

**From:** [Peter Furseth](#)  
**To:** [SJUD Exhibits](#)  
**Subject:** LC38  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 14, 2020 4:45:35 PM

---

The locking of firearms to disable them has unintended consequences. It is unclear what is meant by under the control and could be interpreted in a way that would prevent that weapon from being used to defend one's home. I was under the impression that the locking of weapons making them unavailable for self defense was thrown out by the **Supreme Court in District of Columbia vs Heller**. Why are you putting my life and my families life in danger to prevent an imagined problem to prevent gun violence.

This locking rule also prevents gun buyers from testing guns in a gun store or FFL place of business. It is totally absurd if a gun buyer cannot test the bolt on a bolt action rifle or the trigger on any gun to determine if it fits their needs or even functions correctly.

The "gun room" is also subject to interpretation. Are you going to have the Oregon Health Authority determine what is considered a qualifying lock for the room. Does my locked house count?

Every "Whereas" that I read are overly simplified and exaggerated statements aimed at making gun ownership more difficult and does nothing to improve gun safety or gun violence.

I am opposed to having any more rights taken away from law abiding gun owners. We are not the problem. Look elsewhere to prevent gun violence.

Sincerely;

Peter Furseth

St Helens, OR