My name is Gary Simon. I am a lifelong resident of Montgomery County. I am a law-abiding MD Wear and Carry Permit holder as well as a MD Qualified Handgun Instructor (QHIC). While I think it fair to say that my viewpoints and philosophies are not very similar to the majority of the esteemed council, I do wish to thank you for the time that each of you dedicate to serving our county. I am here today to ask that you do so from a perspective of practicality and one that adheres to the laws that make our country what it is today.

You have proposed a law, 21-22, in response to a decision of the Supreme Court in the NYSRPA v. Bruen matter. In doing so, you present a code that directly defies the majority opinion written by the Honorable Judge Thomas. I offer a portion of that decision for the record here today. I offer only text, removing citation and reference in the essence of time and brevity.

“Consider, for example, Heller’s discussion of “longstanding” laws forbidding the carrying of firearms in sensitive places such as schools and government buildings. Although the historical record yields relatively few 18th- and 19th-century “sensitive places” where weapons are altogether prohibited—e.g., legislative assemblies, polling places, and courthouses— we are also aware of no disputes regarding the lawfulness of such prohibitions. We therefore can assume it settled that these locations were “sensitive places” where arms carrying could be prohibited consistent with the Second Amendment. And courts can use analogies to those historical regulations of “sensitive places” to determine that modern regulations prohibiting the carry of firearms in new and analogous sensitive places are constitutionally permissible. Although we have no occasion to comprehensively define “sensitive places” in this case, we do think respondents err in their attempt to characterize New York’s proper cause requirement as a “sensitive-place” law. In their view, “sensitive places” where the government may lawfully disarm law-abiding citizens include all “places where people typically congregate and where law enforcement and other public-safety professionals are presumptively available. It is true that people sometimes congregate in “sensitive places,” and it is likewise true that law enforcement professionals are usually presumptively available in those locations. But expanding the category of “sensitive places” simply to all places of public congregation that are not isolated from law enforcement defines the category of “sensitive places” too broadly. Respondent’s argument would in effect exempt cities from the Second Amendment and would eviscerate the general right to publicly carry arms for self-defense that we discuss in detail below. Put simply, there is no historical basis for New York to effectively declare the island of Manhattan a “sensitive place” simply because it is crowded and protected generally by the New York Police Department.”

I am a permit holding, law-abiding citizen who will certainly be effected by this error-filled piece of legislation. What I believe gives me the greatest concern is that a body such as yourselves would propose such a piece of legislation that you know would be challenged and likely overturned. Rather than focusing on laws that focus on criminal conduct and are centered on the solving of an issue at hand, you propose something that is nothing more than window dressing to your constituency so that you are able to say we tried to do something. Perhaps if this type of energy was directed at criminals rather than law-abiding citizens exercising their constitutionally protected rights, you might garner the support of people like myself.

Thank you for your time and consideration.