Regarding the following bills, I would like to provide the a quick testimony.

S.B. No 60: I oppose this bill due to the basis that this bill assumes anyone carrying a gun in the state of CT is doing so illegally and unlawfully. A holstered weapon is the proper and safe way to carry a firearm and is not typically done so by criminals or people with evil intent.

H.B. No 7218: I oppose this bill due to the overwhelming evidence of minors as young as 15 years of age being home alone and having to defend themselves with a parent's firearm. This bill will leave teenagers who are likely proficient and safe with firearms completely defenseless if they ever need to defend themselves from a home invasion when their parents are not around to allow access to a firearm.

H.B. No 7219: I oppose this bill because it seeks to solve a problem that does not exist. Like the vilified AR platform, home-made firearms are nothing more than a hobby for gun enthusiasts seeking to build a firearm specific to their needs. The AR platforms popularity is not due to its ease of use in mass-shootings but because it allows people to customize firearms not available in retail form to their specific needs or hobbies. This bill seeks to criminalize legal and harmless behavior in fear of a problem that does not exist.

H.B. No 7223: I oppose this bill because it is vague on the specifics of safe storage. In other bills proposed around the country, safe storage is defined and storing a firearm unloaded and disassembled. This makes a firearm incapable of being used for self-defense. In addition, court precedent has established that a motor vehicle regardless of where it is parked is still considered the owners private property. Therefore the standard set by the US Supreme Court regarding safe storage of a firearm while being usable for self-defense has already been settled. Any further restriction would risk court challenge and goes against the 2nd Amendments core purpose of protecting self-defense.

S.B. No 940: I support this bill because in order for people to safely enjoy our state public lands people should not leave themselves exposed to the dangers posed by predators on those lands. A handgun has the primary purpose as a self defense tool and at the bare minimum should be legal to carry on state land since personal protection is specifically denoted in the CT state constitution. Any fear of this allowing people to poach wildlife ignores the fact that someone intending to poach wildlife would likely do so with an instrument designed specifically for hunting, and not self-defense. Not to mention hunting wildlife out of season is already illegal.

H.B. No 5227: I support this bill because regulation of firearms on a town by town or by municipality creates unnecessary confusion for licensed carriers and leaves them prone to unknowingly breaking rules that are not well communicated or publicized. The types or restrictions that have been proposed by municipalities also again assumes the individuals carrying a holstered weapon are a threat despite no evidence that this is the case.

H.B. No 5870: I support this bill but more importantly I strongly oppose the current regulations restricting magazine size and the assault weapon classifications passed in the state of CT in 2013. Studies that have come out since 2013 and crime statistics have shown that states and cities who passed such restrictions not only did not see any reduction in crime, but the crime increased. The restrictions on their face are not logical and the
effect of them has been grossly overstated by their supporters. I would refer the magazine restrictions and assault weapons ban be struck down by the CT legislature. But I will gladly support this bill as a good first step.

I hope you strongly consider my perspective on these bills and hope you can oppose and support the bills I have designated above.

Thank you

Peter Maisano