

I am writing in opposition to this bill as an stupid "solution" to a problem that doesn't exist.

The state has not seen a rash of licensed individuals irresponsibly using or carrying firearms or other weapons in public buildings. Why, then, is the legislature spending its time trying to "fix" a problem that doesn't exist?

CHL holders, by definition, are law-abiding individuals. We can make this categorical claim because not only are they given extensive background checks at the time of the license being issued, but they also went to the trouble to acquire a license in the first place. Criminals don't care about getting permission to carry guns, they just carry them anyway. If someone wants to go shoot up a library, why would they submit themselves to their county's sheriff for fingerprinting and photographing beforehand?

Besides that, CHL holders are already strictly limited in what they can do with their guns, other than carry them. Drawing or displaying an otherwise legally-carried weapon is already illegal. The prosecution of Michael Strickland has showed that in Oregon, even being chased by an angry mob is not sufficient cause to draw a weapon, even if it is never fired -- so what scenarios are Democrats worried about that this bill would fix, exactly?

Furthermore, this bill conflicts with another priority of the majority -- the so-called "safe storage" bill. By making it illegal for CHL holders to carry their firearms inside on their person, they are forced to leave their guns in their cars, where they are far more likely to be stolen. Or maybe that is the entire point -- the authors of these bills want more guns to be stolen and used by criminals. Why do Oregon Democrats want criminals to have more guns?