My name is Christopher Wade and I strongly oppose any expansion of Oregon's failed background check system.

State money and resources would be better served in education (giving poor, gang member potentials other options), treating the mentally ill/unstable, and enforcement of laws currently already on the books. This bill is useless and efforts could be made in other areas to have a much greater effect. Focus on education to give our urban youth an outlet aside from the gang life. Focus on mental health and expanding services for those suffering from depression.

If this bill was in effect 5+ years ago, it would have done nothing to prevent the (media hyped and emotionally charged) tragic events that have plagued us (Jared Michael Padgett & Jacob Tyler Roberts). Both of those individuals stole the locked away guns from family members or friends that bought them legitimately. What could have prevented those tragedies?? State sponsored services, available to those individuals to counsel them and assist them in getting the help they need. Then, maybe it never would have happened and **Cindy Ann Yuille, Steven Forsyth,** and **Emilio Hoffman** would all still be with us today. None of the recent tragedies that have rocked our state would have been prevented if this potential law would have been in effect years ago. When felons are denied firearms they are NOT held accountable, so nothing in this legislation has any impact on them at all.

This bill also won't stop gangs from getting guns. That's why gangs have systems set up for straw purchases, which is already illegal. It still doesn't stop them. This bill won't stop them either, especially since the bill now goes to permissive reporting of failed checks. Criminals don't follow the law. By passing this bill, you're punishing the law abiding and making it more difficult for the poor, living in those gang ridden neighborhoods, to get access to the protection opportunities they deserve.

This proposed law is not enforceable and only inconveniences the law abiding citizens. It will do nothing to prevent criminals getting access to guns. To Sen Floyd Prozanski's own admission, there are 180 denials per month out of 21000. That's 0.8%. What he doesn't mention is none of the 180 were ever prosecuted and determined legitimate denials. **Oddly, the senate didn't pass one of the only merits in SB941, the mandatory reporting of denials and failed background checks** so that we could attempt to get felons, attempting to commit another felony by purchasing a gun, off the streets. That makes an already poor bill even less effective and **proof that the supporters and sponsors of this bill don't care about stopping crime or offenders!** If you support the bill in this form, it shows you don't either. Law enforcement officials don't even think this law would be effective in removing firearms from those that shouldn't have them.

If you insist on continued support of this flawed bill, ensure **an exemption is written in for current Concealed Handgun License holders.** All CHL holders must undergo a background check every 4 years and given anything that would show up on a NICS check results in the revocation of the CHL. Therefore, they would meet the intent of the law currently being proposed. Most transfers could take place in minutes instead of hours, save thousands of dollars of your constituents' money, and provide the safety and security the legislature is seeking. Don't mistake me: **I still oppose this measure in its entirety** as it will accomplish nothing and our resources are better served as I mention above.

The background check system, NICS, doesn't work. Any denied background check's are not even currently followed up upon by the police. It is relying upon a system (NICS) that is flawed. Due to the 10th Amendment of the US Constitution, the federal government cannot mandate participation in NICS. That has allowed 22 of the 50 states to only supply the system with 100 records (as of Nov. 30, 2013) [http://www.fixnics.org/factinfo.cfm]. Half of those submitted 10 or less! So, we're going to rely upon this

check system that only checks records based upon half of the country?!?! Per Sen. Dembrow's words, "I believe that the issue of criminal background checks is one over which there is broad consensus, or let's say broader consensus,... In my experience if there's anything that a lot of people can agree on, it's keeping guns out of the hands of criminals with a good background check system." The system is far from "good" and this law would do nothing to make the background check system any better because it relies upon incomplete data. Any denied background check's are not currently followed up upon by the police. I know it's gotten better over the past year, and hopefully will continue the trend, of police actually following up on attempted purchasers of firearms that get denied. Last numbers I heard that of the 19,000 transfers, there were 190 denials that happen in a given month considering all firearm sales in the state, only about a dozen actually were followed up upon by law enforcement. Of those dozen, only 3-4 were actual felons or otherwise ineligible to purchase a firearm, given current laws. Resources for law enforcement are already tight, I understand that. But, denials are ineffective unless the anomaly (of a person getting denied) is investigated further.
[https://news.yahoo.com/oregon-focus-effort-expand-background-checks-guns-154828650--finance.html and http://www.oregonlive.com/mapes/index.ssf/2014/03/expanded_gun_background_checks.html]

Please, vote this down and make an impact by doing the right thing with mental services and education. Do the right thing and represent your constituents accordingly by voting this proposed legislation down!
All this does is set up a registry for law abiding citizens. If that is your intention, it is unconstitutional and it will be challenged in court, further costing the state money; money that will be better spent in education and mental health services.

I recently underwent a background check for an out of state transfer. It took almost 2 hours! It will be a major inconvenience (not to mention the loss of time, money, and resources) for **law-abiding** citizens to have to undergo such governmental scrutiny every time an individual wants to transfer personal property to extremely little potential benefit. This requirement of undergoing a background check for every transfer is fixing a problem that does not exist. Also, it has no effect on safety, security, or criminals because by their very nature, they won't follow the law anyway! If I must do a background check on an individual I am selling my personal property to, and that person is denied, what safety coverage would I have for my own personal protection, being in the close proximity with a potentially unstable/non-law abiding individual that is just getting the news that I can't give him what he wants? This law could potentially ENDANGER my life!

Thank you,

Christopher Wade
Portland, OR