

PA 11-186

HB5263

| | | |
|---------------|--|-----------|
| House | 6314-6320 | 7 |
| Public Safety | 103-106, 153-156, 168-170, 172, 173-174, 186, 188-189, 198, 201-202, 228, 229, 235, 256-262, 265, 274, 277, 279, 301, 303, 307, 309-311, 318 | 41 |
| <u>Senate</u> | <u>7167, 7176-7178, 7182-7183</u> | <u>9</u> |
| | | 57 |

H – 1110

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2011**

**VOL.54
PART 19
6188 – 6541**

Are there any other announcements or points of personal privilege? Any other announcements or points of personal privilege?

If not, will the Clerk please call Calendar 110.

THE CLERK:

On Page 4, Calendar 110, Substitute for House Bill Number 5263 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL BY MAIL OF A STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVE. Favorable Report by the Committee on Public Safety.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Jutila of the 37th.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Will you remark? Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would allow for the renewal of pistol or revolver permits by mail, thereby conforming Connecticut law to the current State Police practice for renewing permits for out-of-state residents.

Mr. Speaker, the holder of the gun permit seeking renewal would have to meet five criteria in order to be able to mail in their renewal and the five criteria are, they would have to complete a form according to Department of Public Safety instructions, enclose their renewal fee, a copy of proof of citizenship or legal residency, enclose a notarized or date-stamped photograph, and otherwise be eligible for the permit.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good Bill. We heard substantial testimony about the unfair burden placed on Connecticut residents versus their out-of-state counterparts.

Many times, long travel time, wasted time and money, fuel, there are long waits, in some cases having to take as much as a half day or more off from work, and general lost productivity.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further? Representative Giegler of the 138th.

REP. GIEGLER (138th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in the support of the Bill before us. We heard a lot of testimony and support of how convenient it would be if individuals could,

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

315
June 1, 2011

in fact, apply by mail for their renewals, as it would lower processing costs. It would also reduce travel and work time.

There's only a limited number of locations within the state that someone can actually renew, I think there's about five of them that they specified, so it makes it very difficult because it does require a long time to travel to these locations, and they're not open every day.

So I urge my colleagues' support of this Bill before us. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Sampson of the 80th.

REP. SAMPTON (80th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good evening. I also rise in support of this Bill. I want to just reiterate some of the things that were said.

Very simply, this Bill is going to allow Connecticut residents to renew their pistol permits with the same ease that out-of-state residents currently do using the exact same process that's already in effect.

I think it's a good move toward making it a little bit more convenient. I know from personal experience that it is very difficult to find time to make it to one of the few

locations that we have here in Connecticut. There's only the Middletown office that's open pretty much regular hours. The other locations are open one day a week, that kind of thing.

And I think this is a great Bill and I think it ought to pass. So thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Sawyer of the 55th.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to thank the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman as well as the Ranking Member for their work on this particular Bill.

What it does is create equity between those people who are out of state and in state, and will make life for the law-abiding citizens who want to renew, much more easy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Sharkey of the 88th.

REP. SHARKEY (88th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill, but just for the purpose of

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

317
June 1, 2011

legislative intent, I wanted to ask a quick question of the proponent of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir. Representative Jutila, prepare yourself.

REP. SHARKEY (88th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in the Bill, I believe it's in line 55, I believe it's line 55 or 56 of the Bill, the language calls for the applicant to provide a notarized photo.

And the question I just wanted to clarify for legislative intent is, is the form that we're using for these in-state applicants, essentially the same form as we would use for out-of-state applicants?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Jutila.

REP. JUTILA (37th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, that would be the intent, to have the DPS use the same form that they currently use for out-of-state applicants.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Sharkey.

REP. SHARKEY (88th):

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

318
June 1, 2011

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That answers my questions and I think it just helps clarify the Bill for legislative intent, and I support the Bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Would you remark further on the Bill. Will you remark further on the Bill?

If not, will staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Will Members please take their seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by Roll Call.

Members to the Chamber.

The House is taking a Roll Call Vote. Members to the Chamber, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Have all the Members voted? Have all the Members voted? Will the Members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast. If all Members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5263.

Total Number Voting

147

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

319
June 1, 2011

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| Necessary for Passage | 74 |
| Those voting Yea | 143 |
| Those voting Nay | 4 |
| Those absent and not voting | 4 |

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The Bill passes.

The Chamber will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

The Chamber will come back to order. The Chamber will come back to order. Representative Olson of the 46th.

REP. OLSON (46th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for the immediate transmittal to the Senate of all items acted upon today that require further action by the Senate.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The question is on immediate transmittal of the Bills to the Senate. Is there any objection to transmittal? Are there any objections? Hearing one, the Bills will be transmitted to the Senate.

Will the Clerk please call Number 350. Will the Clerk still please call Calendar Number 350.

THE CLERK:

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
SAFETY AND
SECURITY**

**PART 1
1 - 318**

**2011
INDEX**

of this in Australia and the U.K. All residents were required by law to turn in personal firearms. The goal was to dramatically reduce crime in those countries but it had the exact opposite effect. Crime rose exponentially. It's happened in Latin America, where countries were overthrown, where it was illegal to own a firearm.

In addition, such legislation will require a mountain of paperwork, untold time to enforce and comply which translates to adding government jobs and increasing the operating costs to a state that bonded some of its operating costs last year. We should be looking at other ways to reduce the size of government not growing it. Government is not a producer, it's a consumer and it is big enough already. Your proposed legislative initiative is not a problem solving effort. We hear that on a percentage basis Connecticut has a per capita debt of obligation which is the highest in the nation.

You should all avail yourselves of every working moment to do something to address what is a real and threatening problem to all Connecticut residents not what appears to be this agenda driven legislation. I thank you for your time.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you, Barbara. Questions from committee members? Thank you very much for your testimony. Next is Representative Pam Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER: Mr. Chairman, ranking members and other members of this committee. Thank you for allowing me to testify today. I am the proud owner now of a gun permit, something I decided to do a year and a half ago and I found out it was one of the most cumbersome, annoying

HB 5263
HB 5270

processes that I've been through in a long time because it took six checks to be able to get that particular permit by the time you satisfy each and every requirement from your town clerk with a notary check of \$2 through sending multiple checks to your town and to the state.

So, if we were to streamline anything, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it would be grand to be able to work on that too. But, not that's not why I'm here to testify. It is in favor of the renewal for a state pistol permit to be done by either mail or electronic submission. Currently, if you have an out-of-state permit to carry in the State of Connecticut, you may, you may, with this form and your photograph, that is notarized, you know typical passport photograph, you may renew by mail. So, if you live up in Springfield and have a reason to have a permit to carry in the State of Connecticut, you can renew by mail. Currently if you live in Woodstock or Greenwich, you have to go to Meriden to be able to renew your permit.

In the grand scheme of things where we are looking to streamline state services, save money and protect the environment, I believe that we should be able to renew pistol permits by mail or preferably electronically but I don't think that is something that we could do immediately because of the costs. As the department already knows and has a system for renewing by mail, I think it is only logical and makes a lot of sense. It would save the state police department money. It would save people from having to spend the money to take time away from work to go down, because it's during the week during business days to be able to renew and it must be done every five years.

Currently bail bondsmen are able to renew their

15
djp

February 10, 2011
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE 10:00 A.M.

license by mail. Bail enforcement agents are able to renew by mail. Private detectives and private security companies are able to renew by mail. So, to me it's only logical that we extend this to those people who are interested, very interested in abiding by the law. When I went down to get my permit, I was in line with people who were there to renew and it was a very long line. Now, I knew someone down in the department, I did call someone who I've known for many, many years to find out what's the best time of the day to go. So, I did, I went down, what I thought was the best time and day to go and it still took me two hours and fifteen minutes after I'd been through the course, had all the forms, been fingerprinted, had the background check and all I needed to do was to pop to get my permit. They saw my face, it matched the picture and it was ready to go. I'm going to have to do this again in five years to renew. Now, if you think I'm going to change my hair color that may be true and so I can see buying a new picture, but I think it is certainly something that is very doable and I won't take any more of this committee's time because you all know how to get a hold of me. I'd like to say thank you very much for allowing me to testify.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you, Representative. Just another courtesy, I mean, if you have a cell phone, if you could just put it on vibrate. That goes for committee members too, if not the chair is equipped with a taser and they would come over and taser that individual. Even though that's not licensed yet that I know. Thank you for your testimony. Representative Mikutel.

REP. MIKUTEL: Good morning. Sorry about that. I thought it was off, Mr. Chairman.

16 February 10, 2011
djp PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE 10:00 A.M.

REP. DARGAN: You know, I do have that number.

REP. MIKUTEL: I just want to say that, Representative Sawyer, this sounds like a very good bill and it sounds like a lot of my constituents would benefit from avoiding these lines and the inconvenience of having to take a half a day off to travel to renew a pistol permit. I don't see why we can't do it. It sounds like a sensible bill. I will be supporting it.

REP. SAWYER: Thank you, Representative Mikutel. You know, I say just one more time that these are the good guys that are trying to go out and get their pistol permits renewed. They've already had the background checks, we have information on them and certainly when you submit it by mail it doesn't stop the department from doing any more investigation on the person if they wish to.

