

MINUTES OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
January 20, 1983

The meeting of the House Judiciary Committee was called to order by Chairman Dave Brown at 8:00 a.m. in Room 224A of the Capitol. All members were present. Brenda Desmond, Legislative Council, was present.

HOUSE BILL 184

REP. HAND, sponsor, stated House Bill 184 would revise the requirements for obtaining a permit to carry a concealed weapon. The sponsor stressed this is not a gun control bill. The bill was requested because some public officials have received threatening letters.

MIKE LAVIN, Crime Control, was in favor of the bill. The problem with the existing statute is there are no requirements on how to handle a concealed weapon. Some judges do not issue permits while other judges issue the permits quite freely. If a citizen is not issued a permit in one judicial district, he is free to apply for a permit in the neighboring judicial district. Therefore, the law enforcement agencies in the original district do not know the person has a permit, and therefore, do not know he is carrying a weapon. If this bill were passed, it would require an applicant to apply for a permit in his own judicial district only. An application would be completed, which would include verification of credentials and fingerprints. The fingerprints would be sent to the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington D.C., where a check against federal records would be made. LAVIN urged the committee Do Pass on the bill.

JOHN SCULLY, representing the Montana Sheriffs and Peace Officers, was in favor of the bill. SCULLY noted that in this bill the district judge would issue a permit with the concurrence of the sheriff, which is not in the present statute.

The wording "may grant a permit to carry or bear, concealed or otherwise" is wording in the present statute. It has been suggested that "or otherwise" might mean that a hunter who has a weapon could be charged with carrying a concealed weapon. We feel the prosecuting attorney would have to prove that the weapon was concealed or otherwise. If a weapon is on a person, he is obviously attempting to conceal it because there is no particular place on the body where a weapon would normally be carried. If a person carries a weapon in his car, and he has not sought out a place to conceal it, it is just a matter of where that weapon is kept.

SCULLY did not oppose removing the serial number from the bill. He did object, however, if the fingerprint section was deleted.

SCULLY stated they do not want to be in the business of issuing gun permits, but since we are asked to review a person's application and background, a fee should be charged. The fee would be charged because of the court proceedings and for the sheriff to complete the necessary paperwork. The alternative is to issue permits to everyone who applies, regardless of the person's background. The sheriff, police department, and judge should confer about who would receive a permit.

MARC RACICOT stated the sponsor requested his presence at the hearing. He noted he supports the bill.

There were no further proponents.

REP. GLENN SAUNDERS was opposed to House Bill 184. He felt the problem was not really addressed by the bill. The Representative stated it may weaken or remove our constitutional right to own and possess firearms. EXHIBIT A.

JIM MCCONNELL, Montana Rifle and Pistol Association, was also opposed to the bill. He was concerned with the wording "concealed or otherwise." It is questionable legislation as to what the intent of the words "or otherwise" are. MCCONNELL stated one judge already refuses to issue permits. The Association has no objection to a uniformity in the law and of the screening of applications. The way the bill is written, however, would allow a judge to "sit on" an application indefinitely without issuing or denying the permit. There should be a time limit provision in the bill.

MCCONNELL did not object to the fingerprinting. He was concerned, however, who would do the fingerprinting and if the Washington D.C. authorities decided to no longer process the prints whether the permits would still be available.

He objected to the serial number of the weapon being listed. There is no reasonable basis for this requirement.

Merely directing the sheriff to consider the application is too vague. There should be some guidelines for the sheriff. The statement that reasonable restrictions on carrying the weapon may be imposed is also vague. There should be guidelines for this also. The fee of \$100 is excessive.

MCCONNELL stated he would be willing to amend the bill by working with the proponents to make it suitable legislation. As the bill is now, however, he felt it is a step backwards.

STAN FRASIER was opposed to the bill. He stated it is almost impossible to carry a pistol without breaking the law now. FRASIER told the committee of his recent experience in applying for a permit to carry a concealed weapon. The Clerk of the Court gave him an application which requested information about his past history, employment, character references and the request for a photograph. After completion of the form, the permit was denied. He asked the sheriff why it was denied, to which it was replied they just don't issue permits. The Clerk of the Court, the sheriff and the judge were all aware of this. It was a waste of his time. He tried to speak to the judge about this, but the judge did not keep regular office hours and FRASIER was told that he would have to just wait until the judge came in.

