

SUBJECT: Confirm time and location of Proposed Gun Ordinance Public Hearing -
9:30 AM - World Trade Center Auditorium - 121 S.W. Salmon

PRESS LIST

DATE: 12/20/89

THE FOLLOWING WERE CALLED THIS DATE REGARDING:

- a) Meeting: 12/21/89
- b) Executive Meeting:
- c) Other: Formal - Public Hearing - Gun Ordin.

Signed: *David L. Larson*

KOIN	Channel 6	464-0797 or 464-0614	Assignment Desk ✓
KGW	Channel 8	226-5111	Assignment Desk ✓
KATU	Channel 2	231-4260	Assignment Desk ✓
KPTV	Channel 12	222-9921	News Desk ✓
KPDX	Channel 49	239-4949	Lee Haglund
KEX	1190 AM	222-1929	Newsroom/Message ✓
KSGO	1520 AM	223-1441	News Desk ✓
KXL	750 AM	231-1071/0750	Newsroom/Message ✓
KGW	62 AM	226-5095	News Desk ✓
K-103 FM		643-5103	Newsroom ✓
KXYQ - 105 FM		226-6731	✓
Oregonian		294-4065	Liz Moore OR ✓
		221-8383	Mark Kirschmeier
GreshamOutlook		665-2181	Robin Franzen ✓
Skanner		287-3562	Patrick Mazza ✓
Cable		667-7636	Mike Heinrich or Gary Ellis ✓

GUN SAFETY ORDINANCE HEARING
CARDS ONLY/DID NOT SPEAK

12/7/89

JOHN W. ARCHERD

DAVID J. ARCHERD

DON BARTON ★

JOHN S. BERGESON

LEONARD BRITTON

SCOTT EUGENE CLARK

ROBERT COGGBURN ★

ALLEN D. COOK ★

RICHARD COWGER ★

BRADLEY D. CRIST

I.M. DAMBERG ○

MARK EDWARDS

JOHN F. GRANT

BOB GARRETT

HOWARD HANSON

JOHN V. HOLM

DEAN JONES

GARY JONES

DAN KOCK

HENRY W. KROUT

LAWRENCE H. LEININGER, JR. ●

ERBEST E. McWHORTER ★

JIM MIKEN

ARTHUR W. NELSON

★ spoke at
12-18-89 mtg.
○ at both mtgs.
did not speak

ROBERT ORTH ✱

DAVID PELTO

GEORGE E. PHILPOTT

MELWOOD REED

ANNETA REED

TEX SHIRELY

MERLIN E. TERRY ✱

JIM VANEK Ⓞ

CHAREUNDI VAN-SI

GEORGE WATSON

DKENNETH A. WHITNEY

PUBLIC SPEAKERS/GUN SAFETY ORDINANCE HEARINGS

12/7/89 & 12/18/89

NICK ALBRECHT
DONALD G. ALLEN
STEVE BACH
ROGER D. BACON
HAROLD BANGS
DON BARTON
BOB BELL *
MARCEL BENDSHADLER
SHERMAN BISHOP
JIM BLEAKLEY
DEWALD BOSWELL
JON SCOTT BRADFIELD
PAUL D. CARRIER
DANA CARTER
CLIFFORD CHENEY *
CHARLES F. CLARK
ROBERT COGGBURN
PATRICK CONLEY
JEFF CONNOR
ALLEN COOK
KATHRYN COOK
RICHARD A. COWYER
RALPH DAWSON
DAVID DEMARKEY

BILL DICKSON
STEPHEN DONNELL
DARRELL DURFEY
BOB ENRIGHT
AUGIE ENRIQUEZ *
CHUCK FOLEY
BRUCE FORBUSH
CHRIS FURROW
DENNIS GELFAND
ROBERT A. GEORGE *
KEN GLASS *
ROBERT GRAHAM *
JIM GUTHRIE
BILL HENDRIX
ALFRED S. HERRING
JERRY HOFFMAN
JOHN A. HOSFORD
CLARENCE KOENNECKE
MARTIN KOCHAN
ANNA KROUT
STEVE LAVALLEY
JOHN LEBRUN
PAUL LISAC *
CLEE LLOYD
CHARLES LOKEY
L. H. LONDON
ERNEST E. MCWHORTER

LARRY MCQUAIN
PATRICK MARSON
CLINT MARTINDALE
WALTER J. MILFORD
BILL MONTGOMERY *
TED MORFORD
THOMAS MOSER *
DUKE NEWBY
WILLIAM H. NEWHOUSE
JOHN NICHOLS
LEWIS NOREN
CHARLES OAKES
ROBERT ORTH
GREGORY PEKRUL
MOLLIE PETERS
JON PETERSON
LADDIE POLANEK
DOUG RENFROW
EARL RHEA
RONALD L. RICHERT
RUTH ROBINSON
JOHN SAEMANN
CRAIG SCHIMSCHOK
WALLACE SCHMIDT
JACK L. SMITH
JULIE STERLING
WARD C. STEVENS

