Author: Peter Rykowski
Date: February 12, 2026



Stop Wyoming Federal Constitutional Convention Resolution SJ 5

URGENT: COS Con-Con resolution SJ 5 passed the state Senate by a 19-12 vote, sending it to the House for consideration. *Contact your state representative, and urge him or her to oppose this dangerous resolution.*

Wyoming lawmakers are seeking to pass a resolution applying to Congress to "call a Convention for proposing Amendments," under Article V of the U.S. Constitution, otherwise known as a federal constitutional convention (Con-Con) or "convention of states," as some erroneously refer to it.

Senate Joint Resolution No. SJ0005 (SJ 5) follows the wording of Mark Meckler's Convention of States (COS) Project application, urging Congress to call a convention to propose amendments "that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government and limit the terms of office for federal officials and members of Congress."

SJ 5 claims it is "limited to" their listed topics. However, ***any Article V 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.

Article V of the Constitution is also silent about who the delegates to such a convention would be and they would be selected. However, ***assuming that the state legislatures would choose the delegates to an Article V constitutional convention, what kind of delegates would Wyoming send to such a convention? Constitutionalist conservatives or RINO moderates and liberals?***

In a radio interview on *Cowboy State Politics with David Iverson*, Congresswoman Harriet Hageman (R-Wyo.)

echoed the same concern:

> I'm not reflecting on anybody in the in the House or the Senate right now … but we've had people in previous years that I vehemently disagree with. They may have an 'R' behind their name but I vehemently disagree with them on their policies, their positions, and their viewpoint of how Wyoming should be governed. Yet, had we had a constitutional convention when they were in positions of power, they most likely would have been the ones representing the state of Wyoming in that process.

During the same interview, Rep. Hageman said of a constitutional convention:

> Part of the reason that people want to have a constitutional convention is they don't believe that we are adhering to our existing Constitution. And my view of it is how about if we enforce the Constitution as it currently exists and 95 or 98 percent of your concerns would go away…. I don't see how there are constraints that that would not have result in a runaway convention.

Hageman concluded, "Simply changing the Constitution isn't going to force these people to comply. We need to force them to comply with what we already have."

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).

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 Wyoming 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 SJ 5 and all other pro-Article V convention resolutions, and to instead consider nullification as a safe and constitutional means to limit government.**

Congresswoman Harriet Hageman on Stopping a Con-Con

Rep. Hageman: Article V Con-Con is Dangerous!