ALASKA LEGISLATURE COMMITTEE FILES 1987-1988 8672
4789 HJUD SJR 15

361

> By the edicts of authority vested in the sovereign power by the proposed constitution, the militia of the country, the bulwark of defence, and the security of national liberty is no longer under the control of civil authority; but at the rescript of the Monarch, or the aristocracy, they may either be employed to extort the enormous sums that will be necessary to support the civil list—to maintain the regalia of power—and the splendour of the most useless part of the community, or they may be sent into foreign countries for the fulfilment of treaties, stipulated by the President and two thirds of the Senate.[62]

The supporters of the proposed constitution were well-prepared to meet these and similar arguments. They had the support of America's two national heroes, George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, and this helped make the Constitution respectable, as well as alleviating fears. Articles favoring the Constitution, such as the *Federalist Papers*, were often reprinted in distant states. Intelligent and well-educated, the proponents of the new government carefully and consistently answered the arguments of their rivals.

To the general argument that there were not sufficient restrictions on the power of the proposed general government, the federalists replied that no bill of rights was necessary. This was because the Constitution would establish a novel type of government, one of enumerated powers; restrictions were necessary only where full sovereignty was conferred. In Federalist Number 84, Alexander Hamilton made the argument in these words:

> It has been several times truly remarked that bills of rights are, in their origin, stipulations between kings and their subjects, abridgements of prerogative in favor of privilege, reservations of rights not surrendered to the prince. Such was MAGNA CHARTA, obtained by the barons, sword in hand from King John. Such were the subsequent confirmations of that charter by succeeding princes. Such was the Petition of Right assented to by Charles I, in the beginning of his reign. Such, also, was the Declaration of Right presented by the Lords and Commons to the Prince of Orange in 1688, and afterwards thrown into the form of an act of parliament called the Bill of Rights. It is evident, therefore, that, according to their primitive signification, they have no application to constitutions professedly founded upon the power of the people, and executed by their immediate representatives and servants.[63]

To particular criticism of the military clauses of the proposed Constitution, both Hamilton and Madison replied in detail in the Federalist Papers.

---

62. E. GERRY, OBSERVATIONS ON THE NEW CONSTITUTION AND ON THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONVENTIONS 10 (1788).

63. THE FEDERALIST No. 84, at 536 (H. Lodge ed. 1888) (A. Hamilton).

Hamilton denied that a standing army was necessary, citing recent experience:

> Here I expect we shall be told that the militia of the country is its natural bulwark, and would be at all times equal to the national defence. This doctrine, in substance, had like to have lost us our independence. It cost millions to the United States that might have been saved. . . .
>
> The American militia, in the course of the late war, have, by their valor on numerous occasions, erected eternal monuments to their fame; but the bravest of them feel and know that the liberty of their country could not have been established by their efforts alone, however great and valuable they were. War, like most other things, is a science to be acquired and perfected by diligence, by perseverance, by time, and by practice.[64]

Hamilton did not, however, go so far as to say that standing armies were a good thing. Instead, he argued that a strong militia would minimize the need for them.[65]

Madison also addressed himself to the fear that the new national government would disarm the militia and destroy state government. He first argued that the states would still have concurrent power over the militia, thus denying that the proposed Constitution gave exclusive jurisdiction over the militia to the general government. He also pointed out that the militia, comprised of half a million men, was a force that could not be overcome by any tyrant.[66]

The arguments of the federalists appear to have quieted the fears of their countrymen, since the early state conventions were all easy victories for the new Constitution. Between December 7, 1787 and January 9, 1788, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia and Connecticut all ratified unconditionally and overwhelmingly; the vote was unanimous in three of these states. In Massachusetts, the contest was close. On February 6, 1787, the state convention ratified the new Constitution by a narrow margin.

---

64. *Id.* No. 25 at 150 (A. Hamilton).

65. Hamilton explained: "If a well-regulated militia be the most natural defence of a free country, it ought certainly to be under the regulation and at the disposal of that body which is constituted the guardian of the national security. If standing armies are dangerous to liberty, an efficacious power over the militia, in the body to whose care the protection of the state is committed ought, as far as possible, to take away the inducement and the pretext to such unfriendly institutions. If the federal government can command the aid of the militia in those emergencies which call for the military arm in support of the civil magistrate, it can the better dispense with the employment of a different kind of force. If it cannot avail itself of the former, it will be obliged to recur to the latter. To render an army unnecessary will be a more certain method of preventing its existence than a thousand prohibitions upon paper." *Id.* No. 29, at 169 (A. Hamilton).

66. *Id.* No. 46, at 297-99 (J. Madison).

On the other hand, Maryland overwhelmingly approved the Constitution on April 28, 1787. South Carolina was next, on May 23, 1787. Eight states had now ratified the document and only one more was needed. All of the ratifications, except Massachusetts, had been by majorities of two-thirds or more. The remaining states were to see close contests, and all of them would suggest that a Bill of Rights be added to the Constitution.

New Hampshire, on June 21, 1787, became the ninth state to approve the new form of government, thus assuring that the proposed Constitution would go into effect. The New Hampshire convention proposed some amendments in its ratifying resolution. Among the proposals were a three-fourths vote requirement for keeping standing armies, a flat prohibition on quartering troops, and a prohibition against Congressional disarmament of the militia. Although no records were kept of the debates, it seems likely that the delegates feared that New England's experiences with General Gage's redcoats would be repeated.

As yet undecided, Virginia was vital to the Union as the largest, richest, and most populous state. The Virginia convention was also important because it was the only one in which the military clauses of the Constitution were extensively discussed.

The main protagonist of the Virginia debates was Patrick Henry, backwoods lawyer, ardent republican, and incomparable orator. By means of the rhetorical question, Henry was able to capture the fears and emotions which led to the adoption of the Second Amendment:

> A standing army we shall have, also, to execute the execrable commands of tyranny; and how are you to punish them? Will you order them to be punished? Who shall obey these orders? Will your mace-bearer be a match for a disciplined regiment? In what situation are we to be? . . .
>
> Your militia is given up to Congress, also, in another part of this plan: they will therefore act as they think proper: all power will be in their own possession. You cannot force them to receive their punishment: of what service would militia be to you when, most probably, you will not have a single musket in the state? for, as arms are to be provided by Congress, they may or may not furnish them. . . .
>
> By this, sir, you see that their control over our last and best defence is unlimited. If they neglect or refuse to discipline or arm our militia, they will be useless: the states can do neither—this power being exclusively given to Congress. . . .
>
> . . . If we make a king, we may prescribe the rules by which he shall rule his people, and interpose such checks as shall prevent him from infringing them; but the President, in the field, at the head of his army, can prescribe the terms on which he shall reign master,

so far that it [illegible] under the galling yoke. . . .[67]

While other critics lacked Henry's oratorical talents, they also feared disarmament of the militia by the new national government. George Mason, for example, spoke as follows:

> . . . There are various ways of destroying the militia. A standing army may be perpetually established in their stead. I abominate and detest the idea of government, where there is a standing army. The militia may be here destroyed by that method which has been practised in other parts of the world before; that is, by rendering them useless—by disarming them. Under various pretences, Congress may neglect to provide for arming and disciplining the militia; and the state governments cannot do it, for Congress has an exclusive right to arm them . . .[68]

Mason then went on to cite the case of a former British governor of Pennsylvania who had allegedly advised disarmament of the militia as part of the British government's scheme for "enslaving America." The suggested method was not to act openly, but "totally disusing and neglecting the militia."[69] Mason said:

> . . . This was a most iniquitous project. Why should we not provide against the danger of having our militia, our real and natural strength, destroyed? The general government ought, at the same time, to have some such power. But we need not give them power to abolish our militia . . .[70]

In these words lie the origin of the Second Amendment. The new government should be allowed to keep its broad general military powers, but it should be forbidden to disarm the militia.

Madison, leader of the Federalist forces, still argued that the militia clauses were adequate as written. He said the states and national government would have concurrent power over the militia. In response to a question, he explained why the general government was to have power to call out the militia in order to execute the laws of the union:

> . . . If resistance should be made to the execution of the laws, he said, it ought to be overcome. This could be done only in two ways—either by regular forces or by the people. If insurrections should arise, or invasions should take place, the people ought unquestionably to be employed, to suppress and repel them, rather than a standing army. The best way to do these things was to put the militia on a good and sure footing, and enable the government to make use of their services when necessary.[71]

---

67. Spoken at the Virginia Convention 3 STATE DEBATES 51-59.
68. *Id.* at 379.
69. *Id.* at 380.
70. *Id.*
71. *Id.* at 378.

It is interesting to note that Madison uses the words "people" and "militia" as synonymous, as does the Second Amendment, which he was later to draft.

The Federalists still maintained that a bill of rights was unnecessary where there was a government of enumerated powers. Governor Randolph, who had attended the Philadelphia Convention and had refused to sign the Constitution, but who was now supporting its adoption, spoke as follows:

> On the subject of a bill of rights, the want of which has been complained of, I will observe that it has been sanctified by such reverend authority, that I feel some difficulty in going against it. I shall not, however, be deterred from giving my opinion on this occasion, let the consequence be what it may. At the beginning of the war, he had no certain bill of rights; for our charter cannot be considered as a bill of rights; it is nothing more than an investiture, in the hands of the Virginia citizens, of those rights which belonged to British subjects. When the British thought proper to infringe our rights, was it not necessary to mention, in our Constitution, those rights which ought to be paramount to the power of the legislature? Why is the bill of rights distinct from the Constitution? I consider bills of rights in this view—that the government should use them, where there is a departure from its fundamental principles, in order to restore them.[72]

This statement is very important, because it clearly explains how men in the eighteenth century conceived of a right. A right was a restriction on governmental power, necessitated by a particular abuse of that power.

The Virginia convention, however, decided that it would be wise to impose restrictions on the power of the general government before abuses occurred. So the delegates appended to their ratification resolution a long document recommended to the consideration of the Congress. This document is divided into two distinct parts: a declaration of principles and specified suggested amendments to the Constitution designed to secure these principles.

The declaration of principles tells much about the social and political philosophy of eighteenth century Americans. The theory of government as a social compact is affirmed. There are five provisions that relate directly to the background of the Second Amendment.

The third principle condemns the Anglican doctrine of nonresistance as "absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind."[73] This is not surprising, since Virginia had recently dis-

---

72. *Id.* at 466.

73. J. Madison, The Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 660 (G. Hunt & J.B. Scott ed. 1920).

established the Anglican Church, [illegible] authority of the head of that church.

The seventh principle is "that all power of suspending laws or the execution of laws by any authority, without the consent of the representatives of the people in the legislature is injurious to their rights, and ought not to be exercised."[74] The attempt to assert such power had cost James II his throne and George III his American colonies, even though both Kings had been backed by powerful standing armies.

The seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth principles are as follows:

> Seventeenth, That the people have a right to keep and bear arms; that a well regulated Militia composed of the body of the people trained to arms is the proper, natural and safe defence of a free State. That standing armies in time of peace are dangerous to liberty, and therefore ought to be avoided, as far as the circumstances and protection of the Community will admit; and that in all cases the military should be under strict subordination to and governed by the Civil power.
>
> Eighteenth, That no Soldier in time of peace ought to be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, and in the time of war in such manner only as the laws direct.
>
> Nineteenth, That any person religiously scrupulous of bearing arms ought to be exempted upon payment of an equivalent to employ another to bear arms in his stead.[75]

These words encapsulate the Whig point of view in the long debate over the relative merits of standing armies and the militia. The specific amendments that were proposed to protect these principles were:

> Ninth, That no standing army or regular troops shall be raised or kept up in time of peace, without the consent of two thirds of the members present in both houses.
>
> Tenth, That no soldier shall be inlisted for any longer term than four years, except in time of war, and then for no longer term than the continuance of the war.
>
> Eleventh, That each State respectively shall have the power to provide for organizing, arming and disciplining it's own Militia, whensoever Congress shall omit or neglect to provide for the same. That the Militia shall not be subject to Martial law, except when in actual service in time of war, invasion, or rebellion; and when not in the actual service of the United States, shall be subject only to such fines, penalties and punishments as shall be directed or inflicted by the laws of its own State.[76]

It is important for our purposes to note that there is no mention here of any individual right.

---

74. *Id.* at 661.
75. *Id.* at 662.
76. *Id.* at 663.

The Purpose of the Second Amendment

There might never have been a federal Bill of Rights had it not been for one alarming event that is almost forgotten today. As part of the price of ratification in New York, it was agreed unanimously that a second federal convention should be called by the states, in accordance with Article V of the Constitution, to revise the document. Governor Clinton wrote a circular letter making this proposal to the governors of all the states.

Madison feared that a new convention would reconsider the whole structure of government and undo what had been achieved. Professor Merrill Jensen, in *The Making of the American Constitution*, analyzes the situation as follows:

> The Bill of Rights was thus born of Madison's concern to prevent a second convention which might undo the work of the Philadelphia Convention, and also of his concern to save his political future in Virginia. On the other side such men as Patrick Henry understood perfectly the political motives involved. He looked upon the passage of the Bill of Rights as a political defeat which would make it impossible to block the centralization of all power in the national government.[77]

Madison had outmanuevered the antifederalists by drafting the Bill of Rights very soon after the First Congress met.

Madison's original draft of the provision that eventually became the Second Amendment read:

> The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; a well armed but well regulated militia being the best security of a free country; but no person religiously scrupulous of bearing arms shall be compelled to render military service in person.[78]

There was debate in Congress over the religious exemption, and it was removed. Otherwise, there was general discussion of standing armies and the militia, and widespread support for the proposal. It became part of the Constitution with the rest of the Bill of Rights on December 15, 1791.

Considering the immediate political context of the Second Amendment, as well as its long historical background, there can be no doubt about its intended meaning. There had been a long standing fear of military power in the hands of the executive, and, rightly or wrongly, many people believed that the militia was an effective military force which minimized the need for such executive military power. The pro-

---

77. M. JENSEN, THE MAKING OF THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION 149 (1964).
78. 1 ANNALS OF CONG. 434 (1789).

posed Constitution authorized standing armies without Congressional power over the militia. Some even feared disarmament of the militia. The Second Amendment was clearly and simply an effort to relieve that fear.

Neither in the Philadelphia Convention, in the writings of the pamphleteers, in the newspapers, in the convention debates, nor in Congress was there any reference to hunting, target shooting, duelling, personal self-defense, or any other subject that would indicate an individual right to have guns. Every reference to the right to bear arms was in connection with military service.

Thus the inevitable conclusion is that the "collectivist" view of the Second Amendment rather than the "individualist" interpretation is supported by history. It thus becomes necessary to examine the decisions of the Supreme Court in order to determine whether that body has expanded the right to bear arms beyond what was intended in 1789.

VII. Supreme Court Interpretation of the Second Amendment

The Second Amendment has been directly considered by the Supreme Court in only four cases: *United States v. Cruikshank*,[79] *Presser v. Illinois*,[80] *Miller v. Texas*[81] and *United States v. Miller*.[82]

In *Cruikshank*, the defendants had been convicted of conspiracy to deprive negro citizens of the rights and privileges secured to them by the Constitution and laws of the United States, in violation of the criminal provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1870. Among the rights violated were the right to peaceably assemble and the right to keep and bear arms for a lawful purpose.

Chief Justice Waite, speaking for the majority, held that the rights violated by the defendants were not secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, and thus the judgment of conviction was affirmed. The chief justice began with a long discussion of the nature of the federal system in general, and the attributes of state and national citizenship in particular. The only rights protected by the national government were those necessary for participation in that government. The right to petition Congress would be such a right, but a person must look

79. 92 U.S. 542 (1875).
80. 116 U.S. 252 (1886).
81. 153 U.S. 535 (1894).
82. 307 U.S. 174 (1939).

to his state government for protection of similar rights in other situations.

In particular reference to the Second Amendment, the opinion states:

> The second and tenth counts are equally defective. The right there specified is that of "bearing arms for a lawful purpose." This is not a right granted by the Constitution. Neither is it in any manner dependent upon that instrument for its existence. The second amendment declares that it shall not be infringed; but this, as has been seen, means no more than that it shall not be infringed by Congress. This is one of the amendments that has no other effect than to restrict the powers of the national government, leaving the people to look for their protection against any violation by their fellow-citizens of the rights it recognizes, to what is called, in *The City of New York v. Miln*, 11 Pet. 139, the "powers which relate to merely municipal legislation, or what was, perhaps, more properly called internal police," "not surrendered or restrained" by the Constitution of the United States.[83]

The only dissenter in *Cruikshank* was Justice Clifford, who found the indictment vague on its face. He thus concurred in the result reached by the majority without discussing any constitutional issues.

