

OPPOSED.

Owners of concealed handgun licenses are legal, law-abiding and responsible when it comes to carrying their firearms. The first and foremost proof of this is the fact that they have a LICENSE to do so. The process one must go through in order to get the license; i.e. the time it takes to sit through the class, then wait on the background check, the fingerprinting, the money to pay for each and every step of the process -- is not something that just happens. It happens over a long, drawn-out two-to-three month period.

Owners of concealed handgun licenses obtain these licenses in order to protect themselves and their families. If a situation arises where a CCL holder is in need of defending themselves and CANNOT do so due to infringement of their Second Amendment RIGHT by the Oregon legislature as well the city/county/entity which then subsequently enacted the "no tolerance" ruling, who is going to be held responsible? The person who put the CCL holder on the defense? No. It should be the owner of the building/entity that prevented the action of SELF-DEFENSE, if not the State of Oregon. The concealed carry owner is NOT the problem. The problem is the person who illegally, ill-lawfully, and with full disregard of any rules or ruling enters ANY building with the intent of creating havoc. A posted "gun-free" notice at the door will only become a magnet for such a person.

The fact that SB 554 and HB 2510 have now been combined to create SB 554-20 has not gone unnoticed. Another last minute behind the scenes sleight-of-hand on the part of Oregon legislators.

HB 2510 had some credibility. SB 554 did not.

By moving the full text of HB 2510 to the top of the document and pushing the text of SB 554 to the bottom shows the realization that SB 554, no matter the degree of amendments, is unviable.

I am fully OPPOSED to SB 554, with or without the addition of HB 2510.

Wendy L Berger Wood