

11-Mar-2019

To: Honorable Members of the Judiciary Committee

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

My name is Tom Maloney, of North Stonington. 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 am opposed 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.

Regarding the three bills I listed my support for; I would ask you to consider how many times you have heard those who would oppose these bills decry 2nd Amendment supporters "unwillingness to compromise". Compromise means give and take. Can you give me one example where gun owners have seen any beneficial bills enacted? We have only had our rights taken, with no compromise from the supporters of gun control. These bills being considered today represent an opportunity to recognize that one of the most law-abiding segments of our society deserve something out of the legislative process as well.

None of these bills take away anything from someone else or have any conceivable negative impact on public safety. For instance, S.B. 940, regarding being able to carry in a State Park or Forest – I am perfectly legal carrying a sidearm on the roads leading to a Park or Forest, and yet then because of arbitrary and bureaucratic reasoning, I cross a line that suddenly makes the same activity illegal. No logical person can claim that we trust someone on one side of a property boundary, but not on the other. Even more absurd, as a licensed hunter, I can drive to a State Forest, park outside, secure my defensive handgun in my vehicle, remove a rimfire handgun and proceed to hunt with that handgun.

I urge you to consider these three proposed bills favorably.

Regarding opposition to **S.B. 60** - This bill has become a perennial favorite of the anti-gun groups and every year we're forced to remind this Committee that 4th amendment rights apply to all. The marginalization of any group by diminishing their rights hurts all Americans. If ever there was an example of the "slippery slope" principle, this bill exemplifies it. There is simply no justification for stopping someone who is obeying the law and demanding that they show papers to prove they're obeying the law. As a society we wouldn't stand for this in any other context. Due process is the cornerstone of American justice, and no segment of society deserves less. For those Legislators that support this bill, I ask you; are you willing to abandon the rights codified by Terry v. Ohio? Today it may be legal gun-owners, tomorrow it will be someone who just doesn't "look right".

I urge you to oppose S.B No. 60.

Tom Maloney

North Stonington, CT

