

March 8, 2015

Linda Czaplinski
30 Freeman Road
Oxford, CT 06478

To the Judiciary Committee
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT

RE: Proposed Bill HB6962 An Act Concerning Firearm Safety

Position: OPPOSED

Dear Committee Members,

Please allow this document to serve as testimony in opposition to the referenced bill.

This bill is a clear example of unconstitutional, government overreach. This bill runs so far afoul of common sense and personal accountability it could not have been proposed in 2014, an election year. It was too much of a risk to political capital.

My home is my castle and no one has any right to *dictate* how I manage my personal property. In fact, the Supreme Court reinforced this in DC vs Heller <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2008/rpt/2008-R-0578.htm>

“By a five to four margin, the Court held that the Second Amendment protects an individual right to possess firearms for lawful use, such as self-defense, in the home (emphasis ours). Accordingly, it struck down as unconstitutional provisions of a D.C. law that (1) effectively banned possession of handguns by non law enforcement officials and (2) required lawfully owned firearms to be kept unloaded, disassembled, or locked when not located at a business place or being used for lawful recreational activities.

According to the Court, the ban on handgun possession in the home amounted to a prohibition on an entire class of 'arms' that Americans overwhelmingly choose for the lawful purpose of self-defense. Similarly, the requirement that any firearm in a home be disassembled or locked made “it impossible for citizens to use arms for the core lawful purpose of self-defense.” These laws were unconstitutional “under any of the standards of scrutiny the Court has applied to enumerated constitutional rights.”

The modern-day crusade for cradle-to-grave protection is nothing more than an attempt at cradle-to-grave control whose trend is to all but eliminate personal responsibility and accountability with a boot on the neck of the lawful.

Laws such as these are proposed with extreme prejudice against a class of citizens for the simple exercise of a constitutionally guaranteed right. If that were not the case then by the logic of this bill if my neighbor borrowed my cast iron frying pan and then used it to crush his/her spouse's skull I would somehow be held responsible. This is yet another attempt by one group to deny another group its rights.

Just what is it about guns and gun owners that make some view us as evil incarnate? We come from all walks of life. We are your colleagues, neighbors, teachers, coaches and clergy. We are responsible. We have been vetted. We are everywhere.

If the goal of our government were truly to reduce criminal use of guns it would focus its attention on our cities where sadly, young lives are senselessly snuffed out on an almost daily basis. Where is the outrage? Where is the mantra to 'do something'? I suppose it is less challenging to demonize the lawful since gang members would most likely shoot back.

As we observe daily the dangers of, ISIS, Lone Wolf Terror attacks and Connecticut's own early release program you want to hamper the means to protect myself? I think not.

I counsel you to be mindful of your oath of office to protect and defend the constitutions of both our state and our great nation. This bill must be pronounced DOA.

Linda F. Czaplinski