

The Whole Truth And The Real Hazard Facing The People Of Oregon

We have been told that the governor of Oregon, Kate Brown, dispatched Oregon State Police to search for 11 Senate Republicans who walked out of the session to avoid a vote for a climate change bill. But did the governor of Oregon really do that? Is that the real story?

Kate stated, "The Senate Republicans have decided to abandon their duty to serve their constituents and walk out."

Brown continued claiming the authority as Governor of Oregon, "I am authorizing the State Police to fulfill the Senate Democrats' request."

Brown had stated, "It is absolutely unacceptable that the Senate Republicans would turn their backs on their constituents who they are honor-bound to represent here in this building. They need to return and do the jobs they were elected to do."

KOIN-TV reported, 'Officers can arrest the *lawmakers* if they refuse to willfully return'.

They will also be fined \$500 every day they do not appear in the session. Why is this all taking place and did it really need to happen?

Supposedly HB 2020 is a comprehensive cap-and-invest strategy for combating climate change. But is it? Others claim "This is a sad day for Oregon. There is no fine that could ever amount to the FEAR democrats have put on Oregonians over the #hb2020 legislation that will destroy livelihoods of many in our state." Republican Sen. Herman Baertschiger Jr. tweeted.

Herman also said, "Protesting cap and trade by walking out represents our constituency and exactly how we should be doing our job, We have endured threats of arrest, fines and pulling community project funds from the Governor, Senate President and Majority Leader. We will not stand by and be bullied by the majority party any longer. Oregonians deserve better. It's time for the majority party to consider all Oregonians – not just the ones in Portland."

I have heard reports that the Three Percenters[\[1\]](#) are hiding the Senators and some are seeing this as a historical moment. Sen. Brian Boquist, a Republican from Dallas, said late Wednesday "Send bachelors and come heavily armed. "I'm not going to be a political prisoner in the state of Oregon."

While some will report that this bill is a good faith effort to fight climate change, others say it is a money and power grab to create a massive *slush fund* that will raise taxes and devastate the Oregon economy, hurt the poor, and enrich crony capitalists who are dipping their hands into the treasury.[\[2\]](#)

PUC Commissioner John Savage says: "This bill is absolute crap ... a shell game that will result in no actual emissions reductions and higher rates for Oregon customers. And then the utilities get to stuff our decisions they didn't like down our throats."

We could go through a long coverage of all the detailed provisions of the Bill, their long-range consequences, and other Bills that both the Republicans and many citizens feel are being "shoved down their throats".

The walkout might have been avoided if the Democrats had not tacked on an *emergency clause*. The emergency provision blocks Oregonians from being able to take the bill to a vote. The Senators felt they had to walk out to prevent a quorum and thereby stop the Democrats from ramming HB 2020 through avoiding the *vote of the people*.

All these claims and counterclaims could be a slippery slope to a violent confrontation. But is that the real story or is there a bigger story of corruptions so egregious that the media will not touch it?

The Real Problem

We can tell Oregonians who will listen about the long term effects of these bills[\[3\]](#), the corruption going on behind the scenes to pass laws that make millions of dollars for special interests. We could advocate for Petitions being circulated to recall Kate Brown as the Governor. But is that really a good idea? Does that approach get to or even address the real problem which no one in the media wants to talk about?

Is there a better, more fundamental answer to the conflict?

Do we even know the *whole truth* and are we willing to hear it and provide for it?

Our greatest concern is the “Slip Hazard”[\[4\]](#) facing the people who are running around in the halls of power and authority searching for solutions when they “lack knowledge”,[\[5\]](#) do not have the “whole truth” and most importantly, their own feet need cleaning.

The problem of corruption in Oregon is essentially the same thing we can see all across the American landscape and even around the world. If the truth is to be known, this corruption has been the norm throughout the history of mankind whenever he looks to governments of the world to solve his problems.

The problem is too often that people do not love the truth enough to be “willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.”[\[6\]](#) especially if the truth exposes their own sloth, avarice, and wantonness.

On June 20, Oregon State Police (OSP) issued the statement:

“State Senators left the Salem area before various bills made it through our legislative process to a final vote. A bill cannot move forward to a vote without a quorum. The departure of the Senators leaves the Senate without the minimum number of members required to constitute a quorum, so the legislative process has stalled.”

