

Article 2 Section 22

"And thou shalt take no gift¹: for the gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous." Exodus 23:8

If we just look at Article II, Section 22 of the Oregon Constitution which covers "Political Campaign Contribution Limitations"², we can see plainly that a "candidate may use or direct only contributions which originate from individuals who at the time of their donation were residents of the electoral district of the public office sought by the candidate".

If we then go to Vote Smart's website, they provide factual, unbiased information on candidates and politicians to ALL Americans. The election records show that Kate Brown³ received \$20,297,458.95 in donations and only \$12,703,984.53 of that was from within the state. By law, she is only allowed to receive 10% which would be \$2,029,745.90. It is clear she accepted \$7,593,429.42 from outside the state. That would mean that Kate is in violation of Article II, Section 22 of the Oregon Constitution which, according to paragraph (2) of that section, means she must "forfeit the office" of the governor and "shall not hold a subsequent elected public office for a period equal to twice the tenure of the office." Also, according to paragraph (4), she is guilty of a "felony" and should be charged and arrested for a "felony".

So, if Kate is not the lawful governor of Oregon because of her violation of Article 2 Section 22, then the OSP should not be doing what she says. They could be arresting her for trespass and impersonating the Governor of Oregon instead of vacating the office she now holds hostage.

What about other legislators?

Why didn't the outspoken Republican Sen. Herman Baertschiger Jr.⁴ tell the people of the Governor's violation of the Article 2 Section 22 which should instantly remove her as a threat to Oregon's economy?

1 The Hebrew word translate gift in Exodus 23:8 is the same word translated bribe in 1 Samuel 8:3.

2 Oregon Constitution, Article II, Section 22: Political Campaign Contribution Limitations

- (1) For purposes of campaigning for an elected public office, a candidate may use or direct only contributions which originate from individuals who at the time of their donation were residents of the electoral district of the public office sought by the candidate, unless the contribution consists of volunteer time, information provided to the candidate, or funding provided by federal, state, or local government for purposes of campaigning for an elected public office.
- (2) Where more than ten percent (10%) of a candidate's total campaign funding is in violation of Section (1), and the candidate is subsequently elected, the elected official shall forfeit the office and shall not hold a subsequent elected public office for a period equal to twice the tenure of the office sought. Where more than ten percent (10%) of a candidate's total campaign funding is in violation of Section (1) and the candidate is not elected, the unelected candidate shall not hold a subsequent elected public office for a period equal to twice the tenure of the office sought.
- (3) A qualified donor (an individual who is a resident within the electoral district of the office sought by the candidate) shall not contribute to a candidate's campaign any restricted contributions of Section (1) received from an unqualified donor for the purpose of contributing to a candidate's campaign for elected public office. An unqualified donor (an entity which is not an individual and who is not a resident of the electoral district of the office sought by the candidate) shall not give any restricted contributions of Section (1) to a qualified donor for the purpose of contributing to a candidate's campaign for elected public office.
- (4) A violation of Section (3) shall be an unclassified felony.

3 Kate Brown's Campaign Finances <https://votesmart.org/candidate/campaign-finance/2990/kate-brown#.XRU2Eo97ms0>

4 Republican Sen. Herman Baertschiger Jr.

As we examined the data at the Vote Smart website we can see that many other legislators and elected officials are also in violation of the very Constitution they have sworn to uphold.

Article II, Section 22 of the Oregon Constitution is the law, especially for elected officials who are sworn to uphold its terms. Despite previous attempts to challenge it in District court in 1995⁵, the Oregon Supreme Court in 1997⁶, and the United States Court of Appeals in 1998⁷ it remains the legal terms by which they may hold office.

The data tells us that Republican Sen. Herman Baertschiger Jr. received a total of \$155,416.91 in contributions. According to the data, he can only accept and use a total of \$15,541.69 from outside of District 2. But data shows In-State funding at \$112,573.75 and the Out-Of-State funding at \$42,750.00. Moreover his "Top Contributors" are sometimes statewide special interest groups. But anyone seeking election may only receive 10% of their donations from outside their district.

