

OREGON CITIZENS LOBBY

A statewide collaborative effort by conservative citizens to promote legislative accountability

February 28, 2012

Testimony in opposition to SB 1594

The following testimony is being provided on behalf of the Oregon Citizens Lobby, a statewide collaborative effort by conservative citizens to promote legislative accountability. We ask that the Senate oppose SB 1594. Please find our concerns and reasoning for opposition below.

Lack of Public Process:

- To introduce this bill 48 hours before the legislative session is scheduled to sine-die denies adequate input and consideration by the citizens of Oregon who are affected by this legislation. There were many concerned citizens who testified on a similar bill this session which died according to the Senate Rules. Those citizens assumed that bill would not advance through the legislative process this session. Now those concerned citizens are unaware that this legislation is once again moving through the process under a new bill number.
- At the one committee hearing this bill was given, it was brought directly into a work session and public testimony was precluded.
- There is no means for the citizenry to know this bill is being considered unless they are physically at the Capitol and know the right people to ask, or if a paid lobbyist from one side or the other is able to quickly alert one's clients. This bill has not even been posted on the Oregon Legislature's web-site to alert people that it has been introduced and scheduled for a hearing. This is a perverse aversion to a citizen's legislature for and by the people.

Bill technicalities and concerns:

- Section 1 (b) "any other instrument used as a dangerous weapon" is extremely broad and ambiguous. This could apply to an ink pen, sports equipment or as simple as a person's hand or mind. This potentially can be applied to citizens of all ages including a child who picked up a rock on the school grounds and threw it at another child.
- Section 2 (4) Adjacent property is undefined and can potentially be interpreted as affecting property that is not owned or a part of the school.
- Section 2 (4) would make a parent with a CHL in legal possession of a firearm liable for arrest simply for driving onto the school grounds to pick up a child.
- Student safety is not enhanced by passage of this legislation and in fact may diminish the capacity of citizens to respond to a violent act while waiting for police to respond.
- This bill doesn't eliminate guns from a school campus. It only eliminates legal guns from the campus; folks who have no regard for our laws will still break the law.
- This bill asserts public safety will increase, but historical facts demonstrate that this is not the case. Columbine High School and Virginia Tech were both so-called "gun-free zones" yet we all are very aware of those tragedies. Let us exercise common sense for a moment: someone intent on committing murder on a school grounds or other

public building is not going to be hampered by thoughts of retribution for violating a “gun-free zone.” Virginia’s Attorney General recently stated that gun-ban polices “are ineffectual because persons who wish to perpetrate violence will ignore them, and that the net effect of such policies is to leave defenseless the law-abiding citizens who follow these policies.”

Respectfully Submitted on behalf of thousands of OCL participants,

Karla Kay Edwards, OCL volunteer co-leader

kedwards@afphq.org

Ph# 503/876-8830