

On Wednesday, April 1, 2015 2:14 PM, "ott.irene@frontier.com" <ott.irene@frontier.com> wrote:

This is the second time I have sent this testimony and comments regarding SB 941. It has not been published with the other public testimony on the bill. Given that I was denied an opportunity to speak by the chairman of this committee, I hope you will see to it that my comments are posted tomorrow on the public record for this bill.

On Wednesday, April 1, 2015 2:08 PM, "ott.irene@frontier.com" <ott.irene@frontier.com> wrote:

On Wednesday, April 1, 2015 11:58 AM, "ott.irene@frontier.com" <ott.irene@frontier.com> wrote:

Senate Judicial Committee Member:

I drove 5 hrs. this morning from La Grande, Oregon to get to testify for two minutes in front of the above committee. I listened to multiple speakers from California, Washington, and other states interjecting their opinions about what Oregon should be doing. I heard as much misinformation regarding facts and figures as I have heard in a two hr. period in my entire life. What I did not hear was the testimony of hundreds of Oregonians including myself who were not provided the opportunity to testify. The head of this committee has apparently forgotten that he is supposed to be representing the citizens of Oregon. Those are the people who will have to live with the legislation that is passed in this state. When there is no effort to provide opportunity to hear from all those citizens who take the time and effort to appear at the capital, then the testimony that is heard should be coming from the citizens of this state, not special interest groups from out of the state. I submit the following testimony in writing due to the lack of interest in hearing from me directly this morning:

My name is Irene Gilbert. My significant other owns and we operate a gun store in La Grande, Oregon. I am concerned about this bill due to the fact that it provides multiple barriers to the rights of law abiding citizens to own firearms, The following applies to this bill:

- The state charges us \$10 for each gun check we do. We charge an additional \$35 for processing the paper work.
- Many of our customers drive an hr. or more to get to our store which adds a significant cost in terms of gas and time required to obtain a gun check.
- We are open Tuesday through Friday 10-5 and Saturday 10-2. This means that people who are not familiar with our hrs. but would be coming to our business for a gun check may make the trip more than once due to our hrs. of operation.
- It is not uncommon for people to have to wait an hr. or more for the computer to give an authorization number.

--Of the cases denied by far the majority are due to an expired drivers license, an error in the home address on the driver's license or another simple error.

--When cases are pended, it can take several weeks for a response which is normally an approval. I pulled 7 random forms from our denied and "problem" file. Of those, the following applies:

1. Form completed 3/5/15 Delayed until 4/21/15
2. Form completed on 2/21/15 Approved for release on 3/28/15
3. Form completed 1/10/15 Delayed until 4/24/15
4. Form completed on 8/27/14 Approved for release on 1/8/14 but the purchaser refused gun due to delay
5. Form completed on 1/2/14 Approved for release a month later but the purchaser refused gun due to delay
6. Form completed on 12/3/14 Delayed until 1/19/15 and was later approved but customer refused gun due to delay
7. Form completed on 3/5/15 Delayed until 4/21/15

The one denial I processed during the past 6 months was a young boy who came in with his mother to purchase his first gun. The policeman came in for the information on the purchaser while they were still in the store. He talked to them and said that it was no big deal and he had told them how to fix the problem.

--By making the failure to complete this paper process a Class A Misdemeanor you put a paper processing failure in the same category as assault in the fourth degree or theft in the second degree. This means that issuing citations for this infraction will result in more verbal and physical abuse or death of police officers, will consume hrs. of their time due to the increase in court time that will be required. Since it is recommended that anyone charged with a Class A Misdemeanor be represented by an attorney, the bill serves no one other than the attorneys of the state.

--This bill places a disproportionate burden on those in rural and economically depressed areas and removes our police officers from providing protection for serious crimes as well as requiring jail space to incarcerate otherwise law abiding citizens.

-- We do not need the additional liability of keeping people's firearms on pended cases. It opens us up to accusations that we have damaged a gun, or whatever. In addition, we do not need to assume additional liability for having accurate records when we are visited by ATF. The last time we were inspected, we had two men who recorded every serial number of every gun in the store and made sure they were all correctly logged in. They then reviewed every gun we sold to make sure every box was correctly filled and check mark made. We were notified that we had not always checked the "proceed" box even though we had recorded the release number on some of the forms. I could continue with facts, however, it appears that there is little interest in hearing facts about the consequences of this bill. What I will say is this: In my 60+ years in this state, I can say with confidence that those controlling this legislature have done more harm to the freedom and pocketbooks of the people of this state in the name of "protecting" us than any other group coming before you. Please just leave our constitution alone!

Irene Gilbert
2310 Adams Ave.

La Grande, Or. 97850