



Pacific Green Party of Oregon
PO Box 9
Corvallis, OR 97339
info@pacificgreens.org
(541) 516-6059

March 30, 2021

Pacific Green Party support of HB 3343

We strongly support HB 3343 because in an elegant document, the bill accomplishes the following:

- 1) Addresses both incoming and outgoing expenditures, covering all possible sources
- 2) It proposes limits that are large enough to allow for sufficient financing of successful campaigns
- 3) It addresses good enforcement that can be initiated by citizens
- 4) It provides for clear identification of contributions, political ads and individual expenditures.

The concern that these limits undermine BIPOC candidates and challengers is not borne by research. On the contrary, the Brennan Center and recent races show that such limits support increased participation by a diversity of potential candidates in the electoral process.

Therefore we strongly urge you to adopt HB 3343.

**Sincerely yours
Pacific Green Party**

By contrast, we have submitted the following testimony opposing HB 2680:

HB 2680, while a tiny step in the right direction, includes such large loopholes that it is in effect window dressing.

At this point the only bill that effectively addressed campaign finance reform and meaningful implementation of Measure 107 is HB 3343, which does not have the problems of HB 2680 outlined below.

The following are major concerns regarding HB 2680:

- 1) There is effectively no limit on contributions to/from political parties or caucus committees, particularly since there is no limit to the number of committees that can be created
- 2) There is no limit from candidate committees to/from caucus or party committees.

Because a single donor can donate to many candidates or caucuses, those funds can then be transferred to a particular caucus or committee.

3) The local veto of contribution limits on local candidates clearly runs contrary to the mandate expressed by Oregonians, when 78% of us voted in favor of campaign finance reform.

4) In Multnomah County, we approved contribution limits for small donor committees. HB 2680 allows for a candidate to accept unlimited contributions from small donor political committees.

5) Limiting contributions to a political party committees only “for the purpose of” specified electoral activity is no limit at all.

HB 2680-1 states that contributions limits to political parties only apply to contributions “for the purpose of: (A) Making any direct monetary contribution to a candidate or the principal campaign committee of a candidate for any office; or (B) The dissemination of any communication in support of or in opposition to a clearly identified candidate if the communication is made in coordination with any candidate or the principal campaign committee of any candidate;”

This language effectively sets no limits on contributions to political party committees, as long as the contributor does not specify that the funds are to be used for those purposes.

6) We need to limit donations from membership organizations to donations from residents in Oregon.

HB 2680-1 allows any membership organization to contribute up to \$250 per year per member, regardless of the amount of dues paid by any member and without connecting contributions to actual people.

To cite good governance groups: Under this construction, The National Rifle Association, with 5 million members, could contribute \$1.25 billion to an Oregon small donor committee. Furthermore, anyone could form a new membership organization, advertise it on social media, charge dues of one cent per year, and gather up thousands of members. It could then contribute to small donor committees \$250 times its number of members using money derived from any source in very large contributions.

HB 2680-1 also does not include under the \$250 per person cap the in-kind contributions. This may be read to allow unlimited in-kind contributions from membership organizations to small donor committees.

7) Allowable contributions to and from some entities are abnormally and unjustifiably large.

- Caucus committees: Caucus Committees are allowed to receive \$50,000 per election from any candidate committee (local, state, or federal), meaning between a primary and general election they are each able to receive up to \$100,000 per candidate committee. They are also allowed to contribute \$50,000 per year to any candidate. These limits are much higher than for any other committee and would likely lead to large amounts of money being funneled through caucus Committees.

- Small donor committees: Small donor committees are allowed to make unlimited contributions to candidates. Especially given the membership organization loophole identified previously, this has the potential to shift large giving through a different entity.

7) Enforcement is limited only to the Secretary of State or sometimes the Attorney General. With 78% approval for Measure 107, we demand the right to enforce campaign finance limits. Campaign finance regulations that depend on partisan elected officials enforcement is an invitation for bias or selective enforcement.

8) There must be a limit to self funding by candidates, especially at the end of a campaign

9) There must be very explicit disclosures and tag lines to campaign advertisements, clearly identifying top donors and the source of funding used for the ads. Individual large contributors to a candidate of campaign must clearly be identified.

We want to highlight the difference between HB 2680 and HB 3343 with the following two charts

[Limit Chart of SALINAS HB3343](#) - This is the bill we support: Note how comprehensive it is

[Limit Charts Rayfield bills](#): (HB 2680 is based on HB 2714 presented in 2019) Note the number of loopholes (pink)

Sincerely,



Nathalie Paravicini, ND

Member, State Coordinating Committee

On behalf of PGPOR SCC members

Mary Geddry, Ken Adams, George Hutchinson, Emma Lugo,
Brian Setzler, Suzia Aufderheide, Justin Filip