From:
 Ben Martin

 To:
 SJUD Exhibits

 Subject:
 SB 978 Testamony

Date: Sunday, March 31, 2019 3:39:31 PM

Sir or ma'am,

This is my written testimony against SB 978 in lieu of providing it in person.

This legislation is overtly unconstitutional in light of relatively recent Supreme Court rulings in terms of it's mandate that firearms be kept secured while in the home. DC v. Heller rules that such laws are unconstitutional.

Next, imposing any sort of liability on a gun owner who sells a firearm who cannot prove that they sold it with a trigger or cable lock is inane. These cheaply made devices offer little in terms of security, and "proof" is ambiguous. Will a signed bill of sale do? A picture of the firearm with the lock? A notarized annotation that it was received by the seller with such a device? Et cetera.

The bill's requirement that 80% complete firearms be treated as firearms is an especially hazardous one. Will 75% complete kits be next? When will it become unlawful to possess a billet of aluminum and a drill press? The reason 80% are not sold as firearms today is because they. Are. Not. Firearms.

Lastly, I am very upset that much of this bill seeks to restrict the places where a lawful CHL holding Oregonian can carry their handgun. There has been no evidence to point to CHL holding Oregonians as the source of violence in the Beaver State. The level of scrutiny is already high to simply obtain a CHL, and restricting lawful carry at airports is unwarranted. Allowing lower jurisdictions to prohibit concealed carry in public buildings is also without basis or justification.

Much of this bill is written with blatant malice towards lawful gun owners. It is also clear that it does not seek to actually reduce violence, but rather make it more restrictive for the vast majority of gun owners to conduct themselves in their daily lives. I lament I have to rely on written words vice spoken ones to express my opposition to SB 978, but it will have to do.

Benjamin Martin Corvallis