

Dear Representatives,

My name is Jeff Lamont. I am writing this email to you as a concerned law abiding and continual tax paying citizen from Saint Helens, Oregon and as a registered Democrat. I recently read through house bill 4005 and while I see what it aims to do, I cannot help but point out some obvious key points to this house bill which worry me regarding wasted time and money.

My writing of this letter is not intended to support or oppose firearms storage solutions as I truly see both sides of the argument. My purpose for writing this letter is to ask that you all as my elected officials review previous court decisions and do not waste a ton of time and tax money debating this issue. I watch the State of Oregon, as decisions and issues are brought forward for review without respect for previous higher court ruling. To me, it appears this issue is a rather large waste of money and I'd like to voice my disapproval of spending money on salaries, research, court filing, and more, to debate issues that have already been decided by higher courts in the past.

In this instance, HB 4005 aims to prevent tragedy by requiring storage solutions of firearms. And to some extent I agree. However, in 2008 there is already established case law (District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008)) which established that locked up firearms including several types named in HB 4005 would violate the guarantee of the people the right to keep and bear arms. It established the right to keep and bear arms to each person rather than having to have a status with a militia in order to provide the right to defend ones self. Bu in that context was a fight against this very same issue.

Then the issue was brought up regarding whether District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008) established whether or not the second amendment of the united states are incorporated by the 14th amendment against the states regarding due process. Another landmark case was born... McDonald v. Chicago (2010) which turned out the decision that the 14th amendment against the states in fact does apply, protecting second amendment rights from infringement by the state and local governments.

To me I just don't see any debate here with our state. It appears to be nothing more than a gian money suck and a giant waste of time.

District of Collumbia v. Heller went to the supreme court where it was affirmed by a vote of 5 to 4 which struck down provisions of the Firearms Control Regulation Act of 1975 which required many of the exact same regulations that are being proposed by HB 4005. Now, I don't say this as a person attempting to curb firearm bills or to support them. My purpose is to point out the catastrophic waste of money that will be spent by the Oregon tax payers for our house members and elected officials to fight over something that has already been decided and will ultimately be appealed and face the same decisions. I beg my elected officials to understand this and save our state money and time. For me it isn't about guns, it's about the abuse of money to look at things already decided. I worry for my children and their children about the status of our beautiful state when our income tax is already higher than sales tax in our neighbor states, and the frivolous abuse of this money is spent without regard for those of us paying into the pot.

Please consider bills and legislation that are better tuned for less fraudulent and obvious waste. I beg my elected officials to begin their journey to save our children the bill we are leaving them. While I understand that firearms regulation and laws aim to protect more people, fraudulent spending impacts all people. I promise that the impact debating this bill and spending money on it, will far greater impact our children than the provisions in the bill aim to protect against. I never want to see a child or another

person hurt or killed from an unlocked or unattended firearm. But I feel that is the responsibility of people to prevent and not for our government to spend millions of dollars debating just to be eventually struck down in appeals to higher courts.

Of course there are many other issues this argument can apply to, I just see this one as too obvious a set of circumstances to not say something.

Thank you,

Jeff Lamont
Concerned Citizen