

From: ywika@yahoo.com
To: [SJUD Exhibits](#)
Subject: SB 978 -- opposed
Date: Sunday, March 31, 2019 9:56:14 AM

I'm opposed to amendment -1 to SB978 -- except for Section 30, (e) that references transferring a firearm to a museum.

Addressing the other sections (that I'm opposed to) in detail...

Minimum age for firearm sales

I fail to see what's wrong with an adult purchasing and owning a firearm. After all, they've been doing it responsibly for decades.

These legal adults are accountable for their actions, have jobs, are taking advantage of higher education, and, perhaps have a family.

They may have gone hunting with their families when they were growing up, and most likely, wish to continue the activity. So they had to "wait 'till you're older", went hunting with mom and dad, and now have to "wait 'till you're older", again?

This section is just trying to codify age discrimination that certain companies want to engage in because of boycott pressures by folks who dislike firearms. It isn't about age, it's about firearms.

Storage and Liability

It's very strange getting the Oregon Health Authority involved in designing locks and such. And it's wide open for abuse.

The phrase "readily available", in regard to someone finding the key or code, is equally wide open for interpretation.

Making the owner liable for the actions of a thief is priceless. It's like saying if someone steals your baseball bat and injures another person -- that you bear the full liability for the thief's actions.

The thief who broke into your home, vehicle or trailer -- with a lock on it.

But wait, it gets better, let's extend that craziness for two years *after* the thief stole your property.

Then this fine section goes on about minors. Because obviously every parent wants their child to get their hands on a firearm so that the child can act in a careless and angry manner.

"One size fits all", does not.

I have additional concerns about storage requirements as it relates to CHL holders. Because if you have to go into a federal facility, like a post office, you have to leave the firearm in the vehicle. Meaning options are limited, especially if one is trying to be discrete.

Unfinished frame or receiver / Undetectable / Downloaded Firearm / Unserialized

Federal law allows an individual to manufacture a firearm for their own use.

An unfinished frame and receiver is just a component of this process. No different than a barrel.

Plastic firearms via 3D printers are novelties that don't hold up to stress. And federal law already specifies that such firearms must have a certain amount of metal in them so that metal detectors can detect them.

The black market is a much quicker and easier way to obtain a firearm illegally.

Prohibited Possession and Transfer

An individual should not be denied their Second Amendment rights over misdemeanors.

Concealed Carry License Fees

In theory the CHL fees already include what it costs to do FBI fingerprint checks. It's not like the fingerprint check is different than any other fingerprint check that the sheriff is doing all day long. So, what's up with the extra charges?

Local Authority to Regulate Firearms in Public Buildings

The purpose of a concealed carry license is to allow one to go about their daily activities while carrying a firearm. Which includes picking up/dropping off someone at an airport or school.

People who have a license to carry a firearm in public is just that. They are legally permitted to carry one, in public.

Publicly owned airports, schools and universities get significant benefits due to being publicly owned.

There is nothing special or unique about these public locations that deserves an exemption from CHL holders.

Changing the definition of a "public building" to include the grounds around and acres beyond a building.

So now a "building" is no longer a structure with walls and a roof? What sort of stupid is that? Heck, sometimes it's even "part of a building".

How exactly does one keep track? Because if you're mistaken, Class C felony.

Yost Wikander
Cornelius, OR 97113

From: ywika@yahoo.com
To: [SJUD Exhibits](#)
Subject: SB 978 -- opposed
Date: Monday, April 1, 2019 6:58:30 PM

I'm opposed to amendment -1 to SB97 in it's entirety.

Regarding Storage and Liability in particular,

A cable lock, trigger lock or a case is not a panacea. And will do nothing to prevent a thief from stealing one or more firearms with ease.

Said thief will take the firearms from the home; and with a bolt cutter (\$30), drill (\$30) and/or cut-off grinder (\$100) from Home Depot, simply remove said impediments with little trouble; and in short order.

Such locking mechanisms will only stop anyone roughly under 13 years of age.

This bill goes though considerable gyrations, hand waving and trying to dump liability on the burglary victim; ultimately doing absolutely nothing that would prevent a thief from stealing a firearm. And the thief doesn't have to be very determined.

If said thief gets caught they'd claim that it wasn't locked -- to avoid a destruction of property charge. So now it's your word against the thief that the firearm was locked. I'd bet that any DA would love two convictions for the price of one.

If this was the committee's goal, I applaud you for your deviousness.

To top it off, if you happen to be home while a thief is trying to get in, you have to spend considerable amount of time removing your firearm from it's locked state -- most likely while trying to wake up -- to defend yourself. Making the purpose of the locked firearm one to help the thief get in, beat you up, and steal your property... including your firearms.

Wouldn't increasing the penalty for stealing a firearm yield better results? That's assuming that the committee is really interested in reducing firearm thefts.

Yost Wikander
Cornelius, OR 97113