FRASIER felt the bill is just another way to try and discourage the issuance of concealed weapon permits. The \$100 fee is also a way to discourage the public. A \$10 fee would be more appropriate. Or, perhaps a large fee the first time and a lesser fee in subsequent years. FRASIER also stated when a person is denied a permit it should be so stated in writing including the reason why. The wording sheriff and chief of police should be changed to the sheriff or chief of police as it should not be necessary to confront both offices. They would have the ability to contact each other. FRASIER noted the constitution states the citizens right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

EVELYN B. JOPPA was also opposed to House Bill 184. She did not feel the bill would prevent the criminal element from carrying concealed weapons. The \$100 fee would create a hardship on law-abiding citizens. EXHIBIT B.

FREDERICK JOHN MACKINTOSH, a former lawman, was opposed to the listing of the description and serial number on the application. As many people have a number of weapons, they might carry different weapons on different days. MACKINTOSH was in favor of the fingerprinting of the applicant but was against the \$100 fee. EXHIBIT C.

REP. ADDY submitted to the committee testimony from BILL WARNEKE in the form of a letter to ROBERT BACHINI, EXHIBIT D.

There were no further opponents.

In closing, REP. HAND stated there is presently a lack of standards that this bill is intended to deal with. Guns should be exposed if carried on a person.

REP. KEYSER was concerned with three people checking the application. LAVIN replied the intent is not to have the district judge on the

level of establishing the credentials of the applicant. The sheriff and police would look into the applicant's history and recommend to the judge the issuance or denial of the permit.

REP. HANNAH asked how many permits were requested last year. LAVIN replied he did not know how many were issued or the percentage that applied and were denied. Because of the lack of records in some counties, it is impossible to obtain the accurate information.

REP. HANNAH asked if there is a problem with honest people concealing weapons. LAVIN replied this law would merely help establish a recordkeeping process on who has permits.

REP. CURTISS asked if the bill passed, would it prevent an applicant from going to another judicial district and reapplying. It was answered yes. REP. CURTISS stated she knew an individual who was a good citizen but was denied a permit. SCULLY replied this bill would help solve that type of problem because it would establish a criteria for the officers to follow. Also, if denied a permit, the applicant could appeal to the court. Presently there are no records kept that would prevent a felon from obtaining a permit in another county. If the sheriff felt the application should be denied but the police chief felt it should be granted, it would be the judge's decision.

REP. JENSEN asked about page 2, line 20 concerning denial of the application because of a person being an "adjudicated drug or alcohol abuser." SCULLY replied it would be left up to the officer depending on the situation. RACICOT stated if the person was a known alcoholic or drug abuser, and caused a public scene, it would be probable cause for denial of a permit.

REP. DAILY asked about the \$100 fee. O'REILLY replied every case is different. It would all depend on the individual's record, whether investigation outside the state was required. O'REILLY felt \$50 would be appropriate but felt that should be the minimum amount.

REP. KEYSER asked if there would be an objection to amend out of the bill "or otherwise." SCULLY replied there are no Supreme Court decisions on this. SCULLY further stated the opponents to this type of bill must give the serial number and other types of information in order to have a weapon repaired; however the opponents do not feel it is necessary to list the information in order to kill with the weapon. REP. KEYSER replied the manufacturer and serial number are not necessary for the authorities to know.

REP. SEIFERT asked if an applicant receives a permit in a particular judicial district, would he be able to carry the weapon throughout the state. It was answered yes. REP. SEIFERT asked about the records. LAVIN replied some judicial districts keep good records of the permits while others do not.

REP. J. BROWN asked about the penalty for unlawfully carrying a concealed weapon. SCULLY replied that is in another section of the MCA. REP. J. BROWN further asked about the other types of information subjective to the application. SCULLY replied that would be the law enforcement information available on the application. For example, if he had a previous record.

REP. J. BROWN wondered about the people who carry a weapon but do not have a permit now. It was replied they are breaking the law and would probably not obtain a permit even if the bill passes.

REP. EUDAILY asked if it is necessary to pay the \$100 fee for each gun carried. SCULLY replied the permit is to carry a weapon and each weapon would be listed on the permit. The \$100 fee would be for the permit and not the number of weapons.

