

From: Jonathon Hill <JHill@schouse.gov>  
To: 'Ed Dutton' <duttone@att.net>  
CC: Kevin L. Bryant <KevinBryant@scstatehouse.gov>  
Date: 2/1/2017 5:19:54 PM  
Subject: RE: H 3330 Jacob Hall's Law ~ Website email from Ed Dutton

---

Mr. Dutton,

Clearly you have spent some time thinking through this and I appreciate your sharing your concerns. I welcome a good healthy debate.

In my perspective, my bill as drafted either addresses or allows the school to address each of your concerns. The bill was carefully drafted to leave the door wide open that if schools decide to allow someone with a CWP to carry on the grounds, that they are allowed to require whatever level of additional training that they see fit. This could be anywhere from very strict training requirements to no additional training at all. As I have pointed out before, this would only be an issue if they *take action to make a policy allowing someone to carry*. In the absence of such a policy, the state ban on school carry would continue in force.

As to teachers or staff becoming targets, if they are concealed carrying, the attacker would not know who may have a gun and who would not. This is actually the whole point of the bill. The possibility of someone on the premises carrying concealed deters an attacker from picking that school as a target. I would also point out that an SRO carrying openly and in uniform would be a much more obvious target than a non-SRO carrying concealed.

Finally, shooting when under stress and moving is an issue any CWP holder should be thinking about and training for. That's why organizations like IDPA exist, and it applies to many other situations. If you're going to shut down a person's right to self-defense because they might not shoot as well under pressure, then you have to take away all CWP carry for anyone but police and military. I doubt that's where you personally want to go.

Sincerely,

Rep. Jonathon Hill  
864-245-5885

---

From: Ed Dutton [mailto:duttone@att.net]  
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2017 1:18 PM  
To: Jonathon Hill  
Cc: Kevin L. Bryant  
Subject: RE: H 3330 Jacob Hall's Law ~ Website email from Ed Dutton

Jonathon, thanks for your reply.

Some of my concerns about H 3330 are as follows:

1. This bill opens the door to unintended consequences needlessly. One cannot think of all of the things that could go wrong. For just this reason I suggest that the risks outweighs the action that this bill allows.
2. I am a member of the Belton Gun Club and am quite familiar with various fire arms.....long guns and handguns. Also, sometime ago I attended a multi-week Anderson County Sheriff's school concerning crime and guns. One of the sessions had us at a firing range firing handguns under simulated conditions. Also, I have seen actual films of shootings. I will tell you, and I feel, that law enforcement personnel at the sheriff's office will back me up when I say that the accuracy of firing a handgun under stressful conditions are less than 50% of the results at a range. And this is when experienced people are firing. This means that bullets could go anywhere.
3. Based on the foregoing I think it wishful thinking if not ludicrous to think that school personnel – even if they have a CWP – could perform like a law enforcement officer. There would be too high a risk of

collateral damage. Under stress an untrained person could fire not realizing what is in the background or miss a threat before the threat fires back.

4. At a firing range a shooter is stationary. Under actual conditions one is probably moving and does not have time to aim properly. This is why trained law enforcement officers would keep firing until the threat is over because they probably have missed more than they did not miss. They will exhaust a clip and immediately insert a new clip and keep firing if the threat is still there. Law enforcement officers are trained to perform in this manner and they are required to go to a range routinely to keep familiar with their weapon.
5. Just because a person has a CWP license does not mean that they would perform like a trained law enforcement officer who always carries extra clips of ammunition.
6. I had the unique experience of seeing a shoot-out between a bank guard and a robber when I worked at a bank in Atlanta long ago. The guard had a 38 service revolver. The battle took place just outside of the branch bank, so, I got to see what happened through bullet proof glass. In summary, the guard's bullets never hit the robber but the robber did shoot the guard who died on the bank floor. The robber drove away in a truck that was later found and there were no blood stains in the truck. However, there was one bullet hole in the door of the truck. We don't know where the guard's other bullets went. So, this was a trained guard who did not hit his target. What would school personnel person do?
7. It is impractical to think that teachers and other school personnel could carry a firearm and extra ammunition.
8. Also, it is impractical and dangerous for school personnel to keep a firearm in a desk or cabinet where it might be stolen or not within reach if needed.
9. Also, if it became generally known that a teacher might be armed, a shooter would probably shoot a teacher first.

Jonathon, as you can see the list goes on and is only limited by your imagination. The bottom line is that, while there are good intentions about this bill, this is an ill- advised action for the foregoing reason and other unintended consequences.

Currently the "door" is closed to let schools allow guns for school personnel..... and guns, etc. are not allowed on school property except by law enforcement officers. In my opinion, this "door" should remain closed!

Thanks for your consideration.

Ed Dutton

---

From: Jonathon Hill [<mailto:JHill@schouse.gov>]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 3:17 PM  
To: 'duttone@att.net' <[duttone@att.net](mailto:duttone@att.net)>  
Subject: RE: H 3330 Jacob Hall's Law ~ Website email from Ed Dutton

Hello Ed,

Thanks for your question, and I am interested in your perspective and why you think this is a bad approach.

My position is that I am in favor of the state holding up our end of the deal by fully funding the education funding formula. If the funds are available, I am also willing to support additional funding specifically for SROs. I am also in favor of removing the state ban on allowing CWP holders to carry on school grounds.

I am NOT in favor of state mandates, especially unfunded ones. I am not in favor of a state mandate that every school have an SRO. I am not in favor of requiring schools to allow CWP holders to carry guns. I am not in favor of state mandates in general, because I don't think it is our job to micromanage education from the Statehouse. What I think a school should do is irrelevant. My job is to protect each school's ability to make the decisions that best suit the individual school and their communities.

There are many ways to respond to the safety vulnerabilities that are highlighted in the wake of a tragic incident like

what happened at Townville Elementary. I do not think we can presume to know the *best* way in each situation for each school, but we should support their decision making by supplying the legally-required funding for education, by making sure they have the flexibility to spend all the funds they are given in the way that works best for them, and by making sure they have all the policy flexibility we can give them on matters like self-defense.

If my bill passes, nothing changes except that the school board and school administration would have the ability to make a policy to allow CWP holders to carry. If they choose to exercise this ability, they would decide for themselves who could carry, what training requirements would apply, and under what conditions. Or, they could simply do nothing and maintain the status quo. It's up to them.

Please feel free to share your reasoning, I'm interested to hear what your thoughts are.

Thanks,

Rep. Jonathon Hill  
SC House District 8  
864-245-5885

From: [duttone@att.net](mailto:duttone@att.net) [mailto:[duttone@att.net](mailto:duttone@att.net)]  
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 12:25 PM  
Subject: H 3330 Jacob Hall's Law ~ Website email from Ed Dutton

Jonathon, I am interested(as are others) to know what prompted you to introduce this bill. Just off the top it seems like a terrible idea. BUT, I am sure you know that. So what is the motivating factor that motivated you to act on this? Please respond. I have been a supporter. Incidentally, there is a super electronic method that I feel many schools will adopt that will be far and away better than guns. Thanks for your response, Ed Dutton

Ed Dutton  
129 Sea Palms  
Anderson, SC 29621  
864 222 4076