

**From:** [Rob McMonigal](#)  
**To:** [SJUD Exhibits](#)  
**Subject:** SB 978 Testimony  
**Date:** Monday, April 1, 2019 6:40:23 PM

---

I present the following to be public testimony for the record regarding SB 978:

To the Chair and members of the Committee:

My name is Robert McMonigal and I am a resident of the State of Oregon. I come to you in an odd position, because I believe in sensible gun control. Certain measures, such as the President's recent banning of so-called "bump stocks" is completely in line with the meaning and intent of the Second Amendment. Ensuring background checks are performed at gun shows, while still not enacted, is completely in line with the meaning and intent of the Second Amendment. Limiting the size of magazines for ammunition, while still not enacted, is also in line with the meaning and intent of the Second Amendment.

Unfortunately, as written, the sweeping amendments proposed as "Amendment -1" to SB 978 are neither common sense nor Constitutional.

In an attempt to do good things and prevent harm, this bill will make it harder on law-abiding Oregon citizens and do nothing to change the actions of criminals. I've explained a few of the bill's flaws below:

\* By placing liability on the hands of the gun owner and not the user of the firearm, Oregon is making a dangerous mistake, one that will lead to endless lawsuits, fail to solve mass shootings, and ultimately force Oregonians to pay for lawsuits that the State of Oregon will ultimately lose.

\* By making sweeping attempts to prevent "3-D printing" it appears that anyone who wishes to show pride in their work by building a firearm in their own home may be labeled as a felon. There are plenty of kits for items such as replica flintlocks that would not be covered under the "antique" provision that are completely legitimate but could be criminalized by the wording of this proposed law.

\* The Oregon Health Authority has neither the expertise or resources to properly oversee gun safety. If such regulations are to be prepared at all, they need to be prepared by the Oregon Attorney General's Office, who can work in consultation with law enforcement officers throughout the state and tap into the knowledge of other states.

\* It is absolutely absurd that after only two instances of violating arbitrary storage rules, an Oregonian's right to own a firearm would be denied. That puts a person who, in the eyes of a health care authority, not a member of law enforcement, is improperly storing a firearm, on the same level as a person who commits robbery, assault, or murder. That cannot possibly be the will of Oregon's voters!

In summary, I am absolutely in favor of trying to ensure the safety of all Oregonians. There are ways in which our existing laws can be amended that are both constitutional and provide safety. SB 978 is NOT that bill, as amended. I urge you to vote against this amendment and this bill and prevent it moving forward to the Senate Floor. Then, in the next session, look at ways to implement the spirit of its concepts

(making Oregon safer for all) in ways that do not criminalize ordinary citizens.

Thank you.

Robert McMoniga