

From: Gary Weis
To: [Arrington Kristi](#)
Subject: SB 764,797, 868
Date: Monday, April 17, 2017 3:20:11 PM

Testimony in opposition to SB 764, 797, and 868.

Due to the restricted time for testimony I was unable to present my full testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee. This is the full testimony.

There have been several amendments to these bills and I will not be able to address all of them.

I am opposed to SB 764 because it requires live fire training that is expensive and difficult to provide due to the lack of training facilities and in addition requires training on the law which would also be expensive and difficult because in my opinion only an attorney is licensed to provide this training for a fee and to give legal opinions. No data has been provided that would suggest that this training is necessary. Surely of the 250,000 CHL holders in this state if there was a problem it would have shown itself. It has not ,therefore it doesn't exist.

Now I think this training would be useful and beneficial ,even if not necessary, because I believe in education. Perhaps the State of Oregon could provide this and the training facilities and it could be done under an **enhanced CHL program** (current CHL program would be retained) which would provide a background check waiver and include a reciprocity agreement along with a tax credit. This would be working together and across the aisle to resolve differences.

Absent the above paragraph I remain opposed.

I am opposed to SB 797 because I believe that Article 1 Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution provides us with a Constitutional right to bear arms and does not allow the Department of the Oregon State Police to deny us our Constitutional right to bear arms without CAUSE. If the State Police can't make a finding within three days, quite frankly that is not my problem. It is their responsibility to find a reason do deny me (a violation of law or court finding of mental problems). There is a presumption that I am qualified until PROVEN disqualified (presumption of innocence).

Now if the law provides me **without fee** the right to petition the court to force the State Police (with a reasonable doubt standard) to approve the transfer then I would be willing to discuss eliminating the three day rule as it exist today.

Absent the above paragraph I remain opposed.

I am opposed to SB 868 because there is no miranda standard for the respondent. This is a court proceeding, where the court may find that the respondent might commit a violent crime and every step of the process the respondent is entitled to be represented by an attorney and if he or she cannot afford one then the state should be required to provide one. I am absolutely resolute on this. Period! After all if the respondent is a real danger to himself ,herself ,or others, he or she is not competent to represent themselves wouldn't you agree?

The court has **not** been given the authority to order treatment or counseling. Why? The court has made a finding of fact! This causes me to believe that this bill is not about violence prevention or mental health, but actually a anti-gun bill.

Given the above problems and problems with some of the amendments, I find that this bill has too many problems. Provide an attorney and mental health help for the respondent and I will reevaluate . Otherwise I stand opposed to this bill.

Gary Weis
Dallas, Oregon 97338