

Mary Weaver Mann



"God doesn't require us to succeed, he only requires that we try."

"Not all of us can do great things, but we all can do small things with great love."

~Blessed Teresa of Calcutta

Daniel George

From: Patricia Miles <triciamiles68@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 6:07 AM
To: Sen. Bill Stoltze; Sen. John Coghill; Sen. Charlie Huggins; Sen. Lesil McGuire; Sen. Bill Wielechowski
Subject: Please Vote NO on SJR 15

Categories: Bill in Committee

Dear Honorable Members of the Alaska Senate State Affairs Committee:

Please oppose the above-referenced bill. Contrary to many claims, once called, the states will not have any control over an Article V Convention. It may not even be one state-one vote. In all likelihood, representation to the convention will be based on the number of electoral college votes a state has, and the states may not even have the ability to choose their delegates to the convention. Congress could appoint them! According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS), the authoritative source that Congress uses for accurate information, Congress will make all the rules for an Article V Convention. Also, the precedent for changing the rules on the fly was set with the convention that was called to amend the *Articles of Confederation*. *The Articles*, instead of being amended, were scrapped altogether, giving us *The Constitution* we have today. However, back then, we had statesmen like George Washington, George Madison, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, etc. Who do we have now? Certainly not the same caliber of people!

As for a Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA), please consider that a BBA isn't necessary since *The Constitution* already spells out what Congress can legally spend money on in the enumerated powers. If Congress obeyed *The Constitution* as it stands, there would be no budget deficit in the first place. A BBA, if passed and ratified, would rubber stamp even more spending run amok. The only limit on what Congress could legally spend money on would be the amount of money available, and if there weren't enough, it would just raise taxes, borrow more, or print more. Sound familiar? What would such an amendment solve? Absolutely nothing! The solutions are already in *The Constitution* as it stands, and we cannot risk it being changed or scrapped. The states must assert their authority over the federal and call them on the illegal actions they take and their failure to honor their oaths to obey, protect, and defend *The Constitution*.

Although I don't reside in your state, if such a convention is called, the whole country will be affected. I pray you will vote against this dangerous bill.

Respectfully,

Patricia H. Miles
P. O. Box 424
Port Haywood, VA 23138

Daniel George

From: Patricia Miles <triciamiles68@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2015 7:52 AM
To: Sen. Bill Stoltze; Sen. John Coghill; Sen. Charlie Huggins; Sen. Lesil McGuire; Sen. Bill Wielechowski
Subject: Please Vote NO on SJR 15

Dear Honorable Members of the Alaska Senate State Affairs Committee:

Please oppose the above-referenced bill. Contrary to many claims, once called, the states will not have any control over an Article V Convention. It may not even be one state-one vote. In all likelihood, representation to the convention will be based on the number of electoral college votes a state has, and the states may not even have the ability to choose their delegates to the convention. Congress could appoint them! According to the Congressional Research Service (CRS), the authoritative source that Congress uses for accurate information, Congress will make all the rules for an Article V Convention. Also, the precedent for changing the rules on the fly was set with the convention that was called to amend the *Articles of Confederation*. *The Articles*, instead of being amended, were scrapped altogether, giving us *The Constitution* we have today. However, back then, we had statesmen like George Washington, George Madison, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, etc. Who do we have now? Certainly not the same caliber of people!

Although I don't reside in your state, if such a convention is called, the whole country will be affected. I pray you will vote against this dangerous bill.

Respectfully,

Patricia H. Miles
P. O. Box 424
Port Haywood, VA 23138

Daniel George

From: Dorothy and Paul <pjamer7227@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 2:45 AM
To: Rep. Bob Lynn; Rep. Wes Keller; Rep. David Talerico; Rep. Liz Vazquez; Rep. Louise Stutes; Rep. Max Gruenberg; Rep. Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins; Sen. Bill Stoltze; Sen. John Coghill; Sen. Charlie Huggins; Sen. Lesil McGuire; Sen. Bill Wielechowski
Subject: Oppose SJR 15, HJR 14, HCR 4 and any other creative legislation that may have holding a constitutional convention added as a rider.
Categories: Bill in Committee

Honorable Legislators All,

Subject: A constitutional convention and any Balanced Budget Amendment

I am asking you to Oppose SJR15, HRJ 14, HCR 4 and any U.S. Constitution application for a convention of the states .

And any other creative legislation that may have holding a constitutional convention added as a rider.