The next, and undoubtedly the most important Second Amendment case was *Presser v. Illinois*[84] decided in 1886. Herman Presser, a German-American, was the leader of *Lehr und Wehr Verein*, a fraternal, athletic and paramilitary association incorporated under Illinois law. He was convicted for parading and drilling with men under arms, in violation of an Illinois statute, and was fined ten dollars.

On appeal to the United States Supreme Court, it was contended that the Illinois statute conflicted with the military powers given to Congress by the Constitution, with federal statutes passed in pursuance of those powers, and with various other parts of the Constitution, including the Second Amendment. The Supreme Court unanimously rejected all of these claims and affirmed the conviction.

It should be emphasized that *Presser* was argued and decided as a case presenting broad issues of the relationship of state and federal military power, and that the Second Amendment was only one aspect of that question. In reference to the Illinois statute, the Court observed:

> We think it clear that the sections under consideration, which only forbid bodies of men to associate together as military organizations, or to drill or parade with arms in cities and towns unless authorized by law, do not infringe the right of the people to keep

83. 92 U.S. at 553 (1875).
84. 116 U.S. 252 (1886).

> and bear arms. But a conclusive answer to the contention that this amendment prohibits the legislation in question lies in the fact that the amendment is a limitation only upon the power of Congress and the National government, and not upon that of the States.[85]

The Court cited *Cruikshank* in support of this proposition. The inapplicability of the Second Amendment to the states was a sufficient ground for rejecting Presser's Second Amendment contentions, but the Court did not stop there. It preferred to discuss the problem further and make clear the nature of the right protected by the Second Amendment.

> It is undoubtedly true that all citizens capable of bearing arms constitute the reserved military force or reserve militia of the United States as well as of the States, and, in view of this prerogative of the general government, as well as of its general powers, the States cannot, even laying the constitutional provision in question out of view, prohibit the people from keeping and bearing arms, so as to deprive the United States of their rightful resource for maintaining the public security, and disable the people from performing their duty to the general government.[86]

One view of the Second Amendment suggests that this dicta constitutes the first step toward incorporating the right to bear arms into the Fourteenth Amendment,[87] apparently forgetting that the Court was laying the Second Amendment "out of view." The Court had stated that the Illinois law does not have the effect of depriving the federal government of its military capacity.

To further clarify its view that the Second Amendment is concerned only with military matters, the opinion focuses on *Presser*:

> The plaintiff in error was not a member of the organized volunteer militia of the State of Illinois, nor did he belong to the troops of the United States or to any organization under the militia law of the United States. On the contrary, the fact that he did not belong to the organized militia or the troops of the United States was an ingredient in the offence for which he was convicted and sentenced. The question is, therefore, had he a right as a citizen of the United States, in disobedience of the State law, to associate with others as a military company, and to drill and parade with arms in the towns and cities of the State? If the plaintiff in error has any such privilege he must be able to point to the provision of the Constitution or statutes of the United States by which it is conferred.[88]

The obvious implication here is that any right to bear arms by virtue of the Second Amendment, even if asserted against the national gov-

85. *Id.* at 264-65.
86. *Id.* at 265.
87. *See generally* H. Black, *The Bill of Rights*, 35 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 865 (1960).
88. *Id.* at 266.

ernment, is contingent upon military service in accordance with statutory law. This implication is confirmed later in the opinion, as the Court declared:

> The right to voluntarily assemble together as a military company or organization, or to drill or parade with arms, without, and independent of, an act of Congress or law of the State authorizing the same, is not an attribute of national citizenship. Military organization and military drill and parade under arms are subjects especially under the control of the government of every country. They cannot be claimed as a right independent of law.[89]

Thus the *Presser* case clearly affirms the meaning of the Second Amendment that was intended by its framers. It protects only members of a state militia, and it protects them only against being disarmed by the federal government. There is no individual right that can be claimed independent of state militia law. Furthermore, the dicta relating to preservation of the nation's military capacity could not be used as the basis for questioning any regulation of private firearms, unless such a regulation violated an act of Congress; Congress is obviously the best judge of the proper means of preserving the nation's military capacity.

The third, and least important, of the Second Amendment cases was *Miller v. Texas*.[90] A convicted murderer asserted that the state had violated his Second and Fourth Amendment rights. The Supreme Court unanimously dismissed the claim in one sentence, relying on the inapplicability of these provisions to the states, and citing *Cruikshank* and other cases.

The fourth and last time that the Supreme Court considered the Second Amendment was in *United States v. Miller*.[91] The result reached by Justice McReynolds for a unanimous Court was obviously correct, but the opinion is so brief and sketchy that it has undoubtedly caused much of the uncertainty that exists today about the meaning of the Second Amendment.

Defendants Miller and Layton were indicted for violation of the National Firearms Act of 1934,[92] which was designed to help control gangsters, and which infringed the right to keep and bear sawed off shotguns, among other arms. The District Court of the United States for the Western District of Arkansas sustained a demurrer and quashed the indictment, holding the 1934 Act unconstitutional on Second

89. *Id.* at 267.
90. 153 U.S. 535 (1894).
91. 307 U.S. 174 (1939).
92. National Firearms Act *as amended* 26 U.S.C. §§ 5801-5872 (1972).

Amendment grounds. The government appealed to the Supreme Court, which reversed and remanded.

When *Miller* was argued before the High Court, there was no appearance for the defendants. With only one side presenting a case, it is easy to understand why the Court viewed the issues as rather simple, and not needing very much analysis.

The Court began by observing that the National Firearms Act was a valid revenue measure, and not a usurpation of the police powers of the states. The opinion then addresses itself to the Second Amendment issue:

> In the absence of any evidence tending to show that possession or use of a "shotgun having a barrel of less than eighteen inches in length" at this time has some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia, we cannot say that the Second Amendment guarantees the right to keep and bear such an instrument. Certainly it is not within judicial notice that this weapon is any part of the ordinary military equipment or that its use could contribute to the common defense.[93]

It is this paragraph that is the source of the uncertainty and confusion arising from the *Miller* case. The Court was merely correcting the error of the district judge, but it made the mistake of looking at the weapon, rather than the person, in determining that the Second Amendment is not applicable.

Fortunately, however, Justice McReynolds went on and partially clarified the ambiguity in the above paragraph. He cited the militia clauses of the Constitution and said:

> With obvious purpose to assure the continuation and render possible the effectiveness of such forces the declaration and guarantee of the Second Amendment were made. It must be interpreted and applied with that end in view.[94]

These words alone undercut any individual right interpretation of the Second Amendment.

Justice McReynolds then proceeded to give a brief history of the militia, stressing its function as a military force. He then considered the relevance of state interpretations of the right to bear arms, and noted:

> Most if not all of the States have adopted provisions touching the right to keep and bear arms. Differences in the language employed in these have naturally led to somewhat variant conclusions concerning the scope of the right guaranteed.[95]

---

93. 307 U.S. at 178.
94. *Id.*
95. *Id.* at 182.

...e concluded that such decisions did not support the trial judge's ruling. He then referred the reader to "some of the more important opinions" concerning the militia. First among these opinions was *Presser v. Illinois*."[96]

Thus, in spite of some ambiguity in the Court's opinion in *Miller*, there is no reason to suppose that there was any change in the established view that the Second Amendment defines and protects a collective right that is vested only in the members of the state militia.

VIII. Conclusion

In the last angry decades of the twentieth century, members of rifle clubs, paramilitary groups and other misguided patriots continue to oppose legislative control of handguns and rifles. These ideological heirs of the vigilantes of the bygone western frontier era still maintain that the Second Amendment guarantees them a personal right to "keep and bear arms."[97] But the annals of the Second Amendment attest to the fact that its adoption was the result of a political struggle to restrict the power of the national government and to prevent the disarmament of state militias.[98] Not unlike their English forbears, the American revolutionaries had a deep fear of centralized executive power, particularly when standing armies were at its disposal. The Second Amendment was adopted to prevent the arbitrary use of force by the national government against the states and the individual.

Delegates to the Constitutional Convention had no intention of establishing any personal right to keep and bear arms. Therefore the "individualist" view of the Second Amendment must be rejected in favor of the "collectivist" interpretation, which is supported by history and a handful of Supreme Court decisions on the issue.

As pointed out previously, the nature of the Second Amendment does not provide a right that could be interpreted as being incorporated into the Fourteenth Amendment. It was designed solely to protect the states against the general government, not to create a personal right which either state or federal authorities are bound to respect.

---

96. 116 U.S. 252 (1886).

97. A recent call to action was made by an organization which calls itself the *Sheriff's Posse Comitatus*. This group, dismayed over claimed violations of the Second Amendment promises to "come together and do something about it." Its propaganda concludes rather ominously, "The PEOPLE are the rightful masters to both congress and courts, not to over throw (sic) the Constitution, but to over throw (sic) the men who pervert the Constitution." *Flyer, Sheriff's Posse Comitatus*, Petaluma, California, 1975.

98. See notes 60-66 and accompanying text.

The contemporary meaning of the Second Amendment is the same as it was at the time of its adoption. The federal government may regulate the National Guard, but may not disarm it against the will of state legislatures. Nothing in the Second Amendment, however, precludes Congress or the states from requiring licensing and registration of firearms; in fact, there is nothing to stop an outright congressional ban on private ownership of all handguns and all rifles.

SOURCE:
HASTINGS CONSTITUTIONAL
LAW QUARTERLY
Vol. 2, No. 1, Winter,
1975

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
42 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036

Gun Control Legislation

By THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION

INTRODUCTION

Since the enactment of the Gun Control Act of 1968 there has been a substantial increase in the incidence of gun-related crimes and it has become evident that the existing system of law is inadequate. Efforts have been underway in both Houses of Congress to enact further gun control legislation and the Executive Branch has indicated support for stronger gun control. Both the Subcommittee on Crime of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Crime and Juvenile Delinquency of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary have accumulated a substantial factual record on which to base legislation.

We believe that the contribution of handguns to the current increase in homicide and other violent crimes requires immediate and comprehensive action. In our opinion, the continued existence of an unwarranted supply of handguns is an underlying factor in the decline of our major urban centers. This Committee does not find any substantial justification for the continued widespread public possession of handguns, and, accordingly, we strongly endorse the legislative proposals calling for a prohibition on the manufacture, importation, sale, and private possession of handguns.[1] Whether or not our recommendations are politically feasible at this moment in time, we are of the firmly held conviction that a complete ban on handguns should be the ultimate objective of any new federal gun control legislation.

This report is divided into four parts. Part I describes the current federal law and the congressional proposals for change. Part II examines the constitutional bases for Congress legislating a prohibition on the manufacture, importation, sale, and private possession of handguns. Part III discusses the need for adopting far-reaching gun control legislation. Our recommendations are contained in Part IV.

II. *GUN CONTROL AND THE CONSTITUTION*

To determine whether a federal statute restricting handguns would be constitutional, two questions must be answered: (A) Is there a constitutional right to possession of handguns which cannot be infringed by legislation, and (B) does regulation of handguns fall within the scope of any of the subjects on which Congress is empowered by the Constitution to legislate? A review of the relevant decisions demonstrates that Congress may constitutionally enact legislation restricting and prohibiting the possession of handguns by private citizens.[10]

A. *Is There a Constitutional Right to Possess Handguns?*

Debates on the merits of gun control legislation are regularly punctuated by claims of a constitutional right to possess firearms. The source of these claims is the Second Amendment to the Constitution, which provides:

> "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."

Although spirited controversy as to the meaning of the Second Amendment continues unabated among commentators,[11] courts over a long period of time have consistently given the amendment a very narrow construction. The Second Amendment as so interpreted places no restrictions on Congress' ability to regulate handguns.

A constitutional provision concerning the right to "bear Arms" is directed at checking power. The question is what the framers of the Constitution intended. There are basically three relationships which could have been intended to be affected: (1) the individual against the world; (2) the populace against the government, whether state or federal; and (3) the state government against the federal government. The first possibility, that the framers were concerned with the right of individuals to protect their homes and their persons from whatever depredations might confront them, appears to be without historical support.[12] The amendment itself speaks of the "security of a free State." The disputes have centered around the second and third possibilities.

The initial question is the proper interpretation of the term "Militia." The practice in Europe of maintaining large standing armies while prohibiting the general populace from having guns led to a preference in colonial America for the militia as the primary military force. This force would be drawn from the people and would be active only in time of military need.[13]

Some have argued that the militia was regarded as the populace at large—or at least those members of the populace capable of bearing arms.[14] To these commentators, militia meant the "unorganized militia," so that the Second Amendment must be read as permitting the populace to maintain arms as a check against excesses of any or all government. This position is sometimes characterized as more extreme than it really is. The framers of the

Constitution need not have created a "right to revolution" or a license to band together in paramilitary organizations to have established a check on the government by permitting the populace to keep and bear arms.[15] Whatever the merits of the "unorganized militia" analysis may be, however, it has never found judicial favor.

The federal courts have long regarded the Second Amendment as concerned only with the "organized militia" maintained by the states. In 1875, the Supreme Court ruled in *United States* v. *Cruickshank*[16] that the Second Amendment restricted Congress alone and not state governments. More recently, in *United States* v. *Miller*,[17] the Supreme Court held that Congress could regulate firearms so long as there was no evidence of a relationship between the regulation and the preservation or efficiency of the state militia. The Court said that Miller could not attack his indictment for interstate shipment of a sawed-off shotgun under the Second Amendment:

> "In the absence of any evidence tending to show that possession or use of a 'shotgun having a barrel of less than eighteen inches in length' at this time has some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia, we cannot say that the Second Amendment guarantees the right to keep and bear such an instrument. Certainly it is not within judicial notice that this weapon is any part of the ordinary military equipment or that its use could contribute to the common defense."[18]

Some have argued that the *Miller* case should be read narrowly, since evidence of a military use can be shown as a matter of fact for most kinds of weapons.[19] However, federal courts after *Miller* have read the decision as requiring a showing that the challenged legislation actually interfered with the state militia. Under this standard, Second Amendment challenges to federal gun control legislation uniformly have been rejected.[20]

Further, even if the Second Amendment were to be interpreted to refer to an "unorganized militia," it would not follow that Congress would be barred from regulating the ownership of handguns. Such regulation would still be constitutional unless handguns were regarded as "Arms" within the meaning of the Second Amendment. It appears instead that the "Arms" of the militia were understood to consist of rifles and muskets.

In addition to the constitutional provisions and old state statutes quoted in *United States* v. *Miller*[21] and other secondary sources,[22] there are a number of early cases considering whether handguns are "Arms" within the meaning of the Second Amendment. While the decisions are not uniform, the weight of authority is that handguns do not constitute such "Arms."[23]

This position is most effectively expressed in *State* v. *Workman*,[24] where the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia wrote:

> ". . . in regard to the kind of arms referred to in the amendment, it must be held to refer to the weapons of warfare to be used by the militia, such as swords, guns, rifles, and muskets,—arms to be used in defending the state and civil liberty,—and not to pistols, bowie-knives,

> brass knuckles, billies, and such other weapons as are usually employed in brawls, street fights, duels, and affrays, and are only habitually carried by bullies, blackguards, and desperadoes, to the terror of the community and the injury of the state."[25]

Thus, in our view, the Second Amendment poses no barrier to congressional efforts to reduce "the terror of the community and the injury of the state" by prohibiting the private possession of handguns.

B. *Does Congress Have Power to Regulate the Manufacture, Possession and Sale of All Handguns?*

While several congressional powers could be invoked in support of gun control legislation,[26] justification is ordinarily found under Congress' power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce.[27] There can be no serious dispute that certain kinds of gun-related activities—for example, interstate sales of firearms—can be regulated under the commerce clause. The disagreements arise over how far Congress may go in regulating local gun activity under its power to regulate matters "affecting" commerce.

