

Submitter: Deb Finck
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

The Second Amendment finishes with a very clear directive to government, "THE RIGHT OF THE PEOPLE TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED", Infringe is defined as "to act so as to limit or undermine something, or to encroach upon." How can you explain any other meaning to not only HB3075 but M114? When stipulations are established, you are infringing upon the ability for a person to use and maintain any Right, not just the ability to keep and bear arms. These 2 "laws" would absolutely infringe upon our ability as Oregonians to Keep and Bear arms as both the US and Oregon Constitutions enumerate. Many argue that limitations do not stop people from buying and owning guns. A limitation is the very definition of the word INFRINGEMENT. What's next, limiting how sharp a knife can be? And truly what is the point of this bill? Placing limits on law abiding citizens who do not commit crimes is going to prevent criminal acts how? You are targeting the wrong people with your abusive legislation and instead making criminals out of people who do not commit crime. This bill does nothing to make Oregon safer, in fact it does the opposite. We have a Natural, GOD GIVEN right to self-defense and by creating barriers to the means of self-defense, this legislature puts good, well-meaning people in danger of violent interactions with people who have no interest in following your RIGHT VIOLATING legislation. The reality here is you are putting our lives at risk, and in turn the State becomes as much a threat to our Liberty and Safety as the common criminal who intends to violently do harm. The difference is your violence against us is under the guise of being "lawful". I would also remind this committee that in 1801 the Supreme Court opined that any law repugnant to the Constitution is null, void of force. Repugnant is defined as "in conflict with, or incompatible with". HB3075 and M114 are both by definition REPUGNANT to both Constitutions.

To close, James Madison talked of the constitution as a parchment barrier against the encroaching spirit of power. "Experience has shown us that the efficacy of the provision has been greatly overrated; and that some more adequate defense is indispensably necessary for the more feeble, against the more powerful members of government. The legislative departments everywhere extend the sphere of its activity and drawing all power into its impetuous vortex." The documents are merely ink and paper and only when the principles are followed by the people can we truly uphold the intent that the Founder's envisioned. Liberty is dangerous and very difficult for government to keep its hands off of. YOUR OATH is your promise to the People that you will keep your hands off of our Rights. You were elected based on the premise that you would uphold your word, even if you think differently about certain topics. You do not have to like the 2nd Amendment or even Article 1, Section 27 of the

Oregon Constitution, yet you swore to uphold those documents as written and protect them. Can you truly look yourself in the mirror and say you are being true to your word?

The very reason the Founder's enumerated all Americans have the right to keep and bear arms was not merely as a self-defense provision from violent criminals. It was a guarantee that they would have the ability to defend themselves from another abusive government should it ever resurface. It seems as if the Founders knew what they were talking about as this government continues its assault on the Liberty of the Good People of Oregon. The intent of a Constitutional Republic is to protect the rights of the individual from the means of the majority. It seems that you all have forgotten the very thing you swore to uphold and protect. Our Republic (it is NOT a democracy) functions only when you, our representatives, uphold your word to protect our Rights granted to us by our Creator, otherwise you are no different than a King in 1776.