

Chairman Peterson, Vice Chair Thomas, Ranking Member Forhan and members of the Government Oversight Committee I am writing to you and asking that you oppose HB51. **My biggest concern is that I see efforts to oppose federal legislation to address this pandemic of gun violence in this country as a threat to our democracy. We elect the federal officials as well as our state representatives and expect that they complement one another in addressing the needs of our citizens.** This bill pits the state against the federal government and therefore I see it as a threat to our democracy.

I personally do not own a gun and don't feel I need one for my personal protection. But I respect the right of others to own a gun. But gun violence is out of hand in our country! There are more guns owned in America than there are people! In fact, by the first week of February, more guns deaths have occurred in America than occur in a year in other developed countries!

The way this law is written it would allow a convicted domestic abuser or one who is under a domestic violence restraining order to be deemed a 'qualifying adult' and would be allowed to carry a concealed firearm without a permit. Currently domestic abusers are prohibited from permitless carry in Ohio because current Ohio law adopts the federal gun disability list. (18 USC sec 922g)

Not only does this law say Ohio law enforcement shouldn't follow federal law but it exposes them to civil suit and fines of up to \$50,000. This will inevitably lead to confusion and second guessing by law enforcement and puts an undue strain on them in carrying out their duties. I understand some policemen own the current pistol stabilizers that are currently being banned by the ATF and understand any gun owners' anger at possibly being fined or arrested because they had purchased one of these devices when it was considered legal. Why not pass a grandfather law allowing them to keep their pistol stabilizer, but make it illegal to buy or sell from a certain date. Or why not pass a law that would give them some financial reimbursement for them purchasing the stabilizer prior to the ruling that makes them illegal?

I encourage you to address their needs by some legislation that addresses the 'law abiding' citizen's concerns that augments the federal legislation but doesn't water down the regulations that are focused on curbing gun violence in this country. As something has to be done and it will entail an adjusted way we view gun ownership in this country!

Thank you,

Donna Malone

Toledo, Ohio