

Submitter: Colby Sager
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

Good afternoon,

Here we are again, having to oppose yet another tyrannical and oppressive house bill proposed by Oregon legislators. I would like to express my disapproval of this house bill, and have listed my grievances below. There is an exhaustive list of things I disagree with in this bill. As a native Oregonian and law-abiding gun-owner with NO CRIMINAL HISTORY, I want to exercise my 2nd Amendment right without paying extra fees, additional waiting periods/background checks and severely altered firearms for the sake of "public safety." None of the things listed below contribute to public safety.

1) Imposing a 72-hour waiting period. This is absolutely reprehensible. Why on earth should I, or any other Oregonian, have to wait an additional 72-hours after my background check clears to take possession of a firearm? I already have to wait for a background check to be cleared. Key word - cleared. If I pass my background check, I should be allowed to take possession of the firearm immediately. I've been approved to. At what point with this cycle end? If the background check isn't sufficient, who's to say the 3-day waiting period is? Will legislators continue to add on additional days until we have to wait months, years, indefinitely to possess our firearms that we've been approved to own?

2) Banning a wide range of firearm accessories. Another absolutely appalling proposal. One that must have been made by someone who is either uneducated in firearms or has a personal bias against them. How can legislators take away my right to modify my firearm to be able to comfortably use it, that does not affect the lethality of the firearm? They are accessories which one, make the firearm more comfortable to use and two, make the firearm safer to shoot. Whether it be grips, hand guards, muzzle devices, etc., the firearm is not made any more lethal with them.

3. Perhaps the worst of the proposed changes is requiring Oregonians to be 21 to purchase a firearm. Not only is this unconstitutional, it does not follow in the history and tradition of the United States. Men (and now women) ages 17-45 are, and have always been considered military aged, and eligible to serve in the federal armed forces and militias, dating back to the Revolutionary War. Even with no formal weapons training, a 17 year old was able to bear arms and fight for the United States. How can legislators justify taking away 2nd Amendment rights of young Oregonians who are able to bear arms for their country, but not for themselves? I served in the Air Force at 18 years old, and was entrusted with safeguarding millions of dollars of

Department of Defense equipment, and the lives of over 10,000 servicemembers and their families on my Air Force installation. I carried a loaded handgun every day at work, and frequently carried a rifle too. As soon as I went on leave however, I was no longer able to one, purchase a handgun (even the one I carried in the military) and two, wasn't able to carry my handgun for self defense. Any reasonable person can see the hypocrisy in that.

I am disappointed in Oregon legislators for proposing such egregious ideas to limit the rights of Oregonians. I hope that my testimony can offer some additional insight to why these proposals are counter-productive to firearm ownership and downright oppressive to those in our beautiful state. These proposals do nothing but negatively affect law abiding gun owners in Oregon.

Thank you,

Colby