

David A. Bishop of Arnold Maryland: Testimony to be read February 11, 2020.

As a very strong 2nd Amendment supporter and gun rights advocate, I can confidently stand behind the concept of this bill. I believe many of our state laws are over burdensome to purchasing and owning a firearm. However, I also strongly believe we should have measures in place that prevent violent convicts from possessing fire arms AND to protect untrained and young children from handling firearms without proper supervision. So far as I can tell, this legislation does NOT put an undue burden or infringement on our right to own and carry fire arms, with one small exception, section c, paragraph 1.

I would strongly suggest an amendment that would stop this legislation from hinting on overreach. The language in this section indicates that a child "Could" come into unsupervised possession of a firearm. Children could be curious enough to sneak away with keys and try to gain access. I have personally taken additional steps in my own home to ensure my firearms are locked securely and that the access to unlock them is beyond my child's ability to sneak past. It is necessary that owners go above and beyond to keep their families and children safe from accidents or even malicious behavior. However, when we set language in law to require a burden of impossibility for an owner, then it infringes on their right to keep arms. They cannot possibly safeguard against every possible scenario, however, they should be held responsible for maintaining reasonable control of their weapons at all times, just as any military or militia member would be expected to do. I believe this law should set the standard for reasonable control and security rather than simply stating the word "could".

Language to the effect of:

"4-104.(c)1. A person shall not leave a firearm in a location without security storage devices in place to restrict an unsupervised child from accessing OR manipulating the firearm to discharge."

The proposed legislation does a good job of creating requisites for sections 2 and 3 of this paragraph. But by changing section 1 it will ensure that people are not charged with a crime when they store their key and safe in the same home.

Is this splitting hairs? Maybe. But I believe that our natural rights are worth having these detailed discussions to propose the "what-if" scenarios in enforcement of proposed laws.

Thank you for your time today and for considering this change before sending this bill to the floor.