

Submitter: Anthony Caputo
On Behalf Of:
Committee: Senate Committee On Judiciary
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

These studies have been done to death already. Such measures only serve to be a tax on time for gun purchases, not an effective form of crime prevention.

See here:

<https://bjs.ojp.gov/document/suficspi16.pdf#:~:text=Off%20the%20street%20or%20underground%20market%20%E2%80%93,groups%20involved%20in%20sales%20of%20illegal%20drugs.>

only ~10% of "crime guns" came from an FFL, most were obtained in an uncontrolled manner not subject to any kind of legal restrictions (i.e. they were illegally obtained). Furthermore most firearms (~80%) were not obtained pursuant any specific crime, which indicates the firearm was in the possession of the criminal for an indeterminate period of time before the commission of a crime.

In short such a policy can have little effect on criminal acquisition or use of firearms, as it assumes that criminals only acquire guns from legal sources immediately before the commission of a crime with that firearm. Such an assertion does not pass any form of rational or logical test for legislative efficacy.

But such measures can be a significant tax in time and effort against legal gun owners, especially those that already own other firearms. What could possibly be the rationale for requiring multiple visits to a gun store to complete a single firearms purchase for someone who already owns other firearms other than trying to be an unconscionable burden of time an effort to discourage future purchases? If the goal of such legislation is to be an undue burden on legal gun ownership mandatory waiting periods are one effective way to do that. But if that is the goal why couch it in terms of "gun safety"? Just be honest with the goals and outright say the objective is to hinder legal gun ownership as much as possible.