

Regarding SB 978

I am an average native Oregonian who has raised four children and currently have 9 grandchildren. I served as a City Counselor in Milwaukie for 6 years. I believe I speak for a majority of responsible law abiding citizens in Oregon.

With all due respect, this "Dash 1" amendment *is an outrageous affront to my constitutionally protected right to defend myself and my family!*

As a basic premise let's not forget that criminals by their nature follow no laws whatsoever! The worst thing we can possibly do it to make it impossible for law abiding citizens to defend themselves from this element.

If I read it correctly this amendment would require that your self-defense firearms be locked up.

Are you kidding me?! How are you supposed to defend yourself and your family from ever increasing crime in your own home if your defense is locked up?! This is beyond ridiculous!! I have to wonder what the real intent is here because on its face it is beyond moronic stupidity!

It also appears that under this bill you can be prosecuted even if you did lock up your guns with a cable lock if someone has "access" to a device to defeat the lock.

This is totally preposterous! Criminals always have the tools they need to steal anything.

It would hold gun owners responsible for two years for guns they "transferred" unless they could prove the transferred gun had a trigger or cable lock.

The insanity goes on and on! Exactly what would this accomplish? The lock would just be immediately removed by the new owner. How would this pointless bureaucracy be paid for? This is one of the most inane ideas I have ever heard of and is completely unenforceable!

Hold gun owners responsible for crimes committed with guns that were stolen from them.

On what possible ethical, moral, social or legal principle does this make any sense whatsoever?!

It's bad enough that you have been violated by a criminal but now you are responsible for their criminal's actions?

Allows cities, counties, metropolitan service districts, airports, schools, colleges and universities to ban CHL holders from "public buildings."

On what basis are you choosing to "discriminate against" law abiding citizens who have chosen to take the extra responsible step to get a license? Close to 1/2 million Oregonians have done the responsible thing in order to protect themselves and others. This is another egregious attack without merit. Available statistics show concealed carry saves many live and takes very few.

This amorphous language does NOT say buildings owned by those entities. It says "public buildings." As a potential consequence under this bill a school in John Day could forbid a law abiding citizen from carrying their firearm in a public building in Troutdale. This is antithetical to rational thought.

Ban CHL holders from airports. Not just the terminal. But the parking lots and grounds "adjacent" to parking lots.

What possible benefit could this create? The net result of this means simply going to pick up a relative or friend at the airport would subject you to going to being arrested and going to jail.

Gun free zones have proven that only criminals have guns in those areas and the law abiding citizens are made victims by design. This is the antithetical to rational thought!

With all the serious financial, traffic, infrastructure and other problems we have in Oregon why is time be wasted on something like this?! This whole thing should be scrapped and start addressing the real problems.

Sincerely,

Larry Lancaster

Larry Lancaster
10505 S.E 55th Avenue
Milwaukie, Oregon 97222
971-236-2810