

**From:** William Carter  
**To:** [SJUD Exhibits](#)  
**Subject:** Testimony in regard to SB 797  
**Date:** Friday, April 14, 2017 7:10:04 PM

---

ORS 166.412 Section 1) 3 b & c - I would rather see the current language retained rather than creating an open-ended means for the department to leave a purchaser without the means to complete a transfer. The department needs to have a set period in which to complete their check.

The proposed language presumes that the purchaser is "guilty" and not qualified to receive a firearm rather than the presumption of innocence.

The -3 amendment dated 4/14/2017 gives too much authority to the department's rules writing people. Having worked with the Oregon Dept of Revenue and having been involved in writing administrative rules to carry out some of their statutes I know rules can be written in such a way as to change the intent of the original law unless the law is written in a very precise manner. The original language is better. If the department does not respond the transfer goes through.

I would suggest that you retain the original language of Section 1) 7 (a) and change the word may to shall in the original bill page 3 line 20. All these reports and notifications added to the departments already overburdened staff increases the need for more staff when there is little need and budgets are tight. We should be making it easier rather more difficult for them to do their jobs.

Felons that are intent on possessing firearms are not going to be deterred by these laws. The law abiding citizens are the only ones affected by these restrictions. Your desire to keep firearms away from criminals is admirable but criminals do not obey the law.

The Oregon Senate rather than restricting responsible firearm ownership should be encouraging firearm education and ownership.

Bill Carter  
Lebanon, Or