

Testimony of Rod Harder prepared for the hearing on Senate Gun Control bills, Friday, April 5, 2013.

**SB 347** . This bill and any bill that disarms lawful firearms owners is not only unconstitutional, it is short sighted and irresponsible. That statement has been borne out time and time again. For the record. **GUN FREE ZONES ARE AN OPEN INVITATION TO INDIVIDUALS BENT ON CREATING HAVOC. GUN FREE ZONES ARE AN OPEN INVITATION TO THOSE OBSESSED WITH MAYHEM AND MURDER. GUN FREE ZONES ARE AN OPEN INVITATION TO ENTER AND KILL WITHOUT FEAR OF RESPONSE BY ARMED PEOPLE WITHIN.**

Sound familiar. I stated those exact words in a Senate hearing on the same subject in April 2005 and again last session. . Unfortunately events before and after those dates have proven this statement to be all too true. Any aware person knows that the vast majority if not all of the multiple shootings have taken place in locations that were designated as gun free. Avoiding a repeat of those horrific events should be your only concern. This bill does not approach doing that.

In addition such a move defeats the purpose of Oregon's pre-emption law by **creating a patchwork of laws** where citizens would have no way of knowing where their CHL was valid and where it was not.

**SB-699** Having to get permission from the "supervisor" of a building to carry a legally possessed firearm is ludicrous. It likely means few if any members of the general public holding CHL's would be included. There is no criteria establishing supervisor "ground rules" in the bill. I am also unable to determine what "totally concealed" means. Given that violation of this Statue is a Class C Felony, it is reasonable to define what a CHL holder must do to remain in compliance.

I understand that there are amendments to this bill. I have, to this date, not seen them.

It is my personal policy to make sure my carry piece is concealed at all times. That is why I have a CONCEALED handgun license. It is no ones business . Should the bill be amended to include a reasonable definition of

Concealed and the balance of the verbiage removed the bill would solve the perceived problem. Otherwise it should be scrapped.

**SB 700** - Requires a person to request a criminal background check before transferring a firearm to any other person outside the transferor's immediate family. There are a number of problems with this.

1. OSP currently does not do a stellar job of meeting the requirements of current law. There are too often situations when their system is overloaded and does not function, delaying transfers for extended periods.
2. The above now takes place when OSP is dealing with FFL holders who are familiar with the intricacies of the system. I do not want to even consider the confusion that will be caused by a 77 year old man (me) and other laypersons trying to comply with this law. Figure out another way to ensnare the bad guys.
3. The statue allows individuals to utilize the services of an FFL to complete a sale. If I understand the statement of Chair Prozanski during the recent hearing on the bill, he will be offering an amendment that allows the FFLs to charge whatever fee they choose to conduct the transaction. Imagine that! The other part of that, is how long a person must wait while the FFL conducts his own business transactions if they choose to do it at all.
4. Current law allows a Dealer to transfer a firearm if OSP does not approve or deny the transaction within 3 days. This protection is not provided in this bill.
5. The bill also establishes an opportunity for additional firearms registration. Oregon already has more strict firearms sale statues than the majority of the 50 states in that we do background checks on all transactions at gun shows and retain the records. In spite of that, OSP response to felons attempting to purchase a firearm, in itself another felony has resulted in a dismal number of investigations and arrests.

**SB 700** has a lot of problems. On the surface it sounds reasonable. The devil, as they say is in the details. Like many other bills this one does not get beyond a feel good solution.

**SB 796** - Requires person applying for a concealed handgun license to pass a "live fire" firing range test. During the development of the "must issue" provisions for obtaining a CHL many years ago, we studied all of these

issues thoroughly. During these discussions I was an advocate of live fire, or documentation thereof for persons seeking a CHL. I was shown then, that for many individuals based on their physical locations, lack of instructors , lack of available ranges and other reasons that it was not a feasible requirement. Even at that time my support for live fire was based on a concern for safety in weapon handling and not a competition or scoring test process. After reading this bill, my thought is that if one were searching for a way to discourage people from obtaining a CHL, this idea would be at the top of the list. Chair Prozanski has stated that he has drafted a "Texas Lite" amendment that eliminates the time period from the test requirement. This still leaves the logistic nightmare of the lack of adequate range facilities, the current shortage and expense of ammunition and current demand on instructors conducting face to face training classes. As of this writing there are unacceptable delays for Oregon citizens in obtaining and renewing a CHL. This bill will add to that problem.

In my opinion there is no reason to move any of these bills forward. It is my good fortune to no longer be able to offer my limited assistance in doing so.

Respectfully,

Rod Harder.