

Chair Hoyle and members of the committee:

Both HJM 2 and HJM 4 are grounded in the presenters disapproval of a U.S. Supreme Court decision which they claim “*removed restrictions on amounts of independent political spending.*” They further contend that “*these decisions have permitted the wealthy to buy enormous influence in our government through uncontrolled political spending.*” Both bills contain additional vague references which, when considered singularly, may garner support of a wide audience. For example, many people would be in agreement that it is harmful for our system of self-governance to allow “*the wealthy to buy enormous influence in our government through uncontrolled political spending*”. Yet the authors and promoters of such ideas to amend our Constitution do not protest such influence cast by names such as Bloomberg and Soros. We saw Bloomberg money injected into at least one key legislative race here in Oregon last November.

Neither HJM 2 nor HJM 4 present a clearly defined and specifically worded amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Rather, they request the Oregon Legislature to petition the U.S. Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing several amendments to the Constitution, the details of which we must blindly place our trust in. This presents an unacceptable risk to the freedoms of all Americans. I submit that if the presenters of these measures are sincere in their rhetoric, they would more successfully achieve their goals by demanding Congress adhere to its duties as enumerated in Article I Section 8, and leave all other duties and authority to the states, as directed by the Tenth Amendment. These actions would go a long way toward curtailing the influence of special interests.

I ask the House Rules committee reject HJM 2 and HJM 4. Thank you.

Allan Page

18843 NE Hoyt Ct.
Portland, 97230