US v. Miller, 307 US 174, United States Supreme Court, 1939

In the Supreme Court case the United States government (US DOJ) brief before the court stated:

> ...While some courts have said that the right to bear arms includes the right of the individual to have them for the protection of his person and property as well as the right of the people to bear them collectively (People v. Brown, 253 Mich. 537; State v. Duke, 42 Tex. 455), the cases are unanimous in holding that the term "arms" as used in constitutional provisions refers only **to *those weapons which are ordinarily used for military or public defense purposes...***

And the court issued out a final opinion that stated:

> ...In the absence of any evidence tending to show that possession or use of a "shotgun having a barrel of less than eighteen inches in length" at this time has some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia, we cannot say that the Second Amendment guarantees the right to keep and bear such an instrument. Certainly it is not within judicial notice that this weapon is ***any part of the ordinary military equipment, or that its use could contribute to the common defense. Aymette v. State,* 2 Humphreys (Tenn.) 154, 158....**

Heller v. DC, 554 US 570, United States Supreme Court, 2008

The court issued its opinion and noted in detailing more regarding common defense arms:

"...Miller, 307 US 174, does not limit the right of people to keep and bear arms ... those in common use...the people have a right to keep and bear arms for the ***common defense***...bearing arms...***of the kind in common use at the time...***"

It appears as if our legislators have an issue with our 2nd amendment and are trying to end-run the law.

So what are the goals of the legislature and its members? This can be answered from examination of individual legislator's statements that this author has obtained through FOIA requests over the past several weeks. Lets examine a few..

"..guns are appropriate to hunting and target shooting but not to the community.." Sen. Meyer, who clearly believes that the 2nd amendment applies only to hunters and target shooters; it's an affront to this state's citizenry.

"...handguns and rifles that are more than .22 caliber, can hold more than 7 rounds, or can be semi-automatically fired banned. Guns already in circulation that fall into these categories must be placed in target range lock-down cases. Possession of such weapons outside of target ranges banned as of Oct 1, 2013..." Rep. Fleischmann who wishes to ban almost all guns and remove them from citizens' possession. Clearly Rep. Fleischmann wishes to live in China ... it's east, have a good journey comrade.

"..First amendment. ...yelled Fire! .. Subject to arrest" Sen. Bye But one can yell "fire" w/o being arrested if there is a fire; and speaking of fires, I don't not have a fire in my kitchen right now so does this mean I do not need an extinguisher? That's the mentality of our legislature now, trying to dictate what arms and equipment we need without considering why we need them or even being able to state when an arm could be needed and under what circumstances it would be. Preposterous. Also, in oral arguments in the Heller and McDonald cases before SCOTUS, the court noted that the 1st amendment rights have also caused deaths, so this "guns kill people" argument is a moot point when speaking about our natural rights and rights acknowledged by our courts; and its wrong altogether.

"...guns in lawful compliance paying liability premiums would invariably protect their second amendment rights...others ..would ... eliminat(ing) possession of firearms..." obtained from Rep. Godfrey (concerning insurance mandates) indicating his enthusiasm with gun grabs which is a similar viewpoint of the gun registration scheme of SB 1076; it's a gun grab when one considers that it's a yearly requirement to be re-applied for months before the registration lapses. This is the purpose behind the registration processes noted in that SB 1076, there is no doubt. Rep. Godfrey's records indicate that he clearly thinks that the second amendment does not even exist.

This author could fill many pages with the deranged thoughts of Connecticut legislators but I was also specifically interested in the Public Protection and Security Committee members' thoughts that they put to paper. However, this author must report that all but one legislator on the committee has failed to comply with the state's Freedom of Information Act and decided to ignore the law that they helped pass and there are now currently cases pending before the Freedom of Information Commission due to the lack of compliance with our FOI Act. I can only assume that the committee members don't want the public to know their actual motives behind the legislation being considered today and in this legislative session.

This bill is nothing more than an attempt to increase the burden on FFLs. Now they have to be fingerprint experts. Additionally, the requirement for a fingerprint serves no lawful purpose other than to fingerprint every gun owner over time. A waiting period of a MINIMUM of two weeks and NO MAXIMUM is also included in this bill for firearms; this serves no legitimate purpose other than to harass both the seller any purchaser of a firearm. And why is this waived for active military members? Doesn't the US Government provide them with firearms that they need for the performance of their duties?

And the bill's requirements would be applicable to private sales as well and this is outrageous. DESPP does nothing but lie to people today about pistol permit processes and does not even have any procedures in respect to this aspect of their involvement with carry laws. Why should one have to ask permission from the government to acquire firearms that they need to protect themselves FROM the same party? It's a retarded notion. It is very clear that this bill's provisions are in direct conflict with our 2nd amendment.