REP. DURGAN: Thank you. Other questions from committee members? Thank you very much for coming before us today. The next speaker is Representative Roland Lemar. I don't see him here yet either. Next speaker, Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, nice to be with you. I'm here today in support of Senate Bill 42, which is the number one bill on your agenda that would set standards for firing ranges in Connecticut. Remarkably, Connecticut has no standards for firing ranges and this bill comes to us in an urgent way because of a series of events that took place in Durham and Wallingford and with me today is the First Selectwoman of Durham to describe those circumstances and hopefully elicit your interest in this bill.

LAURA FRANCIS: Good morning and thank you for the

the state -- New Haven, Bridgeport and Hartford. These three locations are where the bulk of the shootings and violence occur so why come after the law abiding gun owner or gun club member when we are not the problem. This is an unreasonable anti-second amendment bill, a feel good bill that is a knee-jerk reaction to the Tucson shootings in my opinion.

Therefore, I ask you to please decline/chill bill H.B. 5800. This is an overreaction to an incident that took place 2,500 miles away from here. Connecticut is already overburdened with existing gun laws. Incidentally, my cousin just retired from the ATF and commented to me how restrictive our Connecticut gun laws are already. He knows the gun laws of the entire country. Gentlemen and ladies please do the right thing and kill this bill. You are going after the wrong people. I don't want Connecticut to be Germany 1932 where first it was the registration followed by confiscation.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you very much for your testimony. Any questions? Thank you very much for coming before us and testifying. The next speaker, the last speaker that signed up on the legislator's agency heads and municipals, is Representative John Rigby. Just to let you know before you get started, there's a new rule that went into place, that the last legislator to speak under the public comments has to buy everybody lunch in the room, so just go down to the caf and say you're on John Rigby and have a nice day.

REP. RIGBY: I have to say I have a pressing meeting in the district, but maybe next time. Good morning, Senator Hartley, Representative Dargan, Senator Daily, Representative Jutila, Senator Guglielmo, Representative Giegler and esteemed members of the Public Safety

HB5263

Committee. I'm State Representative John Rigby. I represent the seven towns of the 63rd district and I appreciate you giving me the opportunity to testify and offer my support for H.B. 5263, AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF A STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL.

This issue was brought to my attention by a constituent who continues to be forced to miss a half day at work every time he has to renew his permit to carry a pistol. As you may know the current policy requires that Connecticut residents appear in person at a designated location each time an individual has to renew their permit. If a permit holder lives out of state however, that person is allowed to renew by mail. I think this is a double standard and it deserves revision.

Unfortunately, the locations where Connecticut residents can renew their permits are limited and they may require up to a 45 minute drive. Moreover, the wait to submit one's renewal paperwork can be up to four hours at the different locations. This is an unfair burden when you consider that an out-of-state permit holder simply sends in a form with an updated photo and they're completely done with the process.

As was the case with my constituent, many Connecticut residents who must renew their permits in person are forced to take time off from work to do so. This results in a loss of wages to the employee and a loss of productivity to the employer. In today's tough economic climate, our residents can ill afford to miss work and lose their wages. Not only would this policy change be beneficial to our residents, but it would also be beneficial to the state by increasing efficiencies within the

65
djp

February 10, 2011

PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE 10:00 A.M.

Department of Public Safety. Ultimately, there would be no change to the renewal process itself but rather an added convenience for our residents by offering the mail-in option.

I feel strongly that this is a reasonable change to the Departments protocol. Thank you very much for your consideration of my thoughts. I think it's time to afford Connecticut residents that same convenience that's been available to out-of-state permit holders.

REP. DURGAN: Thank you, John. Questions? Representative Giegler did you have a question?

REP. GIEGLER: Thank you and thank you, John, for coming before us today. You alluded that there are limited locations. Do you know how many locations there are in the State of Connecticut and where they are?

REP. RIGBY: It can vary from year to year but in the Northwest corner where I am there's a state police barracks where they typically hold in and it's in North Canaan and I think they try and put it in a different corner of the state. But, it's very limited. I can find out for you the specific number.

REP. GIEGLER: So, you're telling me it moves? It's not a like a DMV or you have a certain location, this is not an established location, it moves?

REP. RIGBY: Well, I think the person has the option of going to the main office and you can do it there in person -- Middletown, I believe -- or the state police barracks is the one I'm aware of. I'm not sure how they do it in the Eastern corner but for my folks, if you live in say, Winsted, you're going to drive 35 to 40 minutes

66 February 10, 2011
djp PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE 10:00 A.M.

to get to that police barracks.

REP. DARGAN: Further questions? Representative.

REP. JUTILA: Thank you. Thank you, Representative for your testimony. In the testimony submitted by the Department of Public Safety, they say permit renewals should be conducted in person to confirm the identity of the person that is renewing their permit. But, you say that out-of-staters can do their renewals by mail?

REP. RIGBY: There's a form they provide along with an updated photo and that form gets a notary stamp indicating that the signature is authentic and that it was witnessed by the notary public. So, we would have a similar for Connecticut residents with a current photo and the notary attesting to that person's identity.

REP. JUTILA: This question is better asked to the Commission of DPS I guess, but do you have any idea how they rationalize that or maybe they don't even -- maybe they didn't even support that exception originally but have you talked to them at all about that by any chance?

REP. DIGBY: I think that it's always been done that way where you can renew in person and I don't know what the original rationale was to do it that way, you know possibly its easy now to get a photo taken, you know a passport photo. Maybe it was a more convenient way to do it -- to show up in person, get your picture taken and renew it.

REP. JUTILA: Thank you.

REP. DARGAN: Further questions from committee members? Thank you very much for coming to testify. Next speaker is Bill Hicks.

know if they're testifying together or separately. Okay. That's good.

SCOTT WILSON: Good afternoon committee people. My name is Scott Wilson and I am the president of -- you heard some people mention that they were members of the Connecticut Citizens Defense League -- I'm the president of that organization. We are second amendment rights organization that advocates for the rights of gun owners but we also preach responsible and safe gun ownership for Connecticut citizens. I currently reside in New London, Connecticut and I am testifying in opposition to the following: H.B. 5800, AN ACT REQUIRING REGISTRATION OF ALL FIREARMS; S.B. 42, AN ACT CONCERNING GUN SAFETY STANDARDS FOR FIRING RANGES. Also testifying in support of 5263, 5270, 5643, 547 and 554.

H.B. 5800 would be a tremendous burden for law abiding gun owners which compel them to adhere to a cumbersome and seemingly unforgiving process, this whole registration process. I personally feel that the bill is designed to make gun ownership less desirable and more difficult for people. I want to be able to pass this tradition of the right to gun ownership down to my son who just turned 21 and who will hopefully be applying for his pistol permit very soon.

And, I also feel that people that go to work pay taxes should be allowed to basically be able to mind their own business and live within their community and not be harassed by bureaucratic difficulties. Also, the costs associated with the registration system would undoubtedly be incalculable based on some of the statistics that come in from some of the states and I'm going to cite Canada as the most well-known registry system that has ballooned from what was estimated to be after the

registration fees were included in the calculations, the initial costs were projected for \$2 million and it has since ballooned to five years ago \$1 billion and today it's ballooned up to close to \$2 billion by all reasonable estimates.

And, also I would like to focus on S.B. 554, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PISTOL PERMIT APPEALS PROCESS. As the president of CCDL, I receive countless direct emails from people all over the state seeking reasonable due process to obtain a hearing for their permits after being denied by their local issuing authorities. This is an on-going problem throughout the State of Connecticut. Some of the local municipalities and the issuing authorities just very simply do not pay heed to what the requirements are based on the State of Connecticut and we've tried to walk these people through the appeals process and tell them what to do because that's the first suggestion that we make to them. And, if they're not getting anywhere in their towns, we suggest that they file for an appeal and as you've heard, it takes a very long time -- 18 months to three years for certain types of hearings. And, that's my testimony.

If I'm busy and not out of town I would also like to summarize. Somebody made a comment earlier about the registry that if that information was available for law enforcement during a domestic call that they would be more alert to go into a house or onto a call -- law enforcement officers should always be on alert whether they're making a routine traffic stop, whether or not they're knocking on somebody's door for domestic disturbance or violence charge or reported violence charge, they should always be on their toes. If a law enforcement officer is going into a house or any type of

situation where they're going to encounter somebody guarded with suspicion, if they're not on their toes already, then they probably shouldn't be a law enforcement officer in my opinion. That's it.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you. Questions from committee members? Thank you very much for your testimony. Leonard followed by Virginia.

LEONARD BENEDETTO: Good afternoon, Chairman Dargan and members of the committee that are still here. I appreciate you being here to listen to what I have to say. You've all got copies of my testimony. My name is Leonard Benedetto, I'm the vice president of CCDL. We are the largest grassroots second amendment, pro second amendment organization in the State of Connecticut with over 1,000 members, 1,000 voting members, folks.

