

Dear Senator Harp, Representative Wood, and members of the Mental Health Committee:

I am opposed to any further restrictions against law abiding citizens including but not limited to magazine size, modern sporting rifles and many of the other bills that have been proposed.

I also must insist you all do your jobs to consolidate the nearly 100 bills to a small set and then hold public hearings on the resulting final proposals. Citing an “emergency” need to avoid a public hearing on a final bill is a affront to Connecticut voters, an anathema to democracy.

Section 15 of Article 1 of the CT Constitution states very plainly, “Every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the state”. You’ve, by now, been saturated with education about the 2nd amendment.

When the term “citizen” is used, we recognize felons, certain misdemeanors and mental defects are just cause to limit certain rights.

Clearly, sociopaths, mentally defective psychopaths like Adam Lanza have no business possessing firearms. Laws were broken, and that crazed young man murdered his own mother prior to going on his rampage. So how do you address issues of dangerous deranged individuals.

Some ways that FAIL, include shutting down mental health facilities, de-funding treatment options, and you also fail by inserting the State into the privacy of a Doctor/patient relationship.

The very same people you might want to seek help may avoid their Doctor because of the fear of “mandated reporting”.

You also fail when politics enters medicine. According to “Wikipedia”, “In the Soviet Union, systematic political abuse of psychiatry took place.[1] Psychiatry of the Brezhnev period was used as a tool to eliminate political opponents (“dissidents”), people who openly expressed their views that contradict officially declared dogmas.”

In a desire to avoid penalty, how many politically motivated health workers will seek to force their personal views by disparaging those who are truly not dangerous.

I submit to you that mandatory reporting will backfire; tying purchase of a lawful product to a mental check will be rife for abuse, and likely to be a direct conflict with DC v. Heller and McDonald v. Chicago.

Yet, under current law, when Mr. Lanza was denied a rifle purchase, why was that not followed up with further checks?

So, what will help keep firearms out of the hands of the deranged?

- 1) Enable proper treatment options and funding.
- 2) Re-evaluate “mainstreaming”, it’s failed.

If someone is unfit for one legal activity, what about others like driving a car or operating a crane?

Lanza should have been committed, and those so committed can be flagged as ineligible for firearms. It's that simple. Commitment is a clear line, stays on the record. "Suspicion" that someone "might be unstable" is no due process. The dividing line to deprive a civil liberty must be clear.

Fund adequate treatment, reconsider the failure of mainstreaming, but do NOT infringe on the rights of sane, law-abiding gun owners.

Respectfully,
Bill Hillman