

June 13, 2025

Chair Bowman, Vice-Chairs Drazen and Pham, and Members of the Committee,

My name is Michael Smith. I am a resident of Multnomah County, a Precinct Committee Person and former Vice-Chair of the Multnomah Democrats. I write on behalf of myself and Kelie McWilliams, a resident of Polk County, where she serves as PCP and former Vice-Chair of the Polk County Democrats. For identification purposes only, we serve as officers of the DPO Gun Owners Caucus. We offer this testimony in opposition to Senate Bill 243.

We appreciate the intent of this bill, and also that this iteration is much improved from the previous, more broad omnibus bill. Nonetheless, serious concerns remain about this bill as written.

Firstly, we recognize that gun owners of all political affiliations feel deeply skeptical of this bill—for varying reasons—many of which we find are reasonable concerns. We feel that it is often the case that the legislators who know the least about guns feel the most strongly about enacting gun control measures that brush against established precedent (or would actually violate) the Second Amendment. We've endeavored to serve as a bridge between state and county Democratic parties and gun owners, to open dialogue and support scientifically valid policy proposals. Because of this, we've spent years developing and annotating a library of research on the topic. It is our strong belief that work needs to be done to build bipartisan and public support for evidence-based policies.

For example, we've heard from gun owners that they're concerned about vague definitions resulting in the overzealous prosecution of responsible, law abiding gun owners. We've also heard of concerns around exceptions for law enforcement officers. Even if one accepts that law enforcement agencies and officers have a *bona fide* reason to own firearms and accessories not available to civilians, it makes little sense to allow law enforcement agencies to own, for example, a bump stock, when law enforcement agencies already have the privilege of keeping machine guns. If this exception is meant to

ensure that law enforcement can collect evidence and/or provide training, then that should be specified.

Finally, we wish to address the -B13 Amendment which would enact the magazine restriction from Measure 114. We oppose this amendment on three grounds.

1. The best available evidence ([Rand Corporation, "The Effects of Bans on the Sale of Assault Weapons and High-Capacity Magazines"](#)) is that the effectiveness of a magazine ban in preventing deaths or injuries is limited or questionable.
2. The US Supreme Court is signaling that a review of magazine restrictions may come soon, which would make defending a magazine ban in Oregon a substantial drain of money and Attorney General's attention, time, and resources.
3. As with many other laws, we believe this will be used, even inadvertently, as an additional means to prosecute and incarcerate communities of color, limiting their access to Constitutionally protected self defense in a way not typically experienced by those of us who are white.

We urge the Committee to reject the -B13 Amendment.

Sincerely,

Michael Smith, PCP HD 46

Kelie McWilliams, PCP HD 22