Herman is probably a great guy and certainly a courageous one in his fight for what he thinks as right for Oregonians. But everyone running for elected office needs to come clean⁸ and abide by the law if they want to be lawmakers.

"You must abide by the law if you want to be a just lawmaker."

Both sides of the aisle need to be held to the same standard of upholding the Constitution that has given them power even if it means they must vacate their office for a Season. Even Moses knew that.⁹

Not only the governor but also many holding elected office in the State of Oregon need to step down together from those offices to set a good faith example and give their support to law enforcement in Oregon and to the courts to do the right thing and remove those who do not willingly step-down.

That will take courage and sacrifice. They have individually pledged to uphold the Constitution and they now need to mutually pledge to each other "Sacred Honor"¹⁰ to uphold the whole Constitution that created the office of power they sought. It would be a shot for freedom and righteousness heard round the world.

Once the elected officers of the State come clean and do the right thing, it would mean that many of the appointed officials who were chosen by candidates that legally do not have a right to the office they occupy are also holding their offices and taking their pay under false pretenses.

Acquiescence

"Nothing strengthens authority so much as silence." — Leonardo da Vinci

Some citizens who have also discovered this blatant and pervasive violation of the law have been

5 Vannatta v. Keisling, 899 F. Supp. 488 - Dist. Court, D. Oregon 1995

6 Vannatta v. Keisling, 931 P.2d 770 (Or. 1997)

7 Vannatta v. Keisling, 151 F. 3d 1215 - Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit 1998.

8 They need to metaphorically "wipe their feet" lest they slip and break the law they have sworn to uphold.

9 Hebrews 11:24-27 "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompence of the reward. By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible."

10 The final sentence of the Declaration of Independence is a promise among the signers, to "mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our Sacred Honor," and, in fact, many of them and their fellow citizens did sacrifice their lives and fortunes in service to what they knew was right.

advised to "wait". Wait for what?

Every day an elected official refuses to vacate any office they do not have a right to is an "unclassified felony" and compounds their violation. If those who are responsible for the enforcement of the law and the constitution of Oregon fail to uphold its provisions, they also become subject to arrest.

“If I were to remain silent, I'd be guilty of complicity.” — Albert Einstein

State officials are not enforcing their own rules and it is becoming increasingly clear that the citizens of Oregon need to make a "timely" specific objection or they will have "acquiesced" to the lawlessness.

"Acquiescence. In law, acquiescence occurs when a person knowingly stands by without raising any objection to the infringement of his or her rights, while someone else unknowingly and without malice aforethought acts in a manner inconsistent with their rights."¹¹

If citizens wait or delay in objecting, their silence is then assumed to be acquiescence, which will result in "the person whose rights are infringed" losing the ability to make a legal claim against the infringement or may be unable to obtain an injunction against continued infringement. The doctrine of acquiescence infers a form of "permission" that results from silence or passiveness over an extended period of time. Silence in the face of a transgression may result in a loss of a right to make a claim for loss or damage, on the principle of consent inferred from accepting or permitting the wrongful acts without protest or claim.¹²

I would not presume to give any legal advice to the citizens and residents of Oregon and none is implied. But I ponder the wisdom of a recall. Once the people know an office is invalidly occupied by an unwarranted usurpation¹³, any attempt to recall might suggest an "estoppel by acquiescence"¹⁴ since there is no reason to recall someone who has no right to the office.

“There is no need to give an eviction notice to a burglar nor sue for a divorce from a rapist.”

We are only interested in the moral character of the people to abide by their word and keep the other commandments. Of course, it is our desire that their desire is to repent and seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness. What made America great was not its presidents and governors. Whatever greatness we may claim sprang from the people who had a sense of justice and mercy. It was their unswerving willingness to drop what they were doing in a minute to do what was right for their neighbor and their neighbor's children and not just for themselves. It is your choice either to work for the rule of law¹⁵ or to be ruled by the lawless.

11 "Acquiescence". The Free Dictionary. Farlex. Retrieved 28 September 2017.