REP. CURTISS asked about an official "sitting" on an application. SCULLY stated there is nothing that would prevent that from happening. However, it would probably not happen because the applicant would keep calling asking the status of his application.

REP. DAILY asked if the fact that a person has a permit is available to law enforcement officers statewide. O'REILLY said no. He stated he is able to look at the records in Lewis & Clark County. The Department of Justice keeps records from all the counties. If a person moved, the record could be forwarded to his new county.

REP. FARRIS spoke about nurses and barmaids who get off work in the early morning hours and their ability to obtain a permit. REP. FARRIS felt they would have a legitimate reason for having a concealed weapon. SCULLY agreed with the Representative. A prejudiced person might not issue a permit as the law now stands, however. Under this bill, the person could appeal if denied a permit. O'REILLY stated a few years ago in the Helena area nurses who left the hospital late at night were being attacked. This would be a legitimate reason for obtaining an application. REP. FARRIS further stated there is a presumption of women being hysterical. The bill should be amended as to whether a person is paranoid or if someone is really out to get the person.

REP. EUDAILY noted when a person applies for a driver's license, he must be able to show he can drive. This bill does not require the applicant show the ability that he can handle a weapon. SCULLY felt that was a legitimate question. It was stressed this is not a gun control bill. If it were required a person to show his ability in using a gun, many more opponents would have testified.

REP. DAILY asked about the accessibility of the records. LAVIN stated the records are on a teletype system. Any enforcement office that has a similar system can easily look up requested information.

REP. SPAETH commented "with concurrence" should be amended to "by the recommendation." SCULLY agreed, as did LAVIN.

REP. J. BROWN noted the \$100 a year might be excessive, especially in the year following the first permit. LAVIN replied a minimum record check is required each year the application is to be renewed. The same amount of work goes into the checking. REP. J. BROWN stated if it was a law-abiding citizen, he would not have a record. LAVIN replied that if a check is not made, there is no way of knowing that he did not get a record in the years after receiving the initial permit.

There were no further questions on the bill. The hearing on House Bill 184 closed.

The Judiciary Committee then went into Executive Session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

HOUSE BILL 178

REP. ADDY moved DO NOT PASS, seconded by REP. KEYSER.

CHAIRMAN BROWN noted he introduced the bill at the request of the Highway Patrol.

REP. KEYSER stated he felt the enforcement agencies would be able to enforce this type of legislation under the present reckless driving statute. Most people flee from the patrolman because they are scared, and not because they have committed a crime.

CHAIRMAN BROWN stated the Highway Patrol wanted a statewide campaign to stop people from eluding an officer. He felt the program could probably be done under the present statute.

The motion of DO NOT PASS carried with only CHAIRMAN BROWN voting in opposition.

HOUSE BILL 139

REP. EUDAILY, Subcommittee Chairman, requested more time so the appropriate amendments could be drafted.

HOUSE BILL 184

REP. DAILY moved DO PASS, seconded by REP. SPAETH.

REP. HANNAH felt the appeal process was an important part of the bill. REP. ADDY responded the applicant does have an appeal now by applying at another judicial district. REP. IVERSON stated that is not an appeal, that is merely reapplying.

REP. EUDAILY wondered why it is necessary for the sheriff and the chief of police to both be involved. REP. KEYSER stated both parties have separate records. The sheriff has records of the county while the police have records of the city.

REP. KEYSER noted the type and caliber are necessary information for the application whereas the serial number and manufacture are not.

REP. DAILY moved to amend the bill by reinserting all existing language. And to have a uniform application throughout the state that contain items i through v on page 3 of the bill. (Item iii would be deleted from the bill after "fingerprints.")

On page 6 the new language would be deleted. The appeal process as on page 5 would be left in the bill. On page 6 of the bill, the new material of subsection 8 and of subsection 13 would be left in the bill, according to REP. DAILY's motion.

REP. EUDAILY asked about the effective date of October 1, 1983 instead of January 1, 1984. BRENDA DESMOND replied if someone is granted a permit on 11/83 he would not have to reapply until 11/84. CHAIRMAN BROWN added under existing statute the permit is good for one year. There is nothing about reapplying in the statutes. REP. ADDY felt the applicant could use the same information as in the first application, just updating it for the past year if needed.

