

Submitter: Benjamin Juhl  
On Behalf Of:  
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary  
Measure: SB348

Dear Committee Members,

I'm not much involved in these processes, but I heard about the amendment to SB 348 which is dated 3/24 (Friday, two days ago as of the date of me writing this comment, and apparently submitted late), for which the public hearing is tomorrow. Just looking at word counts, the original bill has 227 words. The amendment has 21,687 words!! This is something like a 10,000% increase! Back to the timing, I'm sure you know how it appears to those of us looking on from the outside, but I will go ahead and say it anyway: Submitting such a huge amendment this late in the game, giving only a few days for review and testimony, appears to be a FULLY INTENTIONAL action to limit comment. And that, of course, signals that you must have some idea how much opposition you would get to this as currently written. Listen, I try to maintain some faith in the system. But when I find about things like this, and look at the actual bill and amendment and find out the actual case is even worse than it sounded at first, that faith goes out the window. If it IS a good idea (and I do hope at least Prozanski or SOMEONE out there actually thinks so), then why the trickery with the timing? If you couldn't get the amendment done earlier, then delay the public hearing. Or have a second one. But as it is, this appears to be an intentional act to limit public knowledge as much as possible, and game the system rather than do the actual job of finding consensus and making sure all are represented.

And has Prozanski heard about Gregory Robinson and Christopher Alexander, who allegedly drove down from Portland and attempted to break into a home in the 400 block of S 51st PL in Springfield? (reported by KATU on March 17, 2023.) This is a person who lives in HIS DISTRICT!! Fortunately, I would say, the victim was also armed and the robbery was prevented. From what I see in the bill, Prozanski would have that resident armed only with guns that are poor self-defense options, and this real situation might have gone the other way.

Back to the bill, I oppose the large increase in fees, the introduction of new terms into gun law without defining them, and of course the magazine restrictions that render many common guns much less appropriate for self-defense.

And I ESPECIALLY oppose the provisions to prosecute anyone who purchased a standard magazine since December 8, 2022. It is currently legal to do so, but this is written to make it RETROACTIVELY ILLEGAL, \*and\* to prosecute? That's just plain old revenge, or so it sounds to me. Not a great look for someone who strives "to

represent interests of the entire district" (Prozanski, according to his gov website intro).

I also find it amusing that the amendment requires "The maintenance of a procedure to correct errors in the criminal records of the department;" (paragraph 10.b in Sections 6, 12 & 17)-- when so many errors on voter registration rolls have been found over the last several years, that have been used fraudulently, despite already-existing requirements to correct those types of errors.