They go on to say:

“Consistent with the provisions in the Oregon Constitution, the Senate President requested the assistance of the Oregon State Police to bring Senators back to the capital to resume the legislative process. Consistent with her authority under Oregon law (ORS 181.050), the Governor has directed OSP to provide that assistance.” [\[7\]](#)

The Whole Truth

One problem is, the OSP are not upholding the “whole truth” of the provisions in the Oregon Constitution, to say nothing of the citizens who have not heard the “whole truth”. Only a few people in Oregon know of the truth about the lawlessness in the high offices of the State. And the few who have are *acquiescing* to known violations of their Oregon Constitution.

The OSP also goes on to state that “Oregon State Police serves the Governor in her elected role as leader of Oregon’s Executive Branch of government, and she has now given a lawful directive which OSP is fully committed to executing.”

If you read the whole Oregon Constitution and access just some public information, which is a matter of record, the question arises as to just “Who is the lawful governor the OSP is supposed to be serving?”

If we just look at Article II, Section 22 of the Oregon Constitution which covers “Political Campaign Contribution Limitations” [\[8\]](#), we can see plainly that “candidate may use or direct only contributions which originate from individuals who

at the time of their donation were residents of the electoral district of the public office sought by the candidate”.

If we then go to Vote Smart.org’s website, they provide factual, unbiased information on candidates and politicians to ALL Americans. In the record for Kate Brown[9] we can see that she received \$20,297,458.95 in donations and only \$12,703,984.53 of that was from within the state. That would mean that Kate is in violation of Article 2 Section 22, which according to paragraph (2) of that section, means she must “forfeit the office” of governor and “shall not hold a subsequent elected public office for a period equal to twice the tenure of the office.” Also, according to paragraph (4), she is guilty of a “felony” and should be charged and arrested for a “felony”.



So, if Kate is not the lawful governor of Oregon because of her violation of Article 2 Section 22, then the OSP should not be doing what she says. They could be arresting her for trespass and impersonating the Governor of Oregon instead of vacating the office she now holds hostage.

What about all the other legislators?

Why didn’t the outspoken Republican Sen. Herman Baertschiger Jr. tell the people of the Governors violation of the Article 2 Section 22 which should instantly remove her as a threat to Oregon’s economy?

As we examined the data at the VoteSmart.org website we can see that many other legislators and other elected officials are also in violation of the very Constitution they have sworn to uphold.

Article II, Section 22 is the law, especially for elected

officials who are sworn to uphold its terms. Despite previous attempts to challenge it in District court in 1995[\[10\]](#) the Oregon Supreme Court in 1997[\[11\]](#), and the United States Court of Appeals in 1998[\[12\]](#) it remains the legal terms by which they may hold office.

The data tells us that Republican Sen. Herman Baertschiger Jr.[\[13\]](#) received a total of \$155,416.91 in contributions. According to the data, he can only accept and use a total of \$15,541.69 from outside of District 2. But data shows In-State funding at \$112,573.75 and the Out-Of-State funding at \$42,750.00. Moreover his "Top Contributors" are sometimes statewide special interest groups. But anyone seeking election may only receive 10% of their donations from outside their district.

Herman is probably a great guy and certainly a courageous one in his fight for what he thinks as right for Oregonians. But everyone running for elected office needs to *come clean*[\[14\]](#) and abide by the law if they want to be *lawmakers*.

"You must abide by the law if you want to be a just lawmaker."

Both sides of the aisle need to be held to the same standard of upholding the Constitution that has given them power even if it means they must vacate their office for a Season. Even Moses knew that.[\[15\]](#)

Not only the governor but also many holding elected office in the State of Oregon need to step down together from those offices to set a good faith example and give their support to law enforcement in Oregon and to the courts to do the right thing and remove those who do not willingly step-down.

That will take courage and sacrifice. They have individually pledged to uphold the Constitution and they now need to mutually pledge to each other "Sacred Honor"[\[16\]](#) to uphold the *whole Constitution* that created the office of power they sought. It would be a shot for freedom and righteousness heard

round the world.

Once the elected officers of the State come clean and do the right thing it would mean that many of the appointed officials who were chosen by candidates that legally do not have a right to the office they occupy are also holding their offices and taking their pay under false pretenses.

Acquiescence

“Nothing strengthens authority so much as silence.” – Leonardo da Vinci

Some citizens who have also discovered this blatant and pervasive violation of the law have been advised to “wait”. Wait for what?

Every day an elected official refuses to vacate any office they do not have a right to is an “unclassified felony” and compounds their violation. If those who are responsible for the enforcement of the law and the constitution of Oregon fail to uphold its provisions, they also become subject to arrest.

