

May 11, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

RE: SJR 4

I write in support of eliminating mandatory retirement for judges based upon age. Webster defines discrimination as "to make a difference in treatment on the basis of other than personal merit." Frankly, I am quite insulted by discrimination in any form, in this case, age discrimination. To assume ineptitude or a disconnection to social issues based upon age is a travesty of justice.

I am a life-long Oregonian. May 5th, 2015 was my 95th birthday. My service to this great state was as an elementary teacher in Dallas Oregon. While I retired at 62, at the request of several principals and teachers I continued to regularly substitute until the age of 79. I fully retired in 1999 to care for my husband who passed away three years ago. I continue to live independently in my home, travel extensively, read prolifically, tend my fruit and vegetable gardens and provide service to my church and community.

Since 1976 I have provided financial accounting for my church. Additionally I am fully responsible for the Rickreall Grange and Monmouth Gleaners financial records. The latter two organizations require accounting to the state as non-profits which I have done faithfully and accurately for many years.

Defining an arbitrary age for release of service in any employment is officious and a terrible social injustice. For heavens' sake, what puts a judge in Oregon outside ORS 659A.030(1)(a)-(b):

Oregon state law makes it unlawful for Oregon employers to "discriminate against {an} individual in compensation or in terms, conditions or privileges of employment" or "refuse to hire or employ {an} individual or to bar or discharge {an} individual from employment" because of an individual's age.

As an educator, active community member, great grandmother and Oregonian, I urge you to present this matter before the people of our progressive state. In advance, thank you for your consideration.

Jane Lorraine Landes
745 East Clay Street
Monmouth, Oregon 97361