

ADDENDUM TO FISCAL NOTE FOR HB 254 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT/CONCEALED CARRY

Rep. Larry G. Pittman

July 13, 2021

The fiscal note provided for HB 254 expresses concern that a reduction in applications for concealed carry permits might adversely affect funding for various functions of State and local law enforcement. It should be noted that those FTE's mentioned in the fiscal note would never have been funded by concealed carry permit fees if there had never been a concealed carry permit. So either they would have been unnecessary, or they would have been funded some other way, anyway. That is as it should be, in the view of this proposed amendment, because the requirement of a permit to carry a concealed weapon has always been a violation of the fundamental right of self-defense, which this proposed amendment is meant to rectify.

As for the concern over less fingerprints being taken if fewer citizens choose to obtain concealed carry permits, that is a fact to be embraced. The government should have no reason to obtain fingerprints from citizens who have not committed a crime, in effect treating them like criminals just because they wish to exercise the right of self-defense. So there should be no need for that many fingerprints to be taken in the first place.

The fiscal note is understandably ambiguous about whether the number of citizens who seek to obtain a concealed carry permit will be significantly decreased by the passage of this proposed amendment. There is certainly no way of being certain about the extent of that effect. The author of the proposed amendment intends to continue renewing his concealed carry permit, for the purpose of reciprocity with other States that continue to violate citizens' rights by requiring concealed carry permits, if for no other reason. The speculation as to how many other citizens will do the same or how many will carry concealed without a permit is not capable of a definitive answer, which is good, because the government has no ultimate right to know that information, which is part and parcel to the intent of the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 30 of the North Carolina Constitution, minus the language which this proposed amendment seeks to remove from the latter. It is to be expected, however, that a significant number of citizens who wish to be able to carry concealed in other States will continue to obtain and renew concealed carry permits for that purpose. If revenues from these permits are decreased enough to cause various State entities to have to "repurpose those positions," and "any loss in receipts due to fewer CHP applications would need to be replaced with General Fund appropriations," and a minor reduction in force for purposes of fingerprinting may be necessitated, as the fiscal note suggests, that will be entirely appropriate, considering the enhancement of the people's ability to exercise their rights upon which the Second Amendment clearly states that the government has no right to infringe.

The understanding underlying this proposed amendment is that the offensive language it seeks to remove from Article I, Section 30 of the North Carolina Constitution was originally placed there to deprive citizens freed from slavery of their right to self-defense under the guise of preventing them from carrying concealed in order to murder their former masters, and that such violation of the rights of citizens of this State and these United States must be repudiated. It is clear that where citizens are

allowed to practice concealed carry, even under a permit system, violent crime is reduced because potentially violent criminals realize that they never know which citizens may be able to defend themselves. This proposed amendment takes this a step further, to create a situation in which persons with criminal intent NEVER KNOW whether their intended victims might be armed. Law enforcement resources should not be wasted on hindering peaceful citizens in exercising their right to keep and bear arms, but should be focused on bringing to justice those who actually commit crimes, instead.

Rep. Larry G. Pittman