

Brian Dunn

Suffield, CT

Written Testimony

This serves as spoken/written testimony of Brian Dunn of Suffield, CT:

Senator Winfield, Representative Stafstrom, and distinguished members of the Joint Committee on the Judiciary:

My name is Brian Dunn, I am from Suffield. I am testifying today in support of;

S.B. 940 AN ACT AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PERSONS TO CARRY HANDGUNS IN STATE PARKS AND STATE FORESTS.

H.B. 5227 AN ACT CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF FIREARMS BY MUNICIPALITIES.

H.B. 5870 AN ACT CONCERNING TRANSFER OF ASSAULT WEAPONS AND LARGE CAPACITY MAGAZINES.

I'm oppose to;

S.B. No. 60 AN ACT CONCERNING THE PRESENTATION OF A CARRY PERMIT.

H.B. No. 7218 AN ACT CONCERNING THE SAFE STORAGE OF FIREARMS IN THE HOME.

H.B. No. 7219 AN ACT CONCERNING GHOST GUNS.

H.B. No. 7223 AN ACT CONCERNING THE STORAGE OF A PISTOL OR REVOLVER IN A MOTOR VEHICLE.

I will not be talking about the bills I am not in favor of for the sake of time. The three main bill I would not like to see pass are SB60, HB 7218, and HB7219:

SB 60

This would make every motor vehicle stop into a reason to search a vehicle for a permit holder. This is a breach of the 4th amendment. The odds of finding a person who legally owns a firearm in this state is virtually zero, in order to own a firearm in the state of CT I already have to submit to an in-depth background check as well as undergo fingerprinting. Every time I buy a firearm I undergo a background check. Reasonable suspicion is a lower threshold than probable cause, so you are basically making a pistol permit holder a second-class citizen.

HB 7218

This is unenforceable until an incident happens. This basically makes you liable for something if your property is stolen. If a person steals your car and runs over a bunch of people are you liable for what they did with your car? This is a nanny state law, we don't need the government telling us how to run our households. You are telling me that if there is a woman, in fear for her life because her husband is unstable and violent that she can't have a loaded firearm to defend herself. Restricting a person's

ability to have access to their loaded firearm under this bill would make a person lawfully having a firearm to defend themselves illegal in any similar situation.

HB 7219

This contains an ambiguous statement that defines the frame or lower receiver as anything that can contain the parts that make it a gun or anything that could be intended for that. So does that mean we can no longer buy stock metals? You can buy a brick of aluminum that could be made into a receiver with some machining experience, is that now illegal? Where do we stop with these laws?

This also makes manufacturing a firearm illegal. This is an age old practice of the person who can't quite get what they want on the available market. Why would you be in favor of a hobbyist making their own firearm? How many crimes have happened in CT with a so called "ghost gun"? Well I really can't tell you, because there is no statistic on this, how about instead of banning something we find scary you record statistics on it, I'm sure the state police would be completely willing to record some numbers on this. I would be willing to say it's very low, because criminals can already get illegal firearms for much cheaper on the black market than building their own.

I do approve of the part that defines a stun gun as a different class of weapon as a dangerous weapons, if you remove the two previously mentioned issues I would have little to no problem with this bill.

I urge you to favorably vote; S.B. 940, H.B. 5227, H.B. 5870 out of the Judiciary Committee and oppose; S.B. 60, H.B. 7218, H.B. 7219, H.B. 7223.

Thanks you for your time