

I oppose SB 978 and the amendments so far proposed.

"Minimum age for firearm sales"

Oregon law prohibits age discrimination,

ORS 659A.403 "all persons within the jurisdiction of this state are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities and privileges of any place of public accommodation, without any distinction, discrimination or restriction on account of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, marital status or age"

I agree with this. This is a good thing.

For the legislature to then turn around and without any reason legalize discrimination against people for wanting to exercise a constitutionally guaranteed civil right, is shocking, to say the least.

Empowering political bigotry and hatred to disenfranchise people who would otherwise be within their rights, is not a legitimate government interest nor is it in anyway compelling or rationally related to any government interest.

"Firearm storage, loss or theft reporting and access by minors"

This at initial face value isn't a big problem. Unlike standard gun control that vindictively punishes innocent people, this at least revolves around actual acts and real harms. If this was offered as a stand alone bill, we could have had a good faith discussion about it in the hearing and come to a reasonable solution.

The single biggest issue with this as written is that the legislation does not define what secured means, and instead delegates this to the Oregon Health Authority. Without these definitions we can't even begin to discuss the merits of the bill.

Do these undefined terms defy the Supreme Court's ruling in *Heller v. DC*? We don't know.

Are they going to be effect or are they going to be a disenfranchisement? We don't know.

So the legislature needs to do its job and define "engaged trigger lock or cable lock," "locked container," and "tamper-resistant lock." These terms can not be left to a political body that is hostile to civil rights.

"Undetectable and untraceable firearms"

"Prohibited possession and transfer"

These are largely repeats of existing Federal law. Though as the individual from the National Shooting Sports Foundation pointed out, a second set of rules, worded ever so slightly differently still creates a burden and uncertainty for compliance.

Additionally, they also appear to be written with the intent of scaring private citizens, who are not FFLs, from building their own firearms as is allowed, should continue to be allowed, and would be continue to

be allowed.

Existing Federal law already covers these issues, and any additional burden is unnecessary.

As an aside, if the desire to "do something" persists perhaps make committing a crime with an undetectable or untraceable firearm a modifier to the crime, such that the crime becomes an aggravated crime. This places no new burdens on manufacturers, and also avoids the common anti-civil rights approach of hurting peaceful and innocent people.

"Firearm Injury Reporting"

I have no on this aspect at comment at this time.

"Concealed Handgun License Fees"

CHL fees should be reduced or waived. People who get trained, fingerprinted, background checked, have a clean bill of mental health and clean criminal record should be encouraged.

"Local Authority to Regulate Firearms in Public Buildings"

This section, along with the age discrimination section, show the worst in the anti-civil rights movement. There isn't even a pretense of being about public safety with this; It's not pretending to go after murderers, robbers, rapists, etc..

Instead it is explicitly going after good people who have jumped through every hoop ever asked of them; They've gotten trained. They've been fingerprinted. They've been background checked. They've not been committed to the Oregon Health Authority. They've not been found to be a person with mental illness. They've never been convicted of a felony.

This, and the age discrimination section, are petty and vindictive partisan attacks on good people.

"Museum exception for private transfers"

Unlike all the other portions of this measure this is not at all offensive, though there are a few deficiencies that need to be addressed.

- 1.) Return from the museum also needs to be allowed.
- 2.) CHL holders need to be given an exception. They have already been background checked so this should be no problem.

Sincerely,
Chris Janik
Forest Grove, OR