

Dear Representatives,

I am writing to voice a "no" opinion on SB 978, a bill which was much shorter and limited in scope until 44 or so pages of sweeping amendments was added to it.

This bill is written with far too much of a broad stroke; it attempts to do far too much in a single bill. Because of its broad strokes, it includes many items that will immediately promote lawsuits the very day it would pass should Oregon representatives be so short sided as to pass it. This bill contains items that are illegal and contrary to the Oregon constitution. These items will be litigated. It includes items that are against the U.S. Constitution, these items will be litigated. The stage for these litigations are already being set. I have noticed that the courts are increasingly standing up for Second Amendment rights.

Litigation costs the citizens of Oregon. We are better represented having our money spent on other things, such as medical care. I have noticed that the courts are increasingly standing up for Second Amendment rights. I suspect they will continue to swing this direction with the recent changes in the Supreme Court. If you want to legislate gun control, it is important to be more limited and specific.

Gun control bills statistically are shown to have little to no effect in terms of reducing violence, and in most cases, to have had any efficacy in preventing the very actions in the past that the bills are intended to prevent or which prompted the writing and passing of the bill. Feel good legislation is of little to no value and just punishes those who are law abiding and in many cases, the actual first responders.

One of the ironies about this bill is the limitations that it places on concealed hand gun carriers. Across the nation, concealed carry persons are shown to be one of or the most law abiding groups in existence. In addition, they are often the true first responders, the persons on the spot at the time that something bad is going to happen. There are many shootings that do not escalate into increased numbers of victims because of the presence of a CCW holder. Why are we attempting to limit these law-abiding citizens? It just doesn't make sense.

The reduction in magazine size has not been shown to have any efficacy in reducing crime. It does however, make it much more difficult for a person to defend themselves, especially against multiple attackers. I notice that recently, for the third time, the courts in California have denied the attempt there to limit magazine size. As in California, this law will be challenged in the court and ultimately taken to the Supreme Court. I would prefer seeing Oregon use its taxpayer's money more wisely than on litigating a law which is not known to have any affect on crime.

Another aspect of this bill that I suspect is not properly understood by our representatives is that these gun "control" laws fracture our citizenship between the urban and rural areas. We are seeing counties in Washington and elsewhere declaring themselves "2nd Amendment Sanctuaries," we can expect to see the same an more here in Oregon. I know many law abiding

citizens who are absolutely unwilling to see unconstitutional constraints placed upon their 2nd Amendment rights. These laws will further fracture Oregon's citizenry. In addition I would ask you to consider that the largest increasing demographic of gun owners are women and minorities. These people are voters. We've seen in the past how gun control legislation has completely turned about political power. I recommend you reconsider the onerousness of the controls you are proposing. Moreover, if you research and come to understand the origins of gun control, you will see that it is RACIST in origin. Please stop these attempts to deprive women and other minorities of their rights to self defense.

The number of bad things in this law would require as lengthy an exposition as the 44 pages of amendments that add them. This law like most gun "control" laws appears to be written by people who have no true understanding of guns, gun violence, violence in general, and what does and does not affect crime. I used to be this way until I under took a thorough research on the topic and ended up having to conclude something that I hadn't expected or liked: the Second Amendment is both important and necessary for a healthy nation whose government is by and for the people.

Sincerely,

Sidney St.Onge