

Why support the Convention of States Project's resolution for an Article V convention to propose amendments that "impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress"?

- The federal government today operates far beyond the scope of its constitutional powers. This has resulted in a crippling national debt and the erosion of policymaking authority in the states. Through the Article V Convention of States process, the states can meet to propose constitutional amendments that will restrain federal spending, limit federal power, and term limit bureaucrats and judges.
- The Article V Convention process was included in the Constitution to provide the states with a "check" on federal power. The states' failure to use this constitutional "check" has allowed Washington to amass more and more power.
- Because activist courts have affirmed decades of federal overreach by twisting or perverting constitutional language, the only way to set our nation back on course is to definitively correct bad precedents through constitutional amendments that set the record straight.
- 2 out of 3 voters support this effort (75% of Republicans, 55% of Democrats, 63% of "Others")

Objection: There's nothing "wrong" with the Constitution, so why change it?

Response: While there is nothing "wrong" with the Constitution, the problems we now face are the result of constitutional interpretations that capitalize on ambiguities in the wording of certain phrases (i.e., the general welfare clause). People like to say that federal officials "ignore" the Constitution, but what they actually do is creatively "lawyer" around its limitations. We can restore the federal government to its proper, limited place only by clarifying the original meaning of the language through constitutional amendments—effectively overturning bad Supreme Court precedents.

Objection: An Article V Convention of the States can't be limited to specific topics.

Response: The states whose applications trigger the convention can limit its scope however they choose. This is inherent in their power of application. As the agents of the state legislatures who appoint and commission them, the delegates only enjoy the scope of authority vested in them by their principals (the state legislatures). Any actions outside the scope of that authority are void as a matter of common law agency principles, as well as any state laws adopted to specifically address the issue.

Objection: An Article V Convention of the States could become a "runaway convention."

Response: The idea that the 1787 Constitutional Convention was a "runaway" is a myth, that has been definitively disproven. (Read Volume 40 of the Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy). While our country has a rich history of interstate conventions (which formed the model for the Article V convention process), not a single convention has ever become a "runaway."

Objection: We don't know how an Article V Convention would operate.

Response: An abundant history and legal precedents tell us what we need to know. To learn more, read

Professor Robert G. Natelson's treatise, *The Law of Article V: State Initiation of Constitutional Amendments* (Apis Books, 2018).