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I ask this committee not to pursue further consideration for the proposed requirements of S.22

- A burgeoning liberal/Progressive ideology is attempting to reduce our constitutional 2nd amendment rights to the level of a “privilege” versus a “right”. This should set off alarm bells in every citizen’s mind.
- Every time there is a “single” incident involving a firearm it seems to incentivize legislators to punish all gun owners by enacting that “one more gun law”!
- Firearm ownership is treated as a pariah and not with the respect afforded by our 2nd amendment.
- Anti-gun groups in Vermont say that the 2nd amendment needs to be repealed, or brought into the 21st century, as it is no longer relevant.
- A single incident in 2018 is the impetus for the bill’s sponsors to implement a waiting period on all firearm purchases.
  - A single incident does not achieve the formidable benchmark for controlling all other citizens for one person’s misdeeds or indiscretions.
- There were 41,550 completed firearm transfers in 2018. 99.9976% of all transactions would not have benefited from the proposed “waiting period”
- CDC, Johns Hopkins, and others have declared that there is no “conclusive” evidence that waiting periods reduce suicides or crime.
- Legislators need to step up and deal with the undisputed systemic causes of suicides: illicit drugs, opioids, mental illness, social media, domestic violence, bullying, etc.
- Guns don’t precipitate people to commit suicide
- The storage provisions of this bill are in direct conflict with the SCOTUS ruling in Heller. The Court struck down as unconstitutional a requirement that all firearms, including rifles and shotguns be kept “unloaded and disassembled or bound by a trigger lock”.
  - The court ruled that to lock up firearms inherently inhibits immediate access for self-defense.
- The storage requirement of (S.22) would be unenforceable