“If I were to remain silent, I’d be guilty of complicity.” – Albert Einstein

State officials are not enforcing their own rules and it is becoming increasingly clear that the citizens of Oregon need to make a “timely” specific objection or they will have “acquiesced” to the lawlessness. [\[17\]](#)

If citizens wait or delay in objecting, their silence is then assumed to be *acquiescence*, which will result in “*the person whose rights are infringed*” *losing the ability to make a legal claim against the infringer or may be unable to obtain an injunction against continued infringement. The doctrine of acquiescence infers a form of “permission” that results from silence or passiveness over an extended period of time. Silence in the face of a transgression may result in a loss of*

a right to make a claim for loss or damage, on the principle of consent inferred from accepting or permitting the wrongful acts without protest or claim. [\[18\]](#)

I would not presume to give any legal advice to the citizens and residents of Oregon and none is implied. But I ponder the wisdom of a "recall". Once the people know an office is invalidly occupied by an *unwarranted usurpation* [\[19\]](#), any attempt to recall might suggest an "estoppel by acquiescence" [\[20\]](#) since there is no reason to *recall* someone who has no right to the office.

"There is no need to give an eviction notice to a burglar nor sue for a divorce from a rapist."

We are only interested in the moral character of the people to abide by their word and keep the other commandments. Of course, it is our desire that their desire is to repent and seek the kingdom of God and His righteousness. What made America great was not its presidents and governors. Whatever greatness we may claim sprang from the people who had a sense of justice and mercy. It was their unswerving willingness to drop what they were doing in a minute to do what was right for their neighbor and their neighbor's children and not just for themselves. It is your choice either to work for the rule of law [\[21\]](#) or to be ruled by the lawless.

"Not only will we have to repent for the sins of bad people; but we also will have to repent for the appalling silence of good people." – Martin Luther King Jr.

If you want your rights back, you need to take your responsibility back and attend to the "weightier matters". [\[22\]](#)

You will need to gather together and work together for the sake of righteousness with courage and perseverance. You will need a consistent and unwavering team of dedicated men and women. You will need to support them and protect them. And you

will need an honest lawyer or two.

To hear more Truth search [“Keys of the Kingdom” Podcasts with Brother Gregory](#).

Or [Join the Living Network](#).

© 2019 NWV – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Gregory Williams: network@hisholychurch.org

Footnotes:

[1] The Three Percenters (also styled 3%ers and III%ers) is an American militia organization whose members pledge protest and armed resistance against attempts to curtail constitutional rights.

[2] Matthew 6:19 “Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal:”

[3] <https://votesmart.org/bills/OR/2019/#.XRWnIo97ms1> 2019 Oregon Key Votes

[4] The meaning of the phrase “Slip Hazard” here is to denote a dangerous practice. Because governments of the world require “hierarchy controls” there is a “corruption risk” if you ignore constitutional limitations. Those that do not hold themselves to the highest of standards cannot hold others to those standards inviting corruption into the whole body. It does not matter that you are not influenced by the offer of donations from outside of your electorate, to disregard licenses abuse of power.

[5] Hosea 4:6 “ My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou

hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children.”

[6] “We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth, and listen to the song of that siren till she transforms us into beasts. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and, having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it.” from Patrick Henry’s “Give me liberty, or give me death!” speech given during the Second Virginia Convention presented a resolution to raise a militia at St. John’s Church, Richmond, Virginia, March 23, 1775.

[7] June 20, **Oregon State Police** full text:

: “State Senators left the Salem area before various bills made it through our legislative process to a final vote. A bill cannot move forward to a vote without a quorum. The departure of the Senators leaves the Senate without the minimum number of members required to constitute a quorum, so the legislative process has stalled.

: Consistent with the provisions in the Oregon Constitution, the Senate President requested the assistance of the Oregon State Police to bring Senators back to the capital to resume the legislative process. Consistent with her authority under Oregon law (ORS 181.050), the Governor has directed OSP to provide that assistance.

: OSP has assisted in resolving a similar situation in the past, and, with the help of diplomats from both sides of the aisle, the Department has done so in a peaceful, gentle, and process-supporting way which allowed members of our Legislature to return to work without forfeiting the good relationships essential to moving forward collaboratively and

productively.

: Oregon State Police serves the Governor in her elected role as leader of Oregon's Executive Branch of government, and she has now given a lawful directive which OSP is fully committed to executing. OSP is utilizing established relationships to have polite communication with these Senators. While we obviously have many tools at our disposal, patience and communication is and always will be our first, and preferred, option.

