

Submitter: Tony Fischer  
On Behalf Of: My Entire Immediate Family 10 People  
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary  
Measure: HB3513

1. The summary of the bill, tells us that the main purpose of the bill is to allow easy transfer of a weapon. Suicide prevention is an "add on" for concealed handgun license. A suicide prevention bill should be dealt with separately and what is the rationale for adding it on here? It's better dealt with in another manner, a separate bill where it is not mixed into a much larger bill whose primary purpose is weapons transfer. Look at provision "f", for example, removing the requirement of a criminal background check requirement for the person receiving the gun. One could transfer his weapon to an actual criminal, unbeknownst to anyone. A "trusted person" could literally be anybody. Oddly, asking someone who is suicidal or homicidal to stop and find a "trusted person" is asking them to do something they may not be mentally balanced to figure out to begin with.

2. The type of suicide prevention is not specified. No length, no topics, no qualifications for the presenter, etc. A separate bill involving suicide prevention would do this. HB 3513 is essentially a bill about expanding gun owner's rights and the vast majority of the text relates to that. Just look again for yourself at the summary description of the bill, check out the order of importance and the language.

"a. Authorizes federal firearms licensee or other person to enter into firearm hold agreement with firearm owner.  
b. Provides immunity from liability for person who takes possession of firearm pursuant to firearm hold agreement except in actions arising from unlawful conduct.  
c. Directs Oregon Health Authority to establish grant program to fund storage of firearms pursuant to firearm hold agreement.  
d. Appropriates moneys to authority to fund grants.  
e. Requires that training course for concealed handgun license include use of firearm hold agreements for firearm suicide prevention.  
f. Provides that transfer of firearm pursuant to firearm hold agreement is exempt from private transfer criminal background check requirement "

3. This bill even puts the cost of storage on the backs of the taxpaying public, a public which voted in Measure 114. Personally, do I want to pay for a gun owner's storage (See "d" above.) . How do we even know someone is homicidal or suicide? Their own self-description? That seems silly. Perhaps they just want someone to pay for their weapon storage.

4. In effect, this allows anyone to have any weapon. In fact the person receiving the weapon could themselves be unbalanced. Beyond that we shouldn't assume

someone who is suicidal or homicidal person is rational enough to "enter into an agreement" specifying terms and a date with someone they are handing their weapon to. Of course I find problematic the idea of just giving a gun to anyone at all from a list of family members. There really is no limit and there is no oversight of this process at all - at any time at all.

5. This bill, HB 3513, expands gun owner's rights. In fact, HB3513, is clearly directly contradictory to the direction of Proposition 114, which stipulates specific requirements on guns and gun ownership and which was approved by a majority of Oregonians in our last election. That is the "democratic process" and HB 3513, as one reads through the details, chips away at the will of the voters.

6. Sally, the problems in this bill far outweigh the one weakly presented good point, suicide prevention, which deserves a separate bill of its' own. In fact "homicide prevention" with guns has nary a mention in this bill! If gun owners, gun sales entities or 2nd Amendment advocates want to have a storage transfer bill, keep it separate and see if it passes. Make it clear what the issue is. HB 3513 is a bad mix. It has no oversight at all and inadequate definition. Taxpayers pay while personal liability is further limited.

I could go on but I'll end it here for now. Thank you for reading and listening. Please vote "No".