

**From:** star fire <starfire@snet.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 18, 2013 7:41 PM  
**To:** INSTestimony  
**Subject:** HB6656

HB 6656 (Raised) An act concerning liability insurance for firearm possessors or owners

I would suggest that all parents be required to register and have liability insurance on all of the children. This is so when the children damage or destroy someone property the parent can pay for the damage. Also, when you by liquor you must show proof that you have liability insurance in case some one is hurt by your drinking.

In addition, all of the members of the State House or State Senate should be require to obtain liability insurance to cover the damage they are doing to the jobs and the economy in this State. Due to job loss and law suits against the state for the discrimination against those of us that target shoot and Hunt.

These bills display a level of discrimination only rived by this country's dark history prior to the Civil Rights Movement. It is a direct assault on the rights guaranteed by Second Amendment and validated by the US Supreme Court. Under no circumstances can this biased draconian bill be considered as anything other than a malicious assault, discriminating against lawful gun ownership. These bills have no legitimacy in curbing crime and should have absolutely **no support here in the state of Connecticut.**

Once again we need to enforce the current laws and lengthen prison sentences for criminals that conduct violent acts. Seventy one percent of criminals of gun related crimes are let off the hook. Fix the judicial system and enforce existing laws! In addition the NICS (Instant Check) system needs to be updated. The mental health system in this state must fix not patched or disregarded as the state currently does.

For a group of people who should be smart you just do not get it. Violent criminals and psychopaths aren't going away; no law will prevent them from committing murder. They are not going to register firearms or obey gun laws. More gun laws are not gong to change anything. Please do not support Bill HB6656.

Respectively,  
Daniel R. Yungk  
39 Pheasant Run Rd  
Stonington, Ct

**From:** star fire <starfire@snet.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 18, 2013 8:04 PM  
**To:** INSTestimony  
**Subject:** Committee Bills

**Committee Bill 6162 (HB-6162)**

**AN ACT CONCERNING INELIGIBILITY FOR A PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER OR AN ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATE BASED ON A PRIOR HOSPITALIZATION.**

To expand the mental health look-back period for permits to carry a pistol or revolver and eligibility certificates for a pistol or revolver to twenty-four months and eliminate the requirement that a probate court order a hospitalization in order for the hospitalization to disqualify a person for a permit or certificate.

**This bill will cause permit holders to surrender currently valid permits and disqualify them from attaining permits. The deletion of the "Probate Court Order" leaves the suitability issue open to much interpretation. Many individuals seek assistance that are no threat and could be easily lumped in with violent individuals by way of willful expansion by regulatory interpretation. We need to be careful not to restrict or otherwise punish someone by way of poorly constructed language.**

**A fair and simple solution would be to define reasonable and specific storage options for gun owners and not deprive them of their rights to responsible firearm ownership. OPPOSE THIS PROPOSAL .**

**Committee Bill 506 (SB-506)**

**AN ACT REQUIRING CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR ALL PRIVATE FIREARM SALES.**

That section 29-37a of the General Statutes be amended to require any individual who sells a firearm in a private sale to another individual, excluding an immediate family member, to take the necessary steps to cause a background check on such purchaser to be performed through the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

**This modification could prove to be more of a protection for the seller and purchaser than a hindrance. It protects both from completing a transaction with someone ineligible from possessing a firearm. The exclusion of immediate family should be retained in its entirety. Provided there is no permanent registration requirements associated with this modification to the statute it should be SUPPORTED.**

**Raised Bill 897 (SB-897)**

**AN ACT CONCERNING REGULATION OF FIREARMS.**

(d) A person holding an eligibility certificate issued by the commissioner shall notify the commissioner [within] not later than two business days [of] after any change of [his] such person's address. The notification shall include [his] both the old address and [his] the new address of such person.

