

To: Oregon Senate Judiciary Committee

Subject: Citizen Comment on SB700, gun registration and universal background checks.

Submitted by John McDonnell of Salem Oregon, 8 April 2013

To the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee regarding SB700, I urge you to vote against and drop this bill. As written, this bill establishes gun registration in the state of Oregon under the guise of background checks to prevent unauthorized persons from possessing firearms. The term “**shall**” retain when referring to records indicates that the authors knew full well that they were creating a firearms registry. There is simply no reason to include firearm information when revealing if a person can legally own a firearm. If law enforcement feels that records should be kept, then these should only be records of an inquiry and then only if the person is determined to be ineligible to possess a firearm in Oregon. For purposes of search of a persons’ residence or person, the state can still use the existing system to find out if that person is eligible to possess a firearm. Again, registration and firearm information is not necessary, only the fact that the person is prohibited.

Some legislators are presenting opinion polls that indicate that up to 90% of Oregonians want universal background checks. However, there is nothing to indicate that these people also want gun registration. There is also nothing to show that the idea of gun registration was even presented as a question to the public. I suspect that this omission was purposeful and points to a case of misleading the citizens of Oregon.

Other problems with the bill include lack of any way to possess a firearm a short period of time. It’s common to borrow a friends’ shotgun or rifle for a hunting trip or to test fire it. This law would now make these types of use illegal. Other examples include test firing a gun prior to purchase, use at a shooting range where the range rents out guns, or sighting in a friends’ rifle.

The bill also takes away the private individuals ability to complete a possession transfer in the event that the system is down. FFLs are afforded this protection but not the individual. We know that the system has gone down frequently or could also be taken down as any computer system can.

This law is over reaching and infringes upon the rights of law abiding citizens while providing absolutely no increase in public safety. I urge that you defeat this nonsense.

Regards,
John McDonnell
Salem Oregon