

April 20, 2021

Re: Senate Bill 554

I oppose Senate Bill 554 for the following reasons:

1. The Oregon Constitution, Article I Bill of Rights, Section 27 Right to Bear Arms, specifically states “the people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence [sic] of themselves, and the State...”

The constitutional right of self-defense is not restricted solely at one’s home but anywhere and time a person may be. The current 2019 restrictions are more than satisfactory.

2. It gives power to individuals of local and state governments who have no authority to restrict a person’s right under the Oregon and Federal constitutions to keep and bear arms and will create a nightmare of regulations that only a legislature has the constitutional authority or restrictions to create. **See Items 1, 7 and 8.**

3. **There is no data showing that legal concealed carry is a problem, past or present.**

4. If people like Chris Mintz were allowed concealed carry the tragedy at Umpqua Community College would had ended at the front door.

5. Is a sidewalk considered “the grounds” of the public building for purposes of a violation? Keep in mind that sidewalks in many communities are the responsibility of the building owner and that many public buildings are scattered within communities. Will walking past a building banning firearms be a violation?

6. Women walking on or near college grounds, especially at night, would be defenseless against sexual predators.

7. On June 28, 2010, the Supreme Court, in a 5–4 decision, reversed the Seventh Circuit's decision, holding that the [Second Amendment](#) was incorporated under the [Fourteenth Amendment](#) thus protecting those rights from infringement by state and local governments.

8. In McDonald v. Chicago, 561 U.S. 742 (2010), the [Supreme Court of the United States](#) found that the right of an individual to "keep and bear arms," as protected under the [Second Amendment](#), is [incorporated](#) by either the [Due Process Clause](#) or [Privileges or Immunities Clause](#) of the [Fourteenth Amendment](#) against the [states](#). The decision cleared up the uncertainty left in the wake of [District of Columbia v. Heller](#) as to the scope of [gun rights](#) in regard to the states.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Getty
119 South K
Lakeview, OR 97630