

**Written Testimony:**

Douglass R Palmer  
14001 Molly Berry Road  
Brandywine, MD 20613  
814-207-6052

Date: February 6, 2023

I am writing in regards to the follow bills and would like to make the following statements on each as noted:

**SB001:**

**I am in opposition of this bill in its entirety.** I would like to believe that the Maryland Legislature is making policy based on sound evidence and facts. The limiting and restricting of possession of firearms by permitted carriers is not based on either. Unless one is very meticulous cherry-picking studies performed on the subject there is no basis in facts to limit law abiding citizen from defending themselves outside their homes. The criminal rate of wear and carry permit holders is one of the lowest rates among any groups of people nationwide. The crime **rate** of gun permit holders is lower than that of off duty police officers. There is no data that even suggest that restrictions on permit holders will affect crime rates. The reality is that the states that have the most restrictive gun laws also have the highest violent crime rates. Despite Maryland having some the most stringent gun laws in the nation and, up until July of 2022, an almost impossible means to get a wear can carry permit we still have some of the highest gun violence in the nation. Baltimore is either first or second in the nation in gun violence currently. There is no correlation or connection between lower rates of gun violence and increase restrictions on a person's ability to legally wear and carry a firearm for personal protection. The overwhelming majority of locations that gun violence and mass shooting take place are in areas that either guns are entirely prohibited or that the laws make having a gun so burdensome that no one, except those committing crimes, have them. The statical reality is, the more "gun free" zones there are, the more targets murderous lunatics have to commit atrocities. And they do exactly that, they attack the area that are gun free because they are coward and know that they will not be stopped until they have killed as many as possible. The SCOTUS ruling clearly denotes that one has a right to protect themselves outside of their homes. Its sad time in this country when it takes a SCOTUS ruling to affirm that right, but it did. I hope that this legislative session also affirms that constitutional right, instead of choosing to act out of ignorance and emotion.

**SB0086:**

I am in opposition of this bill in its entirety. The constitution grants **all** full right of citizens at the age of 18. Owning a firearm and purchasing the ammunition for the firearm is a constitutional right. Unless we decide to change the legal age of adulthood, we should not be taking away constitutional rights from 18-20 year old citizens. If a person is legally an mentally able to choose their leadership (able to vote), they are also legal and mentally able to exercise the right of owning a firearm.

**SB0113:**

I am in opposition of this bill in its entirety. We need to hold the people who commit a crime responsible for their actions. We don't blame a car manufacture when someone purposely uses a vehicle to harm or kill someone, but we are somehow we are trying to justify doing exactly that with firearm producers. This law is a subjective law that will allow people to go after third parties who are not a party to a crime in an effort to make purchasing a firearm more difficult. Anyone trying to sell this bill as anything other than an end run around the Constitution and federal law is not be intellectually honest with themselves or others.

**SB0159:**

I believe this bill as written could be abused. If it is solely construction to be **entirely voluntary** and would requiring an affidavit, then I might support the bill. My fear is that the law enforcement would use this as a tool in criminal plea bargaining. I would hope that the process to restore a persons right after they have voluntary surrendered it is clear and unburdening.

**HB0364:**

I fully support this bill. Half of the state in the country are now constitutional carry states. The first state became so in 2003. We now have two decades of crime data on the impact of removing the requirement of permits to carry a firearm for your personal protection. Clearly, there is no correlation between the increasing or decreasing of legal firearms possession and crime rates. There have been multiple studies conducted and the best that can be said is that there was no impact on crime rates by making it legal to carry firearm without a permit. There are multiple studies that have inferred that it may actually reduce the crime rates in certain states.

**HB0413:**

I support this bill. There is no factual or evidentiary basis for denying a legal cannabis user the ability to purchase a firearm. There is absolutely no evidence that a legal cannabis user is more prone to commit violent crime than any other group of people. Denying someone their constitutional right solely based on an arbitrary guideline that is not basis in fact or evidence is wrong.

**HB0481:**

I am in opposition of this bill in its entirety. I think that any prison sentence upon people that are constitutionally entire to ware and carry a firearm for personal protection is a travesty. Increasing the already overly punitive sentencing is idiotic at best.