



February 2026

**TO:** House Judiciary Committee

**RE:** AAUW OPPOSES HB26-1021—Second Amendment Protection Act

Dear Committee Members:

The American Association of University Women (AAUW) is one of the oldest women's organizations in the country, empowering women since 1881. The mission of AAUW is to advance equity for women and girls through research, education and advocacy. More than 700 community leaders are members of AAUW branches around Colorado.

AAUW has declared that gun violence is a public health crisis. We support existing laws aimed at reducing gun deaths, and believe HB1021 represents a dangerous step backward. We should not undo important safeguards around firearms sales and safe storage of firearms, as well as preventing intimidation at polling places.

AAUW of Colorado strongly opposes HB1021 and requests your NO vote in committee.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Su Ryden".

Su Ryden  
AAUW of Colorado Advocacy Director

16699 E. Kentucky Ave. • Aurora, CO 80017  
303.898.5797  
[suryden25@gmail.com](mailto:suryden25@gmail.com)

*American Association of University Women--AAUW is a top-rated 501(c)3 charitable organization whose mission is to advance gender equity for women and girls through research, education, and advocacy.*

**As a citizen of Colorado's 2A community, I support HB26-1021 because policies have steadily restricted the rights of law-abiding gun owners. I hope the bill will help restore the balance of burdensome regulations that impact responsible citizens more than criminals. I believe protecting constitutional freedoms while continuing to promote safe and educated firearm ownership is essential to preserving our rights for future generations.**

**Sincerely,**

**Jonathon Reece**

**Second Amendment Protection Act**  
**Hearing: Tuesday, February 17, 2026**  
**Submitted by: Alexandra Goldberg**

Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Alexandra Goldberg, and I am a survivor of the Columbine High School shooting in 1999.

Nearly 27 years ago, I survived one of the earliest and most devastating school shootings in modern American history. Since then, Colorado has endured many more tragedies, from the 2012 Aurora theater shooting, to the 2019 STEM School Highlands Ranch shooting, the 2022 Club Q nightclub shooting, the 2025 Evergreen High School shooting, and many other incidents of gun violence that have left families devastated and communities traumatized.

In an average year, about 977 people die and nearly 1,400 are wounded by gun violence in Colorado. In 2024 alone, an estimated 961 Coloradans died from gun-related injuries — a rate higher than deaths from motor vehicle accidents.

These aren't just statistics, they are lives cut short, families forever changed, and communities left to pick up the pieces.

Each morning when I kiss my young children, ages two and five, goodbye before school, I can't help but hope with all my heart that it will be just a regular day. That I will get to kiss them again when they come home. That this will not be my last kiss with them. THIS IS NOT NORMAL.

Colorado has been a state where we have chosen to prioritize safety alongside responsible firearm ownership. We have enacted measures like background checks on all gun sales, safe storage requirements, waiting periods, age-based purchase limits, protections in schools and licensed childcare centers, and programs to educate the public about firearm safety. These laws reflect a belief that life, especially children's lives, is worth protecting.

It should be harder to obtain and carry a weapon than it is to get a driver's license or to buy cigarettes, yet too often in this country that is not the case. The fact that guns have become one of the leading causes of death for children and teens nationwide underscores the urgency of sensible protections rather than repeal.

HB26-1021 would wipe out nearly every meaningful gun safety law Colorado has worked toward. It would eliminate safeguards that help keep guns out of the hands of people at risk of harming themselves or others. It would remove protections in schools, reduce the ability of local communities to act, and send a dangerous message about where we stand as a state.

Repealing these laws would not make our communities safer, it would make them more vulnerable. As a survivor, as a parent, and as someone who deeply loves this state, I urge you to vote NO on HB26-1021.

Please choose the safety of our children and families over rolling back progress we have fought so hard to achieve.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,



Alexandra Goldberg - Colorado Resident

Testimony in support of: HB26-1021 Second Amendment Protection Act  
The Firearms Coalition of Colorado, PO Box 1454, Englewood, CO 80150-1454

Thank you, Chair and Committee

My name is Robert Edmiston. I am with the Firearms Coalition of Colorado an NRA- affiliated, all-volunteer, grassroots organization dedicated to the protection of individual rights and public safety.

