

From: [David Roselip](#)
To: [SJUD Exhibits](#)
Subject: SB 978 Testimony
Date: Monday, April 1, 2019 11:19:31 PM

My name is David Roselip and I am a lifelong Oregonian. I'm writing to oppose SB 978, a bill I can only imagine was written out of fear for all its unreasonable and ineffective proposals.

At last reading SB 978 calls for the disenfranchisement of citizens under 21 from equal protection of their rights under law.

Allowing private businesses to discriminate against citizens beyond the age of majority would be as nonsensical as it is immoral. One could argue we do something similar with alcohol to protect society from harm but such an argument denies the nature of each item. Alcohol by its nature robs the user of his/her intellect, at which point the person is no longer fully themselves. Firearms carry no such handicap, placing them in a category similar to vehicle ownership (potentially dangerous items which have uses beyond the worst case scenario). I will add there are no constitutional protections for the "right to bear" cars or alcohol.

This bill attempts to make former gun owners responsible for crimes they did not commit. The very idea a citizen could be prosecuted because a third party violated their home and stole their legally held property is an affront to the very idea of justice. Even having sold a weapon to a third party should not attach such a liability, particularly since all transfers in Oregon now require an OSP background checks. To hold a citizen responsible for a crime the State itself failed more directly to preempt is not only unjust but hypocritical, assuming the Legislature does not intend to prosecute State officials who allow ill-fated transfers to occur.

The trigger lock language represents less than a fig leaf in justification of this policy. Unreasonable legal burdens cannot and should not be explained away by laying more burdens on citizens in the exercise of their rights.

SB 978 requires weapons to be locked, and therefore useless for self defense. No matter the intent, no Legislator's wishes should override the individual citizen's right to effective self defense. Our police are a valuable resource but they cannot reach victims quickly enough to be relied upon for defense, especially in rural areas where an officer may take the better part of an hour to arrive. If passed, this amendment would steal the initiative in every self defense situation from every victim who could have otherwise defended themselves properly. Unlocking such devices requires multiple small and detailed movements which are often not possible when adrenaline takes hold.

Even when a lock is applied the bill states that may not be enough if a thief has access to a device to defeat it. This can be as simple as a set of bolt cutters, a power drill or heavy crowbar, all of which are incredibly common in every corner of this State. This language makes it impossible for any individual or group of individuals to follow the law so long as a thief has done the minimum amount of prep work. I hope our legislators have the integrity to vote down this poorly conceived and lazily written provision.

Further, this bill greatly expands gun free zones which have been broadly ineffective in stopping the shootings which have inspired this legislation. It should be obvious to any one who has fallen victim to violent crime that procedural bans do not stop violent people from committing violent acts. Mass shootings at gun free zones have become a cliché due to their relative frequency. Disarming people in sensitive areas who have charge of vulnerable populations practically guarantees large body counts and the Legislature should take note. Banning firearms in areas adjacent to such properties is an extra layer of unenforceable law

which will at best add months to a mass shooter's life sentence.

The rest of this bill appears aimed at banning categories of firearms rarely used in crime for the sake of exercising the Legislature's assumed power to do so. This is opportunistic policy at its worst and will have little to no impact on violent crime while further restricting our citizens' access to their enumerated rights.

This bill is an affront to the rights of Oregonians under both the State and national constitutions. It is poorly conceived, poorly written and represents a seizure of power from the people of this state. We deserve better.

Thank you.

David Roselip