The majority of the language changes within this bill are clarifications or updates and have no real significant impact. Unless the changes are significant and have a real and recognizable impact the language should remain unchanged to avoid unnecessary financial expense. However, language in Section 29-37g should be reviewed and modified from "to business days" to at least "five" business days. As the person holding the eligibility certificate has been investigated and found suitable there is no inherent urgency with such notification. **SUPPORT MODIFICATION TO FIVE BUSINESS DAYS.**

**Raised Bill 6595 (HB-6595)**

**AN ACT PROHIBITING THE DISCHARGE OF FIREARMS NEAR PRIVATE RESIDENCES.**

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 1. Section 53-203 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective October 1, 2013):

Any person who (1) intentionally, negligently or carelessly discharges any firearm in such a manner as to be likely to cause bodily injury or death to persons or domestic animals, or the wanton destruction of property, or (2) intentionally discharges any firearm within five hundred feet of any building that is used for residential purposes and not owned by such person, without the owner's consent, shall be guilty of a class C misdemeanor.

**This bill punishes a lawful gun owner for "intentionally" discharging a firearm causing injury or death to a home invader, rapist or other criminal bent on perpetrating deadly force upon them or their family. The 500 foot restriction makes it unlawful to defend oneself in an apartment, condominium, private residence or yard within the set restriction unless the adjacent neighbor(s) give permission. This is absolutely absurd, and removes the ability to defend one's life or family from bodily harm. I'm not sure I have seen a bill so irresponsibly and badly written. This bill defies common sense and should be **OPPOSED BY THE ENTIRE LEGISLATURE!****

**Raised Bill 1076 (SB-1076)**

**AN ACT CONCERNING THE REDUCTION OF GUN VIOLENCE.**

To enact various initiatives to reduce gun violence in this state including expanding the definition of assault weapon, requiring a rifle permit for the purchase of a long gun, requiring registration of firearms, establishing a gun offender registry, regulating the sale of ammunition and eliminating the bulk purchase of firearms.

**Assault Weapons: The mischaracterizations of so called "assault weapons" are so numerous it is difficult to address in a simplified manner. They are "NOT" military style assault weapons. They are "Not" capable of fully automatic fire (machine gun) or select fire (capable of full or semi-automatic fire). The cosmetic characteristics have no application to an increased performance or lethality level. These cosmetic characteristics are designed "specifically" for individual shooter comfort and add no enhanced mechanical advantage. The visual effect may resemble a military firearm, but in no way does it rival one. Even a cursory review of these features would reveal the nonsense surrounding these "semi-automatic" firearms. These firearms are also not "state of the art" as they have been available to civilians for over 50 years (AR-15 since 1963) and have been in "common" use since then.**

**Relating to "Gun Violence": The exception being Newtown (still pending full disclosure), these firearms are, in fact, almost never used in crimes. From 2007 through 2011 FBI Unified Crime**

Report Records (latest publications) reflect of 385 Connecticut Homicides, only "Two" (0.5%) were committed with "some type" of rifle and eight (2%) were committed with "some type" of shotgun. However, 96 stabbings (25%), 76 bludgeoning's (19.75%) and 30 beatings (7.8%) contributed to 52.55% of the homicides, indicating that knives, clubs, hand & feet are more dangerous than rifles or shotguns. The accusation that semi-automatic "assault type" weapons are responsible for a notable percentage "gun violence" is simple inaccurate and specifically meant to mislead the public and the legislature.

The expired Federal Assault Weapons Ban was deemed ineffective by both the DOJ and the ATF and was reported by both as having no evidence in significantly reducing crime. These firearms are very popular across the country in in our state for sanctioned competitions (professional and armature), recreational sporting use, hunting and have been deemed by Homeland Security as an ideal firearm for personal protection (their report).

These proposal are misguided and a direct attack on a firearm type that has "least" contributed to crime. It is a complete mischaracterization of the use of these firearms. This expansion may also be in violation of the Heller vs. D.C. SCOTUS ruling concerning "common" firearms as these rifles & shotguns have been in "common" use for decades. This expansion of banned firearms should be OPPOSED as it is completely without merit.

Firearm Registration will have "zero" effect on crime and is an affront to lawful gun owners. It is in fact "Discriminatory" in that it segregates, profiles and places into a data base a specific group of citizens based on their personal and lawful choice and who shall be treated differently than others. We cannot do this to any group based on religion, ethnicity or race, sexual orientation, political or any other legal affiliation. The Firearms Owners Protection Act specifically forbade the U.S. Government agency from keeping a registry directly linking non-National Firearms Act (machine guns) firearms to their owners. This bill would violate Federal Law and lend itself to legal challenges. DO NOT SUPPORT ANY FORM OF REGISTRATION.

