

**From:** [Linda Houlihan](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** explanatory statement" for the voter's guide for IP 17, now ballot measure 114  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 5:54:43 AM

---

I just read the statement for this ballot measure 114.

A total deception, miss leading information, untruthful statements.....

This measure is UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

The 2nd Amendment of the Constitution of the united States of America is very clear...

"A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be INFRINGED. "

Definition

INFRINGED: broken; violated; transgresses. ( webster: 1828 )

Makes it very clear We the People have the right to own guns of any type with out government interference, regulation, statue, code or unlawful law. PERIOD!!

Clearly NO goverment body, legislature, elected or appointed official, goverment agency ( including police, sheriff, FBI, etc), person or group have the AUTHORITY to infringe, regulate, or interfere in any way with this RIGHT.

2nd Amendment is We The People's so called permit, licence or any other name you make up to call it. Without anyone's so called permission or interference especially the government inc.

You took an oath of office ( the constitution requires) to uphold the constitution. That includes protecting the rights of We the People to bear Arms.

Not allowing a clearly UNCONSTITUTIONAL measure on the ballot is your job We the People have authorized you to do.

You also, have an obligation to inform We the People of these facts above anywhere this measure is published, including but not limited to the voters pamphlet, news media, websites, videos, etc.

Anything less is , unacceptable, a betrayal of your oath of office and could be considered treason.

I am sure the Supreme Court would agree.

To top it all off many statements made in your discription are half truths, very miss leading, or down right lies. Deceiving the voter. Unacceptable.

L. Houlihan

**From:** [Ronald Wilmot](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** P 17, the gun and magazine ban initiative  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 10:01:35 AM

---

Dear Elections Committee

I as a Gun owner for nearly 50 years; it appears this purposed Gun initiative is clearly more designed to make it as nearly impossible for any upstanding Lower Class Citizens; especially in our Rual areas to fully complete the process or Red Tape; let alone all the exuberant costs involved.

Making a Public or published List of Permit seekers / Gun Owners could very well endanger the lives of those potential Gun owners / Permit Seekers from violent angry Ex-relationships who really may want to physically harm them; which may have been the reason for needing self protection, as many times Law Enforcement is not able to get there in time.

The Published List is a Bad purposed Law. Even you someday may need to acquire valid needed self protection in a relatively short reasonable time period & if on a Published Waiting List could potentially spur on an enemy of yours to act more quickly than you could going through & doing all the Red Tape & by means of the so called legal way. That is not reasonable & frankly Insane.

I have owned numerous guns of all Calipers & Magazines & never have I misused those weapons in an unlawful manor. There are Millions & Millions of U.S. American Citizens who love the 2nd Amendment & with it there is a whole lot of Tradition of Fathers & Sons, Grandfathers & Grandsons working together to teach & instruct our own how to rightly/ appropriately handle a gun.

By these new training courses you strip good families of hundreds of years of Traditions of learning how to handle & shoot by a Father or

Grandad. That's another bad idea as we already have a plethora of good Gun Ranges & Training Facilities all around Oregon & I bet that type of real training would cost way less than what this new Bill / Law purposed. This too is Insanity.

I'll cut this short, but I just may send some other reasonable objections

Thank you!

Please really think; is this going to make things safer or do more harm than good. Just think about it in regards to your family

Sent from Ron's iPhone

Ron Wilmot  
Canyonville, Oregon

**From:** [Nicholas Chase](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** Measure 114 explanatory statement comment  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 12:23:19 PM

---

The explanatory statement is seriously flawed.

The statement refused to acknowledge that most modern shotguns will be banned under this measure. That is NOT speculation.

The statement falsely claims that the database of gun permit applicants is exempt from public disclosure. That must not be allowed to remain in the statement.

The statement ignores the lack of training facilities or people qualified to provide the training. This is a critical element of the measure.

The statement misleads voters about the live fire requirements.

The statement ignores the complete lack of funding for this expensive measure.

The statement fails to clarify many mandates that will be created later by the Oregon State Police without public input.

Nicholas Chase

**From:** [charlie rouse](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** IP 17  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 1:17:38 PM

---

Dear SOS,  
I have the following concerns about IP 17

The explanatory statement is seriously flawed.

The statement refused to acknowledge that most modern shotguns will be banned under this measure. That is NOT speculation.

The statement falsely claims that the database of gun permit applicants is exempt from public disclosure. That must not be allowed to remain in the statement.

