

House Committee on Rules,

Testimony>

As a longtime resident of Oregon I am asking that you please do not pass SB 941. It is **fact** that this bill will do nothing to keep criminals from acquiring guns. Your time should be focused on mental health issues and the root of violence itself. A bill that encourages Oregonians to break the law in order to uphold their constitutional rights is unacceptable. Writing laws that are unenforceable and unnecessary are a waste of everyone's time. There have been no valid facts shown that warrant this 23 page bill. We all have heard and seen a variety of numbers and percentages about reduction of "this" and increase in "that", but repeating unsubstantiated and untrue "facts" only plays to the emotions. I understand that there is a call to "Do Something". I know some of you in the House believe this "something" is the wrong direction and trust that the rest will do what the both Constitutions have made clear.

If you are on the fence or have your doubts about SB941 being an effective bill to help solve the dilemma of human violence or even reduce it, you owe it to your fellow Oregonians to **vote "NO"**.

Here is the link to written testimony presented at the limited time Senate hearing:
<https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2015R1/Measures/Exhibits/SB941> If you take a few minutes to read some of these, you will see an overwhelming number opposed to further infringement on our rights. Even so, many in opposition there didn't get the opportunity to give their testimony. Many county officials and sheriffs understand that SB941 is unworkable and shouldn't go forward. I trust that enough on the House Committee on Rules will see this for what it is (and is not) and vote it down.

I could send numerous studies and research showing the ineffectiveness of further restricting guns. Here are a few that are meaningful: <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL32842.pdf>
<http://www.ojr.org/what-the-media-gets-wrong-about-guns/>
<http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/crime/item/14859-florida-update-concealed-carry-permits-up-violent-crime-down>

Please see below for further guidance:

http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/bill_of_rights_transcript.html#text

On September 25, 1789, the First Congress of the United States proposed 12 amendments to the Constitution. The [1789 Joint Resolution of Congress](#) proposing the amendments is on display in the Rotunda in the National Archives Museum. Ten of the proposed 12 amendments were ratified by three-fourths of the state legislatures on December 15, 1791. The ratified Articles (Articles 3–12) constitute the first 10 amendments of the Constitution, or the [U.S. Bill of Rights](#). In 1992, 203 years

after it was proposed, Article 2 was ratified as the 27th Amendment to the Constitution. Article 1 was never ratified.

Amendment II - 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.

https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/Pages/OrConst.aspx

The Oregon Constitution was framed by a convention of 60 delegates chosen by the people. The convention met on the third Monday in August 1857 and adjourned on September 18 of the same year. On November 9, 1857, the Constitution was approved by the vote of the people of Oregon Territory. The Act of Congress admitting Oregon into the Union was approved February 14, 1859, and on that date the Constitution went into effect.

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[.]

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Ralph".

Ralph Hughes
Tigard, OR