

**I understand that some state legislative leaders want to pass a composite bill, the major issue being firearms, by Feb. 28. To meet this unnecessary self-imposed deadline, lawmakers will bypass the normal system of legislative committee deliberations and public hearings by using the emergency certification, or "e-cert" process.**

**Normally, legislation of this magnitude would have to go through numerous standing committees including appropriations, judiciary, public safety and insurance – each of which might have held its own hearing. But the emergency-certification process bypasses that. State Senate President Pro Tempore Donald Williams said there's been ample public input. I VERY MUCH DISAGREE!**

**The "e-cert" process, in this case, deprives citizen testimony and other input on the actual bill. At the discussing "Information Hearing" we discussed PROPOSED concept bills with NO statutory language. No lobbyist, legislator, or knowledgeable citizen would ever testify on a bill without viewing/evaluating statutory language. Without a public hearing to promote/oppose/discuss issues of concern and HOW they will be implemented and WHAT will affect the legal gun owner as to bans, restrictions, economics, compliance, and other factors, we believe this is a clear denial of rights to provide input from those who will be affected. To state the "information" hearings are sufficient for passage is a travesty.**

**Also at the public hearing, no questions were asked of those testifying and there have been no gun owners, FFL holders, target shooters, or those who have defended themselves included in the "Experts" meetings. NSSF, representing manufacturers was appropriately included, but no expert end users. Also, No proposals contemplated by gun owning organizations were requested. Why not?**

**As a lawful gun owner I MUST strongly request a public hearing on whatever proposal(s) are developed. If a public hearing isn't held, citizen input will have to be conducted at the Capitol when House and Senate debate takes place. I would expect a significant turnout on this composite bill that would be detrimental to gun owners. We went through something similar in 1979 on "Ban All Handguns" with 8,000 gun owners present mostly outside due to Fire Marshall building capacity rules. Gun owners will perceive such an event as legislative disregard of the public good.**

**Few legislators are aware of the multitude of CT laws with which we have to comply. That our laws are comprehensive and strict no one denies. But there are some unaware of how firearms are legally used and some may still not understand the difference between a machine gun and semi-auto. This is further blurred by purposefully misleading comments and FAQ sheets by anti-gun groups like CAGV. If any of you have any questions on firearms or firearm safety, feel free to contact me and I will do my best to answer any questions you may have.**

**Finally, I would like to ask, what is the justification for this self-imposed deadline and therefore the Emergency Certification process? Do we realistically expect a similar tragedy soon? Will the new laws immediately implemented make any difference to madmen or**

**criminals? Will CT follow the NY “Quick Fix, Do Something“ Emergency Certification bill fiasco, replete with subsequent Constitutional lawsuits and citizen and police defiance?**

**I certainly hope not and ask that you oppose the Emergency Certification process. If this proposed composite bill cannot, or would not make it through the normal legislative process there is probably a good reason for it not to pass.**

**Please do NOT pass any law that will only affect law abiding gun owners in this state. The many of us that choose to exercise our second amendment rights are NOT responsible for the actions of one madman and his misguided mother.**

**Thank You.  
Eric Tucker  
Shelton, CT**