12 Central Pacific R. Co. v. Alameda County

13 "to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction" by occupying an office you have no right to hold while exercising authority, ruling over and impose taxes upon the people through the power of that office is the definition of "Abuses and Usurpations". The Declaration of Independence

14 A claim of estoppel may arise when one party gives legal notice to a second party of a fact or claim, and the second party fails to challenge or refute that claim within a reasonable time. The second party may be said to have acquiesced to the claim, and thus to be estopped from later challenging it or making a counterclaim based upon the actions of the other party. Estoppel by acquiescence is different from estoppel by laches as acquiescence involves an intentional act of the party who is accused of acquiescence, while laches may result from conduct that is not voluntary.

15 Laws are to be clear, publicized, stable, and just; are applied evenly; and protect fundamental rights of the individual

“Not only will we have to repent for the sins of bad people; but we also will have to repent for the appalling silence of good people.” — Martin Luther King Jr.

If you want your rights back, you need to take your responsibility back and attend to the "weightier matters".¹⁶

You will need to gather together and work together for the sake of righteousness with courage and perseverance. You will need a consistent and unwavering team of dedicated men and women. You will need to support them and protect them. And you will need an honest lawyer or two.

Loophole

“good people do not need laws to tell them to act responsibly, while bad people will find a way around the laws”— Plato

Placing some restriction on politicians when running for office has been accepted in Oregon and most states. It has been considered "necessary and proper" in the past, but in 1975 most of those limitations were removed in Oregon and the amount of donations politicians received began to climb rapidly. The People of Oregon saw what appeared to be bribery of, or at least undue influence upon, politicians because those restrictions were taken off of campaign donations in Oregon.

This is why the people passed Measure 6¹⁷ into law. Article II, Section 22 was the will of the people. It did not restrict the people from supporting a particular candidate or their freedom of speech. It simply made it improper for people not directly represented by an office of government to directly line the pockets of candidates who were running for office by more than 10% of the total donations to the candidate. This had been a very lucrative way in which some candidates could dominate campaign spending or even walk away with large sums of money in their campaign accounts or therefore their pocket. Many politicians and PAC groups were not happy with those restrictions imposed by the people and began to seek ways to get around them.

consistently.

16 Matthew 23:23 "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."

17 17. Measure 6 reads: Be it enacted by the People of Oregon:

SECTION 1. For purposes of campaigning for an elected public office, a candidate may use or direct only contributions which originate from individuals who at the time of their donation were residents of the electoral district of the public office sought by the candidate, unless the contribution consists of volunteer time, information provided to the candidate, or funding provided by the federal, state, or local government for purposes of campaigning for an elected public office.

SECTION 2. Where more than ten percent (10%) of a candidate's total campaign funding is in violation of Section (1), and the candidate is subsequently elected, the elected official shall forfeit the office and shall not hold a subsequent elected public office for a period equal to twice the tenure of the office sought. Where more than ten percent (10%) of a candidate's total campaign funding is in violation of Section (1) and the candidate is not elected, the unelected candidate shall not hold a subsequent elected public office for a period equal to twice the tenure of the office sought.

SECTION 3. A qualified donor (an individual who is a resident within the electoral district of the office sought by the candidate) shall not contribute to a candidate's campaign any restricted contributions of Section (1) received from an unqualified donor for the purpose of contributing to a candidate's campaign for elected public office. An unqualified donor (an entity which is not an individual and who is not a resident of the electoral district of the office sought by the candidate) shall not give any restricted contributions of Section (1) to a qualified donor for the purpose of contributing to a candidate's campaign for elected public office.

SECTION 4. A violation of Section (3) shall be an unclassified felony.

The first attempt to challenge Article II, Section 22 of the Oregon Constitution was in District Court in 1995.^[5]

This challenge was contrived over a matter of a \$100 contribution¹⁸ in order to create the appearance of a loophole in the law that might allow politician to disregard the written Constitution they are sworn to uphold and thumb their noses at what the "people" believed to be and voted into law because they believed it was "proper".

Phil Keisling, in his capacity as Secretary of the State of Oregon, did not properly present the case in District Court for Article II, Section 22. "This lawsuit involves a federal constitutional challenge to Ballot Measures 6 and 9 which amended the Oregon Constitution." This case with-Motions for Summary Judgment on the constitutionality of Measure 6^[17] aloud for the creation of bad case law. It simply granted "Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment" and denied "Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment" and then dismissed the case.

