

Judi Caler

March 18, 2026

### **Written Testimony in Support of HJR 41—Rescission of Alaska’s Art. V Convention Applications**

To Rep. Andrew Gray, Chair; Rep. Chuck Kopp, Vice Chair; and Members of the House Judiciary Committee:

My name is Judi Caler, and I’m President of Citizens Against an Article V Convention. Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony.

All applications asking Congress to call a convention under Article V jeopardize our federal Constitution and endanger our Liberty.

Convention Delegates, as sovereign Representatives of “We the People,” have the inherent Right “to alter or to abolish” our “Form of Government,” as recognized by the Declaration of Independence, para 2. And we don’t know who those Delegates would be or how they’d be selected.

In order to respond to the “runaway convention” objection and pass their applications in Alaska and in every other State, the convention lobby told state legislators *then*, and they tell you *now*, that a convention would be limited by the scope of the state application, and that it would be controlled from start to finish by State Legislatures. [But that isn’t true.](#)

Moreover, since 2022 the convention lobby has been simultaneously pushing congressional Calls, like [H.CON.RES.15](#), that don’t pretend to be limited, with ratification by state conventions—not State Legislatures. If passed, the proposed Call would validate and combine all applications *ever passed on any national issue* to meet the 34-state threshold and trigger an unlimited convention. The very existence of [H.CON.RES.15](#) proves duplicity and empty promises on the part of the Convention Lobby.

The Convention Lobby strategy, which had already begun, was announced in [THIS ARTICLE](#) (2020) by convention operatives with ties to both the Balanced Budget Amendment (BBA) and the Convention of States (COS) organizations. And they admit that many of their own scholars don’t believe that Congress has the authority to call a *limited* convention!

***But if they had told legislators the truth, States wouldn't have passed their applications.***

[The momentum today is for states rescinding—not passing](#)—applications. There have been 13 States that have rescinded all their applications in just the past 9-1/2 years, including 4 in 2025; meanwhile COS has claimed only one state in the past 4 years, and the BBA crowd has claimed only one state in over 8 years! If Alaska rescinds all its applications, there would be 18 States

today with no active applications whatsoever. Logically, that would leave only 32 states for Congress to count—effectively blocking the path to the 34-state threshold!

Please defend our Constitution by voting **“YES” to Support HJR 41.**

Thank you for your consideration.

## Dylan Hitchcock-Lopez

---

**From:** Lisa Roulet [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 18, 2026 6:52 AM  
**To:** House Judiciary  
**Subject:** Written Testimony: "Yes" vote urged on HJR 41

Dear Rep. Gray, Chair; Rep. Kopp, Vice Chair; and Members of the House Judiciary Committee:

I am writing to summarize some essential facts about the dangers of an Article V Convention, and to **urge you to vote "Yes" on HJR 41**, in favor of rescinding Alaska's prior applications for an Article V Convention.

Two former Supreme Court Justices and the primary author of the Constitution, James Madison, have sounded the alarm about the profound dangers of triggering an Article V Convention. Madison rejected all efforts to trigger one in his day. Likewise, the former **Supreme Court Justices encouraged state legislators to rescind their applications for an Article V Convention.**

- “...I am glad to see states rescinding their previous resolutions requesting a **Convention.**” “**Whatever gain** might be hoped for from a new Constitutional Convention **could not be worth the risk involved.**” - Former Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren Burger
- “In those state legislatures that have previously petitioned for a convention, I propose that those petitions be considered and withdrawn.” **An Article V Convention is a "profound threat" and a "dangerous course". "There is nothing in Article V that prevents a convention from making wholesale changes to our Constitution and Bill of Rights."** - Former Supreme Court Justice Goldberg

**No one can guarantee that an Article V Convention would be limited,** despite attempts by state legislatures through limiting language in their resolutions.

- “**Proponents of a convention may offer assurances that it can be limited to a single issue** by saying that the state legislatures have called a convention for the ‘sole and express purpose’ of drafting a balanced budget amendment...Any claim that Congress could, by statute, limit a convention’s agenda is **pure speculation**, and **contrary to a historic precedent.** Such ‘procedures legislation’ **might well be unconstitutional** and would **almost certainly be unenforceable.**” - former Supreme Court Justice Goldberg

[Over a dozen highly credentialed legal experts agree](#) that no one can guarantee that a Convention would be limited.

