

Testimony of Brian Corbino in support of CB 5227, RB 940 and in opposition to CB 60, RB 7219, and RB 7223.

Honorable Representatives and Senators of the Judiciary Committee –

I am writing in reference to the following bills before this committee:

Support Committee Bill No. 5227 – AN ACT CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF FIREARMS BY MUNICIPALITIES.

Those who wrote the Constitution of the State of Connecticut saw fit to include in Article I, Section 15 (as amended in 1968) the following language: “Every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the state.” This carries with it an implied state supremacy concerning firearms. Bill 5227 would make this preemption explicit in the Connecticut General Statutes, and grant the state the authority to dispose of any municipal regulations or statutes to the contrary. Please vote to send this bill to the full General Assembly for consideration.

Support Raised Bill No. 940 – AN ACT AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PERSONS TO CARRY HANDGUNS IN STATE PARKS AND STATE FORESTS.

The need for effective self-defense does not disappear at the border of a State Park. All persons that have been shown competent by way of a Connecticut Permit to Carry Pistols and Revolvers should be allowed to carry their defensive firearms without interference regardless of where they are. Please vote to allow this bill to proceed to the full General Assembly for consideration.

Oppose Committee Bill No. 60 – AN ACT CONCERNING THE PRESENTATION OF A CARRY PERMIT.

The removal of the requirement for “reasonable suspicion of a crime” from section 29-35(b) is in opposition to precedent set in *Terry v. Ohio*, and will not survive judicial challenge. Furthermore, there is reason to believe that enforcement of this provision will unduly impact protected classes of citizens under the federal Civil Rights code, opening the state to additional legal liability. Please vote to let this bill die in committee.

Oppose Raised Bill No. 7219 – AN ACT CONCERNING GHOST GUNS.

Once again, paranoia over the use of home-built guns (none of which have ever been used in a mass shooting, and the number used in actual crimes involving the display or discharge of a firearm is unknown, but presumed to be near zero) has led to the crafting of language that redefines firearms in ways that are nonsensical. Additionally, new language meant to avoid the pitfalls of last year’s fatally-flawed bill have introduced a new type of uncertainty. Prior to the passage of the Gun Control Act of 1968, most firearms produced for civilian purchase were not serialized. A strict reading of the proposed language in this bill would require anyone in possession of such arms to apply for and receive a serial number from DESPP should they ever need to disassemble and reassemble the firearm, for cleaning, maintenance or repairs. Furthermore, this bill would require them to permanently alter the firearm in question by marking it with the assigned serial number. Since many of these guns are historical artifacts and collectible, this permanent alteration would destroy most of the value of the firearm – which could potentially be considered an unconstitutional taking under the Constitution of the United States. Additionally, the bill is unclear on whether and how a person might purchase such a firearm in the future, whether from a dealer, or directly under a Federal Curio and Relics Firearms License.

Attempting to legislate away a problem that does not exist is foolish. Please vote to let this bill die in committee.

Oppose Raised Bill No. 7223 – AN ACT CONCERNING THE STORAGE OF A PISTOL OR REVOLVER IN A MOTOR VEHICLE.

While I understand the desire of the legislature to ensure firearms do not easily fall into the wrong hands, this poorly crafted legislation is at once redundant and vague. Redundant, because a firearm placed in the glove compartment of a locked vehicle is considered sufficiently secure, and vague because the law does not define clearly what constitutes a “securely locked safe.”

You may or may not be aware of the critical security vulnerabilities present in most commercially-available lock-boxes used to secure valuables in automobiles. The vast majority of them are intended to be secured to the vehicle by a thin steel cable that is trivial to cut. The key locks used are easily defeated by picking attacks that require little to no skill, and even the ones that require a combination or a fingerprint to open have an override key that is subject to quick compromise.

I would go as far as to argue that a locked glove box is in fact more secure than the typical “safe” offered at most stores. Please vote to let this bill die in committee.