“Summary judgment is a judgment entered by a court for one party and against another party without a full trial.” "Motion for Summary Judgment is a request made by the defendant in a civil action. Through this motion, a defendant asserts that the plaintiff has raised no genuine issue to be tried and asks the judge to rule in favor of the defendant without going to trial."

Because the court was looking at only \$100 being contributed¹⁹ the contributors could seek summary judgment citing Buckley v. Valeo.

This is exactly what the District Court did. Admitting that the contributors were not the "object" of Measure 6 it was clear that preventing them from contributing a \$100 was seen as an injury.²⁰

The "Secretary of State" argued before the Supreme Court of Oregon that "campaign contributions merely are gifts which in themselves are devoid of political expression and, as such, constitute conduct that permissibly may be regulated."

But, of course, this argument was predestined to fail and we can see why only \$100 was at issue in footnote 9 in the Supreme court case of 1997.²¹ Restricting large contributions of a thousand dollars or

18 Plaintiffs Vannatta, Gill, and CTPFS attest that they attempted to make \$100 contributions to an out-of-district candidate but were informed by the candidate that their contributions could not be accepted due to Measure 6. Conversely, Plaintiff Boehnke states that he is soliciting funds for his 1996 campaign and intends to use more than ten percent of his campaign funds from out-of-district contributors.

19 "[3] As stated earlier, during the pendency of this lawsuit, Plaintiffs Vannatta, Gill, and CTPFS attest that they attempted to make \$100 contributions to an out-of-district candidate but were informed by the candidate that their contributions could not be accepted due to Measure 6. Conversely, Plaintiff Boehnke states that he is soliciting funds for his 1996 campaign and intends to use more than ten percent of his campaign funds from out-of-district contributors." Vannatta v. Keisling, 899 F. Supp. 488 - Dist. Court, D. Oregon 1995

20 "Even assuming that these Plaintiffs are not the "objects" of Measure 6, it is well settled that where candidates are prevented from accepting contributions, contributors are also injured: the Supreme Court held in Buckley v. Valeo that contributing money is an act of political association that is protected by the First Amendment because the act of contributing serves to associate the contributor with a candidate as well as with like-minded contributors. 424 U.S. 1, 22, *494 96 S.Ct. 612, 636, 46 L.Ed.2d 659 (1976) (per curiam)."

21 (9)"Buckley concluded that statutes restricting campaign contributions to as little as \$1,000 per contributor did not violate the First Amendment. However, two recent federal circuit court cases have ruled that statutes limiting campaign contributions to as low as \$100 did violate the First Amendment." VANNATTA v. KEISLING Cite as 931 P.2d 770 (Or. 1997) **Find all links at http://www.preparingyou.com/wiki/Article_2_Section_22**

more do "not violate the First Amendment."

Common sense tells you that no one spends tens of thousands of dollars on legal fees so they can give a \$100 to a candidate who has already run for office. The reason for the \$100 donation, the claim of personal injury, and the request for "Summary Judgment" was to create the appearance that Measure 6 was overruled by the court. Nothing can be farther from the truth. The "object" of Measure 6, and therefore the "object" of Article 2 Section 22, is the large contributions that purchase influence, sway campaigns, and corrupt the high office of the land so that elected officials cater to special interest over the interest of the people.

Later, the Oregon Supreme Court addressed the matter in 1997.^[6] This case involved challenges, under various provisions of the Oregon Constitution, to portions of Oregon Laws 1995, chapter 1. The conclusion of this case was only that "Sections 3, 4, 11, 14, 15, 16, and 17 of Measure 9 are declared void." But even the court complained that arguments lacked a genuine attempt to resolve issues that should have been brought before the court.²² The court also made it clear that it was only addressing "facial challenges asserted by the parties." If the parties failed to make proper challenges the court was likely not to address it and stated that they limited their exercise of jurisdiction conferred section 23(1) of Measure 9.

