

Submitter: Matt Coningsby
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: HB3075

As an independent voter, this is very disturbing to me. Much of the changes proposed seem to be designed very carelessly in regards to the rights of the people, and at a time where it's more critical than ever to protect the freedoms of the people. If you are going to enact laws with the goal of improving gun safety and preventing needless death, there are plenty of ways in which that could be done without encroaching nearly as much on the ability of responsible people to acquire firearms for safe recreation or protection of life.

Extending the time for application approval from 30 to 60 days is unnecessary and not justified. If the office is struggling to handle that, it's an opportunity to create more jobs and employ people.

Increasing the maximum fee for applications makes does nothing but make it harder for working class and low income people and families to be able to buy a firearm which they might use for simple recreation, defense of life, or even hunting to sustainably and ethically put food on the table.

There is no "emergency" that warrants this measure being effective upon passage, being a relatively unremarkable issue comparatively to others and statewide. While more training is almost always better when it comes to firearms, to force training upon people accompanied by extra costs is needlessly prohibitive in a way which, along with application fees, filters applicants based on class and income, not responsibility.

And that's not to mention the magazine capacity ban associated with the measure- which any criminal can easily bypass with a 3D printer or basic tools- only effectively restricting the capacity for law abiding citizens, and making it harder for them to effectively defend themselves or others should the unfortunate need arise (particularly important for those who are not physically substantial enough to handle larger calibers, and who for the same reason tend to be more at risk of being a target for violence).

In a situation where one has to defend themselves or others with lethal force, you should have as many chances and as much capacity as you can to stop the threat- and especially in a state infamous for the prevalence of hard drug use, it would not be shocking to encounter someone who cannot be reasoned with, would not be discouraged by nonlethal defense methods, and who would continue to pose a serious threat until their body is physically incapable of moving forward.

Any law abiding civilian who carries a gun for protection of life, carries a handgun- and handguns require more shots fired to achieve the same effectiveness that a rifle

would achieve with less, so a universal magazine capacity restriction across calibers is simply careless at best and dubious at worst.

To summarize, while I believe it is entirely fair to want to enact laws to improve firearm safety and decrease crime, this measure is a bad way to go about it, needlessly making it harder to acquire guns based on class instead of responsibility, and making it significantly harder for law abiding citizens-especially those at a physical disadvantage- to effectively utilize guns for self defense or defense of others; without effectively limiting criminals at all.