From:	Dean Ferguson
To:	DeJong Annola
Cc:	Sen Prozanski; Sen Prozanski; Sen Prozanski; Sen Prozanski; Sen Prozanski; Sen Johnson; Rep Boone
Subject:	Senate Committee on Judiciary - Comments for Session on Friday, April 5, 2013
Date:	Tuesday, April 02, 2013 8:00:54 AM

Honorable 2013 Senate Judiciary Committee Members,

I would like to submit the following comments to the Senate Committee on Judiciary scheduled for Friday, April 5, 2013

Comments on SB 347

This bill would ban licensed concealed carry on school property. This means school buildings and the *grounds adjacen*t to school buildings. It would "allow" a school district to adopt a policy permitting licensed carry *or* allow persons with CHL's to store their guns in a safe or vault that the school controls.

I strongly urge you to drop consideration of this bill due to the following points:

- In the *very* unlikely event that a school provided gun safes, a person would be required to handle a gun that would otherwise not be touched at all. CHL holders carry firearms as defensive tools. Having the school lock them up renders them pointless.

- This bill would have no affect on the tragic shootings that have occurred this past year. The properties already had a ban on guns. I believe our legislator's time would better be spent crafting laws that would actually lead to lower gun violence rather than paying lip service - which is all this bill would do.

Comments on SB 699

As drafted, this would ban those with CHL's from the Capitol Building if in possession of a firearm.

I strongly urge you to drop consideration of this bill due to the following points:

- Since this has historically been how CHL holders (including many legislators) have carried their firearms this is an entirely unneeded change. But it's also a problem. If a license holder's firearm became visible at any point, that person could be charged with a FELONY. There is simply no need for this legislation and it puts gun owners at great risk. What does "completely concealed from view" even mean? Does this mean if a handgun prints through an outer garment, you become a felon**?**

Comments on SB 700

This bill outlaws most private transfers. The original bill allows transfers between:

(A) The person's spouse;
(B) The person's parent;
(C) The person's child;
(D) The person's sibling;
(E) The person's grandparent;
(F) The person's grandchild; or
(G) The spouse of a person specified in subparagraphs (B) to (F)
of this paragraph.

I strongly urge you to drop consideration of this bill due to the following points:

- So you can give a gun to your son, but not your step-daughter. You may give a gun to your wife, but not your girlfriend. You may sell a gun to your son-in-law but not your nephew. However you may give a gun to your wife, who may give it to her sister, who may give it to her husband who can give it to his son. (Your nephew.) You may not give a gun to your domestic partner.

- While the law says that if you purchase from a gun dealer and you are "delayed" you *may* take possession of the firearm *without* state approval after three days have elapsed. There are **no** similar protections for non-dealer transfers. The State Police can delay a private transfer *forever*.

- As you may know, the Oregon State Police ID unit routinely fails to complete background checks for dealers in a timely fashion. Gun buyers are left waiting sometimes months to complete a transfer. This bill would force the failed system on virtually all *transfers*. And when the "system" is down, you are simply out of luck. Sellers would be required to have state issued forms before a transfer could take place.

Comments on SB 796

Range Requirements - This bill creates a baffling collection of shooting requirements to get a CHL. It changes the requirements for legal resident aliens to apply for a CHL. The shooting requirements are totally arbitrary and bear no resemblance to any real life situation.

I strongly urge you to drop consideration of this bill due to the following points:

- It will vastly increase the cost and complexity of getting and keeping a CHL. As with the other four bills, there has been no reason shown for why this bill is needed as its supporters have been unable to provide any examples that would demonstrate that current license holders have been any kind of problem. It would *not* apply to people who just chose to carry openly.

Clifton D. Ferguson
37733 Highway 30
Astoria, OR
503-325-8474