

Good Day,

I am speaking to you today in opposition of SB 978. Before you immediately dismiss this, please understand I am specifically targeting key sections of the original bill and its amendments and not the bill in its entirety. While I do not agree with much of the bill, I do feel that firearms issues are a hot topic, it is a real issue, and that compromise on both sides should be sought.

My greatest objection to SB 978 is the section titled, "LOCAL AUTHORITY TO REGULATE FIREARMS IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS." Oregon CCW/CHL holders have undergone a more in-depth background than most other individuals in the state and one that far exceeds that required to simply purchase a firearm. As a result, this is a group that is statistically less likely to commit crimes than the general population. Studies (1,2) cite that a CHL holder is 5x LESS LIKELY to commit a violent crime than the general population.

An Oregon CCW/CHL, while issued by the individual counties, is regulated by the state. This done with great thought and intent. It explicitly prevents localities from creating and enforcing restrictions and limitations originally granted by the State thus preventing a patchwork of inconsistent laws and enforcement. As a holder of an ODL (Oregon Driver's License) I don't expect to find laws and enforcement different as I travel, work and play throughout Oregon. Why should a CHL, honored by the State, be any different? By allowing localities to enact their own policies, you create a fragmented, inconsistent system.

And who is affected by this?

The ONLY group impacted by this is Oregon CHL holders. The people who proven they are willing to undergo extensive background checks and are statically not committing crimes, much less committing violent crimes.

Given this, why is this additional regulation necessary and how does it impact safety? All it serves to do it pander to interest groups and likely result in more honest, law-abiding citizens becoming criminals as they deal with an inconsistent patchwork of local policies as they go about enjoying this great state. It makes no rational or logical sense.

I also take great umbrage with Section 32 which declares SB 978 an emergency and resulting in it taking effect immediately on passage. I see nothing in this bill which should result in anything contained therein being an emergency. Our state has many more issues that should be classified an emergency such as mental health treatment, healthcare and state infrastructure in general. Those are areas a real impact can and needs to be made in our great state.

As I stated in my opening, I am willing to compromise on some topics of SB 978 in order to move the conversation forward and make progress. However, I cannot and will not support SB 978 in its present form given section, "LOCAL AUTHORITY TO REGULATE FIREARMS IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS" and urge you to do the same. This section does nothing to reduce gun violence/crime and only impacts law-abiding citizens.

Thank you.

Patrick Collins
Oregon City, OR 97045

1. Texas Department of Public Safety and the U.S. Census Bureau, reported in San Antonio Express-News, September, 2000 2. An Analysis of the Arrest Rate of Texas Concealed Carry Handgun License Holders as Compared to the Arrest Rate of the Entire Texas Population, William E. Sturdevant, September 11, 1999