

Testimony of Megan Langford

Volunteer with Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America

January 23, 2024, 9:00AM

Good afternoon Chairman Carpenter, Committee members, and staff. Thank you for acknowledging my testimony today.

My name is Megan Langford.

I've lived in Kansas for nearly 20 years. I am a parent and active community member. In the last few years, I've seen my kids become more and more fearful about the risk of an active shooter entering their schools.

I am testifying today because HCR 5020 is a dangerous resolution that poses a direct threat to Kansas public safety laws that protect our communities by keeping guns out of the hands of people who we all agree shouldn't have them.

I am tired of reading about gun violence in the news. I am tired of living in fear and seeing my kids realize that nowhere in America is truly safe from gun violence. I am tired of the Kansas legislature continually trying to pass laws that not only make our communities less safe, but also put our law enforcement officers at risk.

This bill poses several significant concerns:

If adopted, strict scrutiny would threaten to eliminate Kansas's most crucial public safety laws, including:

- Prohibition on Gun Possession by Convicted Felons: After strict scrutiny amendments passed in Louisiana and Missouri, convicted felons challenged state laws that prohibit felons from possessing firearms. At least one lower court found that Louisiana's law prohibiting felons from having guns was unconstitutional. Fortunately, the Louisiana Supreme Court reversed this ruling.
- Prohibitions on Gun Possession by Domestic Abusers: In Louisiana, after strict scrutiny passed, a convicted domestic abuser challenged the constitutionality of a state law prohibiting possession of a firearm by people convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence crimes.

Strict scrutiny laws make state taxpayers fund the flow of lawsuits brought by criminal defendants.

- The Missouri State Auditor determined that Louisiana’s strict scrutiny law led to “significant time, effort, and expenditures by Louisiana’s public defenders and district attorney’s offices,” imposing “significant workload and related costs on the Louisiana government.” The auditor projected that a strict scrutiny law in Missouri would ultimately cost Missouri taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

I encourage members of the committee to vote NO on House Resolution 5020.

This concludes my testimony. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify today.

Megan Langford
Lenexa, KS