

So this is what's supposed to pass muster as a sensible gun law?

Concealed handgun license owners should by all accounts be considered the ideal gun owners. They've voluntarily gone through additional training, submitted to a background check, and license themselves with the county sheriff, and renew that license every 3 years. In many cases because of the lack of reciprocity with other states, they end up doing more classes and training than Oregon requires so that they can obtain a CHL from another state. Things that many who carry the banner of "sensible gun laws" are frequently asking for in terms of making gun ownership more difficult.

And CHL holders seem to have proven themselves over the years. While the gun death statistics in America are shocking to look at, the number of those committed by CHL holders is quite small. It seems to be easier to find the numbers for mass shootings committed by CHL holders than other shootings, since 2007 the number of mass shootings committed by CHL holders has been 35.

Some will respond that they support the 2nd amendment, and yet still support this bill. How do you claim to support a constitutional right to bear arms and then turn around and support laws that allow "city, county, metropolitan service district, port operating commercial airport, school district, college or university" to decide how or if they'll honor that right? As CHL holders (and citizens related to any right, and even a number of privileges) we should be able to expect that rights and privileges afforded by that license are honored the same regardless of where we happen to be in the state. As an Oregonian I don't just believe in the 2nd amendment right to bear arms, but in the Oregon Constitution Article 1, Section 27 "The people shall have the right to bear arms for the defence [sic] of themselves, and the State, but the Military shall be kept in strict subordination to the civil power[.]"

As this law related to CHL holders, any intimidation factor of openly carried firearms is rendered basically moot. The point of the CHL is in the first word CONCEALED. The firearm should be concealed, those in proximity to the CHL holder should be unaware that a firearm is even present. In cases where a CHL holder has exercised poor judgement and made a point of showing they were carrying in order to intimidate, there are already existing laws in Oregon that have been rightfully used to punish those CHL holders using laws against brandishing a weapon. However what we're talking about here is the ability to punish law abiding citizens, who have gone above and beyond to go through the process of obtaining a CHL, with a felony.

Now we intend to also increase the cost of obtaining that CHL, is there any administrative reason for that cost increase, or is this simply a punitive measure to make obtaining a CHL more difficult? An interesting tack from a legislative body that claims to be trying to move forward with equality, when studies frequently point out that raising costs almost always disadvantage minority and underprivileged groups from being able to fully participate because of the cost. With the fear of such well thought out "sensible" gun regulations as this one we've unwittingly created a demand for firearms that has drastically increased the price of obtaining them, and thus guaranteed that poorer citizens are denied this particular right because of the increased cost of firearm ownership.

This law seems to be either a poorly thought out, or retaliatory attack on Oregon gun owners, with no actual data driven evidence that it will accomplish any increase in safety for Oregon citizens, and only serve as a way to turn law abiding citizens into felons. This seems to not be a "sensible" gun law, but rather the text book definition of a senseless one.