The statement ignores the lack of training facilities or people qualified to provide the training. This is a critical element of the measure.

The statement misleads voters about the live fire requirements.

The statement ignores the complete lack of funding for this expensive measure.

The statement fails to clarify many mandates that will be created later by the Oregon State Police without public input.

Sincerely,  
Charles Rouse

**From:** [Ryan Lund](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** IRR 401 explanatory statement comment  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 1:39:39 PM

---

I am writing without the benefit of access to the committee's draft because it isn't published on the SOS website. However, I listened to the full meeting of the explanatory statement committee.

As this committee and the financial impact and racial/ethnic impact committees noted, this measure is written in such a way that its ultimate impact can't be summarized or explained except as speculation. The explanatory statement **MUST** make this clear. The impact on persons within the state is indirect: it would change the basis on which future legislative and court decisions will be decided. The explanatory statement can't just say it's an "aspirational statement." You have to help people see that, if the measure passes, the legislature would make laws and point to this measure as justification. The executive branch would make policy and point to this measure as justification. The courts would make decisions and point to this measure as justification. You can leave it to arguments for/against to speculate what all of those decisions might be, but the explanatory statement has to explain that this is how the measure would work.

Ryan Lund  
Gresham

**From:** [Matt Dapkus](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** IP 17 Racial and Ethnic Impact Statement  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 1:51:26 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

There's no question that the passage of IP 17 will have the greatest impact on low-income communities of all ages, ethnicities, and abilities. The reality is that the licensing requirements will essentially end firearm sales in Oregon, at least temporarily, which leaves vulnerable populations unable to secure proper defensive tools for their homes and persons at a time when crime, including violent crime, has and is skyrocketing in Oregon. There is no plan or funding provision in the measure's text regarding how or where certified trainers and facilities will be established, and there are no limits set regarding the initial or escalation costs for the training even if and when it becomes available.

Additionally, the measure's text requires "live-fire" training as part of the licensing process, so those who do not already have access to an appropriate firearm will find themselves unable to complete the training requirements and will therefore be excluded from ever owning a firearm of any kind. These types of short-sighted, uninformed, and "open-ended" measures, if passed, always have the greatest impact on vulnerable populations such as the poor, elderly, and disabled in which minorities often find themselves disproportionately included.

Thank you,  
Matt Dapkus, Registered Oregon Democrat

**From:** [Jack Nuttall](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** Ballot Measure 114 Explanatory Statement - Comment  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 2:08:33 PM

---

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my deep concern over the potentially misleading explanatory statement for Measure 114 that has been drafted by the committee.

1) In the section titled "Currently", the statement misleadingly states that no permit is required to purchase at this time; this is disingenuous and ignores SB 941 which mandates background checks for all private firearms sales, outside close family. The background check administered through ATF form 4473 is essentially a permit, as it includes similar questions that would be asked on Measure 114's application. This section should be changed to avoid the voter thinking there are currently no background checks or screening questions prior to purchasing a firearm.

2) Section "Under Measure" item 3 fails to state the fact that determination for fitness to purchase a firearm may be determined exclusively by police and certified shooting instructors (a dangerous precedent). This has profound impacts for many communities of color, refugees and others, who historically have been traumatized by law enforcement. This fact should be highlighted to allow voters full knowledge that they are giving police extra powers. Additionally Form ATF 4473 already determines if a buyer is a danger to themselves or others.

3) Section "Under Measure" item 5 ignores the fact that FOIR from media and others could reveal all gun buyers in the state, leading to doxing, and increased threats of violence in some communities - particularly among those communities of color experiencing increased levels of violence in recent years.

4) Section "Under Measure" item 6 implies that the decision to charge a transfer as a felony is given exclusively to DAs. This again should be expressly called out, and could lead to equity issues, civil rights infringements and discrimination if not applied universally under law.

5) Section "Under Measure" item 8 bans the transfer of many current collectable weapons with an internal magazine capacity greater than 10 round, including a .22LR semi-auto "Nylon 66" rifle that I possess. This must be highlighted.

This measure should correctly be labeled as follows:

1) Measure 114 establishes licensing for, and a database of, current gun purchasers - this database is publicly searchable. 2) Bans the purchase and transfer of magazines holding over 10 rounds, along with current rifles and shotguns with an internal capacity greater than that. 3) Establishes exclusive and arbitrary police and certified firearm instructor control over the educational and training requirements to purchase a firearm.

