

From: [Bill Birch](#)
To: [SJUD Exhibits](#)
Subject: SB 978 Testimony
Date: Monday, April 1, 2019 1:43:08 PM

My name is William Birch. Resident of Oregon for 3 decades. Age 59. I have a spotless record. I have an Oregon CHL and disabled. Why are you coming after me, my rights and my freedoms? It makes no sense but that is the intended consequence of extreme controls on the second amendment and firearms being proposed here.

There are legislators here that awake each day thinking of how to reduce the second amendment to a privilege "in a manner to be prescribed by law". Nothing about SB 978 and its amendments are intended to address the near daily articles of random shootings in the Oregonian/OregonLive. These events typically occur in the Portland area after midnight long into my bedtime in another county renown for shootings. About half end up with a subject in custody. The other half with the shooter at large with police in most cases stating they do not having a suspect and say there is no danger to the community. Like hell there is not a threat. Some homicidal maniac just shot somebody and ran off. That is how I know this is the criminal element and not a shooting involving a homeowner or innocent person with a CHL cooperating with law enforcement. Only criminals run away, not homeowners or CHL holders.

The draconian firearm controls being discussed and those that have been proposed such as Initiative Petition 43 are in conflict not only with the second amendment and the spirit of the second amendment. They are also in conflict with Oregon's own state constitution of self defense. They also are in conflict with state laws of self protection and of property. They violate the very premise of the Heller v DC case in which the firearm and right to self defense become unavailable in the moments of crisis and emergency because state law requires the right to self defense be locked up. What the hell good is a God given constitutional right when that right is locked up by state law? State law cannot lock away the right to self defense.

Finally, the Clackamas mall shooting is a prime example of a CHL holder pointing their firearm at the shooter completely changing the dynamics of something that could have ended far worse than it did. Limiting that ability by posting Gun Free Zone signage has proven 100% ineffective against these types of events. These types of people prey on the innocent using self imposed disarming as a way to subvert the criminal actions of a few believing unarming the law abiding public at large is a moral, legal and constitutional thing to do. How much more wrong can you possibly get? Laws and signage have never stopped a deranged person or criminal element. The silliness being proposed here says legislation of disarming, locking them away to be used only in sporting or hunting and most importantly believe No Guns signage will protect you against yourself, the deranged and the criminal element. Living in a rural setting I can say I would never depend on armed law enforcement being ordered to patrol my property for my personal protection. That leaves the God given constitutional right of self defense and choosing the correct tool for that defense just as you would not send a fire truck with 10 gallons of water and no hoses or EMT with only Band-aids or restrict law enforcement to not wear firearms but have a 6 shot revolver locked in the glove box with a trigger lock. Useless laws. Videos on youtube show how most conventional firearm safes can be compromised by 2 men in under 2 minutes using 2 pry bars readily available at most hardware stores and always online.

I urge mental health legislation rather broad infringement legislation.

William Birch