In *United States* v. *Bass*,[28] the Supreme Court recently avoided a constitutional issue concerning 18 U.S.C. § 1202, which prohibits the transportation, receipt or possession of guns by felons, by holding that proof that the prohibited conduct in each case was in commerce or affected commerce was required by the statute. Prior courts of appeals decisions had differed as to whether that statute was a constitutional exercise of the commerce power without such proof.[29]

However, in *Perez* v. *United States*,[30] a case decided shortly before the *Bass* case, the Supreme Court had laid the groundwork for the power to create a federal criminal law under the commerce clause. The *Perez* case concerned the constitutionality of a provision in Title II of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 891 *et seq.*, making loansharking a federal crime. In holding that Perez had been lawfully convicted despite the absence of proof of the effect of his conduct on commerce, the Court cited a variety of reports and statistical studies providing evidentiary support for the congressional finding that, in the aggregate, loansharking had an effect on commerce. It concluded, therefore, that Congress could prohibit the practice regardless of the extent to which the activities of each particular loanshark may have affected commerce.

An examination of *Perez* and its progeny, and of other federal criminal legislation regulating local activity, points out what may have led the Supreme Court to take a very narrow position in the *Bass* case, namely the lack of any substantial legislative findings. In *Perez*, the Court put great emphasis on the findings made by Congress of the impact of loan sharking on interstate commerce, even as a local activity, and on the very substantial evidence which was available to Congress to support those findings. In *Bass*, in contrast, there was virtually no legislative history to guide the Court in its interpretation of congressional intentions.

The implication of the limitation on Congress' attempted exercise of

power in the *Bass* case is that if gun control legislation is supported by substantial documentation and carefully drawn congressional findings concerning the effects of the proscribed activity on interstate commerce generally, the Supreme Court would sustain the exercise of power under the commerce clause even if the activity of specific individuals were purely local in nature.

In a number of cases involving federal gun control legislation arising after *Bass*, courts have followed *Perez* to uphold the power of Congress to regulate firearms felonies without a showing in each case of a nexus with interstate commerce.[31] In *United States* v. *Nelson*,[32] the Fifth Circuit affirmed a conviction under 18 U.S.C. § 922(a)(6), which prohibits the making of false statements in connection with the acquisition of a firearm, in spite of a failure to show a nexus between the defendant's false statements to the gun dealer and interstate commerce. Although the individual activity was clearly local, the court found that under *Perez* the Congress does have the power to regulate an intrastate activity, an isolated instance of which may have no direct connection with interstate commerce, because that intrastate activity in the aggregate does impose a burden on interstate commerce.[33]

The decision in *Nelson* leaves open the question whether Congress has the power under the *Perez* theory to regulate possession of a firearm. It could be argued that the manufacture and sale of firearms presents a stronger case for federal regulation since a potential impact on interstate commerce is discernible, while possession of a firearm could be an entirely and perpetually local activity in a given instance. Such an argument ignores the aggregate effect on commerce of a substantial number of people possessing firearms. In an analogous situation, regulation of the possession of narcotics and other controlled substances under 21 U.S.C. §§ 841 and 844, and predecessor statutes, courts have upheld the regulation without a showing in each case of a nexus with interstate commerce.

In *Deyo* v. *United States*,[34] for example, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a conviction for possession and sale of a drug against the contention of the defendant that the conviction was invalid because there had been no proof of a connection between the defendant's activities and interstate commerce. The court described at length the congressional findings supporting federal control of the possession of these drugs. The court concluded that effective interstate regulation was not possible if intrastate transactions were not also regulated.[35]

The conclusion to be drawn from the narcotics possession cases is that if it can be shown through proper congressional findings that possession of handguns as a class of activity has an effect on interstate commerce, then individual possession could be legitimately proscribed without any showing in each case of a nexus with interstate commerce, notwithstanding that a particular weapon had never been in interstate commerce. Indeed it is the possession of handguns that can be viewed as being responsible for their manufacture, importation and sale. Thus, if undertaken after congressional findings of effect on interstate commerce based on substantial investigation, federal legislation banning the manufacture, sale and possession of handguns would in our view be authorized by the commerce clause.

STATE OF ALASKA

Bill Sheffield, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

POUCH K – STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
PHONE: (907) 465-3600

April 13, 1983
Redated 7/1/83 for printing purposes

The Honorable Pat Rodey
Senator
Alaska State Legislature
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

The Honorable Charlie Bussell
Representative
Alaska State Legislature
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Re: Handgun Ban
Our file No.: 366-444-83

Dear Senator Rodey and Representative Bussell:

You have asked this office whether a landlord, through a leasehold agreement, may prohibit a tenant from possessing handguns. We conclude that in certain circumstances a landlord may restrict or prohibit the use and/or possession of handguns on property which is leased to another individual.

Our initial inquiry regarding this matter commenced with a review of relevant Alaskan Constitutional provisions. The Alaska Constitution directly addresses a citizens ability to bear arms at Article I, Section 19 which states:

> 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.

The language embodied in Alaska's Constitution pertaining to arms is virtually identical, save for two changes in punctuation, to language found in Article II of the United States Constitution. Article II of the United States Constitution was proposed by the Congress on September 25, 1789 and became the law of the United States on December 15, 1791. During the one hundred and ninety two years since adoption of the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and the twenty-four years since the Alaska Constitution has been in effect, numerous court cases have interpreted the constitutional language which establishes the right to bear arms.

We note the period since the adoption of the Second Amendment has witnessed an ever increasing issuance of opinions from the judiciary of the various states and the federal courts which place limits on an individual's ability to bear arms. Some commentators have theorized that the legislative and judicial limitations increased significantly with the availability of inexpensive surplus weapons following the American Civil War. 1/ According to this theory, the increase in restrictive gun control measures and corresponding judicial interpretations was associated with increasing acquisition of firearms by recently emancipated Black Americans and immigrants coupled with the increased availability of firearms in the post Civil War industrial America. The right of 'bearing arms' is not a right granted by the Constitution nor is it in any manner dependant upon that instrument for its existence. U.S. v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 553 (D.C.La. 1875).

While offering no judgment on the propriety or effectiveness of the restrictive legislative and judicial measures, we observe that the current state of the law pertaining to the constitutional language holds that:

> [The] purpose of this amendment, guaranteeing that the right of the people to keep and bear arms, was to preserve the effectiveness and assure the continuation of the state militia. U.S. v. Oakes, 564 F.2d, cert. denied 98 S.Ct. 1493 (C.A. Kan. 1977).

The modern judicial view has increasingly found that the guaranteed right to keep and bear arms is not an individually protected right, but rather a collective right which allows the people of the various states to serve in a militia. The contemporary judicial view in the great majority of states interprets the constitutional language as posing no limitations on the legislature's power to regulate the ownership or control of firearms. Whatever the scope of any common-law or constitutional right to bear arms, it is not absolute and does not guarantee to individuals the right to carry weapons abroad at all times and in all circumstances. Application of Atkinson, 291 N.W.2d 396 (Minn. 1980). By analogy then, a landlord, too, could restrict

---

1/ Kates, Don B. Restricting Handguns, North River Press, pages 7-30 (1979)

the possession of handguns on property he or she owns and leases. If the State can restrict arms without running afoul of constitutional provisions, an individual almost certainly has similar abilities.

It is conceivable that a landlord's ban on handgun ownership could be challenged under constitutional doctrines which afford a right of privacy. The United States Constitution, while not containing an express provision guaranteeing privacy has been interpreted to afford an individual certain protections, Cf. Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965). "The Constitution extends special safeguards to the privacy of the home, including activities which might be prohibited in other contexts." Cf. U.S. v. Orito, 413 U.S. 137, 142 (1973).

While it is unlikely that a court would find that an individuals right to possess arms (for example a gun collection) is protected by the privacy shield of the U.S. Constitution, the argument could be maintained. We are unaware of this argument being successfully asserted in any anglo-american jurisdiction.

A more likely source of protection under the right to privacy doctrine may be afforded by the Alaska Constitution at Article I, Section 22 which states that:

> The right of the people to privacy shall not be infringed. The legislature shall implement this section.

The Alaska Supreme Court has explicitly stated that the right of privacy guaranteed to Alaskans is broader in scope than that guaranteed by the federal constitution. Woods & Rohde, Inc., v. State, 565 P.2d 138 (1977). Even so, the meaning of privacy or necessity must vary depending on the factual context and the often compelling interests of society and the individual. State v. Glass, 583 P.2d 879 (1978). The test for what interests are protected under Alaska's constitutional right to privacy are, first, whether a person has exhibited an actual (subjective) expectation of privacy and, second, that the expectation be one that society is prepared to recognize as "reasonable". Hilbers v. Municipality of Anchorage, 611 P.2d 31 (1980).

The question of handgun ownership in Alaska and whether such ownership is "reasonable" in the context of a landlord tenant relationship is open ended. Probably the "expectation" and reasonableness of gun ownership in Alaska is different than the reasonableness of gun ownership in many other jurisdictions where actual firearm ownership and use is reduced. In any event,

absent specific language under the Alaska Uniform Residential Landlord and Tenant Act, AS 34.03.010 et seq., or other relevant Alaska law, prohibiting inclusion of provisions in a leasehold agreement, we believe a landlord can properly restrict the terms of the tenancy. 2/ In all probability, under existing Alaska law, a landlord can restrict possession of handguns for tenants in a manner not unlike a landlord's ability to prohibit tenants from possessing dogs, operating businesses in a residential leasehold or operating obnoxious stereo equipment. 2/

While a landlord will probably be able to impose a restriction prohibiting future tenants from possessing handguns, an across-the-board ban applicable to tenants with existing leasehold agreements may be invalid. Under classic contract principles, neither party to an agreement may superimpose an additional term on a valid contract without the consent of each party to the contract. Consequently, a landlord may not prohibit handgun possession among tenants during the pendency of an existing lease. Conversely, where a landlord and tenant agree to a lease agreement which contains a restriction banning handguns, remedial legislative action interpreting Alaska's right to privacy law to permit such possession probably would not invalidate existing prohibitions.

Finally, concern was expressed regarding the state's liability with respect to landlord/tenant agreements which prohibit handgun ownership in buildings located on property owned by the State. This last point is conceivably problematic if the land on which the Panoramic View Apartments are located is conveyed to the state as a result of the current Alaska Railroad transfer negotiations. Attached is a copy of a memorandum by Assistant Attorney General Jack McGee which deals with this subject.

2/ In passing, we note that a landlord concerned with unjustified gun play need not necessarily prohibit gun ownership. Other remedies exist for controlling individual tenants with a propensity to abuse gun ownership. Cf. Osness v. Dimond Estates, Inc., 615 P.2d 605 (1980), where the landlord obtained a Forcible Entry and Detainer (F.E.D.) thereby removing a tenant that proved incapable of properly handling firearms.

Redated 7/1/83 for printing purposes

We trust this response answers your inquiry. If you have any additional questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,

NORMAN C. GORSUCH
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: Joseph W. Geldhof
Assistant Attorney General

JWG:vrb

cc: Norman C. Gorsuch
Attorney General

Ronald W. Lorensen
Deputy Attorney General

STATE OF ALASKA
THE LEGISLATURE

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY

POUCH V STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU ALASKA 99811
907 465 3808

MEMORANDUM April 30, 1986

SUBJECT: Right of a citizen to keep and bear arms [CSSJR 39(Judiciary) am]

TO: Representative M. Mike Miller
Chair, House Judiciary Committee

FROM: Richard A. Bradley
Legislative Counsel

Hayden Kaden has asked that I comment on three issues relating to this resolution proposing a constitutional amendment.

The amendment proposed under CSSJR 39(Judiciary) am would amend art. I, sec. 19 of the Alaska Constitution, "Right to Bear Arms". The resolution contains a statement of "Legislative Intent".

It may be desirable to summarize each to set the stage for the comments that follow.

Section 1 of CSSJR 39(Judiciary) am amends as follows:

> SECTION 19. RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS. The [A WELL REGULATED MILITIA BEING NECESSARY TO THE SECURITY OF A FREE STATE, THE] right of each citizen of the state [THE PEOPLE] to keep and bear arms for lawful defense of self, family, property, and the state and for lawful hunting, recreation, and other lawful purposes, shall not be infringed by the state or by a borough or city of the state.

Sec. 2(a) of CSSJR 39(Judiciary) am states legislative intent: "the legislature intends only that the amendment . . . [provide] that the right to keep and bear arms is an individual rather than a collective right." And the "amendment, if adopted, should not be construed to preclude the regulation of the manner in which arms may be borne, carried, or used." [It] "should not be used to repeal or to

render unconstitutional existing statutes . . . or existing municipal ordinances."

I. What is the effect of an expression of legislative intent in a constitutional amendment?

I believe that the courts will give deference to legislative intent. There is an existing history of them doing that. In Alaska Public Employees Ass'n v. State, 525 P.2d 12, 17 - 18 and in Seward Marine Services, Inc. v. Anderson, 643 P.2d 493, the Alaska Supreme Court considered the extent to which it would consider evidence of legislative intent apart from that stated in the legislation itself. In each case, even though it would seem that extraneous evidence is weaker than legislative intent stated within the legislation itself, it considered the offered evidence carefully.

A statement of legislative intent in the context of a constitutional amendment would be entitled to equal weight as compared to a statement of legislative intent in legislation if everything were equal. Everything is not, however, equal.

There is a unique mechanical problem in the case of a constitutional amendment. In the usual statement of legislative intent, the theory and the fact is that those who vote for the bill have the statement of the legislative intent before them (if it is incorporated into the bill) as they vote or, in the case of the governor, when it is reviewed before signature or veto.

There is a difference here. The voters of the state who actually approve or reject the amendment will not have the statement of legislative intent before them. As a matter of law, it seems that they will have only section 1 of the resolution before them. See art. XIII, sec. 1 of the Alaska Constitution: the "lieutenant governor shall prepare a ballot title and proposition summarizing each proposed amendment, and shall place them on the ballot . . . ."

In an attempt to address that problem, sec. 2(b) of CSSJR 39(Judiciary) am directs the Legislative Affairs Agency, as it prepares the "neutral summary" under AS 15.58.020, to "consider" the statement of legislative intent. It is presumably only through the neutral summary published in the voter's pamphlet that a voter may become aware of sec. 2(a) of the resolution.

I am satisfied that the Agency, when it considers CSSJR 39(Judiciary) am, will prepare a neutral summary. The law requires no less. Some of the problems that the Agency may have in the preparation of the summary are suggested below.

The general rule is that the legislative intent will be considered only after the substantive language has itself been considered and then only if the court is unable to determine what the legislature intended from the substantive language. The corollary of the rule is that the legislative intent will not be considered if the substantive language is clear or to the extent that the legislative intent contradicts, in some fashion, the substantive language.

It is these points that present the problem for legislative intent.

Sec. 2(a) states that the legislature intends that the "right to keep and bear arms" be "an individual right rather than a collective right." Consistently with that, the amendment deletes the reference to the "well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state".

The very substantial problem is that the language added in provides that the purpose of the right to bear arms is "for lawful defense of self, family, property, and the state". [Emphasis added.] It seems clear that the focus of the amendment is broadened; individual purposes for the right are affirmed. But the amendment also states a collective purpose: the "defense of . . . the state". To the extent that the "legislative purpose" seems inconsistent the substantive language of the amendment itself, the court must disregard the legislative purpose.

I assume that the legislative purpose of the amendment "not [being] used to repeal or render unconstitutional existing statutes . . . or existing municipal ordinances" will be effective.

II. What is the likely effect of the language of the amendment on existing laws against concealed weapons, etc.?

The legislative purpose says that the amendment should have no effect on those laws; predictions of actual effect in this area are, however, somewhat difficult.

The amendment and its analogs in the U.S. Constitution and in the constitutions of other states have a long history: I

think it is fair to say that the amendment has a meaning and an understanding that is larger then the language of the section itself; I see no reason to suggest that the amendment changes these understandings.

It has been said that the provision in the U.S. Constitution goes back to 1689. The English Bill of Rights, enacted by Parliament in 1689, granted the English the right "to have Arms for their Defence, suitable to their Conditions, and allowed by Law." See State v. Kessler, 289 Or. 359, 614 P.2d 94 (Oregon 1980).

The Kessler case and State v. Delgado, 692 P.2d 610 (Oregon 1984) construed the Oregon version of art. I, sec. 19. It provides "The people have the right to bear arms for the defence (sic) of themselves, and the State, . . ." [Art. I, sec. 27, Oregon Constitution.] It seems clear that the language of the Oregon Constitution is identical in function and almost identical in language to that contained in CSSJR 39(Judiciary) am. It should be reasonable, therefore, to expect them to be construed similarly.

