

TESTIMONY TO THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

REGARDING SENATE BILLS 347, 699, 700, and 796

BY

H. F. SHELLMAN, Ph. D., CLINICAL & NEUROPSYCHOLOGY

Regarding SB 347

I was trained as a scientist. As such, I was taught and learned to find data that supported the making of decisions. The making of new laws or the amending or rescinding of old laws should, in my judgment, rely on data that supports any amendment or rescission of the law that pertains to the rights of a concealed handgun license holder. I have contacted the Oregon State Police and the Oregon Sheriffs Association and have been unable to find such data. The fact that the sponsors of SB 347 have not presented such data leads me to believe that none is available. The proponents of this bill seemed to be propounding it based on their own personal emotions and wishes rather than any factual need for the bill. They might better serve the public by proposing a bill that would require sheriffs to annually submit such data to the Oregon State Police so that it would be available to our elected representatives and to any citizen who might wish to obtain it. Certainly, this would be a more rational basis for amending or rescinding a bill which has served the citizenry well.

Unfortunately, I must agree with the contention that the passage of this bill would only create “gone-free zone” where any potential malefactor would be free to work his nefarious will. We, the citizenry, must always remember that law enforcement personnel will only arrive after that nefarious will has been worked, unless a law enforcement person is permanently assigned to a school.

That we know of, no concealed handgun license holder has ever committed a breach of the public trust when they are worn a concealed handgun into any school.

I urge all rational lawmakers to vote NO on this bill.

Regarding SB 699

I should like to ask the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee if they remember the history of our state. During one period of time in our state, black people were feared and reviled by much of the state’s population; not for any rational or factual reason. All manner of nefarious and aberrant characteristics were ascribed to us. Slowly, the populace of the state became more enlightened. Increasing numbers of people became aware that their fears were based more on emotion rather than on rational and factual information. In my judgment, the proponents of this bill are basing their judgments on emotion and not factual information. I ask again, where is the data that would support the need for this bill. If any is available, why has it not been brought to the attention of the citizenry. I

am not aware of any such data. Absent such, there is no need to amend or rescind any portion of the current law.

I urge all rational lawmakers to vote NO on this bill.

Regarding SB 700

I am a law-abiding citizen of this state and of the United States. I treasure the Constitution of the United States, especially the 14th amendment. In my will, I leave my firearms to my nephew in Vermont. I have a number nephew who resides in another state. He has never been charged with or convicted of a felony. He has never been adjudicated insane or mentally ill. Because I am privy to certain personal information about him, I chose not to leave my firearms to him. I should argue that most owners of firearms are as responsible as me. Passage of this bill would cause my nephew in Vermont to incur costs that he should not have to bear. Further, for this law to be effective, it would require that a permanent database of firearms owners be established. You must remember that an analyst for Pres. Obama's administration pointed out that for such a law as SB 700 to be effective, such a database would have to be permanent. Thus, I fear such a database. History teaches us that when a democratic nation starts down this road, confiscation of weaponry from the public soon follows. I cite as examples, Canada, which is partially down that road and Great Britain which has completed the journey.

Regarding Great Britain, the confiscation of the firearms of the citizenry abrogated approximately 500 years of British Common Law. The result has been an increase in assaults, rapes, and burglaries and robberies when the home owners were present. The national government has downplayed or obfuscated the statistics. The numbers of the aforementioned crimes given by the national government are significantly lower than those available from the police agencies. Another result has been a loss of faith in their government by the citizenry.

I urge all Judiciary Committee members to vote NO on this bill.

Regarding SB 796

Once again I must ask, "Where of the data to support the need for this bill." How many incidents have occurred where a concealed handgun license holder has had to fire and hit an innocent bystander? At the very least, if the license holder were to hit an innocent bystander, he would be subject to, at the very least, a civil suit. I assure you, most, if not all, license holders are very aware of their responsibilities if and when they have to fire to protect self or other people. I draw your attention to the incident of the murders at the mall in Clackamas. The shooter had already

fired on the crowd. A license holder was present with his girlfriend. The license holder drew his pistol and took cover with his girlfriend behind an obstacle. The shooter saw this. The shooter then ran into a stairway and shot himself. The police had not yet arrived. It could be argued that the actions of that brave young man, the license holder, caused the shooter to stop his aberrant activity. Please note well, the license holder never fired. I can only assume that the license holder was waiting for a clear and sure shot before he fired. I should argue that he exemplified the responsibility that all license holders have.

In my judgment, the purpose of this bill is to make it harder, more difficult for a responsible citizen to obtain a concealed handgun license. It would make it more costly for the average citizen. It would also make it more difficult for those who do not live in a locale which has a proper shooting range within reasonable distance. The requirements for the bill appear to be arbitrary and bear little, if any, resemblance to what would occur if a responsible license holder had to fire.

I urge all Committee members to vote No on this bill.

I thank the committee for this opportunity to testify.