

Testimony before Oregon Senate Judiciary Committee on April 5, 2013

SB 796 – in opposition

- There are several problems with this bill:
- Any future hopes of reciprocity with other states will pretty well be dashed if we attach a specific proficiency to the Oregon CHL requirement.
- Ranges, which are already at full utilization, will have difficulty accommodating the large influx of CHL applicants needing to take the proficiency test.
- Many ranges are not set up to accommodate the different courses of fire required in SB796. This will further reduce the available ranges where a proficiency test can be taken.
- Many people have to travel a great distance in order to get to a range that will provide a proficiency test.
- With Oregon's unemployment rate among the highest in the nation. The additional cost of a proficiency test, ammunition, training, and travel to a distant range could become an insurmountable financial burden to many people of limited means. Basically, those who support this bill are saying to the poor, "Sorry, you can only carry a firearm for protection if you have money."
- Many, if not most encounters between assailants and armed, law-abiding citizens are resolved without firing a single shot, once the assailants SEE that their intended victims are prepared to defend themselves.

Just this past weekend, a young woman in Oregon City was attacked by a man. As her assailant dragged her backward by her ponytail, the woman retrieved her concealed handgun. The mere sight of her raised handgun caused her attacker to flee—no shots were fired. Suppose SB796 had been law and this woman, for any of the above reasons, was unable to obtain a CHL. This story could have ended with her as a tragic crime statistic.

Please vote NO on SB 796 and all amendments