JOAN E. STOVALL *

SHAWN SUTTON *

WAYNE SWANSON

JOHN SWEENEY

MARLIN E. TERRY

BUDDY TILLMAN

JESS M. TOWNSEND

RICK TUNISON

SCOTT VALLANCE

MIKE VLISS

DAVID R. WAGONER

RALPH WATSON

RODGER WEHAGE

LOUISE WEIDLICH

BRIAN WHEELER

LEWIS WHITE

GREG WHITON *

TYE WOOD

DEXTER ZINKE

0717C.1
12/19/89

GUN SAFETY ORDINANCE HEARING
CARDS ONLY/DID NOT SPEAK

12/18/89

KEN ADAMS

STEPHEN ROBERT BACH*

ROGER BAKER

ROGER D. BACON*

KRISTOPHER BARRETT

MARCEL BENDSHADLER*

BRIAN BILYEU

WILJIAM C. BRITT

KEN BUNKER

LLOYD R. BURNS

JAY DEENA BYNUM

JOYCE D. BYNUM

MARY J. BYNUM

JIMMY D. BYNUM

GERALD A. CARLSON

CRISTAL CHRTISSER

RICHARD CARTISSER

ROLAND A. CARTISSER

R.E. CARTISSER

I.M. DARMBEY

RALPH DAWSON*

SAM ELLIOTT

DENNIS A. FREDERICK

CHRIS FURROW*

GLEN GRAHAM
ERVIN HARING
STEVE HAWKINS
JIM HUBBARD
DANFORD JOHNSON
JON JOHNSON
RAYMOND JONES
GEORGE KITZMILLER
GAIL LAFERRIERE
LARENCE H. LEINNIGER, JR.
VALL H. MILLER
GARY ORCUTT
GREGORY PEKRUL*
GARY RASMUSSEN
CRAIG SCHIMSCHOK*
RAYMOND STELZER
B.L. STEVENS
WARD C. STEVENS*
DAN SWICK
ALAN P. THOMPSON
LAWRENCE TURNER
JIM VANEK
JOHN VAUTHIERS
KELLY WEAVER
JOHN WELLS
THOMAS A. WILKES
MAX E. WINN

JAMES WOLFF

0717C.2
CAP

Dec. 18, '89

This statement is against
passage of Mult. Co. Ordinance for
Safe Streets.

My name is Belinda Davis. I
am not a gun owner at this time,
but I want to preserve my right to
buy one if I choose, & from whom I
choose. I believe passage of this
ordinance would interfere with that
right.

Due to ^{clearly} undefined wording, a
premise conflicting with the second
amendment, & unenforceability; this
ordinance should not be passed.

Belinda M Davis

P.S. Many people make it appear that all
victims or families of victims of gun
abuse are for gun control -- FALSE. My
brother was killed by a shot gun, the
killer was found guilty ~~but~~ then the
sentence was reversed due to error
in jury instruction. Last November
the retrial was held & he was found
innocent because most of the evidence
became inadmissable in this trial.
He spent one night in jail. ↓

Despite the fact that my brother's brains were scattered on a field by a man holding a shotgun, I do not support restrictions of shotgun owners -- only this ~~owner~~ particular owner who has a lot of power in the drug scene (of course - inadmissable ^{info} in the courtroom) ~~with~~ ENFORCE the laws we have with serious consequences. ^{see news}
 Please in ^{the future}

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text]

BOARD OF
 COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
 1989 DEC 19 PM 2:11
 MULTNOMAH COUNTY
 OREGON

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, possibly a letter or document body]

I've lived in Oregon for 49 years and have enjoyed many fine camping and Fishing + hunting trips all over this beautiful state, and hope my children and grandchildren will have the ~~same~~ opportunity to do the same, I have taught my children to use firearms in a safe and orderly manner, but in the last five or so years I have watched a growing threat that may or may not end this totally. (Hunting Experience)

I feel that the persons or person using guns in any manner that does bodily harm or personal property damage to another person should carry the total burden of those acts. Any person using a firearm to take another persons life should forfeit his own or be put in prison for life (with-out) parole if proven guilty.

I'm tired of paying more money for taxes on guns and feel that the State of Oregon only sees dollar signs. Any Restrictions on the sales and acquiring of Rifles + shotguns and pistols should not be put on the general public.

I am in favor of outlawing any fully automatic weapon that is not used for sport hunting.

I do not feel that I should have to Register any Rifle - shot gun OR pistol. I pay enough money now for shells tags gas food ect. If this trend of anger against guns continues it will only lead to making the average person who enjoys hunting and shooting, to become an outlaw himself due to the burdens of unjust laws put on him by others.