I am a former U.S. Army Officer and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor. I have a Master's Degree in Psychology, Counseling and Guidance.

I am writing in support of the measure under consideration. Rather than go into detail about the specific problems and unintended consequences inherent in all the well-intentioned gun control laws that would be repealed by this bill, we think it might be more useful to look at the fallacies of the general concept and historical evidence against gun control.

“Laws that forbid the carrying of arms ... disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes.... Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man.” - Cesare Bonesana, Marchese Di Beccaria, *On Crimes and Punishment*, 1764. (Noted by Thomas Jefferson in his personal papers.)

“Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties: (1) those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes. (2) Those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe, although not the most wise depository of the public interests. In every country these two parties exist; and in every one where they are free to think, speak, and write, they will declare themselves.” - Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Henry Lee, 1824.

“The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government.” - David Davis, *Ex Parte Milligan*, 4 Wallace 2, 120-121 1866. (Justice Davis was appointed to the United States Supreme Court by Abraham Lincoln.)

Historically, weapons control was tried in ancient China, when the Chinese Emperor banned crossbows and pole arms on the trade routes. The end result was that only the bandits who preyed on the caravans had crossbows and pole arms. In ancient Rome, common citizens were prohibited from carrying swords in the city. Only the Praetorian Guard could go armed. The result was that gangs armed with clubs terrorized citizens in the streets at night and the Guard became so powerful that it was able to select and kill Roman Emperors at will.

In Japan, Chief Imperial Minister Hideyoshi banned sword possession by anyone but samurai warriors and the nobility and established a rigid hereditary caste system. This situation resulted in the law of “cut down and leave” whereby a samurai could kill a member of a lower caste and simply walk away. The system eventually evolved into the militarization of Japanese Society that played a role in that country’s involvement in World War II.

In this country, gun control was a mainstay in the discrimination against Blacks and Native Americans. Black Codes and Jim Crow Laws were used to disarm Blacks and make them vulnerable to violent White organizations, such as the Ku Klux Klan.

Europe is often cited by proponents of gun control as a model to be emulated; however, it should be remembered that in the last century, Europe experienced one of the most horrible genocides in history. Gun control laid the groundwork for the Nazi’s “final solution” to the “Jewish Problem,” and the murder of political dissidents, persons with disabilities, and other ethnic minorities.

The United Kingdom has often been cited as “the Gold Standard” by proponents of gun control, however, England is now facing an epidemic of “knife” crime. Predictably, the British Government bans the carrying of knives and is cutting off the points of sharp kitchen knives.

Historically, weapons control has failed to solve the problem of violence. Professors Kates and Mauser succinctly summarized the problems with gun control. “The people you need to control are not going to obey the gun control laws...and the people you don’t need to control, those are the ones who obey. So, what you get is...either nothing, or you get worse results with gun control.”

Professor Donald B. Kates is co-author of “Would Banning Firearms Reduce Murder and Suicide? A review of International and Some Domestic Evidence” published in the spring of 2007 in the Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, the most widely distributed law review in the US. Professor Kates served as a professor at Stanford Law School. His co-author, Professor Gary Mauser, served as a Canadian university professor.

The Kates- Mauser study looked at 18 European nations with varying levels of gun ownership. They concluded:

“Whether gun availability is viewed as a cause or as a mere coincidence, the long-term macrocosmic evidence is that gun ownership spread widely throughout societies consistently correlates with stable or declining murder rates. Whether causative or not, the consistent international pattern is that more guns equal less murder and other violent crime.”

We believe that the measure under consideration would eliminate many of the onerous and probably unconstitutional anti-Second Amendment laws that have been passed. Elimination of these laws might provide a basis for discussion of the moral, spiritual, psychological, and societal problems that are the root causes of violence.

We urge an “aye” vote on this bill.

Thank you.

