

Submitter: Paul Goodell
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure: HB2005

Hello, my name is Paul Goodell. I'm a resident of Curry County, a father of three, a medical professional serving my community and opponent to HB 2500.

There's an elephant in the room that should be addressed before moving forward with these bills and that elephant is the NYSRPA vs Bruen ruling.

From Bruen:

"Today, we decline to adopt that two-part approach. In keeping with Heller, we hold that when the Second Amendment's plain text covers an individual's conduct, the Constitution presumptively protects that conduct. To justify its

regulation, the government may not simply posit that the regulation promotes an important interest. Rather, the government must demonstrate that the regulation is consistent with this Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation. Only if a firearm regulation is consistent with this

Nation's historical tradition may a court conclude that the individual's conduct falls outside the Second Amendment's "unqualified command." *Konigsberg v. State Bar of Cal.*, 366 U. S. 36, 50, n. 10 (1961)

Is there any "text history and tradition" that supports prohibiting lawful people from making their own arms for personal use? If no, then the state is looking at a costly lawsuit making its way to the 9th circuit and possibly beyond. There are already laws in effect that prohibit the transfer of un-serialized firearms with the consequences of breaking those laws involving a felony conviction. This bill has nothing in its text that provides a lawful avenue for what is currently the non-criminal home builder of their own personal firearms. As written, it seeks to arbitrarily make felons out of good people.

This and the other two gun bills are nothing more than attempts to join in with other states like Wa, Ill, NY and NJ in their "Post Bruen temper tantrum" and basically wasting our tax dollars by legislatively "throwing spaghetti at the wall to see what sticks". Trying to pass these bills right now is like Alabama trying pass restrictions on married gays immediately after the Obergefell vs Hodges ruling. (Or for a non-hypothetical example) I cannot recall this much of a multi blue state effort to defy the supreme court since *Brown Vs Board of Education* told southern states that they could no longer segregate schoolchildren according to the color of their skin. Oregon has an addiction problem, a suicide/mental health problem, a human trafficking problem and a drug cartel importing fentanyl problem. The people of

Oregon would be better served by a legislature that was working to find effective solutions to some of these current problems instead of seeking ways to make felons out of what are currently lawful Oregonians peacefully exercising a constitutionally protected right.

On what is most likely to fall on deaf ears, I ask that you vote NO.
Paul Goodell