REP. HANNAH made a substitute motion to have the bill placed in a subcommittee. CHAIRMAN BROWN ruled the motion out of order and stated the bill and the proposed amendment would be drafted for the committee's review before final voting on the bill.

REP. DAILY moved to table the bill. A roll call vote resulted. Those Representatives voting in favor of the motion were: D. BROWN, CURTISS, DAILY, HANNAH, IVERSON, KENNERLY, SEIFERT, and VELEBER. Those Representatives voting against the motion were: ADDY, BERGENE, J. BROWN, DARKO, EUDAILY, FARRIS, KEYSER, SCHYE, and SPAETH. The motion failed 9 to 8.

REP. DAILY moved to adopt his original motion that on page 3 part 4 through line 2 on page 4 be put back in. REP. DAILY further included the fee be amended to \$10.00.

The committee requested the staff attorney to draft the amendment into the bill for the committee's consideration at the 1/21/83 meeting. The motion passed.

The committee adjourned at 10:15 a.m.



DAVE BROWN, Chairman



Maureen Richardson, Secretary

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 20,

19 83

MR. **SPEAKER:**

We, your committee on **JUDICIARY**

having had under consideration **HOUSE** Bill No. **178**


First reading copy (**White**)
color

**A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT MAKING IT A FELONY FOR THE
DRIVER OF A MOTOR VEHICLE TO ATTEMPT TO ELUDE A PURSUING POLICE
VEHICLE."**

Respectfully report as follows: That **HOUSE** Bill No. **178**

DO NOT PASS

XXXXX
DO PASS


DAVE BROWN,

Chairman.

	Date: 1/20 No: HB 184 Table	Date: No:	Date: No:	Date: No:	Date: No:
BROWN, Dave	Yes				
ADDY, Kelly	No				
BERGENE, Toni	No				
BROWN, Jan	No				
CURTISS, Aubyn	Yes				
DAILY, Fritz	Yes				
DARKO, Paula	No				
EUDAILY, Ralph	No				
FARRIS, Carol	No				
HANNAH, Tom	Yes				
IVERSON, Dennis	Yes				
JENSEN, James	-				
KENNERLY, Roland	Yes				
KEYSER, Kerry	No				
RAMIREZ, Jack	-				
SCHYE, Ted	No				
SEIFERT, Carl	Yes				
SPAETH, Gary	No				
VELEBER, Dennis	Yes				

Exhibit A
HB 184

1/20/83

My name is Glenn Saunders, Representative of District 72.

Mr. Chairman:

I would like to oppose HB 184, not for the good it may do, or the manner in which the bill changes the responsibility for issuing concealed firearm permits, but for the fact it doesn't really address the problem dealing with the possession of concealed firearms.

I am convinced that HB 184 does nothing to provide some criteria for the basis upon which concealed firearm permits are issued. I realize there are attempts to do this, but too often a person who really should not be issued a permit does manage to acquire one.

I am also opposed to that portion of the bill that requires a description of the weapon to be carried, including type, caliber, manufacturer and serial numbers.

I see no reason why a particular gun should be stressed. Should a concealed firearms permit be issued, the permittee should be able to carry any firearm he chooses.

I also oppose this bill, or until amended to remove the sections or words I find objectionable, on the grounds it may weaken or remove in any way our constitutional right to own and possess firearms. While this piece of legislation doesn't appear to do this, there may be implied conditions that do this to some degree, especially where it calls for firearm registration.

Please do not forget that all firearms purchased since the 1968

Page 2

Gun Law was passed are now registered if purchased from a federal licensed dealer. Also, any firearms taken to a gun shop for repair are likewise registered, so additional registration doesn't appear to be needed, especially when a permittee should not be required to specify the particular firearm he may acquire a permit to carry.

GM/dh

WITNESS STATEMENT

Exhibit B

HB 184

1/20/83

NAME Evelyn B Joppa BILL No. HB 184
ADDRESS 7993 Hwy 12W Helena DATE 1-20-83
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT Self
SUPPORT _____ OPPOSE ✓ AMEND _____

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

House Bill 184 will not prevent the criminal element from carrying concealed weapons. However the fee of \$100 will create a hardship on law abiding citizens. The required registration of a personal hand gun may encourage the lack of cooperation of the normally law abiding citizen. This registration is just another devious attempt to impose gun control on the good citizen people of Montana.
Thank you.