Robert Edmiston  
Volunteer Lobbyist  
The Firearms Coalition of Colorado  
PO Box 1454, Englewood, CO 80150-1454

## **Written Testimony in Opposition to HB26-1021**

**Submitted by:** Angela Bergfeld

**Regarding:** HB26-1021

**Position:** Oppose

Chair, Vice Chair, and Members of the Committee,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony in opposition to HB26-1021. I appreciate the work of the legislature and the seriousness of decisions that directly affect the safety of our communities. I write to you not only as a constituent, but as a mother whose daily life, like that of millions of parents, is shaped by a constant, quiet responsibility: keeping my children safe.

When I send my kids to school, take them to the park, or tuck them into bed at night, I am trusting that the laws in place are doing their part to reduce preventable harm. For families like mine, firearm policy is not theoretical or political. It is deeply personal. The choices made in this building have real consequences for whether parents feel secure raising their children in their own neighborhoods.

After reviewing HB26-1021, I am deeply concerned that it goes too far in repealing existing statutes related to firearms and other weapons without sufficient evidence that these changes will improve public safety. Current laws governing the unlawful carrying and use of firearms exist to create clear boundaries and accountability. As a parent, clarity matters. When laws are weakened or repealed, confusion increases. It makes enforcement more difficult and potentially allow dangerous behavior to go unchecked.

HB26-1021 appears to prioritize deregulation over harm prevention. From a parent's perspective, this is incredibly alarming. Firearm-related injuries and deaths continue to impact children and families, often in sudden and irreversible ways. Rolling back safeguards without strong evidence that doing so will make communities safer risks placing that burden on parents, educators, and first responders.

I am also troubled by how this bill limits the ability of local communities to maintain protections that reflect their unique needs. Parents rely on schools, municipalities, and local leaders to respond thoughtfully to safety concerns. A one-size-fits-all repeal removes important tools that communities may use to protect children where they live and learn.

**I want to be clear: opposing HB26-1021 is not opposition to responsible gun ownership.** As a mother, I respect the rights of lawful gun owners while also believing that commonsense standards are necessary to ensure those rights do not come at the expense of a child's life or a family's sense of security. These values are not in conflict. Instead, they should coexist.

At its core, my opposition to HB26-1021 comes from a simple place. Parents want to raise their children in a state where safety is prioritized, where laws are guided by evidence, and where preventable harm is taken seriously. I urge the committee to oppose HB26-1021 to preserve existing public safety protections, respect local control, and center the well-being of children and families in this decision.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to the people of Colorado.

Respectfully submitted,

Angela Bergfeld



February 16, 2026

The Honorable Javier Mabrey, Chair  
House Judiciary Committee  
State Capitol  
Denver, CO 80203

**Oppose: HB26-1021 - Second Amendment Protection Act**

Dear Representative Mabrey,

I am unable to attend the upcoming hearing on HB26-1021; I am therefore submitting a letter to express Brady Colorado's strong opposition to the bill. I live in Golden and am a member of Brady Colorado, a grassroots organization working to reduce firearm crime, injury, and death. I am also a survivor of gun violence.

You may remember my story. In 2001, my daughter, Laura, bright and beautiful at age 19 - and a college sophomore in the midst of her campaign for the student body presidency - was killed while home on winter break. Laura was filling in at a county behavioral health clinic, when a client opened fire and shot her four times at point blank range, killing her instantly. When the shooting rampage at the clinic and a nearby restaurant ended, three people lay dead, three were severely injured, a community was shaken, and the world was diminished by the loss of an incredible young woman. Laura had extraordinary capability, kindness, and spirit and wanted to make a positive difference in the world; she had the brightest of futures. Because I know the deep grief of losing a loved-one to gunfire, I am compelled to work to reduce gun violence in Colorado.

HB26-1021 seeks to repeal 27 state laws pertaining to firearms and terminate the state Office of Gun Violence Prevention. The bill provides that money in certain funds be returned to payers or donors.