The Kessler case involved a prosecution for the possession of a "billy", an item the possession of which was prohibited as a "slugging weapon."

The Oregon court noted that in colonial time and during the Revolutionary War, weapons used by militiamen and by individuals in the defense of their home or their person were the same. The court noted that the historical analysis of the provision indicated that

> the drafter intended "arms" to include the hand-carried weapons commonly used by individuals for personal defense. The club is an effective, hand-carried weapon which cannot logically be excluded from this term. We hold that the defendant's possession of a billy club in his home is protected by Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution. [614 P.2d at 100.]

The Delgado case involved possession of a switchblade.

> The appropriate inquiry in the case at bar is whether a kind of weapon, as modified by its modern design and function, is of the sort commonly used by individuals for personal defense during either the revolutionary or postrevolutionary era, or in 1859 when Oregon's consti-

> tution was adopted. In particular, it must be determined whether the drafters would have intended the word "arms" to include the switch-blade knife as a weapon commonly used by individuals for self defense. [692 P.2d at 612.]

The Oregon Supreme Court agreed that a law that sought to prohibit possession of the "jackknife" or "mere pocketknives" would violate the Oregon constitution.

> The only difference is the presence of the spring-operated mechanism that opens the knife. We are unconvinced by the state's argument that the switch-blade is "so substantially different from its historical antecedent" (the jackknife) that it could not have been within the contemplation of the constitutional drafters. They must have been aware that technological changes were occurring in weaponry as in tools generally. [692 P.2d at 614.]

Note that the provisions of Alaska law now prohibit the possession of a switchblade. See AS 11.61.200.

It is possible that the reference in the amendment to art. I, sec. 19 to "lawful" uses may be adequate to authorize regulation of an "unlawful" use, that is, to define what is unlawful.

On the other hand, a constitutional provision granting the legislature the authority to characterize a use as unlawful may then authorize a regulation that was unintended by the sponsors of the amendment.

I agree that such a result in this state is unlikely for more practical reasons. But that result occurs because of the understandings on the amendment, not really because of the language itself.

III. Elimination of militia concepts.

Your third question asks whether it would be possible to eliminate the "well-regulated militia" concepts while permitting reasonable regulation. The answer is a qualified yes; I think it is clear that some context for the regulation must be offered. Consider the section with the "militia" eliminated:

SECTION 19. RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS. The [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.

With no context for the regulation, the statement becomes absolute and no regulation would be possible. Accordingly, I believe that some threshold basis for the regulation (such as that in SJR 39) must be offered by the constitution.

If I may be of further assistance, please advise.——

RAB:mkr
m5/046

Bill Sheffield, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

POUCH K – STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
PHONE: (907) 465-3600

May 8, 1986

The Honorable M. Mike Miller
Alaska State Legislature
P.O. Box V
Juneau Alaska 99811

Dear Representative Miller:

You have asked this office to comment upon the effect of "legislative intent" language currently contained in a resolution now under consideration by the House Judiciary Committee: CS SJR 39 (Jud) am. This resolution, if passed, would place a proposed constitutional amendment before the voters at the next general election. The resolution contains an amendment to art. I, sec. 19 of the state constitution, relating to a citizen's right to keep and bear arms. The stated purpose of the proposed amendment is to establish that the right to keep and bear arms under the state constitution is an individual right, rather than a collective one.

The proposed constitutional amendment now states that a citizen's right to keep and bear arms "shall not be infringed by the state or by a borough or city of the state." During consideration of CS SJR 39 (Jud) am on the Senate floor Senator Vic Fischer proposed an amendment which would have added the phrase "except that the manner of keeping and bearing arms may be regulated by law." This proposed amendment was rejected by the Senate on a vote of 16 to 2. See Senate Journal, March 26, 1986, at pp. 2166-2167. The Judiciary Committee version of the resolution, adopted with amendment by the Senate, contains a section entitled "legislative intent." Section 2 of CS SJR 39 (Jud) am now provides, in part, that the proposed constitutional amendment "should not be construed to preclude the regulation of the manner in which arms may be borne, carried, or used."

We are concerned that the language presently contained in CS SJR 39 (Jud) am might allow later constitutional challenge to some existing state statutes. Present law, for example, prohibits a convicted felon from possessing a concealable firearm, prohibits possession of certain weapons such as bombs, hand grenades, silencers, and sawed-off shot guns, prohibits possession of a firearm while intoxicated, the discharge of a firearm from, on, or across a highway, the carrying of a concealed weapon, possession of a loaded firearm

on licensed premises, or possession of a firearm by a minor without parental consent. (See AS 11.61.200-11.61.220.)

These statutes serve an important public safety function by restricting the possession of especially dangerous weapons or weapons carried in an especially dangerous manner or place. If the legislature does not intend that the proposed amendment of art. I, sec. 19 would render these statutes unenforceable, nor foreclose a future legislature from adopting similar provisions (prohibiting possession of loaded firearms in a church or on school grounds, for example), then the legislature's intent to continue to allow reasonable regulation by law should be made clear.

It may be that the Senate, in rejecting the amendment proposed by Senator Fischer but adopting section 2 of CS SJR 39 (Jud) am, believed that it was not necessary to explicitly state in the proposed constitutional provision that regulation of firearms by law is allowed, as this point is included in their "legislative intent" language. As a general rule, however, a measure will be enforced according to the plain meaning of the language on its face. 2A C. Sands, Sutherland Statutory Construction § 45.02 at 4 (4th ed. 1984); Wilson v. Municipality of Anchorage, 669 P.2d 569, 571 (Alaska 1983). It is a "fundamental principle of statutory interpretation ... that a statute means what its language reasonably conveys to others..." North Slope Borough v. Sohio Petroleum Corp., 585 P.2d 534, 540 (Alaska 1978); South Central Health Planning v. Commissioner, Dept. of Administration, 628 P.2d 551, 553 (Alaska 1981). 1/

While the courts in Alaska may consider a measure's legislative history to the extent it may assist the court in correctly interpreting the measure, a legislative committee report or formal statement of legislative intent may not be used to give the statute a meaning not fairly contained within its words. Chicago, M., St. P. & P. R. Co. v. Acme Fast Freight, 336 U.S. 465, 93 L.Ed.2d 817, 69 S.Ct. 692 (1949); North Slope Borough, 585 P.2d at 540.

1/ Although general rules of legal interpretation are most often expressed in the context of statutory interpretation, the same rules apply to the interpretation of legislative resolutions and constitutional amendments. 1A C. Sands, Sutherland Statutory Construction § 29.08 at 500 (4th ed. 1985).

When a reviewing court decides that it must consider the legislature's intent in order to construe a provision, the text of the measure itself is still considered the best evidence of legislative intent. See 2A C. Sands, Sutherland Statutory Construction § 46.03 at 82 (4th ed. 1984) and the cases cited there. Where the terms of a provision are clear and straightforward, the intent of the legislature will be based on those terms, even if the apparent intent conflicts with a statement of legislative intent or a committee report. See Caminetti v. United States, 242 U.S. 470, 61 L.Ed. 442, 37 S.Ct. 192 (1917) and 2A C. Sands, Sutherland Statutory Construction § 48.06 at 308 (4th ed. 1984).

In Commercial Fisheries Entry Commission v. Apokedak, 680 P.2d 486 (Alaska 1984) Apokedak, relying upon legislative intent language contained in the "preamble" to the Limited Entry Act, urged the state supreme court not to adopt a literal construction of the act. The court refused to adopt the interpretation suggested by Apokedak, stating: "a statutory preamble ... can neither restrain nor extend the meaning of an unambiguous statute; nor can it be used to create doubt or uncertainty which does not otherwise exist." 680 P.2d at 488, n.3. Thus, to the extent that language contained in the "legislative intent" section of CS SJR 39 (Jud) am conflicts with the plain meaning of the terms of the constitutional provision, it is the constitutional language which will control.

The courts may also consider the history of legislative action taken on a given measure when determining legislative intent. Generally, the rejection of a proposed amendment indicates that the legislature did not intend the bill to include the provisions embodied in the rejected amendment. Lapina v. Williams, 232 U.S. 78, 58 L.Ed. 515, 34 S.Ct. 196 (1914); United States v. Great Northern Railway Co., 287 U.S. 144, 155, 77 L.Ed. 223, 53 S.Ct. 28 (1932); 2A C. Sands, Sutherland Statutory Construction § 48.04 at 302, § 48.18 at 341 (4th ed. 1984). Thus, a reviewing court may well conclude that if the legislature had intended to allow the continued regulation by law of some aspects of a person's right to possess arms it would have adopted the language proposed by Senator Fischer during the Senate's consideration of the resolution. See, e.g., North Slope Borough, 585 P.2d at 541; Wilson, 669 P.2d at 571.

Perhaps the most important consideration here is that in the case of a measure (such as this one) which is to be decided by a vote of the electorate, descriptive statements accompanying the proposition are an important source of

guidance for interpretation. 2A C. Sands, Sutherland Statutory Construction § 48.04 at 301, § 48.19 at 345 (4th ed. 1984); State v. Lewis, 559 P.2d 630, 637-638 (Alaska 1977), cert. denied, 97 S.Ct. 2943, 432 U.S. 901, 53 L.Ed.2d 1073.

Under art. XIII, sec. 1 of the Alaska Constitution, the lieutenant governor is required to prepare a ballot title and a summary of the proposed constitutional amendment. The election pamphlet prepared pursuant to AS 15.58.010 must contain: 1) the text of the proposed constitutional amendment, 2) the ballot title and summary prepared by the lieutenant governor, 3) "a neutral summary" of the proposition prepared by the Legislative Affairs Agency, and 4) advocatory statements for and against the proposed amendment. AS 15.58.020(6). Thus, although the resolution directs the Legislative Affairs Agency to "consider" the statement contained in section 2 of CS SJR 39 (Jud) am when preparing its neutral summary for the ballot, this language will not appear on the ballot, and may well not appear in the elections pamphlet. Since, in the final instance, a reviewing court will look to the intent in the minds of the voters who voted to adopt the constitutional amendment, the legislature's statement of its intent when placing the measure on the ballot has limited significance. Lewis, 559 P.2d at 637-638.

One of the main purposes of a constitution is to limit legislative power. Ordinary acts of the legislature (i.e., statutes), whether adopted before or after a given constitutional provision, cannot be given effect if the statute conflicts with a substantive provision in the constitution. Thus, an amendment to the constitution may expressly, or by implication, repeal existing legislative enactments. Rhode Island v. Palmer, 253 U.S. 350, 64 L.Ed. 946, 40 S.Ct. 486 (1919); 1A C. Sands, Sutherland Statutory Construction § 23.20 at 387 (4th ed. 1985). The possibility that the language proposed in SJR 39 could be interpreted as invalidating some portions of Alaska's present criminal code is a real one, as this has occurred in similar circumstances in other states. See, for example, State v. Kessler, 289 Or. 359, 614 P.2d 94 (1980) and State v. Delgado, 298 Or. 395, 692 P.2d 610 (1984).

Principals of both common sense and responsible draftsmanship dictate that a well-drafted statute or constitutional provision should reduce the need for disputes about interpretation. 2A C. Sands, Sutherland Statutory Construction § 45.02 at 5 (4th ed. 1984). Statements of "legislative intent" are not an adequate substitute for clear, unambiguous language in the proposed constitutional amendment. A more precisely drafted amendment would minimize the

possibility that, should the proposed constitutional amendment be adopted, a criminal defendant would later be able to argue that a criminal weapons misconduct statute is unconstitutional because it violates his right to keep and bear arms under art. I, sec. 19 of the state constitution.

Sincerely,

Harold M. Brown
Attorney General

STATE OF ALASKA

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bill Sheffield, Governor

POUCH K - STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
PHONE: (907) 465-3600

March 26, 1986

The Honorable Vic Fischer
Alaska State Legislature
P.O. Box V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Re: S.J.R. 39

Dear Senator Fischer:

You have asked for the Department of Law's comments upon the current language of S.J.R. 39, a resolution proposing an amendment to Article I, sec. 19 of the state constitution, relating to a citizen's right to keep and bear arms. As I understand it, S.J.R. 39, as amended on the Senate floor yesterday, provides that art. I, sec. 19 of the Alaska Constitution will be amended to read:

> SECTION 19. RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS. The [A WELL-REGULATED MILITIA BEIN NECESSARY TO THE SECURITY OF A FREE STATE, THE, right of each citizen of the state [THE PEOPLE] to keep and bear arms for lawful defense of self, family, property, and the state and for lawful hunting, recreation, and other lawful purposes, shall not be infringed by a state or by a borough or city of the state.

We are concerned that the language presently contained in S.J.R 39 might allow later constitutional challenge to some existing state statutes. Present law, for example, prohibits a convicted felon from possessing a concealable firearm, prohibits possession of certain weapons such as bombs, hand grenades, silencers, and sawed-off shot guns, prohibits possession of a firearm while intoxicated, or the discharge of a firearm from, on, or across a highway, the carrying of a concealed weapon, possession of a loaded firearm on licensed premises, or possession of a firearm by a minor without parental consent. (See AS 11.61.200-.220.)

These statutes serve an important public safety function by carefully regulating the possession of especially dangerous weapons or weapons carried in an especially dangerous manner or place. If the legislature does not intend to render

those statutes unenforceable, nor to foreclose a future legislature from adopting similar provisions (prohibiting possession of loaded firearms in a church or on school grounds, for example), than the legislature's intent to continue to allow reasonable regulation by law should be made clear. The possibility that the language proposed in S.J.R. 39 could be interpreted as invalidating some portions of Alaska's present criminal code is a real one. See, for example, State v. Kessler, 614 P.2d 94 (Ore. 1980), and State v. Delgado, 692 P.2d 610 (Ore. 1984).

We believe that any possible ambiguity could be eliminated by the addition, at the end of the current language, of the phrase "except that the manner of keeping and bearing arms may be regulated by law." This suggested language is based upon similar provisions in the constitutions of several other states, including Florida (art. I, sec. 8), Georgia (art. I, sec. 1), and Utah (art. I, sec. 6). The addition of this clause would make it clear that, although a citizen's basic right to keep and bear arms may not be infringed, reasonable and appropriate regulation of the manner in which arms are kept or borne (i.e., possession by felons, by minors, in a bar, while intoxicated, etc.) is not an infringement on an individual's constitutional right. Mr. Rupe Andrews, Alaska Field Representative for the National Rifle Association, has indicated that his organization would not object to the inclusion of this additional language in S.J.R. 39. I also suggest that you consider retaining the language in the present constitutional provision "the people," rather than change it to "each citizen of the state." State constitutional provisions have traditionally recognized the equal rights of all residents of the state, regardless of the resident's national origin.

A carefully drafted amendment would minimize the possibility that, should the proposed constitutional amendment be adopted, a criminal defendant would later be able to argue that a criminal weapons misconduct statute is unconstitutional because it violates his right to keep and bear arms under art. I, sec. 19 of the state constitution.

Sincerely,

Harold M. Brown
Attorney General

HMB:GAH:gb-13

Municipality
of
Anchorage

POUCH 6-650
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99502-0650
(907) 264-4545

TONY KNOWLES,
MAYOR

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL ATTORNEY

February 25, 1986

TO: Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee

Re: Senate Joint Resolution No. 39

The proposed amendment to Article I, Section 19 of the State Constitution set forth in Senate Joint Resolution No. 39 could, in its original form, preclude the regulation of conduct which has traditionally been considered to be criminal. Of particular concern is the clause beginning on line 15 which specifies "...personal defense and for the defense of family, property...". This provision could be read to invalidate all existing state and municipal laws governing the use of firearms for self-defense and the defense of property. Historically, the right to use firearms to protect self, family, and property has been curtailed. The amendment in its present form would cast doubt on the viability of continued regulation of such items.

The amendment, in its present form, would also have the likely affect of nullifying state and municipalities laws regulating the possession of firearms. This is because of the deletion of provisions referencing a "well regulated militia." Historically, the courts have interpreted that phrase as creating not a personal right to bear arms, but rather a right of the state to maintain a militia. The deletion of that phrase would cast doubt on the validity of all previous court decisions pertaining to the interpretation of section 19, and a similar provision of the Federal Constitution. With the deletion of that body of law, the phrase "shall not be infringed" would take on a whole new meaning. Thus, the state and local governments could lose the ability to regulate such activities as the carrying of concealed weapons and the obliteration of serial numbers on firearms.