Do not be an accessory to the special interest parties' drive to opening our *U.S. Constitution* to be amended, altered or destroyed by unknown delegates with unlimited powers over U.S. citizens!

Below is an article by Sue Long That explains why you need to vote no.

Sincerely
Paul Jamerson

A constitutional convention and a Balanced Budget Amendment

There are those who support a Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA) who are quite thoughtful and sincere and we applaud their concern about out-of-control spending. However, there are aspects that need to be considered.

If a BBA were in effect, and spending could not be agreed upon, then it would be mandatory to raise revenue – either by raising taxes or printing more money. In VA we have a BBA, but we also have greater spending and higher taxes. (*Please note the possible loopholes by John F. McManus listed below.)

There is no guarantee that a large number of states calling for a convention for a BBA would result in Congress being coerced into passing a balanced budget or a BBA. That is a risk not worth taking.

A BBA could increase the power of the federal government as most of the amendments do, other than the first ten. As it is now, spending by Congress is restricted by the Constitution to fund only the enumerated powers. With a BBA the only restriction would be the cost. Criminals don't obey the laws on the books – so should we change the laws to make them legal?

The same is the case with a balanced budget amendment. Congress doesn't obey the Constitution when they authorize money for things not listed as authorized by the Constitution. The Balanced Budget Amendment would limit spending not by what the Constitution authorizes but only by the amount of the cost- thus legalizing what is now unconstitutional.

There is no guarantee that ratification would be required by 3/4ths of the states. The 1787 convention reduced the number of states needed for ratification required by the Articles of Confederation and a present day one could do so as well. The number could be reduced to half the states or even none.

The solution? State nullification and an informed electorate** that will vote into office, local and state legislators that will not take federal grants and at the federal level, legislators that will

abide by their oath of office and abide by the Constitution which would then result in a balanced budget.

- Some BBAs include a provision that allows 60 percent in Congress to override it. When it comes to protecting favored spending measures, obtaining the support of 60 percent should not be too difficult. Most deficit spending bills are already passed by more than 60 percent majorities.
- Some BBAs call for increases in taxes if the budget isn't balanced, even steering the taxing power to the Executive Branch where it has never been and should never be.
- Some say that the budget doesn't have to be balanced if the nation is at war (even an undeclared war). Would there be some in Congress who would favor a war or a "limited military response" non-war rather than cut their favorite federal expenditures? Sadly, there likely are more than a few.
- Some BBAs claim that a national security threat (real or imagined) would be reason enough not to have a balanced budget. Would some in Congress point to a small or large conflagration in some portion of the globe, and say the disturbance threatens our nation? Some BBAs say that once it is added to the Constitution, its provisions would not take effect for five years. Therefore, there would be five more years of trillion dollar deficits that would speed the nation toward collapse.
- Some say the way to get around all of the deficits and the bloated budgets is to declare some expenditures "off budget."

**

In 1820, Thomas Jefferson stated in a letter to William Charles Jarvis:

"I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion by education.

This is the true corrective of the abuses of constitutional power."

By Sue Long

The Committee for Constitutional Government
Post Office Box 972
Gloucester, VA 23061
4theconstitution@va.metrocast.net

Daniel George

From: ThePubliusHuldah . <publiushuldah@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 8:39 AM
To: Sen. Bill Stoltze; Sen. John Coghill; Sen. Charlie Huggins; Sen. Lesil McGuire; Sen. Bill Wielechowski
Subject: Vote no on SJR 15 and all other resolutions applying for a convention

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Senator:

James Madison, Father of our Constitution, "trembled" at the prospect of an Article V convention because he understood that if there were a convention, "the most violent partizans" and "individuals of insidious views" would have "a dangerous opportunity of sapping the very foundations of the fabric" of our Country.

If you will read this linked paper, you will see the terrible danger explained (with links to original source documents): <http://www.renewamerica.com/columns/huldah/150119>

I beg you - do not be taken in by the celebrities who are pushing for a convention. This is the most dangerous period of our history - because if there is a convention, we will get a new Constitution. As shown in the linked Article, new Constitutions are already prepared - all they need is a convention to impose them.

A terrible deception is being played on us and many have been deceived - please do not ***you*** be one of the deceived. We will all pay dearly for it.