Evelyn B Joppa

I oppose the actual registration of the hand gun including the description & the \$100 fee. With ~~out~~ out those parts & definition of reasonable on line six page 5. the bill would be acceptable.

WITNESS STATEMENT

Exhibit C
HB184
1/20/83

NAME MAC KINTOSH, FREDERICK JOHN BILL No. HB-184
ADDRESS 6390 BIRDSEYE ROAD, HELENA, MT. DATE 1/20/83
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT SELF
SUPPORT _____ OPPOSE _____ AMEND ☒

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

THE DESCRIPTION, SERIAL NUMBER & ETC., SHOULD NOT BE
IN THIS APPLICATION AND/OR PERMIT.

LOWER THE LICENSE FEE FROM \$100.⁰⁰ TO A REASONABLE
FEE OF POSSIBLY \$25.⁰⁰ TO \$50.⁰⁰

Mr. Robert Bachini
Mont. House of Representatives
Helena Montana

Havre Montana
January 15, 1983

Exhibit D
HB 184
4/20/83

Dear Bob:

I am writing in regards to a couple of bills that have been introduced according to the Great Falls Tribune. Both of those I am interested in are in the judicial areas.

The first is of concern to me and that is the \$100.00 fee for a concealed weapons permit. I feel there should be some exceptions to this if it passes. In the case of those of us in the B.M. Police-Special Services Dept. for instance. All of us on the system are required to carry a firearm while on duty. There are thirty of us in Montana in this department. We would hope the company would re-imburse us for the permit and if so, you can see it would be a substantial cost for the company. I don't know of any of us that carry a firearm off duty, in fact the B.M. discourages this practice. In the same sense, we have a very good firearms training program and a very strict firearms policy. I am one of two firearms instructors in Montana and travel to put on the classes. We are required to qualify twice a year and cannot work if we cannot qualify. I believe that since a person has to go through a local Chief of Police or Sheriff before getting the the District Judge, they could use a little more common sense in giving their ok. Judge Thomas used to give a permit to virtually anyone that applied. I agree a stronger policy on concealed weapons is in order, but there should be exceptions. Every member of our department is ready and able to back up any local officer that needs it and every one of us has done so. Most areas also invite our members to shoot with them in the matches or when they qualify. They would not do this if they felt we had no business packing a weapon. Since we work in several counties all over the state, this is the reason we have permits.

The second thing is the bill allowing non-public law enforcement officers to attend the State Police Academy. The way the law reads now, the only persons able to attend are sworn public law enforcement. The BI has send me to several out of state schools in their police academies and I can see no reason why Montana should lose out on the fee they were paid. I personally have over 600 hours of police training, which is more then most city police or sheriff depts. have. Virtually all of this was obtained out of state. Several states such as Washington, North Dakota and Illinois require our people to attend the state academy and upon completion, they are able to obtain state commissions and do not have to worry about concealed permits. The BI now has its own academy, but there are specialized schools at the academy that would be beneficial for us when working with local public agencies. We work very close with local agencies, such as assisting in investigation, NCIC computer use, crowd control on occasion etc. I realize the B.M. Police have a reputation of being untrained, but this is no longer true. We have a very good training section in St. Paul and we are constantly upgrading our training and equipment to become modern police department in the community we work in. Fanny advised he talked to several committees on this matter but couldn't make much headway. I realize the Sheriff and Peace Officers have a strong lobby and I believe they could be convinced to have the law changed if they were made aware of all the changes we have had in the past few years. We can now attend local seminars put on by the Academy and those of us with Sheriff Special Deputy Commissions can now obtain credit through the academy anyway. I realize you and Ray are junior members, but I would appreciate any feedback you may have and any help you can give us in these matters. As you know I follow the legislature pretty close so you can expect more letters as you progress.

Bill Warneke
825 17th St
Helena Montana 59501

SENATOR PETE STORY
CAPITAL STATION
139 ATTN: DAN CROWLEY
HELENA, MT. 59601

HB 184
NB 184
Exhibit E
1/20/83

ILHEE Harris
PO. Box 100
LIVINGSTON, MT 59047
28 Jan., 1983

DEAR SIR,

REFERENCE YOUR NOTE (NOTE DATED) WITH A COPY OF HOUSE BILL
No 184 (REVISION OF PERMIT TO CARRY A CONCEALED WEAPON) ATTACHED.

