

Opposition to HB 2510

Firearms secured with trigger locks or in a safe. This has been ruled unconstitutional in the Supreme Court Case DC v Heller and would put citizens lives in danger if they need access to a firearm to defend themselves at a moment's notice. To push this bill forward will tie the State up in expensive taxpayer funded litigation for years and would obviously and ultimately be overturned. This bill has in mind keeping guns away from children, which I have none, and puts a burden on me for a danger that does not exist in my household. This bill also state that if a criminal breaks into my home, steals my firearm and two years later commits a crime that injures someone with said firearm that I would be "strictly liable" for the criminals actions UNLESS I could prove that I reported the crime in 72 hours AND I could prove that the gun had a lock on it or was in a locked container. This is victim blaming and unjustly puts the victim responsible for a criminal's actions.

Section 4 of the bill also states the same strict liability if a person were to sell a gun through an FFL transfer at a store and both the seller and buyer pass background checks. The seller would be responsible for whatever nefarious actions the buyer does for the next two years unless the seller can prove the gun was locked with a trigger lock at the time of transfer. How is a transfer with a cable/trigger lock supposed to work? Do you have to sell your cable lock as well? When do you take off the lock? Does the buyer keep the lock and then remove it later? There is no reason to mandate locked guns during legal transfers and creates situations that make criminals out of people going through background checks legally.

Further, if this bill were to be enacted, it would be entirely unenforceable and would only be used to add fines and potential jail time to otherwise law-abiding citizens and put the burden of proof on victims of crime. Nowhere in this bill does it address stiffer penalties for those stealing guns and using them to commit further crimes. Nowhere in this bill does it address the gang issues that are a vast majority of the so-called "gun-violence". Mandatory storage laws that impose penalties are unnecessary. Oregon already provides penalties for reckless endangerment, under which an individual found negligent in the storage of a firearm could be prosecuted for a felony and certainly held civilly liable.

While good intentioned, this bill will do nothing to make Oregonians safer and instead creates a "feel-good" law. It is poorly written and aims to burden law-abiding Oregonians in the vague name of safety. Oregonians wishing to exercise their constitutional rights and defend themselves in a way they see fit will are the ones being targeted by this bill. Please use common sense and see that this bill is not worth advancing. I strongly urge you to oppose.

Thank you for your time,

Colin Rowles
Banks, OR