This addendum will update the **FALSE NARRATIVE** supporting the police reform agenda and to respond to a reform not previously addressed.

Nineteen-year veteran Officer Eric Chauvin’s reckless act of kneeling on George Floyd’s neck for over 8 minutes does not represent the actions of Officers on his shift, Minneapolis Officers, Officers in our country and certainly not Connecticut Officers. Yet this isolated incident has fueled the attack on police and led to knee jerk reactions to reform policing. Police hate groups and the media falsely accuse police in general of racism and brutality. Yesterday ABC News announced a presentation about “Seven mothers who have lost sons and daughters to POLICE BRUTALITY.” It includes the mothers of Ahmaud Arbery and Travon Martin who died in incidents unrelated to police. It also includes the mother of Botham Jean who was shot by an off-duty officer in an incident unrelated to law enforcement. None of the cases involves actual police brutality. The show is an example of the media’s false portrayal of police perpetuating the myth that police are killing innocent people because of their race.

The truth is the 3 Officers shot and killed in the last 5 days are more than the number of innocent Black men shot and killed by police in the last 5 years. Thirty Officers have been shot and killed this year. Politicians inflamed by the media and protests are rushing to judgment rather than taking the time to discover the truth and make rational decisions.

I don’t think I am overstating the danger of fueling the attack on police and the need to calm down, research the evidence and then act in the best interest of our State. Reacting to false allegations against police will turn out to be another stain on our Nation’s history. Our government passed Jim Crow legislation because of fear and dislike of Blacks, Hollywood Blacklisting was based on fear and dislike of those harboring communist beliefs, Internment of Japanese resulted from a fear and dislike of Japanese during WWII and now laws attacking police are being proposed out of fear and dislike of police based on false information.

The problem with this type of legislation is that it fuels the attack on police and creates an untrue negative image of law enforcement that goes beyond harming police officers. With reduced numbers of quality police staying in and entering the profession, de-policing, and the destruction of police community relations leading to less effective community protections,
we will continue to see more violence and reduced law enforcement. It is also no exaggeration to say the attack on police has resulted in and will exponentially lead to more unnecessary deaths. If we truly care about Black lives (to be distinguished from BLM organization) and the safety of all in Connecticut, we must evaluate what is happening and make prudent decisions only after careful consideration of the need for changes based on the facts here in our State.

We cannot stand by silently as people and politicians did in the face of Jim Crow, Blacklisting or Interning Japanese Americans. WE need to fully oppose any changes that will negatively affect police and their ability to enforce laws. We need to improve police community relationships and work together to make our communities safer. Unfairly condemning police is counterproductive to that end. We cannot be afraid to confront the mob and tell the truth.

Our State Legislature is not in a better position to craft law related to police liability or enforcement powers than our Supreme and Appellate Courts.

**PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE CONSENT AS A JUSTIFICATION TO CONDUCT SEARCH**

This proposal ignores the law and undisputed realities.

1. Under the law there is no consent if there is coercion.
2. People die because they are killed with illegally possessed weapons, use illegal drugs and are murdered by dangerous people.
3. Legal consensual searches lead to the discovery of illegal weapons, drugs and the apprehension of dangerous criminals.

The legislature should first identify the problem by determining how many innocent people are asked for consent and what is the scope of the subsequent search and inconvenience? The answer will provide us with the measure of harm this legislation will prevent. However, it must be taken into consideration that the consent search may benefit the person.
Police may detain individuals with the low standard of reasonable suspicion and even detain them in or outside their houses with probable cause. If this law is passed a person may tell the officer they have nothing to hide and beg them to search their person, home or belongings, but the police officer will have to tell them NO. “The legislature passed a law prohibiting us for conducting consensual searches so we have to detain you to wait for a canine or get a search warrant.”

The most important function of government is to protect people. More people are probably stopped every day at a busy airport than all people detained during consensual searches in a year. Yet more people are killed by illegal guns, drugs and dangerous people each year than by people bringing guns or explosives on planes. We all suffer inconvenience in exchange for public safety.

**THE ULTIMATE QUESTION FOR LEGISLATORS:** Your loved one is killed by someone using an illegal weapon, someone who sold them drugs or a dangerous criminal. Do you wish a police officer had conducted a minimally intrusive consensual search for guns or drugs before your loved one died? How many consensual searches equal the value of an innocent person’s life?

Our judicial authorities have fine-tuned the standards on detentions, searches and use of force over hundreds of years. Does the legislature really presume they know better?