

**Re: Testimony in SUPPORT of HR 7792, JOINT RESOLUTION RESCINDING  
PREVIOUS ARTICLE V CONVENTION APPLICATIONS**

To: Honorable Rep. Evan P. Shanley, Chair; Rep. Mary Messier, First Vice Chair; Rep.  
Arthur J. Corvese, Second Vice Chair; and Members of the **House State Government and  
Elections Committee**

My experience is that convention supporters love to say the Framers put the Art V  
convention route in the Constitution for us to use. But they fail to consider that the Framers  
also allow us to double our national debt and go to war with Canada tomorrow. My point is  
that just because the Constitution allows for something **does not mean we should do it!**  
**Or that now is the time to do it!**

As legislators, you know laws work when violators of them are held accountable. That's  
why we have law enforcement, courts and jails. We the People are not doing our jobs; we  
don't know the rules, we're not demanding they are followed. And we are certainly not  
holding scoundrels accountable. Changing our rules cannot make the Constitution self-  
enforcing and does not change the hearts and minds of scoundrels. That's why the Framers  
never said to use the convention route to control the reality of this day.

The reason the convention route of Article V was left unlimited in the Constitution is  
because the Founding Fathers originally intended it to provide a way for future Americans,  
if ever the need should arise, *to alter or abolish the current form of government and replace  
it with a new form of government and Constitution* as stated in the preamble to the  
Declaration of Independence:

...That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right  
of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government...

Because of this inherent right of the sovereign people, an Article V convention cannot be limited, otherwise it would never succeed in empowering the people to make the necessary changes in the Constitution (without civil war), in case the government should ever become oppressive due to defects in the Constitution — not defects in the personal characters of men.

All the factions of pro conventioners overlap ([here](#), [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#)). They have all repeated the same incorrect information regarding passed applications. Historical facts prove them wrong. See this article with [CHART](#). Plus, COS [lobbyist](#), Regional [Director David Schneider](#), published on the Convention of States website, see sixth paragraph [here](#). Even if the pro conventioners' information was correct, good parents know you don't make a threat that you are not wanting to do! Playing chicken with our Constitutionally protected rights is horrifying.

Scholarly men has said there's no way to limit the Art V convention. (see Compendium [here](#) and article [here](#). [This is a powerful candid conversation with another expert, Harvard educated Dr. Edwin Vieira, PhD, J.D.](#) . And this is beautifully summed up [2026 convention opposition testimony from state representatives, first a Democrat and then a Republican](#).

In our wonderful Constitutional Republic, we trust you, our elected agents to be well-informed and make the best decisions for us that are within our rules. If you have any reservations about all this, please **vote “YES” to support recession.**

Respectfully,

Lynette Indiana