

Submitter: Robert Ramsey
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure: SB348

This amendment is 64 pages long! The really sneaky part is that the 2-paragraph bill that was scheduled for a hearing on Monday, a 64-page amendment was submitted late Friday evening, and now the hearing will be on THIS amendment which gives the public NO time to voice their opposition. The people have only had 2 days to get this information and share it! It will increase the cost of a "permit to purchase". From \$65.00 to \$150.00.

It will increase the cost of a renewal from \$50.00 to \$110.00.

This change will be of interest to communities in low income, high crime areas. So much for "the consistent and equitable administration of the permitting process" (page 6 of the amendment.)

It will increase the wait time to get a permit after application from 30 days to 60 days. Once again, people whose safety is at risk and live in places where the police simply do not respond will want to take special note of this provision.

The amendments still require that you complete a class that includes an: "in-person demonstration of the applicant's ability to lock, load, unload, fire and store a firearm before an instructor "approved" by a law enforcement agency."

They provide no definition for what they mean by "lock." The word may not mean what they think it means.

It creates a 72 hour waiting period to take possession of a gun from a dealer AFTER you have gone through the process of getting a "permit." A process that does not, of course, exist.

It requires the State Police create a "report" which "shall additionally specify, for each county, racial and gender information concerning each applicant within the total number of permits granted..." though it's not clear what "gender" actually means since that is now open to interpretation.

It forbids 18-20 year olds from even applying for permits to purchase.

More restrictions and limitations on our constitutional right to bear arms.

Vote NO! This amendment will be tied up in courts again as it is unconstitutional!