



END CORPORATE RULE. LEGALIZE DEMOCRACY.

MOVE TO AMEND

Side-by-Side Comparison:

Move to Amend's *We The People* Amendment, (HJR 48) and HJR 57, Rep. Adam Schiff's Amendment

The comparisons contain all the language of each proposed amendment. Underlining does not appear in the originals but has been added for emphasis. Italics indicate differences between the two proposed amendments.

**MTA's We The People Amendment
HJR 48 Lead: Rep. Jayapal (Dem., WA)
Introduced 2/22/2019**

**HJR 57. Lead: Rep. Schiff (Dem. CA)
Introduced 5/8/2019**

Section 1

"Nothing in this Constitution shall be construed to forbid Congress or the States from imposing reasonable content-neutral limitations on private campaign contributions or independent election expenditures, or from enacting systems of public campaign financing, including those designed to restrict the influence of private wealth by offsetting campaign spending or independent expenditures with increased public funding."

- *This language is not mandatory.*
- *It would allow the courts to decide what is "reasonable," giving courts even greater power.*

Section 1

"The rights protected by the Constitution of the United States are the rights of natural persons only."

No equivalent provision.

"Artificial entities established by the laws of any State, the United States, or any foreign state shall have no rights under this Constitution and are subject to regulation by the People, through Federal, State, or local law."

*No equivalent provision.
Corporations and other artificial entities would retain all their existing constitutional rights and others if granted by the Supreme Court.*

"The privileges of artificial entities shall be determined by the People, through Federal, State, or local law, and shall not be construed to be inherent or inalienable."

No equivalent provision.
Corporate "rights" would continue to preempt local, state and federal laws and regulations passed by legislators or enacted by citizen initiatives.

Section 2

(Statement of Intent:) "... to ensure that all citizens, regardless of their economic status, have access to the political process, and that no person gains, as a result of their money, substantially more access or ability to influence in any way the election of any candidate for public office or any ballot measure."

No equivalent provision.
• This amendment provides no direction as to the intention or basis for the amendment when interpretation is required by the Judicial branch.

"Federal, State, and local government shall regulate, limit, or prohibit contributions and expenditures, including a candidate's own contributions and expenditures..."

No equivalent provision.
• This amendment does not provide any directive or requirement for government at any level -- federal, state or local -- to regulate campaign spending.

"Federal, State, and local government shall require that any permissible contributions and expenditures be publicly disclosed."

No equivalent provision.
• This amendment does not require the disclosure of campaign contributions or expenditures.

"The judiciary shall not construe the spending of money to influence elections to be speech under the First Amendment."

No equivalent provision.

Section 3

"Nothing in this amendment shall be construed to abridge freedom of the press."

No equivalent provision.