

Submitter:

Steven Poor

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

Senate Committee On Rules

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

SB243

Regarding Section 2, current background checks required by the federal government are sufficient, and this is a known fact. Technology has advanced to make these instant. There is no compelling reason to add time to wait, as it does nothing to enhance a background check. The current law is there to provide incentive to the state police to complete a check quickly. This would eliminate that incentive. The only discernible reason for requiring a wait is to inconvenience the purchaser. Waiting periods are not band aids for public servants failing to improve mental health support in this state. Stop trying to pretend it does. Countries where guns are pretty well illegal have significantly higher rates for suicide than the United States, which creates a problem for your assumption that gun control will stem suicide. As for wasting money on studies on the effectiveness of background checks, these studies are already out there. You might want to Google it.

Regarding Section 4, limiting the areas where state-approved concealed handgun license carriers only imposes criminal sanctions against legal possessors of handguns for not knowing a building is adjacent to property owned or leased by government agencies. This is a ludicrous move to further criminalize exercise of second amendment rights against a state-sanctioned subsection of public least likely to commit crimes. If you want to do something useful, target people already possessing guns illegally instead of creating a new swath of criminals out of law-abiding citizens. Forcing people to leave guns locked in vehicles to avoid breaking the law now creates a double-standard, where they are then held accountable for losing the gun to a thief aft a time that Oregon is wrestling with a spike in auto thefts. You forced them to leave the gun. Should you then be held accountable for every theft of a vehicle with a firearm in it? Further, allowing governments entities within Oregon to create their own rules further confuses what is now pretty clear-cut. The move here is obvious: you're trying to quell use of legal possession on firearms by the segment of public least likely to commit crimes.