

Gentlemen:

I submit the following thoughts about this bill for your consideration:

Will the locking up of guns truly reduce teen suicide? What will be a true measure of success of this requirement? Perhaps the number of teen suicides utilizing firearms will go down, but will the total number of teen suicides go down? How many teen suicides involve drug overdoses? If someone

has made the decision to kill themselves it's almost impossible to prevent them from doing so. What this requirement will do is make firearms less available for those needing them for instant self defense. If someone is breaking into your home with intent to injure or kill you and you have to work the combination on a gun safe or search for the key to your gun's cable lock, the time spent could cost you dearly. Sorry about those who would be inconvenienced in their desire to

end their lives, but I'd rather keep mine. You might ask yourselves "Why does Oregon have a higher than average State per capita rate of teen suicide?" and take some action addressing the underlying causes.

The Bill makes the assumption that teens and burglars are unacquainted with such tools as small bolt cutters and other tools capable of easily cutting through a cable lock. It also assumes that teens living in a household where guns are legitimately owned and stored will be unaware of where the keys to locked cabinets or rooms are kept, that they won't be able to find them if they search for them, or even to learn combinations to safes. Really, teens can be rather clever.

I have no children at home, but if I did I'd want them to be able to protect themselves against intrusion and attack, and if my firearms were mandated to be locked up I'd certainly tell them how

gain access if needed. I would be unwilling to let one of my children suffer injury or death because

he/she couldn't access the defense of a firearm. So, hypothetically speaking, if an intruder enters

my residence and my teenage son or daughter defends themselves with a firearm, do you intend

to prosecute me for not having the firearm locked up and unavailable, and to prosecute them for

possessing it? This is insanity. The right to self-defense has always been a part of our legal system.

Teens or no, I intend to keep my firearms readily available for use as needed. Your legislation will

turn me into a criminal. I might add that I am presently age 77 with a spotless record and a background in the military, armed security, and law enforcement. Passage of this Bill will put

me on the wrong side of the law, and I did nothing to get there. Suddenly my firearms, used in the past for the public good are now a menace. Something is very wrong with the philosophy behind this legislation.

You see, teen suicide and mass shooters have mental health problems, and therein lies the real problem. Locks will never defeat evil and intent.

In reading through the Bill I immediately noted one glaring inconsistency with present law. Currently, any Oregon citizen who is not otherwise prohibited from owning a firearm is allowed to carry without a permit in their vehicle, providing the weapon is in plain sight. Law Enforcement is not overly alarmed when they stop a vehicle and a loaded firearm is displayed in plain sight as it is legal, but if the weapon is concealed under the seat or on the seat beneath a covering object the owner is in violation of carrying a concealed weapon and bad intent is assumed. The Bill would prohibit one carrying a firearm in a vehicle to conceal the firearm from plain view from without the vehicle upon exiting the vehicle. In other words, to conceal it in violation of the existing law. By covering the firearm the vehicle's owner breaks the law against having a concealed weapon in the car, and by taking it with him he violates the law about carrying without a permit.

Other glaring faults plague this Bill. Many homeowners keep a single handgun in their nightstand or desk drawer. Now, of course, required to be locked up. But, my point is that the presence of the handgun is just about the farthest thing from their mind, and it is there only should the case of need arise. How many times in a month or year do you suppose they check to see if it is still present? But, hypothetically again, a teenager or burglar steals the gun, cuts off the trigger lock or cable, and the gun begins a lengthy progression of subsequent possession by unknown persons. What time is it that the owner should have reasonably known that the gun was missing? The Bill states a reporting requirement of 72 hours after the theft is discovered, but perhaps that would not be for three months, six months, or even a year? No schedule of checking to see if the weapon is present is required by the Bill, so what is a time in which to reasonably know that it is missing? We'll assume that the gun was properly locked as required by the Bill, absent for a long period of time without the rightful owner's knowledge, and during that time is misused in a crime or to cause injury. Does it really seem fair to settle liability on the rightful owner who is actually the victim of a theft? This is so glaringly unfair and with so little precedent in law that I predict it will be the first part of the law to fall in inevitable lawsuit. If someone steals your automobile and is involved in a traffic collision, or purposely runs down a pedestrian it would be practically unheard of for the owner of the vehicle, the victim of theft, to be held liable for injuries to people he didn't even know. You can pass this, but it won't work, and will be struck down under judicial review.

There are at least several other defects in this Bill that create inequities for lawful gun owners. I urge you to oppose passage of House Bill 4005. Why pass poor legislation?

Craig M. North
P.O. Box 157
Chemult, OR 97731-0157