

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

My name is Richard Souza. I am from East Hartford. I am testifying today, March 11, 2019, in **opposition** to:

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

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. 7223 AN ACT CONCERNING THE STORAGE OF A PISTOL OR REVOLVER IN A MOTOR VEHICLE.

**I support:**

S.B. No. 940 AN ACT AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PERSONS TO CARRY HANDGUNS IN STATE PARKS AND STATE FORESTS.

H.B. No. 5227 AN ACT CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF FIREARMS BY MUNICIPALITIES.

H.B. No. 5870 AN ACT CONCERNING TRANSFER OF ASSAULT WEAPONS AND LARGE CAPACITY MAGAZINES.

**OPPOSE: H.B. No. 7219 AN ACT CONCERNING GHOST GUNS**

We use to know what firearms were, but now they can be anything. With the latest Orwellian Newspeak in Connecticut, a billet of metal sitting on a shelf in my workshop, a solid block of steel or aluminum, which meets this bill's definition of a frame or lower receiver, is magically transformed into a firearm. It could have been made into a doorknocker or a toy truck, but this bill will now define those chunks of metal as frames or lower receivers of firearms, which meets the federal definition of a firearm that Connecticut has adopted as the state definition of a firearm.

As if that wasn't bad enough, we would be required to engrave a state issued serial number to the blocks of metal **before** completing the milling process. The Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection will issue these numbers and **keep a database** of those who request them. I'm assuming the government would supply us with that service free of charge, since there's no mention of a fee for that in this bill.

Hopefully, we would put the mark in a place where it wouldn't be cut off during milling, because then, according to this bill, that would be prima facie evidence of removing a serial number from a firearm, punishable by a Class C felony (prison time). And that's going to be nearly impossible to do, when you consider that somewhere between seventy to eighty percent of the metal is removed during machining a frame or lower receiver.

This assumes, of course, that the amateur gunsmith doing the milling is so highly skilled that he never makes a mistake; every billet that he begins working on eventually becomes the basis for a firearm. In reality, however, machine shops have 55-gallon steel drums. After working steadily for hours, a mistake can occur; maybe it was the machinist fault, maybe the machine malfunctioned, but now that chunk of metal is destined for the scrap metal heap in that drum. Unfortunately, the state government now considers that to be a firearm, especially since it now has a serial number, and a felony has just been committed.

Then, this bill wants to make us adhere to the same "requirements imposed on licensed importers or licensed manufacturers of firearms pursuant to the 1968 Gun Control Act Title 18 (United States Code) USC 923(i), as amended from time to time, and any regulation adopted thereunder." But we're not licensed importers or licensed manufacturers of firearms. From the BATFE website's frequently asked questions file (FAQ), "Firearms may be lawfully made by persons who do not hold a manufacturer's license under the Gun Control Act provided they are not for sale or distribution and the maker is not prohibited from receiving or possessing firearms." Furthermore, "markings are not required on firearms manufactured for personal use." Serial numbers are not required.

Do you really want home machinists making hobby firearms like .22 caliber squirrel rifles to be held accountable to the same requirements and regulations of **commercial** manufacturers making Dillon Aero Gatlin guns, also known as the M134 Minigun, that can fire 3,000 rounds of 7.62 NATO a minute? Seriously?

If machining a firearm from plastic, we must attach, before the firearm is fully machined, three point seven ounces of material type 17-4 PH stainless steel. 316, 304 or 18-8 stainless steel isn't good enough; it must be 17-4 PH stainless steel. Supposedly, this is where the serial number is to be engraved, although there is no mention of that in this bill. This is the same requirement that California put in their "Ghost Gun" bill. What an amazing coincidence that Connecticut would have the same stipulation.

This bill would redefine firearms to include things that are not firearms, and it is also a firearm registry bill. We've all seen how Stalin, Hitler, Mao and now Nicolas Maduro, as well as others, used firearm registration as the first step to eventual firearm confiscation and subjugation of their people. Please stand for freedom and oppose this bill.

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

This bill is a flagrant fourth amendment violation. It is perfectly legal for permitted CT residents to carry handguns concealed *or openly*. Just because a law enforcement officer sees a holstered handgun, that does not constitute the reasonable suspicion of a crime that a LEO needs to detain and search. It is easy to imagine how prejudice and bias could cause this law to be unequally enforced among the population. The intention of this bill is to publicly harass and shame firearm owners.

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

This bill would hold a firearm owner guilty of criminally negligent storage of a firearm, which is punishable by a Class D felony (prison time), if “a minor, or a resident of the premises who is ineligible to possess a firearm under state and federal law or who poses a risk of imminent personal injury to himself or herself or to other individuals, obtains the firearm and causes the injury or death of such minor, resident or any other person.”

How does one determine if a person is in imminent personal injury to himself or herself or to other individuals? Most psychiatrists can't figure this out, but you expect the average firearm owner to have this skill?

In a house full of college roommates, how would one know if a particular housemate didn't have a felony conviction in his past, or if he had been adjudicated to a mental institution at some point in his life and is therefore ineligible to possess a firearm?

This bill holds innocent firearm owners responsible for the actions of others, and it does nothing to protect anyone. If someone gets possession of a gun owner's firearm and causes injury to himself or herself or others, the firearm owner will be blamed. Whatever happened to human volition?

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

If someone left an unloaded handgun in a vehicle and told his twenty-year-old son to keep an eye on it while he went to relieve himself in a nearby restroom, he would be guilty of a Class D felony (prison time). When people go to a gun range to shoot, they typically bring several firearms with them and go back and forth to their vehicles, switching out one firearm for another as the day goes by. Firearms are usually out in the open, but I've never seen this to be a problem. This bill makes those back and forth trips to the gun range impossible. If an innocent gun owner's firearm is stolen from his

vehicle, the firearm owner, the victim of the crime, will be charged with a Class D felony. It's a bill meant to harass firearm owners.

**SUPPORT: S.B. No. 940 AN ACT AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PERSONS TO CARRY HANDGUNS IN STATE PARKS AND STATE FORESTS.**

Criminals already carry firearms everywhere, including our parks and forests. This bill lets permit holders carry handguns for self-defense in state parks and state forests.

**SUPPORT: H.B. No. 5227 AN ACT CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF FIREARMS BY MUNICIPALITIES.**

Firearm owners often find themselves in the position of not knowing if they are complying with local firearm laws within the state. If we let 169 municipalities in Connecticut each come up with their own firearm laws, this is going to become a nightmare for firearm owners, law enforcement and the courts.

**SUPPORT: H.B. No. 5870 AN ACT CONCERNING TRANSFER OF ASSAULT WEAPONS AND LARGE CAPACITY MAGAZINES.**

People who are already registered owners of so-called "assault weapons" and "large capacity magazines" would be able to transfer these items within their group. There's nothing nefarious here. No additional "assault weapons" and "large capacity magazines" are being added to the state's registry list.

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

Sincerely,

Richard Souza  
East Hartford, CT