From:	Dustin Fancher
To:	DeJong Annola
Subject:	Testimony - Gun Control Bills
Date:	Monday, April 08, 2013 1:12:09 PM

Dear Oregon Senators and Representatives,

I strongly urge you to oppose any further gun control laws. Oregonians time and time again have proven they are law abiding and responsible gun owners, and we have enjoyed a fair amount of gun freedom in our state with little issue.

Some of the most comprehensive numbers on firearms come not from law enforcement, but medical examiners. In 2010 for example, the Oregon Health Authority vital statistics report shows 458 Oregonians died by firearm. The vast majority were suicides, 59 were homicides and 14 were due to the actions of law enforcement agents on the job. - OPB.org

Regarding SB 347:

I do not understand the logic of this bill. I have not heard of any school violence, or any violence anywhere (except for a few rare cases) that have involved a CHL holder as the perpetrator, and not just with a firearm, but any crime whatsoever. Again, criminals will not obey the current or additionally proposed laws. Having to retrieve a personal protection tool from a safe defeats the purpose of how the tool was designed to work. This could be better understood if those who are proposing the laws were proficient in the use of firearms themselves. The proposals are a solution to a problem that does not exist, and seems to reflect that those who proposed them simply do not like guns, carry, or gun ownership. It is perfectly okay for people to not be fond of guns. I have some extended family who feel the same way. However, "how one feels" should not be involved in the law making process.

Regarding SB 699:

Again, this bill looks for a problem where one simply does not exist. I highly resent that I could potentially be criminalized and become a felon by, for example, my shirt becoming momentarily scrunched, falling down, or using a public restroom which could potentially partially, momentarily, accidently, and innocently reveal my carry pistol. Though situations like these would not be optimal (and do not happen to me, as I am not accident proned), I do not feel it warrants criminalization. Please do not call me a "law abiding citizen", speak of protection of rights, and keeping crime at bay, while at the same time potentially causing an arbitrary situation to make me a felon. Is this bill also essentially saying that because I have a carry permit that I am now not allowed to open carry if I wish? That seems upside down considering I do not need any qualifications to open carry except that I am not a criminal and an American citizen. Again, this bill seems to be based on "feelings". Because some people who may not be used to being around a firearm might feel uneasy in its presence does not mean the person carrying it is breaking any laws, acting violent, or wreckless. The fact is when rally goers went to the capitol they were perfectly well behaved. The police reported no incidents. I choose to concealed carry for the very reason that I do not wish for people around me to be uneasy, nervous, or weary, and I believe most who "concealed" carry may do so for the very same

reason. Something to consider.

Regarding SB 700:

What lawful private transfers are resulting in firearms falling into the hands of criminals? Most transfers happen between close friends and family members already, and I believe most Americans are mindful about who they are giving a firearm to. These bills suggest that most of us are not capable of tying our own shoes, metaphorically speaking. A person transferring to a criminal likely already knows exactly what they're doing and would not go to an FFL to "legally" transfer a firearm, or an illegal firearm to an illegal recipient. Neither do the dirty cops in Chicago who are doing this as we speak, or criminals to criminals. Again, this is addressing a problem that doesn't exist. Criminals don't follow laws. The only way to enforce a universal background check system is through registration, and that is going too far. I strongly oppose registration. You do not need to know what I legally and rightfully own. This still would not allow you to know what criminals own since they will not be registering their firearms.

Regarding SB 796:

The range requirements are arbitrary and reflect no real life situation. Again, it seems to be made up by those who have no experience with firearms or knowledge of self defense training or tactical training. Because of this, there's also no thought about handgun capacity, type, or caliber. All of which can operate differently and can be ideal for different carry types, styles, and scenarios. Again, this looks for a problem where there is none, and complicates the process of getting a CHL.

Regarding mental health"

I believe that background checks can include only previous and officially documented mental health cases of individuals, and only cases that directly affect one's ability to be safe with firearm. I do not agree with people being required to have a mental health exam before being able to purchase a firearm (since it seems that nowadays people can be diagnosed with just about anything for any reason). Secondly, from what I've heard from friends and family members in law enforcement is that the government's mental health care system has been doing a poor job. When clearly unstable people are brought in for examination by my cousin who is a police officer and then released later only to find that the next day, next week, or next month, that person committed suicide (which are most of our state's gun deaths) seems to reflect an already apparent lack which needs improvement. In the example about my cousin, the issue was a lack of removing an identifiably unstable person in society. This issue really doesn't have anything to do with keeping criminals from initially obtaining firearms.

I appreciate your attention to my email. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dustin Fancher

Previous resident of Jackson County. Current resident of Washington County