To the Oregon State Judiciary Committee,

SB 525 expands the definition of "domestic violence" well beyond what any reasonable person would determine it to be yet it does not address the fact that It is undetermined what percentage of protection orders in domestic violence and abuse cases are based on false claims. Estimates range from a low of 5% (by feminists) to more than 90% (men when used in a divorce or child custody dispute). This is dangerous and counterproductive.

Right now, judges have virtually unlimited discretion against the principals the foundation this nation was built upon that being the liberties and freedoms the peoples by-laws our Constitution guaranteed we the people that government was restricted from infringing upon, to take away firearm's rights held solely by the people you serve who have not been accused of, let alone convicted of, any crime and have been denied the de process guarantee found in the peoples fourth amendment.

Myself being a victim of a violence protective order of restraint based on false claims, forcing me to not only prove the falsely convictions were in fact fabricated against me to prevent me from all contact with my child I was one of the lucky ones whom in the end ended up with full care custody and control of my child. In the Circuit Court of the Sate of Oregon, Josephine County. 87-DR-0125.

At that time knowing and fully understanding my rights & duty under our very nations charter our Declaration of Independence and in full accordance to the second amendment to the by-laws of this nation the people constitutional restrictions on government I would not have only exercised my right to bear arms I would have defended them had government tried to take my guns away in full accordance to the Mayflower compact that established the rights of all people in the new colonies.

Oregon Constitution. ARTICLE I BILL OF RIGHTS

Section 27. Right to bear arms; military subordinate to civil power. The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence [sic] of themselves, and the State, but the Military shall be kept in strict subordination to the civil power[.]

Section 15. Foundation principles of criminal law. Laws for the punishment of crime shall be founded on these principles: protection of society, personal responsibility, accountability for one's actions and reformation.

[Constitution of 1859; Amendment proposed by S.J.R. 32, 1995, and adopted by the people Nov. 5, 1996]

Section 9. Unreasonable searches or seizures. No law shall violate the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable search, or seizure; and no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath, or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the person or thing to be seized.—

Section 10. Administration of justice. No court shall be secret, but justice shall be administered, openly and without purchase, completely and without delay, and every man shall have remedy by due course of law for injury done him in his person, property, or reputation.—

Now did this committee take an oath of office to uphold the constitutions and laws of this great nation and state against the very tyranny this bill proposes to do? Because this bill is a very dangerous game this legislature is playing with against the liberties and freedoms of the people.

Section 1. Natural rights inherent in people. We declare that all men, when they form a social compact are equal in right: that all power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their peace, safety, and happiness; and they have at all times a right to alter, reform, or abolish the government in such manner as they may think proper.—

Being a naturalized citizen of this great nation with a legacy dating back to 1641 from a family whom landed in that year as registered in the national archives, aboard the ship "The Charitas", on the shores of New Sweden, the colony that was founded in 1638 located in New Jersey. So understand that coming from a family who's very blood was spilled fighting for the liberties and freedoms we hold true, which there are many memorials earned in blood spilled in my family in my name found throughout New Jersey and Pennsylvania prove and one simple internet search will verify my family blood has been spilled from the revolutionary war and all wars through this great nation's history in most every state of the Union, so to say I understand the powers of government is an understatement. That said what I fully understand is the Oregon legislature is powerless against the foundation of freedoms and liberties of and by the people to "infringe" on the second amendment in any way, shape or form.

That second amendment and the Oregon 1st amendment section 27 right of the people is called the M.C. Hammer clause.

"Can't touch that"!!!

Punish the criminals but do not dare to punish law abiding people for the actions of a few. The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution contain a due process clause. Due process deals with the administration of justice and thus the due process clause acts as a safeguard from arbitrary denial of life, liberty, or property by the Government outside the sanction of law. The Supreme Court of the United States interprets the clauses however more broadly because these clauses provide four protections: procedural due process (in civil and criminal proceedings), substantive due process, a prohibition against vague laws, and as the vehicle for the incorporation of the Bill of Rights.

Thank you for your time.

Michael "Cody" Steelman