: OSP will work with the Governor's office and members of the Legislature to find the most expeditious way to bring this matter to a peaceful and constructive conclusion.

: No further information will be provided at this time.

[\[8\]](#) Oregon Constitution, Article II, Section 22: Political Campaign Contribution Limitations

(1) For purposes of campaigning for an elected public office, a candidate may use or direct only contributions which originate from individuals who at the time of their donation were residents of the electoral district of the public office sought by the candidate, unless the contribution consists of volunteer time, information provided to the candidate, or funding provided by federal, state, or local government for purposes of campaigning for an elected public office.

(2) Where more than ten percent (10%) of a candidate's total campaign funding is in violation of Section (1), and the candidate is subsequently elected, the elected official shall forfeit the office and shall not hold a subsequent elected public office for a period equal to twice the tenure of the office sought. Where more than ten percent (10%) of a candidate's total campaign funding is in violation of Section (1) and the candidate is not elected, the unelected candidate shall not hold a subsequent elected public office for a period equal to twice the tenure of the office sought.

(3) A qualified donor (an individual who is a resident within the electoral district of the office sought by the candidate) shall not contribute to a candidate's campaign any restricted contributions of Section (1) received from an unqualified donor for the purpose of contributing to a candidate's campaign for elected public office. An unqualified donor (an entity which is not an individual and who is not a resident of the electoral district of the office sought by the candidate) shall not give any restricted contributions of Section (1) to a qualified donor for the purpose of contributing to a candidate's campaign for elected public office.

(4) A violation of Section (3) shall be an unclassified felony.

[\[9\]](https://votesmart.org/candidate/campaign-finance/2990/kate-brown#.XRU2Eo97ms0) Kate Brown's
<https://votesmart.org/candidate/campaign-finance/2990/kate-brown#.XRU2Eo97ms0> Campaign Finances

[\[10\]](#) Vannatta v. Keisling, 899 F. Supp. 488 – Dist. Court, D. Oregon 1995

[\[11\]](https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/1169752/vannatta-v-keisling/)
<https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/1169752/vannatta-v-keisling/> Vannatta v. Keisling, 931 P.2d 770 (Or. 1997)

[\[12\]](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=11439113153192091581&hl=en&as_sdt=6&as_vis=1&oi=scholar)
https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=11439113153192091581&hl=en&as_sdt=6&as_vis=1&oi=scholar 151 F. 3d 1215 – Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit 1998

[\[13\]](https://votesmart.org/candidate/campaign-finance/136768/herman-baertschiger-jr#.XRDWl0hKis4)
<https://votesmart.org/candidate/campaign-finance/136768/herman-baertschiger-jr#.XRDWl0hKis4>

[\[14\]](#) They need to metaphorically “wipe their feet” lest they slip and break the law they have sworn to uphold.

[\[15\]](#) Hebrews 11:24-27 “By faith Moses, when he was come to

years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompence of the reward. By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible."

[\[16\]](#) The final sentence of the Declaration of Independence is a promise among the signers, to "mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our Sacred Honor," and, in fact, many of them and their fellow citizens did sacrifice their lives and fortunes in service to what they knew was right.

[\[17\]](#) "In law, acquiescence occurs when a person knowingly stands by without raising any objection to the infringement of his or her rights, while someone else unknowingly and without malice aforethought acts in a manner inconsistent with their rights." "Acquiescence". The Free Dictionary. Farlex. Retrieved 28 September 2017.

[\[18\]](#)

"[https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=17866206001274130168 Central Pacific R. Co. v. Alameda County]

[\[19\]](#) "to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction" by occupying an office you have no right to hold while exercising authority, ruling over and impose taxes upon the people through the power of that office is the definition of "Abuses and Usurpations". The Declaration of Independence.

[\[20\]](#) A claim of estoppel may arise when one party gives legal notice to a second party of a fact or claim, and the second party fails to challenge or refute that claim within a reasonable time. The second party may be said to have acquiesced to the claim, and thus to be estopped from later challenging it or making a counterclaim based upon the actions of the other party. Estoppel by acquiescence is different from

estoppel by laches as acquiescence involves an intentional act of the party who is accused of acquiescence, while laches may result from conduct that is not voluntary.

[\[21\]](#) Laws are to be clear, publicized, stable, and just; are applied evenly; and protect fundamental rights of the individual consistently.

[\[22\]](#) Matthew 23:23 “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.”