



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 1119		DATE: 4/15/2026	
COMMITTEE: General Laws			
TESTIFYING: ☒ IN SUPPORT OF ☐ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: BRETT STERLEY		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: CONVENTION OF STATES ACTION		TITLE: STATE DIRECTOR	
ADDRESS: 2853 E. LAMONTA DR			
CITY: SPRINGFIELD		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65804
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/15/2026 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 1119		DATE: 4/15/2026	
COMMITTEE: General Laws			
TESTIFYING: ☒ IN SUPPORT OF ☐ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: JAN SPALDING		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 4/14/2026 1:39 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

The bill provides a reasonable process to select delegates to a duly called Article V as previously passed by the Missouri legislature. It specifically provides for a process for both the selection of delegates and provision for recall should a delegate deviate from the requirements provided by the joint selection committee nominating the delegates and so protect the interest of all Missourians.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 1119		DATE: 4/15/2026	
COMMITTEE: General Laws			
TESTIFYING: ☒ IN SUPPORT OF ☐ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: ROSENDO MARTINEZ		PHONE NUMBER: 636-866-8222	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: CONVENTION OF STATE		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 22229 CLARK HOLLOW LANE			
CITY: WARRENTON		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63383
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/15/2026 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 1119		DATE: 4/15/2026	
COMMITTEE: General Laws			
TESTIFYING: ☒ IN SUPPORT OF ☐ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ZOE NICHOLSON		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 4/14/2026 6:17 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I am a full and vocal supporter of calling a convention of states to amend our Constitution.

Having said that, Missouri has already voted to pursue an article 5 convention should the other necessary states join.

This bill is about The process for choosing a bipartisan delegation to attend the convention of states when it is finally called.

I encourage the Honorable committee to take part in this process by supporting this bill.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 1119		DATE: 4/15/2026	
COMMITTEE: General Laws			
TESTIFYING: ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ☒ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE C. AC "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF		PHONE NUMBER: 314-440-9000	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: STATE PUBLIC ADVOCACY		TITLE: STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE	
ADDRESS: POST OFFICE BOX #1535			
CITY: O'FALLON		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63366
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/15/2026 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 1119		DATE: 4/15/2026	
COMMITTEE: General Laws			
TESTIFYING: ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ☒ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: KORTNIE HUDDLESTON		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 4/15/2026 11:06 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I urge you to oppose SB 1119 (Trent), which establishes procedures for an Article V Convention. I oppose any attempt to call an Article V Constitutional Convention in the United States or set up procedures for such a call. Throughout the over 230-year history of the United States Constitution, an Article V convention has never been called. The unknowns surrounding a constitutional convention pose an unacceptable risk, particularly in the current polarized political climate. The risks are as follows:

THREAT OF A RUNAWAY CONVENTION: There is nothing in the Constitution to prevent a constitutional convention from being expanded in scope to issues not raised in convention calls passed by the state legislatures, and therefore could lead to a runaway convention.

INFLUENCE OF SPECIAL INTERESTS: An Article V convention would open the Constitution to revisions at a time of extreme gerrymandering and polarization amid unlimited political spending. It could allow special interests and the wealthiest to rewrite the rules governing our system of government.

LACK OF CONVENTION RULES: There are no rules governing constitutional conventions. A convention would be an unpredictable Pandora's Box; the last one, in 1787, resulted in a brand-new Constitution. We risk the possibility that the process would be used to undo hard-won civil rights, civil liberties advances and environmental protections and undermine basic rights extended throughout history.

THREAT OF LEGAL DISPUTES: No judicial, legislative, or executive body would have clear authority to settle disputes about a convention, opening the process to chaos and protracted legal battles that would threaten the functioning of our democracy and economy.

APPLICATION PROCESS UNCERTAINTY: There is no clear process on how Congress or any other governmental body would count and add up Article V applications, or if Congress and the states could restrain the convention's mandate based on those applications.

UNCERTAIN RATIFICATION PROCESS: A convention could try to re-define the ratification process (which currently requires 38 states to approve any new amendments) to make it easier to pass new amendments, including those considered at the convention. This happened in 1787, when the convention changed the threshold necessary for ratification.

