

Submitter: Randy Statton
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

Testimony

My name is Randy Statton, and I have been a resident of Oregon for approximately 24 years. When I moved to Oregon, I was pleased to be able to enjoy the freedoms and rights that were upheld at that time. However, in the last 24 years, I have witnessed these freedoms and rights vanish bit by bit in the name of public safety. What I find amazing is that the public safety will not be affected the by legislation passed. That is because of this legislation only affects those who are law abiding citizens. And this seems to almost be by design, targeting law abiding gun owners.

First, a redundant "Permit to Purchase" that currently has none of the certification classes available to obtain said permit. And a cost that that is a burden on lower income or fixed income people. A class that has to be administered by Law Enforcement that is already under staffed and under funded. We already have a background check mandated by law on every firearm purchase, on all FFL and Private party sales. This is just a waste of funds that could be used for better purposes- like homelessness, Veteran's service, etc.

Secondly- closing the 3 day "loophole" - honestly it is absurd that with today's technology a check take over 3 days. This arbitrarily gives the State the power to dole out our Constitutional Rights as it sees fit. This is not what was intended in the Bill Of Rights nor in recent Court decisions upholding said rights.

Lastly, the magazine "ban". Why would you want to restrict magazine capacity on law abiding gun owners? Criminals will obtain magazines they hold over 10 rounds from other sources, just like they obtain firearms without background checks. Also, most modern firearms come with magazines they hold over 10 rounds as standard capacity. Some handgun magazines can cost over \$50 each. The cost of replacing current legal magazines with mandated 10 round magazines is an excessive burden. Especially when there is no concrete proof that lower capacity magazines save lives. And the "Affirmative Defense" clause. That is basically a "guilty until proven innocent" clause that could result in a criminal record for items purchased legally. Is that what passes for Justice in America today? No. It isn't. And, saying that "We aren't taking your magazines" but stipulating that there might be criminal consequences, and that those magazines can only be used on your private property (as if everyone can go shooting in their back yard) or at designated shooting ranges (unless you are considering National Forest and BLM land as a designated shooting g range) is plainly an attempt to remove all benefits of ownership.

I am firmly against all provisions of 3075.

Thank you for your time.

Randy Statton