I'm here to oppose H.B. 5800, AN ACT REQUIRING THE REGISTRATION OF ALL FIREARMS. You've heard this over and over, a lot of people opposing it, some people not opposing it but in reality there's one department that would actually take care of the registration of all of our firearms is DPS, the Department of Public Safety. As Peter Kuck a friend of both mine and Representative Dargan had mentioned, that back in October 7, 2009, DPS actually sent out 3,125 letters to gun owners that had legally sold their guns requesting that they submit another copy of the form that they had already filled out the DPS3 forms, because DPS had a transaction number that was given over the telephone to the buyer of the gun or to the seller of the gun if it was a gun store when they called in the transaction and then they lost these forms so since they had the transaction number and the name and address of the person who was making the transaction, they

again, this is the department that we have to register our weapons with.

One other point, if I may, I have weapons that are in my gun safe that are considered modern firearms. As I testified in front of this committee last year, when I was in here testifying against H.B. 5158 which was the long gun registration, I have rifles in my safe that are considered modern firearms that do not have serial numbers. If I'm to get these things registered every five years, what purpose does that serve for me to go in and say I have a 22 rifle. You want to register it, here, I have a 22 rifle. It doesn't have a serial number. If the gun comes up missing there's no way to find that exact gun unless I carve my initials in it or something. But, there is nothing there to actually state. So, this gun registration thing -- it's either a back-ended way to confiscate our weapons some day, tax them, either which way it's not going to do any good for us to be safer. As public safety you're here for our safety. Gun registration is not any way of making us any safer. I thank you. I appreciate the extra time also.

REP. DARGAN: Any questions from committee members? Hearing none, next presenter is Virginia Benedetto.

VIRGINIA BENEDETTO: Hello. I am Virginia Benedetto from Stratford. I am a founding and executive member and the technology coordinator for Connecticut Citizens Defense League. I am here today to talk to you about a couple of bills. The first one is S.B. 42, AN ACT CONCERNING SAFETY STANDARDS FOR FIRING RANGES. I do oppose this bill especially as I could not find any text for the bill. I have been to many clubs and ranges around the state and they all have their safety standards and all safety

HB 6185

HB 5263

HB 5270

standards at ranges are fairly common.

I also as any shooter that has taken any kind of safety courses, as a shooter you are responsible for your weapon and what you do with that weapon. So, I'm not sure what the purpose of the bill. I know that I heard the Senator earlier talking about the bill but as written and presented, I would have to oppose it until I actually heard what they wanted to incorporate into a bill like that.

The second bill is H.B. 6185, AN ACT CREATING A GUN OFFENDER REGISTRY. Again, this is one that I would have to oppose being written as it is. First of all, it's an unnecessary burden on the town police to maintain another registry of a database of people that does already exist as has been stated already. The other thing about this bill that bothers me is that a gun crime is not defined in the bill.

Also, it's not defined that the person would have to be convicted of a felony. It just says convicted of a gun crime. There are many gun crimes that would not make someone a threat to society. One example is an unlawful discharge. If you're in your home and you have an accident that doesn't hurt anyone, that is a gun crime and you could be convicted of that. And, to have to be on a registry that you have to reregister every single year with your town that's just unacceptable if you've already paid for that crime that you've committed. So, I do oppose that as written.

The last one is H.B. 5263, AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL and also H.B. 5270, AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL OR BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION. I support that bill. I believe it

84
djp

February 10, 2011

PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE 10:00 A.M.

would save the state money and also the citizens of Connecticut. A recent example is the DMV, some huge changes that they've made in their process has saved them a lot of money and I believe it could also save money in this process as well. Thank you.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you very much for your testimony. Representative.

REP. JUTILA: Thank you. And, thank you for your testimony. When Senator Meyer testified back at the beginning of this hearing on the gun safety standards for firing ranges, he suggested that we might use the NRA range sourcebook guidelines which he indicated a number of other states have adopted and I know from your testimony your concern seems to mainly that what we have in front of us now is uncertain because it's just a conceptual bill. If we were to incorporate the NRA sourcebook, would that be something that would be acceptable to you?

VIRGINIA BENEDETTO: I believe with review it possibly could be. I don't necessarily know the NRA source rule. I don't know everything that's in there and I also saw the research that he spoke of and there are really only about five states, I believe, that were listed that adhere to that.

REP. JUTILA: Okay. Thank you.

REP. DARGAN: Further questions from committee members? Thank you very much for your testimony. Next presenter is Thomas Mitney followed by Judy Aron.

THOMAS MITNEY: Good afternoon, Representative Dargan and members of the Public Safety Committee. My name is Thomas Mitney and I'm a

SB547

JOHN KYSER: I have been to that one and the big thing that I laugh about is there is a huge land mass, a giant hill covered with trees between that range and the houses that are getting struck by bullets and the news segments that I've seen, the way the bullets are hitting those houses, they're not coming from way above, they're coming at an angle. And, there's rumor that there's a lot of people who go into that woods and shoot guns, illegal guns. So, I think the few incidents that have happened have been from in those woods, not from the range.

SENATOR GUGLIELMO: Well, I fired on that range myself when I was in the National Guard we -- I don't know if they still go down there and use that range or not, but it was pretty safe back then and we were using automatic weapons. Okay, thank you very much.

JOHN KYSER: You're welcome.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you. Further comments? Thank you very much, John, for your testimony.

JOHN KYSER: Thank you for your time.

REP. DARGAN: Next speaker is Amy followed by Michael from Killingworth. It might be Butler.

AMY STEGALL: Good afternoon, Representative Dargan, members of the committee. I'm Amy Stegall. I actually had submitted written testimony so I'm going to forego reading it and I just wanted to touch on a few points.

SB 42 HB 5800
HB 5263 HB 5270
SB 547

Many of you see me on a regular basis up here; I testify a lot on various things and I have to say I'm very disappointed that the committee would raise -- there are three bills on here

February 10, 2011

PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE 10:00 A.M.

list of people who had shot at that range to examine the firearms. I was sent basically a phonebook that's a shopping list -- names, serial numbers, locations, everything. It shouldn't have come to me, I shredded it, but I'm alarmed by that, that I got that merely by requesting information on -- I was just looking for information on the range report.

And, as you know, it's been in the paper a lot in the last few years, laptops have been lost by state employees, they're various breaches with private companies. Information is extremely powerful and I would be alarmed to have my personal private information that I'm required to provide to suddenly end up in the wrong hands.

So, I have concerns that that won't be able to be dealt with properly if you enact 5800 which no one yet has said to me how this is supposed to stop crime. I've seen various comments about it, but if I'm a law abiding gun owner giving you my information and you have all these guns registered, how does that stop crime? I'm not sure -- no one has provided that information to me. So, I would ask that you oppose that as well.

Also, the two bills regarding renewals by mail, the whole process as Representative Sawyer has pointed out, is very cumbersome. And, you're actually encouraging people not to renew their permits and what you're trying to get is compliance from people but you're not helping them do that. I had to take a vacation day from work, go down in bad weather, and it was far from where I was and of course I got out of my car in the parking lot it was a winter day and I slipped and fell on the ice. So, yes, it's definitely a miserable process and I am hopeful that you for once would agree that you

HB 5263
HB 5270

would allow this renewal by mail and give the law abiding gun owners at least a little something for once.

We always seem to be the perpetual whipping boys for everything else regarding gun crime. So, I would encourage you to do that. As was pointed out, many other permits are renewed by mail and I know that my driver's license renewal comes in the mail, it's very simple to do. You wouldn't give up any security and you certainly would help more people comply with their renewals.

Bill 547, I have some concern about. Mr. Strillacci had said that it would loosen up the laws. I've called the Department of Public Safety Firearms Unit, three different, three different occasions about that provision, about the section of statute and gotten a different answer to the same question each time. So, I think the statute as its written now is too gray and I think that you should probably move forward with 547 just to make it clear so that everyone is doing what they're supposed to.

So, I'm hopeful that you will oppose 5800 and 42 and go on from there. That's it.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you, Amy. Questions? No questions, thank you very much for your testimony. Up if there's --

REP. MIKUTEL: I just want to thank you for your testimony. It was very thoughtful testimony and very well articulated.

AMY STEGALL: Well, thank you. And, I hope that the committee understands people testifying here today, we're not the enemy. We're the people that are trying to abide by the laws that you're putting out there and Connecticut is

it's a lot more than 5,000. We also found out at that time that 20 states had reported zero.

REP. REBIMBAS: And, you know what that's very good information and data and I appreciate that and I think that again, goes to the point that it is a national issue and even though there's other states that don't provide the information whether or not Connecticut whatever they did provide was all that we had or if that needs to be improved I would certainly look and enjoy to look at how that could be improved. But, because it is a national problem, I'd like to see it being funded nationally as opposed to again, creating a completely new system that would just again with all intentions we already have one and to have the State of Connecticut then have to fund one, not know how it's going to be handled administratively and heaven forbid we don't know how many people it's going to take to handle and with those salaries or the cost of implementing it, improve the system that we currently have.

REP. DARGAN: Further questions? Thank you very much. Next speaker is Bob Crook. I thank you very much for your testimony, any questions?

BOB CROOK: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Bob Crook. I'm the executive director of the Coalition of Connecticut Sportsmen. I think you've got all my testimony in front of you.

