



PROBLEMS WITH PROP 63

General

Prop 63 would **waste scarce law enforcement resources and overburden an already overcrowded court system** on enforcement of flawed laws that will turn harmless, law-abiding citizens into criminals.

Prop 63 asks voters to adopt 34 pages of **complex and confusing laws** that few lawyers can understand.

Due to strict limitations on the legislature's ability to amend voter-enacted propositions, **Prop 63's problems will be difficult or impossible to fix**, even if public safety want to fix it.

The Legislative Analyst's Office estimates Prop 63's cost at **tens of millions of dollars** annually, *forever*. Based on California Department of Justice's track record, it will actually cost much, much more.

Prop 63 permanently requires California to participate in a voluntary federal system, even if it turns out to be harmful for California.

Prop 63 has no "mandate." It currently has roughly the same amount of donors as the Coalition for Civil Liberties.

Prop 63 is **funded by wealthy elitists** who want favor with Gavin Newsom as he seeks the Governor's mansion; just three individuals have contributed almost \$1 million.

No law enforcement group supports Prop 63, while multiple respected California and national law enforcement groups oppose it.

Civil rights groups oppose Prop 63, including the Congress of Racial Equality, Children of Holocaust Survivors, Pink Pistols (an LGBT group), and the Liberal Gun Club of California.

Prop 63 would **criminalize the action of Olympic athletes** like Kim Rhode, who this year became one of only two people in history to medal in six Olympics.

Counter-terrorism experts have opposed Prop 63.

Prop 63 **forces courts to adopt costly and time-consuming systems** that they have no say in developing.

Prop 63's fees will **disproportionately affect poor people** who want to protect their families or hunt for food.

Ammunition Restrictions

New York recently abandoned enforcement of an effectively identical ammunition registration scheme due to the practical, technical, and financial obstacles to creating a database.

The federal government abandoned a similar program in 1986 after years because, according to then ATF Director Steve Higgins, its “recordkeeping requirements for ammunition have no substantial law enforcement value.”

Prop 63 violates privacy by creating government databases of all legal ammunition purchasers, including their residential address and phone number.

Prop 63 requires even police to pay up to \$50 and wait 30 days to be authorized to purchase ammunition that they use to protect the public.

Prop 63 prohibits even siblings from selling ammunition to each other.

Requirement to Report Lost or Stolen Firearms

Prop 63 makes victims of theft criminals if they do not report the theft in time.

Similar ordinances have never been enforced by the cities that have the same law on their books.

Prop 63 **cannot** be used against straw purchasers because: (a) they do not technically violate it; and (b) the 5th amendment precludes compelling them to report their crime.

Prop 63 discourages firearm owners from cooperating with police for fear of prosecution.

Ban on Commonly Owned Magazines

Prop 63 confiscates private property from people who have legally owned it for at least 16 years.

Prop 63 opens the door for the government to ban property owned by unpopular minority groups.

In the three cities that have already banned these standard capacity magazines (Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Sunnyvale) not a single person has turned one in, nor has anyone been prosecuted. Good people have been turned into criminals either by civil disobedience or unknowingly.

Paid For By
Coalition for Civil Liberties, a project of the California Rifle & Pistol Association
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 600
Sacramento, CA 95814