

OREGON PROGRESSIVE PARTY



411 S.W. 2nd Avenue
Suite 200
Portland, OR 97204
503-548-2797
info@progpatty.org

February 6, 2018

**Oregon Progressive Party
Position on Bill at 2018
Session of Oregon Legislature:**

SB 1511: Support

Dear Committee:

The Oregon Progressive Party supports SB 1511, which would require major party candidates for President and Vice-President to provide their latest federal tax returns to the Secretary of State, or to complete a statement of economic interest, to appear on the Oregon primary or general election ballots.

This seems well intentioned to encourage candidates to provide information about their financial dealings that voters should definitely be able to know and evaluate.

Similar bills requiring disclosure of tax returns have been filed in New York, California, Ohio, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Virginia, and Massachusetts. None has been enacted. The New Jersey legislature passed the bill, but the Governor vetoed it.

Yes, SB 1511 would open the door to similar bills in other states, which could completely change the way that Presidents of the United States are elected, so that all Presidents for the foreseeable future would be Republicans (as explained below). But this particular idea is already circulating among state legislatures, so enacting SB 1511 should not earn Oregon any blame for the oncoming constitutional crisis.

Would SB 1511 Have Any Effect?

Some might say that Oregon adopting this requirement would have no effect. If this law had been in place last year, Donald Trump would not have released his tax returns anyway, because he knew that it was close to impossible for him to win Oregon's electoral votes. But that may not be the case in future Presidential elections in Oregon involving other candidates.

Some might say that SB 1511 would be declared unconstitutional by the courts. We disagree with that prediction and explain why later in this testimony.

SB 1511 alone could change the outcome of the general election for President, if the National Popular Vote (NPV) Compact is approved by sufficient states to control 271 electoral votes. Under the NPV Compact, the exclusion of a major party presidential candidate by SB 1511 from the Oregon general election ballot would reduce the national popular vote total for the excluded major candidate by about 1%, which could make the difference between winning or losing the Presidency, under the NPV Compact.

Even without the NPV Compact, adoption of bills like SB 1511 would likely have a large effect on the outcome of future Presidential elections. This idea would probably be copied by many other states--particularly states where Democratic presidential candidates usually win but where state legislatures are controlled by Republicans. The first attached map shows a pretty accurate rendition of the recent history of Blue v. Red v. toss-up states in Presidential races. The second attached map shows where Republicans control the state legislatures. **There are at least 10 states where the Presidential electorate is Blue or toss-up but the state legislature is Red:**

Florida	Iowa	Michigan
Minnesota	New Hampshire	North Carolina
Ohio	Pennsylvania	Virginia
Wisconsin		

There would appear to be no reason why deep Red states would not also adopt laws similar to SB 888.

The laws in other states would be similar to SB 1511 in that they would disqualify major national Presidential candidates from the state ballots for a stated reason, but the stated reason could be just about anything, such as:

- > failure to maintain lifetime membership in the National Rifle Association
- > failure to have run a successful business for a specified number of years
- > current or past membership in a labor union
- > under investigation for misuse of government email

The reason could be tailored by the state legislature to match the characteristics of the most prominent Presidential candidate disfavored by that legislature. The obvious result would be that the Democratic candidate for President would likely be kept off sufficient ballots in every election as to make winning impossible, because Republicans control 32 state legislatures (while Democrats control only 13).

SB 1511 and similar laws would effectively nullify the NPV Compact, if it were to go into effect. Keeping Hillary Clinton off the Florida ballot would have cost her about 7% of her national popular vote total; off in Texas would have cost her another 6%; off in

Ohio about 4%; off in Michigan about 3.5%; off in North Carolina about 3%; off in Wisconsin about 2%; and so on in states with Red legislatures. Yes, California could reduce Trump's popular vote total by about 7%; New York could reduce it by about 4.5%; and so on. **But Red legislatures could reduce the popular vote of the Democratic candidate far more than Blue legislatures could reduce the popular vote of the Republican candidate, since Red legislatures control 32 states v. 13 states for Blue legislatures.**

The obvious result would be that the Democratic candidate for President could be kept off sufficient ballots as to make winning impossible.

Would SB 1511 and Similar Laws Survive Constitutional Challenge?

The U.S. Supreme Court has struck down state laws that attempt to create additional mandatory qualifications for candidates for Congress, as in **Cook v. Gralike**, 531 U.S. 510, 121 S.Ct. 1029, 149 L.Ed.2d 44 (2001). But that decision was based on the Elections Clause in the U.S. Constitution (Article I, § 4), which applies only to congressional elections.

There are 3 reasons why the U.S. Supreme Court would uphold laws like SB 1511:

1. Some believe that U.S. Supreme Court decisions reflect the political agendas or leanings of its justices. The Court is now evenly split between "liberals" and "conservatives," but the Court's membership is likely to trend to the right in the near future.
2. One tenet of conservatism is respect for "states rights," and SB 1511 surely asserts that states have rights to control their ballots.
3. It has also been important to Republican-appointed justices to ensure that Democrats do not win the Presidency, as in **Bush v. Gore** (2000). Upholding laws similar to SB 1511 would ensure that outcome.

What Would be the Ultimate Consequence of Adopting SB 1511 and Similar Laws?


Adoption of SB 1511 and similar laws could effectively remove the choice of President from the voters. Instead, each state legislature could devise new disqualifications that would remove from its Presidential ballot the candidate disfavored by a majority of state legislators. The choice of President would devolve from the imperfect Electoral College system to the state legislatures.

There is nothing in the U.S. Constitution that requires that the President be elected, directly or indirectly, by voters.

For the foreseeable future, the result would be Republican wins in Presidential

elections, because Republicans control 32 state legislatures, while the Democrats control 13.

Usual Presidential Electoral Votes 2000-2012



State Legislatures After the 2016 Elections

