

Thank you all for letting me come out here this morning (or afternoon) to speak. My name is Krystopher Lawrence Dibella. I am 21 years old, and I reside in the town of South Windsor Connecticut. I've been around firearms my entire life as my father is a member of the NRA and a member of a local rifle range. Like my father I also own various firearms and have always treated them with the utmost care and due diligence that is required. I am recently a certified National Rifle Association Pistol Instructor, and will soon be teaching pistol safety courses in order educate people on how to care for their firearms, how they work, and proper range safety techniques. Upon discovering the existence of SB 353, I pondered the negative implications this would have on the community of legal firearm owners. In addition, I also realized the adverse impact this bill would have on not only Connecticut's economy, but it would effect U.S. Economy as a whole. Although State Senator Looney's idea of creating a tool to help solve and reduce crime as a whole is very salient to community, this legislation will only prove to be more burdensome to many. The social stability that this bill tries to create does not solve the core problems related to gun violence. In addition, passing this bill would be disastrous for the Connecticut Economy already facing a rise in foreclosures on homes, increasing layoffs specifically from manufacturing companies such as United Technologies, and those whom have lost money in their pensions, IRA's, and/or investments tied with the bank failures of last fall. Overall, this bill would be disastrous for the community already facing tough economic times.

So why is Micro Stamping such a bad idea? The idea behind this bill is to assist law enforcement in being able to apprehend perpetrators committing serious crimes involving firearms. While this sounds all well in good, ultimately in the end it will be nothing more than a nuisance to law enforcement already overburdened with trying to murders. For example, lets say someone breaks into my house and steals my pistol which is in a locked container. I contact the local authorities to report the theft, however, a year later the firearm was used in a murder that was out of state. Since under this legislation my firearm and ammunition were micro-stamped, which allowed authority to identify the murder weapon using this technology. That's all well and good, except for the fact that the firearm is not registered to the murderer, so the crime is still unsolved, and the murderer is still on the loose. Micro stamping semi-automatic pistols will not reduce crime nor will it deter it from occurring. If someone intends on taking another life, they will do so by any means necessary even if they have to resort to using another weapon. We need to focus our resources on apprehending illegal firearm smugglers, traders, and consumers. In conjunction with that, we need to penalize those criminals more severely, and attack this root problem at its core.

The economic implications of this bill could not come at a worse time. Already the manufacturing sector has suffered critical losses with Caterpillar laying off thousands of people as well as United Technologies, and other industrial firms. Most economists project continuous economic decline this quarters with fear of the collapse of General Motors, AIG, and Citigroup. Although the Dow Jones Industrial Average increased last week by over 600 points, that doesn't mean that the economy has improved. Local firearm manufacturers such as Smith and Wesson located in Massachusetts, and Colt as well as Stag Arms located in Connecticut would be drastically effected by this bill. The cost to retool and develop micro-stamping technology would burden these companies into complying with state regulations that would ultimately place additional burden on

the economy. In order to pay for the additional cost to micro-stamp each firearm and bullet, firearm manufacturers will have to expand an additional line of credit from their lending institutions, or issue other debt instruments, which will further cut into company profits through higher Cost of Sales, and Financing expenses. Prices for firearms as a result will increase creating a squeeze on firearm dealerships competing for customers, and the consumers purchasing the firearms. Since the cost of firearms will increase, the likely hood that sales will decrease more exponentially since this market tends to have elastic demand. With all of these factors interacting, the likelihood that these companies will lay off workers in order to remain profitable and competitive is extremely high. This effects us directly since Colt Manufacturer's and Stag Arms is located in Hartford, and New Britain respectively. Although Connecticut is the only state to shoulder such a bold initiative, this will create tension among the states since many state governments would not chose to adopt this legislation. Firearm manufacturers will terminate some of their business with Connecticut firearm dealerships, because the cost to manufacture the products will outweigh the economic benefits from continuing this business relationship. In order to remain competitive in a declining economy, companies will do whatever it takes to cut costs, even if it means severing business relations as I mentioned. As a state and as a nation we need to remain united and competitive in the global economy, and we need to export our goods overseas to keep international trade strong. This bill is counter intuitive to our American spirit to be able to grow, live, and prosper in order to live the American dream, and places further burden onto our economy.

You've all heard the phrase, "Guns don't kill people, people kill people." Well my belief is that "People have been at war with another since they came into being and will continue to do so until we are all extinct. You cant change human nature." I wish to thank everyone in this chamber to allow me to openly express my opinion on this sensitive topic.

*I also want to give a special thanks to Corey Matfess who could not be here. He contributed to the economic portion of this speech.

Thanks again.