

11 March 2013

Richard F. Wisner
Post Office Box 434
Siletz, Oregon 97380-0434

Oregon Senate Judiciary Committee
900 Court St. NE
Room 453
Salem, Oregon 97301

Dear Chairman Prozanski and members of the Committee,

I am writing to urge the Committee to keep in mind our nations Bill of Rights while debating various legislation dealing with weapons and guns that come before you.

Some of these bills seem more designed to transform ordinary lawful acts into criminal activity, such as SB 347 (which has already been deemed legal by Oregon's Supreme Court if I'm not mistaken). SB 699 looks more like a vendetta than a reasonable law as there has never been an gun incident in our capitol and besides, our capital is the "people's house". SB 758 is one of the more ridiculous ideas to come out of our legislators to date.

SB 760 is going to cause nothing but trouble should it be made law and SB 796 is a waste of time. How many times have you seen someone or heard of someone driving down the highway – after having previously passed a written test and has demonstrated skills behind the wheel – with not a clue about what they were doing.

As you know, Oregon currently has strong background check requirements in place. Furthermore, it is already a federal felony for any private person to sell, trade, give, lend, rent or transfer a gun to a person they know or should have known is not legally allowed to own, purchase or possess a firearm. It should be noted that every year, many people fail to pass the background checks required for firearm purchases. Before considering the passage of more onerous rules and regulations, I suggest enforcing the laws that are currently on the books. Those who urge passage of so-called "universal background checks" fail to grasp the fundamental truth that this will only affect law-abiding citizens - not criminals. Please keep in mind that criminals do not obey the law in the first place.

Citizen (read, 'victim') disarmament advocates claim to be fighting "gun violence" when they really mean restricting the rights of law-abiding gun owners to protect themselves, or demanding a ban on the sale of "assault weapons" when they are actually referring to semi-automatic guns that happen to look intimidating. Picture a society in which the only people who have guns are the government and criminals. The citizen disarmament advocates seem to like that picture, at least theoretically. And as usual they focus on the tools used by the killer, rather than on what made him a killer in the first place.

I'm sure you've noticed the tendency towards emotionalizing this issue, which might come in handy whey trying to persuade idealistic souls to make political contributions or venture out on

a walk for 'stopping violence' or some such. But, in the field of government policy making, I expect that the decision making process be based on something a little more concrete. Like, hard factual evidence and rational analysis.

According to our very own FBI's annual crime statistics, [easily verifiable] the number of murders committed annually with hammers and clubs far outnumber the number of murders committed with a rifle. For example, in 2011, there was 323 murders committed with a rifle but 496 murders committed with hammers and clubs. While the FBI makes clear is that some of the "murder by rifle" numbers could be adjusted up slightly, when you take into account murders with non-categorized types of guns, it does not change the fact that their annual reports consistently show more lives are taken each year with blunt objects than are taken with the dreaded rifle. Another interesting fact: According to the FBI, nearly twice as many people are killed by hands and fists each year than are killed by murderers who use rifles. So it would seem the bottom line is this: A rifle ban is as illogical as it is unconstitutional. We face far greater danger from individuals armed with carpenters' tools and sticks.

Then, what about obesity? I mean, spoons and forks account for over 300,000 deaths in America every year. Where are our priorities? Spoons don't feed people, people feed people. For reasons hard to follow, citizen disarmament advocates think that a ten-round clip turns a so-called assault weapon into something else.

As for school violence what about this observation isn't it amazing that all the folks who are so afraid of guns and who would be appalled at the idea of (free market) armed guards protecting their children, are completely okay when they see an armed guard standing at the door of a bank or carrying bags of money into the bank..... protecting their dollars. Where are our priorities?

"Guns don't kill people. People kill people". It is my profound hope that you will protect the rights of Oregon citizens while you are defending the constitution of our nation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Richard F. Wisner". The ink is dark and the handwriting is fluid and legible.

