

To: Oregon congressional representatives

Re: Congressional Hearings on various new guns laws and restrictions

Date: April 2, 2019

In a realistic and analytical approach to laws, in large they tend to allow for punishment to criminals for committing a crime(s). When a criminal is intent on robbing or assaulting a person or persons, he/she cares very little if the crime, if caught, results in the charge of 1) murder and 2) unlawfully carrying/using a firearm 3) in a 'gun-free zone'. In fact, in the case of 'Mass Murderers', they often are on a murder/suicide mission (They either intend to take their own life in the incident, or intentionally have the police to take their (the criminal's) life at the end of their unlawful act.

Restricting or banning certain firearms are laws that only law-abiding citizens will obey. "When guns are restricted or banned, only criminals will have them..." --- because they don't obey the laws anyway (see above).

Depending on the locality, the response time to a violent crime is about 7 minutes, while the average violent crime is completed in 3 minutes or less. Therefore, seldom do police get there in time to prevent a crime, but rather to gather evidence and process a crime to conviction (generally in less than 50% of the crimes).

On the other hand, potential crime victims, when armed and trained, have a much higher rate of preventing the completion of the crime, and especially for preventing injury or death to the victim. For Example:

- ⤴ Violent assaults on Portland train and Max platforms or stops, seldom ever have an armed security or police office present at the scene, and therefore police/security seldom ever prevent such a crime from be committed.
- ⤴ Assault/rapes on Portland State University campus were committed repeated , with too few security guards on campus. Laws preventing the carry of weapons by these women (CCL), resulted in their becoming victims of crime, and only emboldened the criminals...
- ⤴ Shootings at Salem malls and restaurants resulted in police officers arriving on scene well after the injuries and deaths have occurred. One armed citizen might have prevented or greatly mitigated these crimes...

Five round magazine capacity, 30-60 day waiting periods, increasing the age to purchase/possess firearms, requiring firearm purchase or possession permits, firearm ownership registry, limiting purchase of ammunition top 20 rounds per month, etc.: all are infringements on the 2nd amendment and lead to minimizing the ability of citizens to protect themselves and family.

1. **Five round magazine capacity:** in a home invasion incident, or when hunting dangerous game, this can result in serious injury or death to the law-abiding citizen.

2. **30-60 day waiting periods:** in a matter of a death threat, a stalking order only protects from a semi-honest attacker; a defensive firearm protects them. A waiting period gives the stalked a 'window' to freely attack.
3. **increasing the age to purchase/ possess firearms:** An 18 year old law abiding citizen can fight and die for his country, but would not be allowed to own/possess a firearm to hunt or for protection. This would be especially catastrophic for a disabled veteran under the required age.
4. **limiting purchase of ammunition top 20 rounds per month:** Practicing shooting is what makes a shooter safe and accurate, and 20 rounds a month is not even enough to practice one day.

Our 2nd Amendment Right is the right that protects all of the our rights guaranteed in our constitution and Bill of Rights. Victims of the Holocaust, survivors of various dictatorships around the nation and throughout history first had their right to keep and bear arms restricted and then taken away, and then all of their other citizen rights were eroded away (political prisoners without a right to fair trial, search and seizures, trial by jury, right to redress grievances against government, religious freedom, free speech, unreasonable punishment, etc. --- all gone).

These laws (amendments to laws) you are proposing and contemplating, only injure the law-abiding citizens, which embolden the criminals.

I would suggest that laws that keep violent criminals in jail longer, keep foreigners from possessing firearms in the United States, allow carry of concealed firearms by trained school officials (and in other 'gun-free' zones), and other laws that punish and restrict the criminals, and not effect laws that restrict a law-abiding citizens from being able to defend themselves.

Joan K. Seaman

I yield my time to m husband, William D. Seaman