

Submitter: Tony Pokorny
On Behalf Of: Law abiding citizens and CHL's
Committee: House Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

Salutations House Committee on Rules

I strongly oppose SB 243. As indicated by another representative of Oregon, this bill will do nothing to stop or curve any crime. Another even mentioned of selling activators or keeping them in a safe, still making them a criminal, stated by a lawyer AND another representative of Oregon.

Oregon SB 243 unduly restricts the rights of law-abiding citizens to carry firearms for self-defense, infringing upon fundamental Second Amendment protections. The proposed prohibitions on carrying firearms in public spaces, including parks and certain government buildings, limit the ability of responsible gun owners to protect themselves and their families in everyday settings where threats can arise unexpectedly.

The broad scope of restricted areas and the burden of obtaining permits create unnecessary obstacles, particularly for rural residents or those with limited access to licensing offices. Restricting concealed carry in public demonstrations may also infringe on constitutional rights of assembly and expression, leaving citizens defenseless in potentially volatile situations. Additionally, the legislation may create confusion for lawful carriers, increasing the risk of inadvertent violations.

Moreover, there is limited evidence that restricting carry in the proposed areas reduces crime or improves public safety. Criminals are unlikely to comply with such laws, leaving only law-abiding citizens disarmed. The bill's state preemption clause removes local control, disregarding community-specific safety needs and preferences.

In sum, SB 243 prioritizes restrictive regulations over personal freedoms and effective self-defense, compromising individual safety and constitutional rights without providing a clear, proven benefit.

Lastly, hearing testimony, I could not get over one testimony in which I was made familiar with about CHL holder, a father, who was shot by police at a Eugene school where he was to pick up his kids as written in custody order. The school was well aware of the order but denied the father the kids due to "school policy". This incident was not a gun incident fully, as this father was denied custodial rights because a public school choose to rewrite court orders without any judge's approval, something that is commonly seen. I went through the same thing, just that I had no firearm, and

through my lawyer charged my ex with contempt of court successfully, and still the school refused to follow court orders. I would add to this incident, I did get the chance to see the body cam footage, and as I recall, the father's gun was still holstered when he was shot. What was presented of the incident had several differing stories as this was my neighborhood, knowing several folks with kids who went to that school.

In the end, this is a bad bill putting people at risk because this only targets CHL holders who are the least likely to commit crimes than any other social demographic, be they police, firefighters, or anyone else. More folks with CHL stop shooters more than police. That is a statistic fact. This committee, and legislative body, needs to hammer on criminals and stop criminalizing law abiding citizens.

Tony of Lincoln County