

Senate Bill 941 which is the gun background check bill Takes privacy away from the law abiding citizen with no impact to criminal access. It punishes law abiding citizens and does nothing to the criminal element.

I have been a citizen of Oregon since 1976. I am currently a resident in the area between Milwaukie and Gladstone. I have dire concerns with how the above mentioned bill is worded and how it is to be implemented. Not to mention how it was fast-laned through the Senate process.

I too want to reduce the access of firearms to those who should not have them. I do fail to see how this particular action is going to accomplish this. Criminals do not obey the laws, that is why they are criminals. So this will have no impact on them transferring firearms to each other. That is what is known as the black market.

For the law abiding citizen, this will be eroding away an element of our Second Amendment rights, our right to privacy, and taking away a freedom we have had for over 200 years.

This law would require a law abiding citizen to go through several un-guaranteed steps (these were not covered in the brief) should they wish to pass a firearm to another. Un-guaranteed in the manner that one has to find a dealer willing to perform the background check. It will become mandatory for a law abiding citizen to use a dealer but there is nothing about a dealer requirement to perform the action. Since you are not buying a firearm from a dealer, they could charge you anything for the service, as there is no fixed fee.

This also puts an added burden on those living outside the Willamette valley area since dealers are few and far between in those rural areas.

A proposed amendment suggested in the Senate was to add a mark on Oregon ID/Drivers License to those not allowed to receive a firearm. This would make it easy to deny transfer from a citizen or a dealer before any burden has been placed on anyone, dealer, or State law enforcement to fill out, review, acknowledge, or deny the background check.

This proposal amendment was denied because it was stated as like put a "scarlet letter" on an individual trying to reenter society. An individual that is not allowed to have a firearm. An individual this law was supposed to prevent access to a firearm in the first place. Another protect the criminal and offend the law abiding citizen.

There is the other concern of this bad law.

If this law passes, it will provide the state an easy stepping stone towards firearms registration whether it be announced, or occurring in secret in the background, out of sight of the public. Registration that would allow the government to remove those firearms without due process should they so choose to do so.

This in violation of both Federal and State Constitutions that you were sworn to protect in whole, not in the parts of your choice. Or did your oath mean nothing to the fine law abiding citizens of this fine state.