

Submitter: David Tetrick
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure: SB348

I am writing to lodge my opposition to SB 348 in its entirety as currently amended. As a member of my Portland community and a father, I fully support the intention behind this bill- reducing gun violence in our state. However, this bill is unlikely to achieve that in any reasonable measure, and places profound burdens on hunters such as myself. I am willing to sign on to significant burdens to my ability to legally use firearms in pursuit of feeding my family, but only when those burdens stand a chance of actually achieving the goal of reduced gun violence.

First, the designation of the county sheriff as the agent in charge of my ability to purchase or own a firearm is insulting- why should this right be subject to the whim of any elected official? What reasonable standard would ever be applied by both the sheriff of Multnomah County and Grant County? We have an objective standard for firearms ownership already- felon status and mental health background. Are we really wanting to create a political test as well? Do you really believe that sheriffs will demonstrate a similar level of scrutiny toward all applicants, rather than significant bias against BIPOC citizens seeking to purchase a firearm?

If you want to pass a magazine restriction, just roll it out in a separate bill- this grab bag approach is insulting in its intent to confuse and obfuscate.

You know a great way to make us all less safe? Create a bunch of new concealed carry permit holders to make sure there are more firearms around in public, because that's the only training course currently in place to allow them to purchase a firearm- congratulations of making things measurably worse due to the firearms purchase rush over the last four months.

Raising age limits for some firearms makes a ton of sense, but not for semiautomatic shotguns commonly used for waterfowl or turkey hunting. Why are you punishing legal adults who just want to hunt birds?

Sound firearms policy starts with engaging citizens in the process of regulation, which is emphatically not what you're doing when you post a 64 page amendment on a Friday night and schedule a hearing for Monday evening. Stop trying to rush this process- you'll only get it wrong.