

Making firearms illegal for Marylanders to build at home will not only be a gross violation of constitutional rights and American traditions, but will also not accomplish any goals of reducing crime, and put many responsible citizens in violation of the law simply by continuing to possess their legally owned property.

The goal of reducing violence will not be served by SB0387 simply because felons are already breaking multiple laws to be in possession of firearms. It is illegal for felons to possess, carry, make, and use firearms. A felon who is already breaking multiple laws will not be deterred by an additional law. Many firearms used in crime are stolen, which is already against the law. How would this bill in any way change that dynamic? Shouldn't that problem be addressed before hobbyists and legal gun owners are targeted by an overarching law prohibiting the home building of firearms?

The vast majority of privately made firearms are in lawful common use by law-abiding gun owners. Whether it be for customization for competition, or to enhance a collection, there are an infinite number of practical uses for home built firearms. There are certain collectible firearms that can only be owned by building them at home. For example, many WW1 and WW2 era firearms were destroyed, and only parts remain today. If someone wishes to own an example of these rare firearms, they would have to be assembled by an individual from existing parts, while other parts would need to be made from scratch. This bill would make all of these types of firearms illegal to own, or make in the future.

There are likely many hundreds of thousands of unserialized firearms legally owned by law-abiding Maryland citizens who use them daily for lawful purposes. There is no reason to penalize these gun owners by requiring engraving that will cost them, in most cases, \$50+ per firearm that they already own. Why should this cost be thrust upon legal gun owners retroactively?

In many cases, it is not possible to engrave alternative materials (such as ABS and PLA plastics) according to ATF guidelines. Therefore, any currently legal firearm frame owned by law-abiding citizens made from materials such as ABS and PLA would likely not be able to be compliant with SB0387.

The ATF has long held that the 80% threshold determines at what state of manufacture that raw materials become a firearm. This is the point where it has long been established by the ATF that a firearm can "readily be completed." The current 80% threshold is objective and enforceable. The proposed SB0387 5-701 (H) (1) doesn't provide an objective definition of "MAY READILY BE COMPLETED" and should defer to the long-established ATF 80% definition. Under SB0387, any chunk of metal or plastic could be considered a firearm arbitrarily.

SB0387 generates significant burden on citizens, FFLs, and non-FFL manufacturers with minimal benefit. There is no evidence presented that being able to more easily trace unserialized firearms would provide any crime-reduction benefit. The minimal speculative benefit of this proposed rule doesn't justify the significant burden that further infringes on the 2nd Amendment rights of citizens in Maryland.

If unserialized firearms are being unlawfully manufactured, creating additional rules and levying requirements will have zero effect on the unlawful manufacturer since they are already violating federal law. If a felon is already willing to possess a firearm knowingly and illegally, and use it to commit a violent crime, why would they bother to put a serial number on it, and why would they have any reservation to manufacturing it?

“UNFINISHED FRAMES OR RECEIVERS” often require significant machining on multiple/all faces of the item which may obliterate any existing markings on the raw castings/forgings. Once completed, certain designs may be susceptible to damage due to the force used to create the stampings of serial numbers.