Submitter: E. D. Searcy

On Behalf Of: California Funded Lobby Groups in Oregon

Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

## NO on SB 243-1

California billionaire Michael Bloomberg allegedly is funding gun lobby groups to come to Oregon so they can tell WE THE PEOPLE how to run our state. Who is in bed with these people?? I vehemently oppose SB 243.

## FACTS:

- Criminals, not law-abiding gun owners, misuse these devices The overwhelming majority of gun owners do not use bump stocks or other devices for criminal activity. Restricting their sale punishes responsible citizens rather than criminals who already ignore gun laws.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 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. HB 2002 (2024) allows for 10 year-olds getting abortions and making gender identity choices but they cannot own a gun at 18???
- 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. A 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.
- 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. 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.

- 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).
- 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.
- 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.

## CONCLUSION

These bills do not improve public safety but instead restrict law-abiding citizens' rights

while criminals remain unaffected. Instead of imposing new gun control measures, Oregon

should focus on:

- 1) Criminal accountability Enforce existing laws against violent criminals rather than creating new restrictions that impact responsible gun owners.
- 2) Mental health solutions Address suicide and violence through mental health services,

not by restricting self-defense.

3) Protecting constitutional rights – The Second Amendment is a fundamental right that

should not be arbitrarily restricted based on location, age, or waiting periods. Lawmakers should reject these bills and instead focus on real solutions that enhance public safety while respecting constitutional rights.