

Submitter: Anthony Pokorny
On Behalf Of: Oregon Firearm Advocates
Committee: House Committee On Rules
Measure: HB2572

Greetings,

I strongly oppose the bill and alterations of ORS 166.660 with HB 2572 for several reasons. First, this denies in part, peaceful assembly which is Unconstitutional, armed or not. The language is dangerous and vague; open to interpretation by individual/s. This is completely reckless language completely to be interpreted that a sporting good store to be accused by HB 2572 easily, in turn, shutting the store down. Secondly, interpretation of a group, as example of my family, or anyone else for that matter, together going to a firing range to be considered "paramilitary" and "intimidating" under the language of this House Bill even if said group has, and is, gathered peacefully talking about the Yankee's winning the Super Bowl with a slam dunk of a puck into the basket from the penalty box. It can be easily construed to be intimidating just because a family is going out to the firing range and pluck holes in bullseyes down range.

As a family person, and a family whom regularly visits a firing range along with like minded folks desiring to participate in putting holes in a bullseye or pizza box (after properly pizza box emptied) would or will be illegal. Nobody is threatening anyone, but this sort of peaceful assemble will be illegal according to the language 2572. Furthermore, in family gatherings while carrying firearm peacefully, hiking and foraging (legally so) becomes illegal, while many, many people from other states come to Oregon to visit who do carry will find out the hard way that they become a criminal very quickly if someone sees them at all.

What does it take? Reading he language, just seeing the firearm is enough is enough to be considered "intimidating". That's it. That's all it takes. Peaceful is assemble is protected under the First Amendment. Let me remind to any who read this:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." per First Amendment.

Further, the language denies clarity of known intent to be interpreted to an individual to choose to be "intimidated" and therefore, even if the individuals in conversation comparing their progress of activity or the Yankee's winning the Super Bowl as "intimidating" and therefore in violation of "civil disorder". The intent is not finely define and left to interpretation to whoever is making the claim.

Lastly, this law is not used. ORS was not used as designed at all during the rioting in 2020 as Eugene was and Portland burning when it was well known in advance that political fascist with explosives, from fireworks being aimed at people to pipe bombs, and incendiary devices, like Molotov Cocktails being used against police and damaging public property, causing damages and costing tax payer resources to be reallocated to repairs and, disrupting government procedures and business. These fascists rioters were not charged with any crime and made bale by community fund support entity's like GoFundMe by donors, private activists and political individuals in which, some are still working in the Capital building in Salem.

In previous paragraph, it concerns me and many others, that only folks who carry firearms will be, and are, targeted just going out to the firing range or some other outdoors activity with a desire of protection; and yet, those who are politically correct are allowed to be free to cause civil disorder. ORS 166.660 has not been used correctly back in 2020 during the riots in which no one that I'm aware of was charged with anything.

I again oppose this bill as the language is left to be vague and, in my opinion, deliberately so.

Live long and prosper.