

Dear Members of the Senate Committee on Judiciary,

The second amendment of the US Constitution states in part, "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." SB 978 as amended certainly violates the second amendment by allowing some retailers to restrict the age to purchase a firearm.

While this is an affront to the second amendment, this is not the most egregious part of this bill. Allowing local authorities to create a patchwork of restrictions across the state leaves an average resident the unable to manage various jurisdictional laws. Any city, county, school district, etc. *could* enact ordinances or policies prohibiting otherwise legal concealed handgun permit holders. How is a visitor supposed to know?

Page 36, line 23-24 makes it a crime to possess a firearm 'at a city *hall or the residence of any state official elected by the state at large and the grounds adjacent to each such building.*' Is "adjacent" on the public sidewalk, in the public street or the restaurant nearby? Why aren't duly elected state officials forced to mark their residence with a conspicuous sign? As a law-abiding citizen, mandates outlined in this bill make it nearly impossible for one to be constantly compliant should one want to remain law abiding. Now, if I approach a building that has a sign, I respect the law, return to my vehicle to properly store my firearm in a locked storage box. With the new proposed law, I would not be following the terms of "lawful storage". It makes it impossible for a legal CHL holder to carry their firearm and stay compliant.

The unlawful storage and the liability provisions are completely unenforceable without gun registration. How could the state possibly trace a stolen firearm back to an owner without registering every weapon? Anyone who thinks this through would never report a stolen weapon. This is one of those "unintended consequences" of a poorly written bill. Will the state come into a citizen home to check for proper storage? This is clearly unconstitutional according to the fourth amendment.

Essentially this is another attempt at a "feel good" law which only makes an average gun owning citizen a criminal and doesn't prevent the underlying issues surrounding gun violence. This law is so egregious it will be in court nearly immediately and the state will be required to use tax revenue to defend it's position.

I urge you to acknowledge the shortcomings of SB 978 with a no vote.

Thank your for your consideration on this matter,

Darlene Atkinson

Oregon voter