Very truly yours,
Publius Huldah

<http://publiushuldah.wordpress.com/>

Daniel George

From: Richard Salomon <rsalomon1913@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 5:54 PM
Subject: FW: Please vote against all Article V legislative initiatives A convention cannot be limited!
Attachments: State Committees to limit the federal budget.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

As a resident of Virginia I realize how closely connected Virginia is with the heart and sole of the entire Nation. During our legislative session we were able to have the Article V legislation and Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA) attempts withdrawn as the Senate and Houses of Delegates, after learning of the pitfalls associated with any Convention to Consider Amendments.

If I were to have the opportunity to speak with one directly I would implore you to consider the unintended consequences that are laying in wait during a convention to consider AMENDMENTS to the Constitution. Remember, the convention to be called is to consider Amendments; that means that all those that are there can offer their amendment for consideration!.

With regard to the Article V the most significant points seem to be:

1. The congress and executive branch are not listening to the people; they are out of control and exceeding their authority as enumerated in the Constitution. WE HAVE TO DO SOMETHING!
2. Article V is a State remedy and the Feds will have nothing to do with it! The States are in control.

To be exasperated is understandable but to risk all that is good is irrational.

a. It makes no sense to believe that those that are "out of control" Supreme Court? Congress? and Executive Branch will respond to a new set of words that limit their actions! The are outside their enumerated powers in their current actions why will a new amendment (s) make them limit their actions. SO WHY DO WE THINK THAT NEW AMENDMENTS OR A NEW CONSTITUTION WILL BE FOLLOWED AS WRITTEN!

b. The Necessary and Proper clause of the Constitution gives the Congress broad power to promulgate regulations and rules for everything that relates to government. It is not rational to believe that the Congress will not exert their right to set the rules for an Article V convention. [Note: Article V simply gives the States to make the call and tells the Congress to take action to Call the Convention to Consider Amendments when a certain number of legitimate calls are received. Mason was not happy with the Article V language as he knew that the Feds would never limit their own power; that is why he backed away from the Constitution after spending so much of his life to bring it about.

c. Key to this argument seems to be; Intent of the Founders? Well we are 250 years down the road from the founders and their intent has been usurped by the Supreme Court. The body of law interpretation that now gives us the intent of the Constitution. Judge Roberts is a prime example of this with his decision on Obama Care! [Sonia Sotomayor](#), [Stephen G. Breyer](#), [Elena Kagan](#) and [Ruth Bader Ginsburg](#) with Kennedy close behind have clearly stated and acted in a manner that demonstrates that they are empowered to re-write the Constitution when they think it is appropriate! Kennedy, Alito, Roberts seem to be committed to doing this on occasion with only Scalia and Thomas traditionally seeking to interpret the Constitution in a constructionist manner. **Do you think that**

such a court will choose to interpret the Article V problems that are brought to them in a manner that will likely result in a reduction of their power?

BTW- the Senate weighed in on this when they Bork (ed) Judge Bork. The Senate Judiciary Committee, lead by Biden, clearly rejected the notion that the Constitution means what it says (constructionist) so they will certainly push to have the Congress in control of any Convention so they can control the Amendments themselves and the outcome of the convention!

The State Committee document; attached, is an outline of what States can do! The States have the power to push back against the Feds; as they have done with the Affordable Care Act suit. The court's ruling on that suit may well demonstrate that States Rights are completely dead! WE will see.

Daniel George

From: suemlong3@va.metrocast.net
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 10:27 PM
To: ;
Subject: Please vote NO to SJR 15
Categories: Bill in Committee

Dear Senator,

This bill would result in petitioning Congress to call a constitutional convention aka an Article V Convention, Convention of States etc.

Some things you should know.

Once convened by Congress (not the states by the way) it is anyone's guess as to what would happen.

At the only constitutional convention that has been held, and that was in 1787, although called for the express purpose of amending the then constitution, the Articles of Confederation, they totally scrapped the Articles. The same could happen today. Our Constitution could be totally replaced .

And, the convention could reduce the number of states needed for ratification to half or none.

Term limits? We already have that. It's called an election. But if the constituents want a certain type to represent them, they will just vote for another such person. No change will come of it.

Balanced Budget? These amendments are not based on limiting spending to the authorized powers listed in the Constitution. To do so is to legitimize the unconstitutional spending.

And, even if something good did come out of a convention, why think that the same people who totally disregard the Constitution as it stands today, would abide by an altered one?

May I depend on you to vote NO to this bill calling for a convention.

Thank you,
Sue Long
"Abide By The Constitution, Not Change It!"

Daniel George

From: suemlong3@va.metrocast.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 3:40 PM
To: Sen. Bill Stoltze
Subject: Please vote no on SJR 15

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Senator Stoltze ,

If your boat has a leak it doesn't help to drill a hole in the bottom.