Please Punish the persons who break the laws that we already have.

Gary Jones 6141 SE 30th
Crescent Oregon

BOARD OF
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

1989 DEC 19 PM 2:11

MULTNOMAH COUNTY
OREGON

1494 NW 15th
Gresham, OR 97030
(503) 665-7902

December 18, 1989

1989 DEC 19 PM 2:11
MULTNOMAH COUNTY
OREGON
CLERK OF
COMMISSIONERS

HAND DELIVERED

Multnomah County Board
of Commissioners
Multnomah County Courthouse
1021 SW Fourth Ave.
Portland, OR 97204

Re: Vote No on Proposed Firearms Ordinance

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing in opposition to the currently proposed firearms ordinance and to request that each of you disapprove such ordinance. The ordinance is unworkable, an affront to law-abiding citizens of the state and metropolitan area, and goes beyond the statutory and constitutional authority allowed to the county. It is a blatant attack on basic civil rights guaranteed to Oregon citizens in the constitution of the state.

I understand that the proponents of the ordinance characterize it as a reasonable extension of the firearms statute passed last summer by the Oregon Legislature (1989 Oregon Laws, Chapter 839). Such assertion is ludicrous. No one familiar with the history and passage of the new state law could, in good faith, characterize the proposed ordinance as remotely related to the intent or purpose of the state statute. Instead, it is an oppressive attempt that is calculated to impose unreasonable restrictions on law-abiding citizens and will not, if experience in other jurisdictions is any indication, have any effect on the conduct at which it allegedly is aimed.

In enacting Oregon Laws 1989 Chapter 839, the Oregon Legislature expressly chose not to require registration or prior waiting periods for the purchase of long arms, including so-called "assault rifles" addressed in the proposed ordinance. Section 38 of that law allowed cities, counties and other political subdivisions to regulate "only the possession of firearms and ammunition in a public place." Certainly the provisions of the ordinance with respect to registration and aspects other than possession exceed the statutory authority. Likewise, under the recent Supreme Court case of City of

Multnomah County Board
of Commissioners
December 18, 1989
Page 2

Portland v. Lodi, 308 Or 468 (1989), it is clear that the county lacks the authority to enact much of the ordinance as the state has specifically chosen not to require registration, training or other aspects addressed by the ordinance.

The proposed ordinance, from its misleading preamble to its conclusion, rather than being a reasonable extension of the state statute, is diametrically opposite in intent and effect to the purposes of the state statute. True to form, the drafters of the ordinance ignored the conclusions of their own advisory task force drawn from the public and private sectors that supported only the firearms training and education aspect of the proposal.

Not only is the proposed ordinance beyond the authority left to the county by Oregon Laws 1989 Chapter 839, it is also unconstitutional under the constitution of Oregon. The state constitutional right to keep and bear arms is found in Article 1, Section 27 of the Oregon Constitution. It does not mention "sporting purposes" as a prerequisite for constitutional protection. Instead, it covers arms for defense of self and state.

It is clear from early cases that the right to keep and bear arms encompasses and includes small arms used in modern warfare. While the Oregon Supreme Court has not yet addressed the constitutional right to keep and bear arms in relation to military small arms, the constitutional analysis applied by the court in construing similar constitutional provisions lead to the conclusion that the Oregon Constitution protects the rights of its law-abiding citizens to keep and bear assault rifles and other arms free from the constraints that the proposed ordinance would attempt to impose.

This is not a battle between people who are enamored with guns and those who are not. This is an issue of fundamental rights guaranteed to Oregon citizens by its constitution and the right of each person to protect him or herself and their families. It is an individual right in Oregon, not a collective right as in some other jurisdictions. It seems ironic that the same individuals and entities that applaud constitutional protection of nude dancing and pornography as protected speech or are wont to find other rights "implied" in the constitution or refuse to acknowledge or respond to the justified alarm and outrage of citizens

Multnomah County Board
of Commissioners
December 18, 1989
Page 3

concerned with the right to keep and bear arms. It is clear from a historic and recent perspective that the right to keep and bear arms has been and will continue to be fundamental for the preservation of our freedoms from tyranny.

Everyone is interested in reducing preventable accidents of all types. For year the National Rifle Association has offered courses in firearm safety and training to both civilian and governmental personnel. I believe the NRA has offered to provide such training courses to the public schools as well. Commissioners may wish to consider supporting NRA's public education and safety programs. Education is the key to preventing unwanted firearms accidents.

One of the alleged purposes of this law is to keep firearms out of the hands of the drug gangs and criminal element. Experience and a modicum of common sense tells us that it will be ineffective. Organizations capable of smuggling hundreds of thousands of tons of illicit drugs into the country with impunity certainly can do the same with firearms. Passing this ordinance would not change that. If you are interested in addressing such behavior, why not enhance the penalty of anyone caught in a drug-related activity who has any firearms in their possession immediate or constructive.

