

Senator Langley, Representative Kornfield, and Members of the Education and Cultural Affairs Committee,

Thank you for the time to express my concerns yesterday afternoon. I presented a position that was neither for nor against LD 1761:

An Act Regarding the Prohibition on the Possession of a Firearm on School Property

My name is James Mosher. I am a Maine resident. I am a husband, father, and Navy veteran who has great concerns about restricting constitutional rights.

Mottos like *semper fidelis*, *semper paratus*, *carpe diem*...honor, courage, and commitment mean something to me.

I made these following points in response to the perspectives presented during the hearing:

- 1) You can't get a more progressive utopian concept than "gun free".
- 2) LD 1761 appears to go in the opposite direction of the spirit of LD 652: Sen. Brakey's "constitutional carry" bill that became Maine law in 2015.
- 3) LD 1761 is based on Gun-Free School Zones Act of 1990; it is my understanding that the GFSZA was revised in 1995 because of congressional overreach involving the *Commerce Clause*. The GFSZA of 1990 was dismissed as too invasive for the states.
- 4) The verbiage of LD 1761 and specifically the terms "not loaded and locked" are already stipulated in the GFSZA of 1995. There doesn't seem to be anything new here.

So, two dead and eighteen injured in Benton, Kentucky. It is a "gun free zone". And all the others (i.e., Sandy Hook, etc.) are "gun free zones".

Gabby Gifford's tweet summarizes the position we heard during the hearing "we know how to solve this problem. Congress can protect kids in their classrooms, in the cafeteria, and at the playground – but to do that they must strengthen our gun laws"; to put it simply, when criminals break laws, more laws are needed.

If we are to be honest the problem and the solution in every one of these cases where guns have been employed involves basic physics.

Newton's First Law of Motion "states that a body remains at rest or in uniform motion in a straight line unless acted upon by a force".

To go from science to reality:

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." (Edmund Burke)

“The only thing that stops a bad guy with a gun, is a good guy with a gun” (Wayne LaPierre)

If Maine lawmakers are really concerned about public safety, why handcuff the law abiding? Why not follow the lead of at least 20 other states that are actively pursuing legislation that enables the amplified presence of firearms in schools? Why hamper individual freedom by nullifying the effectiveness of a tool?

As of 2015, the *National Education Association* noted that “state lawmakers in nearly 20 states...are considering, or have recently considered, bills that would allow guns in k12 schools or on college campuses — including Colorado, Texas, Nevada, Florida, and Georgia”.

Why not here in Maine?

Those of us who truly care about the safety and security of our children know the truth. The terrorists have promised to hit the soft targets; “...well-armed bands of terrorists striking simultaneously and sequentially against multiple soft targets in an urban area...added suicide vests to increase the carnage...the big worry is that more people will decide to attack using handguns and rifles and not focus on bombs.”

Just imagine events like this happening in one, or several of our school districts.

The threat is real. I suggest we respond proactively instead of reactively.

Laws don't hinder criminals. Decent citizens with the aid of significant neutralizing force do.

If we can't be free to proactively protect our kids, what good is a constitutional right?

Locking up our guns is not a viable option, but rather a major problem. We want to be prepared when thugs come to wreak havoc, not left exposed with our pants down around our ankles.

For what it is worth!