

Daniel J. Carlin-Weber  
SB624 – UNF  
Judicial Proceedings Committee  
2/17/2021

I am a firearms instructor and advocate of responsible firearms handling and ownership. Currently, I am certified by the Maryland State Police as a Qualified Handgun Instructor and regularly teach the course necessary to receive the Handgun Qualification License (HQL). I'm also a Utah Concealed Firearm Permit Instructor, and NRA Range Safety Officer and Basic Pistol Instructor. Since 2016, I have instructed Marylanders from all walks of life on how to safely operate firearms and the responsibilities that come with their usage. I come before you today to urge an unfavorable report of Senate Bill 624.

SB624/HB638 are the first bills brought before the General Assembly that do not immediately threaten current owners of homemade guns with jail for possessing items Marylanders have always been able to make and keep. Rather, SB624/HB638 allows current owners to keep their privately made arms so long as they follow a number of requirements by January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2022. Any private gun making after that date could be penalized without first going through a Federally Licensed dealer as a civil violation for a first offense and “unfinished firearms receivers” cannot be brought into the state short of them being serialized and handled as if they were “Regulated Firearms” under Maryland law. So-called “ghost guns” and the parts for them could not be lawfully created or possessed after this date.

While it's important that this bill does attempt to create a legal pathway for current owners of homemade guns to keep them, those owners still face a complicated series of regulations that will be difficult and cost-prohibitive to follow for most people. Violations are costly whether the

violation was intended or not and the laws ripe for selective, discriminatory, and abusive enforcement. The bills also unnecessarily target “undetectable firearms” and would criminalize the current possession “covert firearms,” of which are legal items currently possessed within the state, and highly regulated under the National Firearms Act (NFA) as “Any Other Weapons” (AOW). SB624/HB638 should be withdrawn or at minimum be made more accommodating so the typical Marylander can comply without facing financial or legal ruin.

Making one’s own gun has always been legal in the United States and indeed, Maryland. An owner must not be legally prohibited from firearms possession and the gun itself must be in compliance with federal, state, and local laws. The manner of production has not mattered, whether it be via welding metal parts together, removing metal from an unfinished receiver (i.e., common 80% receivers), or by any number of possible methods. As a result, there are an untold number of homemade firearms in Maryland. There lacks an all-seeing authority with the ability to peer into every person’s basement, garage, or kitchen. Therefore, these items are not accounted for in any database, nor have they ever been required to be reported to an agency within the state merely because they were created. Serialization of these firearms has also never been required.

Though the bill does allow Marylanders to keep guns they may have made, they must engrave them in a very specific manner. While some homemade gun owners do voluntarily serialize or otherwise mark their own guns with something identifiable in the event of loss or theft, any of these marks are inadequate unless they comply with the very strict and lengthy requirements put forth in the bill. A unique serial number, the gun’s caliber, a model, the country of origin, and the owner’s full name and city must be engraved into the receiver or frame in-line with federal regulations. See *Firearms - Guides - Importation & Verification of Firearms, Ammunition - Firearms Verification*


*Overview, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives*, <https://www.atf.gov/firearms/firearms-guides-importation-verification-firearms-ammunition-firearms-verification-overview>. Complying with these requirements is in many cases much more difficult than making the gun itself. This sort of work usually requires CNC (computer numerical control) machines capable of spinning a purpose-made bit accurately enough to meet the requirements of § 5-703(a)(1). Unless the owner has this hardware on their own, they'll need to seek the services of a gunsmith. Not all gunsmiths offer engraving services and those that do are free to charge whatever price they set. Every personally made firearm made by a citizen would need to be engraved in this manner at their expense and with prices being variable and gunsmith availability not guaranteed, these mandates will prove burdensome. It's also worth noting that the proposed requirements require at least **63 years-worth** of guns be serialized and engraved in only a handful of months. This is a very short window of time and it is doubtful the network of capable gunsmiths in the state would be able to meet demand, especially when considering that they have had their hands very full with regular gun sales and demand is not relenting in 2021. See *Issue Papers 2021 Legislative Session*, Maryland Department of Legislative Services, <http://dls.maryland.gov/pubs/prod/RecurRpt/Issue-Papers-2021-Legislative-Session.pdf> (p. 249). Also see *Gun Sales Rise During Civil Unrest, Pandemic*, News4 Washington, January 15, 2021, <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/us/gun-sales-rise-during-civil-unrest-pandemic/ar-BB1cLQNb>.

