

Submitter: Victor Arista-Medina  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

The second amendment of the US Federal Constitution was put in place so we could defend ourselves against tyrannical government. It wasn't for hunting, it wasn't for Target shooting, and it wasn't for self-defense. That being said I believe that it is absolutely unconstitutional to limit the amount of ammunition citizens can carry in their firearms at any given time. If we were to be invaded by a foreign tyrannical government while I'm grocery shopping, I would want the most rounds possible. Also to add to that, banning magazines a back door ban, Some firearms require a magazine to function so the logic that the magazine isn't an arm and therefore can be limited is wrong. The magazine is a key component to having the firearm function; maybe not with all guns but some firearms WILL NOT fire unless it has a magazine. This would be like trying to pass a bill that would ban bullets. Other the bullets aren't considered arms there would be unconstitutional to ban them because they are a key component to that arm and are in common use. Now this aspect of it, remember how I said the second amendment wasn't put in place for self-defense. Here's the kicker, article 1 section 27 of the Oregon state constitution is the right to bear arms for the purposes of self-defense. We have the right to self-defense in the state of Oregon and if it comes down to situation where my life or my wife's life or my daughter's life is at risk, then I would like to have as many rounds as possible on my person so that way I could officially and effectively defend my family. The fact that you guys are even discussing and debating whether to put this in law makes me sick. People that would be exempt from this law would be security for lawmakers and law enforcement officers. It almost seems as if you're saying that my family is an important enough to defend while we're out in public. You want to start off with 10 round magazine limit, then what? Eventually, we're not even going to be allowed to have magazines? Ballot measure 114 is an extreme overreach when it comes to our God-given rights. US Federal Constitution and the state constitution is not a document that grants us rights, as a matter of a fact what it does is it restricts the government. The literal definition for infringement is limitation, so this limitation would be an infringement on the second amendment as well as on article 1 section 27 of the Oregon state constitution. Secondly, the permitting process and registry is unconstitutional. We the people are actually supposed to know more about you guys than you do us but at some point it's flipped around, that besides the point. We shouldn't have to ask for permission from a local law enforcement agency and pay for that permission/permit to go and try to purchase a firearm, essentially asking for more permission from Oregon State Police to be able to exercise the constitutional right. We don't need a permit to go to church, we don't need a permit to peaceably assemble, we don't need a permit to remain silent, we don't need a permit to be protected from unreasonable searches or seizures. Why would we need a permit for the only right that says SHALL

NOT BE INFRINGED!! We have the right to KEEP and BEAR ARMS! The Constitution is the supreme law of land. If people wanted to vote out the right to freedom of speech, would that fly? No because it's unconstitutional and the Constitution triumphs feelings. We the people pay you tax dollars and I would ask that you use those tax dollars to honor your oath!!! Any law repugnant to the Constitution is null and void Marbury v. Madison supreme Court ruling 1803

"no state shall convert a liberty into a privilege, license it and attach a fee to it" is a principle derived from Supreme Court cases like Murdock v. Pennsylvania and Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham