

I oppose SB479. It will render any firearm owner subject to unjust owing to the bill's unreasonable nature. It penalizes any owner whose firearm "could" be accessed by a minor. That means that even if extraordinary security measures are in place, the owner can be prosecuted. This is capricious and an unattainable standard, and the bill should be scrapped.

The fundamental problem lies in subjecting an owner to prosecution for doing no wrong. The bill puts responsible firearm owners in legal jeopardy, imposing unreasonable and arbitrary standards. It declares firearms owners criminally liable if a minor COULD gain access. The word "could" can and would be construed to mean "under any circumstances, to include even highly improbable ones, and even circumstances that cannot be anticipated.

The bill is rife with ambiguous terms such as "could have", and "should have". There is good reason that such terms have become the subject of the mocking colloquial term in common use today that goes: "Coulda, woulda, shoulda...". This tongue-in-cheek jab describes one who blames others for his poor planning or performance. This bill blames gun owners for occurrences beyond their control.

Even the Secret Service cannot guarantee against threats to those they protect, even though this elite agency takes every conceivable precaution. Yet, despite their sophistication and extraordinary efforts, those under Secret Service protection COULD still face danger. Yet we do not threaten the Secret Service with prosecution. Why not? Because common sense tells us that not every eventuality can be predicted or anticipated.

This bill has the effect of declaring me a criminal if a minor COULD access my firearm even if locked away in a Fort Knox two-ton safe in an underground vault surrounded by alarms and guards. Well, what if a minor were to slip past one of the guards and was a safe cracking prodigy? In that case, I go to jail. I would be subject to prosecution, because suddenly that firearm is accessible to a minor, yet every reasonable precaution was in place to prevent unauthorized access. Implausible? Sure, but the bill makes no exemption for the implausible. The reality is such that even well-intended legislation cannot anticipate all circumstances, yet this bill is not even well-intentioned – its intent is not public safety, but persecution. This bill simply declares me a criminal because something COULD happen. How fair is that? It is NOT fair, nor is it sensible.

The bill is poorly and maliciously constructed. It offers no social benefit, while serving only to criminalize responsible firearms owners that already take reasonable measures to secure their firearms. It is not humanly possible to guard against any possible scenario that could lead to an undesired outcome. Therefore, it is unfair and unreasonable to hold firearm owners to the unattainable standard that this bill imposes. This bill imposes unattainable standards upon citizens. On day one - it renders me and every other owner a criminal, and I stand in opposition.

Charles Regan

Ijamsville MD