

Josh Jacques
Sidney
LD 2283

Merely that we are here in this absurd departure from house rules is egregious and a smudge on the history of the State.

This attempt by the ravenous anti-Constitution, authoritarian, anti-2A crowd to take inherent rights away from Americans will never be satiated, but here we are.

There is a simple issue to discuss here. There are people in office who wish to use their limited powers to take away, without due process, all to push their parties unfounded and uneducated narrative that this bill would solve some issue. This bill will solve nothing. In fact, nationwide, none of the red flag bills have conclusive evidence of helping at all. There are already procedures in place to address this. The event that caused the emotional response to submit this bill could have been prevented if the severely underfunded police and mental health resources were in place to act on the existing procedures.

There is no conclusive evidence that red flag laws are effective in stopping violent actions. "The evidence for whether extreme risk protection orders work to prevent gun violence is inconclusive, according to a study by the RAND Corporation on the effectiveness of gun safety measures." The New York Times reported. Article cited below.

The only thing this bill would be effective in, is creating more tax burden. This bill would add more cases to the docket of the already extremely overburdened public defender backlog, which last month the Commission on Indigent Legal Defense counted more than 750 criminal cases where defendants lacked lawyers. Maybe this is the goal of the bill, to provide more justification to get more public defenders and more tax revenue for one of the most heavily taxed States in the nation.

I urge you to not consider this unconstitutional bill. The second amendment is absolute, and the Supreme Court is going to be issuing rulings soon that will upset you. If you continue on this path with these types of assaults on the Second Amendment, it will cost the State millions in legal fees.

Rhode Island ACLU, An Analysis of 18-H 7688 and 18-S 2492, Relating to Extreme Risk Protective Orders,

http://riaclu.org/images/uploads/180302_analysis_RedFlagsLegislation.pdf

New York Times: Found. for Econ. Educ., (Aug. 10, 2019),

<https://fee.org/articles/7-reasons-to-oppose-red-flag-guns-laws/>

Maine needs significant action to address shortage of legal representation
(bangordailynews.com)