YES, PLEASE KEEP ME INFORMED AS TO THE STATUS OF THE PROPOSED BILL.

I DO NOT AGREE WITH SOME OF THE LANGUAGE AND IDEAS SET
FORTH IN THE AMENDED PROPOSED BILL. I TAKE EXCEPTION TO THE FOLLOWING

1. PAGE 2, LINES 4 THRU 9. I GO ALONG WITH THE DISTRICT COURT REQUIREMENT.

I DO NOT HOWEVER THINK AN INDIVIDUAL SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO OBTAIN
THE CONCURRENCE OF BOTH THE SHERIFF AND THE CHIEF LAW ENFORCEMENT
OFFICER. IT SHOULD BE ONE OR THE OTHER. THE SHERIFF IF THE
APPLICANT LIVES OUTSIDE OF A MUNICIPALITY, THE CHIEF LAW ENFORCE-
MENT OFFICE IF HE LIVES WITHIN A MUNICIPALITY, BUT NOT BOTH.
IT'S A DUPLICATION OF EFFORT AND COSTS MONEY.

2. PAGE 2, LINE 25 AND PAGE 3, LINES 1, 2 AND 7 THRU 11. BY WHAT
STRETCH OF THE IMAGINATION SHOULD THE APPLICATION BE MADE ON A FORM
PRESCRIBED BY THE IDENTIFICATION BUREAU, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE? SOUNDS
LIKE THEY ARE TRYING TO EMPIRE BUILD (CREATE NEW JOBS WITHIN THE DEPT). AGAIN
IT COSTS MONEY. THE STATE ALREADY HAS A THUMB PRINT ON A DRIVERS
LICENSE. THE DRIVERS LICENSE COULD BE USED AS A CROSS REFERENCE ON
THE APPLICATION FOR PERMIT, IF FINGER PRINTS ARE REQUIRED. I
HOWEVER FAIL TO SEE WHY FINGER PRINTING SHOULD BE A REQUIREMENT.
I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH THE DESCRIPTION OF THE WEAPON ETC.
WHY SHOULD AN APPLICANT BE LIMITED TO WHICH ONE OF SEVERAL HE
MAY OWN OR WANT TO CARRY? SUPPOSE THE APPLICANT REGISTERED
ONE WEAPON, IT BROKE, HE REPLACES IT WITH ANOTHER WEAPON, ONE OF
HIS OWN OR ANOTHER HE BOUGHT OR TRADED FOR. AGAIN HE HAS TO GO

than the gun registration process. This one has the smell of back door gun registration. I consider this requirement stupid, unneeded and it will serve no useful purpose.

4. Page 3, lines 22 thru 25, page 4, lines 1 and 2. Again, not just the Sheriff, but either the Sheriff or the Chief Law Enforcement Office which ever is appropriate considering the residence of the applicant. Avoid duplication of effort or records - it costs money.

5. Page 4, lines 14 thru 16, Again, why the Department of Justice why not the District Court?

6. Page 4, lines 19 and 20. Here we are back to proposed mandatory gun registration which I addressed in #3.

7. Pages 5 and 6, lines 24, 25 and 1 thru 6. A permit fee of \$100.00 are they trying to price some applicants out. A \$100.00 for what, what is the applicant really getting for \$100.00. He should have the right to protect himself, his family and/or property, it appears the permit fee far exceeds the the administrative costs for obtaining a permit. It sounds like they are trying to generate more jobs and record keeping in our existing, supposedly understaffed law enforcement agencies.

8. Page 16, lines 7 thru 19. Why duplicat paperwork? As I've stated before - it costs money. One agency should be sufficient. Again I take exception to the fingerprint requirement.

9. Page 7, lines 1 thru 3, duplication of effort, why is it needed.

I trust you can state my objection, reason and questions to the appropriate people. Thank you.

Yours truly
[Signature]

cc: Rep Dan Vardkey
NATIONAL RIFLE ASSN.

JUDICIARY

COMMITTEE

DATE January 20, 1983

SPONSOR Rep. Hand

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR LONGER FORM.

WHEN TESTIFYING PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.