

Submitter: Patrick Iler
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure: SB348

I am strongly opposed to SB 348.

Why was the amendment to this bill presented so late in the Session?

Was it in an effort to reduce or eliminate debate and prevent those who might oppose the bill adequate time to review the bill and present effective testimony against the bill?

Why wasn't a representative of the Oregon Firearms Federation, who represents legal firearm owners all over the state allowed to provide testimony at the 1 pm hearing today?

Is it an obvious effort to silence opposition?

Why would proponents offer a bill that is clearly unconstitutional on so many fronts?

Do they truly believe their flawed agenda to disarm our citizenry will accomplish their stated goals?

Don't the proponents of this bill see that the constitutionality of the majority of provisions is already being challenged in courts not only in Oregon but throughout the country?

I would note that the proponents and supporters of SB 348 like to talk about the reasonableness of the bill, and that they are common sense measures to curb gun violence. However, you could apply the same logic and arguments to any right found in the U.S. and Oregon Constitutions. If that were allowed to happen, we could effectively limit or eliminate any right enumerated in either Constitution in the name of reasonableness and common sense. Before this statement is discounted as hyperbole, it should be acknowledged that entities are at this moment attempting to eliminate some or all of our rights as currently ratified in U.S. Constitution in the name of "reasonableness and common sense."

Proponents argue that "in theory" preventing law abiding citizens from exercising their right to bear arms will reduce or prevent gun crime. They say "in theory" because no evidence exists that the bill would prevent or reduce gun crime. Preventing a legal adult from legally exercising any right enshrined in the U.S. Constitution would require a much higher bar than simply "in theory"

The proponent's arguments are based on emotion and fear instead of truth and facts. Without exception the proponent's testimony is based on their fears of what might happen, not what is happening, and they are presenting data and testimony that is misleading, incorrect, fabricated, or meaningless assumptions. All you and the other Committee members have to do is investigate the points made in the proponent's testimony to discover this for yourselves.

If SB 348 were to pass, it will be challenged and found unconstitutional. As a taxpayer, I find it abhorrent that if passed, the state will inevitably spend huge amounts of money to defend a bill that is indefensible and will ultimately be found unconstitutional. There are many higher priority issues to invest time and resources on rather than a ridiculous bill like this which will have absolutely no effect on the issues it purports to address and that is almost criminal.

Representatives, I believe you to be intelligent persons. And in being so you already know the points above are valid. Prior the hearing I viewed some of the on-line testimony submitted on OLIS. In my review of the testimony, I discovered that as of this afternoon there are 11 in support and 848 in opposition of SB 348. Which means the submitted testimony in opposition is 98.7% more than the testimony in support. So based on submitted testimony to date 98.7% more Oregonians oppose SB 348 than support it. Please do not disregard the will of those you and the Committee represent and please uphold your oath to protect both the Oregon Constitution and U.S. Constitution.

I strongly urge you to reject this foolish and contemptable bill and invest our state's finite resources into more productive areas and needs. Thank you for your time.

Patrick Iler
Central Point