

Federalist Papers #46

The Citizens-the Militia-are armed to defend ourselves, our families, our neighbors, communities, and states from an overreaching tyrannical federal government.

~James Madison, father of the constitution

Chair Prozanski, committee members, ladies and gentleman

My name is Casey Runyan. I am a resident of coastal Douglas county, senate district five and house district nine. I am also the sole challenger against the incumbent, Caddy McKeown's seat for state representative of house district nine.

I am speaking here today to remind you of your limited authority. You have been overreaching in that limited authority for quite some time now, and quite honestly I am disgusted that you remain in the office in which you hold.

Article VI Clause III of the U.S Constitution requires that every state official to support the U.S Constitution, not just parts of it that you like and disregard parts you don't. If you prefer to argue the case against the fundamental, God given inherent liberty of the people to bear arms, and require lawful citizens to prove innocence in order to exercise it, because the arms in question are not single shot muskets, please, return to your offices at the end of this hearing and mail out your senatorial messages with your feather quill pens on parchment paper from the office of the printing press.

When state officials acquiesce in unconstitutional acts, you are conniving with tyrants against your own people, and if you are conniving with tyrants against your own people so you can keep your federal funding then shame on you for becoming so corrupt that you allow yourself to be bribed with money that your grandchildren will have to pay back, and if you connive with tyrants against your own people because you are too cowardly to stand up to them, then you need to resign your office and let a real man or a real woman do the job that you are too coward and weak to do.

~Publius Huldah, constitutional scholar

last year. We are being asked to restrict access to semi-automatic rifles in order to prevent their use in less than 2.5 percent of all murders. That's irrational and is a result of the media and our politicians engaging in inflammatory rhetoric that is meant to instill an overinflated fear of semi-automatic rifles in Americans. Restricting our access to semi-automatic rifles will not make a statistically significant impact on our safety and security.

Even more concerning is that as a society, we have willingly accepted the premise that we should have to justify exercising our Constitutional rights. Those rights are not granted to us; we are born with them. We do not have to prove we need them; we inherently have them. We are born with them, the Constitution protects them, and it's the primary function of our government to uphold our Constitution."

"But still, we expend a tremendous amount of time and energy justifying our need for the rights protected by the Second Amendment. And every time someone abuses that right, the government threatens to take it away by asking the rest of us to prove, yet again, we still need it.

Imagine, for the sake of the argument, if we did the same thing every time someone abused one of our other rights. Take, for example, our Constitutionally protected right to due process.

There are times when there's a preponderance of evidence linking a suspect to a crime. Say, for example, there were several witnesses, police arrested the suspect on scene, holding the murder weapon, there's ample DNA evidence. It's obvious that the person is guilty, but the suspect insists on a trial."

"We will, of course, grant one—even if it comes at horrible psychological costs to the victims and enormous monetary costs to the taxpayers.

And in the end, when the suspect is found guilty and sentenced, no one will ask why we need to have trials or whether we should restrict them to instances when we don't have strong evidence that the suspect is guilty. Why? Because that's not how it works. The commitment to protecting our rights and restricting them as little as possible is vital to maintaining a Constitutional republic.

Restricting access to rifles is a restriction on our Second Amendment rights. Further, when tens of millions of Americans own rifles, less than 325 were used in homicides last year. Restricting access to rifles will not make us safer, but it will make us less free.

I'm a law-abiding American citizen. I vote. I pay taxes. I would serve on a jury if asked to do so. I take my responsibilities of citizenship seriously. It undermines the very foundations of our nation when our elected leaders force our citizens to earn, justify or barter for the rights protected by the Constitution. And those who would ask us to do so are not fit to lead us."

The 2nd Amendment

A well regulated militia-civilians who band together in times of emergency to form an army of irregulars

Being necessary to the security of a free state-not as in the 'fifty states', but as in the **STATE OF BEING FREE**

The right of the people-law abiding citizens

To keep and bear Arms-arguably any unclassified weapon which can be wielded by an individual citizen soldier

Shall not be infringed-shall suffer no dilution upon which civilian capability to thwart tyranny may hinge.