

Dear House Committee on Judiciary,

Please reject this damaging and clearly unconstitutional proposal and ensure that it doesn't make it out of Committee. The complete disregard for the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens displayed by the authors of this amendment and the proponents of Measure 114 just astounding.

SB 348-1 is an outrageous end run around the judicial system – a near carbon copy of the duplicitous and misleading Measure 114, which passed by a bare majority of votes – and then only because it was sold to the voters under false pretenses - just like Measure 110.

The fact that this 64-page amendment was proposed at the last minute, through the subversive gutting-and-stuffing of a formerly innocuous bill purporting to study the “unlawful use of firearms,” is an egregious affront, as is the continuing abuse of the “emergency clause”. Given the time constraints on this amendment, it is clear the Legislature cares little about what The People actually think, and functions merely to placate their chosen interest groups.

This amendment, along with Measure 114 throw up procedural roadblocks that can be manipulated by the state administration to prevent law abiding Oregonians from purchasing firearms. This is the precise reason that Measure 114 is in court at this moment. How is it that we are going to be required to apply for a permit to exercise our constitutional right to self-defense? Are we required to apply for a permit to exercise our right of free speech? Of religion? Of course not! The exorbitant cost of the permit itself could present a barrier to entry to those who need the protection of a firearm the most. Measure 114 clearly was not ready for implementation when it was passed and the chaos it created appeared to be deliberate. Given the general ineptitude of Oregon state leadership, it's doubtful that SB 348-1 will have a different outcome. Oregon already has a robust background check system. What more do we really need?

This amendment purports to “promote the public health and safety of the residents of this state.” Where is the evidence of this? Most of the folks testifying in support are from the northwest part of the state - Portland. They have an irrational fear of those firearms to begin with, so the only answer for them is to ban firearms completely, which Measure 114 – and this amendment - lays the groundwork to do. If these supporters feel so strongly, why don't they advocate for local firearms bans, and leave the rest of us alone?

I would ask the supporters of this measure – do they think that criminals will bother to apply for a permit prior to procuring a firearm? Do they realize that the largest suicide demographic - white rural males – likely already have access to a firearm? As someone who has experienced suicide in their immediate family, I will tell you that a person does not need a gun to die by suicide. In a state that seemingly embraces death – through abortion, “physician assisted suicide,” and lax drug enforcement policy, it seems ironic that this proposal would be styled as a way to reduce deaths in Oregon.

SB 348 softens some of the more burdensome provisions of Measure 114, such blocking permit application records from public disclosure; however, anyone with a modicum common sense does not trust that this information won't be obtained by those who wish ill intent towards gun owners. Sorry folks – the original intent was clear and the cat's already out of the bag. This amendment will create a defacto gun registry, which will - intentionally or unintentionally - be used to “doxx” law abiding gun owners.

A major provision of Measure 114 and this amendment – the “large capacity” magazine ban - is clearly unconstitutional. Similar bans implemented by other states are being overturned as I’m writing this. Why are you wasting resources trying to implement this? Even more outrageous, this ban is proposed to be retroactive to December 2022, making criminals out of those who surmised – apparently incorrectly - that they could continue to purchase magazines of more than 10 rounds legally subsequent to that date, since Measure 114 was under injunction pending a court ruling. Beyond that, the “large capacity” magazine ban places law abiding Oregonians at high risk for prosecution for using items that they lawfully own. Yes, technically there is a “grandfather” provision, but the restrictions placed on those legally owned items are so onerous that it would be very easy to make a costly mistake.

Dangerous criminals are being turned out of our jails and prisons, and our street are flooded with the mentally ill and drug addicted, which further endangers the population. So in response, you continue to make it more difficult for law-abiding citizens to exercise their Second Amendment right to self-protection? This bill, coupled with the many others currently on the docket in this Legislative session make it clear that our state’s political class wants the law abiding disarmed and unable to protect themselves from the real crime epidemic in this state. “Death by a thousand cuts,” that’s for sure.

SB 348, if it does become law will be immediately challenged and likely overturned – at great expense to Oregon taxpayers. Does this effort represent responsible governance? I think not.

Enforce laws that are already on the books. Punish criminals and those who provide guns to them. Increase resources for suicide prevention and firearms safety training. Gun crime is not caused by guns, but by the **people** that use them unlawfully. That’s where the focus should be.

Thank you.

Keith LaHaie

Central Point