

Submitter: Sonja Feintech
On Behalf Of: Libertarian Party of Oregon
Committee: Senate Committee On Rules
Measure: HB2572

Good morning
My name is Sonja Feintech
Secretary of the Public Policy Council for the LPO

I am testifying in opposition to HB 2572

This bill is a whole can of worms that is a blanket solution to a situation largely created through the stoking the flames of political discontent in the first place. Problem, Reaction, Solution in effect. It certainly doesn't give a warm and fuzzy feeling that this bill won't be used against citizens regardless of the argument Representative Grayber just made.

Hb 2572 is an unnecessary and irresponsible attack on our right to self defense and our ability to gather in groups of our friends and train for whatever purpose we deem necessary, regardless of our political views, or ideologies. A bill built like this can easily be spun into an attack by the government on groups of people, regardless of their political beliefs.

If Sue and Bob get together with their friends and happen to think poorly of the current state, and also happen to be utilizing firearms, will this bill make Bob and Sue a paramilitary group capable of domestic terrorism? Because it says right here - "assembling with one or more people for the purpose of training, practicing, or receiving instruction in the use of any firearm, explosive, or other technique with the intent to engage in civil disorder.

What is intent to engage in civil disorder?

Who determines that?

Is this the same thing as pre-crime?

It also references the AG possessing the authority to seek injunctive relief if the AG has reasonable cause to believe that a person or a group of persons has engaged in or is about to engage in paramilitary activity.

How will the AG determine if someone is ABOUT TO ENGAGE in paramilitary activity?

If Sue is loosely associated with and has trained with gets arrested or entrapped and is found guilty, will Sue be wrapped up in the AGs investigation?

The measure provides the AG with authority to serve an investigative demand on any person who may have material relevant to an investigation of paramilitary activity.

Who may have? So if the attorney general decides some guy is now paramilitary then does this open the door to investigating everyone associated?

Where does the distinction stop? What is built in to safeguard the rights of Oregonians and to not make criminals out of the state's ideological opponents? How will you protect the citizens and engage in their right to free speech and their right to Firearms?

You mentioned in the hearing that this only applies to groups of 3 or more with intent to commit crime and have a command structure. Why are you singling out command structures? Does that mean if a group of three or more engage in this so called paramilitary activity but don't have a command structure that they are not included in this bill?

Group organizing and civilian training with firearms exemplifies the American spirit. You cannot make laws to stop a tradition that exists for good reason and is strongly protected by the 2nd amendment.

And it's funny because republicans probably love this because they think it'll be used against the baddies on the left and the Democrats love this because it'll stop the bad guys on the right but at the end of the day when our rights are given away to the state the state comes for ALL of us. This is not a door that should be opened and i oppose this bill.

Thank you.