

Chair: Senator Floyd Prozanski
Vice-Chair: Senator Kim Thatcher
Senator Cliff Bentz
Senator Shemia Fagan
Senator Sara Gelser
Senator Dennis Linthicum
Senator James Manning Jr.

Opposition to SB 978 and Amendment 1

Dear Senate Committee on Judiciary Chair, Co-Chair, and Members,

At the opening of the 2019 legislative session several anti-gun bills were introduced that will severely burden law abiding citizens both financially and in the exercise of their right to bear arms. I am writing you to urge you to oppose any such restrictions and to honor your oath to Oregon Constitution and the Constitution of the United States. From the Oregon Constitution Article I Section 27: "Right to bear arms; military subordinate to civil power. 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[.]" SB978 Amendment 1 is in conflict with the right to bear arms for selfdefense and I would encourage you to vote no on any legislation coming through your committee that infringes on the rights of the people of Oregon.

I oppose this bill and amendment for several Common-Sense reasons that I will outline below.

1. Firearms secured with trigger locks or in a safe. This has been ruled unconstitutional DC v Heller and would put citizens lives in danger if they need access to a firearm to defend themselves at a moment's notice. This section has in mind keeping guns away from children, which I have none, and puts a burden on me for a danger that does not exist in my household. This secure lock-up section also rules that if a criminal breaks into my home, steals my firearm and two years later commits a crime that injures someone with said firearm that I would be "strictly liable" for the criminals actions unless I could prove that I reported the crime in 24 hours and I could prove that the gun had a lock on it or was in a locked container. This is victim blaming and unjustly puts the victim responsible for a criminal's actions. I would support education on gun safety, pamphlets in pediatrician's office about locking up guns or things like that. I would also support an incentive for taxpayers to purchase safes if they get a rebate or tax credit for doing so. Offer the carrot instead of raising the stick.
2. Undetectable and Untraceable Firearms. The BATF has ruled that a receiver that is less than 80% complete to be used in a functioning firearm is not a firearm. This legislation attempts to make up definitions of what is a gun to address a problem that does not exist. I challenge those in favor of banning untraceable firearms to provide a single instance of an untraceable gun being used in a crime other than guns that criminals have scratched out or removed the serial number. Further, Section 18 is so expansive in what could be a

firearm that a block of aluminum in the general shape of a firearm receiver would be illegal to transfer or possess because it could be considered to be partially completed. There is a reason BATF set the standard at 80% complete to avoid vague requirements such as this.

3. Increase in Concealed Handgun License Fees. This is another way to financially burden those wishing to defend themselves. Taxpayers already fund police departments and would be paying \$15 to the State Police, \$65 to their county Sheriff, and another undisclosed fee amount to the Sheriff to run the background check through the FBI NICS database. The increase in fees are an undue burden on Oregonians and disproportionately affect the poorest citizens among us.
4. Banning Concealed Weapons holders from Public. Inside capitol buildings are already prohibited but the definition of a building now includes "grounds adjacent" as part of this amendment. Walking through Portland State University Campus, participating in a rally on the State Capitol grounds, and driving a friend to the airport could all become illegal to do with a concealed carry license. This creation of additional gun free zones is a "feel-good" political move that will make nobody safer. When a criminal wants to commit an act of violence, a sign saying "No Guns Allowed" will not stop them. Criminals are stopped by police officers and citizens with firearms. This law is unenforceable and will do nothing to protect people and will generate an illusion of safety that will create a patchwork of legal and illegal places in public that a person with a concealed handgun license may legally carry their firearm and be given an opportunity to defend themselves.
5. Purchase age to 21. This is possibly the most egregious of all the proposals by stripping a legal adult at 18 of their constitutional rights and allowing discrimination of an adult based solely on age, not criminal history or any of a number of other prohibiting factors. A person can legally vote and serve their country in the armed services but be denied the right to defend themselves at home? How does that even make sense? A 20-year-old single parent could be denied their right to defend themselves, their home, and their children simply because they are not 21. This is an egregious violation of a person's right to defend themselves and seeks to find a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. Oregon does not have a problem with 18-20 years old buying rifles and shotguns.

This proposed amendment will do nothing to make Oregonians safer and will instead create "feel-good" laws that will financially burden law-abiding Oregonians wishing to exercise their constitutional rights and will effectively chip away at their ability to defend themselves in a way they see fit.

Thank you for your time,

Colin Rowles
Beaverton, OR