The list of policies to be repealed under HB26-1021 can be placed in five broad categories, all of which are important: 1) Keeping guns out of dangerous hands, 2) Protecting the safety of the public, 3) Preventing intimidation and firearm injury related to elections, 4) Limiting or regulating dangerous weapons and 5) Enforcement.

For more than a decade, a majority of the American public has said that our nation's laws need to keep guns away from people at risk of causing harm.<sup>i</sup> To that end, our state enacted laws to

keep guns out of dangerous hands, including regulating firearm transfers, firearm dealers, gun shows, the storage of firearms, child access, training requirements, and more. These policies save lives and should not be repealed.

Carrying firearms in public, particularly in sensitive places, such as government buildings, childcare facilities, schools, institutions of higher education, and polling places can both intimidate and place people at risk. Those who carry a loaded hidden gun in public must be screened, properly trained, and permitted. Recognizing these risks, our state has enacted relevant laws.

High-capacity magazines and the ability to rapidly reload a weapon and maintain continuous fire increases the lethality of any mass shooting event. After the Aurora shooting in 2012, the state legislature understood this and enacted a large capacity magazine ban. More recently, the legislature enacted an extended firearm safety training requirement for those wishing to obtain specified semiautomatic firearms. Obviously, the state must have the funds to implement, enforce, and investigate its gun laws.

From fifteen years of annually comparing state gun laws and gun violence, the data is clear: **states with stronger gun laws have lower gun death rates.**<sup>ii</sup> A majority of Coloradans have been voting for legislators who support strong gun laws and in recent years there has been much progress. It takes time for laws to become fully implemented and have an impact. It would be foolish to repeal these laws before their life-saving benefits are fully realized.

To protect the safety of Coloradans, Brady Colorado stands strongly opposed to HB26-1021 and asks for your NO vote.

Sincerely,



Amanda Wilcox  
Brady Colorado

Cc: Representatives Carter, Bacon, Clifford, Espenosa, Flanell, Garcia, Keltie, Slaugh, Soper, and Zokaie

---

<sup>i</sup> <https://news.gallup.com/poll/653489/majorities-back-stricter-gun-laws-assault-weapons-ban.aspx#:~:text=Stricter%20Gun%20Laws%20in%20U.S.,where%20it%20has%20remained%20since.>

<sup>ii</sup> <https://giffords.org/lawcenter/resources/scorecard/>

Testimony in support of: HB26-1021 Second Amendment Protection Act  
The Firearms Coalition of Colorado, PO Box 1454, Englewood, CO 80150-1454

Thank you, Chair and Committee

My name is Robert Edmiston. I am with the Firearms Coalition of Colorado an NRA- affiliated, all-volunteer, grassroots organization dedicated to the protection of individual rights and public safety.

I am a former U.S. Army Officer and Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor. I have a Master's Degree in Psychology, Counseling and Guidance.

I am writing in support of the measure under consideration. Rather than go into detail about the specific problems and unintended consequences inherent in all the well-intentioned gun control laws that would be repealed by this bill, we think it might be more useful to look at the fallacies of the general concept and historical evidence against gun control.

“Laws that forbid the carrying of arms ... disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes.... Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than to prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man.” - Cesare Bonesana, Marchese Di Beccaria, *On Crimes and Punishment*, 1764. (Noted by Thomas Jefferson in his personal papers.)

“Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties: (1) those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes. (2) Those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe, although not the most wise depository of the public interests. In every country these two parties exist; and in every one where they are free to think, speak, and write, they will declare themselves.” - Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Henry Lee, 1824.

“The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government.” - David Davis, *Ex Parte Milligan*, 4 Wallace 2, 120-121 1866. (Justice Davis was appointed to the United States Supreme Court by Abraham Lincoln.)

Historically, weapons control was tried in ancient China, when the Chinese Emperor banned crossbows and pole arms on the trade routes. The end result was that only the bandits who preyed on the caravans had crossbows and pole arms. In ancient Rome, common citizens were prohibited from carrying swords in the city. Only the Praetorian Guard could go armed. The result was that gangs armed with clubs terrorized citizens in the streets at night and the Guard became so powerful that it was able to select and kill Roman Emperors at will.

