

To whom it may concern,

Please note my concern about the rampant gun legislative action in Oregon in general, and the specific feedback about SB 978-1 below. I generally believe change should not be made unless the specific proposed change addresses, in a logical way, a real problem statement, driven by data. Typically, problems are defined, MANY potential solutions are considered and ranked in terms of anticipated positive impact, and potential negative consequences, cost, etc. I believe the current anti-gun fervor in our state is driving people to jump on board with proposals before deeply considering how it may negatively impact many people with different cultural and public safety views. I'm concerned that MANY community-conscious, and community-contributing people will be made criminals if several of the Oregon introduced bills and amendments pass, if for only the complexity of navigating gun ownership rules. I DO support information outreach activities educating everyone about the risk of guns getting into the wrong hands, and encouraging people to secure ANYTHING they own that may be dangerous. Some amount of liability also may make sense to encourage taking safety seriously.

However, SB 978-1 making a gun owner be liable for someones use of their gun, with no limitation of liability under certain circumstances, seems absurd. What other transfer of something potentially dangerous to someone that chooses to break the law with their use carries such potentially HUGE consequences? (Lawn mower?, car?, lighter?, hammer? other?). If I lend my car to someone I believed to be sane, but they maliciously drive it into a crowd of people, am I liable for that?

SB 978-1 also may make it impossible to transport, check-in or ship guns. How does one check in a rifle for a hunting trip at the airport if the airport decides to make it unlawful to approach the check-in area with one?

SB 978-1 seems to assume concealed carry permit holders are not trustworthy, given all of the targeted restrictions. The whole point of the concealed carry permit process is to ensure holders have been thoroughly trained, background checked and vetted for personal history that would identify they are a risk. Returning to my problem statement comment above, is there any data that suggests this population of gun enthusiasts is responsible for any of the titillating press coverage for attackers that choose to use guns? Why would anyone want to takeaway or reduce the power of citizens in our community that they can trust, and that may very well protect others that choose to only rely on police response to life-threatening criminal activity? This would be shifting the balance of power (and criminals' expectations) to the criminals.

Lastly, I do not agree that "an emergency exists". If someone believes that, we should be seeing them strongly pursuing root-cause issues like mental health, bullying, gun-owner information outreach, criminal control, and copy-cat-inducing free press.

Sincerely,

Phil Burkum