HB 5800

HB 5263 HB 5270
SB 42 HB 5643

The first one I'd like to address is 695, gun offender registry. My question is why hasn't law enforcement done this on its own? This is such a critical item, they have the data, why don't they make their little pin board down in New Haven and satisfy their own problem rather than taxing the rest of us taxpayers.

111
djp

February 10, 2011
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE 10:00 A.M.

need more.

So, my position would be let's get this gun trafficking task force back in operation, let's fund it, let's do it right, make the Commissioner of Public Safety do it right, hire undercover agents, get them into the cities, get rid of these guns being sold out of the trunks of cars.

Renewal of state pistol permits that's a good bill and I think Pam Sawyer gave the best presentation and I think that bill should go. Pistol appeals permit process -- pistol permit appeals process, boy I'm tongue tied today. You've got some data from a guy named Craig Fishbind. He's an attorney and I think it probably got to you by email, it may have gotten to you hard copy, I don't know. But, essentially what he's saying, he's saying the appeals process which right now takes 18 to 30 months to appeal a pistol permit revocation or a denial.

HB 5263

HB 5270

What he would like to see is all appeals filed under this section should be duly heard no more than 90 days following the filing of the appeal. Failure to be heard within this 90 day period shall be cause for the board to grant relief sought forthwith and without further hearing. So, what he's saying is he's saying, do your job; if you don't do your job, give the guy the permit. We support him.

The select -- an act concerning firearms, this selective fire provision, I've tried it before, but this really an imposition on the gun collector. You've heard from some other people here. This was put in by an erroneous amendment by one of the most pro-gun legislator's that was up here at the time. He changed it and unfortunately he didn't know how

112
djp

February 10, 2011
PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE 10:00 A.M.

he was changing it. I think you all know that a machine gun is one pull of the trigger, a whole bunch of bullets go out; semi-automatic which is called assault weapons in some cases, one shot, one pull of the trigger; select fire you may not know. Select fire is purely military, it fires three to five rounds, it's called burst fire.

Having this definition in there on the select fire, prohibits people from collecting within this state. I think you heard from a collector here today. These are very, very expensive firearms. They start cheap at \$5,000 and I think he mentioned one at \$43,000 -- these are not guns that the average citizen has. And, we have a machine gun statute in this state and this select fire should be in the machine gun statute. It's a technical change, that's all it is but it will allow collectors to do what they're supposed to be doing and that's collecting and spending a lot of money.

By the way, when you transfer a machine gun there's a \$200 tax placed on it by the feds. So, this is not a cheap business and when you fire the gun at 50 cents a round, it becomes rather expensive also. So, I would suggest you help these people out. Transfer the selective fire into the machine gun statute and eliminate it from the assault weapon statute.

I already know the position on this. This is a good bill this is reciprocity. It does have a fiscal impact. I'd be more than glad to tell you what the fiscal impact is, in fact, I didn't think Representative Dargan was going to raise it. The comparison with driver's licenses is valid. They had a bill down in Congress which failed by two votes just last year on reciprocity. We'd like to see this. I think every gun owner feels as though if he can

HB5643

in favor of safety. I just stated an NRA certified range safety officer. But, because it has no wording, one cannot enforce rules which don't exist. So, it's a foolish bill.

I also would like to reiterate my colleague, John's invitation. Rockville Fish and Game Club -- well this is our own thing, but for your information, it's only 20 miles from here. We have very safe ranges, obviously and our ranges are right off the highway and easy to find. My particular name and phone number are on the Rockville Fish and Game Club's website as the president. If you call me, I'd be delighted to meet any of you and introduce you to safe shooting. Thank you very much. Do you have any questions?

REP. JUTILA: Thank you. Questions from any members of the committee? If not, thank you, Sally for your testimony. Is there anyone else in the room who didn't sign up who would like to testify? Yes, sir.

PAUL MATHEWSON: Good afternoon. My name is Paul Mathewson. I'm a lifelong resident of Stratford, Connecticut. I retired approximately 12 years ago next month; 20 years of service as an agency police officer for the State of Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services and for approximately the last seven years since the Law Enforcement Officers Act of 2004 was established by President Bush, I've been trying to conform without federal law through my agency that I retired from.

HB 5263

And, on an annual basis they have been less than expedient, less than timely or convenient in issuing the credential required to comply under the federal law. Therefore, I'm speaking in favor of the Proposed Bill S.B. 552, AN ACT

CONCERNING RETIRED OFFICERS TO CARRY CONCEALED FIREARMS, that the general statutes be amended to permit any qualified retired law enforcement officer to apply for and receive from the Department of public Safety, permission to carry concealed as it pertains to the requirements for the credential from the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2004 which was amended August 12, 2010.

I also received contact from a prominent citizen in Stratford asking me to consider speaking of favor of bill number 5263, AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL. I think that it's a good idea, streamlining state government making it more convenient for the law abiding citizen. They proved their identity once when they initially received the permit. Why should they have to do it on an annual or every three or five year basis? Why can't it be through the mail without technology today, I don't think it should be a problem to go back to the old way -- renew it by mail and be over with it. Thank you.

REP: JUTILA: Perfect timing. Questions from any members of the committee? If not, Paul, thank you for your testimony. And, could you just stop by the clerk's desk over there so they get the correct spelling of your name. Thank you. Anyone else who was not signed up who would like to testify? If not, we'll close the public hearing. Thank you.



Every citizen has a right
to bear arms in defense
of himself and the state.

Connecticut State Constitution, Section 15

Connecticut Citizen's Defense League, Inc.

Public Safety and Security Committee, February 10, 2011

OPPOSE:

SB 42 An act concerning gun safety standards for firing ranges

HB 6185 An act creating a gun offender registry

SUPPORT:

HB 5263 An act authorizing renewal of state permit to carry a pistol or revolver by mail.

HB 5270 An act authorizing renewal of state permit to carry a pistol or revolver by mail or by electronic submission

Chairwoman Hartley and Chairman Dargan, and the members of the Public Safety and Security Committee, my name is Virginia Benedetto from Stratford, CT. I am a founding and Executive member, and the Technology Coordinator of the Connecticut Citizens Defense League, Inc.

SB 42 An act concerning gun safety standards for firing ranges

While I am for gun safety standards at any venue, I find the lack of text in the bill concerning, as there is no detail as to what safety standards would be set. Being an avid shooter, I have attended many clubs and ranges that adhere to certain safety standards, that I also practice on my own as a safe shooter. Not knowing what type of standards would be set could possibly present undue burden on some clubs and ranges that is unnecessary. Until further wording is introduced and clarified, I must oppose this bill.

HB 6185 An act creating a gun offender registry.

What public safety value is gained by a gun offender registry? This would be an unnecessary burden on the town police to maintain a registry of people that at one time were convicted of a 'gun crime'. While 'gun crime' in this bill is not defined, being convicted of a gun crime does not necessarily make one a threat to society, while violent criminals use weapons of all kinds (not just guns), and would only be on this registry if they were convicted of a 'gun crime'. I see no reason or benefit to the citizens of CT for a registry of this kind, therefore I oppose this bill.

HB 5263 An act authorizing renewal of state permit to carry a pistol or revolver by mail.,

HB 5270 An act authorizing renewal of state permit to carry a pistol or revolver by mail or by electronic submission

Either of these bills could save the state money by allowing pistol permit holders to send in required renewal documents to be processed, and save any confusion in the renewal process. Just as the DMV has recently made changes to bring their offices into the "21st century" (by eliminating stickers and reducing renewal mailings, to a cost savings of about \$800,000 annually), I believe the pistol permit renewal process would benefit both state and customers by allowing renewals by mail.

Virginia Benedetto
Technology Coordinator, CCDL
203-362-7581

CCDL, Inc. - PO Box 642 - Groton, CT 06340
www.ccdl.us

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER*James M. Thomas*
Commissioner*Lieutenant Edwin S. Henion*
Chief of Staff

February 10, 2011

Rep. Stephen Dargan, Co-Chairman
Sen. Joan Hartley, Co-Chairman
Public Safety and Security Committee
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106

**HB 5263 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR
REVOLVER BY MAIL**

The Department of Public Safety opposes this bill.

This proposed bill would amend sections 29-28 to 29-30 of the general statutes to permit the holder of a state permit to carry a pistol or revolver to renew the permit by mailing the renewal form and renewal fee.

Permit renewals should be conducted in person to confirm the identity of the person that is renewing their permit. This also allows for a current photograph of the person renewing their permit as well as verification of their status. Driver license renewals require that the applicant appear in person to renew their license and have a new photograph taken. The public safety interest is at least similar, if not greater, in regard to renewal of permits to carry.

Sincerely,


James M. Thomas
COMMISSIONER

COALITION OF CONNECTICUT SPORTSMEN

P.O. Box 2506, Hartford, CT 06146, (203) 245-8076
www.ctsportsmen.com ccsct@comcast.net

Testimony presented to the PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE

IN SUPPORT of Proposed H.B. No. 5263 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL. And Proposed H.B. No. 5270 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL OR BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION.

by Robert T. Crook, Director

02/10/11

After reviewing ALL the renewal procedures found on the Special Licensing and Firearms Unit of the CT State Police, the ONLY renewal procedure requiring personal presence is the State Pistol Permit to Carry Pistols or Revolvers.

