

Dear Senate Judiciary Committee,

This law prohibits 18 year old legal adults from purchasing firearms and ammunition.

Anybody who is legally an adult should have the ability to exercise all of the enumerated constitutional rights that legal adults possess. That includes the right to purchase, keep and bear arms and their accessories as the second amendment and the Oregon constitution both guarantee. It is wrong to violate enumerated constitutional rights guaranteed to legal adults.

If a sixteen year old can drive a deadly weapon known as a automobile, which is NOT an enumerated right, and in which they kill thousands by accident every year, then an 18 year old should be able to own a firearm, which is an enumerated right, and with which virtually no one is killed by accident.

This law renders the homeowner with children living in the home defenseless in the case of a sudden home invasion. The need to use a firearm for self defense arises very suddenly, and there is no time to remove a lock while being victimized by a criminal.

Criminals love trigger lock laws, because it renders their victim helpless to defend themselves in time. To require a trigger lock, is to effectively remove the firearm as a means of self defense, and give criminals total advantage over the honest citizen. Trigger locks render a firearm useless for self defense.

Each parent is responsible to teach their children to respect guns and to use them in a responsible manner. Invading the home with your laws, and attempting to replace parenting with procedures, render parents unable to defend their children from child snatchers while fumbling to get a gun unlocked. Trigger locks render a firearm useless for self defense. This law reduces child safety.

This law restricts CHL holders from carrying a weapon in the schools and airports who pass regulations prohibiting them. This is ridiculous. Why does my need and right to the means of self defense disappear because I am in a certain geographical location? It is a proven fact that since 2009 92% of mass shootings have occurred in "gun free zones" - the very zones this bill seeks to establish. Where the people cannot defend themselves, is where the mass shooters go. Gun free zones are

slaughter zones for criminals.

By making good people helpless, you won't make bad people harmless. You will only make the body count exponentially higher by assuring that no one has the means to self defense when the criminal begins shooting. Criminals do not obey 'gun free zones' regulations. These regulations are not stopping them at all. They only render the honest citizen an easier victim. This law does NOTHING to advance public safety. It actually reduces it, and makes us more vulnerable to criminal action.

This law holds gun owners responsible for the actions of a thief who stole the gun from them and then used it in a crime. This is as wrong as holding a automobile owner responsible for the actions of the car thief who recklessly drove his stolen car and killed someone with it. No one can be morally or legally responsible for the actions of a thief of their property.

Background checks and gun registration does nothing to advance public safety. To further expand them is only a harassment of law abiding gun owners, because criminals acquire guns through black market means, and do not submit themselves to background checks.

All CHL fees and licenses are a violation of an enumerated constitutional right. I do not have to get a license and pay a fee to exercise any other enumerated constitutional right, such as the right to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, or freedom of assembly. Why do I have to get a license and pay a fee to exercise the freedom to keep and bear arms, especially when the constitution expressly declares that this right shall not be infringed? Having to pay a fee and get a license is clearly an infringement.

You need to stop infringing on our rights at all, by abolishing all CHL permits as being necessary to bear arms in any place. The Second Amendment is our carry permit, and we need no other.

Gun control does nothing to reduce crime, it only endangers the honest citizen by making them vulnerable to the criminal, who never obeys such laws.

By restricting our rights to firearms, by requiring us to lock up our guns so they are inaccessible to us when we are attacked, you are giving criminals advantage over us, because they will never obey such laws.

If violent crime is to be curbed, it is only the intended victim that can do it. The Felon does not fear the police , and he fears neither the judge nor the jury.

Therefore, he must fear his victim, and be deterred from crime by the knowledge that he will be met by a well armed adversary.

But any kind of gun control reduces the deterrent to criminals to act. Laws that disarm those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes make it worse for the assaulted, and easier for the assailant, and they serve rather to encourage than prevent homicides, because an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man.

The CDC found that guns are use 8 times more often in self defense that they are used to commit crimes. Guns are a net benefit to the safety of the citizens, not a liability to it.

By the time the police get there, it is already all over. We must have the same firearm resources that the police have to defend ourselves. Their guns deter crime, and so do ours.

Why should the honest citizen not have the same capacity to defend themselves against criminals that the police have? Is our right to self defense any less than theirs?

If you care about the safety of the citizens you represent, vote NO to all gun control measures.

Max Doner

Foster Oregon

Members of the Judiciary committee,

I find every single provision of SB 978 as amended to be both unconstitutional and destructive of citizen safety. I have already submitted my specific comments in writing to the committee. I hope you will give them thoughtful consideration.

But I want to address the larger issue of the morality of gun control, and the illegitimacy of imposing further gun control on the citizens of Oregon.

All gun control laws are the result of somebody thinking “something has to be done” about the misuse of guns by criminals.

Such thinking is inherently flawed, because something has already been done about the misuse of guns. Thousands of state and federal laws have already been put in place to fully criminalize the improper use of firearms.

The misuse of guns is already illegal, and more than enough laws already exist to provide for the restraint of the misuse of guns, if such laws actually have any restraining effect.

If someone is inclined to misuse a gun, no additional number of gun laws will either restrain his behavior or limit his ability to do the damage he is inclined to commit. By definition, criminals do not obey gun laws.

Furthermore, more than enough laws already exist to provide for the adequate punishment of those who ignore the existing gun laws, and misuse guns anyway.

If more than enough laws are already on the books to restrain and to punish those who commit gun crimes, then what possible use could further gun laws have, but to harass and limit the

freedoms and rights to self defense that law abiding citizens inherently possess?

If the laws that already exist do not deter criminals, will additional laws do so? The answer is: clearly not.

More laws will not deter those determined to misuse guns. More laws will only serve to render honest citizens less able to defend themselves against the violent criminal.

To limit the rights of the honest citizen to keep and bear arms because criminals misuse firearms, is to tell the law abiding that their rights and liberties depend not on their own conduct, but on the conduct of the guilty and the lawless.

It is to say that our rights are defined by the criminal that misuses guns, and that we should be denied our liberties because of his bad behavior.

This is immoral. It is like saying that because one person misuses alcohol and drinks, drives, and kills an innocent person, that therefore all responsible drinkers should be denied access to alcohol and automobiles.

When a drunk driver kills an innocent person, we do not ban either alcohol or cars, because we recognize that the instrument is not the problem. It is the person who misuses that instrument that is the problem, and he alone should be punished.

In the same way, guns are not the problem. The criminal who misuses the gun is the problem, and he alone should be punished for his crimes. To limit our liberties because of his behavior is to punish us for the crimes he commits. That is legally and morally indefensible.

Often the best course of action in the face of a problem is to do nothing, because all of the proposed solutions are worse than the problem they seek to solve.

That is the case with further gun control. It creates a worse problem than it seeks to solve.

The problem it creates is the criminalization of the honest citizens of this state who have never misused guns, and who never will.

The problem it creates is depriving the honest citizen of their God given and constitutional right to keep and bear arms without infringement by the government.

The problem it creates is to make the honest citizen more vulnerable to criminals, as they have less and less ability to keep and bear arms.

And worst of all, the problem it creates is that it turns the honest citizen against the state, as they begin to see the state as a tyrant intent on oppressing them, instead as a protector of their liberties that is worthy of their loyalty and support.

The best citizens of this state are the responsible gun owners. Do not turn them into your enemy by punishing them for the actions of criminals who harm others.

We gun owners want to support the state, but we need for the state to support us as well, by protecting our God given constitutional liberties, and by protecting us from those who want to deprive us of them.

Protect your best citizens. Protect gun owners, by protecting our right to keep and bear arms without any further infringement.

Thank you. Max Doner, Foster, OR