Rifle Permit: This expansion requiring a permit for a rifle is completely unwarranted and will have no effect on crime. It places another financial burden on a lawful citizen and demands a "permit" to exercise a "Right" guaranteed by the Second Amendment. Will we soon need a permit for the First Amendment too? This proposal and any like it should be OPPOSED.

One Gun per Month: This is another provision that only affects lawful gun owners. As all purchases require a background check the quantity is irrelevant. ATF recognizes this on the 4473 Form required for firearm purchases. ATF is currently informed of Multiple Handgun Sales and any duplicity is un-needed. It precludes lawful collector's firearm enthusiasts from purchasing sets or groups of firearms in current legal fashion. There is no credible evidence that this restriction would affect criminal activity in any way. Criminals don't go through background checks. This is another "feeble" effort to convince the public and legislators that only criminals purchase multiple guns and lawful citizens do not. OPPOSE THIS MEASURE

Ammunition Purchases: Documentation of ammunition purchases was discontinued by the ATF, determining it to be useless as an effective tool in criminal investigations. It will have no effect on criminal activity, criminals will not use permits. One again, requiring lawful citizens to have a permit to access their constitutional right is unacceptable. This action should also be OPPOSED.

Raised Bill 1071 (SB-1071)

**AN ACT CONCERNING ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE CRIMINAL INJURIES  
COMPENSATION FUND**

To create an additional source of funding for the Criminal Injuries Compensation Fund by collecting a tax from firearm manufacturers and firearm importers for the sale of each firearm manufactured in or imported into the state.

**The essence of this bill is "Punitive" and is contrived to punish Firearm Manufacturers and Importers for criminal activity using a firearm. This bill is completely discriminatory toward a manufacturing base in an effort to eliminate the manufacturing of firearms and importation in our State. This proposal is an outlet for biased legislation that shows no regard for the negative financial impact it will reap.**

**Connecticut's economy has sustained significant losses stemming from the decline of businesses operating here. Stag Arms is a prime example of a relatively new company that developed into a successful operation. Its roots came from a business that supports aerospace manufacturing.**

**Other firearms manufacturers supply our military, law enforcement and citizens. Some of these names are familiar to us today, such as Colt, Mossberg and Ruger, but some also have left. Great American companies such as Winchester and Remington are no longer here, victims of prohibitive costs in doing business in Connecticut. Their departures have caused significant job losses and hardships in the surrounding communities. This bill will further reduce jobs, income and tax revenue to the state and resulting in deepening the financial decline in our state. Supporting this malicious legislation would be financially "irresponsible" and should "SHOULD NOT BE SUPPORTED."**

Committee Bill 710 (SB-710)

**AN ACT CONCERNING PERMITS FOR GUN SHOWS.**

Section 1. Section 29-37g of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective October 1, 2013*):

(a) For the purposes of this section, (1) "gun show" means any event (A) at which fifty or more firearms are offered or exhibited for sale, transfer or exchange to the public and (B) at which two or more persons are exhibiting one or more firearms for sale, transfer or exchange to the public; [and] (2) "gun show promoter" means any person who organizes, plans, promotes or operates a gun show; and (3) "local authority" means the chief of police or, where there is no chief of police, the warden of the borough or the first selectman of the town.

(b) Not later than [thirty] sixty days before commencement of a gun show, the gun show promoter shall [notify the chief of police or, where there is no chief of police, the warden of the borough or the first selectman of the town in which the gun show is to take place of the] apply to the local authority of the city, town or borough in which the gun show is to take place for a gun show permit. Such application shall be in the form and manner prescribed by the local authority and shall include the proposed date, time, duration and location of the gun show and any information the local authority deems necessary to determine the applicant's suitability to be a gun show promoter. The local authority may issue a gun show permit to any applicant he or she determines is suitable to be a gun show promoter. If the local authority determines that the applicant is not suitable to be a gun show promoter, he or she shall notify the applicant of such decision in writing not later than thirty days after receiving the application. No person shall operate a gun show without first obtaining a gun show permit from the local authority of the city, town or borough in which the gun show is to take place. Any gun show permit issued pursuant to this subsection shall be valid only for the gun show for which it is issued.

