Haggerty, Katie

From: Ken Ventresca <mrcounty1441@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 16, 2015 5:02 PM
To: JudTestimony
Subject: I Am Strongly Oppose To: Senate Bill 650, House Bill 6848, House Bill 6962, Which Circumvent Our Rights Who Are Legal US Citizens, Connecticut Residents and Who Legally Own Firearms!

I strongly oppose raised bills: Senate Bill 650, House Bill 6848, House Bill 6962, and am personally mortified how legislation that so blatantly defies our system of due process can even get into the legislative pipeline. Our entire system of jurisprudence in America is rooted in due process. The concept runs through a myriad of both Liberal and Conservative issues alike. That being said I submit to you…..

Our Declaration of Independence recognizes that our Rights come from the Creator, NOT from government. All peoples (whether they believe in God or not) have the Right to protect themselves from the evil acts of humans, albeit by an individual, by renegades or by a tyrannical government. An unalienable right of protection/self-defense is a Right that no power on earth can change even if the 2nd Amendment was not codified in the Constitution. The unalienable right clearly spells this out in the wording of the 2nd Amendment by the following words, "shall not be infringed."

To refresh your memory here is the definition of "infringe" from the 1828 Noah Webster's dictionary in the time period in which Jefferson and Madison left us the guideline for the interpretation of the construction of the Constitution,

INFRINGE, v.t. infrinj'. [L. infringo; in and frango,to break. See Break.]

1. To break, as contracts; to violate, either positively by contravention, or negatively by non-fulfillment or neglect of performance.

2. To break; to violate; to transgress; to neglect to fulfill or obey; as, to infringe a law.

And, last but not least "shall not" is a pretty decisive authoritative statement. What is it about this restrictive phrase that it is not understood by you and your colleagues who advocate government infringement?

Thomas Jefferson clearly stated how the U. S. Constitution is to be interpreted:

"On every question of construction [of the Constitution] let us carry ourselves back to the time when the Constitution was adopted, recollect the spirit manifested in the debates, and instead of trying what meaning may be squeezed out of the text, or intended against it, conform to the probable one in which it was passed."

James Madison, who penned the Constitution, also was not silent on the construction of the Rule Book:

"The powers of the federal and state governments are enumerated; they can only operate in certain cases; it has legislative powers on defined and limited objects, beyond which it cannot extend its jurisdiction"

In fact, Madison wrote a lengthy theses on this important issue in Federalist Paper #43.

The purpose of the 2nd Amendment was not written to protect "hunting rights" but to restrain the government from overreaching the limited and delegated authority of the Constitution as was clearly pointed out to us by the following:

"No free man shall ever be debarred the use of arms." Thomas Jefferson

"If the representatives of the people betray their constituents, there is then no recourse left but in the exertion of that original right of self-defense which is paramount to all positive forms of government." Alexander Hamilton

"Permit me to once again ask, what is the militia? As I have already noted: "It is the whole people. To disarm the people (is) the best and most effectual way to enslave them." George Mason, Co-author of the 2nd Amendment.

Nowhere in the U. S. or Connecticut State Constitutions is it written that gives the federal or state government (Senate, House, Executive Branch, federal and/or state agencies) the authority to INFRINGE (break, violate, transgress, obey) upon the peoples' 2nd amendment Right. To be more specific, there is no delegated authority in the Constitution that gives the federal or state governments the power to require registration of firearms, federal or state background checks or prohibiting ownership of any type of firearm. If I had the desire I have the unalienable Right to procure a 105 Howitzer to defend myself against aggression - foreign or domestic, even against an unjust aggression by government as forewarned by Alexander Hamilton. This Right of protection is codified in the Document that was left to posterity when the Founding Fathers created this nation.

While the uneducated always set their sights on the weapon It is up to us patriots to explain it is not the weapon itself that decides to fire its missile but it is the individual.

Oh yes I must emphasize The 2nd Amendment says: "the right of the people to keep and bear arms SHALL NOT be infringed." It does NOT say-"except for" anywhere therefore there is no need for any further discussion or debate necessary on this issue other than to say **I vehemently oppose Senate Bill 650, House Bill 6962, House Bill 6848 and would request and strongly suggest you oppose them as well**. Thank You.

Sincerely Yours In Liberty

--
Ken Ventresca,
MBA,
CPLM, CSBLO

41 Upper Reservoir Road
New Milford, CT 06776

" Time Sets All Things Right. Error Lives But a Day, Truth is Eternal " -- James Longstreet