

Two general items that I would ask you to consider:

1) when I was a youth about 60 years ago, semi auto pistols, shotguns, and rifles were easy to obtain, and high capacity magazines were also available for many of them. However, essentially no one would have dreamed of committing mass attacks/murder with them. Mass murders only started to become common several decades later. The guns didn't change, people changed. If we are going to reduce mass murders we need to figure out how to change people back.

2) when Oregon became a "shall issue" state in 1989, many community leaders and politicians predicted that the streets would flow red with blood because more people would be carrying guns. In fact the opposite occurred, with crime and murder rates falling for nearly 30 years until the riots, reduced charges and minimal jail time for violent criminals, and policies to defund the police became prevalent in the past few years. Many community leaders and politicians refuse to acknowledge the realities of history, and seem to blame the lawful ownership of firearms.

One item specific to SB348 that others may not have brought up:

I completed an 80% receiver in compliance with state and federal regulations for my personal use and not resale. The reason for doing so was because I needed to update my legal. 40 year old pistol that did not come with an accessory rail. A rail is needed to mount a light on the pistol, and a light is a very good thing as I get older and can't see as well in the dark. The light allows me to be certain if I am facing a potentially lethal threat. I marked the new frame so I could identify it as mine if it was ever stolen. There is a good chance that other upstanding citizens have done the same, so I am asking that previous markings be allowed as a serial numbers if legislation is enacted to require them.

More to the specifics of SB348 which are likely to have been brought up by others

--Known felons and known gang members (some of whom haven't been convicted of felonies) account for 70-80% of all shootings and murders in Portland, so why doesn't the legislature provide more resources to prosecute them and require DAs to demand longer sentences. If gun thieves or straw purchasers actually had to serve 5 years for **each** gun they helped put in the hands of criminals, and if the criminals actually had to serve an extra 5 years for each crime committed with a firearm, it would be nearly impossible for crime not to drop significantly.

--Criminals often commit crimes in groups, and even individual criminals aren't likely to give up their high capacity magazines. So why does the legislature want to put law abiding citizens at a disadvantage with a 10 round limit?

--One state that saw a decrease in crime after it implemented a permit to purchase law has been cited as a major reason Oregon needs to do the same. However the entire country saw a similar drop in crime over the same time period due to demographic and economic changes, so the permit to purchase law really didn't help. This is an example of cherry picking one true fact rather than real science which includes relevant comparisons and replication to make sure the first change wasn't just a fluke.

--Currently, many people are waiting 2 months to pass a simple background check that the state had assured us would be "nearly instantaneous" with only rare exceptions that might take a few days. This certainly seems like an abuse of lawful gun ownership.

--Many of the supposed "ghost guns" are guns that have had the serial numbers filed off, which is already a federal crime. It is also a federal crime to create (3D print) a firearm without enough metal to trigger a metal detector. A huge number (probably the majority) of serialized guns are effectively "ghost guns" and can't be traced because they have been stolen or sold by straw purchasers (see first item in this section)? Others can't be traced because they never had a serial number to begin with (prior to the 1964 federal law) or they have been legally resold over the decades since the first sale. I certainly agree that no one wants criminals making guns, but why do some legislators practice such fear mongering?

-- Back before 1989, only the wealthy or politically well connected could carry a concealed firearm in public and crime levels were high. Now that law abiding people can get CHLs, it looks like the legislature wants to go pass legislation which would effectively take us back to the bad old days by allowing all sorts of entities to preclude previously lawful carry on their property (possibly excluding parking lots where car prowlers can steal guns that have been left in the car). I'm not sure that I've read about a case in which a CHL holder used their gun other than in self defense. Are there actually a significant number of cases where this has happened? Or is SB348 catering to the people who fear all guns, including those in the hands of good citizens?

Sincerely,  
Peter Krook  
SW Portland