There are many concerns with this proposal. Although the definition of "gun show promoter" is defined herein, further new language allows for local interpretation by the local authority, allowing for inconsistency throughout the State. Allowing the local authority to require "any information" gives open license to demands by local authorities that could make it impossible to qualify as "suitable". A standard application form should be developed for all towns and cities, etc. in an effort to provide reasonable and fair requirements. The current language is unsuitable and should be **OPPOSED**.

#### Committee Bill 6152 (HB-6152)

#### **AN ACT REQUIRING FINGERPRINTING AND CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS PRIOR TO THE SALE, DELIVERY OR TRANSFER OF ALL LONG GUNS**

To require the completion of fingerprinting and a criminal background check prior to the sale, delivery or transfer of any long gun.

Section 1. Section 29-37a of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective October 1, 2013):

(a) No person, firm or corporation may sell, deliver or otherwise transfer any firearm, as defined in section 53a-3, other than a pistol or revolver, to any person unless such person makes application on a form prescribed and furnished by the Commissioner of Emergency Services and Public Protection that includes a section requiring the applicant to provide his or her fingerprints. Such application shall be filed and retained by the transferor for at least twenty years or, if the transferor is a federally-licensed firearms dealer, attached by the transferor to the federal sale or transfer document and filed and retained by the transferor for at least twenty years or until such transferor goes out of business. Such application shall be available for inspection during normal business hours by law enforcement officials.

**This bill would require that all licensed dealers and individuals transferring a firearm now become trained in fingerprinting and retain such files for twenty years. No individuals or retailers should have access to a citizen's fingerprint for any reason. If the citizen purchasing a firearm passes a background check there should be absolutely no further action required. This is one of the more "invasive" bills proposed and it should be "OPPOSE THIS PROPOSAL".**

**Committee Bill 505 (SB-505)**

**AN ACT CONCERNING THE MINIMUM AGE TO PURCHASE A RIFLE OR OTHER LONG GUN.**

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 1. Subsection (a) of section 29-37a of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective October 1, 2013*):

(a) No person, firm or corporation may deliver, at retail, any firearm, as defined in section 53a-3, other than a pistol or revolver, to any person unless such person is twenty-one years of age or older and makes application on a form prescribed and furnished by the Commissioner of Emergency Services and Public Protection, which shall be attached by the vendor to the federal sale or transfer document and filed and retained by the vendor for at least twenty years or until such vendor goes out of business. Such application shall be available for inspection during normal business hours by law enforcement officials. No sale or delivery of any firearm shall be made until the expiration of two weeks from the date of the application, and until the person, firm or corporation making such sale, delivery or transfer has insured that such application has been completed properly and has obtained an authorization number from the Commissioner of Emergency Services and Public Protection for such sale, delivery or transfer. The Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection shall make every effort, including performing the national instant criminal background check, to determine if the applicant is eligible to receive such firearm. If it is determined that the applicant is ineligible to receive such firearm, the Commissioner of Emergency Services and Public Protection shall immediately notify the person, firm or corporation to whom such application was made and no such firearm shall be sold or delivered to such applicant by such person, firm or corporation. When any firearm is delivered in connection with the sale or purchase, such firearm shall be enclosed in a package, the paper or wrapping of which shall be securely fastened, and no such firearm when delivered on any sale or purchase shall be loaded or contain any gunpowder or other explosive or any bullet, ball or shell.

**There has been literally no evidence that the “legally authorized” purchase of long guns by 18 year old citizens has made any contribution criminal activity or created legitimate threat to public safety. Dealers in Connecticut contact the Public Safety Weapons Division for a 14 day wait, after which they are issued an authorization number confirming eligibility, or upon use of a hunting license under sub-section c (exemptions) a NICS background check is run and an authorization number issued if warranted. As these individuals have had background checks completed and been authorized under the law(s) to purchase a firearm, any further restrictions would be needless and unjustified. Without any further reliable evidence that this modification would have an obvious effect on criminal activity or enhance public safety, this bill should NOT BE SUPPORTED.**