Again, I ask you to vote against this proposed ordinance. It is neither reasonable nor constitutional. It would make persons traveling from Corvallis to Baker on a hunting trip a criminal. It would do the same for countless other law-abiding citizens in the metropolitan area who travel daily on the roads. While I can understand a restriction on carrying of firearms in such places as public parks, schools or government office buildings, the proponents of the ordinance were not interested in being reasonable. They were interested in depriving law-abiding citizens of their rights. Please vote no on the proposed ordinance.

Very truly yours,


Eugene A. Frassetto

EAF:v-m

December 18 1989

BOARD OF
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
1989 DEC 15 PM 2:11
MULTNOMAH COUNTY
OREGON

To Multnomah County Board of Commissioners;
Re: Gun Safety Ordinance

I have been a trap and skunk shooter for the last 15 years. I have been a safe and responsible gun owner.

I received a copy of the Gun safety ordinance and read it thoroughly.

I don't believe this ordinance will accomplish its intended goal. It lumps all law abiding gun owners into one category and penalizes them because others (a small percentage) don't handle their firearms safely or legally.

People who use their guns to inflict harm on others will disregard this ordinance.

Please don't punish people who have not committed a crime. This violates ~~both~~ the spirit (if not the letter) of the law and the constitution of the United States.

Sincerely

Reece Sullett
2247 NE 38th Dr.
Gresham, Or. 97030

*Read Handout
#33 speaker*

JOAN ELIZABETH STOVALL

8750 S.W. Dolph Street
Portland, Oregon 97223
Phone: (503) 244-9869

1989 DEC 9 3 PM 2 11
MULTNOMAH COUNTY
OREGON

December 9, 1989

Multnomah County Commissioners
Multnomah County Courthouse
1021 S. W. Fourth Avenue
Portland, Oregon, 97204

To the Editor:

I found the recent Multnomah County Commissioners hearing on the Anderson/Bauman "gun control" ordinances to be very disturbing.

Commissioner Pauline Anderson arrogantly claimed she had overwhelming support for the Anderson/Bauman ordinances.

Fact: Over 95% of the people who came to testify were opposed.

Fact: The Oregonian reported the Multnomah County Sheriff said he would not support the ordinances.

Fact: The Oregonian reported Speaker of the House Vera Katz said she would not support the ordinances.

Fact: Callers on the KATU poll line rejected the ordinances by 3 to 2.

Fact: The Oregonian rejected the Anderson/Bauman ordinances.

Fact: KATU in its news editorial rejected the Anderson/Bauman ordinances.

Evidently any overwhelming support exists only in the imagination of Commissioner Anderson.

In his grandstanding, Commissioner Rick Bauman, with an apparent total disregard for safety, pointed a rifle in the general direction of the audience. Furthermore, there was no evidence that he had cleared the gun, by locking the bolt back, while he was handling the weapon. This was a serious violation of firearms safety.

This is highly ironic, because Commissioner Bauman is one of those "gun control" advocates who is screaming about gun safety. Evidently he learned nothing about gun safety from Handgun Control. Commissioner Bauman would definitely benefit from a safety class offered by the National Rifle Association.

As to any concerns about violent crime, I believe the solution is to permanently remove the habitual violent criminals from our streets. This is especially important, since over 90% over the violent crime is committed by habitual criminals. We certainly should not make it more difficult for the honest, law-abiding citizen to defend themselves.

Sincerely,

Joan E. Stovall
Joan E. Stovall

7 Dec.1989

Commission Members, ladies and gentlemen:

Article II of the Bill of Rights as found in the Constitution of the United States, reads: A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a Free State, the Right of the People to Keep and BEAR ARMS, shall not be INFRINGED.

To require a monetary fee, a permit or a license as a condition to exercise a Right is not only an infringement but is also illegal. The United States Supreme Court decision, relating to the poll tax, stated that voting was a Right and as such could not be taxed. Therefore, the Right to keep and bear arms cannot be legally taxed either.

If the law is to be effective, it must be obeyed by all citizens, including elected and/or appointed, public officials. To enact the proposed ordinance(s) would, in my opinion, be clearly an illegal act and would serve no useful purpose.

At all levels of government, officials should command the respect of the citizenry. This cannot be done unless civil Rights are protected.

I respectfully request that you withdraw the proposed ordinance.

Ralph W. Watson

10060 Southeast 92nd Ave.
Portland, Oregon 97266-7331

SECRET OF
COUNTY COMMISSIONER, 11/15
1989 DEC 19 PM 2:11
MULLEN COUNTY
OREGON