

I'm opposed to HB 4005.

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 through 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 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 its 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