

My name is Robert Golding, and I live in Bryan, OH 43506.

I unfortunately have a prior commitment this Thursday that keeps me from coming to Columbus to speak in person. However, I would like to provide the following testimony against HB585.

Testimony:

Chairwoman Anielski, Vice-Chair Hambley, Ranking Member Holmes and members of the House State and Local Government Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in opposition to House Bill 585, the gun-control bill by Representative Mike Henne and Governor Kasich.

I wish to briefly address several parts of HB585 that I find objectionable.

1. The insertion of language banning armor piercing ammunition is very troublesome, as it mirrors the federal definition which has been, against its initial legislative intent, expanded to cover not just cartridges "designed" for handgun use, but any cartridge that could be fired from a handgun. This has been used under the Obama administration to ban the import of cheap rifle ammunition commonly used by Ohio sportsman and competitive shooters for practice. Specifically this includes the recent attempt by the BATFE to classify M855/SS109 .223 ammunition as armor piercing pistol ammunition although .223 was used designed for, and used exclusively in rifles for some 40 years. At best, it is a pointless law, as all centerfire rifle ammunition, and a number of conventional pistol cartridges can pierce soft armor, and "armor piercing" ammunition has never amounted to a significant issue in Ohio. I have conducted a brief Lexis search, and found NO mentions of armor piercing ammunition being an issue in Ohio over the last 10 years.
2. The creation of a new, poorly defined ability to remove firearms from law abiding citizens with inadequate due process is a horrible idea. There are already mechanisms in place to remove firearm rights from the mentally ill, abet ones that require more effort (commitment). There are serious 4th and 5th amendment concerns in the current language of HB 585 that need resolving to protect the rights of Ohio citizens that may have vindictive ex-spouses and other enemies.
3. The firearm accessory language is pointless. It is possible to bump-fire any semiautomatic firearm, even those that are 100+ years old (C96 Mauser, Remington Model 8, Browning A-5) with nothing more than a belt loop on a pair of levi jeans. If anything, bumpfiring reduces the efficacy of each shot, such that we should HOPE that any future shooter chose to bump fire rather than use aimed shots. Such firearm accessories have never been an issue in Ohio, and are unworthy of restriction.
4. Removing the path to removing weapons disability (RC 2923.14) has nothing to do with making Ohio safer, as in the rare case that firearm rights are restored, it is done after careful consideration, and has not resulted in ANY significant violent crime in Ohio. Frankly, this is a mean-spirited and pointless exercise, that disproportionately targets minorities.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Robert Golding.