Richard F. Wisner

Dear Chairman Prozanski, Vice-Chair Close and members of the Committee,

I am writing to urge you to not pass the bills coming before your Committee this Friday. As you know, Oregon currently has strong background check requirements in place and it is already a federal felony for any private person to sell, trade, give, lend, rent or transfer a gun to a person they know or should have known is not legally allowed to own, purchase or possess a firearm. It should be noted that every year, many people fail to pass the background checks required for firearm purchases. Before considering the passage of more onerous rules and regulations, I suggest enforcing the laws that are currently on the books. Those who urge passage of so-called "universal background checks" fail to grasp the fundamental truth that this will only affect law-abiding citizens - not criminals. Please keep in mind that criminals do not obey the law in the first place.

Citizen (read, 'victim') disarmament advocates claim to be fighting "gun violence" when they really mean restricting the rights of law-abiding gun owners to protect themselves, or demanding a ban on the sale of "assault weapons" when they are actually referring to semi-automatic guns that happen to look intimidating. Picture a society in which the only people who have guns are the government and criminals. The citizen disarmament advocates seem to like that picture, at least theoretically. And as usual they will focus on the tools used by the killer, rather than on what made him a killer in the first place.

I'm sure you've noticed the tendency towards emotionalizing this issue, which might come in handy when trying to persuade idealistic souls to make campaign contributions or venture out on a walk for 'stop school violence' or some such. But, in the field of government policy making, you might expect hope that the decision making process was based on something a little more concrete. Like, hard factual evidence and rational analysis. According to our very own FBI's annual crime statistics, [easily verifiable] the number of murders committed annually with hammers and clubs far outnumbers the number of murders committed with a rifle. For example, in 2011, there was 323 murders committed with a rifle but 496 murders committed with hammers and clubs. While the FBI makes clear is that some of the "murder by rifle" numbers could be adjusted up slightly, when you take into account murders with non-categorized types of guns, it does not change the fact that their annual reports consistently show more lives are taken each year with blunt objects than are taken with the dreaded rifle. Another interesting fact: According to the FBI, nearly twice as many people are killed by hands and fists each year than are killed by murderers who use rifles. So it would seem the bottom line is this: A rifle ban is as illogical as it is unconstitutional. We face far greater danger from individuals armed with carpenters' tools and sticks.

SB 347

There are 175,000 CHL holders in Oregon. There is not a single example of a CHL holder misusing a firearm in a school. This bill is nothing more than harassment of law-abiding gun owners. What, exactly, makes license holders more dangerous in schools than in libraries, playgrounds or on crowded sidewalks?

SB 699

As drafted, this would ban those with CHL's from the Capitol Building if in possession of a firearm. The fact is when rally goers recently went into "their" building they were perfectly well behaved. The police reported "no incidents." Once again, for years licensed carry was allowed in the Capitol. There have been *no* problems. Some claim they were intimidated by the sight of people openly carrying rifles so they respond by outlawing the concealed carry of pistols! If

the current amendments are adopted, the ban would *not* apply to retired cops and corrections officers. There has been no explanation for that proposed change. But another amendment would allow concealed carry "*provided that the firearm is completely concealed from view.*" It would also extend these new restrictions to *all public* buildings. Since this has historically been how CHL holders (including many legislators) have carried their firearms this is an entirely unneeded change. But it's also a problem. If a license holder's firearm became visible at any point, that person could be charged with a felony. There is simply no need for this legislation and it puts gun owners at great risk. What does "completely concealed from view" even mean?

SB 700

The amended version defines transfer as "the sale, gift or lease of a firearm." So you can give a gun to your son, but not your step-daughter. You may give a gun to your wife, but not your girlfriend. You may sell a gun to your son-in-law but not your nephew. However you may give a gun to your wife, who may give it to her sister, who may give it to her husband who can give it to his son. (Your nephew.) You may not give a gun to your domestic partner. Additionally, it creates a state wide gun registry as well.

SB 796

This bill creates a baffling collection of shooting requirements to get a CHL. The shooting requirements are totally arbitrary and bear no resemblance to any real life, bona fide situations. The bill has two amendments. One would make it only apply to new license applicants. The other amendment changes the required course of fire by a few seconds and makes some changes in the order and sequence of the shooting, proving the original bill makes demands that are totally arbitrary. The bill makes no allowances for the different rates of fire of semi-auto pistols vs. revolvers.

Again, I strongly urge you to toss out these four bills.

Richard F. Wisner
PO Box 434
Siletz, Oregon 97380
541.444.2334
02 April 2013