

Caroline Brunger
11281 Gunsmoke Ct.
Lusby, MD 20657

Re: SB0624, Testimony in Opposition

February 15, 2021

As a lifelong resident of Maryland, and a hobbyist firearm-maker, I am concerned about some of the knock-on effects of Senate Bill 624 in its current state. While I understand and generally support the aims of this bill - first, to enact additional penalties for prohibited persons who circumvent the law by illegally manufacturing firearms, and second, to preserve the right for law-abiding hobbyists - this bill still greatly restricts hobbyists' ability to continue their activities. While the most popular and most accessible method of home manufacture is by completing so-called 80% receivers, that is not the only method by which hobbyists create their own firearms. Many, out of a desire to better understand the gunsmithing process or a desire to truly "know" their firearm inside and out, or simply even the pride of being able to say they built their own firearm from scratch, prefer to start from nothing but a block of aluminum, a so-called "0% receiver." The requirement of unfinished receivers to be serialized by an FFL prior to sale beginning in 2022 would mean that the *only* way to legally manufacture a firearm at home for personal use would be by using a pre-made 80% receiver, greatly restricting the types of firearms they can build. While I appreciate the bill's consideration for home-manufactured firearms that have already been completed, I don't appreciate that I would be limited to only 80% receivers within a year. This bill would much better maintain the rights of individual hobbyists like myself if it maintained the standards of serialization and record-keeping that are permitted for pre-2022 manufacture for home-manufactured firearms post-2022.

My other major concern about this bill is that it attaches the outrageous barrier to entry of acquiring a Handgun Qualification License to home manufacture of firearms. I attempted to get my HQL in 2016 - I had completed the required training, I spent the \$60 to have my LiveScan fingerprints completed, but I experienced technical issues with completing the application on the Maryland State Police website. When I sent them an email to try to correct the issues, I was told that my fingerprints would not expire for the purposes of applying for an HQL. This turned out to be a lie, and by the time I had gotten my technical issues sorted out, I needed to spend another \$60 to get fingerprinted. As there are no accessible LiveScan fingerprinting locations near my home, I elected not to pursue the HQL and instead build a handgun for home defense. Given

the issues with the HQL requirement (see *Maryland Shall Issue v. Hogan*, MD District Court case #1:16-cv-03311), I have very serious concerns about eliminating Marylanders' ability to exercise their right to possess a handgun (secured by *DC v. Heller* in 2008) without overcoming this burden.

I understand the desire to ensure that a background check takes place for anyone who endeavors to build a firearm, however, this bill would have no teeth in making that happen. The Nation's Gun Show in Chantilly, VA, which takes place many times each year, includes vendors who sell 80% receivers; any Maryland resident wishing to circumvent the proposed law would be able to do so very easily by taking a short trip on any of half a dozen weekends throughout the year, and Maryland law enforcement would be none the wiser. I would not do so, as I wish to comply with the law, no matter how much I disagree with it. However, this means that a criminal now has another avenue to firearms ownership which I do not.

I appreciate the General Assembly's desire to protect Marylanders from lawbreakers. I do not support this bill in its current state; if it is to pass, I hope to see it amended to address these issues.