

Please accept this as my testimony for the task force public hearing for January 30th.

This is to summarize key points of my testimony offered for each of the three public hearings.

The tragedy forced on our community on December 14th was the work of a psychopathic, deranged individual who may have been subject to the mismanagement of psychiatric medicines. Many existing laws were broken in the commission of that heinous crime, including many existing firearm laws. Unlawfully obtained weapons (perhaps not secured) were used to commit murder, additional weapons stolen, unlawfully transported, brought unlawfully onto school property to then commit multiple murders.

In determining what actions to be taken, one litmus test has to be, what would have prevented the killings at the moment the school's perimeter had been breached.

Magazine capacity is irrelevant to a killer capable of tactical reloads. The choice of weapon could have easily been a less customized version of a hunting rifle with multiple ten round magazines. No difference would have been evidenced in the outcome. The caliber could have been different; no difference in the outcome.

On the other hand, magazine capacity is EVERYTHING in terms of self defense. The typical standard capacity of a 9mm defensive handgun used for personal and home protection is 17. **Restrictions will result in the death of homeowners and others defending themselves** and do NOTHING to stop an assailant from causing great harm in a sterile venue.

The Bushmaster, Armalite Rifle or "15" style sporting rifles are not a military grade M4's or M16's, which are fully automatic or selective fire assault rifles. Stop misusing terminology and get your definitions correct. Modern sporting rifles function in identical fashion to less accessorized consumer grade rifles. It is wrong-headed thinking to ban lawful use of a non-military *consumer* firearm, when doing so changes absolutely nothing in terms of a potential future mass killing.

There should be no ban on these consumer "black plastic" non-military sporting and target rifles.

Punishing lawful citizens who exercise their constitutional rights through the use of taxes and other restrictions on ammunition because of the act of a mentally defective criminal is also wrong-headed, and would also do absolutely nothing to stop a criminal from obtaining the materials to cause havoc. The worst school killing in US history was the Bath school killing in 1927, the weapon was a bomb, not firearms. A regressive tax on ammunition impacts only those who obey the law; it does nothing to stop a criminal.

Over 90 law proposals have been submitted. These need to be consolidated to a single or few bills with complete wording that must be subject to an adequate public hearing with a normal and not emergency bypass of the legislative process. Laws that violate the rulings of "Heller v. DC" and "McDonald v Chicago" must never leave committee.

Issues of proper treatment for the mentally ill must be addressed, but the patient / Doctor relationship must not be one where medical professionals become spies of the State. Basic Constitutional Rights must not be abrogated because of "suspicion" or administrative actions offering no due process or challenge.

To address school security (here's where something would be effective) one needs to follow the best practices shown in the State of Texas, including a certain 2006 report I'm told the State has reviewed. In fact, one could argue that failure for implementation of those best practices from six years ago constitutes gross negligence. I'll leave that for the attorneys to sort out.

Among the best practices; armed personnel in the schools offer the only reliable defense. However, the cost of SRO's in each school is prohibitive. Deputizing volunteer staff in line with a proposed "Texas defense of children act" enables a cost effective and controlled way for staff to exercise their own (presently infringed) rights under the Connecticut Constitution article 1 section 15 which you have all heard many times this week.

To summarize, all are horrified by the consequences of a mass murderer, and all sympathies go out to the families of the victims. I shared that grief attending several memorials and funerals. However, the focus of the solution must result in changes that actually work. The plethora of proposed laws follows a political agenda that is and has made political use of this tragedy.

- Do not pass laws that violate the US and CT Constitutions
- Do not pass laws that would have offered no benefit whatsoever on December 14.
- Do not restrict lawful application of standard capacity magazines for self defense, leave capacity alone
- Do not encumber lawful firearms owners with mandated purchase of additional insurance. Keeping arms is a RIGHT, not a privilege.
- Do not misclassify rifles because of plastic cosmetics, what you call "assault weapons" are simply not military grade. No BAN is needed, true military grade assault rifles are already banned from consumer purchase and ownership.
- Do not place false labels on non-military consumer rifles that are plain semi-automatics with plastic decorations and ergonomic features.
- Do not punish sports enthusiasts with regressive taxes and restrictions of interstate commerce, also in violation of the commerce clause.
- Do not destroy Doctor / Patient confidentiality.

- DO address the link between psychiatric medicines and violence, including genuine studies of prior school killings.
- DO place armed "good guys" in the schools, including a removal of the infringements that now prevent staff from exercise of their rights, Use Texas as a best practice template

- DO hold a public hearing on a final consolidated set of bills. We have a right to comment, you have no moral right to pass anything on an emergency basis.
- DO honor the oaths you have taken when you were sworn in
- DO understand that the rights guaranteed by the second amendment have been fully compatible with the right to liberty and pursuit of happiness for over 200 years. Arguments that one Right supplants the other must be rejected as false arguments and propaganda.

Rights guaranteed by the supreme law of the land are just that. It's the supreme law of the land. It's not a popularity contest, no matter how emotional arguments play. Do what works; disregard what does not accomplish better school safety. Would whatever you want to do have made a difference in December? It's a simple yes or no. Would your proposed laws have made a difference once a killer got inside? Yes or no?

Bill Hillman
Bethel, CT