

I'm a gun owner but I am in favor of stronger background checks, revoking gun ownership rights for convicted domestic abusers, violent felons, and severe mental health conditions. I recognize that gun deaths take as many lives in the U.S. as traffic accidents, but IMHO this bill is flawed.

Here's why I think this bill is flawed:

* Section 2/3/b - says that you are not in control of a firearm if there is a minor in the house or if any window or door is not closed and locked. These are unreasonable conditions. If I open a window for airflow that is 10 feet off the ground (as I do in the summer) that does not make me lose control of articles in my home.

* Section 3/1/a through 3/1/b/A should only apply if there is a reasonable expectation that convicted violent felons or domestic abusers will be present. Keeping firearms available for home defense is notably diminished if obstacles are put in the way of accessing those firearms. Since Oregon is an open carry state one could always walk around the house with a gun on your hip, but that seems more less safe to me.

* Section 3/3, 4/3, and 5/3 holding a previous owner criminally liable for someone else's use of a firearm for two years after the transfer is irrational.

I do not have an objection to the goals of this bill, but I oppose the bill as written for the above reasons.

Sincerely;
Michael Kemp
michael@kempclan.com
541 654-3444