All other permit renewals can be done by mail. These include: Out of State Residents State Pistol Permit to Carry Pistols or Revolvers (including the initial submission); Private Detectives; Private Security Company License; Private Security Service License; Security Officer; Criminal Justice Certification Instructor, and Professional Bondsman's License.

Clearly, CSP has the procedures in effect to extend the mail renewal to the Resident State Pistol Permit to Carry Pistols or Revolvers. This would lower the cost of processing firearms permit renewals, reduce travel and lost work time for applicants, and add convenience for the citizens of the state.

Renewals are every 5 years, and a photograph is required on the permit. Out of State Residents and others submit a passport photo. Both mail and the current appearance system would have to be available, but as with the other renewals many would use mail.

Electronic renewal submission is a more difficult procedure due to photographs required and payment. CSP does not have any credit card process that I'm aware of. Also many do not have electronic means or refuse to use it.

Initiation of a mail renewal program for the State Pistol Permit to Carry Pistols or Revolvers is obviously feasible and would standardize all Special Licensing and Firearms Unit renewal procedures.

We urge support.



State of Connecticut

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN B. RIGBY
SIXTY-THIRD DISTRICT

84 ENO HILL ROAD
COLEBROOK, CT 06021

HOME (860) 307-3778
CAPITOL (860) 240-8700
TOLL FREE (1-800) 842-1423

E-mail John.Rigby@housegop.ct.gov

MEMBER
ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE
HIGHER EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT
ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE
HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE

Public Safety Committee
Public Hearing Testimony
Thursday, February 10, 2011

Dear Senator Joan Hartley, Representative Steven Dargan, Senator Eileen Daly, Representative Ed Jutila, Senator Anthony Guglielmo, Representative Janice Giegler and esteemed members of the Public Safety Committee.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify and offer my support for H.B. 5263, An Act Authorizing Renewal of State Permit to Carry a Pistol to Revolver by Mail

This issue was brought to my attention by a constituent who continues to be forced to miss a ½ day of work each time he renews his permit to carry a pistol. As you may know, the current policy requires Connecticut residents to appear, in person, at a designated location each time an individual wishes to renew their permit. If a permit holder lives out of state, however, that person is allowed to renew by mail. I think that this is a double standard that deserves revision.

Unfortunately, the locations where Connecticut residents can renew their permits are limited and may require up to a 45 minute drive. Moreover, the wait to submit one's renewal paper work can be up to an additional 4 hours. This is an unfair burden when you consider that out of state permit holders may simply send in a form with an updated photo and be done with the process entirely.

As was the case with my constituent, many Connecticut residents who must renew their permits in person are forced to take time off from work to do so. This results a loss of wage to the employee and a loss of productivity to the employer. In today's tough economic climate, our residents can ill afford to miss work and lose wages. Not only would this policy change be beneficial to our residents it would also be beneficial to the state by increasing efficiencies with the state's Department of Public Safety. Ultimately, there would be no change to the process renewal requirements themselves, merely an added convenience to our residents by offering a mail in option. I feel strongly that this is a reasonable change to the department's protocol.

Thank you for your consideration of my thoughts. It's time to afford Connecticut residents that same convenience that has been available to out of state permit holders.

Public Safety Committee
Legislative Office Building
Hartford Connecticut

February 10, 2011

SUPPORT: HB5263, HB5270, HB5643, SB547, SB554

OPPOSE: HB5800, SB42

Chairman Dargan, Chairman Hartley, Distinguished Members of the Public Safety Committee:

I am opposed to the following two bills:

HB 5800 AN ACT REQUIRING REGISTRATION OF ALL FIREARMS. This legislation will do nothing to prevent crime, and in fact will encourage less compliance in the tracing of firearms. Criminals will not move to register their firearms, and I do not feel the potential extra expense that would be required to monitor compliance would be justified. The bill does not contemplate how the Department of Public Safety plans to enforce this registration, but the ways that come to mind seem to me like they would border on violating Constitutional rights. It should be noted that Canada has its own firearm registry in place, which has proven ineffective and extremely expensive. They are currently moving to eliminate the entire program. We should learn from their mistake.

SB 42 AN ACT CONCERNING GUN SAFETY STANDARDS FOR FIRING RANGES.

I am very disappointed that the committee would choose to raise this bill without providing the actual text prior to the public hearing. It is virtually impossible to provide accurate comments without knowing the specific language. I would ask you to oppose this bill based on that alone. Also, historically, we have seen gun range related legislation introduced in previous sessions which would have been difficult for the ranges to comply with and would ultimately have caused them harm, so I can only surmise this bill is of similar nature. Given that many ranges have employees, sell products and/or pay property or sales taxes, I believe that this legislation could potentially harm ranges, which can be ill afforded in this economy. I would sincerely hope that this committee takes the impact of small businesses into consideration before any further action is taken on this bill.

I would very much like to thank this committee for raising the following bills, which I would urge you to SUPPORT:

HB 5263 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL. Purpose: To permit the holder of a state pistol permit to renew the permit by mail.

HB 5270 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL OR BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION. Purpose: To permit the holder of a state permit to carry a pistol or revolver to renew said permit by mail or by electronic submission

HB 5643 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CARRYING OF FIREARMS BY OUT-OF-STATE RESIDENTS. Purpose: To allow an out-of-state resident who holds a license or permit to carry from another state to carry firearms in this state

SB 547 AN ACT CONCERNING FIREARMS. To revise the applicability of the statute regulating the sale, delivery and transfer of handguns and to modify the definition of "assault weapon.

SB 554 AN ACT CONCERNING THE PISTOL PERMIT APPEALS PROCESS. Purpose To set certain time limits for pistol permit appeals.

In closing, I hope the committee will give serious consideration offered on these bills today, and I appreciate the opportunity to testify.

Sincerely
Amy Stegall
Stafford Connecticut
oldshotgun@live.com

Testimony in absentia from James M. Hoover

9 February 2011

SUPPORT: HB5263, HB5270, HB5643 HB6185, SB547, SB554

OPPOSE: HB5800, SB42

I am presently outside of Connecticut , expecting to return in June 2011. I am a State Pistol Permit Holder and former Range Officer at the Edwards Air Force Base, California , small arms range where General Curtis LeMay would often maintain his proficiency. During my time and to my credit as unit commander we built a self-help M-60 machine gun range adjacent to the small arms range, the first of its kind in the United States Air Force. I submit the following statements in testimony to this committee.

1. As per any thoughts of controlling ammunition vice legislating the ownership of small arms, I suggest that that not be attempted as the US Supreme Court would no doubt turn around this legislation. Ammunition, magazines, etc. are an extension of the gun protection in the 2nd Amendment. There is precedence in this matter as that High Court has determined that a drug dog's nose is an extension of the law enforcement officer's senses. A recent case in California should be enough evidence to abandon any ideas of considering this type of issue. Pursuing this type of legislation would be costly and futile for Connecticut .

2. I fully **SUPPORT** the following bills for consideration by the Connecticut State Legislature:

HB 5263 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL. Purpose: To permit the holder of a state pistol permit to renew the permit by mail.

HB 5270 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL OR BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION. Purpose: To permit the holder of a state permit to carry a pistol or revolver to renew said permit by mail or by electronic submission

HB 5643 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CARRYING OF FIREARMS BY OUT-OF-STATE RESIDENTS. Purpose: To allow an out-of-state resident who holds a license or permit to carry from another state to carry firearms in this state

HB 6185 AN ACT CREATING A GUN OFFENDER REGISTRY. Purpose: To require that persons convicted of certain gun crimes register their names and addresses with the local police department for the municipality in which they reside.

SB 547 AN ACT CONCERNING FIREARMS. To revise the applicability of the statute regulating the sale, delivery and transfer of handguns and to modify the definition of "assault weapon.

SB 554 AN ACT CONCERNING THE PISTOL PERMIT APPEALS PROCESS. Purpose To set certain time limits for pistol permit appeals.

OPPOSE:

SB 42 AN ACT CONCERNING GUN SAFETY STANDARDS FOR FIRING RANGES I do believe that **SB 42**, is one more attempt (there have been many over the last 6 years) to shutdown one of Connecticut's older and very good ranges, i.e.- The Blue Trail Range and Gun Shop, in Wallingford. One of the few "rifle & black powder" ranges left. Sen. Meyer is a "shoreline" Senator, Branford, Madison , North Branford, etc. and the range is in Wallingford so I don't see a lot of his constituents calling him up and complaining about that.

3. I oppose **HB 5800 AN ACT REQUIRING REGISTRATION OF ALL FIREARMS** as there is no good reason to enact more cumbersome directives.

4. I suggest that this committee consider becoming friendly with the firearms industry here in Connecticut as it is not conducive to adversarial behavior to those who provide jobs in this State during negative economic times.

