

Anthony Barber
22350 SW Stafford Rd
Tualatin, OR 97062
503-964-0822
tonyandcathy@outlook.com

I hereby respectfully submit the following testimonial comments regarding SB978 and proposed amendments to the same.

The SB978 Dash 1 amendments are an extreme, harsh, and hateful attack on Oregon gun owners. We all want our communities to be safe, but the dangerous and pointless provisions of these amendments would take us in the opposite direction. I can hardly believe why elected officials would seek to make criminal felons out of law-abiding Oregonian gun owners like me simply by being near a government-controlled building. Our rights to keep and bear arms are the underpinning securing all our other civil rights. I have included some comments below on specific Sections of the Dash 1 amendments. Please, I implore you to vote no on this awful attack on all our civil rights.

Section 1

1. I object to limiting the access of adults between the ages of 18 to 21 to firearms, ammunition, services, etc., as stated in this Section. I see this proposed provision as a clear infringement upon the civil rights of those individuals, in violation of both the spirit and letter of the Constitution of the United States, as amended by the Second Amendment.
2. I find it even more troubling that the proposed amendments in this Section would prohibit a person between the ages of 18 and 21 who already lawfully possesses a firearm from seeking and obtaining repairs of such firearm to keep it in safe working order. This would mean, for instance, that a 19-year-old competitive target shooter may not be able to obtain safety-related needed repairs, and thus be more likely to use the firearm in a less-safe condition. This specific provision results in an overall reduction in public safety.

Sections 5 and 6

3. I strenuously object to the idea that a securely locked room, home, or vehicle is not sufficient security to keep firearms safe, to the extent that the owner of a firearm should be responsible for doing so. A securely locked vehicle can certainly be broken into and/or stolen. However, the unreasonable burden of placing additional security mechanisms (i.e. trigger locks) on firearms that are already secured in a locked vehicle are both unnecessary and ineffective. A firearm in a vehicle with a lock on it can be stolen just as easily one without a lock on it. The difference for the criminal is a delay of a minute or two with a few simple tools – in other words, no tangible improvement in public safety. The difference for the lawful firearm owner is an unreasonable infringement to the civil right to keep and bear arms which could easily lead to the delayed availability of the firearm to the owner when that firearm is immediately needed to defend oneself from violence and harm. This specific provision results in an overall reduction in public safety. As a public government employee who has received multiple credible death threats over my career, I view these proposed amendments as a significant threat to the safety of my family and me.
4. Section 6 clearly has the impact of shifting blame and responsibility for using a stolen firearm from the thief to the lawful gun owner. Nearly all lawful gun owners currently provide for good

security of their firearms without this draconian and unfair provision. Improvements vis-à-vis educational campaigns and provision of free or reduced-price safety devices is a much better path to pursue, as it is more effective and doesn't infringe on civil rights.

Section 7

5. Given the other provisions in the proposed Dash 1 amendments, there seems to be absolutely no logical safety-related reason for the provisions of Section 7. This provision seems to mandate transfer of a person's safety-related property when they also transfer a firearm, even when the recipient may already have enough trigger locks, etc., and the person transferring may not. Thus this provision may serve to reduce public safety in certain circumstances and does nothing to improve public safety.

Section 12

6. In many homes and families, minor access to and use of firearms is both reasonable and safe, especially in rural communities. The exceptions provided in Section 12 (i.e. ...does not apply if in an act of self-defense) are meaningless since the necessity of such acts are unpredictable. The provision essentially says to those families "you can take your chances providing appropriate access to your well-trained and responsible teenager, and if they need it to protect themselves it is there...but you better not get caught doing that or we'll send you off to jail". My personal experience includes using a firearm to defend myself and my family and home when I was 15 years old. This provision might have resulted the death and me and my younger sister!

Section 24

7. Rather than increasing fees for Concealed Handgun Licensing, these fees should be eliminated or reduced to the minimum possible. This would encourage greater compliance with the relevant laws, cause more background checks to be accomplished, and enhance access and realization of the civil right to keep and bear arms to those who are socio-economically less likely to be able to afford such fees.

Sections 26-29

8. Perhaps the most heinous and disturbing provision of the proposed Dash 1 amendments is the expanded infringement on the civil right to keep and bear arms in public buildings. This is a bad solution in search of a non-existent problem. This harsh and punitive attack on lawful CHL holders is unwarranted and negatively impacts public safety. I personally have been thanked by educators, elected officials, medical personnel and others in public buildings for carrying firearms in those same public buildings. Oregon's existing infringement on the ability for the common citizen to openly bear arms is already too much. Once a CHL holder has been vetted that should be enough.

Sincerely,
Anthony Barber