

From: [Greg Black](#)
To: [SJUD Exhibits](#)
Subject: TESTIMONY FOR SB 978-1 – Relating to firearms
Date: Sunday, March 31, 2019 6:38:59 PM

TESTIMONY FOR SB 978-1 – Relating to firearms

TO: Senate Judiciary Committee

FROM: Greg Black

DATE: March 31, 2019

Please accept this letter as my formal testimony for SB 978.

SB 978 started as an innocuous bill for the Oregon State Police to study illegal firearms transfers. Then it was gutted and stuffed with a 44-page amendment. I have issues with this amended bill.

First, for all practical purposes legal adulthood begins at age 18. One can enter into a contract at 18 or serve their country in the military. Federal law allows purchasing of long guns and their ammunition by 18-year-olds. Allowing firearms sellers to decide individually whether the age of the purchaser should be above 18, be it 19, 20 or 21 is age discrimination. I do believe in proper training and received my first firearms training in middle school when I completed the Oregon Hunters Safety Course. I also competed in a rifle club in school where I learned safe firearms handling. I began hunting with my dad at 14 and purchased my first hunting rifle (legally) at a church yard sale when I was 16.

Second, trigger or cable locks can be defeated as can many so-called security boxes. To mandate or depend on such devices is questionable. I do believe stolen firearms should be reported ASAP and have known of some who were afraid or embarrassed to do so. Those who steal arms should be punished accordingly, but punish the victim of the theft?

Third, so-called 80% lowers and frames are legal under federal law. There are some for whom finishing the machining is a hobby. Are these really an issue? 3D printing of a firearm may be possible, but doesn't seem very practical. When Glock pistols first appeared, they were decried as being plastic guns that were invisible to airport x-ray machines. That was not true.

Fourth, Firearm Injury Reporting. Firearms don't act of their own accord to cause injury. Assuming there are illegal activities involved, will the outcomes of the perpetrators be tracked, or only the victims?

Fifth, regarding Concealed Handgun License holders – as a rule, CHL holders are among the most law abiding citizens there are because they know what is at stake. Why does this bill take aim at them by allowing the creation of gun free zones in and around “public buildings”? Have CHL holders been a problem? The addition of more gun-free zones provides many with an illusion of safety while in reality creating target rich environments for those so disposed to do harm where they know there is likely to be little to no resistance. What is the rationale for this proposal?

Sixth, this bill is not an emergency.

I am a native Oregonian, one who has enjoyed the safe and responsible use of firearms since an early age. I enjoy hunting, fishing, target shooting and other outdoor activities. I attended the recent Second Amendment Rally at the Capitol Mall where I observed an abundance of politeness, no litter afterward, and little for the Oregon State Police to do as the crowd in attendance was well behaved. Please consider what impacts this omnibus bill may have on the million-plus Oregonians who enjoy their safe and responsible exercise of their Second Amendment rights.

Respectfully, Greg Black

TESTIMONY FOR SB 978 – Relating to firearms

TO: Senate Judiciary Committee

FROM: Greg Black

DATE: March 31, 2019

Please accept this letter as my formal testimony for SB 978.

I am a native Oregonian, one who has enjoyed the safe and responsible use of firearms since an early age. My outdoor interests include hunting, fishing, hiking, camping, target shooting and more. While I oppose those who take up firearms to commit crimes, I also oppose SB 978 because it could turn currently law abiding citizens into criminals while infringing on our United States and Oregon Constitutional rights regarding the right to keep and bear arms.

SB 978 would not only allow unfair age discrimination against 18-20 year-olds' right to purchase long guns, but it would also shelter businesses who have already engaged in such discrimination. This is not right.

This bill could prosecute victims of theft if their arms are stolen and used in the commission of a crime. Punish and blame the victim?

Why does this bill take aim against CHL holders who are among the most responsible firearms holders? Provisions of this bill could make leaving one's home with a firearm illegal. Why?

Please vote no on HB 978. Punish criminals, not law abiding citizens. The whole purpose of this bill seems to make firearms ownership so onerous that no one will want to exercise their rights.

Respectfully,

Greg Black