

Submitter: Paul Goodell
On Behalf Of: Brookings
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure: SB348

Hello, my name is Paul Goodell. I'm a resident of Curry County, a father of three, a medical professional serving my community and an opponent of SB 348.

It appears that Oregon legislature is attempting to circumvent the judicial process that is holding up the implementation of Measure 114 with behavior that can be compared to that of a banana republic and also hop on board with the "multi-blue state temper tantrum" to the Supreme Court's ruling on NYSPA vs Bruen.

My criticisms of SB 348:

It has elements in it that are comparable to the "Black Codes" of the Jim Crow era. Quoting Dr. King, "A right delayed is a right denied". Imposing a 63-day delay on what is a constitutionally protected right is a denial of said right. Early Jim Crow laws also sought to deny recently freed blacks from exercising their 2nd amendment rights by making it too expensive for said blacks to be able to afford effective arms for their own protection and essentially, these early "common sense gun safety laws" of the reconstruction era served as the equivalent of OSHA regulations for mobs of racist idiots wearing hoods on their heads looking to attack recently freed slaves in their homes at night. One hundred and fifty dollars is an undue financial burden on the 2nd amendment rights of Oregonians. You're literally creating a class system here and coming from the party that continually goes on about equity and institutional discrimination of marginalized communities, this is really just dropping an egg on your own face.

Regarding age limits: Although I am concerned with the behavior that is typically seen from our young adults, until we legally redefine what is an adult, they still have the same constitutionally protected rights as the rest of us. Would an argument for narrowing the scope of 4th, 5th or 6th amendment protections for eighteen- to twenty-year-olds under the pretext of enhancing public safety pass constitutional muster? Probably not. If eighteen- to twenty-year-olds are considered old enough to competently sign contracts that bind them to fighting and/or dying in foreign wars, then they are old enough to enjoy all the protections afforded by the Bill of Rights that the rest of us have. People in support of this bill like to reference how there is an age limit on alcohol when trying to justify it, but I don't recall any text in the Bill of Rights that reads "A well intoxicated social event, being necessary to having a good time, the right of the people to keep and drink alcohol shall not be infringed".

Regarding the proposed magazine ban: It is irresponsible to waste taxpayer money trying to pass such a law while Duncan vs Bonta is making its way to the 9th circuit

post Bruen ruling. There is no measurable data collected in an intellectually honest manner that shows how banning what are currently standard capacity magazines (15-30 round) save lives. I have yet to hear a clear explanation on how a magazine with an eleven round capacity does not have protection under the 2nd Amendment, but a magazine with a 5 round capacity does.

Stop wasting our time and money,
Paul Goodell