

Committee Members,

As both a long-time resident of this State and a sworn Law Enforcement Officer since 2012, I have a unique perspective on the shift of gun rights and their impact upon the citizens.

As a citizen, I hold in high regard the process through which we bring order and justice to society, so when I perceive injustice it is hard for me to remain silent. In reading through all 44 pages of the Dash 1 amendment to SP 978, I see primarily an unjust restriction of the rights afforded to law abiding citizens.

My presumption is this bill is, ostensibly, intended to reduce violent gun crime, yet in nearly every section I see only a burden placed on the law abiding. It is a tautology of sorts to say "only the law abiding will keep the rules", but when viewed in the context of the 2nd Amendment constriction such as exemplified in this bill, that's the first phrase which comes to mind.

We already have laws on the books that address firearms and firearms crimes, and I have been directly involved in bringing those to bear on individuals through the course of my employment. The gentleman I arrested last week who was illegally carrying a concealed firearm on his person knew it was wrong, knew there was a law against it, yet did it anyway.

What law could we then enact to prevent this? The answer is: We already have one, and it was broken, as they are time and time again. Instituting new laws such as found in the sections of this bill will not change behaviors of those who would not abide by the law regardless, and yet will only impact the law abiding who will then suffer the reduction of their 2nd Amendment rights.

How is this just lawmaking? The answer is, it is not.

To be more particular to the bill, how is holding accountable a seller for the buyer's actions with a gun defensible as a just law? It is analogous to legally selling a car in good faith, yet for two years being held liable for the buyer's commission of a crime with that vehicle. No one would consider that just, yet that is exactly what is being proposed in Section 7. Section 8 is in line with this as well, holding liable the "victim" of a gun theft under certain circumstances. Again, and unjust law that impacts the good while doing nothing to truly abate the evil. The same can be said of Section 12, holding the gun owner accountable for the actions of another.

And what of personal protection? As a Law Enforcement Officer I essentially wear a target on me, my house, and my family. I am easily found by those who wish me harm through something as simple as a Google search or even looking for my patrol car parked in front of my house. I have been trained that gun violence can be perpetrated in a shockingly short period of time...measured often in seconds or fractions of a second. How then would the locking/storage

mandates in Section 6 do anything but reduce the chances of me or my family successfully defending ourselves in our home?

There is far too much in this bill for me to address in the allotted two minutes for individual testimony, so let me end by saying I am not alone in my views here, and should the lawmakers of the State of Oregon continue to push a clearly anti-gun, anti-freedom agenda such as exemplified by this and the numerous other similar bills being proposed, I and those like me will focus our time, energy, money, and efforts to strengthen our liberties, and vote out of office all legislative members who support such a blatant anti-2nd Amendment agenda.

Thank you for your time and service.

Respectfully,

David Hughes