In Japan, Chief Imperial Minister Hideyoshi banned sword possession by anyone but samurai warriors and the nobility and established a rigid hereditary caste system. This situation resulted in the law of “cut down and leave” whereby a samurai could kill a member of a lower caste and simply walk away. The system eventually evolved into the militarization of Japanese Society that played a role in that country’s involvement in World War II.

In this country, gun control was a mainstay in the discrimination against Blacks and Native Americans. Black Codes and Jim Crow Laws were used to disarm Blacks and make them vulnerable to violent White organizations, such as the Ku Klux Klan.

Europe is often cited by proponents of gun control as a model to be emulated; however, it should be remembered that in the last century, Europe experienced one of the most horrible genocides in history. Gun control laid the groundwork for the Nazi’s “final solution” to the “Jewish Problem,” and the murder of political dissidents, persons with disabilities, and other ethnic minorities.

The United Kingdom has often been cited as “the Gold Standard” by proponents of gun control, however, England is now facing an epidemic of “knife” crime. Predictably, the British Government bans the carrying of knives and is cutting off the points of sharp kitchen knives.

Historically, weapons control has failed to solve the problem of violence. Professors Kates and Mauser succinctly summarized the problems with gun control. “The people you need to control are not going to obey the gun control laws...and the people you don’t need to control, those are the ones who obey. So, what you get is...either nothing, or you get worse results with gun control.”

Professor Donald B. Kates is co-author of “Would Banning Firearms Reduce Murder and Suicide? A review of International and Some Domestic Evidence” published in the spring of 2007 in the Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, the most widely distributed law review in the US. Professor Kates served as a professor at Stanford Law School. His co-author, Professor Gary Mauser, served as a Canadian university professor.

The Kates- Mauser study looked at 18 European nations with varying levels of gun ownership. They concluded:

“Whether gun availability is viewed as a cause or as a mere coincidence, the long-term macrocosmic evidence is that gun ownership spread widely throughout societies consistently correlates with stable or declining murder rates. Whether causative or not, the consistent international pattern is that more guns equal less murder and other violent crime.”

We believe that the measure under consideration would eliminate many of the onerous and probably unconstitutional anti-Second Amendment laws that have been passed. Elimination of these laws might provide a basis for discussion of the moral, spiritual, psychological, and societal problems that are the root causes of violence.

We urge an “aye” vote on this bill.

Thank you.

Robert Edmiston  
Volunteer Lobbyist  
The Firearms Coalition of Colorado  
PO Box 1454, Englewood, CO 80150-1454

## **Testimony in Support of HB26-1021: The Second Amendment Protection Act**

Honorable Members of the Colorado General Assembly,

I am writing today to express my strong support for HB26-1021, the Second Amendment Protection Act, which seeks to safeguard the constitutional rights of Coloradans by protecting our ability to keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

The right to defend oneself, one's family, and one's property is not just an inalienable right, but a fundamental pillar of personal freedom and security. This bill is essential in ensuring that Coloradans can continue to exercise this right free from the encroachment of restrictive state and local laws that seek to undermine our Second Amendment rights.

### **The Constitutional Foundation**

The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution is unequivocal: "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." The U.S. Supreme Court has consistently upheld the core principles of this amendment, recognizing it as an individual right. In *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008), the Supreme Court ruled that the Second Amendment protects an individual's right to possess firearms, unconnected to service in a militia, and that this right is fundamental to the nation's conception of liberty.

This ruling was further reinforced in *McDonald v. City of Chicago* (2010), where the Court extended the Second Amendment's protections to state and local governments, ensuring that Americans have the right to keep and bear arms in their homes and communities. By passing HB26-1021, Colorado will join the ranks of other states that are committed to defending these rights, preventing unnecessary and unconstitutional restrictions on firearms that would erode the ability of citizens to protect themselves.

