

I am submitting this testimony to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in opposition to the adoption of SB 348, as follows:

1. This bill is discriminatory, in that the \$150.00 cost of the proposed permit, plus any cost attributable to the required training to obtain the permit, is well beyond the ability of many to pay. In other words, only those of means will be able to exercise their 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights to owning a firearm under the proposed law. Those whose financial condition is not conducive to paying these amounts in order to own a firearm, are often those who need personal self defense the most, since the same financial condition often requires them and their family to live in areas where crime is more prevalent.
2. This bill will do nothing to reduce crime, since the criminals rarely go through the legal process to obtain a gun. Criminals are not looking to have a traceable firearm with which to commit their crimes, so they obtain them through less than legal means. The only thing that will reduce crimes in which guns are involved is to enforce the laws that are on the books, stop looking to make legal and responsible gun owners the criminals, and look to give more teeth to the laws where guns are involved in the crimes. If there is no consequences to the criminal, there is no deterrent to committing the crimes.
3. Increasing the age to 21 in order to own a firearm will do little to nothing to decrease gun violence and crime. Again, criminals are not concerned with obtaining firearms legally, since they don't necessarily intend to use the gun in a legal manner. Young adults of the age of 18 are required to register for the military draft, to serve our Country and put down their lives for our Country, but this Bill proposes making them a criminal if they should own a firearm. Those of the age of 18 or 19 that legally own a gun today, would instantly become a criminal for owning the same gun if this Bill becomes law, without anything that grandfathers in their right to the firearm. It is being proposed that 16 year olds be allowed to vote, which indicates some faith in their judgement, while this Bill

suggests that at the age of 18 there is a lack of judgment, although they are fit for military service.

4. If this Bill is intended to reduce the violence of suicide or other moments of mental fragility, I don't know how that would occur. If someone is committed to causing harm to themselves or others during an episode of mental anguish, they will find a way to find the means to do so, no matter what the laws dictate. Oregon has a dismal reputation when it comes to assisting the mentally ill and more effort should be directed toward assisting the mentally ill toward mental health, instead of depriving legal and responsible firearms owners their 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights.
5. By limiting the capacity of firearm magazines, as proposed by this bill, many of the most sought after firearms for self-protection, as well as hunting and recreation, which are produced to only operate with a magazine capacity of 10 rounds or more. This would appear to be a violation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights of Oregon citizens, by eliminating the ability of Oregon citizens to choose the most appropriate firearm for their needs.

I urge the Committee to stop SB348 at this hearing and to listen more closely to all the people of the State of Oregon.

Roy R. White  
Oregon Senate District 12