

RE: SB 978 Testimony

Dear Senators,

I strongly oppose and I urge you to vote no on SB 978 and its amendment(s), if passed would make Oregon a more dangerous and discriminating place to live and visit. My first question is how does a bill start as a simple study and then with a 44-page amendment turn into one of the most draconian pieces of legislation?

As one of the approximately quarter million Oregon CHL holders, I'm appalled by this proposed legislation. At a time when police agencies are undermanned and having a hard time hiring, SB 978-Amendment 1 wants to restrict the places CHL holders can carry concealed in some of the most vulnerable locations where protection is needed the most.

Now, also consider other proposed language in this amendment for restricted areas and securing a firearm then put it into a scenario of a CHL permit holder, which statistically are more law abiding than police. Let's think about the following:

A CHL holder wants to go and visit a "public building," like their kids' school that has decided to ban CHL holders. Under this proposed amendment, a CHL would need to unarm, secure the firearm in a lockable container in their vehicle, all while trying not to bring attention to themselves in the front seat of their vehicle, parked off of the property owned by the banning jurisdiction. Then, while inside the "public building," praying and hoping that no one commits a crime and breaks into their vehicle and steals their firearm. This puts the CHL holder in a unique situation, while trying to comply with the proposed law, they are now liable for the actions of the criminal who stole their firearm and how they intend to use it in the future. When we all know, the safest place for the CHL holder's firearm is in its holster. Now, take this proposed legislation and apply it to something almost all Oregonian's have and apply this to stolen motor vehicles. Would you hold the owners of stolen motor vehicles to the same criminal liability standards?

Another concerning piece of this amendment is how it proposes to legalize discrimination in the State of Oregon, contrary to federal law. Why would you want to take away the rights of young adults? In my opinion, it is obvious that if "all" young adults can't handle the responsibility of a long gun, then they "all" are not responsible enough to handle making other decisions that affect others until the age of 21. So, amendment 2 of SB 978 should be added to raise the minimum age

requirements of voters in Oregon to the age of 21, as well requiring extensive training to handle, secure, and transfer this very important document that can affect the lives of all Oregonians, their mail-in ballots. Now, how could restricting access to one thing be unconstitutional and the other not?

The other concerning issue, is why this age discrimination would now be retro-active, allowing retailers who have violated current Oregon law a pardon for their previous discriminating actions.

I find it very concerning why anyone would want their name associated with any form of legislation that would hamstring your most law-abiding citizens, make Oregonians more vulnerable to crime and would allow for any kind of discrimination, Oregon is better than that. And as such, I strongly urge you to vote no on SB-978 and any of its amendments.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'W. Kennedy', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Walter Kennedy
Banks, OR 97106