



THE
UNIVERSITY
OF UTAH

COLLEGE OF LAW
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 8412

November 29, 1983

I here offer brief comments of my own. The proponents are trying to blend the two methods of constitutional change made available by Article Five. They are saying that they do not trust a convention, so they propose to resort to such a body. That is incongruous. They may not have it both ways.

It is to be noted that in the American tradition a constitutional convention is not a constituent assembly -- a body competent both to draft and to adopt a constitution. In such an assembly is reposed sovereignty. The state antecedents of the Federal Constitution of 1787 all contemplated voter ratification. In this context it is not unreasonable to conclude that the members of the 1787 federal convention perceived such a convention to be competent to have the widest range of action in proposing amendments. Of course the very text confirms this by use of the plural "amendments." A convention might propose a single amendment but it would clearly have a wider range.

If what proponents desire is a particular change, the state legislative initiation method is adapted to the purpose. If more general review and possible changes are contemplated the convention method is plainly indicated.

Jefferson B. Fordham