**All our rights would be in jeopardy at an Article V Convention.** It would jeopardize both our Constitution and our Republic.

- An Article V Convention would "challeng[e]" the Constitution's "very existence." - former Supreme Court Chief Justice Burger
- "There is nothing in Article V that prevents a convention from making **wholesale changes to our Constitution and Bill of Rights.**" - former Supreme Court Justice Goldberg

**This is a dangerous time to trigger an Article V Convention.**

- "At present the public mind is neither sufficiently cool nor sufficiently informed for so delicate an operation." - James Madison, who rejected all efforts to trigger an Article V Convention in his day.
- "[Triggering an Article V] Constitutional Convention is a **horrible idea. This is not a good century** to write a constitution." - Former Supreme Court Justice Scalia, a constitutional originalist.
- **It's clear that billionaires, heavily funded special interest groups, and foreign players** would have their hands in the Article V Convention pie. It's highly likely they would seek to alter our Constitution in their favor.

Two rights that would likely be at heightened risk of "reinterpretation" if an Article V Convention were triggered are Free Speech and the Right to Bear Arms:

- "**Free speech is hanging by a thread globally**...The establishment is desperate to either shut it down or censor it..." Michael Shellenberger, a top expert free speech suppression
- "A poll this year found nearly 1 in 3 Americans now **believe the First Amendment goes too far.**" ([The New 'Ministries of Truth'...](#))
- "This anti-free speech movement is the most sophisticated, largest, and global movement we've ever faced." [Jonathan Turley](#)
- "There's **no guarantee to Free Speech** on 'misinformation' or 'hate speech' and especially around our democracy." [Tim Walz](#), 2024 Vice Presidential Candidate
- **The Second Amendment would be under attack:** "Let's get to the heart of it. We know that that is where our colleagues wish to go [**limit all firearms**] because that's been stated any number of times over the last several decades...That's the reality." - [Rep Chip Roy](#)

The ratification process is **not a sufficient safeguard at an Article V Convention**, especially given historic precedent. Delegates to the 1787 Constitutional Convention **went rogue**. They were sent to propose amendments to the existing constitution (the Articles of Confederation) but ended up writing a new Constitution. **States had believed that they were fully in control** when they sent delegates to propose amendments in 1787. But the **constitutional guarantee** that no changes would be made unless all states approved them was **not honored**. North Carolina and Rhode Island **faced being kicked out of the Union** and **legally classified as "foreigners"** unless they ratified it.

- North Carolina Gov. Samuel Johnston, regarding the consequences of not ratifying the Constitution: "In my humble opinion, **we shall be entirely out of the Union**, and can be considered only as a **foreign power**."
- **Vice President John Adams warned:** "If the [Rhode Island] Convention should reject the Constitution or adjourn without adopting it Congress will probably find it **necessary to treat them as they are, as Foreigners**, and extend all the laws to them as such."

A Further Consideration to Vote "Yes" on HJR 41:

**How do you feel about our current political landscape?** If an Article V Convention is triggered, **the safety seal would be removed from our U.S. Constitution and our rights would become exposed and vulnerable.**

**Would the majority of delegates to an Article V Convention be fierce lovers of liberty?** Would they stand firm and **resist all pressure to dial back our rights?**

I hope this email has been helpful. If you believe, as I do, that **we cannot trust that delegates to an Article V Convention would fiercely safeguard our rights, and since no one can guarantee that it would be a limited Convention, I urge you to vote "Yes" on HJR 41**, to allow the House to discuss rescinding all prior applications for an Article V Convention.

Thank you,

Lisa Roulet  


## Dylan Hitchcock-Lopez

---

**From:** Judith Stahl [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 17, 2026 6:46 PM  
**To:** House Judiciary  
**Subject:** Written Testimony in Support of HJR 41

Rep. Andrew Gray, Chair; Rep. Chuck Kopp, Vice Chair; and members of the House Judiciary Committee;

I urge you to vote YES in committee on HJR 41 to RESCIND ALL of AK's applications for an Article V Constitutional Convention.

Applications include such topics as balancing the budget, term limits, restraining government overreach, etc. Some of these issues may have merit but ANY reason for a Constitutional Convention (Con-Con) should not be supported as it would bring us closer to the 2/3 (34 states) necessary for Congress to call a convention.

