Author: Peter Rykowski
Date: January 12, 2026



Stop Indiana's Unconstitutional Article V "Compact" Bill SB 210

URGENT; IMMEDIATE ACTION NEEDED: By a vote 34 yeas to 11 nays the Indiana Senate passed SB 210, which calls for creating a "compact" for a Article V "convention of states," on January 22, 2026. The bill has been referred to the Indiana House of Representatives, where it is pending further action and final passage. *Call and urge your state representative to oppose this disastrous and unconstitutional bill — SB 210.*

Phone calls are the MOST effective way to contact and influence your legislators. You can call your Indiana state representative over the phone at either of the following three telephone numbers: (317) 232-9600, (800) 382-9842 , or (800) 382-9842. Additionally click the big red "Take Action Now" button above to send an editable, prewritten message to your state legislators, as well as call them.

The Indiana General Assembly is considering a deceptive bill intended to give state legislators false confidence in a disastrous Article V constitutional convention (Con-Con) — a dangerous step toward deceiving them into applying for a convention. ***Please contact your state representative and urge him or her to oppose this bill.***

Senate Bill No. 210 (SB 210) has been introduced by Senator Travis Holdman (R-Markle), who holds a 42% lifetime Freedom Index score. If enacted, it would enter Indiana into a "Compact for a Safe and Equal Convention of States" (making Indiana the first member of said compact), which would ostensibly regulate the conduct of delegates to prevent a runaway convention. A legislative synopsis of the bill reads:

> Article V convention of the states compact. Adopts the compact for a safe and equal convention of the states. Specifies compact requirements. Provides that each state that adopts the compact intends to ensure that the following rules are followed at a convention under Article V of the

> Constitution of the United States: (1) All voting is conducted on the basis of one-state, one-vote. (2) The convention shall not consider any proposed amendment on any topic other than the topics or subjects specifically enumerated in the applications of 2/3 of the several states which formed the basis for the call of the convention.

Not only does this bill seek to put the Constitution at risk of modern revision through a federal constitutional convention, but it seeks to do so via a "compact" of states, along with its own governing commission, to oversea the convention and determine the qualifications of the state delegates or commissioners. ***Such a compact, as well as the notion that each state will have one vote at the requested federal convention to propose amendments, has absolutely ZERO BASIS in the black letter of Article V, the text of which can be read here. Seeing as Article V makes provision for the creation of a "compact" among the states for an Article V convention, SB 210 is blatantly unconstitutional and reckless.***

Furthermore, the 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). The bills would merely create a false sense of security that a convention will not get out of control.

When speaking to your legislators, emphasize a few of 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 convention (according to the process determined by Congress for consideration of proposed amendments) then that amendment would become part of the Constitution regardless of the will of the people.
19. The same scenario is true of a proposed amendment was 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).

Any Article V convention could lead to a runaway convention reversing 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.

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 Indiana 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 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.

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 Indiana General Assembly 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 to oppose SB 210 and all other pro-Article V convention legislation, and instead consider nullification as a safe and constitutional means to limit government.**