

March 4, 2020

I am a member of Multiple Gun Rights organizations. Maryland Shall Issue, Associated Gun Clubs, Maryland State Rifle and Pistol Association, and the National Rifle Association. I am a certified Range Safety Officer with the NRA. I compete in multiple shooting events such as Steel Challenge, 3-gun, small bore, and vintage military rifle matches. I am an avid firearms collector. I have serious concerns about this bill.

I understand that we are lacking data for many things related to firearms. I have been present for every gun control bill that has been submitted this year. Time after time we ask where the data is for more restrictive gun laws. I submit data that is easily located to support my opinion. Legislation is submitted as solutions for alleged problems, when there is no data, or data that does not support such legislation. I myself have presented data from the FBI, and from Johns Hopkins, yet it gets ignored.

My concern with such a study is that it will not be completed in a non biased manner. Regularly, we see data presented by “expert panels” that is extremely biased, blatantly false, and goes against the FBI statistics. Quite frankly, I do not trust the Maryland Office of the Attorney General to complete a non biased study. That office has proven that it supports a certain agenda. If we want accurate data, groups from both sides of the issue need to be involved, and only legitimate, non biased sources used to compile data.

There is now a study conducted by UC Davis School of Medicine, and Daniel Webster of the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health that show that California’s Comprehensive Background Check system did not reduce homicide or suicide rates. This study can be found here: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1047279718306161?via%3Dihub>

This was an interesting study that did not have the effect the researchers expected. Therefore the researchers decided to try to explain away the results. <https://fee.org/articles/california-s-background-check-law-had-no-impact-on-gun-deaths-johns-hopkins-study-finds/> and <https://health.ucdavis.edu/health-news/newsroom/study-does-not-find-population-level-changes-in-firearm-homicide-or-suicide-rates-in-california/2018/11> These own studies attempt to discount the results, because they were not what they expected. If a study is performed, the results must be taken for what they are.

Furthermore, we need assurances that such a study is being done with an honest desire for facts in mind, and not with a predetermined agenda. If the study found that liberalization of carry permits reduced crime, and that licensing schemes like the HQL increased it, I would expect that data to be just as widely published as if the opposite were to be found true.

Finally, I would expect the legislative agenda to reflect findings. If it was determined that permissive gun laws create a safer climate, I would expect the legislature to rescind laws that are found to have a negative effect. If results that do not meet expectations are ignored, there is not reason to perform a study of any kind.

Katherine Novotny

District 7

443-617-7568

Katie.Novotny@hotmail.com