

Submitter:

Steven Shapiro

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

Senate Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

SB243

To Whom it may Concern,

Not only is the right of a citizen of the United States to keep and bear arms protected by the bill of rights of the Constitution of the United States, but the citizens of Oregon are also guaranteed this right in the Oregon Constitution. " Article 1 Section 27. 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[.]" This guarantee of our constitution is clearly delineated as a right of the people, not the military or the State, It allows them to be armed for the defense of themselves and the State. In other words they have the right to bear arms so that should they or the State be under the threat of attack, they can defend themselves or the State from that attack. Along with the Bill of Rights declaring that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed, it is clear that the founders of our nation and our state knew the importance of recognizing the rights of the people to bear (to carry, to wear) arms. Implicit in these guarantees is the right of the people to purchase or otherwise acquire these arms. Lest the current members of the legislature of Oregon protest that they are not infringing on these rights but only enacting "common sense safety measures," I will state that any legislated obstacle to the ability of a citizen to obtain or bear a firearm constitutes infringement on those rights guaranteed by our constitutions. "Infringed- broken, violated." The constitutionality of background checks is already questionable, but to add to that cumbersome process a requirement to apply for and obtain a permit to purchase firearms is giving the State way too much power to then take the next step and forbid citizens from obtaining firearms. Rights aren't given up all at once, they are slowly yielded up in small increments in the name of safety or "the greater good." The American Revolution began when the British tried to prevent the people from having their arms. Nazi Germany disarmed the Jewish people prior to the Holocaust. Many other historical examples could show how that giving the government power to control the sale, purchase and ownership of firearms is a step in the direction of tyranny. I am registering this testimony as a strong protest to the bill currently being discussed in the Oregon legislature, SB243 and also the amendment 27451. Having glanced through some of the proposed laws, it is evident that those who have crafted this legislation have no regard for the aforementioned rights that we the people were guaranteed by the founders of the United States of America and the State of Oregon. Not only are our rights in jeopardy with this legislation, but the statistics on gun violence and homicides in the United States shows that these measures are unnecessary and would be ineffective in bringing about the "safety" that their proponents are claiming that they are trying to achieve. Sincerely, Steven Shapiro Jr.