

Charles Knaggs
35296 Golf Course Drive
Mechanicsville, MD 20659
c-knaggs@hotmail.com
301-643-3285

Senate Bill 1

Position: Oppose

I am writing you today in opposition to Senate Bill 1. There are many egregious portions of this bill, however; I would like to focus on a couple that are particularly overbearing. The first being the statute stating any one in lawful possession of a carry permit may not carry their firearm into a place that has a liquor license and sells alcohol for on site consumption.

It is already Maryland State law that any person carrying a firearm under the authority of a Maryland wear and carry permit may not consume alcohol while carrying their firearm. This statute would effectively reduce the areas in which a person could carry their firearm to defend themselves dramatically. Nearly all restaurants now feature a bar area or serve alcohol. Even some movie theaters now serve alcohol. The numerous crab houses, VFW halls, moose lodges and many other places across the states would be off limits to carry permit holders to carry their firearm even if they do not take part in consuming alcohol. This is a very large over step. I personally do not drink, I also have a CDL that would prohibit me from drinking regardless if I was carrying a firearm or not, and yet under this statute I would be prohibited from carrying my firearm for protection into one of these places even though I remain stone sober.

Where do most of the crimes around these types of locations happen, inside the destination or outside in the parking lot? It is in the parking lots, especially around the city areas or areas where parking is not immediately accessible at the location and patrons must walk a block or more to get to the establishment after parking. This statute in SB1 removes every Maryland carry permit holder's ability to defend themselves from violent crime to and from these locations as well as while they are patronizing these locations.

The special purpose locations defined in this bill are much too broad and include many areas that can not be supported by historical analog as directed all new laws must be measured against from the Bruen supreme court decision last year. Race tracks, museums, concerts, live theater events, and fairs and carnivals. These are all high profile, unsecured locations that are ripe for the picking when it comes to criminals and violent crime. Wolves do not hunt in their own dens, they go to where the prey is abundant. This is exactly how the criminal element operates. To force citizens to remain unarmed and vulnerable in these unsecured locations is unconscionable. This Bill effectively tells criminals their targets at these locations will be unable to defend themselves and will increase the risk attendees to these events become victims. These two areas of this bill are the biggest parts I have issue with. The whole bill is faulty and many portions of it unconstitutional. This bill has clearly been created in response to the Bruen case as stated by the bill's creator and singles out a group of this state's citizens with great prejudice.

Thank you,



Charles Knaggs