

Richard Shapiro
Brunswick
LD 1821

My name is Richard Shapiro, I am from Brunswick, and I am testifying against LD 1821: An Act to Ensure Responsible Business Practices by Licensed Firearms Dealers

I strongly urge you to vote against this proposal.

We don't have an out of control, or even a significant, problem with thefts from gun shops or gun shows.

We don't have an out of control, or even a significant, problem with uneducated or dangerous gun shop employees.

We don't have ANY problem with gun shop record keeping, which is the province of the ATF and which is carefully monitored by them.

And, we certainly don't need yet another piece of random paper that everybody will ignore to be posted behind the counter of gun shops, to remind people that lethal weapons are actually capable of causing lethal injuries.

Our excellent law enforcement agencies, along with the ATF and FBI are thoroughly on top of what few problems do occur at gun shops and shows.

Yet, even given these circumstances, in the safest state in the US, this proposal comes before us, bearing an tremendous burden of massive, bureaucratic, intrusive, incompetently drafted, and even some impossible, regulations replete with fines and even the occasional criminal penalty.

As to that penalty, I would point out that it's draconian and unreasonable. It is a felony, of course – removing the subject's gun rights for life and instantly deleting the FFL holder's business and ability to make a living, and a conviction could be based on a biased prosecutor's interpretation of a clerical error as being a falsification.

The very existence of this proposal is baffling under any circumstance other than as a product of a mindset that is utterly phobic of the very concept of the existence of firearms in the hands of law abiding citizens, despite the large proportion of our population that owns firearms, despite the fact that firearms in Maine likely outnumber people, and despite this being the safest state in the nation.

Some of the provisions of this bill, which was clearly written to throw every possible "solution" against the wall to see if any of it would stick, aren't even practical – and one isn't even possible.

State or federally approved alarm must be installed? Really? What is that?

Apparently, a state agency would need to be created to vet alarms for the fairly modest number of firearms dealers in this state? What standards are to be applied? Is the alarm to be affordable, available, even vaguely appropriate to the usage? Is the state going to budget for this?

As to the proposed employee background checks, the federal NICS system CANNOT be used to do background checks on prospective employees. The federal government does not do NICS background checks unless a firearm is being purchased, and refuses to allow this overburdened system to be used for other purposes. This provision cannot be legally implemented.

The "training" provision is not only utterly unnecessary, but is dependent of the invention of a set of standards that doesn't currently exist, the creation of which would require funds and manpower that the government, which already can't pay its obligations, doesn't have. This is extraordinary overreach for the modest number of FFL employees in our state. Furthermore, this bill requires that such training be administered before gun sales can occur – but makes no provision that such training be available or affordable. This is an obvious way to abuse our law abiding FFL holders, and not a rational requirement for doing business.

Finally, the recordkeeping provision not only explicitly duplicates federal

requirements, so its simple existence is unfathomable, but it also subjects dealers to random paperwork inspections that duplicate already required Federal inspections and serve no purpose whatsoever except to burn government resources and burden law abiding FFL holders.

To add insult to injury, this proposal requires annual reports from the government, using resources the government doesn't have, for no discernible or rational purpose whatsoever.

To summarize, this is not a reasonable, rational, or even implementable proposal, and I strongly urge you to oppose it.

Thank you.