The provision could easily be amended so as to affirm the right of the individual to own and possess firearms (as opposed to the right of the state to maintain a militia) without precluding the Legislature's ability to prescribe certain conduct with respect

to the use and possession of deadly weapons. First, I would propose a change to line 15 whereby the term "personal" would be replaced by "lawful" and the phrase "and for the defense" be replaced by the phrase "of self". In addition, line 17 should be changed by adding language after the term "city" which would read "...except that the manner in which arms are possessed may be subject to reasonable regulations designed to protect the public safety".

In addition, if the Committee's intent is merely to establish a personal right to the ownership and possession of firearms and not to overturn existing laws governing the use of firearms, then such intent should be plainly set forth in a permanent report that will serve in the future to guide the courts. Furthermore, if the additional language I have suggested is added to the amendment, the Committee report should clarify the Committee's intent by specifying that the ability of state and local government to impose reasonable regulations on the possession of firearms would include laws curtailing the possession of concealed weapons or weapons that have altered identification marks, but would not include the right of the state or local government to enact an outright ban on the ownership or possession of arms.

Very truly yours,

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

Jerry Wertzbaugher
Municipal Attorney

JW:gml

STATE OF ALASKA

Bill Sheffield, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF LAW

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

POUCH K – STATE CAPITOL
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
PHONE: (907) 465-3600

June 27, 1983

The Honorable Patrick M. Rodey
Senator
Alaska State Legislature
Pouch V
Juneau, AK 99811

Re: SJR-28
A. G. #366-444-83

Dear Senator Rodey:

The Department of Law has completed a preliminary analysis of Senate Joint Resolution 28 regarding the proposed amendment to the Alaska Constitution pertaining to the right of a person to keep and bear arms.

You may wish to consider inserting the word "lawful" after the term "for" and before the word "defense". With this insertion, the new constitutional clause would read as follows:

> The right of a person to keep and bear arms for lawful defense of self, home and property, or for lawful hunting and recreational use, or for other lawful purposes shall not be infringed.

I believe it would be wise to make explicit that the Constitution provides for lawful activities, which of course are established by the legislature. In the absence of the term "lawful", I can envision a situation where persons attempt to use the constitutional language as a defense to behavior which ordinarily would constitute a violation of the Alaska criminal statutes. Also, I'm not sure the explicit mention of lawful hunting, recreational use and other specific activities is necessary to insure that individuals have a guaranteed right to keep and bear arms, however, I realize this language may be reassuring to certain groups within our state.

You may wish to review the language in other state Constitutions which relates directly to the right to keep and bear arms. In many instances this right is explicitly characterized as an individual right without mentioning specifically what constitutes appropriate use by an individual citizen. The

constitutional clauses relating to arms from the thirty-seven states which have such constitutional language are as follows:

Alabama: That every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the state. ALA. CONST. art I, §26.

Alaska: 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. ALASKA CONST. art. I, § 19.

Arizona: The right of the individual citizen to bear arms in defense of himself or the State shall not be impaired, but nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing individuals or corporations to organize, maintain, or employ an armed body of men. ARIZ. CONST. art. II, § 26.

Arkansas: The citizens of this State shall have the right to keep and bear arms for their common defense. ARK. CONST. art. II, § 5.

Colorado: The right of no person to keep and bear arms in defense of his home, person and property, or in aid of the civil power when thereto legally summoned, shall be called in question; but nothing herein contained shall be construed to justify the practice of carrying concealed weapons. COLO. CONST. art. II, § 13.

Connecticut: Every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the state. CONN. CONST. art. I, § 15.

Florida: The right of the people to keep and bear arms in defense of themselves and of the lawful authority of the state shall not be infringed, except that the manner of bearing arms may be regulated by law. FLA. CONST. art. I, § 8.

Georgia: The right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed, but the General Assembly shall have power to prescribe the manner in which arms may be borne. GA. CONST. art I, § 1.

Hawaii: 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. HAWAII CONST. art I, § 15.

Idaho: The people have the right to keep and bear arms, which right shall not be abridged; but this provision shall not prevent the passage of laws to govern the carrying of weapons concealed on the person nor prevent passage of legislation

providing minimum sentences for crimes committed while in possession of a firearm, nor prevent the passage of legislation providing penalties for the possession of firearms by a convicted felon, nor prevent the passage of any legislation punishing the use of a firearm. No law shall impose licensure, registration or special taxation on the ownership or possession of firearms, except those actually used in the commission of a felony. IDAHO CONST. art. I, § 11.

Illinois: Subject only to the police power, the right of the individual citizen to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. ILL. CONST. art. I, § 22.

Indiana: The people shall have a right to bear arms, for the defense of themselves and the State. IND. CONST. art I, § 32.

Kansas: The people have the right to bear arms for their defense and security; but standing armies, in time of peace, are dangerous to liberty, and shall not be tolerated, and the military shall be in strict subordination to the civil power. KAN. CONST., Bill of Rights, § 4.

Kentucky: All men are, by nature, free and equal, and have certain inherent and inalienable rights, among which may be reckoned: ...The right to bear arms in defense of themselves and of the State, subject to the power of the General Assembly to enact laws to prevent persons from carrying concealed weapons. KY. CONST. § 1.

Louisiana: The right of each citizen to keep and bear arms shall not be abridged, but this provision shall not prevent the passage of laws to prohibit the carrying of weapons concealed on the person. LA. CONST. art. I, § 4.

Maine: Every citizen has the right to keep and bear arms for the common defense; and this right shall never be questioned. ME. CONST. artl, § 16.

Massachusetts: The people have a right to keep and bear arms for the common defence. And as, in times of peace, armies are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be maintained without the consent of the legislature; and the military power shall always be held in an exact subordination to the civil authority, and be governed by it. MASS. CONST. pt. 1, art. 17.

Michigan: Every person has a right to keep and bear arms for the defense of himself and the state. MICH. CONST. art I, § 6.

Mississippi: The right of every citizen to keep and bear arms in defense of his home, person, or property, or in aid of the civil power where thereto legally summoned, shall not be called question, but the legislature may regulate or forbid carrying concealed weapons. MISS. CONST. art. III, § 12.

Missouri: That the right of every citizen to keep and bear arms in defense of his home, person and property, or when lawfully summoned in aid of the civil power, shall not be questioned; but this shall not justify the wearing of concealed weapons. MO. CONST. art I, § 23.

Montana: The right of any person to keep or bear arms in defense of his own home, person, and property, or in aid of the civil power when thereto legally summoned, shall not be called in question, but nothing herein contained shall be held to permit the carrying of concealed weapons. MONT. CONST. art II, § 12.

New Mexico: No law shall abridge the right of the citizen to keep and bear arms for security and defense, for lawful hunting and recreation use and for other lawful purposes, but nothing herein shall be held to permit the carrying of concealed weapons. N.M. CONST. art. II, § 6.

North Carolina: 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; and, as standing armies in time of peace are dangerous to liberty, they shall not be maintained, and the military shall be kept under strict subordination to, and governed by, the civil power. Nothing herein shall justify the practice of carrying concealed weapons, or prevent the General Assembly from enacting penal statutes against that practice. N.C. CONST. art. I, § 30.

Ohio: The people have the right to bear arms for their defense and security; but standing armies, in time of peace, are dangerous to liberty, and shall not be kept up; and the military shall be in strict subordination to the civil power. OHIO CONST. art I, § 4.

Oklahoma: The right of a citizen to keep and bear arms in defense of his home, person, or property, or in aid of the civil power, when thereunto legally summoned, shall never be prohibited; but nothing herein contained shall prevent the Legislature from regulating the carrying of weapons. OKLA. CONST. art. II, § 26.

Oregon: The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defense of themselves, and the State, but the Military shall be kept in strict subordination to the civil power. OR. CONST. art. I, § 27.

Pennsylvania: The right of the citizens to bear arms in defence of themselves and the State shall not be questioned. PA. CONST. art. I, § 22.

South Carolina: 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. As, in times of peace, armies are dangerous to liberty, they shall not be maintained without the consent of the General Assembly. The military power of the State shall always be held in subordination to the civil authority and be governed by it. No soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner not in time of war but in the manner prescribed by law. S.C. CONST. art I, § 20.

South Dakota: The right of the citizens to bear arms in defense of themselves and the state shall not be denied. S.D. CONST. art. VI, § 24.

Tennessee: That the citizens of this State have a right to keep and to bear arms for their common defense; but the Legislature shall have power, by law, to regulate the wearing of arms with a view to prevent crime. TENN. CONST. art. I, § 26.

Texas: Every citizen shall have the right to keep and bear arms in the lawful defence of himself or the State; but the Legislature shall have power, by law, to regulate the wearing of arms, with a view to prevent crime. TEX. CONST. art. I, § 23.

Utah: The people have the right to bear arms for their security and defense, but the Legislature may regulate the exercise of this right by law. UTAH CONST. art. I, § 6.

Vermont: That the people have a right to bear arms for the defence of themselves and the State-and as standing armies in time of peace are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be kept up; and that the military should b kept under strict subordination to and governed by the civil power. VT. CONST. ch. 1, art. 16.

Virginia: That a well regulated militia, composed of the body of the people, trained to arms, is the proper, natural, and safe defense of a free state, therefore, the right of the

people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; that standing armies, in time of peace, should be avoided as dangerous to liberty; and that all cases the military should be under strict subordination to, and governed by, the civil power. VA. CONST. art. I, § 13.

Washington: The right of the individual citizen to bear arms in defense of himself, or the state, shall not be impaired, but nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing individuals or corporations to organize, maintain, or employ an armed body of men. WASH. CONST. art. I, § 24.

Wyoming: The right of citizens to bear arms in defense of themselves and of the state shall not be denied. WYO. CONST. art I, § 24.

In addition, thirteen states do not have express constitutional provisions related to the right to keep and bear arms.

I would be happy to discuss this matter with you in more detail.

Sincerely,

Norman C. Gorsuch
Attorney General

NCG:ml

Distribution of identical letter: The Honorable Jalmar M. Kerttula
Alaska State Senate

The Honorable Rick Halford
Alaska State Senate

The Honorable Don Bennett
Alaska State Senate

Municipality of Anchorage

POUCH 6-650
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99502-0650
(907) 264-4545

TONY KNOWLES,
MAYOR

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL ATTORNEY

May 6, 1986

Members of the House Judiciary Committee

Re: SJR 39

The Municipality does not oppose a constitutional amendment that redefines the "right to bear arms" as a personal right vested in each citizen of the state. We are very concerned however with the way in which the measure is now drafted. Our concerns are based on the fact that the present language, quite arguably, would not permit the state or a municipality to regulate either the type of arms possessed or the manner and circumstances of possession.

While the version passed by the Senate clearly allows regulation of the use of arms, many existing laws do not relate to the simple use of a weapon, but rather to its function and to the manner and circumstances in which it is possessed. Public safety concerns demand that the state legislature and local assemblies be permitted to ban certain types of arms such as bombs, hand grenades, machine guns, silencers, sawed-off shotguns and bullets designed to pierce protective devices worn by law enforcement officials. We believe likewise that the constitution should permit the Legislature to bar the possession of arms by certain classes of convicted criminals, intoxicated or mentally disturbed persons. Finally we feel it is essential to control the circumstances in which otherwise lawful weapons are possessed by limiting the carrying of concealed weapons, the possession of loaded firearms on licensed premises, the possession of a firearm by a minor without parental consent, et cetera. We reiterate the position taken by Attorney General Harold Brown in his March 26, 1986 letter regarding SJR 39:

> These statutes [that would be invalidated by SJR 39] serve an important public safety function by carefully regulating the possession of especially dangerous weapons or weapons

> carried in an especially dangerous manner or place. If the legislature does not intend to render these statutes unenforceable, nor to foreclose a future legislature from adopting similar provisions (prohibiting possession of loaded firearms in a church or on school grounds for example), then the legislatures intent to continue to allow a reasonable regulation by law should be made clear.

The clarity of intent referred to by the Attorney General must be embodied in the measure itself. Otherwise both State and Municipal prosecutors will face a flurry of legal challenges by those charged with weapons-related offenses.

In conclusion, we urge that if the committee does not intend to invalidate existing statutes and ordinances regulating the type of arms that may be possessed, and the circumstances of possession, then it must embody this intent clearly within the amendment that is offered to the voters for ratification.

Jerry Hartzbaugher
Municipal Attorney

Brian Porter, Chief
Anchorage Police Department

298 Or. 395

STATE of Oregon, Petitioner on Review,

v.

Joseph Luna DELGADO, Respondent on Review.

TC CR83-946, CA A30962, SC S31059.

Supreme Court of Oregon, In Banc.

Argued and Submitted Nov. 6, 1984.

Decided Dec. 28, 1984.

Defendant was convicted in the District Court, Polk County, Walter W. Foster, J., of unlawful possession of a stabbing weapon, and he appealed. The Court of Appeals, 69 Or.App. 254, 684 P.2d 630, reversed, and appeal was taken. The Supreme Court, Lent, J., held that defendant's constitutional right to bear arms was violated by prohibition of mere possession and mere carrying of a switchblade knife.

Decision of the Court of Appeals affirmed.

Weapons ⇐1

Defendant's constitutional right to bear arms was violated by prohibition of mere possession and mere carrying of a switchblade knife. Const. Art. 1, § 27; ORS 166.510, 166.510(1).

Robert W. Muir, Asst. Atty. Gen., Salem, argued the cause for petitioner on review. With him on the briefs were Dave Frohnmayer, Atty. Gen., James E. Mountain, Jr., Sol. Gen., and Lynn Torno, Certified Law Student.

Susan M. Garrett, Salem, argued the cause and filed briefs for respondent on review.

Robert Dowlut, Washington, D.C., and Steven L. Krasik, Salem, filed a brief amicus curiae for Nat. Rifle Ass'n.

LENT, Justice.

The issue is whether ORS 166.510(1), insofar as it prohibits the mere possession and mere carrying of a switchblade knife, violates defendant's right to bear arms under Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution. We hold that in that respect the statute does violate defendant's constitutional right.

ORS 166.510(1) provides, in relevant part:

"* * * [A]*ny person who* manufactures, causes to be manufactured, sells, keeps for sale, offers, gives, loans, *carries or possesses an instrument or weapon having a blade which projects or swings into position by force of a spring or other device and commonly known as a switch-blade knife* or an instrument or weapon commonly known as a blackjack, slung shot, sandclub, sandbag, sap glove or metal knuckles, or who carries a dirk, dagger or stiletto commits a Class A misdemeanor." (Emphasis added)

Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution provides:

"The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence of themselves, and the State * * * [.]"

The accusatory instrument charged that defendant "did unlawfully possess and carry" a weapon commonly known as a switch-blade knife in violation of ORS 166.510. Defendant demurred to the accusatory instrument on the ground that the statute was overbroad as impinging on the right guaranteed to him under Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution. The trial court overruled the demurrer.[1]

Trial then proceeded on the basis of facts stipulated to be the same as those found by the trial court in the hearing on the motion

1. The defendant had also filed a motion to suppress the knife as evidence on the basis that it was obtained as a result of an unlawful search and seizure. The trial court's denial of that motion was not assigned as error.

to suppress mentioned in footnote 1, *supra*. Those facts are as follows.

On October 3, 1983, defendant was walking with a companion on a public street. The two appeared disorderly to an officer nearby, and when defendant reached up as he passed a street sign and tapped or struck it with his hand, the officer confronted both individuals and conducted a patdown search. Defendant was found with a switch-blade knife in his back pocket. Defendant told the arresting officer that he carried the knife "for protection" (defendant evidently feared attack by a jealous rival for his present girl friend).[2]

Defendant moved for judgment of acquittal, which was denied. The trial court then found defendant guilty and eventually sentenced defendant to jail "suspended on the condition" that defendant meet certain terms of probation.

Defendant appealed, assigning as error the trial court's overruling of his demurrer and denial of his motion for judgment of acquittal. The Court of Appeals, 69 Or. App. 254, 684 P.2d 630, per curiam, reversed on the basis of our decisions in *State v. Blocker*, 291 Or. 255, 630 P.2d 824 (1981), and *State v. Kessler*, 289 Or. 359, 614 P.2d 94 (1980). We allowed review to determine whether a switch-blade knife is within the constitutional guarantee. 298 Or. 37, 688 P.2d 845 (1984).

