
Author: Peter Rykowski
Date: January 24, 2026



Stop Article V Con-Con Resolutions in Arizona

URGENT: The Arizona Senate could hold a floor vote any time on Con-Con resolution SCR 1011. *Meanwhile, the House passed companion resolution HCR 2043 by a 33-24 vote, sending it to the Senate and bringing it halfway toward being enacted.* ***Contact your state legislators, and urge them to oppose these dangerous resolutions.***

Members of the Arizona State Legislature are seeking to pass a resolution applying to Congress to "call a convention for proposing an amendment," under Article V of the Constitution, otherwise known as a federal constitutional convention (Con-Con) or "convention of the states."

House Concurrent Resolution 2043 (HCR 2043) and Senate Concurrent Resolution 1011 (SCR 1011) would apply to Congress to call a convention to propose a constitutional amendment "to set a limit on the number of terms a person may be elected as a Member of the [U.S. House and Senate]."

House Bill 2908 (HB 2908) has also been introduced. It is designed to give false assurance that a convention won't get out of control, doing this by ostensibly regulating the appointment and conduct of delegates. Such a bill would be completely useless at preventing a runaway convention — for example, it doesn't regulate delegates from other states, and doesn't prevent delegates from proposing an entirely new constitution (in the 1787 Convention, states also attempted to limit delegates' authority).

Any convention, no matter how well intentioned, could lead to a runaway convention that would reverse many of the Constitution's limitations on government power and interference. In other words, **a Con-Con could accomplish the same goals that many of its advocates claim to be fighting against.** As evidence, both a 2016 and 2023 simulated "Convention of States" resulted in amendments massively increasing the federal government and expanding its spending powers.

Furthermore, **term limits would do nothing to limit the federal government or improve our representation in Congress.** For example, they would throw out the best congressmen along with the worst.

Furthermore, term limits ignore the most serious problems our nation faces, including fiscally-irresponsible policies and lack of adherence to the Constitution. In fact, we already have term limits — elections — while formal ***term limits on the U.S. president or in legislatures such as California, by contrast, have failed to rein in the executive branch of the federal government or the legislative branch of out-of-control state governments, respectively.***

And in 2018, Congressman Thomas Massie (R-Ky.) tweeted:

> I don't support a COS. If my colleagues won't follow the present constitution, why would they follow a new one?

In another tweet on December 30, 2022, Massie correctly noted that:

> Repeal of the [16th and 17th amendments and the Federal Reserve Act] would obviate any need or want for a term limit amendment and a balanced budget amendment.
>
> The document our founders gave us was genius, and we tamper with it at our own peril.

When speaking to your legislators, emphasize the following irrefutable facts about an Article V convention for proposing amendments:

1. There is no constitutional authority for a limited convention.
2. There is no guidance on how delegates would be selected.
3. There is no guidance on who could qualify as a delegate.
4. There is no guidance on how many delegates each state could send.
5. There is no provision for stopping a runaway convention.
6. There is no provision for how rules would be established.
7. There is no provision for how rules would be enforced.
8. There is no role provided for the people to play in the process.
9. There is no power provided for the people to stop a convention once it starts.
10. There is no description of the ratification conventions Congress could choose to call.
11. There are no rules governing the ratification conventions Congress could choose to call.
12. There is no means provided for either the states or the people to challenge Congress's choice of the method of ratification.
13. There is no test provided for a qualifying application submitted by a state.
14. The acceptance by one Congress of a state application for a convention does not bind subsequent Congresses from accepting that application.
15. Application for a convention submitted by one state legislature does not prevent subsequent state legislatures from revoking the previous application.
16. All these issues would be challenged in court and would take years to be decided.
17. The issues to be addressed at a convention to propose amendments would likely be moot by the time the challenges reached the U.S. Supreme Court for final adjudication.
18. If 100 percent of registered voters opposed an amendment proposed by a convention, but the requisite number of state legislatures or ratifying conventions (according to the process determined by Congress for consideration of proposed amendments) supported it, then that amendment would become part of the Constitution regardless of the will of the people.
19. The same scenario is true if a proposed amendment were approved by 100 percent of registered voters but rejected by the ratification conventions or state legislatures (according to the process determined by Congress for consideration of proposed amendments).

The late Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia understood the danger of a constitutional convention. In 2015, Scalia reiterated his opposition to an Article V convention, stating, **"This is not a good century to write a**

constitution." Furthermore, ***what kind of delegates would Arizona send to such a convention? Constitutionalist conservatives or RINO moderates and liberals?***

In 1979, then-U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona correctly warned about an Article V convention:

> If we hold a constitutional convention, every group in the country — majority, minority, middle-of-the-road, left, right, up, down — is going to get its two bits in and we are going to wind up with a constitution that will be so far different from the one we have lived under for 200 years that I doubt that the Republic could continue.

Goldwater considered an Article V Convention as threatening to the continuity of the United States' republican form of government. It would be foolhardy and downright reckless to disregard these and other legitimate concerns.

Additionally, Congressman Andy Biggs has also spoken out against the deceptive efforts for a so-called "Convention of States."

As Rep. Biggs said to *The New American*, "I'm a big believer that it isn't the Constitution that's the problem, it is the people who ignore the Constitution that usurp power and abuse the constitutional power that they ostensibly have."

An Article V convention possesses the inherent power to propose ***any*** changes to the U.S. Constitution, including drafting and proposing an entirely new "modern" (i.e., socialist) constitution. Instead, ***the Arizona Legislature should consider Article VI and nullify unconstitutional laws.***

Furthermore, ***state lawmakers should also consider rescinding any and all previously passed Article V convention applications to Congress, regardless of the desired amendment(s).*** Passing rescission resolutions will help prevent aggregating past Article V convention applications with those from other states to force Congress to call a convention.

Above all, **urge your state representative and senator to oppose HCR 2043, SCR 1011, HB 2908, and all other pro-Article V convention resolutions and to instead consider nullificationas a safe and constitutional means to limit government.**

Congressman Biggs on Why an Article V Convention of States or Con-Con Would Be Dangerous