

I am submitting this email as my written testimony related to SB 978, sine I will not attend the hearing.

I urge you to oppose SB 978. This bill is unnecessary and as a result appears to be a trojan horse for anti-second amendment amendments. The data "desired" in the study is very likely available through an administrative request for a database query.

Thank you for your service.

Erik Colville
1528 Eagle Cap St SE
Salem, OR 97317

--

Disclaimer: Do not read this email if you do not accept the following:

Nothing in my communication contains threats, expressed or implied, or is intended to be threatening. Any conclusion otherwise is solely the responsibility of the concluder and not me.

This email contains my written testimony related to the SB 978 3/27/19 proposed amendments, since I will not attend the hearing.

I urge you to oppose SB 978 and its 3/27/19 proposed amendments. The most obvious failings of this bill and its amendments include:

Minimum Age (SB 87) -

This bill discriminates against individuals under 21 who are legally protected by current anti-discrimination law, and are considered mature enough to serve in the military (to protect our Second Amendment rights, among others), drive a vehicle (a potential weapon of mass destruction), and to vote (choosing who will have the privilege of swearing to uphold our Constitution). That this bill is discrimination is evidenced by the filing of a bill sponsored by the Bureau of Labor and Industries to revise state anti-discrimination law to allow discrimination against those under 21.

Storage, Loss or Theft and Access by Minors (SB 275 and 817) -

While creating the crime of unlawful storage of firearm may well provide a law enforcement tool for this specific negligent behavior, legislating prescriptive behavior requirements will do NOTHING to improve public safety. This is because it is not possible to legislate behavior...only education can change behavior.

Means for addressing youth accidental contact with a gun lie in age appropriate education of youth about guns and gun safety, and educating adults in the need and how to keep guns away from youth. Legislating prescriptive means of keeping guns away from youth (such as means for securing guns) is a poor and irresponsible substitute for education. Legislating prescriptive requirements also ignores the many effective means of keeping guns away from youth that may best fit the gun owner's family and safety. One-size-fits-all solutions by government nearly always fail and nearly always cause unintended negative consequences. However, legislating consequences for negligence in keeping guns away from youth IS an appropriate, responsible action.

Specific failings include:

- Safety, especially firearm safety, cannot be legislated...it can only be taught.
- Failure to account for the circumstances when a youth gains unauthorized possession of a firearm when that firearm was initially in an authorized person's possession.
- Legislating prescriptive requirements ignores the many effective means of keeping guns away from youth that may best fit the gun owner's family and safety.
- The stipulation worded "trigger or cable lock that meets or exceeds the minimum specifications established by" ignores the fact that Oregon does not have the power to drive the market for design, manufacture, and marketing of trigger or cable locks. The end result of this naïve stipulation could leave Oregonians without a legal means of compliance.
- The stipulation worded "a firearm is not secured if a key, combination or other means of opening a lock or container is readily available to a person the owner or possessor has not authorized to carry or

control the firearm” ignores the existence of standard shop/home tools which may be used to remove a lock. In addition, the wording ignores that the way an unauthorized person may know of the existence/location of a firearm will also allow an unauthorized person to know the location of a lock key.

Firearms in Public Buildings (SB 925) -

Note that:

- This bill effectively restricts or prohibits access to publically owned buildings and property by people who have subjected themselves to extensive evaluation and have been found by law enforcement to be responsible to carry a concealed weapon.
- This bill will effectively make it a crime to drop off a student at school or a passenger at an airport, for example, while exercising a constitutionally protected right.
- These licensed people have not done, nor are they likely to do, anything that would decrease public safety, yet they are being restricted or prohibited from accessing public facilities their tax dollars are paying for.
- The law resulting from this bill will run afoul of the D.C. vs Heller decision by largely prohibiting an individual's right to possess a firearm, unconnected with service in a militia, for traditionally lawful purposes.
- Allowing a hodge podge of ordinances/laws related to concealed carry is irresponsible and creates nearly an entrapment situation due to the extreme difficulty of knowing in advance and tracking changes in those ordinances/laws.
- There is no evidence what-so-ever that restricting or prohibiting these licensed people from accessing publically owned property will improve public safety.

Because there is no evidence to support a position that restricting or prohibiting these licensed people from accessing publically owned property will increase public safety or provide a public benefit this bill is in violation of the plain reading of the Second Amendment and must be rejected on that basis.

In closing, please stop the cruel persecution of law abiding citizens who have chosen to exercise their Second Amendment rights. Please pursue only legislation that will improve public safety while defending the constitution and the rights it protects.

Thank you for your service.

Erik Colville
1528 Eagle Cap St SE
Salem, OR 97317

--

Disclaimer: Do not read this email if you do not accept the following:

Nothing in my communication contains threats, expressed or implied, or is intended to be threatening. Any conclusion otherwise is solely the responsibility of the concluder and not me.