



PO Box 1606  
Eugene, OR 97440  
Tel: 541 516-6059  
info@pacificgreens.org

May 13, 2021

Testimony on HB 2680-1  
Campaign Contribution limits  
For the Pacific Green Party and its adherents

To members of the Committee and testimony attendees

We, members of the Pacific Green Party, are baffled by the continued effort to make a flawed bill (HB2680) into an effective Campaign Finance Reform vehicle. We are aware of the efforts of multiple good governance organizations who have provided feedback for weeks. The voice of these organizations and that of the vast majority of the Oregon electorate is being ignored.

Considering that

1. Measure 107 received support from 78% of Oregon voters
2. a viable, clear and reasonable bill (House Bill 3343) exists providing sensible limits that allow for effective campaigning
3. HB 3343 already 20+ sponsors – compared to 13 sponsors of HB2680

why are we not starting with HB 3343 instead of trying to fix an unfixable bill?

Why continue working on a flawed process? We have been providing feedback for several weeks and we are going backwards. This is becoming increasingly frustrating.

### **Why is HB 2680 in its current manifestation so flawed and a travesty of transparency?**

Some of the most egregious concerns include:

1) The amendment to exclude the first \$50,000 for each staff allows for numerous staff persons to be deployed in a number of campaigns as there is no limit on the number of staff allowed. Furthermore, there is no specification as to the timeframe to deploy said staff. This would effectively allow an organization to pay for unlimited new personnel at the end of a campaign

⇒ **HB 3343** has clear meaningful limits for money coming on and coming out.

2) Neither corporations, unions nor other organizations are voters or persons. These are legal entities and are not voters. Donations MUST be traceable to individual voters. Donations must be traceable to individual voters in Oregon.

Why are elected representatives not learning from the New York “LLC Loophole” that was eventually closed in 2019?

Any bill that allows donations by legal entities is inherently flawed and will be exploited by those with the means to create unlimited numbers of legal entities.

Money is NOT speech, money is property that is buying speech.

⇒ **HB 3343** provides clear meaningful limits for money received and disbursed.

It meets the expectations expressed by 78% of Oregon voters who voted for Measure 107.

3) The current bill effectively allows almost unlimited contributions from membership organization: up to \$250 per member (including in-kind contributions), regardless of the organizations sources of funds – so national organizations would have an undue influence on Oregon law. This would allow contributions far greater than those of small donor committees, in addition to \$50,000 of paid staff work time with no limits to the number of staff.

It is surprising that the bright representatives and staff working on this bill have not considered these loopholes! It begets mistrust in the process and points to a lack of transparency.

The process is going from bad to worse. It is becoming clear that the purpose of HB 2680 is to pretend to address the desire of the electorate as expressed in the overwhelming support for Measure 107 – but really to meet the needs of moneyed interests, those being unions, businesses or individuals.

⇒ **House Bill 3343** again has clear traceable campaign limits for contributions traceable to actual voters and individuals in Oregon.

4) The amount allowed to/from caucuses is too large and disproportionate. It also does not place a limit on the number of caucuses.

⇒ **House Bill 3343** does not have such discrepancies.

5) There are no effective means for enforcement. In particular, we need a vehicle for citizen-led enforcement (an example is those in the 2016 Multnomah County Measure 26-184 and the 2018 Portland Measure 26-200) and penalties are not a deterrent.

6) There are no provisions banning the earmarking of contributions to political committees. Contributions must be clearly traceable for purposes of meaningful campaign finance reform.

7) "Pecuniary benefit" must also apply to campaign contributions. This provision in Oregon's bribery statute is unacceptable this day in age.

8) Those complying with the campaign contribution limits and public financing of campaigns should have free access to the Voters Pamphlet.

It appears that representatives are trying to accommodate money instead of representing *We the People*, their constituency.

The current process is a clear manifestation of the problem it is pretending to fix: back-door negotiations, lack of transparency and Money Talk.  
It is high time for true leadership and clarity about what you are trying to accomplish.

There is a bill that does what it purports to do: **House Bill 3343**; which should be called the Liz Trojan Bill, honoring the late activist who was instrumental in pressing for electoral reform in Oregon.

House Bill 3343 is clear and reasonable - it is a viable and fair vehicle for meaningful Campaign Finance Reform. 78% of Oregonians have spoken loud and clear: we are watching what you are doing. We are not going to accept a bill like SB2680 which is little more than window-dressing.

Start working seriously on House Bill 3343; it already has over 20 sponsors! This is not a transparent process that inspires confidence in our leadership. This is money talk and backdoor negotiations.

The Pacific Green Party and its adherents strongly oppose HB 2680, before and after amendments. There is a clear alternative with wide support: HB 3343. The process underway to push HB 2680 is an insult to the vast majority of Oregonians

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Nathalie Paravicini'.

Respectfully submitted  
Nathalie Paravicini, ND  
State Coordinating Committee  
Pacific Green Party of Oregon