

SHALL NOT BE INFRINGED

2ND Amendment to the United States Constitution.

"A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed."

Nearly 228 years ago, on December 15, 1791, the Bill of Rights that had been adopted into our United States Constitution became effective. Since that date the Constitution of the United States and its ten Bill of Rights have been the supreme law of this country. For the vast majority of that time not much judicial focus, involving the general public, was placed on the Second Amendment. While there were a few Supreme Court rulings involving the Second Amendment issues, like the attempt to reduce the lethality of Gangland weaponry, most of the controversy over the Second Amendment has taken place since the 1950s. Since the mid-50s there has been a lot of attention on what this amendment actually means, and how it applies to modern-day America.

For the purposes of this testimony it would be pointless and way too time-consuming to go over all of the controversy, the explanations, the examinations, and the scholarly definitions of the words and meaning of this amendment. On its face value this amendment is basically the subject of the current SB 978 being presented, because this Bill is a gross infringement on the rights guaranteed by that amendment. In the big picture this may be true, but what I want to point out are the issues surrounding the issue.

- Who and what is really behind this Bill? For decades American citizens have heard two sides of the equation regarding gun control. The left has always asserted, with great umbrage, that nobody is out to take anyone's guns away. "All that they are seeking is reasonable gun control." This Bill is the unmasking of that big lie. The nibbling around the edges of the Second Amendment has gone on long enough, I suppose, so that now with a super majority of both chambers of the State Legislature, the Oregon State Legislature feels safe enough to let the cat out of the bag. What's even more troubling than this, is that it's evident by virtue of how secretive, and how much gamesmanship has been going on (including the ridiculous requirement to put it on the emergency clause status) in the development of this Bill, that even the legislature knows that it is not what the majority of Oregon citizens want. If that statement were untrue than this would be on a ballot measure before the people and not in a legislative Bill. The fact is, one or two out-of-state billionaires with an anti-gun agenda have bribed their way into having more influence over Oregon politics and gun policies, than the citizens of Oregon. For this reason, I challenge the legislature to take the language of their proposed Bill and put it on a ballot measure. If it's the will of the people, they will get their way. If it isn't, they will get their answer. I know this won't happen, which leads me back to the first point, who and what is really behind this Bill, and why?
- A big part of this Bill involves the personal liability of the Oregon gun owner. This is a very interesting concept since it's unique to the ownership of guns. It is similar to the other progressive movements attempting to make gun

manufacturers liable for what people do with their products. The hypocrisy of these positions is deeper than Crater Lake. Let's take for example automobiles. If someone steals my car and subsequently runs someone over and kills them, am I libel for the death of that victim? Of course not! Or, how about if a drug company that manufactures opioids, even knowingly manufactures 10 times the opioids that the legitimate market needs, are they liable for the overdose deaths of tens of thousands of people a year? Of course not! Even though they knowingly overproduce their deadly product line no one's ever suggested that they be liable. Why? On both examples, why? The answer is quite clear. No gun control measure ever submitted in a legislature anywhere had anything to do with public safety. Not at all. Not even a little bit. Gun control is about control. It's not about public safety. Everyone knows that none of these measures will change the outcomes of statistics one little bit. But that's not the purpose of this bill. The purpose of this bill is to make owning a firearm so onerous, and so risky that people ultimately give it up. The goal of this bill, coupled with whatever other Bills will be coming next, is the disarmament of the Oregon citizen.

Why is it that Progressive, Democratic Socialist governments state and national are always conniving to disarm the law-abiding American citizen? Because they are afraid of an armed citizenry. This of course begs the question, why are they so afraid of a citizenry composed of law-abiding citizens that happen to be well armed? Going back to the opening of this testimony, reread the Second Amendment and understand that its ultimate intention was to create a citizenry of well-armed people. The reference to the militia is a reference to the people. The authors of the Second Amendment had one great concern and that was the intrinsic and inevitable growth of government and its desire to control its legislature citizenry. The Second Amendment is designed to be a check on a tyrannical government. The militia it refers to is an armed people because no government controlled military unit, i.e. National Guard, is a check on the government. The only viable check on an out of control government, is an armed citizenry. What this Progressive Oregon is once again it begs the question why State Legislature wants to do is eliminate the "Militia." That is unconstitutional. That is also frightening, because once again it begs the question, why?

Gary J. Will

1214 Bair Rd. NE

Keizer, OR 97303

(503) 393-2711