In *State v. Kessler*, *supra*, this court for the first time considered the scope of Article I, section 27. There, following the discovery by police officers of two billy clubs in his apartment, defendant was charged with the possession of billy clubs in violation of ORS 166.510(1), the same statute at issue in the case at bar. On appeal defendant argued that the statute violated Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution. The Court of Appeals held that ORS 166.510(1) was within the reasonable exercise of what the court called the state's "police power" to control crime. 43 Or.App. 303, 307, 602 P.2d 1096, 1097 (1979). We reversed.

In *Kessler*, we examined the historical roots of Article I, section 27. We concluded that the drafters of Oregon's constitution did not wish to limit the right to bear arms to a citizen militia, but rather intended that the private citizen also have the right to "possess certain arms for the defense of person and property." 289 Or. at 371, 614 P.2d at 98.

Our analysis in *Kessler* of the meaning of the term "arms" is central to the case at bar and so merits a further discussion. We reasoned that because settlers during the revolutionary era used many of the same weapons for both personal and military defense, the term "arms," as contemplated by the constitutional framers, was not limited to firearms but included those hand-carried weapons commonly used for personal defense. 289 Or. at 368, 614 P.2d at 98. Thus, the term "arms" "includes weapons commonly used for either purpose, even if a particular weapon is unlikely to be used as a militia weapon." 289 Or. at 369, 614 P.2d at 98. On the basis of this historical examination, we held that the possession of a billy club was constitutionally protected:

> "Our historical analysis of Article I, section 27, indicates that the drafters intended 'arms' to include the hand-carried weapons commonly used by individuals for personal defense. The club is an effective, hand-carried weapon which cannot logically be excluded from this term."

2. We have in mind that defendant's principal argument is that, insofar as this charge of criminal conduct is concerned, the statute is overbroad in proscribing conduct in which he has a state constitutional right to engage. Ordinarily, we would have no reason to go beyond the facts described in the accusatory instrument to resolve whether error was committed in overruling defendant's demurrer. In this case, however, a factual record was developed, and the defendant also assigned as error the denial of his motion for judgment of acquittal. The facts are recounted to show that there is no evidence to support any possible charge of an illegal intent to use the weapon or an illegal use of the weapon.

289 Or. at 372, 614 P.2d at 100.[3]

The state argues that a switch-blade is not a weapon "commonly used for personal defense," and is therefore not an "arm" within the meaning of the Oregon Constitution. It insists that the switch-blade is an offensive weapon used primarily by criminals. In support of this argument we are referred to various authorities, especially the Federal Anti-Switchblade Act, 15 USC §§ 1241–44 (Supp. IV, 1980), which is aimed at prohibiting the introduction of switch-blade knives into interstate commerce because they are "almost exclusively the weapon of the thug and the delinquent." S.Rep. No. 1980, 85th Cong., 2d Sess., reprinted in 1958 U.S.Code Cong. & Ad.News 3435, 3437.

We note, first, that that material offers no more than impressionistic observations on the criminal use of switch-blades. More importantly, however, we are unpersuaded by this distinction which the state urges of "offensive" and "defensive" weapons. All hand-held weapons necessarily share both characteristics. A kitchen knife can as easily be raised in attack as in defense. The spring mechanism does not, instantly and irrevocably, convert the jackknife into an "offensive" weapon.[4] Similarly, the clasp feature of the common jackknife does not mean that it is incapable of aggressive and violent purposes. It is not the design of the knife but the use to which it is put that determines its "offensive" or "defensive" character.

There are statutes now on the books that concern the manner in which weapons are carried, the intent with which they are carried, the use to which they may not be put and the status of a person that results in forbidding his possessing a weapon.

> "This state has several such regulatory statutes, with which we are not concerned in this case: ORS 166.220(1) prohibiting possession of a dangerous weapon with intent to use such weapon unlawfully against another; ORS 166.240, prohibiting carrying certain weapons concealed about one's person; ORS 166.250, prohibiting carrying any firearm concealed upon the person or within any vehicle without a license to do so." (Footnote omitted.)

State v. Blocker, supra, 291 Or. at 259–260, 630 P.2d at 826. *See, also*, ORS 166.270, which prohibits an exconvict from possessing a firearm concealable on the person, which this court held not to offend Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution in *State v. Robinson*, 217 Or. 612, 619, 343 P.2d 886 (1959).

The appropriate inquiry in the case at bar is whether a kind of weapon, as modified by its modern design and function, is of the sort commonly used by individuals for personal defense during either the revolutionary and post-revolutionary era,[5] or in 1859 when Oregon's constitution was adopted. In particular, it must be determined whether the drafters would have intended the word "arms" to include the switch-blade knife as a weapon commonly used by individuals for self defense. To answer that question we must journey briefly into the history of knives. We have resorted primarily to three books by H. Peterson for that history: Arms and Armour in Colonial America, 1526–1783 (1956); American Knives (1958); Daggers and Fighting Knives of the Western World (1968). What we have to say generally in

3. One year later, in *State v. Blocker*, 291 Or. 255, 259, 630 P.2d 824, 826 (1981), we held that the possession of a billy club outside as well as inside the home is constitutionally protected.

4. At one time the single-action, single-shot handgun was carried by many men for defense. Did the development of the double-action feature of the handgun or the addition of the revolving cylinder which enabled one to fire the gun several times without pausing to reload, as a matter of law, transform the handgun from a defensive weapon to an offensive weapon? Obviously, the gun, both before and after such changes, could be used for either defense or offense.

5. Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution was taken verbatim from sections 32 and 33 of the Indiana Constitution of 1851. Indiana's bill of rights liberally drew upon the state constitutions of Kentucky, Ohio, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania, which were drafted between 1776 and 1802. *See State v. Kessler*, 289 Or. 359, 365, 614 P.2d 94, 95 (1980).

the next few paragraphs is drawn from those works.

The popularity of the fighting knife has had an uneven history, even to today. During the Roman civilization and for several centuries thereafter, for example, the knife was little appreciated as a tool of combat, but during the Viking Period of the 9th and 10th centuries large knives (scramasax), used for general purposes as well as for war, were popular among the Northmen, Germans, Franks and Anglo-Saxons. It was during the Middle Ages that the real flowering of the fighting knife and dagger occurred. New shapes appeared and the knife became part of the standard dress for all classes: from the knights and their men-at-arms as an adjunct to the sword, to the laborer and peasant for protection and convenience. During the 16th century the dagger came to be used by the aristocracy, mainly in conjunction with the sword, and was used primarily for combat; indeed, during the early part of that century the technique of fighting with sword and dagger developed, thus giving rise to the modern school of knife fighting. Through the 16th and 17th centuries knives and daggers declined in importance and were no longer an important part of the daily civilian costume.

In early colonial America the sword and dagger were the most commonly used edged weapons. During the American colonial era every colonist had a knife. As long as a man was required to defend his life, to obtain or produce his own food or to fashion articles from raw materials, a knife was a constant necessity. Around 1650 one form of dagger popular in the colonies was the "plug bayonet," so called because it fit into the muzzle of a musket. It was used both as a dagger or as a general utility knife. Other knives became popular during the 17th and 18th centuries. The American frontiersman used a large knife to ward off danger from Indian attacks and to hunt and trap; along with that he carried a smaller knife, the blade being three to four inches long, in his rifle bag.

In the 19th century, daggers remained popular, but in the west the renowned Bowie knife became the weapon favored by the lawless and law-abiding alike. These were violent times, particularly from the 1820s through the Civil War, when a weapon might be needed at a moment's notice. In response, "the well-equipped gentleman carried a pistol in his pocket and a knife beneath his coattails."

Of the many varieties of knives, none has been a more constant or enduring companion to man than the pocket knife. Specimens of folding pocket knives have been discovered in Roman archeological sites, indicating that such knives were popular at least from the first century A.D. They have been manufactured for their utility as both instruments of labor and combat. One of the most common of the specific named knives is the jackknife, a word of uncertain origin, which was a large single-bladed folding knife, ranging in size from four to seven inches when closed. By the early 1700s, when the eastern seaboard had become a highly settled area with large towns and cities and relatively good roads, men normally carried a folding pocket knife. Even when they joined the American army during the revolution, the knife they carried was the jackknife, which was mentioned frequently in colonial records. During the American Revolution at least two states, New Hampshire and New York, required their militiamen to carry a jackknife. Even during the mid-18th century, some of these "jackknives" were rather more lethal than their name suggests, measuring two feet long with the blade extended, and designed solely for fighting. G. Neumann, Swords and Blades of the American Revolution 247 (1973). Some others had blades over 16 inches long, extending well beyond the hilt even when folded, and were designed to be used open or closed. "Gentlemen" and officers during this same era often carried canes with slender daggers mounted inside which could be drawn with a quick tug and were used for personal defense. Neumann, Swords and Blades of the American Revolution, *supra*, at 239. In the early 19th century a special form of

dagger also developed, the pocket or folding dagger, with blades ranging in size from four to sixteen inches; they were intended to be carried in the pocket or in special sheathes.

It is clear, then, that knives have played an important role in American life, both as tools and as weapons. The folding pocketknife, in particular, since the early 18th century has been commonly carried by men in America and used primarily for work, but also for fighting.

This brings us to the switch-blade knife. A switch-blade is defined as a "pocketknife having the blade spring-operated so that pressure on a release catch causes it to fly open." Webster's Third International Dictionary 2314 (1971). If ORS 166.510(1) proscribed the possession of mere pocketknives, there can be no question but that the statute would be held to conflict directly with Article I, section 27. The only difference is the presence of the spring-operated mechanism that opens the knife. We are unconvinced by the state's argument that the switch-blade is so "substantially different from its historical antecedent" (the jackknife) that it could not have been within the contemplation of the constitutional drafters. They must have been aware that technological changes were occurring in weaponry as in tools generally. The format and efficiency of weaponry was proceeding apace. This was the period of development of the Gatling gun, breach loading rifles, metallic cartridges and repeating rifles. The addition of a spring to open the blade of a jackknife is hardly a more astonishing innovation than those just mentioned.[6]

We stress again, as we have stressed before, that this decision does not mean individuals have an unfettered right to possess or use constitutionally protected arms in any way they please. The legislature may, if it chooses to do so, regulate possession and use. *See State v. Blocker, supra*, 291 Or. at 259, 630 P.2d at 826; *State v. Kessler, supra*, 289 Or. at 270, 614 P.2d at 100. This court recognizes the seriousness with which the legislature views the possession of certain weapons, especially switch-blades.[7] The problem here is that ORS 166.510(1) absolutely proscribes the mere possession or carrying of such arms. This the constitution does not permit.[8]

The decision of the Court of Appeals is affirmed.

71 Or.App. 356

Gerald Lee ALBERS, Appellant,

v.

Hoyt C. CUPP, Superintendent, Oregon State Penitentiary, Respondent.

137975; CA A31762.

Court of Appeals of Oregon.

Argued and Submitted Nov. 28, 1984.

Decided Dec. 12, 1984.

Reconsideration Denied Jan. 25, 1985.

Review Denied Feb. 12, 1985.

Appeal from Circuit Court, Marion County, Clarke C. Brown, Judge.

6. Charles Dickens, in his novel Martin Chuzzlewit, published in 1842 shortly after his return from America, referred to a certain Scadder, who "picked his teeth with a sort of young bayonet that flew out of his knife when he touched a spring." This suggests that America could have been the origin of the switch-blade. *See* A. Popkess, *Flick Knives*, [1959] Crim.L.R. 640.

7. ORS 166.510(1) was amended in 1957 to include, for the first time, proscription against the possession of switch-blades. Or.Laws 1957, ch. 290, § 1.

8. The analysis we have employed in *State v. Kessler* and *State v. Blocker, supra*, at footnotes 3 and 5, concerning clubs and in the case at bar concerning a knife may not be the same analysis that would be appropriate to the application of Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution to a weapon such as a can of mace, not having a pre-twentieth century form or counterpart. It has been suggested that it is incongruous to believe that a woman today to defend herself from a rapist would have constitutional sanction for carrying a switch-blade knife but not for the can of mace because the latter was unknown to the mid-nineteenth century. Such a case is not before us. The time to deal with that case is when it is presented.

In the present case, had Publishers made a reasonable inquiry and informed Stevens that the inquiry was in preparation for its purchase of the timberland from Fernandez, then Stevens would have informed Publishers that plaintiffs held a mortgage on the timberland and had a "standard timber restriction" clause covering the land. The discovery of these facts would have immediately informed both parties that Fernandez was defrauding plaintiffs. Publishers is therefore charged with knowledge of the fraud because it would have learned of the fraud had it made a reasonable inquiry. *Murray v. Wiley, supra* at 407.

We therefore conclude that Publishers failed to sustain its burden of proving its affirmative defense. Publishers was not entitled to the status of a bona fide purchaser without notice.

Affirmed.

No. 68—July 15, 1980

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON

STATE OF OREGON,
Respondent,
v.
RANDY KESSLER,
Petitioner.

(TC DA 160004-7811, CA 14296, SC 26705)

On review from the Court of Appeals.*

Argued and submitted March 4, 1980.

David L. Slader, Portland, argued the cause and filed the brief for petitioner.

W. Benny Won, Assistant Attorney General, Salem, argued the cause for respondent. With him on the brief was James A. Redden, Attorney General, and Walter L. Barrie, Solicitor General, Salem.

Before Denecke, Chief Justice, and Tongue, Howell, Lent and Peterson, Justices.

LENT, J.

Affirmed in part, reversed in part.

*Appeal from Circuit Court, Multnomah County Philip T. Abraham, Judge 43 Or App 303, 602 P2d 1096 (1979).

STATE v. KESSLER, 289 OR. 359 (1980)

614 P.2d 94

LENT, J.

The defendant in this case was convicted of "possession of a slugging weapon," ORS 166.510(1).[1] We allowed review to consider his claim that the legislative prohibition of the possession of a "billy"[2] in ORS 166.510(1) violates Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution. That provision states:

> "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 language of this provision raises several questions in this case, including:

(a) To whom does the right belong?

(b) What is the meaning of "defense of themselves"?

(c) What is the meaning of "arms," and what, if any, weapons of current usage are included in this term?

The scope of Article I, section 27, has not previously been analyzed by Oregon courts.[3] The decisions construing the second amendment to the United

[1] ORS 166.510(1) provides:

"(1) Except as provided in ORS 166.515 or 166.520, any person who manufactures, causes to be manufactured, sells, keeps for sale, offers, gives, loans, carries or possesses an instrument or weapon having a blade which projects or swings into position by force of a spring or other device and commonly known as a switch-blade knife or an instrument or weapon commonly known as a blackjack, slung shot, billy, sandclub, sandbag, sap glove or metal knuckles or who carries a dirk, dagger or stiletto commits a Class A misdemeanor."

Although the words "slugging weapon" are not used in ORS 166.510, this term was used in the complaint filed in this case.

[2] Webster's Third International Dictionary defines a "billy" as "a heavy usually wooden weapon for delivering blows; club, especially a policeman's club."

[3] In *State v. Robinson*, 217 Or 612, 619, 343 P2d 886 (1959) this court held that ORS 166.270 which prohibits ex-convicts from possessing concealed weapons did not violate Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution. Accord, *State v. Carturight*, 246 Or 120, 134-137, 418 P2d 822 (1967).

States Constitution are not particularly helpful because the wording of the second amendment differs substantially from our state provision. The second amendment has not yet been held to apply to state limitations on the bearing of arms.[4] The wording of Oregon's right to bear arms provision also differs from many other state constitutional provisions.[5]

Despite the many variations in wording, the states' constitutional provisions guaranteeing the right to bear arms share a common historical background. We begin first with an examination of this historical background and then with an examination of the meaning and purpose of the particular words chosen by the Oregon drafters. We are not unmindful that there is current controversy over the wisdom of a right to bear arms, and that the original motivations for such a provision might not seem compelling if debated as a new issue. Our task, however, in construing a constitutional provision is to respect the principles given the status of constitutional guarantees and limitations by the drafters; it is not to abandon these principles when this fits the needs of the moment.

[4] The second amendment to the United States Constitution provides:

"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."

In early cases the United States Supreme Court held that the second amendment proscription applies only to Congress. *Presser v. Illinois*, 116 US 252, 6 S Ct 580, 29 L Ed 615 (1886); *United States v. Cruikshank*, 92 US 588, 23 L Ed 588 (1876). The second amendment has not yet been held applicable to the states, either directly or through selective incorporation in the fourteenth amendment. *See* Rohner, *The Right to Bear Arms: A Phenomenon of Constitutional History*, 16 Catholic U L Rev 53 (1966).

