

Submitter: Richard Fobes  
On Behalf Of: the VoteFair guy  
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB210

Statement of opposition against SB 210

From: Richard Fobes, author of "Ending The Hidden Unfairness In U.S. Elections", and "the VoteFair guy"

Contrary to its stated purpose of protecting election integrity, the long-range purpose of SB 210 is to make it even easier for billionaires and greedy millionaires to control election results.

Expressed in simpler terms, SB 210 is NOT about the circus-like fight between the political RIGHT and political LEFT. Instead it's about the much BIGGER fight between MONEY and VOTES.

In particular, this foolish bill would make it even easier for the biggest campaign contributors to "primary" you, our state legislators, when you don't comply with their requests for yet more ways to steal yet more money from yet more customers.

In case you haven't noticed, billionaires give money to candidates in both parties during the primary election. It's the basis for electing a weak opponent to run against the puppet candidates funded by billionaires. And it's the basis of the "blocking tactic" used to block stronger candidates. (Both of these tactics were demonstrated during the 2008 Democratic primary when money was given to support Barack Obama so that he would block Hillary Clinton from reaching the general election, based on the expectation that a black man could not possibly win the general election.)

This blocking tactic often (but not always, as in 2008) takes advantage of "vote splitting" during primary elections. To defeat this blocking tactic in the future, a second Republican and second Democrat also will reach the general election. (In 2008 both Obama and Clinton could have been on the ballot, along with a second Republican.) These secondary nominees will be the primary candidates who received the second-most votes during their primary. Then, in the general election, ranked choice voting will correctly elect the most popular candidate.

In-person voting would block us from shifting to ranked choice voting. Why? It takes more time for a voter to mark a ranked-choice ballot compared to a single-choice ballot. Partly that's because the list of candidates is longer. Plus, it takes time to look beyond just finding one favorite candidate.

Portland's new mayor and city council were elected using ranked choice voting. Already they have achieved significant success in beginning to solve the homelessness and policing problems that previous mayors and city councilors were unable to resolve. Please protect these election reforms in Portland and Corvallis by opposing SB 201.

Also, in the near future, please copy the success of Portland's use of ranked choice voting to elect Oregon's governor, secretary of state, and attorney general. Measure 117 provided the basic wording for such a bill. Remember that Measure 117 was defeated because voters were waiting to see how well Portland's new election system worked.

SB 210 was written by people who want to cling to the existing, broken election system that makes it so easy for billionaires and greedy millionaires to extort politicians to protect their unethical tax breaks, subsidies, virtual monopolies, and extortion-like legal tactics, all of which drag down Oregon's economy.

I wish the character count in this testimony form would allow me to further explain the link between higher levels of democracy and higher levels of economic prosperity. Instead I'll suggest to policy advisors that you point your browser to:  
[VoteFair\[dot\]org/econ](http://VoteFair.org/econ)

The claim that SB 201 will protect election integrity is a sheepskin that attempts to disguise the wolves who are hungry to steal yet more money from more of their customers, and impose even higher tax burdens on us non-wealthy taxpayers who span both the political "left" and political "right."