

March 16, 2009

Thomas R. Walker from Ashford, CT, speaking on Committee Bill No. 353 concerning micro-stamping of semi-automatic pistols.

I oppose the Bill. Linking a used cartridge casing to the firearm that fired it will have little or no use for the following reasons:

- 1.) Most if not all arrests I have heard of or read about involve an illegal possession charge as well. This indicates that the firearms used in crimes are either stolen or otherwise illegally acquired. The micro-stamping will in no way aid law enforcement or enhance public safety based on this observation. Micro-stamping would, in my opinion, aid criminals by giving them an avenue of escape. As an example; a person contemplating a crime steals a firearm that has been purchased and stored legally, (No security measures are fool-proof.) commits a crime soon after, before the legal owner knows the firearm is missing, discharges the weapon leaving micro-stamped shell casings at the scene, then disposes of the firearm. The only suspect law enforcement would have would be a lead to a law-abiding citizen who had been burglarized.
- 2.) There is no way to stop a criminal contemplating a crime from going to a pistol range or other legal shooting area and picking up shell casings lost or left by a law-abiding citizen. Criminals savvy to the law could easily send the law enforcement agency investigating a crime on a "wild goose chase" by planting these picked up casings at a crime scene. The result of such a deception would cause lost time and money to the investigating agency, the questioning of a law abiding citizen, and allow the real perpetrator(s) time to escape.
- 3.) This Bill would be a financial burden to law-abiding, tax paying, voting citizens. Micro-stamping will cause the law-abiding citizen to incur additional charges in pursuit of their chosen sport through the increased cost of purchasing a firearm that has micro-stamping capabilities. Any new technology always comes at a high price because of the research and development involved. I believe this Bill would also limit the selection of available firearms, possibly setting up a situation where those with the technology could "gouge" the consumer until competitors "caught up" with them. The language regarding the Attorney General certifying that there be more than one manufacturer is too vague. Two manufacturers are not enough for fair trade.

In conclusion, I believe Committee Bill No. 353 will not aid, and may hinder law enforcement. It will not enhance the safety of the public. I further recommend that the Committee issue "no report" on this Public Hearing so that this Bill will fail.