

During the hearing on Monday, Rep Dargan spoke Chief Salvatore regarding the Board of Firearms Permit Examiners exists because in some towns and cities, the police chief and/or the mayor allow the personal or political beliefs to interfere with the process set down by state law. In these cases the paperwork is "lost" or the fingerprint card turns out to be "smudged" or otherwise unusable, something that should have been recognized and fixed the first time the finger prints were taken. Another tactic to stall the process is to require documentation not authorized under the relevant state laws, including, but not limited to, letters of recommendation from multiple people or a letter from the applicant's employer. Many of the major cities are notorious among guns owners for these tactics, among them New Haven, Waterbury and Hartford.

The relevant Connecticut General Statutes are [CGS 29-28a](#) and [CGS 29-29](#).

In response to some of Sen Williams comments and questions.

Claiming the Smith&Wesson promised Smart Gun technology in 2000 but were "*ganged up on*" by other manufacturers and saw a 40% sales drop and "*caved to opinion*":

Definitively not true. S&W made an agreement with the Clinton Administration to add to numerous safety and design standards as well as limits on the sale and distribution of its products. This perceived "sell out" by S&W led to gun owners boycotting S&W products which did lead to the 40% sales drop and the company to suspend manufacturing at two plants.

2. Claiming that Smart Gun technology exists and is viable":

I refer you to the OLR report on this matter: <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2013/rpt/2013-R-0036.htm> I will also note that those proposing this technology almost invariably ask that law enforcement be exempt from "Smart Gun" requirements. A disturbing double standard.

3. Claiming that Smith&Wesson has an "*armor-piercing pistol*":

I believe Sen Williams meant a hand gun that fired an armor piercing bullet. Handgun bullets purposely meant to penetrate body armor have been illegal for civilian use since 1986. There have been a very few number of handguns developed for hunting very large and/or dangerous game. The need to fire a bullet sufficient for those hunting purposes, MAY defeat police body armor. However that would be depend on a number of variables including the bullet composition (lead or copper jacketed), velocity of the bullet upon impact and the rating of the police body armor being used. There is a very significant difference between the body armor used by SWAT members compared to the body armor used by patrol officers.

4. Claiming that gun companies had special protection from tort lawsuits:

This is not true, under the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, prevents firearms manufacturers and dealers from being held liable for crimes committed with their products. It DOES NOT prevent them from being sued or held liable for defective products, breach of contract, criminal misconduct, and other actions for which they are directly responsible. An analogy would be Ford or GM being sued every time one of their cars was used by a drunk driver to injure someone. The need for the Act was due to a rash of lawsuits by those in the anti-gun field hoping to sue the manufacturers out of business.

I hope this clears up some of the inaccurate remarks that were made during Monday's hearing.

Thank you,

Michael Schwabik