

Dear Senator,

I'm wiring you today as the father of 2 young school-aged children, a corporate security consultant specializing in workplace violence, and the son of a retired special agent for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. I have lived my life saturated in firearm law & crime usage for most of my 40 year life, and today I must express my opposition and disgust at SB978. With every part of it.

Since I know you're busy and pressed for time, I'll keep my remarks short and only mention the two most egregious parts of the law, however, I am opposed to the entire bill.

The most pressing travesty of this bill is the section which allows for cities and govt agencies to prohibit concealed carriers from carrying in certain public places. Not only is this a blatant contradiction to the states preemption law, but there is NO justification for this section, other than a personal deep-seated hatred for firearms and firearm owners. This is purely a vindictive and evil proposition that I can absolutely not tolerate. You and I both know that citizens who go through the additional steps and background checks are some of the most rigorously vetted people in the entire state, and in the last 30 years, there has only been 1 incident in Oregon involving malicious intent with a CHL holder. That does not justify this legislation, and I demand that this motion not move further on in the legislative process. When I became a parent, I also took on the most important role a parent has- that of the protector. I have a duty to protect my children and family from danger from all directions. Part of how I do that is by carrying a firearm every day, everywhere I go. I will not be deprived of that right or ability. Should the state suffer a moment of insanity and cause this to become law, our first move will be to pull our kids out of the public school system and homeschool. Our next move, will be to leave the state. This proposition is so ludicrous, the only explanation for its inclusion is a vindictive, personal hatred of firearms and the ability for one to take charge of their own protection.

On August 23rd, 2005, Hurricane Katrina hit Louisiana, causing one of the worst natural disasters the United States had seen in Decades. Overnight, thousands of people lost everything they had or had ever known. I was living in Dallas, Texas at the time and saw the effects first hand. A month following the hurricane, I was at a gas station in Fort Worth, filling up my car for a weekend trip to my farm. While getting gas, I was the almost the victim of an armed robbery, by a refugee from New Orleans who had lost everything in the storm, and was frustrated that no one was giving him any handouts. But I refused to be a victim, and drew my firearm, which I had just started carrying. The confrontation was ended immediately without a shot being fired or anyone getting injured. As a side note, there were 3 Ft Worth Police officers next door having lunch. Had I not been carrying my firearm and the situation declined further, their response would have been too late.

Those who choose to go through the vetting process to legally carry a concealed firearm for protection are NOT the problem in the state, and I will not tolerate my ability to effectively protect my family with a firearm be diminished by the personal whims of a lawmaker.

The other section that I take the most issue with is the section dealing with "untraceable and undetectable" firearms. Remember, as the son of a retired ATF agent with 35 years (and who has also served as Chief of Staff of ATF), I know quite a bit about firearms law and the effectiveness of these laws. First of all, even if a firearm could be 3-D printed, it would never be completely undetectable to a metal detector or other security means. The ammunition, firing pin, and other components must always contain metal, otherwise a single shot would either result in the firearm not firing or a catastrophic misfire. Regarding unserialized 80% firearms, these are well within federal law and have been for

decades. Not only would banning unserialized firearms be a violation of the 2nd Amendment of the US Constitution, but also a violation of the 1st Amendment as well, as I am well within my right to make my own firearms at home, for personal use, never to be sold.

I said I would keep my remarks short, and while they may have run a little long, I thank you for your attention in taking my remarks into consideration on this bill, along with thousands of other Oregonians. The fact is, the majority of Oregonians are extremely opposed to this and all other gun control bills. Having studied the social media & other trends of Oregonians over the last 3 years in particular, I know for a fact that those that support these and other gun control measures are in fact, a tiny, tiny minority in Oregon. Their views are not supported by the majority of Americans.

And in closing, please remember that my ability to protect my family using a firearm is NOT up for debate, discussion, negotiation, or sale.

Robert Anglin

Gresham, OR