There were restrictions in Oregon before 1975 and the court admitted that many other cases have allowed restrictions on contributions without the violation of the First Amendment.²³

And finally, the United States Court of Appeals examined in 1998 the decision which was only a "Summary Judgment" of the District Court.^[7]

In the matter of Article II, Section 22, the Supreme Court of Oregon made it clear that, due to the "present posture of the federal district court decision, we do not find it necessary to resolve that issue in this case."²⁴ None of these cases actually overturned Article II, Section 22 which remains the legal terms by which politicians may seek and hold office.

The court did recognize that "the principle that elections ultimately are for the people, not the candidates" and that "the people" may "take the legislative power into their own hands to make policy decisions. Candidates and measures exist to seek the approval or permission of the voters, not the other way around... even if there were no Article I, section 8."²⁵

22 "13. No party has separately argued for any partial application of Article n, section 22, to corporations, unions, or PACs. Article II, section 22, has been presented to us only in the form of an "all or nothing" pre-emption. As we have explained, that argument is not well taken." VANNATTA v. KEISLING Cite as 931 P.2d 770 (Or. 1997)

23 "9. Buckley concluded that statutes restricting campaign contributions to as little as \$1,000 per contributor did not violate the First Amendment. However, two recent federal circuit court cases have ruled that statutes limiting campaign contributions to as low as \$100 did violate the First Amendment. See Day v. Holahan, 34 F.3d 1356 (8th Cir.1994), cert. den. - U.S. -, 115 S.Ct. 936, 130 L.Ed.2d 881 (1995); CanJer V. Nixon, 72 F.3d 633 (8th Cir.1995), cert. den. - U.S. -, 116 S.Ct. 2579, 135 L.Ed.2d 1094 (1996) (both so holding)."

24 "Petitioners respond by pointing out that Article II, section 22, has been declared void by a federal district court. See Vannatta v. Keisling, 899 F.Supp. 488 (D.Or.1995) (so holding, declaring that Article II, section 22, violates the First Amendment; accompanying injunction bars Oregon's Secretary of State and Attorney General from "enforcing or attempting to enforce" Article II, section 22).12 Petitioners argue that the effect of that federal court decision is that Article II, section 22, no longer has any legal existence and, therefore, cannot be relied on to define the scope of Article I, section 8. The Petitioners' argument raises an interesting question of federalism, viz., whether a federal district court's declaration that a state's constitutional provision violates the United States Constitution and, therefore, is void prevents the state's courts from relying on that provision later to decide a state constitutional matter. However, given the present posture of the federal district court decision, we do not find it necessary to resolve that issue in this case." VANNATTA v. KEISLING Cite as 931 P.2d 770 (Or. 1997)

25 "the principle that elections ultimately are for the people, not the candidates. That is, elections are designed to permit the

The People share power to "enact laws to support the privilege of free suffrage, prescribing the manner of regulating, and conducting elections" and, therefore, "make such laws."²⁶

The people of Oregon who passed Measure 6 into law defining what was "proper" for politicians when running for office have never had their day in court because no one has raised a genuine issue. Whether this was the result of neglect, incompetence, or conspiracy is irrelevant. The fact remains Article II, Section 22 is still the law of the land in Oregon.

Oregonians will have the chance to vote against themselves in 2020. Will they have the vision to see the mischief of those who are greedy for gain or will they, through apathy and ignorance, fall prey to their own vanity and deny the "whole truth"?

"He that is greedy of gain troubleth his own house; but he that hateth gifts shall live." Proverbs 15:27

Fake Reform

"In whose hands [is] mischief, and their right hand is full of bribes." Psalms 26:10

Is Article 2 Section 22 still in place?

Is Article 2 Section 22 the law of the people for candidates seeking office in Oregon?

The people had every right to restrict contributions that go beyond the free speech protected in the First Amendment. Buckley v. Valeo may have allowed for a summary judgment to provide for a single donor giving only a 100 dollars.^[20] But the "object" of Article 2 Section 22 is to prevent, or at least curtail, an undue pattern of influence and legal bribery from with-outside voting districts and the state itself that may "injure" the right to representation. This pattern appears to be rampant in modern campaign practices that is not "proper".

Article 2 Section 22 was meant to govern the very problem that Rob Davis was supposedly warning Oregonians about in his series Polluted by Money.

