

September 19, 2017

Chair Roegner, Ranking Member Leiland and members of the House Federalism and Interstate Relations Committee, I am Gary Witt, a legislative coordinator with Ohioans for Concealed Carry. I am giving opponent testimony on Sub HB 142.

Much has been pointed out to the committee about what is wrong with Substitute HB 142 by OFCC Director Chuck LaRosa's written testimony. I will not waste committee time by repeating the testimony but I will elaborate on it.

Substitute HB 142 contradicts the previous intent of the Ohio Legislature. In 2007, the General Assembly found the need to provide uniform laws throughout the state regulating, among other things, the ownership, possession, transport, carrying of firearms. As a result of the legislature's desire to provide uniform laws, Ohio Revised Code 9.68 was enacted.

By passing Substitute House Bill 142 out of committee you are taking a step backwards. You are doing this by giving your approval to a patchwork quilt of firearms laws throughout the state in opposition to the Legislature's intent in ORC 9.68. The reasoning behind this statement is the Ohio Supreme Court decision in *Niles v. Howard* that allows municipalities to pass laws that would increase penalties to first degree misdemeanors. Municipalities thumb their noses at the law and the Ohio Legislature by violating ORC 9.68. Ohioans for Concealed Carry has successfully sued municipalities for this and continues to find it necessary to file lawsuits for violations.

Has the committee even considered how a 1<sup>st</sup> degree misdemeanor conviction of carrying a concealed weapon may affect an individual's employment? The original House Bill 142 eliminated this cloud over concealed carry licensees heads. Why are you now allowing this cloud to continue?

The SUPPOSED purpose of the Substitute HB is "officer safety". A logical explanation of how notification makes officers safe hasn't been provided by law enforcement. 36 states do not require notification and there have been no problems with officer safety in these states. We believe that Law enforcement claims of officer safety are false claims.

What started out as a good bill for legally armed citizens of Ohio has changed, through the Substitute House Bill, to a bill that contradicts the intent of the Ohio Legislature in 2007, penalizes Ohio's legally armed citizens and does not provide for officer safety.

Ohioans For Concealed Carry strongly opposes Substitute House Bill 142, respectfully requests that the Substitute HB be rescinded and the original House Bill 142 be passed out of committee.

Thank you. I will attempt to answer any questions that you have.

Gary Witt, OFCC Legislative Coordinator

