

Testimony OPPOSING SB 978 "Relating to firearms" and proposed Amendments -1, -2, and -3.

Hello. I am a legal citizen, and a resident of Oregon senate district 01 and house district 02, and a voter.

First, thank you for NOT advancing Bill SB 501 ( Ref.: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/SB501/Introduced> ) as introduced. It was ridiculous.

From SB 978 ( Ref.: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Measures/Overview/SB978> ) - "Directs Department of State Police to conduct study on reporting of attempted unlawful firearm transfers and present report on findings..." Fine. But, almost all of that original text was subsequently replaced by amendment. It looks like the bill was indeed just a "placeholder". That seems devious, and I think that it stinks! I doubt that I completely understand all of the ramifications of Amendments -1, -2. and -3. Yet, even a quick review reveals a few things that are concerning.

My criticisms of Amendment -1 ( Ref.: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/ProposedAmendment/14732> ) include, but are not necessarily limited to the following.

1. Section 32 would declare an emergency. There is no emergency. It is my understanding that these declarations are usually a ploy designed to preclude possible citizen actions like referendums. Therefore, at minimum, the "emergency declaration" should be removed, rightfully empowering voters who might want to oppose.
2. Section 26- Legislation SHOULD NOT specifically grant authority, nor specifically allow, nor encourage the adoption of policies regulating or prohibiting the possession of firearms in public places. I submit that the mass murder and mayhem that occurred at Umpqua Community College on Oct. 1, 2015 might have been prevented or made less severe if more citizens had firearms in their possession.
3. Section 6 would establish some requirements for securing firearms, and it defines violations for failure to meet those requirements. Legislators should take into account the concerns of people who have a need or desire to have a firearm available for use during situations and times such as sleeping hours. The firearm owner or possessor should NOT be held liable if another person causes injury to a person or property after taking possession of a firearm not secured as required in Section 6.
4. Section 7 would establish a requirement for a firearm either locked or in a locked container- otherwise the transferor would be committing a violation. I suggest adding being UNLOADED at the time of transfer as an additional alternative acceptable condition (and therefore not a violation). The firearm transferor should NOT be held liable if another person causes injury to a person or property after taking possession of a firearm not transferred in a secured condition as required in Section 7.
5. Section 8 would establish a requirement for reporting thefts of firearms. Victims of thefts should NOT be held liable if another person causes injury to a person or property after taking possession of a firearm not reported as stolen as required in Section 8.
6. Section 10- OHA should be kept out of rule-making regarding firearms.
7. Section 14 "UNDETECTABLE AND UNTRACEABLE FIREARMS": This section seems too complex. I suggest removing it.

My criticisms of Amendment -2 ( Ref.: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/ProposedAmendment/15002> ) include, but are not necessarily limited to the following.

1. See my preceding comments regarding Amendment -1.

My criticisms of Amendment -3 ( Ref.: <https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2019R1/Downloads/ProposedAmendment/15003> ) include, but are not necessarily limited to the following.

1. See my preceding comments regarding Amendment -1.

Please consider killing this bill and amendments, or at least modify them to be more acceptable. Thank you.

Signed,  
Michael S. (Mike) Berry  
Resident, Oregon senate district 01 and house district 02

cc:  
State Rep. for District 02  
State Sen. for District 01