

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing in opposition to Senate Bill 941, the Background Check Bill. This legislation is poorly written and poorly considered.

In my various community roles I deal with firearms in a multitude of ways.

As a CEO for a small, rural financial institution I oppose SB 941. In the event money is lent wherein the security is firearms, SB941 essentially prevents repossession of those firearms in the event of default. Who is to conduct the background check upon repossession and upon whom should the background check be completed? In the event of repossessed firearms it is doubtful a borrower will cooperate and be present at gun dealer to transfer the firearms to the lending institution. There is no provision for a lending institution to take possession of repossessed firearms.

As a Reserve Deputy Sheriff in Grant County, I oppose SB 941. Law abiding gun owners should be allowed to conduct commerce without the interference of the state. Denials in the present background check system rarely, even if a prohibited person, result in investigation and prosecution. Far too many persons are denied or delayed, not because they are prohibited persons, but as the result of inaccurate or system inaccuracies. I fully understand and appreciate the need to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous persons and mentally disturbed individuals, but SB 941 is not the answer.

As a Certified Firearms instructor I oppose SB 941. I lend rifles to local 4H clubs and youths so that they can shoot in 4H events and hunt (many of these youths otherwise could not afford to shoot or hunt). This bill would essentially end that practice. It is not practical to give the gun to a 4h leader and then take it back at the end of the shooting session each week, or during each day's hunt. Rather, the gun should be able to be loaned over an extended period of time, rather than restricted to a specific shooting or hunting event without the need for a background check every time.

The record retention requirement is burdensome. Requiring a private individual records be kept for 5 years in order to obtain immunity from liability seems onerous, as the record check is information provided and retained by the state - ergo, a record of the state!

Lastly, the use of the emergency provision in section 23 of the bill is an abuse of the practice. No imminent public threat exists to justify such a provision.

Sincerely,

Ken Olson - President/CEO Old West Federal Credit Union
Patrol Reserve - Grant County Sheriff's Office
Certified NRA Instructor