

March 27, 2023

To: Judiciary Committee

From: John Finnessy

RE: OPPOSITION SB1

First, thank you for allowing the citizen to at least have a voice before this gets shoved through the committee and House. Before you do that though, I ask you to consider your own lives.

If you, like Senator Waldstreicher, fear the honest working citizen of Maryland who has completed the requirements of the Maryland State Police. Those who have been approved to carry a firearm have safely done so for over half a century. If you fear them and are willing to trample on the rights you swore to protect, then violate the oath and vote for it. A better question for you delegate is, do you “feel safer” knowing the person next, that honest hard-working citizen who would risk their life for you, can no longer protect you when the criminal pulls a knife or gun on you? Do you have a fear of that criminal? Are you aware the police do not have a responsibility to protect you?

[Justices Rule Police Do Not Have a Constitutional Duty to Protect Someone - The New York Times \(nytimes.com\)](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/01/us/politics/justices-rule-police-do-not-have-a-constitutional-duty-to-protect-someone.html)

SB1 is the most overreach of government I have ever witnessed. I oppose this on so many levels. I will allow the attorneys to solidify the freedom to carry a firearm when they file a law suit against this overreach. You have a chance to stop it! To sit with both sides, to share ideas within a diverse, inclusive committee made of a round table where everyone has a voice! You do embrace inclusivity do you not?

The overreach is so blatant:

- 1) To have to obtain permission from someone to exercise a right.
- 2) You will put the burden on someone who does not drink alcohol to know if there is a liquor license on the property before they walk in.
- 3) To limit a citizen the ability to protect themselves based off an ever moving subjective list legislators deem as a "safe no carry zone".
- 4) You create a good and substantial reason for exemptions. Just because someone was a LEO they are exempt.
- 5) It will be the only license in the state that if you do not have it on you at the time you carry, it is revoked! Who else do you treat so horribly?
- 6) You will require instructors to teach laws you have never passed. Please explain that reasoning.
- 7) You will require instructors, without any onus on the state, to develop curriculum regarding mental health or an outline of which of the 250 pages of firearm laws they will be required to teach.
- 8) This model of legislation has been rejected by the courts in every jurisdiction it has been tried in.

This is a horribly written piece of legislation, written by a senator who obviously has very limited knowledge of the subject, and has not taken the time to become educated on the aspects of carrying a firearm. It is pure arrogance.

For these reasons and more, I OPPOSE this legislation and ask you to not move it out of committee. It is time for your delegate to keep the oath your swore.