

Dear Committee Members

My name is Catherine Kaiser and I am writing today, April 24, 2017 in opposition to SB 754-A as written.

The first thing that needs to be done is to **stop putting Vaping into the same category as smoking** because it does not cause cancer. I cannot find any data on people dying from vaping. Cigarettes contain over 4000 chemicals, 43 known carcinogens and 400 toxins. The science states that it is **not** the nicotine that kills, it is the tar that sticks to your lungs.

Oregon's statisticians see an enormous political opportunity. Like Franklin D. Roosevelt, it must tickle their fancy to dream about growing the state as they create a new, formerly unrecognized class of constituents. The new group will be a bevy of individuals who formerly were law-abiding citizens but will soon become law-breakers in need of ever-more services.

The nanny-state will squeeze another three years of control over a group which they deem in need of protection. If we read between the lines, the nanny-staters are hoping this **"freedom from responsibility" will enable more state intervention for many years to come.**

The claim is that this legislation is needed because these adults aren't capable of making their own choices.

The latest science purports that those with brains under 21-years old are not running at full capacity. Apparently, this immature state of the human brain will be seriously harmed by exposure to nicotine and therefore the state needs to jump in to protect these defenseless creatures.

The questions are, 1) can these adults make decisions for themselves? or, 2) can we relieve them from responsibility and assign blame elsewhere?

Socialism demands that less than 21-year-olds aren't capable of good decision-making, they therefore need state-intervention. Socialism also demands that businessmen and businesswomen be held accountable as greedy capitalists.

Even in this legislation, the only legislated answer takes place in penalizing businesses. The small business will be forced to wear a crown of thorns made up of various fines, penalties, enhanced regulatory efforts and more stringent control over their enterprise for daring to fill a market demand for tobacco products.

There are somewhere between 16,000 - 18,000 Oregonians that are currently between the ages of 12 and 21 who have self-identified as smokers. Two questions, 1) Where are the 12 -18-year-olds currently getting their illicit smokes? 2) How does raising the legal smoking age to 21 change the reality that 12-18-year-olds can currently acquire cigarettes while being "underage"?

We all know the answer. They will simply buy them from their 21-year-old contraband dealer rather than their former 18-year-old supplier.

I'm all in favor of drawing a line but the line ought to be a red-line and it ought to meet consistency requirements for soliciting universal acceptance of what adulthood means. The people targeted by this legislation can vote, go to war, bear children, abort children and go

through sex-change operations all while under the age of twenty-one. I'm not advocating for any of these things but these highlight the inconsistencies that the legislature has created.

Additionally, I would argue that the long-term medical costs and consequences from each of the above named activities is every bit as serious as the long-term cost of care associated with tobacco usage.

It is hard to imagine how Oregon's youth will ever mature into responsible adulthood when the legislature is continually stripping them of key facets of their autonomy. After all, when does an adult exercise good judgment? Does it really happen the day following their twenty-first birthday?

I believe the real issue is one of human dignity.

- What does it mean to be free?
- What does it mean to guide one's own future, to be responsible for one's own choices and actions?
- Will these new-found criminal offenses make Oregon a healthier, happier, more prosperous place for raising our families?

Every time the nanny-state intrudes into the middle of our families, then our individual liberty and personal responsibility is diminished. The gradual accumulation of small, seemingly insignificant legislated tyrannies will destroy the very foundation upon which our free republic was built.

This is not new. The history of the world is rich with similar circumstances spanning all periods of human history. In fact, here in America, John Adams warned the colonialists about the potential danger arising from seemingly legitimate Parliamentary actions. He wrote, "**Be not intimidated... nor suffer yourselves to be wheedled out of your liberties by any pretense of politeness, delicacy, or decency. These, as they are often used, are but three different names for hypocrisy, chicanery, and cowardice.**"

I am NOT proud to say that when I smoked I would give cigarettes to the youth under 18 when I was smoking outside of an establishment. There is no way I would ever give them my vape equipment, it is way too expensive for me to do that.

I am 64 yrs. old and since I started vaping over two years ago I have cut the nicotine in my e-liquid from 24mg to zero but still am able to obtain the hand to mouth gesture that was embedded in me when I smoked for 45yrs.

I do not agree with anyone under 18 smoking or vaping but I do think that is a parental issue and not a Legislative issue to parent other people's children. I believe the Government is over stepping their bounds on this.

Kids whose parents smoke are at the highest risk of starting to smoke cigarettes. My dad smoked and 2 out of 3 of my siblings smoked.

I will end by saying that vaping is not smoking and should not be subjected to the same rules as combustible cigarettes. Vaping has been proven to be at least 95% less harmful than cigarettes. Please keep that in mind and start telling the people of Oregon what the newest science says. All I hear from a majority of committee members and their witness they chose to falsely back up their claims about vaping with unfounded and very old science. They read speeches with information that is way outdated. This is unacceptable to me and should not be allowed to even take place at our Capitol.

I am NOT proud to say that when I smoked I would give cigarettes to the youth under 18 when I was smoking outside of an establishment. There is no way I would ever give them my vape equipment, it is way too expensive for me to do that.

I am 64 yrs. old and since I started vaping over two years ago I have cut the nicotine in my e-liquid from **24mg to zero** but still am able to obtain the hand to mouth gesture that was embedded in me when I smoked for 45yrs.

I do not agree with anyone under 18 smoking or vaping but I do think that is a parental issue and not a Legislative issue to parent other people's children.

I believe the Government is over stepping their bounds on this. People who smoke and are trying to find a way to hopefully get away from smoking deadly cigarettes should be given every opportunity to try all the tools available. whether that be the items that Pharmaceutical companies offer or Vaping. Something that works for certain people to help them get away from smoking cigarettes may not work for others. But all Oregonians deserve to have any tool that helps them available to them by their choice, not the Legislature.

Kids whose parents smoke are at the highest risk of starting to smoke cigarettes. My dad smoked and 2 out of 3 of my siblings smoked.

I will end by saying that vaping is not smoking and should not be objected to the same rules as combustible cigarettes. Vaping has been proven to be at least 95% less harmful than cigarettes. Please keep that in mind.

Respectfully,

Catherine Kaiser 205 Boone Rd. SE Unit#45 Salem, Oregon 97306