

September 20, 2019

The Honorable Garth D. Everett, State Capitol Harrisburg, Pa 17120

RE: HR206 Prime sponsor, Representative Matt Gabler

Dear Representative Everett:

My name is Maria Rayer and I'm District Captain for Convention of States Action Pennsylvania. I reside in PA HD165 and am reaching out to you to ask for your support of HR206.

I support this resolution because the system that our founders put in place has now been flipped on its head. Washington has become a tyrannical monster. They will never know what's best for me and my family, so why are they making so many decisions for me? I believe in an Article V convention because it will return the power to the people and the states where it belongs and how the founders intended.

I'm asking that you please vote YES on this resolution. I look forward to your response and would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Thank you for your service to our great state of Pennsylvania

Sincerely
Maria Rayer

MARIA RAYER
704 PARKER LANE
D. 19064

Why OPPOSE an Article V Constitutional Convention?

"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 the authority of a convention reflects the consensus of most constitutional scholars who have commented on the issue" - *Gerald Gunther* (Stanford Law Professor)

- During April 1788, our 1st US Supreme Court Chief Justice John Jay wrote that another convention would run an "extravagant risque."
 - **In Federalist No. 49, James Madison said a convention is neither proper nor effective to restrain government when it encroaches.**
 - In his Nov. 2, 1788 letter to Turberville, Madison said he "trembled" at the prospect of a 2nd convention; and if there were an Article V convention: "the most violent partizans", and "individuals of insidious views" would strive to be delegates and would have "a dangerous opportunity of sapping the very foundations of the fabric" of our Country.
 - In Federalist No. 85 (last para), Hamilton said he "dreads" the consequences of another convention because the enemies of the Constitution want to get rid of it.
 - Justice Arthur Goldberg said in his 1986 editorial in the Miami Herald that "it cannot be denied that" the Philadelphia convention of 1787 "broke every restraint intended to limit its power and agenda," and "any attempt at limiting the agenda [at an Article V convention] would almost certainly be unenforceable."
 - Chief Justice Warren Burger said in his June 1988 letter to Phyllis Schlafly: "...there is no effective way to limit or muzzle the actions of a Constitutional Convention... After a Convention is convened, it will be too late to stop the Convention if we don't like its agenda... A new Convention could plunge our Nation into constitutional confusion and confrontation at every turn..."
 - Justice Scalia said on April 17, 2014, "I certainly would not want a Constitutional Convention. I mean whoa. Who knows what would come out of that?"
 - Other eminent legal scholars have said the same – Neither the States nor Congress can control the Delegates.
- Yet convention supporters ridicule these warnings as "fear mongering." And they quote law professor Scalia in 1979, before his decades of experience as a Supreme Court Justice, to "prove" otherwise. Ask yourself, "Is it possible that James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Chief Justice Jay, Justice Goldberg, Chief Justice Burger and Justice Scalia understood something about the plenipotentiary powers of Delegates to an Article V convention which the pro-convention lobby hasn't grasped"?