5. I submit the following historical commentary for your edification:

In WWII, Japan 's highest ranking naval officer was Isoroku Yamamoto. Although he was Japanese, and his loyalties were unquestionably with The Empire, he studied for many years in America, graduating from Harvard University. There is an oft-repeated (and sometimes disputed) quote attributed to him regarding the possibility of any nation taking a war to American soil:

"You cannot invade the mainland United States . There would be a rifle behind every blade of grass."

In summary, this citizen is concerned by the overregulation of the Second Amendment rights of responsible small arms owners and users. Other legislative matters to restrict these types of items being considered should be taken off the table.

Signed in absentia

James M. Hoover
Captain, USAF (Retired)
CACM
CAFM
Fellow of the National Contract Management Association

Proposed H.B No. 5270 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL OR ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION.

I SUPPORT THIS BILL

Thank you Co-Chair Senator Joan Hartley, Co-Chair Representative Stephen Dargen, and members of the Public Safety Committee.

My name is Bruce Tolhurst. I am a life long resident of Connecticut, currently residing at 16 Virginia Rail Dr in Marlborough.

I came here today to talk about H.B. No. 5270, <and a similar bill, H.B. No. 5263>, An Act Authorizing Renewal of State Permit to Carry a Pistol or Revolver by Mail or Electronic Submission. I am here as an individual and also as the Head Range Master of The Connecticut Renegades, authorized by the Presidents' Executive committee to speak on behalf of the club. The Connecticut Renegades is a cowboy mounted shooting club. We ride horses through a proscribed pattern while shooting ten targets with a pair of single action revolvers. <think 1880 Colt Peacemakers>. This activity might be described as barrel racing with guns. I invite you all to come see our demonstration at the Four Town Fair in Somers, CT on September 17, later this year. You'll find there is nothing more exhilarating than horses, speed and guns all at the same time.

The Connecticut Renegades as a club and myself as an individual **SUPPORT** proposed bill H.B. No. 5270.

I am a CT Pistol Permit holder. The Connecticut Renegades is a club of over 60 members, with about 40 members as CT Pistol Permit holders. The majority of my revolver use is with the Connecticut Renegades. We recognize not only the personal convenience of a 'mail-in' license renewal process, but also the potential administrative saving to the State of Connecticut if this bill is enacted.

I can't believe there can be any controversy in this legislative proposal, regardless whether you are pro-gun, anti-gun or ambivalent. This is only about convenience and saving administrative costs.

I urge you to please consider this bill in this light and vote to approve it as a "Joint and Favorable" Committee action.

Thank you.

Bruce Tolhurst
16 Virginia Rail Dr.
Marlborough, CT 06447
(860) 295-0327



<<<<<< Bruce & his horse, Pete >>>>>>



Testimony of Jeff Tang before the Public Safety Committee, Room 2A LOB, February 10, 2011Testimony Supporting:HB 5643 An Act Concerning the Carrying of Firearms by Out-of-State Residents.HB 5263 An Act Authorizing Renewal of State Permit to Carry a Pistol or Revolver by Mail.HB 5270 An Act Authorizing Renewal of State Permit to Carry a Pistol or Revolver by Mail or by Electronic Submission.SB 554 An Act Concerning the Pistol Permit Appeals Process.SB 547 An Act Concerning Firearms.SB552And Opposing:HB 5800 An Act Requiring Registration of All FirearmsSB 42 An Act Concerning Gun Safety Standards for Firing RangesHB 6185 An Act Creating a Gun Offender Registry

Members of the Public Safety and Security Committee, my name is Jeff Tang, the Membership Coordinator for the Connecticut Citizen's Defense League (CCDL) and Secretary for the Stratford Gun Collectors Association, residing in Fairfield. I am a self-employed carpenter with my own small business, loving husband, regular church-goer, and gun owner.

● In support of HB 5643 An Act Concerning the Carrying of Firearms by Out-of-State Residents:

I support this Act because it enables residents of other States to exercise their Constitutionally protected rights while in the State of Connecticut. Article One, Section 15 of the Connecticut State Constitution says: "Every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the state." The Second Amendment of the United States Constitution says: "The right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." In keeping with that right, Connecticut issues Permits to Carry Pistols and Revolvers to qualified applicants who meet certain criteria.

Most States also issue permits to carry a handgun on one's person, often with more rigorous criteria than Connecticut requires. Many of these States offer reciprocal recognition of permits toward other States with similar requirements. For instance, Delaware and Maine have a reciprocity agreement, and holders of Maine permits may carry concealed firearms in Delaware, and vice versa.

However, many States do not recognize permits to carry firearms from States which do not recognize their own permits. Thus, Delaware and Maine do not recognize a Connecticut Permit to Carry a Pistol or Revolver, despite having similar requirements to obtain the permit, because Connecticut refuses to recognize their permits.

If a Connecticut driver's license were not valid in a certain State, clearly drivers from Connecticut would avoid that State; and if other State's drivers' licenses were not recognized in Connecticut, drivers from other States would avoid Connecticut. Those who, like myself, routinely carry a handgun for personal protection view this situation as a direct analogy. When possible, we avoid travel to States which do not recognize our permits to carry a handgun, for fear of running afoul of their laws. Thus, Connecticut is losing business from law-abiding citizens of other States because the Constitution State does not recognize a right guaranteed by its own Constitution.

Not only would HB 5643 bring business to Connecticut, but it would also open the door for other States to recognize the rights of Connecticut citizens to bear arms in those jurisdictions. Instead of presenting itself as a backward, and uncooperative State, Connecticut would join the ranks of other States which respect the good will and proper procedure of other States in the Union. Just as good citizens must respect the competence of other credible citizens for a society to function, so must States recognize the competence of other States for the United States of America to function as one nation.

• In opposition to: HB 6185 An Act Creating a Gun Offender Registry

I oppose this Act because it has the potential to endanger the rights of citizens, while spending money which could be used for better purposes, while providing no real benefit to the State or toward the Public Safety. Gun owners are not fans of gun offenders. Criminals who use guns give legitimate gun owners a bad reputation, creating an unjust association between guns and crime. The creation of a gun offender registry would, then, seem like a good idea. Sadly, it is far from a good idea.

Criminals are, by definition, those who do not follow the law. The sex offender registry has been costly and difficult to implement and enforce, especially since criminals have been less than cooperative regarding their participation. Are sex crimes and gun crimes really so analogous that such a registry would have even the same limited effect in warning the public and helping to prevent repeat offenses? Would such a registry keep criminals who have used guns in the past from obtaining other illegal guns, when the enforcement of existing laws and procedures by definition did not prevent them from getting an illegal gun in the first place? Given that mere possession of certain firearms with improper paperwork or in certain situations can be a gun crime, will this registry really prove to be a useful tool for law enforcement against criminals who are really a danger to society? Those who use guns to augment crimes like robbery and murder get no sympathy from anyone, but the same can hardly be said for someone who failed to properly understand Connecticut's complicated gun laws--for instance transporting a lawfully owned pistol outside the home, even in a state not ready for use and locked away separate from ammunition, without a permit to carry such a weapon?

Without clear definitions, HB 6185 leaves too many questions and open ends. At this stage, a gun offender registry would more likely do an incomplete job of tracking a group composed, in part, of statutory criminals who do not pose a significant danger to society, mixed in with the truly dangerous gun criminals who are likely to offend again. If more money is to be spent fighting gun crime, it should be used to specifically target violent gun criminals, without dragging down those whose offense consisted of a misuse of paper, not a misuse of guns for violence.

• In support of HB 5263 An Act Authorizing Renewal of State Permit to Carry a Pistol or Revolver by Mail and HB 5270 An Act Authorizing Renewal of State Permit to Carry a Pistol or Revolver by Mail or by Electronic Submission.

I support these Acts because they make State services more accessible to citizens and reduce costs for the State with no negative consequences. The renewal of a Permit to Carry a Pistol or Revolver is merely a paperwork matter, with no need for the physical presence of the permit holder. Is there any benefit to a clerk seeing an applicant in person? Some States, such as Utah, issue such permits via mail from the beginning, and have not reported any problems with such a system. Allowing renewal of a Connecticut permit by mail or electronic means would reduce traffic congestion and fuel waste by a small amount, free up parking spaces at State Police barracks, and allow personnel to work more efficiently on the actual paperwork instead of waiting at a window for permit holders.



CCDL, Inc.
PO Box 642
Groton, CT 06340
www.ccdl.us

P12 L20 19

Connecticut Citizens Defense League, Inc.

Chairwoman Hartley, and Chairman Stephen Dargan, Members of the Public Safety and Security Committee, My name is Scott Wilson Sr. I am the current President of Connecticut Citizens Defense League. We are a 2nd Amendment Rights Organization that advocates for the rights of gun owners, and also preach responsible and safe gun ownership for Connecticut citizens.

