

## To: Members of the House Business and Labor Committee

**From:** Kevin Campbell, Executive Director Oregon Association Chiefs of Police

Date: February 10, 2014

## Re: Testimony in opposition to HB 4011

Chair Doherty and Members of the House Business and Labor Committee,

On behalf of the Oregon Association Chiefs of Police (OACP), please accept this letter in opposition to portions of HB 4011. We oppose portions of this measure that seek to eliminate the requirement of pawnbrokers engaging in secondhand transactions to photograph precious metal items like jewelry. We respectfully request that the committee remove Sections 1 and 2 and to remove any references to these changes noted in Section 5.

In 2012, State Representative Nancy Nathanson introduced HB 4108 (Precious Metal Secondhand Dealing) which regulates pawnshops and secondhand dealers who purchase items of precious metal (gold, silver, platinum, etc.). The State Legislature passed the bill and it was adopted into law. As part of the reporting requirements, secondhand dealers and pawnbrokers are required to provide an identifying description or photograph of the item of precious metal acquired through the transaction. However, one of the final revisions made to the bill before it passed into law exempted pawnbrokers from the photographic requirement unless so required by their local city or county laws.

With HB 4011, pawn dealers are seeking to exempt themselves from any city or county laws governing secondhand transactions. This creates an inequity between pawn brokers and secondhand dealers for purposes of conducting a secondhand transaction. To be equitable, the law should specify that the exception applies only to pawn transactions and not to secondhand transactions made by a pawn broker.

The value of the requirement to photograph items of precious metal (gold, silver, platinum, etc.) has several direct and tangible benefits including: the identification and recovery of stolen jewelry, the identification and prosecution of individuals involved in the theft and sale of stolen property and the return of stolen property to victims of crime.

The proposed language in Sections 1 and 2 of HB 4011 would have a detrimental impact on law enforcements ability to effectively identify and recover stolen property and to arrest and prosecute property crime offenders. For these reasons, we cannot support HB 4011 as currently written.