Not only does SB624/HB638 require that finished privately made firearms be marked, but it would also be necessary to mark any unfinished or uncompleted frames or receivers in the same manner. These are merely just parts in such a form and carry little legal significance for someone who is not legally barred from possessing firearms. They are readily available from any number of

sources, including from every surrounding state and from numerous websites. It does not take much imagination to see how easily a bad actor working within a police department could easily obtain these devices and perhaps plant them on someone they wish to make a suspect. As chronicled in *I Got a Monster: The Rise and Fall of America's Most Corrupt Police Squad* by Brandon Soderberg and Baynard Woods, Baltimore's Gun Trace Task Force (GTTF) planted firearms and even BB guns on supposed suspects under false pretenses to initiate an arrest or justify violence against those in communities already reeling from decades police misconduct. In the time preceding the GTTF's unravelling, they were *praised* for getting "illegal" guns off of the street despite the crimes they were committing in order to do so. SB624/HB638 and any similar laws that attack possession of items only provides more avenues ripe for exploitation by similar actors.

There are other problems with SB624/HB638. Under proposed § 5-702(1), any firearms made prior to 1968 are exempted from the new requirements, presumably because commercial firearms manufacturers were not mandated by federal law to issue serial numbers for guns until the enactment of the Gun Control Act (GCA) in 1968. However, the language in the SB624/HB638 does not reflect that the GCA was enacted on October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 1968. See *Gun Control Act of 1968*, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-82/pdf/STATUTE-82-Pg1213-2.pdf>. It is unclear how an investigator, or even the possessor of the gun itself is supposed to know the difference between a homemade gun made in 1966 and one in 1972, let alone one made in September of 1968 and November 1968. The legislation should reflect the proper date of enactment, not merely the year it went into effect. Going further, § 5-706(A)(2) describes items that are currently strictly regulated by the National Firearms Act of 1934 (NFA) (<https://govtrackus.s3.amazonaws.com/legislink/pdf/stat/48/STATUTE-48-Pg1236.pdf>) as "Any Other Weapons" (AOW). Essentially, if a firearm is disguised as something one wouldn't

recognize as a firearm, it's an AOW. § 5-706(B)(2) bans the possession of these items despite that they are legal to possess under federal law so long as the requirements of the NFA are followed. Current owners would be dispossessed of an AOW they legally own without just compensation should this language become law. Public safety is not advanced by criminalizing these extremely law-abiding individuals.



*Fig. 1- Liberator pistol as viewed by an x-ray. Does this look undetectable to you?*

The legislation also seeks to ban the possession of “undetectable” firearms, but this too does not advance public safety as these items do not pose a threat to defeating devices designed to catch contraband like firearms. Purely plastic firearms and potentially undetectable firearms fall under the Undetectable Firearms Act of 1988

(<https://www.congress.gov/bill/100th-congress/house-bill/4445>). For 33 years, at least 3.7 ounces of steel must be present in a firearm so that it can be picked up by an x-ray machine or metal detector. No 3D printed gun can be legally made without that steel. Even the infamous Liberator pistol (fig. 1) has a space in its design to accommodate a 6 oz block of steel and the instructions explicitly warn the maker to insert it before completion so as to not break federal law. Even without the steel block, an x-ray or metal detector would still detect the firing pin (a common nail in the Liberator’s case), any ammunition, and the shape of the design itself.

§ 5-117.1 would be updated by this legislation to require that anyone purchasing an “unfinished frame or receiver” after January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2022 also possess a valid Handgun Qualification License (HQL). Currently, the HQL is only needed for acquiring a **handgun**. Though handguns are “regulated firearms” under current law, there are other items considered “regulated firearms” that do not require the HQL to obtain because they are not handguns. Unfinished frames and receivers can be built into long guns, which are not regulated by Maryland law or by the State Police. Requiring not only that someone comply with all of the marking and registration requirements for unfinished firearms and receivers already detailed previously AND that they have the HQL serves as nothing more than a deterrent against a Marylander working to comply with the law and does nothing against someone who has little to no respect for it.

I understand the desire to make Maryland a safer place for residents and that legislators have a duty to represent their constituents’ best interests, however, this legislation does not contribute in the slightest to public safety and makes many of the same mistakes of legislation submitted in prior years on this topic. Individuals determined to harm others will still find the means in order to do so unabated despite this legislation while honest and innocent Marylanders only face more burdensome and confusing laws that appear to do little more other than to punish them for seeking privacy. Prosecutors in Maryland already have a plethora of criminal statutes at their disposal for targeting those bringing harm against others in our communities (see MD Code, Public Safety, § 5-101(g), § 5-133(b), and § 5-205(b), just to name a few). Complying with the overwhelmingly intricate and tedious gun laws in Maryland that currently exist already leaves responsible people at risk of innocently running afoul of them and here the State again demands that gun owners shoulder more burdens entirely on their own. They do not need more potential pitfalls.

I urge an unfavorable report.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'D. Carlin-Weber', is centered below the text. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a small circle at the end of the final stroke.

Daniel J. Carlin-Weber  
300 St Paul Pl., 711  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
Djc\_w@icloud.com