

I ask that the following information be included in the public comments at the hearing scheduled tomorrow, April 22, 2014 in front of the House Rules Committee. Should this hearing date be postponed until a later date, I asked that these comments be presented then.

This proposed legislation (SB 941) will not accomplish a desired effect of making our society safer. The bill imposes draconian measures upon a select class of Oregon citizens, the gun owner. There is nothing in this legislation that is not currently covered by state and federal gun law except for the additional stringent measures that are proposed.

Gun owners should not be required to pass any type of a background check, including the one currently in effect, since such check endangers the gun owner and I believe violates the Second Amendment of the US Constitution as well as the Oregon Constitution (Article 1 Section 27).

The time it takes to get a background check and the governmental entity that decides this time frame can and has put potential gun buyers in jeopardy. This bill purports to insure that if expanded background checks are conducted the Oregon citizen will be safer. However, a political and calculated LOOPHOLE exists where background checks are not required for transfers among close relatives. The methodology for this is confusing. Why, if background checks will make us safer do we have the exemption for relatives? Are relatives any more trustworthy? Or is the reasoning that if this bill should become law, then the writers will return and amend it?

This bill imposes undue and unfair standards on how a firearm can and must be stored and implies if the gun owner fails to comply with all requirements, fines and imprisonment can occur. Yet nowhere in this bill is there criteria determining the safety of the gun owner when burglars and robbers steal a gun. A gun locked up and inaccessible, as required by this bill, does nothing to help the gun owner defend his/her family and home.

There are rules implementing more stringent guidelines regarding intra and interstate transfers of firearms. The implication is that current transfers make all of us unsafe because criminals can easily obtain firearms via the mail or other common carrier. There are laws which restrict the sale of firearms through public commerce. All handguns must be transferred via two licensed Federal Firearms Licensed (FFL) Dealers. All long guns must have, at least, one FFL dealer included in an interstate transfer. If there are no FFL dealers involved in the transaction, then the law has been violated. Adding a similar regulation is duplicitous and imparts the impression that close relatives don't have to follow existing transfers.

Another section mandates penalties if a gun is stolen from a car and, again puts the potential of fines and imprisonment upon the gun owner. Where is there safety in that? If a gun owner follows current law, and then has a firearm stolen from his automobile, why is the gun owner to be punished?

Finally there is the addition of implementing "gun buyback programs" within the State. If this program is currently legal then why have a separate section (exemption or loophole) covering it?

The approval of this bill is divergent to any common sense approach whereby Oregon citizens will be safer from gun violence. You as elected legislators have the obligation to insure the freedoms of each citizen are preserved and that each citizen has the ability to maintain his/her safety, through the use of a gun if necessary. Anything less is contrary to the meaning and spirit of the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution.

Please table this bill or refuse to let it be voted on. It is bad, ill conceived legislation.

Thank you.

Bob Jensen
9203 SW Abalone
South Beach, Or 97366

541-867-4450