

My name is Romain Godin, I live in Beaverton and I operate a small business in Portland. I opposed Measure 114 and I am submitting testimony in opposition of HB3075.

I am 'yet another white guy' and, for lack of a better option, I vote "blue". My community includes many LGBTQIA2S+ and BIPOC firearm owners / 2A supporters who vote on the left side of the political spectrum. Many are health professionals and educators, the latter of whom might not be willing to submit public testimony for fear of backlash in their professional lives. From my perspective, the second amendment / "gun control" debate is not polarized along party lines in quite the way the media portrays.

Measure 114 *narrowly* passed by a 1.3% margin. On paper, the limited information on the ballot appealed to folks' "seems like common sense" nature, earning a vote without deeper consideration. The breakdown in the voter's pamphlet exposed the measure for what it truly is, which immediately stands out as problematic for anyone who has experience with firearms or the current purchase process. I'm left wondering how many of our legislators crafting these bills have navigated the purchase process or even interacted with firearms. For those who haven't, I see them as no better than those trying to regulate differently gendered peoples' bodies in other states.

We all saw the "war on drugs" prove to be an exercise in futility. Legislation is not going to make standard capacity magazines go away and I don't expect it to make anyone safer from violent criminal activity – the letter of the law is irrelevant to those seeking to violate it. M114/HB3075 will only serve to drive sales underground, diverting funds to a criminal run black market instead of honest businesses. The entire pretense of the magazine aspect of this legislation is misleading – with practice, it takes fewer than 2 seconds to change the magazine in most firearms. Those seconds might count in symmetrical combat, but we would not be buying someone unarmed and under fire a meaningful amount time to not get shot. We also live in an era where manufacture of the regulated parts of a firearm has been trivialized by technological innovations in 3D printing. A magazine is but a box with a spring in it.

Our state constitution reads:

"The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence [sic] of themselves, and the State [...]"

I don't believe that exercising a right requires payment or permission. To exercise their right to vote, would you have Oregonians paying \$150 to apply for a permit and require them to visit a location that is only open 9-5 weekdays? These parameters would disproportionately affect the working class who often need to seek permission from an employer and arrange for travel, not to mention the impact to their income missing work *and* paying a fee. Many would consider that voter suppression.

A purchase or transfer in the state of Oregon already requires clearing a background check, these redundant measures only serve to impede Oregonians' rights. Restricting access to firearms and standard capacity magazines will also undermine the peoples' capabilities in the defence of our State from threats both foreign and domestic.

The lack of clear and objective criteria for denial of a permit to purchase is especially concerning. "Likely to be a danger to self or others" is highly subjective and will only pave the way for discrimination against marginalized groups. Semantically, anyone in possession of a firearm has the potential to be a danger - that is by design. Lest you forget, our country was born of a bloody 8-year war against an oppressive monarchy. Armed populations are difficult to oppress, so the right to bear arms is the final check and balance should our leadership stray from being "by the people, for the people".

I recognize the need to do *something* to reduce gun violence, but this legislation is not going to achieve that outcome. AR pattern rifles first became available in 1964, fully automatic variants were available (with a \$200 tax) until 1986, and, adjusted for inflation, they were priced similarly to a higher end AR today (\$1,600-\$2,000). An AR pattern rifle wasn't involved in a mass shooting event until 2007.

If the tools were indeed the problem, one would think that problem would have been just as bad – if not worse – during those years. The reality is that firearms have barely changed, but our society has. If we want to reduce the gun violence symptom, we need to address its underlying root causes: Loss of economic opportunity, growing wealth inequality, and a healthcare system engineered to benefit the shareholder rather than the patient. The legal debacles surrounding measure 114 have cost taxpayer funds that would have been better appropriated in pursuit of those objectives.