

To: Senate Committee on Judiciary: Chair Prozanski, Vice-Chair Thatcher, Senators Broadman, Gelser Blouin, Manning Jr. and McLane,

From: Caleb Sale, Bonanza, OR

RE: Opposition To SB243

Honorable Chair Prozanski and members of the Committee on Judiciary,

I write to you today to voice my opposition to SB243, specifically in the -1 amendment filed 3/26/2025. I oppose this bill in all aspects and I hope you will take consideration of the written testimony provided by myself and many other Oregonians who also oppose.

I oppose each of the 4 separate sections of this bill, "Dealer purchase waiting period", "Rapid Fire Activators", "Firearm Age Restrictions" and "Public area restrictions" and will address each individually.

1. Dealer Purchase Waiting Period

The waiting period described in the -1 amendment does nothing more than delay the right of all Oregonians as recognized in the state constitution Article 1 section 27. Article on Section 1 establishes that the following are "Natural rights inherent in people" To deny by delay the rights of the people is odious to the state constitution and, as noted by the testimony in opposition available to be seen, to Oregonians.

2. Rapid Fire Activators

The change to current law enumerated in this section is, I believe, both out of step with federal restrictions on Machine guns, but also based purely in emotional "feel good" legislating. It is there to pacify the "do something" cries of those who feel that all firearms should be banned for the sake of safety. I oppose this section because it, like most other restrictions of firearm ownership, is merely trying to treat the symptoms of a morally degrading society. Someone willing to use a device as noted in this section to commit a crime, would have done so without it. Furthermore we have seen in the past few years that

as increased numbers of offenders are not held before trial but are let out on no bond there is no foothold here to make a safety argument.

3. Firearm age restrictions.

I oppose this change to Oregon law for a simple reason, a Natural right of fully fledged, voting eligible citizens would be denied. While the courts have argued that the right enumerated in Article 1 section 27 is not unlimited, creating a second class of citizen is contrary to everything that this state stands for.

4. Public area restrictions.

I oppose this change to Oregon law also. As a concealed handgun license holder, I am responsible for knowing where I am allowed to "bear arms in defense of [myself]". Removing the exemption from ORS 166.370 on a local, location by location basis makes the defense of oneself a dangerous proposition. Having to check each and every building I may encounter, and if bearing arms as a moral, upstanding citizen, father and husband, I am prohibited from entering this creates a situation where I may be forced to leave my firearm unattended in a vehicle, something I think we may agree on in all of this is that this is an unacceptable option. By disallowing the exemption of ORS 166.370 we are again denying the right of people to defend themselves, just because of their location.

I hope that this opposition is read in full and considered, along with the overwhelming majority of written testimony in opposition to this bill as the will of the people of Oregon to be left alone in their rights. Oregon has long been a state proud of its protection of individual liberty, why should this be any different?

Sincerely,

Caleb Sale

In a final remark, I am opposed to the procedure that has brought the -1 amendment to this bill a mere 24 hours before public hearing. This seems an underhanded attempt to fool voters and constituents into being unable to voice opposition for the bill as to be discussed in the hearing.