

Dear Senators:

I urge you to vote "NO" on SB 978, especially Amendment -1. I live in a rural area. To keep a firearm "secured" as prescribed by this amendment could very well put myself, my family, or my livestock at risk of harm due to the amount of time it would take to obtain said firearm, prepare it for use, and then USE it for the purpose for which it was intended, ie: to STOP a predator (whether critter or human) attempting to take the life of another. That is just WRONG. If you have ever been awakened in the middle of the night by a chicken screaming as it is being killed by a raccoon, you would understand my objections to this amendment. If I hear a goat screaming in the middle of the night being attacked by a cougar or coyote, I need to head out there NOW, not 5 to 7 minutes from now, after I unlock, remove weapon, load, and head for the pasture with something more substantial than a baseball bat or a sling shot. What if my grandchildren are spending the night and if I am awakened in the middle of the night by an intruder who is armed, there is NO WAY to get to the safe, unlock it, retrieve my self-protection, load it, and respond. Ooops - too late! We lose! PLEASE think about this!

It is appalling to me that if someone stole a firearm that belonged to me and then committed a crime with it, that for 2 years after the theft, I would be liable for what THEY did. Or if I could not prove that I sold a firearm with a lock ON it, and it later got used for a crime, I would be liable for THAT crime! That's like saying that if someone used my car without my knowledge and got drunk and killed someone, I would be liable for that death! Or if someone stole my fishing rod and had in their possession an illegal catch, that would be my fault! The entire idea is absurd in my opinion. PLEASE vote NO on this bill! I am opposed to other parts of this bill, but I am testifying about the parts that are most important to ME.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jean M. Hart
5126 W. Evans Creek Road

Rogue River, OR 97537

SB 978

Additional Testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee
Submitted by Jean Hart
5126 West Evans Creek Road
Rogue River, OR 97537

Chair Prozanski, Vice Chair Thatcher, and Committee members:

My opposition to SB 978 has not changed, but I have some additional thoughts.

1) The specifications of acceptable locks and containers to be adopted by the Oregon Health Authority does not have to be completed until the day the Act becomes operative. That gives the people no real time to be sure that what they have complies with the law, or to take further steps to comply. That is unreasonable.

2) Though I have not tried it, I am pretty sure the cable lock that I have could be easily cut with a simple bolt cutter which most of us out here in the country have in our garages or barns for multiple uses. That makes the cable lock seem more like an annoyance to the owner than an actual preventive device for a would-be criminal.

3) It is truly troublesome to me that Concealed Handgun License holders who have gone through training and extensive background checks in addition to filing an application through the local Sheriff's office would be prohibited from concealed carry in Public Buildings. We are the Good Guys! We are the first line of defense for ourselves and for the defenseless until Law Enforcement arrives! As you allow the creation of more and more so-called "safe spaces," you create the opposite! You create the spaces where deranged people would go in order to create as much bloodshed as possible before being stopped - by someone with a capable weapon. The gun is just a tool. The heart of the person bearing it is what is important. Remember, Cain killed Abel with a rock.

4) My previous written testimony did not include my thoughts about the use of the Emergency Clause in this bill, or in the use of all the bills I have looked at in the course of this legislative session, many of which have nothing to do with firearms.

I believe the over-use and outright mis-use of the Emergency Clause is currently generating a LOT of distrust in our government. There is lots of talk about that out here among the people. When the people do not see any real emergency when that tool is used, they perceive that our government is simply attempting to prevent the use of the referendum and keeping us from having a say in our government. The legislature appears to be over-controlling and attempting to pass legislation which they are pretty sure would not pass muster if we, the people, could vote on it. Just thought I would bring that to your attention.

Thank you.