

Members of the Senate Judicial Committee,

My name is Craig McDermott, I live in Hillsboro, Oregon and I'm opposed to SB 978.

SB 978 is a clear example of legislative "gut and stuff" by the Oregon Legislature. I stand opposed to this proposed legislation as it's clearly in violation to Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. The Oregon Senate and this Judicial Committee, is a body of reasonably educated law makers who have each sworn an oath to "support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Oregon" and to faithfully discharge the duties of the office you each have sworn an oath to. That being true, I implore each of you to also oppose SB 978. Ladies and gentlemen, it's come time to honor that oath that you've sworn, and vote NO on SB 978 for it's unconstitutional content and clear violation of Oregon's State Constitution as well as the Constitution of the United States of America.

***In support of this -***

***Minimum Age for Firearms Sales*** – this bill would limit firearms sales to those over the age of 21, yet at the same time there's proposed legislation within this very legislative session to lower the voting age in Oregon to the age of 16. So which is it, are 16 years old's responsible or not? Denying law abiding citizens between the ages of 18 and 20 access to firearms, a clear violation of Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution.

***Firearm Storage, Loss or Theft Reporting and Access by Minors*** – on the face appears to be reasonable but holding the last legal owner of a lost or stolen firearm to a two year liability is absurd. Once the loss or theft is reported to the authorities, the owner's liability should terminate. Much like the owner of a stolen vehicle is not held liable once the theft is reported, that minimum should be applied to gun owners. To maintain a two year liability, after reporting theft or loss, what purpose does that serve other than to further punish gun owners.

***Prohibited Possession and Transfer*** – The wording here is a direct attack on what is commonly known as 80% lowers, what ATF defines as essentially blocks of aluminum, steel or polymer. So now, the Oregon legislature wants a more finite definition than the chief Federal Firearms Enforcement Agency? How are blocks of aluminum, steel or polymer going to be regulated? A clear violation of Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution.

***Firearm Injury Reporting*** – Although most duly licensed medical treatment facilities currently do report gunshot injuries to the local authorities, I feel this legislative requirement is an overreach of power and the information gained will only be used against the citizens of Oregon in a manner to continue to attempt to disarm the law abiding and through careful use of facts, be the grounds for further erosion of Oregonians Second Amendment rights.

***Concealed Handgun License Fees*** – this section calls for an increase of 30% for CHL fee's. Why? Why the additional cost other than to punish law abiding citizens who abide by the current laws and want the ability to defend themselves. This additional fee could be prohibitive for those on a fixed income and should be seen as a violation of Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution. This shouldn't even be an issue, Oregon should become a Constitutional Carry state, where citizens don't have to ask permission to exercise a constitutional right.

***Local Authority to Regulate Firearms in Public Buildings*** – the expansion of definitions simply makes it more difficult for citizens to protect themselves in areas that provide inadequate security and inadequate enforcement. In doing so, citizens have two choices, willingly violate these expanded definitions in order to provide their own protection, thus becoming a criminal. Or abide by these expanded definitions and take the chance on becoming a victim in unsecured areas. Clearly a violation of Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon State Constitution.

Again, I implore each member of the Judicial Committee to vote NO on this legislation, allow Oregonians the ability to protect themselves without worry of becoming criminals themselves.

Respectfully,

Craig McDermott  
6087 NE Sherborne St  
Hillsboro, OR 97124

Dear Chair Prozanski, Vice Chair Thatcher, and Senate Judiciary Committee Members:

My name is Craig McDermott, I live in Hillsboro Oregon, I've been a firearms owner for over 30 years, enjoying several disciplines of the shooting sports and competitions over those years and I stand opposed to SB 978. And here is why:

As I listened to the testimony from all Oregonians on Tuesday, April 2nd, there were several recurring ideas in support of Oregon Senate Bill 978. These ideas were based on emotions and false claims that Oregonians, mainly children, will be safer with the passage of this bill.

The sections of safe storage, regulation of firearms in public places, or undetectable/untraceable firearms will not make Oregonians safer or deter crime. To prosecute someone for these laws it will be due to a person breaking other existing laws. This bill also violates the second amendment of the US Constitution. See District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008).

I understand the intent of safe storage in the bill is to prevent unlawful transfer of firearms. Gun safes and simple trigger locks are only time deterrents to criminals. Existing laws are being broken for the unlawful transfer to take place. Another law will not help here.

The safe storage law cannot be applied to all Oregonians as there are many variables to consider. Oregonians deserve the right to self defense and should be free to store a firearm according to their choosing.

Gun owners with children in the home do need to have their firearms safely stored. This is common sense. If a firearm is not safely stored the gun owner is already committing a crime of child endangerment. We don't need another law as existing laws are in place.