Thank you,

Jack Nuttall  
Portland, OR



**From:** [Cody Smith](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** Ballot measure 114  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 2:36:51 PM

---

The explanatory statement is seriously flawed.

The statement refused to acknowledge that most modern shotguns will be banned under this measure. That is NOT speculation.

The statement falsely claims that the database of gun permit applicants is exempt from public disclosure. That must not be allowed to remain in the statement.

The statement ignores the lack of training facilities or people qualified to provide the training. This is a critical element of the measure.

The statement misleads voters about the live fire requirements.

The statement ignores the complete lack of funding for this expensive measure.

The statement fails to clarify many mandates that will be created later by the Oregon State Police without public input.

Cody Smith

Hillsboro OR

---

**From:** [Ryan Lund](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** Comment on IP17 explanatory statement  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 4:23:55 PM

---

I watched the entire explanatory statement committee discussion live. In order to do right by the voters and all Oregonians, please commit to representing both the present process and proposed process accurately.

Some tricks that have already made your task more difficult:

-- Combining two petitions into one measure. In fact, there are three separate issues: the permitting process, the searchable database of permit transactions and permit-based firearm transfers, and the magazine capacity ban. The people who combined these knew full well that it would cloud the facts of each matter.

-- Cutting off discussion of valid concerns about the explanatory statement. Saying there isn't space allowed to cover it. Saying there isn't time allowed to discuss it. Saying there isn't a way to explain it. And so on. These tactics will continue in the next discussion if you allow them.

It's important to cover the proposed process impact accurately and not assume voters will get this information from arguments for/against.

I suggest explaining the measure in three parts of process impact: 1) how is the proposed permit process different from the existing background check process, 2) how is the proposed searchable database different from the existing record keeping process, 3) what are the proposed restrictions on ammunition capacity and what are the exclusions/exceptions. This is organized first by subject, then it contrasts present vs proposed for that subject.

Where the specifics are to be clarified through rule making, please state it.

Please think of what misunderstandings a reader might have about the \*impact of the proposed measure on the citizen's process of obtaining and keeping firearms, and the state's process of handling noncriminal data and criminal allegations\* and ensure the explanatory statement disallows those misunderstandings. For example, someone could easily be misled by the very first sentence of the draft into thinking there isn't a background check presently.

This is difficult but can be done if the committee comes already understanding the facts, ready to engage in discussion in good faith, and ready to stand up against deflection tactics.

Ryan Lund  
Gresham

**From:** [Diana Aldridge](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** IP 17  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 4:45:44 PM

---

To all elected officials. The new permit gun laws are grossly unfair. It takes away the rights of the law abiding citizen, and makes it easier for the non-law abiding citizen to procure illegal weapons to use in an illegal way. All the while the law abiding citizens are not able to procure a gun for protection or for sport. The large magazine argument is crazy, it only would take one bullet to kill a person, if you know how to aim. The illegal gun owner wants to be able to kill one but usually does not know how to aim. Again he is an illegal gun owner therefore has not gone through any training. So the large magazine argument is moot as he is illegal he can get the large magazine. Bottom line: strengthen our laws by keeping crooks in jail, give our police the weapons and tools they need to arrest these crooks. No, we do not need larger jails. If they are in a crowded jail and do not like it, maybe they should choose another line of **legal work**. Please all the elected officials and their family members think this through. Think about your constituents, they want to be left free to choose. Not treated as if they are the crooks.

--

Diana Aldridge  
Stumbling blocks, or stepping stones. Depends on how you use them.  
Unknown

---



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

**From:** [W.K](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** IP17 explanatory statement objection  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 5:16:39 PM

---

To whom it may concern,

The explanatory statement for this ballot measure is flawed and misleading. The statement fails to address major issues with this proposed legislation and ignores major financial impacts of the bill. Voters must be made aware of the major impacts this bill would have on personal privacy, state budget, and training requirements.

**From:** [Randy Antonson-](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** IP 17 total bull  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 5:57:56 PM

---

I just hope the fraud is exposed and fails.

Randy antonson, Tigard

**From:** [Frank L](#)  
**To:** [SOS Elections \\* SOS](#)  
**Subject:** IP 17 / ballot measure 114  
**Date:** Saturday, July 30, 2022 6:58:12 PM

---

Enough is enough, I will not stand for the corruption of the 2nd Amendment , my rights and others are not to be voted on nor infringed.

Frank L