

To the members of the Oregon Senate Judiciary Committee,

I am hereby submitting written testimony regarding proposed Senate Bill 978. I am fundamentally opposed to SB 978, as a **blatantly anti-Constitutional abuse of authority on the part of the state legislature.**

When duly-elected individuals begin their terms of public service, on behalf of the people of Oregon, each must take an oath to support — i.e., "preserve, protect and defend" — the Constitution of the State of Oregon.

Do you recall that you each swore such an oath, and signed it?

Since you all made such an oath how, in all honestly, can you justify your continued egregious, willful violations of **Article I, Section 27 of the Constitution of the State of Oregon**, in even proposing legislation that, in any manner, restricts the right of **law-abiding, legal citizens of Oregon** to bear arms, in accordance with **Article I, Section 27 of the Constitution of the State of Oregon**?

While many have addressed purported ambiguities in the language of the 2nd Amendment of the Constitution of the United States — i.e., "militia," as opposed to, "the people," — to disingenuously enact legislation restricting the right of law-abiding, legal US citizens to bear arms in their own defense, **Article I, Section 27 of the Constitution of the State of Oregon is not the least bit ambiguous.**

If you're unaware, the PRECISE language of Article I, Section 27 of the Constitution of the State of Oregon

[https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/Pages/OrConst.aspx] is, as follows:

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.

The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence [sic] of themselves, is a clear as it gets.

Over-reaching judiciary semantics have been employed to "justify" numerous prior decisions, as enumerated by the Giffords Law Center

[<http://lawcenter.giffords.org/state-right-to-bear-arms-in-oregon/>], most

particularly:

In State v. Kessler ... the court emphasized that “the right to ‘bear arms’ does not mean that all individuals have an unrestricted right to carry or use personal weapons in all circumstances,” concluding that “[t]he reasoning of the courts is generally that a regulation is valid if the aim of public safety does not frustrate the guarantees of the state constitution.”

In my opinion, **ALL existing and proposed legislation, frustrates the state constitutional right, of law-abiding, legal citizens of Oregon, to bear arms, "for the defence [sic] of themselves, and the State."**

In my opinion, **ALL existing and proposed legislation** not only violates the spirit and intent of **Article I, Section 27** of the Constitution of the State of Oregon but, the letter, as well.

In my opinion, **ALL existing and proposed state legislation** also violates the spirit and intent of the 2nd Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, if not necessarily the letter.

Your constitutional duty is clear: You must invalidate SB 978 as a blatant violation of Article I, Section 27 of the Constitution of the State of Oregon!

Furthermore, you must **abide by your oaths of office** and, invalidate ALL attempts to restrict **legal, law-abiding Oregonians** from the DUAL constitutional right to bear arms in their own defense!

Regards,

M. L. Pershern
Sherwood, OR