

From: [Rep. Calvin Schrage](#)
To: [Amanda Ndemo](#)
Subject: FW: Vote "YES" on HJR 41 (Rescission of Art. V applications)
Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 1:22:25 PM

From: Liz Capazzi <liz_capazzi@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 12:50 PM
To: Liz Capazzi <liz_capazzi@yahoo.com>
Subject: Vote "YES" on HJR 41 (Rescission of Art. V applications)

Dear Representative,

For more than two centuries we have used the traditional method of amending our Constitution, one amendment at a time, and as a result we have had stability, flexibility and accountability. Unelected delegates to an ART.V Convention of States are free to amend or *abolish* our Constitution.

Please Vote "YES" on HJR 41 (Rescission of Art. V applications).

Thank you.

Liz Capazzi

From: [Rep. Calvin Schrage](#)
To: [Amanda Ndemo](#)
Subject: FW: HJR 41 (RESCISSION OF ARTICLE V APPLICATIONS)
Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 1:22:46 PM

From: John W. Ertelt <johnwertelt@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 12:17 PM
To: John W. Ertelt <johnwertelt@gmail.com>
Subject: HJR 41 (RESCISSION OF ARTICLE V APPLICATIONS)

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE; PLEASE VOTE **YES ON HJR41** AND PUT
THIS ARTICLE V CONVENTION LUNACY, TO BED. THANK YOU!

From: [Erik Gunderson](#)
To: [Amanda Ndemo](#)
Subject: Fw: Please vote NO on HJR 22 and YES on HJR 41
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 2:33:08 PM

Erik Gunderson
Chief of Staff
Office of Rep. Calvin Schrage
(907) 465-4931

From: andy.carver@yahoo.com <andy.carver@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 2:32 PM
Subject: Please vote NO on HJR 22 and YES on HJR 41

Dear Representative,

An Article V convention would put the U.S. Constitution in danger extreme but gratuitous. Indeed, we're talking SO gratuitous, that we know for a fact that the Con-con proponents (at least, all those on the "Right") are **not** stupid enough to be pursuing it for the reasons they advertise.

Rather, they simply want to get their hands on our Constitution! Your oath of office, I would suggest, requires you to frustrate those hopes.

Please vote **NO** on **HJR 22** (application for A5 convention), and **YES** on **HJR 41** (rescinding such applications). Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew H. Carver

From: [Rep. Calvin Schrage](#)
To: [Amanda Ndemo](#)
Subject: FW: Please VOTE YES on HJR 41
Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 1:22:20 PM

From: nrlazear@verizon.net <nrlazear@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 12:30 PM
To: Nelson Lazear <nrlazear@verizon.net>
Subject: Please VOTE YES on HJR 41

Dear Representative,

Please vote YES on HJR 41 to rescind the call for Article V convention. There is no existing legislation that allows a state to control selection or votes of delegates nor is there any way to limit a convention once the required 34 state threshold has been reached. History demonstrated that in 1787 and nothing has changed since then. In 1787 they convened in secret so no oversight would be possible discarded the Articles of Confederation and changed the means of ratification! It can happen again.

Please defend what has served us well for 250 years! The problem is the members of the government not the Constitution!

Respectively,

Nelson Lazear, Ph.D.

From: [Rep. Calvin Schrage](#)
To: [Amanda Ndemo](#)
Subject: FW: Support HJR 41 to Rescind Alaska's Applications for Congress to call a Convention under Article V, US Constitution
Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 1:23:07 PM

From: publiushuldah <publiushuldah@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 11:34 AM
To: ThePubliusHuldah <publiushuldah@gmail.com>
Subject: Support HJR 41 to Rescind Alaska's Applications for Congress to call a Convention under Article V, US Constitution

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 - it's 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.

From: [Erik Gunderson](#)
To: [Amanda Ndemo](#)
Subject: Fw: WHY you should should Vote "YES" on HJR 41 (Rescission of Art. V applications):
Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 9:23:36 AM

For letters of support

Erik Gunderson
Chief of Staff
Office of Rep. Calvin Schrage
(907) 465-4931

From: Kay Causey <restofmyself@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 8:44 AM
To: Kay Causey <restofmyself@aol.com>
Subject: WHY you should should Vote "YES" on HJR 41 (Rescission of Art. V applications):

Dear Representative,

1. The Convention Lobby presents no evidence to support their claim that Congress blinks and proposes their own Amendment when 33 States threaten them with applications. There isn't a shred of evidence to support this claim.
No amendment
2. Congress—not the States—determine **how** the Delegates are selected, and no one knows **who** the Delegates will be or what will happen at a convention.
3. State Legislatures have no power to control Delegates to an Art. V Convention.
4. There's no such thing as a limited convention.
5. Delegates to a convention called by Congress under Art. V would have more power than state legislators and Congress put together. They could rewrite our Constitution with an easier ratification process—like they did in 1787.
6. Don't believe the high-powered lobbyists who tell you that there will *never* be a convention—but that you should vote for the application in order to scare Congress into passing the Amendment itself. That's playing with fire!
7. The lobbyists are telling you what you want to hear, in order to get your vote.

Because of legislators' concerns about a runaway convention, the lobbyists are falsely assuring you that there will never be a convention and that they don't want a convention!

8. One-State/One-Vote and limiting the scope of the convention are empty promises by high-powered lobbyists. According to the Constitution, the only Art. V power granted to State Legislatures is the power to ask Congress to call a convention, period.

9. The subject of the application doesn't matter. The subject is only bait to get your vote—since conventions can't be limited to the subject of the application.

10. This is not the political environment to be having a convention and opening up our Constitution.

11. The Constitution isn't the problem! So amending it isn't the solution.

12. Congress can balance the budget without an Amendment. The budget isn't balanced, because Congress doesn't follow our **current** Constitution.

For these important reasons, please vote FOR rescission !

Thank you for your WISDOM as a Representative ! You KNOW no amendment is worth losing our beloved Constitution!

Sincerely,
Kay Rutledge Causey —direct descendent of John and Edward Rutledge who signed the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence respectively. I add this only to let you know that I had to study the Federalist Papers, anti-Federalist Papers and the constitution since a child.