

To Whom it May Concern:

I am opposed to SB 941 on the grounds that it will not prevent firearms from landing in the hands of those who are prohibited from ownership and will be a waste of taxpayer money to implement. I have personally witnessed the ineffectiveness of the background checks at a great inconvenience to myself.

On March 14, 2014 I legally purchased a handgun from a dealer and had it transferred to a FFL dealer in Keizer, OR. When I submitted to a background check, the serial number to the gun came back as stolen. The Keizer police were dispatched and they confiscated the "stolen" gun until its rightful owner could be located.

It turns out that the handgun was stolen from a residence in Kansas City, KS in 1990. It was recovered by the Lenexa, KS police department in 1992 and was placed in an evidence locker. At some point, it was issued to a Lenexa police officer as a backup gun. Upon his retirement, he surrendered the gun to the PD and it was sold to an FFL in Kansas as a part of an auction in 2013. The FFL sold the gun via auction to another FFL in late 2013 and I purchased the gun via auction a few months later.

That a handgun can be stolen, recovered by the police, sit in an evidence locker for years, be issued to an officer, be returned, and sold to two licensed FFL dealers, and ultimately sold to an unwitting consumer (me) is beyond ludicrous. It perfectly illustrates the ineffectiveness of checks and any semblance of gun registration. Fortunately, the FFL I purchased the gun from refunded 100% of my money (\$700).

I am a three year resident of Oregon. Prior to my moving here, I was a resident of the state of Iowa. They utilize a system that I believe is effective and would serve all parties in Oregon well.

Iowa utilizes a permit to purchase and/or carry firearms. At the county level, those desiring to purchase firearms apply for a permit and undergo the same NICS background check that we use today in Oregon. Once an applicant is approved (10-15 minute wait at the counter) he/she is issued a permit card with photo ID and thumb print. Finger printing is done on site and retained. The permit is valid for one year and is \$10. The ID is presented at point of purchase and there is no subsequent background check required. Should one desire a permit to carry concealed, the same process is used and the permit is \$50 and valid for 5 years.

The benefit of this process is that the state could simply pass one law: sale of firearms outside of immediate family requires proof of permit. Consumers could simply provide valid copies of same and forgo the background check on every transaction. Federal Form 4473 which must be completed in FFL transfers has a provisional space for this permit number.

If the focus of proposed legislation is to ensure firearms are transferred only to those who can legally own them, the method I have proposed above is the most effective and least invasive option for the state, consumers, and firearms businesses.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Ford McMurtry
Salem, OR 97304

Sent from my iPhone