

**House Rules Committee
Public Hearing Testimony
in support of HJM 4
April 1 2015
Bob Ozretich, Corvallis Area Move to Amend**

Corporations are nowhere to be found in the Constitution or its amendments. But persons, citizens, and people are. It is pretty clear that the framers did not include corporations within the definition of any of these flesh and blood descriptors of the men, created with inalienable rights, who had just defeated the British.

Once declared persons in the 1880s, corporations and slaves enjoyed the same equal protection and due process rights of the 14th amendment, and later the 5th amendment. Even later laws limiting advertising were found to violate the corporation's right to speak; cigarette packaging requirements, a violation of their right to not speak; lately, requirements of company health plans to include certain reproductive services were found by the Supreme Court to be against the Hobby Lobby company's right to practice religion; Murray Energy is claiming protection of the 1st amendment against defamation by Public Citizen. McDonald's restaurant chain claims equal protection of the 14th in challenging Seattle's new minimum wage law. Corporations are secure in their "houses" because unannounced safety or fire inspections are a violation of their 4th amendment rights.

Too often, company owners consider that which they own to be themselves, thus the confusion and the continuing litigation to expand what next Constitutional right will apply to the thing they own.

Despite Mitt Romney's pronouncement that "Corporations are people, my friend" the common person gets that they are not.

More than 85,000 real people, a 74% majority of voters in Corvallis, Ashland, Eugene and Lincoln County voted in favor of a Constitutional amendment saying Constitutional rights are for natural people and money is a thing and can be regulated in the political arena. They get it.

The language of these measures was clear and specific and essentially the same as HJM 4 before us today.

In HJM 6 in 2013 (in your materials) this very committee and the legislature asked Congress for an amendment whose language was straight forward, unambiguous, specific and essentially the same as HJM 4.

Debatable Constitutional convention cans and can not's aside, why would you not ask in a Constitutional convention application for the same specific language you've already directed Congress to incorporate into an amendment?