

Dear Sirs or Madams:

I am an attorney licensed to practice in the State of Oregon for 10 years. This email is to express my strong objection to HB 4005.

As a backdrop, I present you with the following:

Oregon Constitution, Section 27. "The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence [sic] of themselves, and the State, but the Military shall be kept in strict subordination to the civil power[.]"

Furthermore, the United States Constitution, in addition to the 2nd amendment, expressly states the following:

The United States Constitution, Article V, states "No person SHALL. . .nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

Turning to HB 4005, I generally object to the entirety of this bill.

District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008), stated the [Second Amendment](#) protects an individual's [right](#) to possess a [firearm](#), unconnected with service in a militia, for traditionally lawful purposes, such as self-defense within the home, and that the District of Columbia's handgun ban and requirement that lawfully-owned rifles and shotguns be kept "unloaded and disassembled or bound by a trigger lock" violated this guarantee. Citation omitted.

I strongly urge you to stop considering whether to abrogate a constitutional right.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan Johnson