

It is imperative the committee recognize, if it has any integrity, that this iteration of a ballot measure funded by special interest groups generated from outside the state of Oregon is blatantly unconstitutional—both our own state constitution in Article I, Section 27, and more classically the U.S. constitution—and furthermore, and perhaps more immediate and germane, is nakedly antagonistic and derisive to the people of our State. Nobody who believes that government is “of the people, by the people” can in good conscience allow this bill to pass the committee, despite the urging of the committee head.

Much can and will be said about the constitutionality of the bill, so I will leave others to elaborate on this matter for the most part, and only ask this body how they intend to satisfy the clause of Article I, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution which keeps the military subordinate to civil power, when the goal of this bill is to both further disarm regular citizens and increase militarization of police and armed forces?

Reminiscent of Mexican citizens’ loss of their functional right to arms, Section 4(8)(d)(A) establishes credibility and certification of only trainers approved through law enforcement agencies, and similar to restricting Mexicans’ right to acquire firearms at only two dealers in the country, the subsection allows for the gradual loss of our rights by the whittling away of approved trainers at the whim of politics de jure.

But more egregious and offensively undemocratic are changes made from the original ballot measure wherein the authors grossly manipulate both the levers of judicial jurisdiction and public emotion. Section 22, establishing the Marion County circuit court as the only court where one can challenge the Act, is a clear attempt at bypassing democratic rights of the other 3.8 million Oregonians who do not reside in said county by excluding their elected judges from representing their legal rights. What society can be said to be just where the gamesmanship of players maneuvers to disenfranchise its citizens? And what can be said of the honor and integrity of those who engage in such an action? Similarly, in a prevarication couched in paternalistic government speech to ply on fears of some uninformed Oregonians, Section 24 establishes the Act as a declaration of a public emergency, yet clauses of the bill are enacted years apart in 2026 and 2028. If the Cascadia Subduction Zone or Juan de Fuca plate were to cause another tsunami to hit the Oregon coast, can the residents living in coastal towns expect emergency aid in 15 to 39 months? If Oregon were subjected to foreign invasion or a freak tornado touched down, is that the level of urgency we could expect in a so-called emergency? It is apparent then that declarations of emergency gun violence are so much statistical wrangling and misrepresentation, a prop to make mountains out of molehills, casting shadows in the shapes of monstrosities by, again, special interest groups intent on instituting ideological extremes.

In closing, the authors of this bill have emphatically stated their intent, I believe, in Section 4(6)(a): “A permit-to-purchase issued under this section does not create any right of the permit holder to receive a firearm or carry a concealed firearm.” While the undemocratic sponsors of this bill would doubtless cite the subsections regarding “unique approval numbers,” intent is sometimes disclosed in the simplest of words.