

Smith, Michael

From: Chris Beaulieu [cbliberty@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 10:00 PM

To: Smith, Michael

Subject: Testimony in Opposition to SB1094

I'm writing to voice my opposition to SB 1094.

I grew up with shooting sports, and am an active member of the Rockville Fish and Game Club. During my graduate studies at UConn I was honored to be able to shoot competitively on the UConn Skeet & Trap Team, and I still sometimes teach new shooters as an alumni member of the UConn Pistol and Rifle Club.

I oppose this bill for several reasons.

As a sportsman, many of the firearms that I practice and compete with accept magazines with a capacity greater than 10 rounds. Most shooting events that I participate in require such magazines. If this ban is enacted, I will no longer be able to enjoy my favorite shooting sports in CT.

Further, this bill would require law-abiding gun owners to surrender our magazines by July, or face confiscation and a felony charge. This would require me to give up hundreds of dollars worth of equipment, without recourse or compensation.

There are literally millions of magazines in circulation in CT that would be banned under this bill. In fact, some of the largest manufacturers of such magazines are located here in CT. Manufacturers including Colt, C Products, Mec-Gar, OKAY Industries and Metalform would all be affected by this ban. Not only would CT taxpayers be required to pay for the massive confiscation of personal property, but we'd also lose out on jobs and tax revenue due to the impact the bill would have on these companies.

To those who claim that these magazines have no legitimate self-defense purpose, I have one question: Will the police also be required to turn in their large capacity magazines? Surely our police officers in CT are not mass-murderers, but every single one carries a sidearm with more than 10 rounds of ammunition in a standard magazine. If there is no legitimate defensive purpose, then why will the police be allowed to carry them?

Independent studies have repeatedly shown that magazine capacity restrictions (as in the 1994 Federal Assault Weapons Ban) are ineffective at reducing crime. This bill is based on fear and ignorance. It will destroy jobs, cost taxpayers dearly, and could not possibly result in any life-saving reduction in crime. In fact, it may have the opposite effect when a responsible gun owner is left un-armed after handing in his magazines.

For these common-sense reasons, **I urge you to oppose SB 1094.**

Sincerely,

Christopher L. Beaulieu
(860)550-2197
cbliberty@gmail.com

3/23/2011