

From: [Diane DeSloover](#)
To: [Senate State Affairs](#); [Sen. Scott Kawasaki](#); [Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson](#); [Sen. Jesse Bjorkman](#); [Sen. Bill Wielechowski](#); [Sen. Cathy Tilton](#)
Subject: SB 243
Date: Wednesday, March 4, 2026 1:14:35 PM

Dear Members of the Senate State Affairs Committee,

I am writing today in limbo regarding SB 243. I am not in support of legal firearm suppressors in Alaska. But I understand that the statute being repealed by this bill, AS 11.61.200, does not make suppressors illegal unless they are not registered in accordance with federal law. If removing the language “prohibited weapon” from AS 11.61.200 does nothing to change the legal status, then I guess it is only an editing exercise. With a federal license, suppressors remain legal in Alaska.

There is, however, a difference between prohibited suppressors and those that are only subject to federal regulation. A number of states currently prohibit firearm suppressors. Among them are California, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York and Washington D.C. Banning suppressors is a public safety issue. Silencers can mask detection of criminal activity, causing delay in law enforcement response. Loud gun shots alert the public to the risk of potential harm. Removing that signal leaves people unaware and vulnerable. Even though there is some protection in requiring suppressors to be licensed, many who would use them for criminal purposes would still have legal access to them. When it comes to the use of firearms, there is always a risk to the public, and suppressors increase that risk.

Keeping AS 11.61.200 as is or removing the words “prohibited weapon” will not make firearm suppressors illegal in Alaska. Some other bill would have to do that. For future consideration, I believe the argument of whether to ban or not to ban firearm suppressors is a valid question for Alaskans to consider.

Thank you for your work to improve Alaskan laws.

Sincerely,

Diane DeSloover
6713 Sherri Street
Juneau, AK 99801