And, trusting the current crop of politicians to rewrite our Constitution, which would be the result of a constitutional convention aka Convention of States, Balanced Budget Amendment, Article V Convention et al. is not the solution to government overreach.

It is Congress, not the states, that decides who the delegates will be to such, according to Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution, which could be themselves.

All Article V conventions have the inherent power to be runaway conventions. We have no business convening an unlimited constitutional convention when the outcome is anyone's guess.

Even if something good came out of it, would the legislators who fail to abide by the Constitution we have now, abide by an altered one?

Why take the risk?

Thank you,

Sue Long
"Abide By The Constitution, Not Change It!"

Daniel George

From: redferniii9@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 4:17 AM
To: Redferniii9@aol.com
Subject: OPPOSE SJR15 and All Article V Resolutions/Applications
Categories: Bill in Committee

Dear Senator and *Member of State Affairs Committee*,

Please **OPPOSE SJR15**, and any other Article V Convention resolutions/applications.

The Constitution is not the problem, it's that those sworn to support and defend it don't, and the citizens don't hold them accountable. Do we really think that they will start obeying new amendments?

It's only been in recent decades that many applications have tried to dictate what the convention will and can do, citing various and sundry topics. For the bulk of our history, it was understood that the applications were for a general convention that would, in fact, "propose amendments."

Beyond that, we run the risk that our last experience in looking at our government document through a Convention resulted in a brand new document (1787).

Politically, this is a toxic event. The so-called "conservative" side is split on it. Those who support enforcement of the Constitution cite that Congress will "make all laws" regarding a convention per the "necessary and proper clause". States apply and Congress "shall call a convention for proposing amendments." In the 70's and 80's many applications were filed in the states, and, in preparation, the Congress introduced 41 bills as to how they'd set up a potential convention. These bills generally included quite specific standards for delegate apportionment formulas and delegate qualifications, and that apportionment of convention delegates among the states was generally set at the formula provided for the electoral college. The Convention of States (COS) people are selling it that Congress can be "bypassed", and, among other things, Congress can "only set the date, time, and location" for a convention, that it would be a one-state, one-vote convention, and, furthermore, that only "good" amendments could possibly be ratified by the requisite 38 states. A century ago, the 16th (Income Tax) and the 17th Amendments (no longer would the states put the people in the U.S Senate) were properly ratified; were these "good" amendments? Remember, according to the COS people, that can't happen today. Really??

The Balanced Budget Amendment people are selling it on people believing that Congress will magically reduce spending, when they are spending now on many unconstitutional programs. A balanced budget amendment (convention or no) will, in effect, legitimize unconstitutional spending, and give legislators the excuse that we have to raise taxes, because the Constitution made me do it!

On the "liberal" side, there are many organizations in support of an Article V convention

States are using the Tenth Amendment to stand up to federal overreach, and these efforts increase across the land. State legislators need to stand up to unconstitutional federal government edicts.

In 2004, another state (Virginia) overwhelmingly passed a resolution (HJR 194) to withdraw all previous state applications for a convention. The wording was "..... **the operations of a convention are unknown and the apportionment and selection of delegates, method of voting in convention, and other essential procedural details are not specified in Article Vthe prudent course requires the General Assembly to rescind and withdraw all past applications for a convention to amend the Constitution of the United States.....**"

The Constitution is not the problem, it's that those sworn to support and defend it don't, and the citizens don't hold them accountable. Do we really think that they will start obeying new amendments, or a new constitution?

Tom Redfern

Citizens to Save our Constitution (SOC)

Daniel George

From: William Nightingale Sr. <wnsrbill@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 12:35 AM
To: Sen. Bill Stoltze; Sen. John Coghill; Sen. Charlie Huggins; Sen. Lesil McGuire; Sen. Bill Wielechowski
Subject: Vote No SJR 15
Attachments: The Danger of a.docx

Categories: Bill in Committee

We have had 17 amendments to the Constitution without a convention, please consider the attached before you vote

William nightingale Sr

Daniel George

From: Bill McNally <mcnallyusa@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 10:52 PM
Subject: A Second Constitutional Convention? An Unbalanced Idea.
Attachments: Barbara McNally Con-Con Paper.pdf
Categories: Bill in Committee

Dear Senator,

An interesting article written by an Indiana University student in 1988.

Yours for America's future,

Bill McNally