

Submitter:

Luis Zumaya

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

Senate Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

SB243

I am writing to express my strong opposition to Measure 114, a law that imposes excessive restrictions on law-abiding gun owners in Oregon. While I fully support efforts to reduce gun violence and ensure public safety, this measure places unconstitutional burdens on responsible citizens while failing to address the root causes of crime.

1. Violation of Constitutional Rights

Measure 114 infringes upon the Second Amendment rights of Oregonians by imposing arbitrary permit-to-purchase requirements. The U.S. Constitution affirms the right to keep and bear arms, and the Supreme Court has upheld that this right applies to individuals. By creating additional bureaucratic hurdles, this measure effectively limits lawful access to firearms without demonstrating a clear benefit to public safety.

2. Financial and Logistical Burdens on Law-Abiding Citizens

This measure requires individuals to complete a training course and obtain a permit before purchasing a firearm. However, it provides no clear funding or infrastructure for the permitting system. Many rural communities lack the resources to provide these courses, creating an unfair barrier for residents who wish to exercise their rights. Additionally, the permit process imposes extra costs on citizens, making self-defense an option only for those who can afford it.

3. No Proven Impact on Crime Reduction

There is little evidence to suggest that the restrictions imposed by Measure 114 will significantly reduce violent crime. Criminals, by definition, do not follow gun laws, and background checks are already in place for legal firearm purchases. Instead of targeting law-abiding citizens, we should focus on enforcing existing laws against violent offenders and strengthening mental health support systems.

4. Magazine Capacity Limits Put Law-Abiding Citizens at Risk

The measure's ban on magazines holding more than 10 rounds is an arbitrary restriction that could endanger citizens in self-defense situations. In real-life confrontations, especially those involving multiple attackers, a 10-round limit may not be sufficient. Law enforcement officers are not subject to this restriction,

acknowledging its impracticality in defensive scenarios. Oregon residents should have the same right to defend themselves effectively.