

Recently this paper wrote in support of Massachusetts “Red Flag” laws and supported them as a national model. I could not disagree more and believe the editors of this paper never bothered to read the law, else they would not support them either.

Prior to the current Red Flag law, Massachusetts had a very simple way to deal with a potential problem. You went to the Licensing Authority, told them so-and-so was a problem, and they revoked your license. So-and-so had to transfer their guns to another licensed person, such that so-and-so could not access the guns, and all was well. If so-and-so felt they were wronged, they could go to court.

So what does the Red Flag law change, and why do I oppose it?

First, the “petitioner” can be more than just a relative or household member. Under Section 121 Chapter 40, it can also be “The Licensing Authority.” i.e., The Government.

Second, under Section 131R part d, the guns may ONLY be surrendered to the Licensing Authority, i.e., “The Government”. They are then allowed to dispose of them and keep any proceeds from them.

Lastly, even if the Red Flag is not renewed (and it may be renewed indefinitely), it is up to the licensing authority to re-establish if so-and-so is suitable to get a license again. What is the likelihood of that?

So here we now have a situation where anyone, including the government, can petition to take your private property (guns), remove and sell them, keep the money, and at best, you might get to have a license again.

Sound fair?

But hey, at least they were required to give you “informational resources” including how to commit yourself for help. That will prevent mass shootings and suicides, right?

Bottom line is this law was only passed to slowly eviscerate the Second Amendment. Just wait until they come for the First Amendment.