



Statement of Professor Neil H. Coqan

I agree almost entirely with the foregoing memorandum.

My understanding of the Federal Convention is that it is a general convention; that neither the Congress nor the States may limit the amendments to be considered and proposed by the Convention; that the Convention may be controlled in subject matter only by itself and by the people, the latter through the ratification process. My understanding is further that the States and Congress may suggest amendments and the people give instructions, but that such suggestions and instructions are not binding. Thus, I believe that should the Congress receive thirty-four applications that clearly and convincingly are read as applications for a general convention (whether or not accompanied by suggested amendments), then Congress must call a Federal Convention.

While it is plainly appropriate to examine the traditional historical sources -- text, debates, papers and pamphlets, correspondence and diaries -- it is plain too that these sources must be examined, and other sources chosen, within the context of our evolving theory of government. As I understand that theory, the Federal Convention is the people by delegates assembled, convened to consider and possibly propose changes in our fundamental structures and relationships -- indeed, in our theory of government itself --, and controlled only by the people and certainly not by other bodies the tasks and views of which may disqualify them from fundamental change and which themselves may be the subjects and objects of fundamental change.