I currently reside in New London, CT, and I am testifying in **Opposition to:**

- 1) HB 5800 "an Act Requiring Registration of All Firearms"
- 2) SB 42 "An Act Concerning Gun Safety Standards for Firing Ranges"

I am also testifying in **Support of:**

- 3) HB 5263 "An Act Authorizing Renewal of State Permit to Carry Pistol or Revolver by Mail"
- 4) HB 5270 "An Act Authorizing Renewal of State Permit to Carry a Pistol or Revolver by Mail or Electronic Submission"
- 5) HB 5643 "An Act Concerning the Carrying of Firearms by Out Of State Residents"
- 6) SB 547 "An Act Concerning Firearms". -- To revise the applicability of the statute regulating the sale, delivery and transfer of handguns and to modify the definition of assault weapon.
- 7) SB 554 "An Act Concerning the Pistol Permit Appeals Process"

**Every citizen has a right
to bear arms in defense
of himself and the state.**
Connecticut State Constitution, Article First, Section 15

SB 552SB 554SB 547HB 5263HB 5270HB 5643SB 695HB 6185HB 5898SB 42

My name is Peter Kuck and I am here today as a citizen of the state of Connecticut. I am also a member of the Board of Firearms Permit examiners and in the name of full disclosure one of the individuals who has filed a Civil Rights suit (Kuck v. Danaher) against the Department of Public Safety in Federal Court. I have previously appeared before this committee on February 18th, 2010 and February 24th 2009.

Since I have appeared before this committee the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled in DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA v. HELLER that the 2nd Amendment of the US Constitution is an individual right and in McDonald v. Chicago that the 2nd amendment is binding on the states in the same manor as the other nine rights enumerated in the bill of rights.

I hope you will consider this in your votes during this season. What this legislature passes this year will either pass Constitutional muster or face Court challenge after Court challenge in Federal Court. Laws that were and are based on the erroneous belief that there was no individual right to keep and bear arms are now patently unconstitutional. Laws that are arbitrary or capricious as well as laws that are based on "local variation or experimentation" will be challenged.

This legislature must be prepared to comply with and fund any court mandated changes that will become necessary to assure the due process and constitutional rights that have been addressed by these two Supreme Courts decisions. We have yet to address 2nd amendment rights in the Manner of Cantwell V Connecticut in which the US Supreme Court ruled (1940) in Part that *"the availability of a judicial remedy for abuses in the system of licensing still leaves that system one of previous restraint which, in the field of free speech and press, we have held inadmissible. A statute authorizing previous restraint upon the exercise of the guaranteed freedom by judicial decision after trial is as obnoxious to the Constitution as one providing for like restraint by administrative action."* When the 2nd amendment was ruled to be an individual right it gained the same constitutional protection as all other individual rights in the US Constitution and therefore even the fees for pistol permits are in all likelihood unlawful.

An argument that a permit is not a license is specious at best. Changing the name does not change reality.

Specific comments in regards to the contents of raised Bill No. 5800 An Act requiring registration of all firearms.

I oppose any language in any bill that would give the Commissioner of Public safety any additional authority regarding the transfer or registration of firearms. DPS has failed to maintain the firearms data base they currently possess as evidenced by over 10,000 missing DPS 3 registration forms in 2009. In cases where the DPS data base is incorrect, it is the citizen who must prove his innocence. DPS has been known to use the process as the punishment against citizens in cases such as these. (email exhibit next page)

I might add that DPS currently requires the submission of DPS 3 registration forms for the sale or transfer of long arms from FFL dealers in the State of Connecticut even though the requirement is not supported by State Statute. By doing this they have proven their unworthiness to be given any more authority.

Specific comments in regards to the contents of raised Bill No. 552 An Act concerning retired officers' authority to carry concealed firearms registration of all firearms.

I support this bill but I would like a change to the bill to allow retired police officers the same rights to carry as the other citizen of this state without mandating concealment for them as a separate class of citizen.

Specific comments in regards to the contents of raised Bill No. 554 An Act concerning firearms the pistol permit appeals process.

I support this bill as a means of enforcing the requirement that the Department of Public Safety investigate the reason for the revocation of a pistol permit and to determine if the revocation was for lawful reason within 10 days of the revocation. The written statement will require the Department of Public Safety to document the Statute that authorizes the revocation without avoiding the legal justification for unlawfully revoked permits. The proper solution is to hold pre-revocation hearings as is due on any constitutional right

Specific comments in regards to the contents of raised Bill No. 547 An Act concerning firearms.

I support this bill as a breath of fresh air in that it returns to Connecticut's citizens the rights and privileges granted to them by The United States government as collectors of federally defined antiques and Curio and Relic firearms.

Specific comments in regards to the contents of raised Bill No. 5263 and 5270 Acts Authorizing renewal of state permits to carry a pistol or revolver by mail (or by electronic submission).

I support this bill as it removes the ability of the Department of Public Safety from adding requirements to the process not supported by law, lowers the cost of processing firearms permit renewals, and adds convenience for the citizens of the state.

Specific comments in regards to the contents of raised Bill No. 5643 An Act concerning the carrying of firearms by out-of-state residents.

I support this bill as it confirms the right of a citizen of the United States to carry a firearm that he is lawfully permitted to carry in his home state. This bill should also protect citizens from Connecticut when traveling in other states through the requirement of reciprocal agreements among the states.

Specific comments in regards to the contents of raised Bills No. 695 and 6185 An Act establishing a gun offender registry.

I oppose this Bill as being unnecessarily redundant, wasteful, and in that it misses the point that we do track violent criminals whether they use knives, gun, or clubs.

Do we need another computer system or is this a plan to pad the bloated DPS budget?

How will another computer system assist law enforcement in the investigation of firearms offenses when these records already exist in other Department of Safety computer systems?

Why wouldn't we register all violent felons, or do we believe that violent felons don't count unless they use guns?

February 9, 2011

To the members of the CT Public Safety Committee:

Please be advised of my support or opposition to the following bills being put forth in the public hearing to be held on Thursday, February 10, 2011.

I oppose the following 3 bills.

HB 5800 AN ACT REQUIRING REGISTRATION OF ALL FIREARMS Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened. That section 29-33 of the general statutes be amended to (1) require that (A) any person who purchases a firearm register the firearm within ten days of purchase, (B) any person who purchased a firearm prior to this statute's effective date register that firearm within ten days of the effective date, (C) any person owning a firearm renew registration every five years, and (D) anyone whose registered firearm is sold, stolen or lost report such sale, theft or loss within ten days of such event; and (2) provide that the Department of Public Safety receive the registrations required by subdivision (1) of this section. Statement of Purpose: To require registration of all firearms.

SB 42 AN ACT CONCERNING GUN SAFETY STANDARDS FOR FIRING RANGES Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened: That chapter 943 of the general statutes be amended to require gun safety standards for any target range that holds a regulatory or business license for the purpose of practicing shooting at that target range. Statement of Purpose: To establish gun safety standards for all firing ranges

HB 6185 AN ACT CREATING A GUN OFFENDER REGISTRY. Purpose: To require that persons convicted of certain gun crimes register their names and addresses with the local police department for the municipality in which they reside

I am in support of the following 5 bills.

HB 5263 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL. Purpose: To permit the holder of a state pistol permit to renew the permit by mail

HB 5270 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL OR BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION. Purpose: To permit the holder of a state permit to carry a pistol or revolver to renew said permit by mail or by electronic submission

HB 5643 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CARRYING OF FIREARMS BY OUT-OF-STATE RESIDENTS. Purpose. To allow an out-of-state resident who holds a license or permit to carry from another state to carry firearms in this state

SB 547 AN ACT CONCERNING FIREARMS. To revise the applicability of the statute regulating the sale, delivery and transfer of handguns and to modify the definition of "assault weapon

SB 554 AN ACT CONCERNING THE PISTOL PERMIT APPEALS PROCESS. Purpose To set certain time limits for pistol permit

John Beidler (203) 808-2143
Southington, CT

I SUPPORT THESE BILLS

HB 5263 - AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL.

HB 5270 - AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL OR BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION.

HB 5643 - AN ACT CONCERNING THE CARRYING OF FIREARMS BY OUT-OF-STATE RESIDENTS

SB 547 - AN ACT CONCERNING FIREARMS

SB 554 - AN ACT CONCERNING THE PISTOL PERMIT APPEALS PROCESS

A Little Gun History

- ***In 1929, the Soviet Union established gun control. From 1929 to 1953, about 20 million dissidents, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated.***
- ***In 1911, Turkey established gun control. From 1915 to 1917, 1.5 million Armenians, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated.***
- ***Germany established gun control in 1938 and from 1939 to 1945, a total of 13 million Jews and others who were unable to defend themselves were rounded up and exterminated.***
- ***China established gun control in 1935. From 1948 to 1952, 20 million political dissidents, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated.***
- ***Guatemala established gun control in 1964. From 1964 to 1981, 100,000 Mayan Indians, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated.***
- ***Uganda established gun control in 1970. From 1971 to 1979, 300,000 Christians, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated***
- ***Cambodia established gun control in 1956. From 1975 to 1977, one million educated people, unable to defend themselves, were rounded up and exterminated.***
- ***Defenseless people rounded up and exterminated in the 20th Century because of gun control: 56 million.***

Guns in the hands of honest citizens save lives and property and, yes, gun-control laws adversely affect only the law-abiding citizens !

SWITZERLAND ISSUES EVERY HOUSEHOLD A GUN!

