

NEVADA FIREARMS COALITION

5575 Simmons Street, Suite 1-176 North Las Vegas, Nevada 89031 702-373-5935 <u>www.nvfac.org</u> <u>www.facebook.com/nvfac</u> <u>don@nvfac.org</u>

June 3, 2013

RE: Request for veto of SB221

Dear Chief of Staff Gardner,

The Nevada Firearms Coalition is a grassroots organization representing Nevada's firearms owner. We have some serious concerns about Senate Bill 221, which was intended to address mental health issues but is now about gun control. We respectfully ask for you to veto this bill.

We attempted to work with Senator Jones early in the session, and he was responsive, but no compromises could be found. We were disheartened to see the amendments that were adopted by the Senate Finance Committee were not thoroughly vetted with gun dealers nor law enforcement.

Our supporters have submitted thousands of emails in opposition, and the Nevada Legislature opinion poll reflects 84% opposition to this bill. All Republican legislators in both houses and 4 Assembly Democrats listened to Nevadans concerns about this legislation and voted against it.

This bill was written in large part as a reaction to recent tragic killings where firearms were used, as well as the issue closer to home with Assemblyman Brooks and the IHOP shooting. The bill sponsor testified in Assembly Judiciary that this bill would not have prevented the tragedies his witnesses testified about.

We believe that Nevada's existing 110 firearms laws already do everything that SB221 proposes to do, without infringing on our 2nd Amendment rights. We believe this bill will do more harm than good to the law abiding citizens of Nevada, will place an excess burden on small business owners, and could lead to litigation against the state for potential violations of due process.

We are primarily concerned that SB221:

- Would not prevent any of the tragedies the sponsor claims it would stop. For example,
 - Eduardo Sencion (Carson City, NV), Jared Loughner (Tucson, AZ), James Holmes (Aurora, CO), and Adam Lanza (Newtown, CT) were not prohibited processors. None of the four were adjudicated mentally ill, and none of the three were identified as threats nor reported to local authorities.
 - ↔ Assemblymen Steven Brooks was not in any database prior to his stated threats to the Speaker. He was prevented from purchasing a firearm under existing law.
- The payment mechanism in SB 221 was changed to avoid the 2/3rds vote requirement. The amended version of the bill requires Nevada gun owners to pay a \$30 fee for a background check that is free for the gun dealer.
- Creates a double standard by requiring different background checks depending on whether the gun is purchased from a dealer with a background check through the Nevada Central Repository

1

DEDICATED TO THE OWNERSHIP & SAFE USE OF FIREARMS FOR SELF-DEFENSE, COMPETITION, RECREATION & HUNTING

or via private party with a dealer run background check through the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS).

- The NICS check is not as thorough as the existing Nevada Central Repository check because not all of the information included in the Nevada Central Repository is included in the NICS system.
- Law enforcement officers have no way to determine if background check was made.

In regards to the gun control specifics of SB 221:

- NRS 202.254 already allows citizens to obtain background checks for private party sales.
- NRS 202.360 already establishes persons who are prohibited to have in possession any firearms (prohibited possessor) and establishes the offense as a category B felony with a minimum of one year imprisonment and a \$5,000 fine.
- NRS 202.362 already makes it a category B felony for someone to provide firearms or ammunition to a prohibited possessor.
- NRS 202.3653 through 202.3689 regulates concealed carry of firearms.

With these laws already in place, why do we need a more complicated law that does not achieve its stated objective?

We thank you for your thoughtful consideration, and we respectfully urge you to veto SB 221 and prevent the passage of a complex law without meaningful substance.

Sincerely,

Don Turner, President