If Rob was really concerned about politicians being influenced by Big Money, wouldn't he be telling Oregonians that almost all their elected officials are not in compliance with Article 2 Section 22?

Shouldn't the press be reporting to the people that the politicians are taking large sums of money, not only from outside their districts but from outside the State, and putting it in their personal campaign accounts even after the Oregon voters said that was not "proper" and voted to make it against the law?

people freely to select those who temporarily will hold public office, as well as to permit the people to take the legislative power into their own hands to make policy decisions. Candidates and measures exist to seek the approval or permission of the voters, not the other way around. Indeed, because Oregon citizens have the constitutional right to assemble in a peaceable manner and...instruct their representatives (Article I, section 26), to "free and equal" elections (Article II, section 1), and to use the initiative and referendum (Article IV, section 1(2)), their rights to political expression would be secure, even if there were no Article I, section 8." VANNATTA v. KEISLING Cite as 931 P.2d 770 (Or. 1997). **Find all links at http://www.preparingyou.com/wiki/Article_2_Section_22**

26 "9. Constitutional Law 26, Elections 9. Constitutional provision that "Legislative Assembly shall enact laws to support the privilege of free suffrage, prescribing the manner of regulating, and conducting elections" does not usurp power of the People to make similar laws and, thus, both Legislative Assembly and the People share power to make such laws. Const. Art. 2, § 8; Art. 4, § 1."VANNATTA v. KEISLING Cite as 931 P.2d 770 (Or. 1997)

Shouldn't the Oregonian be reporting to the people that the Vannatta v. Keisling court cases have been rare exceptions which never addressed or limited the "object" of Article 2 Section 22 even though they have been used as an excuse to allow candidates to take in millions of dollars from non-voters outside of their districts and even Oregon itself?

Senate Joint Resolution 18 is touted in the news by By Rob Davis of The Oregonian/OregonLive as "Legislature sends ballot measure to voters setting stage for campaign donation limits"²⁷ and represented as a good thing for Oregonians.

"Voters in Oregon, one of America's biggest political money states, will decide next November whether the state constitution should allow limits on campaign donations."²⁸

Is this Resolution about "limits" or is it about removing all "limits"?

Weren't some of those same people trying to declare that Article 2 Section 22 was a violation of the First Amendment because it restricted the contributions of the people to candidates?^[20]

Kate Brown had pushed for an amendment on campaign finance before the 2019 session and is supposedly "excited to see meaningful campaign finance reform finally pass this legislative session" according to Nikki Fisher and Rob Davis.²⁹

How meaningful is the "reform" found in SJR 18³⁰ and what does it really do?

The Senate and House Joint Resolution 18 will do a number of things. Some of its contents are already law such as (2)(d) because Oregon elections are already limited by what is "permitted under the

27 "By a 22-5 vote Saturday, the Oregon Senate approved Senate Joint Resolution 18, which would put the campaign finance measure on the November 2020 ballot. The House of Representatives concurred Sunday in a 43-11 vote." "Legislature sends ballot measure to voters setting stage for campaign donation limits"

28 "Legislature sends ballot measure to voters setting stage for campaign donation limits" By Rob Davis | The Oregonian/OregonLive. **Find all links at http://www.preparingyou.com/wiki/Article_2_Section_22**

29 "'The governor is excited to see meaningful campaign finance reform finally pass this legislative session,'" said Nikki Fisher, a spokeswoman for Brown." Legislature sends ballot measure to voters setting stage for campaign donation limits By Rob Davis | The Oregonian/OregonLive.

30 Senate Joint Resolution 18 : PARAGRAPH 1. Section 8, Article II of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, is amended to read: Sec. 8.

