

Submitter: Erik Wright
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure: SB348

Dear Legislators,

Im unsure what you're trying to accomplish here with this bill. By essentially making a clone of 114 with small, insignifocant changes, this is likely to just waste time and get injuncted as 114 was.

Measure 114 passed by a slim margin. I would argue that now that the full implications of that bill are more well known, that voter support is far lesa than 50%. These are the voters that represent your districts. It is an overall unfavorable infringement on god given and constitutionally protected rights. A constitution that in its current form you swore an oath to protect.

If you want to enact real change, change that benefits everyone, then turn your focus to enforcing the laws on the books. Reduced crime makes people feel safer. People that feel their local government keep them safe dont buy firearms. At the very least they purchase fewer firearms. By adding these new rules, and not enforcing them like the state opts to with many already on the books, you achieve nothing. Perhaps even causing a negative effect by fueling panic buying like measure 114 did.

As with measure 114, i dont see why conducting a background every 5 years, then repeating the same background every purchase will yield different results than the current system of a background check at the time of each purchase. Thats right, its currently a law that EVERY firearm transaction, public or private (with the exceptions still allowed in this bill based on inheritance etc.) conducted in Oregon has to have a background check and be done at an FFL.

Please quit wasting time on this feelgood legislation that will not result in any actual change. Focus your efforts on improving the quality of life of Oregonians. And I humbly request you make these efforts in ethical and constitutional manners, not just trying to appease corporate donors with agendas. Last i read the constitution, it begins with "We the people, in order to create a more perfect union....". Emphasis on "we the people", not "we the consumers".

In closing "to create more perfect union" is there to encourage us to come together. To do what is best for the whole, and fulfill the will of the whole, not to drive people further apart. Adding legislation, rules, policies, etc. that exclude people or erode their rights, does neither.

Thank you for your time,

Erik Wright

Parent, public servant, law abiding reasonable firearm owner