

Submitter: Joshua Yoder

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Veterans, Emergency Management, Federal and World Affairs

Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB947

The term 'militia' is a core piece of our nation. We cannot redefine it, as that would be absolutely repugnant to the US Constitution and the American way of life.

10 USC Section 246 defines the 'militia' as:

(a) "The militia of the United States consists of all able-bodied males at least 17 years of age and, except as provided in section 313 of title 32, under 45 years of age who are, or who have made a declaration of intention to become, citizens of the United States and of female citizens of the United States who are members of the National Guard."

(b) The classes of the militia are—

(1) the organized militia, which consists of the National Guard and the Naval Militia; and

(2) the unorganized militia, which consists of the members of the militia who are not members of the National Guard or the Naval Militia.

As a male Oregon citizen, who is 40 years of age, I qualify under section 10 USC 246 (a) as a member of the militia, and under (b) as part of the 'unorganized militia'.

Under Oregon Law, it's similar, with the age range being 18-45.

Changing Oregon statutes to create a concept of an "Unorganized National Guard" doesn't even make sense, but this completely undermines the concept of what a militia is, what it means, and threatens to destroy our right to bear arms. I believe that is the real intent behind this legislation. The National Guard is already federally recognized as an Organized Militia, so by creating the language of 'Organized National Guard' is also redundant and doesn't make sense. Honestly it feels like there was no real thought behind this proposal other than to remove the word "Militia", a simple re-definition with ulterior motives. I recommend that all sponsors of this bill be drug tested, as this makes absolutely no sense.

By having works like "State National Guard" and then concepts like "unorganized National Guard" creates massive confusion. Especially when the governor has control over the National Guard.

Would this then give the Oregon Military Department and Governor control over all able bodied men ages 18-45?

Furthermore redefining and broadening the definition of "National Guard" seems that

it would go against the Oregon Military Department who has the duty and authority of control for the Oregon National Guard per ORS 396.305

Bottom Line: Redefining 'militia' is an asinine action, which would be a waste of resources, create confusion and put our rights at risk. There is no lawful reason to redefine the term militia. The only application would be an attempt to strip the people of their rights, which is unlawful, as is any other gun control attempts. Shut this down, and direct your time and attention to lawful matters that actually matter.