

To whom it may concern:


As a native Oregonian, I oppose HB4145 which is being called Measure 114 2.0 completely. As a former Democrat, I was never a firearms owner until Measure 114 narrowly passed in 2022 (and I question the validity of that measure passing). The moment Measure 114 initially passed by the narrowest of margins, convinced me to walk away from the Democratic Party for good and since that time, I'm a lawful firearms owner who went through the required background checks and have taken classes to further my skills to be a safe and competent firearms owner. I am now an NRA certified Basic Pistol and CCW Instructor. These restrictions appear to me that Democrats refuse to acknowledge the facts over emotional antigun groups and are trying to disarm everyday Oregonians while allowing actual criminals to victimize us.

With regards to this revised bill since it is basically a rehousing of Measure 114 and SB243:

- **Point 1: Criminals, not law-abiding gun owners, misuse these devices** – The overwhelming majority of gun owners do not use firearms for criminal activity. Restricting their sale, forcing prohibitive fees and limitations punishes responsible citizens rather than criminals who already ignore gun laws.
- **Point 2: Existing laws already prohibit machine guns and illegal modifications** – Fully automatic firearms have been heavily regulated under the National Firearms Act (NFA) since 1934. Possessing a Glock switch without proper licensing is already a felony.
- **Point 3: This bill criminalizes lawful ownership** – The vast majority of these devices are owned legally by gun enthusiasts, collectors, and competition shooters. Rather than targeting law-abiding citizens, enforcement should focus on illegal possession and use by criminals.
- **Point 4: Firearms are tools - they can be used for good or bad.** This bill takes away our Second Amendment rights by creating road block after road block for law abiding citizens to arm and defend themselves.

With Regards To Raising the Age

- **Point 1: 18-year-olds are legally adults with constitutional rights** – At 18, Americans can vote, enlist in the military, enter into contracts, and be tried as adults in court. Denying them their Second Amendment rights is inconsistent with other legal responsibilities. This is discriminatory which appears to be defacto SOP for Democrats these days.
- **Point 2: This unfairly targets law-abiding young adults** – Most 18-to-20-year-olds who legally purchase firearms do so for self-defense, hunting, or sport shooting, not crime. Arbitrarily raising the age only restricts responsible citizens. The statistics for the highest amount of gun violence with young adults occurs within the black community in larger urban areas via guns obtained **ILLEGALLY** - and the highest gun violence occurs in areas with the strictest gun laws. This is a statistical fact. (**See chart on next page**)



- According to statistics via the CPRC, data shows those areas with stricter gun control laws have **NEITHER FEWER GUN DEATHS or FEWER HOMICIDES AND SUICIDES** (reference - <https://crimeresearch.org/2018/03/states-stricter-gun-control-laws-fewer-gun-deaths-no-fewer-homicides-suicides-definitely-no/>).
- Point 3 Criminals don't follow age restrictions** – Those committing gun homicides are already breaking existing laws. Raising the age won't deter crime but will disarm young adults who may need a firearm for self-defense, **especially young women facing threats**.

Waiting Periods:

- Point 1: A permit to purchase and waiting period violates the right to self-defense** – Law-abiding citizens, **particularly women facing domestic violence threats**, should not be forced to wait for protection.
- Point 2: Suicide prevention requires mental health solutions, not delays on gun purchases** – Suicide is a mental health crisis, not a gun issue. Funding mental health services, crisis intervention, and outreach programs would be far more effective.
- Point 3: Waiting periods don't stop criminals** – Criminals don't legally purchase firearms. A waiting period only restricts those who follow the law, leaving them vulnerable in emergencies.

Allow Local Governments to Prohibit Guns on Municipal Property

- **Point 1: Gun-free zones do not stop criminals** – Violent criminals and mass shooters **IGNORE SIGNS AND LAWS**. Disarming law-abiding citizens only creates soft targets for bad actors. **94% of mass killings happen in Gun Free Zones (GFZ)**.
- **Point 2: Concealed carry permit holders are the most law-abiding citizens** – Studies show CCW holders are less likely to commit crimes than police officers. This bill **only disarms responsible citizens** while doing nothing to stop real threats.
- **Point 3: Self-defense rights shouldn't change based on location** – If a person is legally allowed to carry a firearm for self-defense in public, they should not be stripped of that right simply because they enter a government building.

In conclusion, these bills are in direct violation of the Second Amendment and do nothing to improve public safety but instead restrict law-abiding citizens' rights **while criminals remain unaffected**. Instead of imposing new gun control measures,

Oregon lawmakers should focus on:

- **Criminal accountability** – Enforce existing laws against violent criminals rather than creating new restrictions that impact responsible gun owners.
- **Mental health solutions** – Address suicide and violence through **mental health services**, not by restricting self-defense.
- **Protecting constitutional rights – The Second Amendment is a fundamental right** that should not be arbitrarily restricted based on location, age, or waiting periods.

State laws do not usurp federal law. Rational Lawmakers should reject these bills and instead focus on real solutions that enhance public safety while respecting constitutional rights.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Cliff Etzel