[5] For a helpful categorization of various state constitutional right to bear arms provisions see Note, *The Impact of State Constitutional Right to Bear Arms Provisions on State Gun Control Legislation*, 38 U Chi L Rev 185 (1970).

I. *The historical background*

The first article of Oregon's constitution of 1859 contains the state's bill of rights. Article I, section 27, regarding the right to bear arms was taken verbatim from sections 32 and 33 of the Indiana Constitution of 1851. C. Carey, *A History of the Oregon Constitution* 469 (1926); Palmer, *The Sources of the Oregon Constitution*, 5 Or L Rev 200, 202 (1926).

The original Indiana constitution was adopted in 1816 at Indiana's first statehood convention. Indiana's constitution was revised in 1851, but the 1816 version of the right to bear arms provision remained unchanged. *See* W. Swindler, *Sources and Documents of U.S. Constitutions*, vol 3, p 345-400 (1974).

The drafters of Indiana's bill of rights of 1816 borrowed freely from the wording of other state constitutions, most notably the constitutions of Kentucky, Ohio, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania. Twomley, *The Indiana Bill of Rights*, 20 Ind L J 211, 212-213 (1945). These state constitutions were drafted between 1776 and 1802. Oregon's right to bear arms provision therefore can be traced to state provisions drafted in the revolutionary and post-revolutionary war era.

The constitutions adopted by the original colonies generally included a bill or declaration of rights. Many of the declarations of rights were patterned largely upon the English Bill of Rights of 1689.[6] The background of the English Bill of Rights sheds some light upon the meaning of the right to bear arms provisions in the colonial constitutions.

James II, a Catholic king, ascended the English throne in 1685 amidst domestic religious controversy between the Catholics and Protestants. James II established a strong standing army which he

[6] *See generally*, B. Schwartz, *The Great Rights of Mankind* 1-36 (1977); Feller and Gotting, *The Second Amendment: A Second Look*, 61 Northwestern U L Rev 46, 47-56 (1966).

quartered in private homes. He sought to repeal certain laws of Parliament which barred Catholics from public offices. The Protestants revolted in the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688 and succeeded in deposing James II and bringing to power the king's Protestant daughter, Mary, and her husband, William of Orange. William and Mary were offered the crown in 1689 on condition that they sign the Declaration of Rights. The Declaration was later enacted as a statute, which was divided into two parts, first listing the allegedly illegal actions of James II, then declaring the rights of the people. The first part stated that James II:

> "* * * did endeavor to subvert and extirpate the Protestant Religion and the Laws and Liberties of this Kingdom * * *.
>
> "5. By raising and keeping a Standing army within this Kingdom in Time of Peace without Consent of Parliament and quartering Soldiers contrary to Law.
>
> "6. By causing several good Subjects, being Protestants, to be disarmed at the same Time when Papists were both armed and employed contrary to Law."

The parallel provisions of the declaration of rights provided:

> "* * * 5. That the raising or keeping a Standing Army within the Kingdom unless it be with the Consent of Parliament is against Law.
>
> "6. That the Subjects which are Protestants may have Arms for their Defence suitable to their Conditions, and as allowed by Law."[7]

Historians have noted that the early colonial legislatures perceived themselves as descendants of the House of Commons who shared many of the same political experiences of their 17th century English counterparts. See B. Schwartz, *The Great Rights of Mankind* 15, 31-32 (1977). The French and Indian War ending in 1763 brought large numbers of British

[7] Bill of Rights, 1 W. & M., sess. 2, c. 2 (1689), *reprinted in* Weatherup, *Standing Armies and Armed Citizens: An Historical Analysis of the Second Amendment*, 2 Hastings Const L Q 961, 973 (1975).

soldiers to the colonies. King George III maintained and increased these standing armies following that war, and ordered the troops to be quartered in private homes. The colonists who were accustomed to relying on their own citizen militias viewed the standing armies as an unlawful instrument of oppression. *See* Weatherup, *Standing Armies and Armed Citizens; An Historical Analysis of the Second Amendment*, 2 Hastings Const L Q 961, 975-978 (1975). The state constitutions drafted in the revolutionary war era therefore included provisions guaranteeing the right to bear arms and prohibiting standing armies in time of peace. The relevant provisions of the English Bill of Rights of 1689 provided a useful model for the colonial drafters.

II. *The Oregon right to bear arms*

A. *"Defense of themselves and the state"*

We have noted that Oregon's constitutional right to bear arms provision, Or Const. Art I, § 27, was taken verbatim from the Indiana constitutional provision drafted in 1816. The phrase "for defense of themselves and the state" in Indiana's provision was most likely taken from the Kentucky provision in its 1799 constitution, or the Ohio provision in its 1802 constitution.[8] The phrase "for defense of themselves and the

[8] Art X, §§ 23 and 24, of the 1799 Kentucky constitution provided:

"Sec. 23. That the rights of the citizens to bear arms in defence of themselves and the State shall not be questioned. "Sec. 24. That no standing army shall, in time of peace, be kept up, without the consent of the legislature; and the military shall, in all cases and at all times, be in strict subordination to the civil power."

W. Swindler, *Sources and Documents of U. S. Constitutions*, Vol 4, p 183 (1975).

Art VIII, § 20, of the 1802 Ohio constitution provided:

"Sec. 20. That the people have a right to bear arms for the defence of themselves and the State; and as standing armies, in time of peace, are dangerous to liberty, they shall not be kept up, and that the military shall be kept under strict subordination to the civil power."

W. Swindler, *Sources and Documents of U. S. Constitutions*, Vol 7, p 555 (1978). Ohio's constitutional provision was most likely taken from Art XIII of Pennsylvania's constitutional Bill of Rights of 1776 which provided:

(Continued on following page)

state" appears in the present day constitutions of Oregon, Indiana, and six other states.[9] The language is subject to varying interpretations. It has been suggested that the language includes three separate justifications for a state constitutional right to bear arms: (a) The preference for a militia over a standing army; (b) the deterrence of governmental oppression; and (c) the right of personal defense.[10]

The language "the right to bear arms * * * for defense of * * * the state" most likely refers to the historical preference for a citizen militia rather than a standing army as outlined above.[11] *See People v. Brown*, 253 Mich 537, 235 NW 245, 246 (1931):

> "It is generally recognized that * * * the right to bear arms had its origin in the fear of the American colonists of a standing army and its use to oppress the people, and in their attachment to a militia composed of all able-bodied men. Probably the necessity of self protection in a frontier society also was a factor."

The phrase "the right to bear arms in defense of themselves" has a suggested purpose which is

(Continued from previous page)

"That the people have a right to bear arms for the defence of themselves and the state; and as standing armies in the time of peace are dangerous to liberty, they ought not to be kept up; And that the military should be kept under strict subordination to, and governed by, the civil power."

W. Swindler, *Sources and Documents of U.S. Constitutions*, Vol 8, p 279 (1979).

[9] The phrase "for defense of themselves and the state" appears in the constitutions of Florida, Declaration of Rights § 20; Kentucky Bill of Rights § 1; Pennsylvania, art 1, § 21; South Dakota, art VI, § 24; Vermont, ch 1, art 16; and Wyoming, art I, § 24.

[10] *See* Note, *The Impact of State Constitutional Right to Bear Arms Provisions on State Gun Control Legislation*, 38 U Chi L Rev 185, 190-198 (1970).

[11] Despite the early Americans' objection to standing armies and their preference for citizen militias, our society today apparently prefers the maintenance of federally controlled standing armies. The federal government has assumed total responsibility for training and supplying the "state militias," i.e., the National Guard. *See, e.g.*, 32 USC, §§ 101, 102, 501, 502, 701 (1976); Rohner, *The Right to Bear Arms: A Phenomenon of Constitutional History*, 16 Cath U L Rev 53, 72 (1966).

closely related to the preference for citizen militias. That suggested purpose is the deterrence of government from oppressing unarmed segments of the population. For example, King James II attempted to disarm the Protestants while allowing Catholics to bear arms, thus prompting the guarantee in the 1689 Bill of Rights that Protestants could have "arms for their defense."[12] Joseph Story wrote that,

> "The right of the citizens to keep and bear arms has justly been considered, as the palladium of the liberties of a republic; since it offers a strong moral check against the usurpation and arbitrary power of rulers; and will generally, even if these are successful in the first instance, enable the people to resist and triumph over them."

J. Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution*, Vol 3, p 746 (1833). *Cf, Carlton v. State*, 63 Fla 1, 58 So 486, 488 (1912) (state provision was "intended to give the people the means of protecting themselves against oppression and public outrage").

"Defense of themselves" has also been said to include an individual's right to bear arms to protect his person and home. *Schubert v. DeBard*, Ind , 398 NE2d 1339, 1341 (1980) (Indiana constitution provides citizenry the right to bear arms for their personal self-defense). Self-defense has been recognized as a privilege in both civil and criminal law since about 1400 in England and at all times in the United States.[13] Although the right to bear arms for self protection does not appear to have been an important

[12] *See* text accompanying note 7 *supra*.

[13]

"The privilege of self-defense rests upon the necessity of permitting a man who is attacked to take reasonable steps to prevent harm to himself, where there is no time to resort to the law. The early English law, with its views of strict liability, did not recognize such a privilege; * * *. But since about 1400 the privilege has been recognized, and it is now undisputed, in the law of torts as well as in the criminal law." (citations omitted) W. Prosser, *Law of Torts* 108 (4th ed 1971).

development in England, the justification for a right to bear arms in defense of person and home probably reflects the exigencies of the rural American experience. *See People v. Brown, supra. Cf., Matthews v. State,* 237 Ind 677, 689-692, 148 NE2d 334, 339-341 (1958) (Emmert, C. J., dissenting) (constitutional guarantee based on historical necessity for personal defense.)[14]

B. *The meaning of the term "arms"*

The term "arms" is also subject to several interpretations. In the colonial and revolutionary war era, weapons used by militiamen and weapons used in defense of person and home were one and the same. A colonist usually had only one gun which was used for hunting, protection, and militia duty, plus a sword, and knife. G. Neumann, *the American Revo* the

The revolutionary war era ended at a time when the rapid social and economic changes of the so-called Industrial Revolution began. The technology of weapons and warfare entered an unprecedented era of change. P. Cleator, *Weapons of War* 143-152 (1967). Firearms and other hand-carried weapons remained the weapons of personal defense, but the arrival of steam power, mechanization, and chemical discoveries completely changed the weapons of military warfare. The development of powerful explosives in the nineteenth century, combined with mass-produced metal matic

development in England, the justification for a right to bear arms in defense of person and home probably reflects the exigencies of the rural American experience. *See People v. Brown, supra. Cf., Matthews v. State,* 237 Ind 677, 689-692, 148 NE2d 334, 339-341 (1958) (Emmert, C. J., dissenting) (constitutional guarantee based on historical necessity for personal defense.)[14]

B. *The meaning of the term "arms"*

The term "arms" is also subject to several interpretations. In the colonial and revolutionary war era, weapons used by militiamen and weapons used in defense of person and home were one and the same. A colonist usually had only one gun which was used for hunting, protection, and militia duty, plus a hatchet, sword, and knife. G. Neumann, *Swords and Blades of the American Revolution,* 6-15, 252-254 (1973). When the revolutionary war began, the colonists came equipped with their hunting muskets or rifles, hatchets, swords, and knives. The colonists suffered a severe shortage of firearms in the early years of the war, so many soldiers had to rely primarily on swords, hatchets, knives, and pikes (long staffs with a spear head). W. Moore, *Weapons of the American Revolution,* 8 (1967).

Therefore, the term "arms" as used by the drafters of the constitutions probably was intended to include those weapons used by settlers for both personal and military defense. The term "arms" was not limited to firearms, but included several handcarried weapons commonly used for defense. The term "arms" would not have included cannon or other heavy ordnance not kept by militiamen or private citizens.

[14] *Compare* the provisions in several state constitutions which guarantee that a person has the right to bear arms "in defense of his home, person and property." Colo Const, Art II, § 13; Miss Const, Art III, § 12; Mo Const, Art I, § 23; Mont Const, Art III, § 13; Okla Const, Art II, § 26; *State v. Nickerson,* 126 Mont 157, 247 P2d 188 (1952) (defendant cannot be convicted of assault if he pointed a loaded gun at a trespasser in his home); *accord, State v. Pleasant,* 356 Mo 90, 195 SW2d 495 (1946).

The revolutionary war era ended at a time when the rapid social and economic changes of the so-called Industrial Revolution began. The technology of weapons and warfare entered an unprecedented era of change. P. Cleator, *Weapons of War* 143-152 (1967). Firearms and other hand-carried weapons remained the weapons of personal defense, but the arrival of steam power, mechanization, and chemical discoveries completely changed the weapons of military warfare. The development of powerful explosives in the mid-nineteenth century, combined with the development of mass-produced metal parts, made possible the automatic weapons, explosives, and chemicals of modern warfare. P. Cleator, *Weapons of War* 153-177 (1967).

These advanced weapons of modern warfare have never been intended for personal possession and protection. When the constitutional drafters referred to an individual's "right to bear arms," the arms used by the militia and for personal protection were basically the same weapons. Modern weapons used exclusively by the military are not "arms" which are commonly possessed by individuals for defense, therefore, the term "arms" in the constitution does not include such weapons.

If the text and purpose of the constitutional guarantee relied exclusively on the preference for a militia "for defense of the State," then the term "arms" most likely would include only the modern day equivalents of the weapons used by colonial militiamen. The Oregon provision, however, guarantees a right to bear arms "for defense of *themselves,* and the State." The term "arms" in our constitution therefore would include weapons commonly used for either purpose, even if a particular weapon is unlikely to be used as a militia weapon.

The constitutional guarantee that persons have the right to "bear arms" does not mean that all individuals have an unrestricted right to carry or use personal weapons in all circumstances. For example,

the danger of firearms was recognized shortly after the development of gunpowder. The English Statute of Northampton in 1327 forbade persons to ride at night carrying a firearm for the purpose of terrifying the people.[15] A 1678 Massachusetts law forbade shooting near any house, barn, garden, or highway in any town where a person may be "killed, wounded, or otherwise damaged."[16] The courts of many states have upheld statutes which restrict the possession or manner of carrying personal weapons. The 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. For example, many courts have upheld statutes prohibiting the carrying of concealed weapons, *see, e.g., State v. Hart*, 66 Idaho 217, 157 P2d 72 (1945); and statutes prohibiting possession of firearms by felons, *see, e.g., State v. Carturight*, 246 Or 121, 418 P2d 822 (1966).

III. *The present case*

We now turn to the facts of the present case. The defendant was involved in an off and on verbal argument with his apartment manager in the course of the day on November 13, 1978. The dispute escalated into name calling, colorful words, and object throwing. At one point the defendant kicked the elevator door in the apartment building. The police were called and arrested the defendant. The defendant asked the police to get his coat from his apartment. The officers found two "billy clubs" in the defendant's apartment.

The defendant was charged with disorderly conduct, ORS 166.025, and possession of a slugging weapon, ORS 166.510. The matter went to trial without a jury. The defendant at trial demurred to and moved to dismiss the second charge on the grounds that it failed to state a crime. The motion was denied and the defendant was found guilty as charged on both counts.

[15] 2 Edward III, ch 3 (1328), reprinted in J. Bishop, Statutory Crimes, § 783 (3d ed 1901).

[16] Council held in Boston, March 28, 1678, referred to in Levin, *The Right to Bear Arms: The Development of the American Experience*, 48 Chi-Kent L. Rev 148, 150, n 18 (1971).

The defendant appealed to the Court of Appeals, contending first that his acts did not amount to the crime of disorderly conduct, and second that the statute prohibiting possession of billy clubs, ORS 166.510(1), violates Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution. The Court of Appeals did not consider defendant's first contention because it was not raised at trial.[17] The Court of Appeals held that ORS 166.510(1) was within the reasonable exercise of the "police power" of the state to curb crime. 43 Or App 303, 307, 602 P2d 1096 (1979).

The defendant contends that his conviction for possession of a billy club violates his right to possess arms in his home for personal defense. Pursuant to our previous discussion regarding the purpose and scope of the right to bear arms provision, we hold that Aricle I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution includes a right to possess certain arms for defense of person and property. The remaining question is whether the defendant's possession of a billy club in this case is protected by Article I, section 27.

