



To: Members of the House Judiciary Committee

From: Joelle Hall, President of the Alaska AFL-CIO

Date: March 5, 2026

Subject: HJR 41 - (RESCIND REQS. FOR CONSTITUTION CONVENTION)

The Alaska AFL-CIO supports HJR 41 on the following grounds:

Lack of Convention Rules and Guardrails: There are no rules governing constitutional conventions. A convention would be an unpredictable Pandora's Box. Such a convention could threaten hard-won civil rights, workers' rights, and undermine basic rights extended throughout history as our nation strove to deliver on the promise of a democracy that works for everyone.

Influence of Special Interests: An Article V convention would open the Constitution to revisions, and unknown guardrails could give special interests and the billionaire class to re-write the rules governing our system of government and economy. Many of these special interests have already used our system of government to rig the economy and attack working people and organized labor.

Possibility of unequal representation: It is unclear how states would choose delegates to a convention, how states and citizens would be represented in a convention, and who would ultimately get to vote on items raised in a convention. As a state with a small population and little influence, Alaska would be at a unique risk of being sidelined in a convention. Alaskans' unique needs and wants could go unheard and ignored.

The National AFL-CIO opposes an Article V Constitutional Convention: Our national organization, of which the Alaskan AFL-CIO is affiliated, [signed a letter in opposition](#). The letter includes quotes from multiple former Supreme Court justices and scholars who warn of the potential dangers and the lack of need for an Article V Constitutional Convention. The AFL-CIO signed the letter with dozens of reputable organizations doing important advocacy work for different causes and demographics.



Holding Power Accountable

March 16, 2026

Representative Calvin Schrage
Representative Andrew Gray
State Capitol Room 410 and 118
Juneau AK, 99801

RE: House Joint Resolution 41 (Schrage) – Rescind Requests for Constitution Convention Resolution

Dear Representatives Schrage and Gray,

On behalf of Common Cause, I write to **support House Joint Resolution 41**, the Rescind Requests for Constitution Convention, by Representative Schrage. This measure rescinds all previous calls for an Article V Constitutional Convention by the state of Alaska.

Common Cause is a nonpartisan, grassroots organization dedicated to strengthening the values of American democracy. For more than five decades, we have worked to create an open, honest, and accountable government that serves the public interest and empowers all people to make their voices heard in the political process. Common Cause's 30 state chapters and 1.5 million members have helped to pass hundreds of pro-democracy reforms at the national, state, and local levels to help elevate the voices of everyday Americans.

Our Constitution has endured for 234 years not because it is perfect, but because it is a constant work in progress. Despite its famous first three words "We the People," the Constitution long excluded the very people who make up the backbone of our nation. It excluded those whose ancestors were brought here in chains and whose descendants were counted as three-fifths of a person in the very charter that promised the "blessings of liberty." At our founding, it was only white, property-owning men who had the freedom to vote, the freedom that is preservative of all rights.

Yet through the hard work of generations of our fellow Americans, our Constitution has gradually expanded to protect some of our most cherished rights, expand freedom, protect equality, and make our Union more perfect.

It has been improved through the amendment process, including the Bill of Rights, the Fourteenth Amendment, and the equal protection of the laws. There is yet a long way to go.

Pursuant to Article V, the Constitution has been amended 27 times in our history.

For the entirety of the Constitution's existence, each time we have amended it, Congress has sent proposed amendments to the states after it passed them by two-thirds of the House and Senate. This process provides certainty and predictability to the process of amending our founding charter.

The other way to amend the Constitution is one that scholars, jurists, and others across the ideological spectrum have considered a dangerous path, for good reason. This alternative process would require Congress to convene a constitutional convention if two-thirds of the states petition Congress to do so.

There are at least three reasons why convening a constitutional convention is a bad idea:

First, even if it is purportedly called to address a single issue, there are no rules to limit the scope of a constitutional convention to protect us from big, permanent changes to our constitutional rights.

Second, there is an extraordinary risk that secretive wealthy special interests – the same ones that pump millions of dark money into our elections – will use a constitutional convention to rig the rules in their favor and take power from the people.

And third, it puts at grave risk the rights and liberties that are enshrined in the Constitution.

There are no rules, and it is unclear how any rules would be enforced.

There are no rules to protect Americans from huge changes to their constitutional rights that a convention could undertake. Everything from our freedom to vote to our right to free speech would be up for debate and a total rewrite. Such a risky, untested system would enable wealthy special interests to easily rig and write the rules against the American people.

Article V provides no rules or guidance about how a convention would work, what rules would govern, how legal disputes would be settled, how the American people would be represented, and how to limit the influence of special interests at a convention that would rewrite our founding charter.

Consider the following questions that Professor Tribe asked about a constitutional convention:

1. How will Congress add up the Article V applications?
2. Can Congress and the states constrain the convention's mandate based on those applications?
3. May the convention propose amendments other than those it was called to consider?
4. May Congress prescribe rules for the convention, or limit its powers in any way?
5. May the convention set its own rules, independent of Article V, for how amendments that it proposes may be ratified?
6. Are the states to be equally represented, or does the one-person, one-vote principle apply? What about the District of Columbia? Do the citizens of the District have a role in a convention?
7. Could delegates be bound in advance by legislation or referendum to propose amendments or vote in a particular way?
8. Could the convention propose amendments by a simple majority, or require a supermajority of two-thirds?
9. If each state gets one convention vote, must delegates representing a majority of the population nonetheless vote for an amendment for it to get proposed?

Because there are no answers to these questions, now is not the time to experiment with the Constitution.

Simply put, there are no guardrails in place to ensure an orderly course for a constitutional convention. 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 our economy.

