From:	Bob Karl
To:	DeJong Annola
Cc:	Sen Kruse
Subject:	written testimony re: Senate Bills 347, 699, 700, 796
Date:	Saturday, April 06, 2013 1:31:44 PM

My name is Bob Karl. I'm a resident of West Linn, OR. I'm an inventor in the area of firearms; NRA-certified rifle & pistol marksmanship instructor; ran a concealed-carry handgun certification program for the Greenwich, CT police dept.

As the grandfather of a wonderful 6-year-old, and as a former Connecticut resident, I was as appalled as anyone else in this room by the madman's attack in Sandy Hook-Newtown.

But the shock of those events must not be allowed to displace reason. Pointless, "feel-good" bills only muddy the water. The bills under consideration each are badly flawed, and it's some of those flaws that I'm addressing, today.

For instance, banning handgun possession when going into a school merely forces one to leave his handgun in his car, which leaves the gun far more vulnerable to theft, and likely would result in a minor then being in possession of a handgun. That's dumb. Moreover, it's pointless. The only person who would obey that law would be someone who willingly obeys the law, and that's not the personality that you should be worried about. Not only that... the bill simply would give final authority to someone to impose his or her personal prejudice on others' behavior... hardly the stuff of rational law.

Instituting a background check system that allows the retention of records on people who are exercising their constitutional right creates de facto gun registration, perpetrating an outrage that brings to the fore the concern that citizens have about an overbearing central government instituting a confiscation program. We've had a succession of presidents who have clearly demonstrated their contempt for constitutional guarantees. I'm also concerned about a system that requires citizens to pay costly fees in order to be approved to exercise their constitutional rights. I thought the poll tax was ruled unconstitutional quite a few years ago.

I ran a concealed-carry handgun certification program for an East Coast police department, back in the 1980s. One of the problems we ran into was someone who wasn't very accurate, but didn't need to be particularly accurate in order to protect him or herself. Just why the criteria for passing a range test? Who determines the criteria? How fair are those criteria? Etc.

I'm very concerned that the term "gun violence" has supplanted all violence. Why is it better when a woman's head is split by an axe than being shot by a gun?

If you really want to save lives, you could be a lot more effective saving lives by working on traffic safety. For instance, how about background checks for anyone buying, selling or driving a car?

Are these and many other encroachments on legitimate firearms owners' freedoms really sensible? Don't they infringe on the right to bear arms that you swore to protect and defend?