Simply put, an Article V constitutional convention is a dangerous and uncontrollable process that would put Americans' constitutional rights up for grabs.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 1119		DATE: 4/15/2026	
COMMITTEE: General Laws			
TESTIFYING: ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ☒ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: MICHAEL DREYER`		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 4/15/2026 11:06 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I urge you to oppose SB 1119 (Trent), which establishes procedures for an Article V Convention. I oppose any attempt to call an Article V Constitutional Convention in the United States or set up procedures for such a call. Throughout the over 230-year history of the United States Constitution, an Article V convention has never been called. The unknowns surrounding a constitutional convention pose an unacceptable risk, particularly in the current polarized political climate. The risks are as follows:

THREAT OF A RUNAWAY CONVENTION: There is nothing in the Constitution to prevent a constitutional convention from being expanded in scope to issues not raised in convention calls passed by the state legislatures, and therefore could lead to a runaway convention.

INFLUENCE OF SPECIAL INTERESTS: An Article V convention would open the Constitution to revisions at a time of extreme gerrymandering and polarization amid unlimited political spending. It could allow special interests and the wealthiest to rewrite the rules governing our system of government.

LACK OF CONVENTION RULES: There are no rules governing constitutional conventions. A convention would be an unpredictable Pandora's Box; the last one, in 1787, resulted in a brand-new Constitution. We risk the possibility that the process would be used to undo hard-won civil rights, civil liberties advances and environmental protections and undermine basic rights extended throughout history.

THREAT OF LEGAL DISPUTES: No judicial, legislative, or executive body would have clear authority to settle disputes about a convention, opening the process to chaos and protracted legal battles that would threaten the functioning of our democracy and economy.

APPLICATION PROCESS UNCERTAINTY: There is no clear process on how Congress or any other governmental body would count and add up Article V applications, or if Congress and the states could restrain the convention's mandate based on those applications.

UNCERTAIN RATIFICATION PROCESS: A convention could try to re-define the ratification process (which currently requires 38 states to approve any new amendments) to make it easier to pass new amendments, including those considered at the convention. This happened in 1787, when the convention changed the threshold necessary for ratification.

Simply put, an Article V constitutional convention is a dangerous and uncontrollable process that would put Americans' constitutional rights up for grabs.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 1119		DATE: 4/15/2026	
COMMITTEE: General Laws			
TESTIFYING: ☐ IN SUPPORT OF ☒ IN OPPOSITION TO ☐ FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: SARAH BERRY		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 4/15/2026 7:03 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

This legislation establishes a framework for selecting, directing, and enforcing the conduct of Missouri's commissioners to an Article V convention.

While it is presented as a procedural safeguard, it relies on assumptions of control that may not exist once a convention is convened.

An Article V convention is a federal constitutional process. There is no clear precedent confirming that a state can bind commissioners, void their votes, or enforce compliance once that process begins.

This creates a structural concern.

The bill builds a centralized system that:
Selects commissioners,
Directs their actions,
Monitors compliance,
And attempts to enforce consequences for deviation.

When viewed in isolation, that may appear administrative.

But when viewed in the broader national context—where multiple states are pursuing similar frameworks—it begins to resemble a coordinated, multi-actor structure designed to influence a single high-stakes constitutional outcome.

This is not an allegation of wrongdoing.

It is a recognition of pattern.

The legislation asserts authority to:

Declare votes “void,”

Restrict scope of participation,

And enforce compliance through recall mechanisms,

Yet it provides no enforceable mechanism to ensure those controls would be recognized at the convention itself.

That means the safeguards outlined in this bill may not function as intended.

Instead, they create the appearance of control without guaranteeing it.

When dealing with potential amendments to the United States Constitution, assumed control is not sufficient.

Let the record reflect:

This legislation relies on uncertain constitutional authority over a federal convention process.

It establishes centralized control mechanisms over participants in a process that may operate beyond state enforcement.

It mirrors coordinated structural patterns that, across multiple jurisdictions, are designed to influence a shared constitutional outcome.

For these reasons, I stand in opposition.

This bill does not eliminate the risks of an Article V convention—it assumes them away.