

See attached
(TEXT)

State of Oregon House Judiciary Committee members

At approximately 12 or 13 years of age I was in the house alone with my 7 year old sister on our small farm in the Central Valley of CA. It was grape harvesting time. I heard a car drive up in the evening while my father was in the barn. 3 or 4 farm workers we had hired got out and my father went to meet them. My Brittany Spaniel who loved everyone accompanied him.

A very short time later I heard rising voices. The farm workers were surrounding my father. I dashed to the closet that we were instructed not to go into without permission. I knew it contained a rifle and shotgun which I had been trained to use by my father several years earlier. I took the rifle and walked out on the wooden steps leading toward the barn and equipment area. I loaded the rifle and racked a shell into it. The noise caught the attention of the farm workers who saw me holding the rifle. They hurriedly backed away, got in their car and left.

We noticed at that time my dog bleeding profusely. He had been stabbed by the farm workers.

Had HB4005 been in effect there, at that time - rather than continuing with the harvest it is likely we would have been going to a funeral. My father's.

HB4005 is ostensibly aimed at interdicting suicide among other goals. Yet, in other countries where citizens are essentially forced into being disarmed, e.g. Japan, the suicide rate is higher. Are we to eliminate all tall buildings, the 205 bridge, objects with a cutting edge, rope, etc.?

The provision punishing gun owners who have been victimized by a criminal act when a stolen firearm is used by that or another criminal in another criminal act is absurdity. Whose word is taken as to whether or not it was locked? The criminal? If one considers equal application of the law-when a car is stolen and then used in a robbery or a drunk driving fatality then the victimized owner should be charged. It defies logic.

HB4005 would be better named the "Home Invasion Success Act." It markedly impedes citizens' ability to defend themselves in their own homes. It will truly add to the victimization of Oregonians particularly those of lesser means, older age or smaller and weaker. It is a piece of legislation with a goal, not to protect citizens. but punish and cause harm to Oregonians choosing to exercise a natural right particularly named in our Bill of Rights. In the Heller v District of Columbia Supreme Court Decision it was specifically pointed out that requiring disassembly or locking negates the firearm's ability to be used as self-defense and therefore violates the Constitution.

HB4005 in a free society should never see the light of day – or is it you desire that Oregon's society become something else?

If you want to live in a society where citizens are forbidden from bearing arms, I suggest a 20 – 25-hour drive South to a country where the populace is essentially forbidden from owning firearms. Try Nuevo Laredo – the gun restrictions in place have done so much for the murder rate there.

The use of the "Emergency" designation on this bill is specious as you well know. The frequency it is now being mis-used is evidence that the legislature fears that their acts will be overturned by an unhappy citizenry. The real emergency is the egregious misuse of this provision by tyrannical legislators

to deny legislative override by a democratic vote of the citizenry as has been in place in Oregon for 118 years. By your actions you prove that you wish to control rather than represent Oregonians. You verify James Madison's axiom "All with power should be mistrusted".

R. G. Howell

Jackson County Resident