

Thursday, March 14, 2013

Public Safety and Security Committee

Raised Bill No. 1076: An Act Concerning the Reduction of Gun Violence.

A **privilege** is a special permission, immunity or benefit granted by another authority on a conditional basis. It can be revoked or modified by that same authority in certain circumstances. By contrast, a **right** is an inherent, irrevocable entitlement held by all citizens or all human beings from the moment of birth. A drivers license is a **privilege** granted by CT Statute. As my Senator, you have the **privilege** of serving as a lawmaker granted by my vote. Gun ownership is a '**Constitutional Right**, entitled by the mere fact that I am a US citizen and a Connecticut resident.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT:

ARTICLE FIRST. DECLARATION OF RIGHTS:

SEC. 15. *Every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the state.*

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION: SECOND AMENDMENT: *A well regulated Militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.* (and as ruled by the Supreme Court in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, confirmed that the rights of the Second Amendment adhere to individuals ... and extend beyond the context of militia service to include self-defense.)

I am opposed to Raised Bill No. 1076: An Act Concerning the Reduction of Gun Violence.

The provisions of the proposed bill are overreaching, unreasonable infringements on my rights of gun ownership and will not contribute to a reduction in gun violence.

Each of the provisions of the bill are restrictions on 'legal ownership', which constitute a minor portion of gun violence. Further restrictions and regulations will not curb gun violence because those that operate illegally as a way of life will ignore them anyway. We have an "assault weapons" definition that is sufficient. Restrictions and bans as stipulated in the supreme Court case of *District of Columbia v. Heller*, center around among others: "prohibitions in the carrying of dangerous and unusual weapons". The definitions of the restrictions of the legal definition of "assault weapon", must therefore follow this and create definition of function [which contribute to dangerous weapons] and not appearance, [which by definition cannot contribute to dangerous weapons]. This revision to the Connecticut Statutes is not necessary. Our current law is sufficient. Another section, restricting the "sale" or "receipt" of more than one firearm in a thirty day period is unreasonable restrictive. How do I purchase "matched pairs"? How do I do I transfer or acquire "firearm collections" or "transfers through probate"? The provision for a mandate for a "State Rifle Permit" for the sale, delivery or transfer of any firearm; the requirement for registration of individual guns; and the requirement restricting ammunition purchases to 'individual gun/caliber certificate' holders, are so restrictive it will certainly curtail much of the recreational activity, hunting opportunities and related commerce within the state. No 'criminal' will submit to these restrictions, so no reduction in gun violence can be expected. Residents and non-residences alike will not put up these challenges, and seek other avenues to pursue their recreational desires in both commercial purchases and in venues offering such activities. Huge revenues to retailers and subsequent taxes will be lost to the state.

Many of the committee members, including my own legislator, Senator Osten, told me they could not commit to declaring support or opposition on a bill or concept, "until it was written". I challenge you to decide that with the written provisions of Raised Bill No. 1076; which goes beyond all reason to a moderate thinking politician, one who has taken an oath to uphold our Constitutional Rights, will not be SUPPORTED.

I urge you to recognize these observations and REJECT the proposed Raised Bill No. 1076

Thank you.

Bruce Tolhurst
16 Virginia Rail Dr.
Marlborough, CT 06447
860-295-0327