

---

## HB 5220 - Unanimous vote in favor

---

**Rep. Mushinsky, Mary** <Mary.Mushinsky@cga.ct.gov>  
To: Rich Burgess <connecticutcarry@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 9, 2012

[No, we took out the 1,500 feet to protect my constituents. It only affects schools now. Police testified in favor as they do not wish to accidentally shoot a child. Mary Mushinsky](#)

---

**Rich Burgess** <connecticutcarry@gmail.com>  
To: "Rep. Mushinsky, Mary" <Mary.Mushinsky@cga.ct.gov>  
Cc: Diana Urban <Diana.Urban@cga.ct.gov>

Fri, Mar 9, 2012

Representative Mushinsky,  
Thank you for taking the time to respond.

I am unclear as to what question in my several detailed correspondences you are referring to when you say "No". Hopefully you will clarify.

I am certainly glad you took out the 1,500 feet clause. Now is the time for you to further protect your constituents by helping to get rid of this bill banning toys and tools without orange tips on them in their homes and making them into criminals for simply possessing this property with no ill intent or negative behavior.

As far as these police officers who testified that they did not want to 'accidentally shoot a child', could you explain what you believe this means? How will this law fix this issue?

Allow me to elaborate:

1) Do you believe this law is unique in comparison to school rules? To clarify, do you believe that schools do not already prohibit facsimile firearms in their schools? Would you admit that being expelled from school for having a facsimile firearm would be more of a penalty than any infraction you have the power to issue?

2) Do you believe 53-206c is not adequate to arrest a person using a facsimile firearm in a school? If not, could you please explain how your view aligns with this news article? <http://www.wtnh.com/dpp/news/crime/man-flashes-gun-look-alike-arrested>

3) Police don't 'accidentally shoot' children who point guns (real or not, loaded or not) at them. They do so intentionally, and for good reason. They perceive an imminent threat to themselves or to others in close proximity. It is tragic, but no law has ever or will ever stop a person from bringing a firearm or a facsimile firearm to a school if they are intent on doing harm. I cannot imagine a child who does not already know that it is 'wrong' and 'against the rules' to bring a firearm, whether real or fake, to school with them. Sometimes you just have to understand that you cannot legislate against every potential tragedy.

4) If your intent, at the request of police officers, was to prevent children from coming to school with fake firearms, why is this bill not limited only to the scope of 'school grounds'? Instead, it bans possession of a 'look-a-like' everywhere in the state.

5) Which member of your committee was the one to draft the 1500 feet language into the bill?

Just so we are crystal clear, your assertion that "It only affects schools now" is demonstrably false:

(2) No person shall possess any look-a-like firearm with coloration or markings, as required by any applicable state or federal law or regulation, that have been altered, changed, defaced, removed, painted, embossed or obliterated.

I look forward to your clarifications to my questions.

Respectfully,

Rich Burgess  
President

***Connecticut Carry, Inc***

Ph: [203.208.9577](tel:203.208.9577)

<http://ctcarry.com>