- (1) The Legislative Assembly shall enact laws to support the privilege of free suffrage, prescribing the manner of regulating, and conducting elections, and prohibiting under adequate penalties, all undue influence therein, from power, bribery, tumult, and other improper conduct.[-]
- (2) The Legislative Assembly, the governing body of a city, county, municipality or district empowered by law or by this Constitution to enact legislation, or the people through the initiative process, may enact laws or ordinances within its jurisdiction that:
 - (a) Limit contributions made in connection with political campaigns or to influence the outcome of any election in a manner that does not prevent candidates and political committees from gathering the resources necessary for effective advocacy;
 - (b) Require the disclosure of contributions or expenditures made in connection with political campaigns or to influence the outcome of any election;
 - (c) Require that an advertisement made in connection with a political campaign or to influence the outcome of any election identify the persons or entities that paid for the advertisement; and US Constitution
 - (d) Limit expenditures made in connection with political campaigns or to influence the outcome of any election to the extent permitted under the Constitution of the United States.
- (3) Subsection (2) of this section applies to laws and ordinances enacted by the Legislative Assembly or the governing body of a city, county, municipality or district, or enacted or approved by the people through the initiative process, on or after January 1, 2016.

PARAGRAPH 2. The amendment proposed by this resolution shall be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection at the next regular general election held throughout this state. Enrolled Senate Joint Resolution 18 (SJR 18-B)

Constitution of the United States."

What is hidden in the legalese of this Resolution 18 which will be sent to the unsuspecting voters of Oregon in 2020?

What are politicians really pushing on the people of Oregon and can we hope for Rob Davis and the Oregonian to reveal the Whole Truth?

Supposedly, the Legislature wanted to adopt specific dollar limits before making limits legal.^{31]}

As we have seen in "Loophole" the Oregon Constitution Article 2 Section 22 has never been overturned. But if the voting Oregonians are deceived through subterfuge.³²

This measure is a backdoor attempt through political "chicanery" to undo the purpose of Article 2 Section 22. It does this by amending Article II of the Constitution of the State of Oregon Section 8 with section (2)(a) which begins "Limit contributions" but is an attempt to take all the limitation put on candidates by Article 2 Section 22 to prevent bribery and undue influence on the elected because it ends up saying "does not prevent candidates and political committees from gathering the resources necessary".^[30]

This measure will be sold as reform by an impotent or dishonest press which serves the purposes of big money under the guise of love of the people and the environment. It was sent to the voters without warning by a legislature³³ that is incompetent, ignorant or corrupt and greedy for gain.

Oregonians, Americans, and the honest people of the world need to wake up and "speak to power". They need to be willing to see the truth—the whole truth—and provide for it. Senate Joint Resolution 18 is mischief that will allow an improper influence over Oregonian lawmakers and "injure" the representation of Oregon voters. If passed by the people, it will allow open and legal "bribes" to be collected by the right hand of those who seek offices of power. It is reform meant to open the flood gates of contributions flowing into the campaign accounts of candidates. No wonder Kate Brown "pushed" for this and is so "excited".^[29]

"And his sons walked not in his ways, but turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted judgment." 1 Samuel 8:3

31 Find links at http://www.preparingyou.com/wiki/Article_2_Section_22

"SJR 18 seemed dead as recently as June 19, when [House Speaker Tina Kotek, D-Portland], said she wanted to see the Legislature adopt specific dollar limits before sending an open-ended constitutional referral seeking to make limits legal. The Senate wasn't willing to pass a bill specifying dollar limits as a companion to SJR 18.... "Today's vote shows there continues to be bipartisan momentum for meaningful campaign finance reform," Kotek said in a statement. "I'm hopeful we continue to make progress in the 2020 session."

Sen. Jeff Golden, D-Ashland, chairman of the Senate Campaign Finance Committee, carried the initiative in the Senate. He credited reform advocates and Kotek for making sure the ballot referral got a vote in a crowded last-minute docket. Legislature sends ballot measure to voters setting stage for campaign donation limits By Rob Davis | The Oregonian/OregonLive.

32 Subterfuge synonyms: "trickery, intrigue, deviousness, evasion, deceit, deception, dishonesty, cheating, duplicity, guile, cunning, craft, craftiness, slyness, chicanery, bluff, pretense, fraud, fraudulence, sophistry, sharp practice; informal monkey business, funny business, hanky-panky, jiggery-pokery, kidology, every trick in the book; informal codology - "journalists should not use subterfuge to gain admission to people's homes"- "

33 Who voted to undue the will of the people and who voted to prevent fake reform? Vote on Resolution 18 <https://gov.oregonlive.com/bill/2019/Sjr18/>