

May 13, 2010, 11:17am

A red rectangular button with white text that reads "I-Service: Manage Your Subscription By Clicking Here".

## Glidewell Proposes Vote Nationally For Congress

Posted: Thursday, May 13, 2010 9:20 am

By Jeff Arnold

TIMES RECORD • JARNOLD@SWTIMES.COM |

If District 63 state Rep. Frank Glidewell has his way, voters across the country would have a say in who represents Arkansas in Congress.

Glidewell has prepared a draft House Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would allow voters nationwide to cast a ballot indicating their approval or disapproval of the U.S. House and Senate.

These votes would be cast during regular elections for the U.S. House and Senate.

If 75 percent of voters across the nation disapprove of the House, all incumbents who have served at least six terms - including those re-elected in the current election cycle - would be ineligible to serve under Glidewell's proposed amendment.

A subsequent election would be called with the party of the ineligible incumbent selecting a candidate to represent that party in the election.

If the incumbent is an independent, there would be no independent replacement candidate in the subsequent election.

The amendment would also apply to the Senate, with incumbent senators who have served at least three terms being ineligible to serve if 75 percent of the voters across the country disapprove of the performance of the Senate.

Glidewell provided a copy of the draft resolution to the Times Record, which in turn provided it to several constitutional scholars and political experts.

The consensus opinion from those who responded - all by e-mail - was that there is little chance the amendment will be adopted or that a constitutional convention would be convened to consider it.

In his resolution, Glidewell requests Congress call a constitutional convention "on the application of legislatures of two thirds of the several states" to propose the amendment, which then would need to be ratified by three-fourths of the states to be adopted.

Erwin Chereminsky, dean of the University of California at Irvine School of Law, pointed out that a constitutional convention hasn't been called since 1787, when the U.S. Constitution was adopted.

While it is not impossible, Chereminsky said, it was unlikely a constitutional convention will be called.

Norm Ornstein, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, put the likelihood of Glidewell's amendment being adopted at "slim to none," and likened it to a term-limits plan, which takes matters out of the hands of voters with automatic ejection of lawmakers.

"It certainly does not fit our constitutional framework," Ornstein said.

Roger Pilon, director of the Center for Constitutional Studies at the Cato Institute, was entirely dismissive of the proposal.

"This convoluted amendment is not the way to go about addressing the very real problems we have today with runaway government. We need to get back to the principles of the Constitution, not add more layers on top of the document," Pilon said.

Professor Mark Killenbeck, University of Arkansas School of Law, said a cursory review of the proposed amendment appears to be an "indirect and convoluted attempt" to revisit term limits.

Killenbeck said he doesn't follow Arkansas politics, had never heard of Glidewell until contacted by the Times Record and knows nothing of Glidewell's political views or motives. However, if term limits is Glidewell's goal, Killenbeck said it should be pursued directly.

Glidewell did not respond to a message seeking comment.

© Copyright 2010, The Times Record, Fort Smith, AR. Powered by Blox Content Management System from TownNews.com. [Terms of Use | Privacy Policy]