



Ohio Gun Owners

Ohio's Grassroots Gun Rights Organization
3195 Dayton-Xenia Road, #900-306
Beavercreek, OH 45434

Memorandum of Support

DATE: May 8, 2019

TO: Honorable Members of the Ohio House of Representatives
Federalism Committee

FROM: Chris Dorr, Director, Ohio Gun Owners, and our members
and supporters across Ohio

RE: Support for House Bill 178

Chairman Becker, Vice Chairman Stoltzfus and Ranking Member Miller, on behalf of Ohio Gun Owners and the moms, dads, grandparents, aunts and uncles that are our members and supporters who are busy working today and cannot afford to be here, I would like to express our support for House Bill 178, introduced by Representative Ron Hood (R-78) and Tom Brinkman (R-27).

I think the majority of this bill has already been testified to, so I'll just quickly summarize our support for this beautiful piece of legislation.

House Bill 178 makes the current CHL optional, just not mandatory, if you want to put on a jacket or vest over your weapon.

It strikes the requirement to notify officers that you are exercising your God-given, Bill of Rights-enshrined right to defend yourself, like most states don't require.

It expands the current Concealed Handgun License into a Concealed Weapons License, because right now under a CHL you can strap on six

pistols but still get cuffed for carrying a pocket knife for self-defense.

This bill is retroactive and makes it so that anyone who currently has a CHL is considered to have a CWL.

It makes it legal for lawful people to carry weapons in vehicles without being forced to do what no criminal does, which is either disarm or make sure their thug friends carefully stow away their guns.

But while I have the opportunity, I'd also like to dispel some rumors and fake news you'll hear about this bill in the very near future.

You're likely going to hear opposition testimony from political law-enforcement groups or their associations.

They'll probably come in here and tell you that there will be blood in the streets, how this will endanger their officers and how this is just horrible policy.

But their testimony won't be based in reality.

A year after our neighbors in West Virginia passed it in 2015, WV State Police Spokesman Lt. Michael Baylous described the impact Constitutional Carry had on their state:

"When comparing the raw data from 2015 and 2016, there does not appear to be an overall significant difference in the number of violent crimes committed with firearms. Some counties experienced an increase in gun-related incidents, while others experienced a decrease."

That was West Virginia. Let's look at Idaho.

A July 1, 2017 article in Washington state's *Spokesman-Review* covered this issue of what happened in Idaho after they passed Constitutional Carry.

The article states that before Constitutional Carry passed in Idaho, gun-control groups and political law-enforcement organizations predicted dire warnings about increasing violent crime rates.

But it just never happened.

Nez Perce County Sheriff Joe Rodrigues stated that "nothing has changed," and he also noted that the number of residents applying for concealed carry permits hadn't dropped, either.

In most states where we've seen this bill passed, the chief of police associations are usually the most vocal opponents of 2nd Amendment rights, but this article went on to state that even the Idaho Chiefs of Police Association agreed that Constitutional Carry had not resulted in an increase in crime.

The objections to Constitutional Carry just aren't based in reality.

And they never have been.

We've heard these howls and screams against the restoration of Constitutional 2nd Amendment rights before, when concealed carry was sweeping America during the 1990's and 2000's.

Those warnings were wrong then, and they're wrong now, because what they really were then and really are now are simply disguised attacks on the 2nd Amendment launched to try to stop and block the wonderful restoration of freedom that these bills represent.

Another objection you'll hear from the opponents of freedom and our right to defend ourselves is that "the data supports the gun-control argument."

But that isn't true, either.

Turkey established gun-control in 1911. From 1915 to 1917, 1.5 million Armenians were exterminated in the Armenian Genocide.

The Soviet Union established gun-control in 1929. Between 1929-1953, nearly 20 million dissidents were exterminated.

China established gun-control in 1935. Between 1948-1952, 20 million political dissidents were exterminated.

Guatamala established gun-control in 1964. Between 1964-1981, 100,000 Mayan Indians were rounded up and exterminated.

Uganda established gun-control in 1970. Between 1971-1979, 300,000 Christians rounded up and exterminated.

Cambodia established gun-control in 1956. Between 1975-1977, 1 million educated people were rounded up and exterminated.

You see, governments are the biggest killers of innocent people our world has ever seen.

A lot of gun-control activists and enemies of self-defense point at Australia and now New Zealand as examples of policies America should implement.

But the governments of Australia and New Zealand haven't turned on their own citizens and started slaughtering them, yet.

And this brings us back to square one and why our God-given right to self-defense is enshrined in the 2nd Amendment and our Ohio Constitution in the first place.

They weren't written so that we can always hunt deer. They weren't even written so that we can always defend ourselves against thugs and murderers.

The 2nd Amendment and Article 1 Section 4 of the Ohio Constitution are about protecting people like me and people like Ohio Gun Owners members and supporters from people like you when you decide you want to start killing people like us.

So the people who quote Australia and New Zealand statistics are very short-sighted, and forget the horrifying lessons I already mentioned.

Another thing I'd like to mention are the "studies" you'll be hearing from the opponents of freedom and our right to defend ourselves.

When you take a look at the numbers being spouted, you'll find that virtually every one of them are authored by biased, agenda-driven "centers" or "think tanks" being funded by very worst enemies of American freedom today, people like tiny Mikey Bloomberg and George Soros.

These studies are about as legitimate as CNN's claim to be an objective news organization!

These studies love to mix a little truth with a lot of fiction in order to support their own agenda.

Let's take a look at Missouri as an example.

Generally, the FBI's annual violent crime report stats on their surface are favorable towards the expansion of firearms rights, especially when considered over the long-term.

But the reporting of raw numbers, in and of themselves, does not necessarily show a causal relationship.

Missouri passed Constitutional Carry in 2016 and the law went into effect in January of 2017.

In fact, I'm quite proud of that. I was there, and I helped pass it in 2016 as the legislative liaison to the Missouri legislature for the Missouri Firearms Coalition, working on then-Representative Eric Burlison's bill)

2017's numbers, according to the studies you'll hear by the opponents of the 2nd Amendment, were higher than 2016's numbers.

Quoting these "studies," Constitutional Carry opponents say that this is evidence of why we shouldn't pass Constitutional Carry here in Ohio.

But the honest truth you'll never hear from these studies or their adherents is that St Louis is a very violent city, often the most violent in America, and their violent crime rates make their entire state look bad!

In fact, if you watch the television reports out of St Louis you'll see that they've had massive violent crime problems for the last two summers, and none of those reports have ever said that the problem was caused because the state removed the requirement for gun owners to get a CHL to carry firearms and that because they had removed that requirement for a CHL a lot of gun owners had all of a sudden become killers!

No, a whole city having massive violent crime rate problems is a hearts and minds and the evil therein problem of that city and its criminal residents, rather than a problem caused by the rest of the state's gun-owner community.

Fanatical adherents of these "studies" would have people believe that removing someone's requirement to get a CHL somehow causes them to become stone-cold killers, but that's absurd.

And it sure doesn't make "common sense."

This bill is a great bill. It is common sense. Thank you for bringing it forward.

Ohio's best citizens want to see this committee pass it, and it will help empower good people to equalize the disparity of force between themselves and thugs or killers who want to attack innocent people.

I'd be happy to entertain any questions you might have!