

I previously submitted comments to the Senate **Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety** Committee on SENATE BILL No. 79. Comparing the aforesaid Bill to HOUSE BILL NO. 4144 it appears, as I previously understood, that the latter tracks the former. Therefore, I now provide the following comments on HOUSE BILL NO. 4144.

Unlike my comments upon H.B. 4145, I have minimal objections to the subject. However, I considered comment upon the following sections to be warranted:

- 9(1) : The standard of "*stores or leaves a firearm unattended*" is prudent since it would appear to cover the situation of a person keeping a firearm in immediate proximity or in a night stand, to protect against abrupt hostile incursion; fumbling with a trigger lock, to protect oneself in those situations, is too much of a burden, and it would seem a firearm in those situations would not be deemed "*unattended*". While clarification, by an amendment defining "unattended" could well be prudent, the "unattended" requirement seems to eliminate many objections to storage requirements.
- 9(2) : This section could pose some problems. Admittedly if the nonresident has a CPL, he/she may already have a lock box in their vehicle; but those who do not are unlikely to be able to comply with (a), as defined in 9(8)(a). Many vehicles do not have a lock on the glove box, rendering compliance with (c) also a problem. Admittedly (b) might ameliorate these problems since currently all purchases from an FFL Licensee include delivery of some form of trigger lock; nevertheless, ownership that antedates this requirement might result in the locking device not being available. Perhaps some consideration of this section is warranted.
- 15(3)
& (6) : While these requirements for delivery of printed materials by an FFL Licensee are not onerous, I still wonder whether a State has jurisdiction to impose additional requirements on a person licensed by the Federal government. Since these sections but amend previous requirements imposed on these licensees, perhaps jurisdiction to do so has been established. nevertheless mentioning this, in my admitted ignorance upon this issue, seemed appropriate.

Generally I consider the subject to be reasonable, both in objective and its provisions, and do not believe many firearm owners would consider it unduly objectionable.

Cordially,
WAYNE A. SMITH