

Public Hearing testimony for Proposed Bill 1094

My name is Philip Axelrod, and I am a gun owner here today to voice his disapproval of Proposed Bill 1094. I am also a college student, attending the University of Connecticut as a Secondary Biology Education major, and am president of the Uconn Pistol and Rifle Club. As the president and co-founder of this club, I have taught more than 200 new shooters how to safely fire a firearm. I'm a former competitive shooter, and was the captain of my high school rifle team. I have shot thousands of rounds from dozens of different types and styles of firearms from single-shot rifles to big-bore machine guns. In addition to all of this, I worked for three years at a range and gun store. I tell you all these things to give you an idea of my experience with firearms and my passion for the shooting sports.

This bill, 1094, talks about banning magazines that hold more than ten rounds of ammunition. At this point in time, most new firearms made are fed by magazine. A magazine is basically a box that holds rounds until they are loaded into the chamber of a firearm and fired. Magazines are inanimate objects with no will of their own. They do not convert a firearm to fully automatic, they do not increase the range or power of the projectile, and they do not warp the mind of the person holding the firearm into that of a crazy person, hell-bent on murder and destruction. They hold rounds.

In the year 1935, the Browning Hi-Power was released to the public for purchase. This was the first handgun to use a detachable double-stack magazine, and held thirteen rounds. Since the Hi-Power, most handguns chambered in anything smaller than the .45 ACP cartridge have been designed to hold more than ten rounds. Calling a ten round magazine a "large capacity magazine" is patently inaccurate. A Glock 17, arguably the most-issued police side-arm in the world right now, holds seventeen rounds. A Smith and Wesson M&P9 holds the same. The CZ-75 that I routinely carry holds fourteen rounds. Almost every production handgun designed in the last eighty years has been designed to hold more than ten rounds in the magazine. These are not large, but standard-capacity. There is a

similar story that accompanies rifles, but I will spare you more history lessons.

This bill would do nothing but hurt Connecticut gun owners, branding them as criminal for owning the firearms that are their constitutionally-guaranteed right to keep and bear. Anyone who owns an AR-15 (currently the most popular style of rifle on the market and one of the most popular of all time), anyone who owns a Glock for self-defense, almost everyone who carries a modern semi-automatic pistol or own a modern semi-automatic rifle, would have to turn in or destroy their magazines or be committing a Class-D Felony. And do you know what most of them would do? They would turn in their magazine or destroy them. Gun owners are by-and-large law abiding citizens, and their ownership of firearms proves it. We must already pass background checks to buy them and must be licensed to carry them.

But there is a certain class of person who would not turn in or destroy the magazines in question. These people have little or no respect for the laws of society and would likely consider it a boon to their work if they were better armed than those around them. I refer, of course, to criminals. This law, if passed, would serve no purpose other than to add a trumped-up charge to someone already being arrested. The state police are not prepared, and never will be, to do a house-to-house search of every gun-owner in the state to look for contraband magazines, making it unenforcible except in those circumstances where a different crime had already been committed.

Bill 1094 does not make Connecticut safer, in fact it hampers the ability free citizens... MY ability... OUR ability... to adequately defend ourselves, our property, and our loved ones from those that would seek to do them harm. It was conceived as reactionary politics in response to the tragedy in Arizona. It has no basis other than the actions of one madman , Jarred Loughner, and seeks to paint all gun owners with his same brush. I implore the committee to strike down this poorly-thought-out bill here and now on behalf of all of the Connecticut shooting community.

Thank you.