

Submitter: Richard Roberts
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure: HB2007

Please vote NO on HB2007

What it claims to accomplish is the opposite of what will happen. We have seen it in other states, and we will all be less safe if HB2007 passes.

Of all the recent attempts to add gun control laws, HB2007 does something that absolutely cannot be denied. With the stroke of pen the state of Oregon will be cut up into several different entities with drastically different firearm rules that quite literally would turn myself, my wife and other law abiding citizen into criminals as we travel through different cities. My question is why? Is there any evidence that concealed carrier's are prone to commit criminal acts or more importantly commit crimes that involve a weapon? Quite the opposite is true.

HB2007 is also racist - HB2007 is the opposite of Equity and Equality that is espoused in this state so loudly. HB2007 quite literally opens the door for systemic government racist behavior to be wielded at communities of color. If the local government wants throw a net over its community to deny a constitutional right of a group of people this is the tool that will be used.

HB2007 puts women at risk - some women are especially vulnerable with this bill. Those who support this bill are asking women with CHLs to become criminals or be defenseless.

HB2007 weakens our state by creating even more tribalism. When it comes to laws that are tied so close to both the Oregon and Federal Constitution we should act as a state. Which is where ORS 166.170 comes in.

Finally - along with other recent gun control bills, none of them seem to be passing the constitutional sniff test, which is problematic, as this becomes at least a 4 fold expense to the tax payers.

1. We pay the legislature in the form of money and time to mull over & process the bill (except we seem to be skipping the step where the legislature sniffs it for constitutional viability)
2. If it gets passed, we have to pay to sue in court to show the lack of constitutionality - which should have been caught in the first step.
3. We have to pay the state to defend the bill against the constitutionality legal action.
4. Reduced Liberty

How many times are we going to do this?