SWITZERLAND'S GOVERNMENT TRAINS EVERY ADULT THEY ISSUE EACH A RIFLE.

SWITZERLAND HAS THE LOWEST GUN RELATED CRIME RATE OF ANY CIVILIZED COUNTRY IN THE WORLD!!!

February 10, 2011

Good afternoon members of the Public Safety and Security Committee

E. Jonathan Hardy/CT Gun Safety
Middletown, CT
Member of the Connecticut Citizens Defense League
860.251.9118

HB 5643
SB 547 SB 554

I am here to testify on many pieces of proposed legislation, but the theme is the same Redundancy and cost to our citizens in an already suffering economy.

I oppose:

HB 5800 AN ACT REQUIRING REGISTRATION OF ALL FIREARMS

There are several reasons why this proposed legislation isn't good for Connecticut.

Pistols and revolvers are already recorded at the time of purchase. Any time the state needs to find who has purchased one of these firearms, there is a process to look up this information. A registry would not only make this process redundant and repetitious, it forces citizens with already recorded firearms purchases to "rerecord" that information with the state, and if they fail to do so, make them a criminal for an already registered firearm. This process not only is duplicates current effort, but also will cost the state a tremendous amount of money. There is not enough language yet on this bill, but it would be interesting to find out where the funding could be procured for such a registry. There is not one state or nation that has created similar registries and come anywhere near the actual forecasted costs.

There is another issue that I find particularly frightening, the ten day lost or stolen provision of the bill. If a firearm owner is on vacation, sick leave or any similar absence from their home or storage location of a firearm for an extended period of time – they may not know their firearms are yet missing. They can be rendered an instant criminal.

I fail to understand why creating a redundant process would benefit the state, especially at the financial expense involved.

SB 42 AN ACT CONCERNING GUN SAFETY STANDARDS FOR FIRING RANGES

So far, from the current language, I see nothing here that would make any improvements to the range systems here in the state without incurring yet another unneeded financial burden in Connecticut.

As a firearms instructor, I frequent a good number of ranges here in CT (indoor and outdoor) and they all practice very high safety standards that either meet or exceed those used at state facilities (where I practice on a regular basis). It is already in a range's best interest to make sure the range operates safely and I cannot see why any new standards would be needed without any current major issues.

HB 6185 AN ACT CREATING A GUN OFFENDER REGISTRY.

We already have a process in place where we need a background check when we purchase a firearm. That check already verifies whether a purchaser is indeed valid. I can't see any reason why we need yet another expensive process to create more redundancy in the current system.

SUPPORT

HB 5263 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL.

HB 5270 AN ACT AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF STATE PERMIT TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER BY MAIL OR BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION.

These two bills can save a lot of travel, time and expense with the current system. When I went procure my permit last year, there was a wait of almost two hours, for approximately 20 people in line. This has to be costing the state tons of money in wasted revenue for a simple renewal.

HB 5643 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CARRYING OF FIREARMS BY OUT-OF-STATE RESIDENTS

This could create revenue for the state by allowing the growing firearms competition market to bring larger firearms events to CT. These events are often multi-day competition events and can bring plenty of much needed revenue to CT in the form of range fees, ammunition, food and lodging and other similar travel expenses.

SB 547 AN ACT CONCERNING FIREARMS.

SB 554 AN ACT CONCERNING THE PISTOL PERMIT APPEALS PROCESS

We have a large backlog for appeals. Many of these appeals are unjust denials at the local issuing authority level and are very often overturned at hearings. As a firearms instructor, I help students go through the process of acquiring their local permit (which is used to acquire a state permit). Many towns are not complying with current statues and forcing citizens to wait far in excess of statutory time limits to grant or deny a permit.

Right now, we are in the beginning of February and the earliest time for an appeal according to the Board Firearms Permit Examiners website is mid November. If you add that to the time it takes for many people going through the local process, it can take over a year and a half to get a permit.

This is clearly unacceptable.

I thank the committee for their time and am available to answer any questions at any time if needed.

Public Safety and Security Public Hearing
Legislative Office Building, Room 2A
Hartford, CT.
10:00 A.M., February 10, 2011

Members of the Public Safety and Security Committee,

As a concerned citizen of the State of Connecticut, I am adding my support or opposition, as noted, to the following proposed legislative items:

OPPOSE

HB 6185 An Act creating a gun offender registry.

HB 5800 An Act requiring registration of all firearms.

SB 42 An Act concerning gun safety standards for firing ranges.

SB 695 An Act creating a gun offender registry.

SUPPORT

HB 5263 An Act authorizing renewal of state permit to carry a pistol or revolver by mail.

HB 5279 An Act authorizing renewal of state permit to carry a pistol or revolver by mail or by electronic submission.

HB 5643 An Act concerning the carrying of firearms by out-of-state-residents.

SB 547 An Act concerning firearms.

SB 554 An Act concerning the pistol permit appeals process.

HB5270

Respectfully,

William R. Hicks, Ph.D.
Captain, USA, Retired
Member, Connecticut Citizens Defense League, Inc. (CCDL)

30 Plain Hill Road
Baltic, CT. 06330-1023
860-949-8418

S - 633

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2011**

**VOL. 54
PART 22
6915-7208**

cd/lg/sg/mhr/gbr
SENATE

564
June 8, 2011

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Continuing on Calendar page 15, Calendar 595,
House Bill 5263; Madam President, move to place this
item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Also Calendar page 15, Calendar 594, House Bill
5508; Madam President, move to place the item on the
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Moving now, Madam President, to Calendar page 16,
Calendar 606, House Bill 6581; Madam President, move
to place the item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

Madam President, the items placed on the first Consent Calendar begin on Calendar page 10, Calendar Number 478, House Bill 6488; Calendar 480, House Bill 5256.

Calendar page 11, Calendar 513, substitute for House Bill 6557.

Calendar page 12, Calendar Number 535, substitute for House Bill 6226; Calendar 555, House Bill 6259.

Calendar page 13, Calendar 560, substitute for House Bill 5368; Calendar 567, substitute for House Bill 6157.

Calendar page 14, Calendar 574, substitute for House Bill 6410; Calendar 578, House Bill 6156.

Calendar page 15, Calendar 591, House Bill 6263; Calendar 594, substitute for House Bill 5508; Calendar 595, substitute for House Bill 62 -- 5263.

Calendar page 16, Calendar Number 606, substitute for House Bill 6581; Calendar 609, substitute for House Bill 6501.

Calendar page 17, Calendar 610, substitute for House Bill 6224; Calendar 613, substitute for House Bill 6453.

Calendar page 18, Calendar 614, substitute for House Bill 5068; Calendar 628, substitute for House Bill 5008; Calendars 633, House Bill 6489.

Calendar page 19, Calendar 635, substitute for House Bill 6351; Calendar 640, House Bills, 6559.

Calendar page 20, Calendar 642; House Bill 6595.

Calendar page 21, Calendar 645, substitute for House Bill 6267; Calendar 648, substitute for House Bill 5326; Calendar 650, substitute for House Bill 6344.

Calendar page 22, Calendar 651, substitute for House Bill 6540.

Calendar page 23, Calendar Number 655, substitute for House Bill 6497; Calendar 657, substitute for House Bill 6262; Calendar 658, House Bill 6364; Calendar 659, House Bill 5489.

Calendar page 24, Calendar 660, substitute for House Bill 6449.

Calendar page 36 -- correction -- Calendar page 33, Calendar Number 390, substitute for Senate Bill 1181.

Calendar page 36, Calendar Number 481, House Bill 5472.

Calendar page 37, Calendar Number 584, substitute for House Joint Resolution Number 34; Calendar 585, substitute for House Joint Resolution Number 54; Calendar 586, House Joint Resolution Number 65, Calendar 587, House Joint Resolution Number 66.

Calendar page 38, Calendar 588, House Joint Resolution Number 80; Calendar 589, House Joint Resolution Number 63; Calendar 590, House Joint Resolution Number 35; Calendar 620, substitute for House Joint Resolution Number 45.

Calendar page 39, Calendar Number 621, substitute for House Joint Resolution Number 47; Calendar 622, House Joint Resolution Number 68; Calendar 623, substitute for House Joint Resolution Number 69; Calendar 624, substitute for House Joint Resolution Number 73.

Calendar page 40, Calendar 625, substitute for House Joint Resolution Number 81; Calendar 626, House Joint Resolution Number 84.

Madam President, I believe that completes the items placed on Consent Calendar Number 1.

THE CHAIR:

cd/lg/sg/mhr/gbr
SENATE

579
June 8, 2011

Thank you.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call for a roll call vote, and the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The Senate is now voting by roll call on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. The Senate is now voting by roll call on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gomes?

If all members have voted; all members have voted? The machine shall be locked.

And, Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Motion is on adoption of Consent Calendar
Number 1.

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| Total number voting | 36 |
| Those voting Yea | 36 |
| Those voting Nay | 0 |

Those absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar passes.

The Senate will stand at ease for a moment.

(Chamber at ease.)

SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Yes, Senator.

The Senate will come to order.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda Number 5 for today's session.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda Number 5, dated Wednesday, June 8, 2011.

Copies have been made available.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.