Any convention, regardless of its stated purpose, runs the risk of becoming a runaway convention. Nothing constrains the convention to only consider the issues originally proposed in a state's call for a convention. There is no saying what could happen to any of our rights or what could be traded in an exchange between special interests, who will most definitely have their hands in the process.

In sum, there is no prediction on what could happen and far too many open-ended questions for this to be a good idea.

A constitutional convention would put our rights at risk at a time of significant distrust in institutions.

Trust in government is at near record lows. While a constitutional convention is a route authorized by our Constitution, there are deep disagreements over how a convention would work, who would write its rules, how those rules would be enforced, and how such a convention could be manipulated by wealthy special interests and others who have already shown a willingness to stack the deck against the people.

When the stakes are as high as they are in our country and at this moment in history, too many people would question the legitimacy of whatever came out of the convention.

This would invite constitutional chaos and crisis.

All of our constitutional rights and liberties would be on the table and up for debate. Many of the proponents of a convention want to repeal the progress we have made over the last century that are already under attack—racial justice, access to healthcare, reproductive freedom, climate justice, the freedom to vote, and the right to marry who we love to name just a few.

Thank you for considering our sponsorship and support for this important resolution.

Respectfully,

Viki Harrison
Policy Director, Civil Rights & Civil Liberties
Common Cause

[REDACTED]

From: publiushuldah [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 11:25 AM
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Written Testimony in support of HJR 41 to Rescind Alaska's Applications to Congress for a Convention

Representative Andrew Gray, Chair; Representative Chuck Kopp, Vice Chair; and Honorable Members of the House Judiciary Committee:

Nothing the pro-convention lobbyists have told Legislators about the Article V Convention process is True.

The forces who are pouring hundreds of millions of dollars into getting a Convention don't want Amendments to our Constitution - *they want a Convention so they can replace our Constitution*. New Constitutions are already prepared and waiting in the wings for a Convention. [Our federal Convention of 1787, which was called by the Resolution of Feb. 21, 1787 of the Continental Congress "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation" resulted in a new Constitution](#) which had a new and easier mode of ratification. That is our only precedent for a Convention addressing our federal Constitution.

1. The Convention provided for at Article V, US Constitution, is not a "convention of states". That term is a marketing gimmick used to create the false belief that the States control the Convention. It's false because **Article V** grants *to Congress* the power to call the Convention; and **Article I, Section 8, last clause**, grants *to Congress* the power to make all laws necessary and proper to exercise its power to call the Convention.

The only power State Legislatures have respecting a Convention is to "apply" to *Congress* for *Congress* to call the Convention - and once the requisite number of States have applied, the States have nothing more to do with the Convention. It's a *federal* Convention called by the *federal* government for the *federal* purpose of addressing our *federal* Constitution - and *nothing in the Constitution requires Congress to permit States to participate in the Convention*.

Congress recognizes that **it** has the power to determine the number and selection process for Delegates: See [State Legislatures have no power to select & control Delegates to an Article V Convention](#). *We won't know who the Delegates are until after Congress announces the number & selection process for Delegates & Delegates have been selected in the manner prescribed by Congress*. **Thus, any pretended delegate selection and control bill is a sham.**

2. An Article V Convention is, and has always been, about getting a new Constitution:

- Four US Supreme Court Justices (2 Conservatives & 2 Liberals), Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and other legal scholars warn that a convention cannot be controlled: See [Brilliant Men](#).

- James Madison also warned that those who secretly wish for a new Constitution would push for a Convention under the pretext of getting Amendments. See endnote 3 of [George Mason never said it](#).
- [A COS Board Member, Law Professor Robert P. George, has already co-authored a new Constitution](#) which grants massive new powers to a new federal government.
- Read [here](#) about the proposed Constitution for The New Socialist Republic in North America. It was prepared by The Revolutionary Communist Party, USA. [Here](#) is the text of their Constitution.
- Read [here](#) of the Constitution 2020 movement funded by George Soros and supported by Marxist law Professors. They want a Marxist Constitution for the United States.
- Read [here](#) the globalist Council on Foreign Relations' Task Force Report on the North American Union. Under this scheme, Canada, the United States, and Mexico are to be integrated politically and a Parliament & a militarized and unified police force is to be set up over the three countries. The globalists need a new Constitution before they can move the United States into the North American Union.
- The National Constitution Center's *Constitution Drafting Project* has released three proposed new Constitutions. You can read them [here](#). These proposed Constitutions would transfer massive new powers to the new federal government. The National Constitution Center is a quasi-official branch of the federal government - its website address is <https://www.usa.gov/agencies/national-constitution-center> *There are forces within the US government which want a new Constitution.....*

3. A new Constitution will have its own mode of ratification. E.g., the proposed [Constitution for the Newstates of America](#) is ratified by a Referendum called by the President (Article XII, Section 1). The States don't vote on it - they are dissolved and replaced by regional governments answerable to the new national government. Whoever controls the voting machines will determine the outcome.

US Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren Burger described this proposed Constitution in [his letter of April 8, 1986 to Phyllis Schlafly of Eagle Forum](#). Note that in his last paragraph, Justice Burger refers to the professors who "would like to abolish the states, and reorganize the federal structure along the lines of the division of circuits for the Federal Judicial system, or even on a more rigid regional basis".

4. There are real solutions for our problems: States must do as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, & Alexander Hamilton advised: [refuse to submit to unconstitutional acts of the federal government](#). And stop taking federal funds to participate in unconstitutional federal programs.

Please take the above to heart and **support HJR 41 to rescind** the Applications for a Convention Alaska already sent to Congress.

At your service,
Joanna Martin, J.D.