

Members of the committee,

HB 4005 prohibits minor children for accessing firearms in the home for the purpose of self defense in the case of a home invasion.

If a sixteen year old can drive a deadly weapon known as a automobile, which is NOT an enumerated right, and in which they kill thousands by accident every year, then an 16 year old should be able to own a firearm, which is an enumerated right, and with which virtually no one is killed by accident.

This law renders the homeowner with children living in the home defenseless in the case of a sudden home invasion. The need to use a firearm for self defense arises very suddenly, and there is no time to remove a lock while being victimized by a criminal.

Criminals love trigger lock laws, because it renders their victim helpless to defend themselves in time. To require a trigger lock, is to effectively remove the firearm as a means of self defense, and give criminals total advantage over the honest citizen. Trigger locks render a firearm useless for self defense.

Each parent is responsible to teach their children to respect guns and to use them in a responsible manner. Invading the home with your laws, and attempting to replace parenting with procedures, render parents unable to defend their children from child snatchers while fumbling to get a gun unlocked. Trigger locks render a firearm useless for self defense. This law reduces child safety.

By making good people helpless, you won't make bad people harmless. You will only make the body count exponentially higher by assuring that no one has the means to self defense when the criminal begins shooting. Gun locks render a home a de-facto gun-free zone. Criminals do not obey 'gun free zones' regulations. These regulations are not stopping them at all. They only render the honest citizen an easier victim. This law does NOTHING to advance public safety. It actually reduces it, and makes us more vulnerable to criminal action.

This law holds gun owners responsible for the actions of a thief who stole the gun from them and then used it in a crime. This is as wrong as holding a automobile owner responsible for the actions of the car thief who recklessly drove his stolen car and killed someone with it. No one can be morally or legally responsible for the actions of a thief of their property.

Gun control does nothing to reduce crime, it only endangers the honest citizen by making them vulnerable to the criminal, who never obeys such laws.

By restricting our rights to firearms, by requiring us to lock up our guns so they are inaccessible to us when we are attacked, you are giving criminals advantage over us, because they will never obey such laws.

If violent crime is to be curbed, it is only the intended victim that can do it. The Felon does not fear the police , and he fears neither the judge nor the jury. Therefore, he must fear his victim, and be deterred from crime by the knowledge that he will be met by a well armed adversary.

But any kind of gun control reduces the deterrent to criminals to act. Laws that disarm those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes make it worse for the assaulted, and easier for the assailant, and they serve rather to encourage than prevent homicides, because an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man.

The CDC found that guns are use 8 times more often in self defense that they are used to commit crimes. Guns are a net benefit to the safety of the citizens, not a liability to it.

By the time the police get there, it is already all over. We must have the same firearm resources that the police have to defend ourselves. Their guns deter crime, and so do ours.

If you care about the safety of the citizens you represent, vote NO to this gun control measures.

Max Doner,

Foster, Oregon