

February 16, 2021

Re: Senate Bill 554

Dear Senators:

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 but I do not agree with Section 1 nor Section 2(9)(a)(G) and (H) and Section 2(9)(b), (c) and (d).

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. See Items 1, 8 and 9.

3. Senate Bill 554 will create a nightmare of regulations that only the people have the authority to create. See Items 1, 8 and 9. The bill is "passing the buck", in some cases, to unelected bureaucrats for fear of voter retribution by recall or the next election.

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

5. Local school districts will be left at the mercy of depraved killers. If people like Chris Mintz were allowed concealed carry the tragedy at Umpqua Community College would had ended at the front door.

6. If an off campus or other public building as described in the bill is between two other buildings on the same block and street does Section 2, 9(b) mean that one would have to walk from building 1 out into the street to pass public building 2 to get to building 3. In other words, 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. Situations like this exist in communities throughout the State of Oregon.

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

8. 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.

9. 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