Article V does not specify that all of the applications for a convention need to be on the same issue. In fact, there has now been a bill [introduced.in](#) Congress to have a convention by aggregating applications from various topics some going back to those still on the books from the 1800s! AK should not be a state that puts the number up to 34. It is getting close.

An Article V convention allows amendments which would come from all points on the political spectrum and it is likely that violent street-level demonstrations about proposed changes could cause enough havoc to make the country ungovernable without federal military intervention.

A convention could result in unwelcome or dangerous changes to our Constitution limiting our rights and freedoms or even result in an entire re-write of it. The risk is just too great.

Rescinding these applications will lower the risk and help save our Constitution.  
Vote YES on HJR 41. Thank you!

Judy Stahl, [REDACTED], Evanston, WY 82930

Re: **Support HJR 41**, Rescind Reqs. for Constitution Convention

To: Rep. Andrew Gray, Chair; Rep. Chuck Kopp, Vice Chair; and Members of the House  
Judiciary Committee

Convention supporters love to say the Framers put the Art V convention route in the Constitution for us to use but they fail to consider that we could also double our national debt and go to war with Canada tomorrow. My point is that just because the Constitution allows for something, like doubling our national debt, does not mean we should do it! Or that now is the time to do it, like going to war with Canada.

Laws work when violators of them are held accountable. That's why we have law enforcement, courts and jails. We the People are not doing our jobs. We don't know the rules and demand they are followed. Scoundrels are not being held accountable. And new words on a piece of paper cannot enforce themselves and do not change the hearts and minds of scoundrels. That's why the Framers never said to use the convention route to control the reality of this day.

All the factions of pro conventioners overlap ([here](#), [here](#) and [here](#)) They have all repeated the same incorrect information regarding passed applications. Historical facts prove them wrong. <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See [CHART](#). Plus, COS lobbyist, Regional [Director David Schneider](#) has written, "Every previous attempt to initiate an Article V Convention has always moved Congress to act in the passage of amendments to appease the states and alleviate the concerns of the time." Article "[David Schneider: Trust the Constitution to save the republic](#)" published on the Convention of States website. Sixth paragraph [here](#).

The reason why the convention route of Article V was left unlimited in the Constitution is because the Founding Fathers originally intended it to provide a way for future Americans, if ever the need should arise, *to alter or abolish the current form of government and replace it with a new form of government and Constitution* as stated in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence:

...That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government...

Because of this inherent right of the sovereign people, an Article V convention cannot be limited, otherwise it would never succeed in empowering the people to make the necessary changes in the Constitution (without bloody civil war), in case the government should ever become oppressive due to defects in the Constitution.

We are not a democracy that follows what's trendy, or in this case, what is misleading and exaggerated as being popular. In our wonderful Constitutional Republic, we trust our elected agents to be well- informed and make the best decisions for us that are within our rules. If you have any doubts about the Art V convention route, **you must vote “yes” to support recession.**

Thank you,

Lynette Indiana

## TESTIMONY OF ELLEN HORTON

### House Judiciary Committee

#### **SUPPORT FOR HJR 41 — March 18, 2026**

Rep. Andrew Gray, Chair; Rep. Chuck Kopp, Vice-Chair, and members of the House Judiciary Committee, I appreciate this opportunity to express my support for JHJR 41.

Article V of the *Constitution of the United States* clearly places Congress in charge of all aspects of a constitutional convention for amending the document. The first option presented in the amendment, the congressional method, was safely implemented twenty-seven times in our nation's history. This experience demonstrates that, should a mistake be made in amending, the matter can safely be remedied, as evidenced by Amendment XVIII's nullification by the passage of Amendment XXI with no resulting damage to the character of our Constitutional protection of State rights.

Under the convention method of amendment, there are no assurances of state protection. Other than the application process and the ratification process, no other input from the states is guaranteed. The document gives no assurance that the states will have a voice in deciding who will represent our state in convention, whether or not term limits will be addressed, in deciding how the convention will be structured, what amendments are to be weighed, nor the number of proposed amendments to be considered.

I will thank you for your YES vote on HJR 41 to rescind all applications for a constitutional convention for amendment.