



URGE THE WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATURE TO:
**RESCIND ALL PREVIOUSLY PASSED
CON-CON APPLICATIONS**



Support Rescinding Washington's Con-Con Applications — Enact SJM 8008 and HJM 4005

URGENT: Rescission resolution SJM 8008 is moving forward in the Washington House of Representatives after passing the state Senate by a 47-1 vote. [Urge your state representative to protect the U.S. Constitution by supporting this important and excellent resolution, along with companion resolution HJM 4005.](#)

Members of the Washington State Legislature are attempting to pass legislation to rescind every live application to Congress calling for a Convention for proposing Amendments, under [Article V](#) of the Constitution, otherwise known as a federal [constitutional convention](#) (Con-Con).

Senate Joint Memorial 8008 ([SJM 8008](#)) is sponsored by Senators Deborah Krishnadasan (D-Gig Harbor) and Jamie Pedersen (D-Seattle), while House Joint Memorial 4005 ([HJM 4005](#)) is sponsored by Representatives Joe Fitzgibbon (D-West Seattle) and Sharlett Mena (D-Tacoma). If passed by the State Legislature, they would rescind all of Washington's Con-Con applications. The resolutions declare:

(1) Although historical records maintained by the State of Washington and the Library of Congress are incomplete and, in some instances, unclear as to the final disposition of legislation passed by the Washington State Legislature to initiate a call to Congress for a constitutional convention, it is reported that the Washington State Legislature has passed several such calls for a constitutional convention, including House Bill No. 90 (chapter 164, Laws of 1901), calling for a plenary convention application with no limitation on subject; House Bill No. 207 (chapter 61, Laws of 1903), calling for a plenary convention that specifically highlights the direct election of United States senators; Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 17 (1909), calling for a limited convention to ban polygamy in the United States Constitution; Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 17 (1911), calling for a limited convention to ban polygamy in the United States Constitution; and House Joint Memorial No. 1 (1963), calling for a limited convention to prohibit federal restraint of the state initiative power to redistrict and remove

The John Birch Society

Author: [Peter Rykowski](#)

Date: January 14, 2025



federal judicial oversight of redistricting; and...

NOW, THEREFORE, The Legislature of the State of Washington does hereby officially rescind, repeal, cancel, nullify, and supersede any and all prior applications by the legislature to the Congress of the United States to call a constitutional convention to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States pursuant to the terms of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, regardless of when and regardless of whether such applications were for a more limited convention to propose one or more amendments regarding one or more specific subjects and purposes or for a general convention to propose an unlimited number of amendments upon an unlimited number of subjects, whether or not the calls are confirmed by historical records maintained by the state or the Library of Congress.

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.

Additionally, in the last years of his life, the late Justice Antonin Scalia stood opposed to an Article V convention. Asked about it in a 2015 interview, he [remarked](#) that **"This is not a good century to write a constitution."** Furthermore, **what kind of delegates would Washington send to such a convention? Constitutionalist conservatives or RINO moderates and liberals?**

On December 9, 2021, constitutionalist U.S. Representative [Thomas Massie](#) (R-Ky.), warning against a Con-Con, [tweeted](#):

Show me a single state where Constitutionals comprise a majority of the state legislature.

At this point in history, an Article V Convention of the States would be a disaster.

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.

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 Washington State Legislature should consider [Article VI](#) and [nullify unconstitutional laws](#).**

Above all, **urge your state representative and senator to support SJM 8008 and HJM 4005, rescind all Article V convention applications, and to [consider nullification](#) as a safe and constitutional means to limit government instead.**