

Senators,

My name is Melody Adams, I have been an Oregonian since 2004. I am also a strong supporter of individual rights and freedoms that this country was founded upon. One of the most important rights we have as citizens is our right to defend and protect ourselves as guaranteed by our 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment. This amendment has survived this long because it is just, it is right, and it is NECESSARY. Those of us who have exercised that right over the years by purchasing firearms, going to the range to practice, hunting, or sport shooting have done so with care, and caution because we understand how important it is to be responsible firearm owners. We are the ones that will be punished by this bill, not the criminals who by definition do not care what laws you pass.

I oppose passage of SB 348 on the simple basis that it is being done so while the Measure (Measure 114), upon which language of this bill is based is currently being challenged in court. To bring this bill forward in this manner is justifying a few elected individuals who want to bypass the legal system to get what they want. This is not only unamerican it is unconstitutional. The introduction of this bill is a demonstration that a few individuals in our government are being unduly influenced by a single special interest group.

I have read the Measure and I have read this bill and its amendment, have all of you!!!!

How can a bill be presented that BACK DATES portions of when the bill would be effective? Measure 114 is being challenged and did not take effect on December 8, 2022, therefore it is not reasonable to measure any effective date against that date. This doesn't even follow basic laws. This could, by default, criminalize someone who acted according to the law post- December 2022 but is now suddenly in violation.

I also oppose SB 348 because the courts across the country have been very clear about the constitutionality of a state government trying to restrict the rights of US citizens that are protected by our constitution. This bill is poorly written, unconstitutional and has many flaws, such as:

- The training required under this plan to just apply for a permit doesn't exist, a process to review and approve a training program (or trainers) doesn't exist, so by default no citizen could even apply for a permit to purchase. This is in direct violation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment which states cannot supersede or deny.
- SEC 4(1)(b)(E) Gives a permit agent the power to form an opinion of an applicants mental or psychological state that could allow that permit agent to reject the applicant's application for a permit. The bill is completely silent as to the qualifications this permit agent must have in order to assess an applicant's mental state. What tools, resources, information will that agent use for this assessment? This is not only unreasonable, but also dangerous. What prevents that permit agent from making a decision based on personal bias that could affect that applicant for future applications or expose them to other legal troubles. Being in the LEDS is, by association, a black mark on someone's name. There is simply nothing in the bill covers the training, expertise, or qualifications for the permit agents. This language wasn't acceptable for Measure 114 and it certainly isn't acceptable for SB 348.
- SEC 4(1)(d) requires the permit agent to enter the applicant into a Law Enforcement Data system which is where criminals and crime related information is stored. The LEDS was not

intended to house data on citizens who have not committed a crime. This is not an acceptable use for the purpose of tracking applicants and indirectly tarnishes the applicants by association.

- SEC 4(1)(e) allows the permit agent can reject an application under SEC 4(1)(b)(E) based on “...objective facts and information known by, or records available to, the permit agent to establish a pattern of behavior involving unlawful violence or threats of unlawful violence sufficient to clearly establish that the applicant has ben or is reasonably likely to be a danger to self or others.” This entire section is giving a tremendous amount of power to an individual in a position that has yet to be defined. Does this allow the permit agent to scour a person’s social media? And what qualifications are required for this permit agent to be able to establish patterns of behavior?
- If a person as never owned a firearm and wishes to apply for a permit they cannot do so because they cannot complete the firearms safety training on a rented gun. This rule will prohibit any new firearm owner.
- SEC 5(4) The release of liability to the agency and their employees is by default a recipe for abuse. There is nothing stopping an agent from imposing personal views during the process of performing their duty as an agent. It is unclear why this section was added to the bill.

Passage of this bill as amended would be a gross violation of constitutional rights and an insult to our laws. Do not allow this to be considered.