Another common reason for support of SB 978 is to prevent suicides. Many testified that firearms should not be sold to those under age 21 due to impulsive choices by adolescents and the safe storage of the firearms will prevent youth suicides. The Firearm Fatalities in Oregon study performed by the Oregon Health Authority (Updated July 13, 2016: <https://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/DISEASESCONDITIONS/INJURYFATA>

[LITYDATA/Documents/Fact Sheets/firearms\\_2016v07132016.pdf](#)) does show the majority of firearm deaths, 83%, are by suicide. The study also showed those aged 65 or older were most at risk of death by firearm suicide. Firearm storage has no impact on this age group. The real issue here is suicide. Note the weapons used in firearm fatalities were handguns (74%), rifles (15%), and shotguns (11%). Federal law bans persons under age 21 from purchasing a handgun. This bill must not approve of discrimination and focus on the real issue of preventing suicide.

Please note that the *Oregon Health Authority suggests 'Primary Prevention'* to reduce gun violence; that *is the early identification of troubled persons; gun control is not 'Primary Prevention'*. Their reference is at the bottom of the page, of the link above.

The more laws created will result in more people becoming criminals. Allowing a local authority to regulate firearms in public buildings creates an extra burden to CHL holders to plan their routes and limits their right to self protection. If the firearm is concealed, there is no way to identify someone that is carrying. There is no reason for this to be included in the bill. Stripping a group of their rights is not the right approach.

The section of the bill related to "Undetectable and Untraceable Firearms" is overly broad. At what point do raw materials start becoming "unfinished frames or receivers"? Finishing of receivers is a hobby for some people. There are tools and equipment that must be acquired to finish out a receiver or create a firearm. This also applies to 3D printing of firearms. There are far easier methods for criminals to obtain firearms than creating their own.

Since this is a hobby, there are many receivers finished without serial numbers. There are also many firearms manufactured before 1968 without serial numbers. Federal law already states that a serial number must be applied to a firearm prior to transfer to another individual. This bill continues to turn negatively impact law abiding Oregonians without solving any issues.

In consideration of the testimony above, I strongly urge you to vote NO on SB 978.

*Chair Prozanski, Vice-Chair Thatcher and Senate Judiciary Committee Members,*

*My name is Craig McDermott, I live in Hillsboro Oregon and have held a concealed weapons permit for over 20 years. I stand in opposition to this proposed legislation. This testimony is in regards to the Sections of SB 978 that are listed under the title LOCAL AUTHORITY TO REGULATE FIREARMS IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS*

*All Oregon CHL holders go through an extensive FBI background check before being issued their CHL, how are these individuals a threat to the general public in Oregon? What trouble, other than stopping mass shootings, like the Clackamas Town Center incident, what problems do CHL holders pose in Oregon? And you Chair Prozanski, are known to be one of those CHL holders, what threat do you or other Oregon CHL holders pose?*

*These regulations allowing local authorities to decide where we can or can't defend ourselves is absurd. We have preemption law in this State for a reason. Persons carrying with a concealed carry license are not a problem in need of a solution. These regulations will not prevent any crimes but will certainly increase crime by leaving formerly protected Oregonians unprotected and creating opportunities for criminals.*

*It will be nearly impossible to keep track of where we can or can't legally protect ourselves. Trying to comply with this patchwork of places where we can and can't carry will lead to more theft of stowed firearms, false alarm calls to police when bystanders see people stowing or unstowing their firearms. It could lead to more accidental discharges as people will be removing and re-holstering their firearm numerous times a day.*

*Worst of all it will lead to more soft targets and victims of crime especially women and elderly who may be more dependent on concealed carry to defend themselves. People who work in public buildings and grounds at night will be very vulnerable. The criminals will find that these new gun free public spaces are a variable buffet of victims.*

*I saw nothing that would prevent these regulations from applying to parks, campgrounds and State and County forest areas if buildings are on these grounds, publicly owned stadiums, public owned parking lots, private buildings that house public agencies, etc. The list could go on and on.*

*It will be a nightmare for those who choose to conceal carry if this bill passes as written.*

*With the exception of Section 30 this entire bill is an awful mess of restrictions that will only target those who are not committing crimes now. These regulations allowing local authorities to prohibit concealed carry are the absolute worst in the entire bill. Only somebody with extreme contempt for the electorate of this State could let a bill like this become law.*

*I urge you to not let SB 978 out of Committee. Vote NO against such draconian measures against Oregonians.*

*Thank you for the opportunity to share my testimony.*

*Respectfully,  
Craig McDermott  
Hillsboro, OR 97124*