

To the members of the Oregon Senate Judiciary Committee et al.,

My name is Don Denning, an Oregon elector and 5th generation Oregonian. I ask that you take a moment to read and acknowledge my thoughts.

I hereby submit written testimony in strong opposition of SB 978.

I have read all 44 pages of the -1 amendment to SB 978 and my objections are as follows:

As a lifetime Oregon hunter, outdoorsman, sport shooter, CHL holder, and law-abiding citizen, I'm appalled at the language, intent, and overall divisiveness of this bill.

1: Re: Proposed storage requirements: As written, the bill will require firearms to be locked up immediately upon passage, (rendering them useless). But the definition of what is considered acceptable as trigger locks, storage, etc. may not be determined until Jan 1, 2020 by the Oregon Health Authority. What are people to do in the meantime? If people try to comply by locking up their firearms in a manner commonly available that ends up not being in compliance, will owners be liable for failures to comply with their current locks and containers in the interim? Knit picking aside, this whole concept is flawed. The language is unclear and open ended, and subject to different interpretations. It is also completely unnecessary. The vast majority of firearm owners already practice safe and reasonable storage and do so gladly. We don't need our state to dictate how we do it. I know there have been isolated tragedies where children were hurt or killed because of irresponsible gun storage by parents. Those cases need to be looked at on a case by case basis. Overreaching legislation is not the answer. The result of this section becoming law will prevent lawful gun owners from being able to use their firearms when needed. ie: home and personal defense. Or in more direct terms, to punish gun owners for being gun owners.. This limitation of access to firearms will do nothing to stop mass shootings, keep guns out of the hands of criminals, and is blatantly unconstitutional. I like the idea of tax credits and other incentives for responsible gun storage. I do not like the idea of being forced to do so to the extent that I am unable to defend myself or my family.

2: Re: Future Liability: Holding citizens liable for crimes committed by subsequent owners or those who have stolen weapons, regardless of trigger locks or other safety measures, is absolutely ridiculous. Would you also suggest that the victim of a stolen car be liable for the acts of the thief and then have to show proof that the car was locked in a manner dictated by the state when stolen? This is ridiculous and an outrage. Again, no real purpose other than to punish gun owners for being gun owners.

3: This bill puts unnecessary additional burden on retailers of firearms, accessories, and ammunition and is discriminatory. They are already talking about it and worried about future liability if they "determine" what age limits to impose on purchases and it comes back to bite them later. But that's part of the plan isn't it? -along with the exoneration of mass retailers like Dick's, Bi-Mart, and Walmart who have been doing it illegally. This is wrong and I oppose it.

4: The language regarding unfinished components is unnecessary and overreaching. 80% lowers (you may want to look that up) and other unfinished components are legal by federal law, have not been shown to be a contributor to crime and shootings. Criminals don't take the time to build firearms or

engage in gunsmithing. Hobbyists, gunsmiths, FFL's, and experienced enthusiasts (all among the most law-abiding gun owners) do, but only in small numbers. This language is further overreaching and harassment, and is obviously designed as a publicity stunt for outright gun haters and the uneducated.

5: Raising fees on CHL applications is a self-serving move. I am not aware of any Counties who are losing money issuing concealed carry licenses. If they are, it should be handled at the County level, not dictated by the state as a form of harassment against law-abiding citizens.

6: Re: Further restrictions for concealed carry in public buildings: Again, the language is open ended and overreaching. The language implies anyone in a public building could prohibit concealed carry in their building AND in any other public building. I don't know if this was crafted intentionally or if it was written in error. Either way, it is highly unacceptable. Furthermore, idea that I also could not legally concealed carry on "adjacent properties" is ludicrous. The current law is clear and there is no benefit to modifying it. Another obvious attempt to harass permit holders into not carrying at all. Reprehensible.

The bill as originally written was obviously a "place holder" or "gut and stuff" bill. I find it sickening that our elected representatives have chosen to implement such a divisive tactic to try to cram their own agenda (and that of out-of-state special interests) down the throats of law abiding citizens, rather than follow a proper model of transparency in legislating. This shows they are acting in desperation, knowing that a large percentage of Oregonians oppose their views, and that they are not willing to listen to anyone who may oppose them. Any involved in this obviously well crafted and premeditated ploy to trample the constitutional rights of law-abiding Oregonians need to re-evaluate their oaths of office and step down. The attached emergency clause is the insulting icing on the cake. An excellent example of everything that is wrong with government.

I would also ask that you pick up a newspaper and acknowledge the many recent rulings that actually overturn restrictions in other states that were at odds with the 2nd amendment. ie: Constitutional carry in Alabama and Oklahoma, the lawsuit in Washington that will likely overturn their voter initiated unconstitutional lockup law, and of most recent note, the finding by a Federal Judge last week that the California STANDARD CAPACITY magazine ban was unconstitutional and therefore overturned.

In closing, I'm sure this won't be the last anti-gun bill this session. I will oppose any other legislation that carries the same arrogance and indifference toward responsible firearm owners. I have been watching every related measure and bill for the last number of years and I can't overstate my disappointment with what our great state is becoming. We, lawful firearm owners, are many and we are resolute. We are not criminals unless you make us criminals. We are the safest people to have around you when you are shopping, at a ball game, or even when we are assembled by the thousands in front of the Capitol to protest what you are proposing.

At best, if your draconian agenda becomes law, you can expect near total noncompliance (by both citizens and law enforcement). SB 978 will make many good Oregonians criminals by default and result in civil disobedience that could have been prevented. I sincerely hope it does not come to that.

Respectfully,

Don Denning