### **The Link Between Gun Control Laws and Crime Rates**

The evidence is clear: states with stricter gun control laws do not necessarily experience lower crime rates. In fact, numerous studies show that states with more permissive gun laws often experience lower crime rates and better public safety outcomes.

Take for instance the state of Florida, which passed "shall-issue" concealed carry laws in 1987. Since then, crime rates in the state have steadily dropped, with violent crime rates falling by 38% between 1991 and 2018. The National Bureau of Economic Research found that allowing law-abiding citizens to carry concealed weapons significantly deters crime, as criminals are less likely to target individuals or areas where they know potential victims may be armed.

On the other hand, states with restrictive gun laws, such as California and Illinois, continue to struggle with higher crime rates despite their more stringent regulations. In Chicago, for example, despite some of the toughest gun control laws in the country, the city faces an ongoing crisis with gun violence and a significant homicide rate. In fact, Chicago's homicide rate in 2020 was more than five times higher than the national average, and most of the firearms used in crimes come from out-of-state, where laws are less restrictive.

As demonstrated in *Kleck v. Kates* (1995), a study published in the *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* found that defensive gun use by law-abiding citizens is much more frequent than gun crimes committed by criminals. The study suggests that the presence of firearms in the hands of responsible citizens acts as a deterrent to crime and can significantly reduce the likelihood of victimization.

### **The Importance of Protecting Gun Rights**

The Second Amendment is not just about hunting or sport shooting; it is about self-defense and protecting our individual freedoms. The right to keep and bear arms is essential to preserving liberty in the face of both personal and societal threats. By passing HB26-1021, we are affirming that Colorado values the right of law-abiding citizens to defend themselves and their families.

States that have enacted stricter gun control laws often see higher rates of crime, not lower, because criminals, by nature, do not adhere to laws. They will find ways to obtain weapons, regardless of restrictions. In contrast, empowering law-abiding citizens to lawfully carry and use firearms helps deter crime, protect communities, and ensure that individuals can defend themselves when necessary.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, HB26-1021 serves to protect Coloradans from overreach by state and local governments that would infringe upon our fundamental right to self-defense and the preservation of liberty. Supporting the Second Amendment is not only a constitutional obligation but a practical safeguard against rising crime rates and the erosion of personal freedoms.

I urge you to support HB26-1021 and stand with the people of Colorado in defending our Second Amendment rights.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Andrew Cole *Andrew Cole*

Email: [Ace97Cole@gmail.com](mailto:Ace97Cole@gmail.com)

Phone: 801-814-2861

3831 Josephine Hts

Colorado Springs, CO 80906

## **HB26-1021 – Second Amendment Protection Act**

**Chair and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is David Scott, and I am testifying in support of HB26-1021, the Second Amendment Protection Act.**

**The very fact that citizens must petition their government to protect a right explicitly enshrined in the Bill of Rights—second only to freedom of speech—is deeply troubling. It reflects how far we have drifted from the constitutional principles that were meant to guide this nation.**

**The Second Amendment was not written to guarantee hunting privileges, nor was it drafted with the expectation that technology would remain frozen in the 18th century. Its purpose is far more fundamental: to ensure that ordinary, law-abiding citizens can stand on equal footing against the overreach of a tyrannical government. Our founders understood that the danger lies not in the structure of government itself, but in those who seek power and expand it through ever-growing webs of law and regulation.**

**A second, equally important truth is this: no gun law—no matter how well-intentioned—can guarantee safety from those who harbor violent intent. Laws against robbery, rape, and murder already exist, yet criminals routinely ignore them. They prey on the weak, the distracted, and the unarmed. Conversely, they are deterred by the vigilant and the strong, and by the possibility that their intended victim may be armed and capable of defending themselves.**

**The Constitution states plainly: “*A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.*” Infringed not by well-meaning officials, not by those who seek control, and not by any state, county, city, or municipality.**

**HB26-1021 takes meaningful steps toward reversing previously enacted infringements and restoring the rights of the people—rights that allow citizens to defend themselves against those who would do them harm, whether criminal or governmental.**

**Thank you for your time and consideration.**

**Sincerely,  
David Scott**