

Submitter: Denice Searcy
On Behalf Of: Landlords and Legal Citizens of Oregon
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB599

Vote NO on SB 599

This bill raises several questions;

- If a renter is someone who overstayed their travel visa, should not the landlord know that the person is in fact being actively sought after by immigration officials and could be removed at any time which renders void any lease agreement?
- If landlord currently screens for criminal records, should not felonies be on the list (because illegal entry can be a felony)?

- If Oregon passes this law and makes national news for their unique protections for people who are here illegally, would not this invite more people around the country who are here illegally to reside here? This is currently happening and overwhelming our social services as other governments and non-profits direct people to Oregon. California directed migrants to Oregon's free hotel services for migrants and overloaded the program and it was forced to be shut down. Oregon made national news over the Hacienda program which advertised free \$30,000 grants for first time home buyers who were non-citizens. Even a small fraction of migrants who decide to migrate to Oregon based on these services will only add to our already overwhelmed services, which makes it difficult to help the migrants who are already here.

SB 599 summary: "Prohibits landlords from inquiring about or disclosing immigration status or rejecting an applicant due to immigration status. Prohibits discrimination based on immigration status for real property transactions."

Landlords have the right to know who they are renting to. This is ridiculous the lengths that Oregon will go to protect persons who have broken the law to come here. That's aiding and abetting. The Constitution protects property rights through the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments' Due Process Clauses and, more directly, through the Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause: "nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." There are two basic ways government can take property: (1) outright, by condemning the property and taking title; and (2) through regulations that take uses, leaving the title with the owner — so-called regulatory takings. This bill is a form of "regulatory taking" where the owner is not compensated for losses or inadequately compensated.

Property is the foundation of every right we have, including the right to be free. This bill takes away the right of the owner to protect his property. Through common law, state law, and the Constitution, it protected property rights — the rights of people to acquire, use, and dispose of property freely. The basic rights the founders

recognized, beyond acquisition and disposal, were the right of sole dominion — variously described as a right to exclude others, a right against trespass, or a right of quiet enjoyment, which all can exercise equally at the same time and in the same respect — and the right of active use, at least to the point where such use violates the rights of others to quiet enjoyment.

Do the right thing for the legal citizens of this state. VOTE NO on SB 599 A.