The club is considered the first personal weapon fashioned by humans. O. Hogg, *Clubs to Cannon* 19 (1968). The club is still used today as a personal

[17] The general rule in both civil and criminal cases is that a question not raised and preserved in the trial court will not be considered on appeal. *State v. Abel*, 241 Or 465, 467, 406 P2d 902 (1965). Failure to raise an objection in trial court does not automatically preclude appellate review. The defendant's contention that his acts did not constitute the crime of disorderly conduct, however, does not present the exceptional circumstance or manifest error which justifies this court's consideration of such a claim. It follows that defendant's conviction of disorderly conduct is affirmed. Note that this case is not concerned with that aspect of the statute prohibiting disorderly conduct which we held to be unconstitutional in *State v. Spencer*, 289 Or 225, P2d (1980).

weapon, commonly carried by the police. ORS 166.510 prohibits possession of a "billy;" however, ORS 166.520 states that peace officers are not prohibited from carrying or possessing a weapon commonly known as a "blackjack"[18] or "billy."

The statute in this case, ORS 166.510, prohibits the mere possession of a club. The defendant concedes that the legislature could prohibit carrying a club in a public place in a concealed manner, but the defendant maintains that the legislature cannot prohibit all persons from possessing a club in the home. The defendant argued that a person may prefer to keep in his home a billy club rather than a firearm to defend against intruders.

Our historical analysis of Article I, section 27, indicates that the drafters intended "arms" to include the hand-carried weapons commonly used by individuals for personal defense. The club is an effective, hand-carried weapon which cannot logically be excluded from this term. We hold that the defendant's possession of a billy club in his home is protected by Article I, section 27, of the Oregon Constitution.

The defendant's conviction for disorderly conduct is affirmed, and his conviction for possession of a slugging weapon is reversed.

[18] Webster's Third International Dictionary defines a "blackjack" as "* * * 4. a small striking weapon typically consisting of the striking end of a leather enclosed piece of lead or other heavy metal and of the handle end of a strap or springy shaft that increases the force of impact."

Vol. 80 August 4, 1980 No. 24

COURT OF APPEALS REPORTS

47 OR APP 1 — 108

machine gun 4—

(81).

CASES DECIDED
by the
COURT OF APPEALS

St v Becker poss of billy club outside of home

The CITY OF LAKEWOOD, a municipal corporation of the State of Colorado, Petitioner,

v.

Charles Edward PILLOW, Respondent.

No. C-164.

Supreme Court of Colorado, En Banc.

Oct. 10, 1972.

Defendant was convicted in Municipal Court of violation of city ordinance making it unlawful to possess dangerous or deadly weapon, and he appealed. The District Court, Jefferson County, Christian D. Stoner, J., reversed and declared ordinance invalid, and certiorari was granted. The Supreme Court, Hodges, J., held that the ordinance was unconstitutionally overbroad, where it would prohibit gunsmiths, pawnbrokers and sporting goods stores from carrying on substantial part of their business, it appeared to prohibit individuals from transporting guns to and from such places of business, it made it unlawful for person to possess firearms in vehicle or in place of business for purpose of self-defense, and several of such activities were constitutionally protected and, depending upon circumstances, might be entirely free of criminal culpability.

Affirmed.

1. Weapons ⇐3

City ordinance prohibiting possession of dangerous or deadly weapon was unconstitutionally overbroad, where it would prohibit gunsmiths, pawnbrokers and sporting goods stores from carrying on substantial part of their business, it appeared to prohibit individuals from transporting guns to and from such places of business, it made it unlawful for person to possess firearm in vehicle or in place of business for purpose of self-defense, and several of such activities were constitutionally protected and, depending upon circumstances, might be entirely free of criminal culpability. 1965 Perm.Supp., C.R.S., section 40-11-1; Const. art. 2, § 13.

2. Constitutional Law ⇐81

Governmental purpose to control or prevent certain activities, which may be constitutionally subject to state or municipal regulation under police power, may not be achieved by means which sweep unnecessarily broad and thereby invade area of protected freedoms.

3. Constitutional Law ⇐83(1)

Even though governmental purpose may be legitimate and substantial, that purpose cannot be pursued by means that broadly stifle fundamental personal liberties when the end can be more narrowly achieved.

Raymond C. Johnson, Lakewood, for petitioner.

Theodore P. Koeberle, Boulder, for respondent.

HODGES, Justice.

On petition of the City of Lakewood, we granted certiorari to review the district court's declaration that a Lakewood ordinance is invalid.

The respondent Pillow was convicted in municipal court of a violation of this ordinance which makes it unlawful to possess a dangerous or deadly weapon. He appealed to the district court which reversed the conviction on the basis of a finding that there was a failure of proof before the municipal court and on the further ground that the ordinance was invalid. The district court's declaration of invalidity was premised on its finding that the subject matter of the ordinance is a matter of statewide concern and is therefore preempted by a state statute pertaining to the carrying of a concealed weapon. This state statute is 1965 Perm.Supp., C.R.S. 1963, 40-11-1.

We affirm the district court's reversal of the respondent's conviction but do so on the ground that the Lakewood ordinance is

unconstitutionally overbroad. It is therefore unnecessary to discuss the failure of proof issue; moreover, this case is not a suitable vehicle for a consideration of the preemption issue. Our decision to resolve this case in this manner was prompted to some degree by statements made by counsel for the City of Lakewood during oral argument. He conceded that the ordinance lacked specificity in certain respects and that a replacing ordinance was in the process of preparation.

The subject Lakewood ordinance is numbered 0–70–47, Sec. 3–9 and is set forth in full as follows:

"*Unlawful to Possess, Carry or Use Dangerous or Deadly Weapons.* (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to have in his possession, except within his own domicile, or to carry or use, a revolver or pistol, shotgun or rifle of any description, which may be used for the explosion of cartridges, or any air gun, gas operated gun or spring gun, or any bow made for the purpose of throwing or projecting missiles of any kind by any means whatsoever; provided that nothing in this section shall prevent use of any such instruments in shooting galleries or ranges under circumstances when such instruments can be fired, discharged or operated in such manner as not to endanger persons or property and also in such manner as to prevent the projectile from traversing any grounds or space outside the limits of such gallery or range; and provided further, that nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the carrying of any type of gun, when unloaded, or any bow, to or from any range, gallery or hunting areas. (b) Nothing in this section shall prevent the possession or use of any of said instruments by persons duly licensed for such purpose by the City of Lakewood. (c) Nothing in this section shall prevent the use of or possession of any said instrument by law enforcement personnel."

[1] An analysis of the foregoing ordinance reveals that it is so general in its scope that it includes within its prohibitions the right to carry on certain businesses and to engage in certain activities which cannot under the police powers be reasonably classified as unlawful and thus, subject to criminal sanctions. As an example, we note that this ordinance would prohibit gunsmiths, pawnbrokers and sporting goods stores from carrying on a substantial part of their business. Also, the ordinance appears to prohibit individuals from transporting guns to and from such places of business. Furthermore, it makes it unlawful for a person to possess a firearm in a vehicle or in a place of business for the purpose of self-defense. Several of these activities are constitutionally protected. Colo.Const. art. II, § 13. Depending upon the circumstances, all of these activities and others may be entirely free of any criminal culpability yet the ordinance in question effectively includes them within its prohibitions and is therefore invalid. Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham, 382 U.S. 87, 86 S.Ct. 211, 15 L.Ed.2d 176 (1965); Winters v. New York, 333 U.S. 507, 68 S.Ct. 665, 92 L.Ed. 840 (1948); People of the City of Detroit v. Sanchez, 18 Mich.App. 399, 171 N.W.2d 452 (1969).

[2,3] A governmental purpose to control or prevent certain activities, which may be constitutionally subject to state or municipal regulation under the police power, may not be achieved by means which sweep unnecessarily broadly and thereby invade the area of protected freedoms. Zwickler v. Koota, 389 U.S. 241, 88 S.Ct. 391, 19 L.Ed.2d 444 (1967); Aptheker v. Secretary of State, 378 U.S. 500, 84 S.Ct. 1659, 12 L.Ed.2d 992 (1963); NAACP v. Alabama, 377 U.S. 288, 84 S.Ct. 1302, 12 L.Ed.2d 325 (1964). Even though the governmental purpose may be legitimate and substantial, that purpose cannot be pursued by means that broadly stifle fundamental personal liberties when the end can be more narrowly achieved. Aptheker v. Sec-

retary of State, *supra*, and Shelton v. Tucker, 364 U.S. 479, 81 S.Ct. 247, 5 L.Ed.2d 231 (1960). *See also* Colorado Racing Commission v. Smaldone, Colo., 492 P.2d 619; Arnold v. Denver, 171 Colo. 1, 464 P.2d 515 (1970); and Goldman v. Knecht, 295 F.Supp. 897 (D.C.Colo.1969).

Judgment affirmed.

Minnie May CUNNINGHAM, Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

SPRING VALLEY ESTATES, INC., a corporation, et al., Defendants-Appellees.

No. 72-068.

(Supreme Court No. 24727.)

Colorado Court of Appeals.
Div. II.

June 6, 1972.

Rehearing Denied June 27, 1972.

Certiorari Granted Oct. 24, 1972.

Selected for Official Publication.

Owner of property by adverse possession brought action for damages for alleged trespass on such property through which sewer main was constructed by defendant city and to require defendants to restore property to its former condition. The District Court, Boulder County, Howard O. Ashton, J., determined that city had a right to sewer easement on basis of inverse condemnation, denied owner's request for injunctive relief and awarded monetary damages against defendants. Owner appealed. The Court of Appeals, Enoch, J., held that absent agreement or admissions by parties, resolution, at pretrial conference, of disputed issues as to city's right to easement on property and as to owner's right to injunctive relief was improper. The court further held that subject to any defenses which defendant might have had, owner was entitled to damages for any injury caused by construction of main from date of owner's adverse possession rather than merely from date of the judgment quieting title in owner.

Reversed and remanded for new trial.

1. Trial ⇐9(1)

Absent agreement or admissions by parties, in action for damages caused by defendant's alleged trespass on plaintiff's property and to require defendant to restore property to its former condition, resolution, at pretrial conference, of disputed issues as to defendant city's right to sewer easement on plaintiff's property on basis of inverse condemnation and as to plaintiff's right to injunctive relief was improper.

2. Adverse Possession ⇐106(5)

Subject to any defenses which defendant might have had, owner of property by adverse possession was entitled to damages for any injury caused by construction of sewer main through such property from date of owner's adverse possession rather than merely from date of judgment quieting title in plaintiff. 1967 Perm.Supp., C.R.S., section 118-7-1(1).

James H. Snyder, Boulder, Wesley H. Doan, Denver, for plaintiff-appellant.

Hollenbeck, King, French & Mills, Guy A. Hollenbeck, Peter C. Dietze, Boulder, for defendants-appellees, Spring Valley Estates, Inc. and James M. Burger.

Walter L. Wagenhals, City Atty., Gilbert M. Sackheim, Asst. City Atty., Boulder, for defendant-appellee, City of Boulder, Colo.

ENOCH, Judge.

This case was transferred from the Supreme Court pursuant to statute.

This action was brought by Minnie May Cunningham against the named defendants for damages caused by defendants' alleged trespass upon her property and to require

Weekend, Page D-1

Anchorage Daily News

VOL. XLIII NO. 119 104 PAGES ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1988 PRICE 25 CENTS

Anchorage Daily News/Jim Lavrakas

William O'Shea at his arraignment Wednesday

Victim of shooting dies

Mental health director says suspect had sought help

By LARRY CAMPBELL
Daily News reporter

Renee Vega, the 31-year-old insurance agent shot in her office Tuesday afternoon, died at Providence Hospital Wednesday night.

Vega died at 8 p.m., according to a nursing supervisor.

Earlier Wednesday, William O'Shea, her former boyfriend, sat in a courtroom charged in the shooting.

O'Shea, 35, had been charged with attempted murder and being a felon in possession of a firearm. Assistant District Attorney Stephen Branchflower said he will file new first-degree murder charges today.

O'Shea was captured by Anchorage police two hours after the shooting in an Oceanview neighborhood nearby. He is jailed in lieu of a $1 million, cash-only bond.

Instead of being in court Wednesday afternoon, O'Shea had been scheduled to be in a counselor's office at the Southcentral Counseling Center. That was where Jan Campbell, executive director for the Alaska Mental Health Association, said she had made an appointment for O'Shea after he asked for her help last week.

"This afternoon was the soonest I could get him an appointment," Campbell said Wednesday. "He had come to see me a week ago and said he really needed help.

"He was using all the buzzwords — afraid of hurting someone, very sad and concerned and wanting help before getting into trouble. But Wednesday afternoon was the best I could do."

Campbell said she was willing to talk about his case because she felt the system had let O'Shea down.

Court papers filed by state prosecutors Wednesday say that Vega and O'Shea had been romantically involved for some months, but that the relationship had soured. According to the documents, Vega tried to break it up, but O'Shea refused. He beat her and ransacked her home last Friday, court papers charged.

A judge granted Vega a domestic violence writ against O'Shea the next day and she kicked him out, court papers said.

But the writ would only

See Back Page, SHOOTING

Senate OKs trade bill;

SPIRITUAL BATTLE BECOMES POLITICAL BATTLE

...uary.

...n Corrupt Practices Act ...es have to know specifically that ...violated the law" by bribing foreign ...s to be liable for punishment. This is also ...ored by business.

■ An easier course for passage of one of the president's trade priorities, the U.S.-Canada free trade agreement. Senate Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd has said a bruising veto battle over the trade bill could jeopardize congressional ratification of the Canadian pact.

For labor, the bill contains:

■ A plant-closing notification provision that the unions insisted the Democratic leadership keep in the bill and that President Reagan has made the major reason for his veto. Companies would be required to give 60 days' advance notice of plans for mass layoffs or plant closings. Business supports the veto over this provision.

■ A $1 million training program for displaced workers, initially proposed by the administration, and $80 million in expanded assistance to workers who lose their jobs because of imports.

■ Stronger enforcement of voluntary restraint agreements curbing steel imports.

■ Language making violations of international norms of workers' rights grounds for trade complaints.

Business, which played a major role in crafting the bill, gains:

■ Tougher rules against unfair trade practices, ...for presidential retaliation in the

...bluff on the south side of Bird Creek ...ear the highway bridge.

Pollitt could not say what sparked the chase.

Anchorage Daily News/Bob Hallinen

Troopers inspect the car that was rolled during a high-speed chase.

SHOOTING: Victim dies; counselor says suspect sought help

Continued from Page A-1

protect her if a police officer witnessed him harassing her. Otherwise, if O'Shea again bothered her, all she could do is appeal to the court to issue a warrant for his arrest.

But the morning of the shooting, O'Shea called her repeatedly at work, apparently distraught, according to office co-workers who overheard Vega's conversation.

The court papers also charge that, sometime after 1:30 p.m. Tuesday, O'Shea walked into the Fred Meyer department store on East Northern Lights Boulevard and bought a Ruger .22-caliber semi-automatic pistol — the weapon used 90 minutes later against Vega. In addition, the gun's packing box and receipt were found Wednesday morning in a men's room at the Village Inn restaurant next to Fred Meyer.

O'Shea had just completed a term of probation 24 days ago. He has a criminal record that includes convictions for burglary in 1974, check forgery in 1982, previous probation violations and misdemeanors. Court papers on this case, as well as documents from past court cases, show O'Shea struggled with drug and alcohol problems.

In addition, Campbell said O'Shea had told her of being under psychiatric care while in jail.

"He was looking for help, and it made me sick at heart," Campbell said.

But a quite different O'Shea was known to others, like Ray Clements, executive director of Parents United Inc., a non-profit aid agency for sexually abused children. For the past two months, O'Shea was supposed to be working for the group on contract as a fund-raiser. He had done the same work for Areela House, a drug rehabilitation center.

"We had a lot of plans in process, and he seemed very effective as a fund-raiser," Clements said Wednesday. "He had even stopped in the office earlier that day. To find out what had happened later in the day was shocking, certainly."

ICE CLASSIC: Three men split $130,000 pot

Continued from Page A-1

dents and ice classic officials.

"The ice was real thick so everyone, including myself and the National Weather

TV GLASSES: A boost from space technology

Continued from Page A-1