

My name is Paul Beattie and what I have to say is mostly from personal experience. I am a GOA member and I have been informed that there is discussion of limiting our second amendment rights. I am a scientist and a teacher and would love to make this paper fact heavy with graphs and the whole 9 yards, but I do not have enough time to write such a paper and balance my life. My lack time is also the reason why I am writing this instead of showing up in Austin to give a speech that would probably be longer than what is allowed.

I spent more than 20 years of my life all over California and have moved to Texas for better opportunities. I still have friends and family in CA and I hear about the effects of their policies have amongst normal people. From my understanding CA has implemented a lot of anti-second amendment policies that some people are trying to bring to Texas. These polies include "red flag" laws, extensive background checks, and restricting types of firearms.

From my understanding CA red flag laws states that teachers, family, law enforcement, counselors, and Co workers can all deem a person mentally unstable for a firearm and can confiscate firearms without due process. I see how someone could think this this is helpful in getting firearms away from potentially dangerous people, but it is unconstitutional and from what I hear it is causing more harm than good and it is ineffective. I say it is unconstitutional because there is no due process and it is the government confiscating your rights. I say it causes more harm than good because from what I hear the moment someone tries to talk about the benefits of gun ownership they get a person to call up the police and say that the gun owner is crazy and they start harassing the person. I also say it is ineffective because if I remember right there was a girl who drove into YouTube headquarters, a gun free zone, and killed a few people including herself and her parents happened to call the police and they were able to search her and her belongings right before she went to YouTube. Texas does not need unconstitutional red flag laws and I believe that we could remedy this situation by sticking to existing law or allow everyone to carry to act as a deterrent to criminals while abolishing gun free zones. Some people might say, "that doesn't help a person mental state, because if they are crazy enough to attack you wouldn't you want them to not have a gun?" and my answer is, "if they are crazy enough to attack me, it doesn't matter what they have, I should be able to defend my self and others with what ever I have." And if I remember right crime statistics state people are far more likely to commit crime with non-firearm items than with a firearm so statistically taking away a far less used item will not greatly affect the crime being committed.

From what I hear people want more background checks and say it should be done for every firearm transfer. I can see where they might be coming from because bad people seem to always get their hands-on firearms and that is all they hear about. I would have to disagree because we already have a background check system that wrongfully denies some law-abiding people and hardly catches the people it was meant to catch. These criminals happen to get most of their firearms through other crime and not through conventional means. Some people would then say this is where the "gun show loophole" comes in and they want to make sure that private transfers need a background check. I oppose this because if you look at the existing federal law you could see that if you are going to commence in the sale of firearms for profit you need a FFL and so if you are buying guns just to sell without a license then you are already a criminal. In CA they have that law in place and it does nothing except punish people who want to get rid of their gun. They have even restricted people from lending

their firearms to friends and family to hunt or target shoot even when they are right next to them. This is all unnecessary and a burden on the law abiding. All what someone has to do to bypass this law is steal a gun and they could sell it to whomever and if they don't want to be tracked down, they could grind the serial numbers off. All of these are felonies but if you are a criminal why are you following the law? This method of stealing guns and selling them just so happens to already be the leading cause of how most criminals acquire firearms and therefore its only impact is to make firearms more expensive for the law abiding.

Some people believe that restricting the types of firearms is the answer, but these people are ignorant or just lack understanding of what a firearm is. People who general say this want "assault style" weapons banned but when you ask what that means the smarter ones have a list that features to look for. The general idea of what makes an "assault rifle" is that it must be semi-automatic with the ability to accept a detachable magazine. Most laws then state it might need something else but in CA I believe they renewed it to only be those 2 so I will focus on those 2 but the other features do not matter when it comes to the functionality of the firearm. Semi-automatic means being able to fire a bullet with one function of the trigger and repeat without any extra function required. This definition pretty much defines almost all firearms in the modern day. I will then focus more on the detachable magazine aspect because that limits some of the modern-day firearms. As of the time I wrote this the 9<sup>th</sup> circuit has deemed that a magazine limit is unconstitutional. This is important because everyone who has ever made the remarks of what an "assault weapon" is, always pictures the standard magazine of being 30 rounds and that is what the ignorant fear is the ability to quickly reload so that they can fire infinity rounds almost nonstop and they seem to believe one round equals one death. This is a false equivalent and is easily proven wrong through a little bit a research that people seem to not want to do. Also people have engineered several ways to permanently attach a magazine to a firearm and have found that the difference to reload a fixed magazine and a magazine change can take the same amount of time to perform and thus rendering it only a nuisance to the law abiding when such restrictions exist. There are plenty of other restrictions CA has implemented that are wrong in order to regulate firearms, but this paper would be too long to go over them and why they are wrong and how they all fall short.

This is Texas not California. These anti-gun policies are all Californian elite propaganda, corrupt, unconstitutional, authoritarian, and ineffective. Texas is better than this and should pass better laws to allow the abolishment of gun free zones and allow constitutional carry. I am a teacher and I am currently in the classroom trying not to get Covid and I am not happy that I can not conceal carry in case something sinister happens. I do think that my districts safety policies are all right when it comes to an active shooter but there is always room for improvement and the cheapest and most effective way for the government to make me feel safe is to let me carry. We, as teachers, already go through an intense background check to show we are decent people and we are trusted with everyone's children every day. Why is it that we can we not be trusted with firearms? I truly believe that "The only way to stop a bad guy with a gun is with a good guy with a gun." In the event of a lock down we are only barricading ourselves in hope that it gives us enough time for "good guys" to come and we can only pray the "bad guy" doesn't get anyone else.