From:	charles oakes
To:	DeJong Annola
Subject:	Fwd: Testimony SB 347, SB 699, SB700, SB 796
Date:	Thursday, April 04, 2013 5:10:20 PM

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **charles oakes** <oakeslaw@fmtc.com>
Date: Thu, Apr 4, 2013 at 6:07 PM
Subject: Testimony SB 347, SB 699, SB700, SB 796
To: annoladejong@state.or.us

Dear Honorable Senate Judiciary Committee Members,

I am testifying in OPPOSITION TO SB347:

Current law in Oregon permits CHL holders to carry concealed handguns on school property. There have been no incidents in Oregon or elsewhere that justify changing current state law on this subject. Instead, the presence of a CHL holder at an active shooter situation in a school could terminate the active shooter situation, much like the presence of the CHL holder at the Clackamas active shooter situation caused the shooter to terminate his activity without the CHL holder even firing a shot. His mere presence was enough to cause the shooter to kill himself.

I am testfying in OPPOSITION TO SB699:

Current law in Oregon permits CHL holders to carry concealed handguns in the Capitol. This is the People's building and if any building in Oregon should be open to all persons, whether carrying concealed handguns or not, it is the Oregon State Capitol. When you start excluding persons based upon their ability to protect themselves, you have gone beyond the line of reason in Oregon. No CHL holder has discharged a concealed handgun in the Capitol. Whereas the mere presence of an armed CHL holder could stop the illegal discharge of firearms by active shoters. This is a bill in search of a problem.

I am testifying in OPPOSITION TO SB700:

Requiring background checks before the transfer of firearms between private parties is not going to dissuade a person intending to commit a crime from obtaining a firearm. As we have seen in the recent mass shooting events, people intending to kill someone will either steal a firearm or kill someone to obtain their firearm. Requiring the private party background checks only makes it harder for rural private citizens to transfer firearms and makes the possibility of registration one step closer. Although current regulations require the destruction of background check information. The requirement that all nonfamily transfers go through the background check moves us one step closer to that possibility of keeping the make, model, serial number, and owner in a database for registration in the future. Do not go there. The risk of this slippery slope is not worth the benefits received by the bill.

I am testifying in OPPOSITION TO SB796:

Current law does not require live fire testing for CHL applicants. Adding the live fire testing will only increase the cost of the CHL program without substantially increasing its safety or effectiveness. All NRA certified handgun courses require live fire training. Actual law enforcement live fire testing will only increase the cost and limit the availability of CHL processing as well as add another potential discretionary hurdle to the process. Arranging range time and deputy time to conduct live fire testing will take law enforcement and range time that could be better utilized in other law enforcement tasks. Adding theses tasks at a time of budget tightening is not the appropriate decision.

Thank you for your attention to my testimony.

Charles Oakes
1052 SW 4th Avenue Suite # 1
Ontario, OR 97914

541-889-2302 office telephone number