

Testimony submitted to the

Senate Committee On Judiciary and Ballot Measure 110 Implementation,

regarding SB 554 by

R. Leon Noble
Oregon citizen of Newport, Lincoln County
and
2022 Oregon Gubernatorial Candidate
setOregonfree.com

Ladies and Gentlemen

One of the many capacities of my personal repertoire is the ability to apply reasonable outcomes to pattern information.

I have taken the opportunity to read the proposed bill.

The patterns that result from the approval of this bill, it's sister bill, HB 3005, in the House, and SB 585 are Gotham City dark. Our law abiding citizens, who are already on edge from the past year, will be turned into criminals because of a patchwork of rinky dink political areas.

I will elaborate.

I used to hunt people for a living.

In other states, Bounty Hunting is legal. I operated as a Private Investigator, Bounty Hunter, and combat instructor for a few years, participating in red cell training that "never happened".

My world was filled with healthy caution, for lack of a better description, as part of a set of skills. I recognize these skills as a defensive mechanism that operates as a 6th sense, of a sort. This mechanism has kept me from being engaged in vehicle crashes, hostage situations, and fights.

When the issues of this past year began, Newport had a protest that briefly shut down highway 101, riots were declared in Portland, Salem, and Eugene, and my personal protective sense demanded that I actively arm myself for the first time since 2003.

I tried to write it off as just nervous energy for a couple of weeks. Then I learned that friends of mine were arming themselves.

After nearly a year, I still haven't shaken the feeling.

I am not alone. You, as representatives of the people have exhibited the same feeling. This was evidenced during recent actions at the Capitol building. The difference is that I have developed tools to deal with it and you have not.

The biggest problem with this, the idea that is subjecting law abiding citizens to extra regulation, is that it only affects law abiding citizens. For those who are criminals, the people who willfully disobey laws, this means nothing.

Additionally, places like Newport, Salem, Portland, Eugene, and a handful of others have adopted ordinances to limit open carry, forcing their citizens to get a Concealed Permit to exercise their right to self defense.

As I mentioned I was a combat instructor. After Columbine, when the FBI released their profile on School shooters, I read it.

What I discovered in their white paper was that everyone who had ever been hurt by another person, which qualifies everyone in existence, fit the profile. In 1997 when the Kinkles were murdered, and students at Thurston High School in Springfield were engaged by their killer, the difference between a normal student and a school shooter was simply a state of mind; the shooter had lost his mind and was lashing out at people he believed had hurt him.

The shooter at Pearl Mississippi was quoted as saying, "The world has wronged me", as he was stopped from changing target areas, by an armed school administrator, while police were still trying to respond.

Students at Virginia Tech responded to the shooter with their own firearms, kept in their vehicles. Had they been allowed to keep their arms on their person, the body count at Virginia Tech would have much lower.

Clackamas Town Center had an armed response by a citizen, which prompted the shooter to disengage.

...

I understand that this bill is being presented with the idea of best intentions.

Murder, in any form is illegal. Unlawful detainer in any form is illegal. Assault in any form is illegal.

None of these laws stop a shooter; adding this restriction to our laws will not stop a shooter, but will stop the ready response by those who are capable and willing to respond quickly in seconds, while police are still minutes away.

Now that we have dealt with the self-defense issues of this bill, let's deal with the Constitutional issues of the bill.

The Oregon Constitution, Article 1 Section 27, states, "The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence [sic] of themselves..."

Some municipalities already limit this right by restricting open carry.

This bill would limit the rights of the people, to keep and bear arms for their defense, or the defense of their families and others. This bill will be challenged in court because of its infringement upon the rights of the citizens. This bill will cost the taxpayers billions of dollars to prosecute, and punish, otherwise law abiding citizens. This bill will put our already strained law enforcement at further risk.

Now, let us return to the patterns.

The patterns are this:

The passage of this bill and any others like it, prove to the people that the government of Oregon does not care about their safety.

Gun rights are women's rights.

A gun provides capacity for someone who is smaller or weaker to defend themselves against a larger, stronger attacker. A gun allows someone to defend themselves against domestic violence. A gun allows those who need protection to get that protection immediately.

The patterns, witnessed in other locations that have done the same thing, are very simple and very predictable. By creating an area that is defined as a gun-free zone, you create a shooting gallery for those who would harm others, with far too much time for law enforcement to respond effectively.

Gun laws in the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand have actually backfired on them. The United Kingdom is currently trying to deal with a large number of stabbings and knife attacks. The only thing that changed by limiting guns, is the tool that is used to commit mass murder.

The patterns indicate that there will be more crime as the result of this bill. There will be more rapes, assaults, killings, and other crimes too numerous to list here as the result of this bill and the random spaces that it creates.

Throughout the summer and fall, there have been calls to defund the police. Defunding the police cannot work without the citizens being able to protect themselves.

As a personal note to this bill:

I have personally used a gun to stop domestic violence twice, once against myself and once in defense of others.

Additionally, this year's interesting nature has produced for me a stalker, which I would normally deal with by staying low profile; I am very good at hiding my location at any point in time. My declaration of candidacy for Governor and the need to publicize my schedule, has opened me up to risk of this stalker actually being able to locate and act.

Noting my experience with red cell operations, I understand that law enforcement, even if I were already under their protection, cannot marshal enough resources to protect me at all times. I can, however, utilize my own resources to do so with citizens already attending events that I am at.

I prefer to open carry. I believe in visible deterrence. I was forced to obtain a Concealed Permit to carry in my town. It bothers me that I would be further restricted in protecting myself, my family, or others who would benefit from my action because of this bill. It also bothers me that the cost of the permit application, what is essentially a tax on my right to self defense, will be higher.

Simply put, SB 554 is a detriment to the people of Oregon.