

Submitter:

S A

On Behalf Of:

Committee:

Senate Committee On Judiciary

Measure, Appointment or Topic:

SB243

I believe SB 243 is problematic in general but especially at this time in US History. First off, the 72 Hour waiting period may help address Suicide by Gun, but will do nothing to curb the underlying problem of suicide by other means. It may deter people intent on committing crimes of passion, but what stops them from pursuing other means? What it will definitely do is prevent people from exercising a constitutional right to protect themselves from an urgent threat like domestic violence, stalking, or any number of other urgent threats. It will hurt the most vulnerable in our society, by putting another obstacle in their path towards self-protection. The State cannot guarantee safety for all citizens, so it needs to not interfere when citizens have no choice but to provide for their own safety.

Secondarily, are 18 year olds adults or not? It seems we're confused as a society about that. There's a strong argument that if you're old enough to join the military you're old enough to purchase a civilian weapon for self-defense, hunting, or sport. If we delayed adulthood to 21, I could get on board but I believe we should be consistent.

Third, banning firearm accessories that are easy to make, or attain through illegal means only works to ensure criminals can eek out an edge over the law abiding.

Fourth and most dangerous of all, is expanding gun free zones. I'm not asking you to love or trust guns, but I am asking that you consider their near ubiquitous presence in America among the both the law abiding and the criminal class. I understand this proposed law is a well intentioned attempt to curb shootings, but unless you can disarm all would-be criminals, the unfortunate fact is that would-be shooters won't heed this new law, only law abiding citizens will. Thus you are ensuring a disparity of force, turning more areas and more of the public into easy/soft targets. When was the last time you heard of a mass shooting at a bank? Or post security at an airport? Not as common as churches, movie theaters, and schools. Those with a murderous intent are likely to be deterred by a high chance of failure provided by security forces and/or the threat of being stopped by a legally armed citizen. Creating gun-free zones, without also providing armed-security is overly idealistic and detached from our unfortunate reality in today's America. Why make it even harder to stop shootings? Why make it harder to keep the public safe from gun violence?