

Good morning Chairman Becker, Vice-chair Stoltzfus, Ranking Member Miller and Members of the Federalism Committee.

My name is Cathi Kulik, and I'm here today to speak in opposition to HB178. I'm a retired teacher and will be speaking from that perspective today.

I do not wish to take away your guns. I support the 2nd Amendment, but I also concur with the late conservative Justice Antonin Scalia and the majority opinion that he authored in the Heller decision (Law Library of Congress), where he said the right to own a gun is not unlimited. Currently, to secure a concealed carry license in Ohio, you must have eight hours of training. No training, no license. Your right is limited. I have heard members of this committee as well as proponents of HB 178 say training is a good idea, but it can't be mandated. If current requirements for a CCL mandate eight hours of training, why can't training be mandated in HB178? I know I am not permitted to ask questions, but I would appreciate an explanation of the difference.

I've heard proponents claim that background checks are not effective, with the tragic killing of nine during a Bible study in a Charleston church given as an example. The shooter filled out the background check paperwork, and three days later, he was sold a gun. But the whole story is that, by law, if gun dealers do not receive a flat denial in three days, the customer may buy the gun. The dealer did not receive that denial, so the dealer sold the gun. From [The American Bar Association Journal](#) (July, 2015), I learned that large retailers, Wal-Mart, for example, won't sell a gun without background check results, no matter how long it

takes. “The marginal sale of a gun means little to the bottom line of a large dealer, which is not the case for smaller stores, such as the one who sold Mr. Roof his gun.” According to FBI and ATF statistics (2015), 2.8 million applications were denied in the past twenty years; 42% were because of felony convictions. 2.8 million people who wanted to purchase a gun were denied because they could not pass a background check.

During testimony, a member of the committee indicated that he had seen pictures of armed teachers in Israel on the Internet. According to The Times of Israel, a publication founded by conservative writer, David Horowitz, “There is no record of any teacher being allowed to bring a gun into a classroom.” Such a picture was likely a school security guard. To own a gun in Israel, you must prove why you need a gun, which then determines what type of gun you are permitted to buy, your criminal, physical and mental health record is studied, and you must pass a mandatory shooting course. Your application may still be rejected; 40% are (Israeli government website). I’m not advocating for these requirements, but if Israel is going to be cited as an example it is important to have complete and accurate information.

On the topic of teachers carrying guns, a committee member specifically asked if armed teachers would have prevented the loss of life at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. In researching this, I found an interview conducted by Jeremy Hobson (May 29, 2019) with Greg Pittman, a teacher at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. He was there the day of the shooting, teaching his history class. Mr. Pittman is a gun owner, but he said he would not want to carry his gun on campus. For a \$500 stipend, teachers are

supposed to *identify and respond properly* to an active shooter. He further states that arming teachers is a cheap solution to a complicated problem that actually helps the gun industry because, potentially, more guns could be sold. Mr. Pittman maintains that the root of the problem is it is too easy to access weapons. This man has lived through the trauma of a school shooting and does not believe armed teachers will prevent school shootings. Because of circumstances beyond his control, he knows more than he ever wanted to know about school shootings.

Mr. Pittman cited many issues that he has with teachers being armed, and I encourage you to listen to the full interview, but lack of training was a major concern of his. I decided to research training of police officers, as it seemed logical to me that they would be among the most highly trained in our society. Training varies from department to department, but most require qualifying on marksmanship and simulated training, up to four times a year on both. From a Force Science News study (February 22, 2018) of the Dallas Police Department that was conducted over a fifteen-year period, Dr. Christopher Donner and Nicole Popovich from Loyola University stated, “Along with good marksmanship and firearms training, a successful training for officer-involved shootings requires accurate shoot/don’t shoot decision-making ability, the ability to shoot at unpredictable and moving targets, and the ability to perform these skills within high-stress circumstances.” All of this training, and the hit rate in the study was 35%. We expect teachers to be more accurate?

Chris Grollnek is an active shooter prevention expert (www.chrisgrollnek.com) with an extensive resume, including testifying before Congress and appearing as an expert on news shows, such as

Tucker Carlson's on FOX. He says, "Simply putting a gun on the premises and hoping someone's going to do the right thing with it is baseless. All you're doing is signing people up for PTSD."

At the June 5 hearing, a committee member said, "It's not about somebody being shot," in reference to this bill. Yes, it most certainly is. To every person sitting in this room, whether you think a gun is necessary to protect you from an assailant, or you fear someone who doesn't know how to handle a gun will shoot you, this is absolutely about "somebody being shot."

There was a time that I didn't understand why anyone would want a gun, but as I have engaged in conversations with gun owners, I have adjusted my thinking. Perhaps you live on a farm and need to protect your livestock from wild animals. Or maybe you are a competitive shooter and you like the "rush" from competing and winning. There are a number of reasons that you might want to own a gun. I have no interest in denying you. I simply want you to be trained. That's finding common ground, as most proponents have agreed that training is important. I'm asking you to oppose HB178 and make Ohio safer for all of us.

I'm happy to entertain questions.