

## An open letter to the Senators and Representatives of CT

The "Constitution State's" state constitution says: "Every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the *state*." (*Article I, SEC. 15*)

The Hartford Courant front page on Thursday Jan 17th indicated that Connecticut is behind the proposals adding additional restrictions to arms ownership by the President.

I am not in favor of the proposals and neither are most people I know. The author provides no facts backing up his opinion that "Connecticut" supports them.

Our state representatives (Senators and House members) have a duty and take an oath attesting to their responsibility.

You swore: "You do solemnly swear (or affirm) that you *will support the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the State of Connecticut, so long as you continue a citizen thereof; and that you will faithfully discharge, according to law, the duties of the Office of State Senator/Representative to the best of your abilities; so help you God.*"

I believe each of you has taken this oath. As a result I would ask that:

- You protect my status as an individual who owns firearms.
- You critique each proposed law under consideration by asking is it effective? Will it do harm? Would it have had an impact on the tragedies in Connecticut in the last 10 years? Does the restriction of freedom inherent in all laws outweigh the benefits in a time tested environment?

- Are you voting for or against the proposals because they reflect your educated, informed opinion?
- Are the specific protected rights of the individual infringed? Is your position in conflict with the State and Federal Constitution?

I have not read any proposal before you that, if enacted, would have changed the outcome of the recent spate of senseless killings.

I am a law-abiding citizen and responsible gun owner.

I am saddened by the tragic events in Newtown, Connecticut, but I believe that efforts to impose new restrictions on me and other lawful and responsible owners like me are a misguided result and does not reduce the potential of a similar tragedy happening again. It is playing to fear.

Are you aware that violent crime with firearms has declined since the Federal "assault weapons ban" expired in 2004? If you have a question regarding the efficacy of any aspect of a proposal did you seek an informed opinion?

Your focus should be on strengthening mental health care, improved reporting of a person's threat potential and improving the quality of data supporting NICs checks (National Instant Criminal Background Check System). Do NOT pass more gun laws; instead, work to enforce the more than 20,000 gun laws already on the books.

I am your constituent and I vote. Please represent me.

I ask what is the legislature doing other than promoting a platform of more restrictions on legal firearm ownership?

If it is the standard to pass something "that may save even one life" you are fooling the public and yourself and that is shameful. With similar logic can we expect that more restrictions should be put forward raising the driving age to 21, Connecticut recently experienced

a 42% increase in driving fatalities (319 people in 2010 were killed in CT) or licensing owners of backyard swimming pools (600 children drowned in 2009 in the US) or licensing trampolines or imprisoning adults who have carelessly left poisons under the kitchen sink that are ingested by children or prosecute people who have allowed unsecured proscription medications to be stolen from homes by thieves and teenagers. We cannot continue to pile on ineffective law and generally restrict our freedoms when any activity or incident causes harm. Yet this is the natural progression of law and legislation. This is not the legislative philosophy I wish to govern my life or guard my liberty. Note that the state and federal constitutions offer no protection for these subjects and pursuits but we expect that common sense should prevail.

Please use your good sense to not be bullied by those souls who would chose "pseudo" security at the expense of freedoms especially those that are constitutionally protected. Think it through and always walk away when the promoter of a solution requires "immediate" action. They are usually selling emotionally charged bunk. Represent me well.

Respectfully,

David Stahelski

40 Silo Hill

Madison CT 06443