

Truly dangerous people need interventions.

People who are NOT dangerous should not lose their rights simply because of the accusations of an angry or a vindictive family member, or even a prankster. According to this bill, you don't even have to commit a crime or actually be dangerous to be involuntarily stripped of your right to "keep and bear arms", you only have to be accused of being dangerous or suicidal.

- What defines "dangerous"? What if somebody simply gets angry?
- Where's the penalty for filing false or malicious reports? Or is that simply accounted as an acceptable risk?
- Who vets the caller as a "family member"?
- What prevents a random caller from claiming to be a niece or nephew, uncle or aunt, or some other family member and simply targeting somebody they believe has guns?
- What does somebody do who has been target and lost their guns because of a false accusation?
- This bill virtually legalizes SWATing, those spurious 9-1-1 calls claiming some event involving guns to elicit a SWAT team response.

At its best, this bill is ill conceived and does NOTHING to help and even opens the door to a whole host of "unintended" problems. As written, it could actually put those living in the house with a truly dangerous person at risk.

Owning a gun is not a crime. The only intelligent option is to vote NO on SB 719, without amendments, and to focus your legislative attentions on REAL crime that involves REAL criminals, not law-abiding, gun-owning legal residents of Oregon.

Ward Barker  
Cottage Grove