

This bill has nothing to do with protecting anyone, as the proponents falsely claim. It's just another way for gun-grabbers to take guns away from law-abiding citizens.

There's no logical reason the definition of who is covered by a restraining order should be expanded to include anyone someone might have had sex with 30 years ago, such as an ex-spouse.

This definition is unrealistically broad. Anyone you ever had a sexual relationship with, or who claims to have had a sexual relationship with you, would be considered your "family member" and could request an order that forbids you from having firearms. This includes vindictive and bitter ex's.

Furthermore, the bill employs even more subterfuge by purposefully encouraging people not to contest the order. If a court issues a restraining order against you under current law, you have the option to contest it to attempt to "prove" your innocence. The problem is that under federal law, if you contest this order, and it's upheld, you'll lose your gun rights.

If you don't contest it, and the court hasn't ordered a gun prohibition, you'll not lose your gun rights. In other words, if you agree to comply with the order, no matter how false the accusations are, you may not automatically lose your gun rights.

Please recognize this atrocious bill for what it is: an unconstitutional attempt to deny law-abiding citizens from owning a gun. After all, criminals don't obey laws, do they!?

Thank you.
Bob Hawley
PO Box 45
Mt Angel, OR 97362