

Testimony by Glenn Frankfurter
On Senate Bill 1094
March 23, 2011

Good morning. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity today to testify in opposition of Senate Bill 1094 - An Act Banning Large Capacity Ammunition Magazines. I am here representing myself and over two hundred other members of the Matabasset Rifle and Pistol Club located in Berlin, CT. We oppose this bill in its entirety.

There is no benefit in this bill, nor would it make anyone safer. Criminals, who are already breaking the law, would have no compunction against breaking this proposed law as well. We all know that criminals are not going to turn their magazines over 10 rounds in with the rest of the law abiding citizens of Connecticut. Even if they did, there would be nothing at all to stop these criminals from traveling out-of-state to purchase new magazines over 10 rounds. So who, in fact, does this proposed bill affect?

The answer is simple: The only people legislation like this would affect are law abiding citizens - and this is unacceptable.

Limits on magazine capacity only help to stack the odds against law abiding citizens and homeowners in the case of a home invasion scenario or violent assault. When you factor in the reality that a third of aggravated assaults and robberies involve more than one assailant and that it may take *three or more* shots to effectively stop an aggressor (according to the Justice Department's Bureau of Justice Statistics) the obvious need for more than ten rounds in a defensive scenario becomes apparent.

These magazines are standard equipment for handguns and other firearms owned by tens of millions of Americans. Besides using these magazines for self and home defense, gun owners own them for competitive or recreational shooting, as key parts of collectible firearms, and for other lawful purposes. There are national and international shooting competition disciplines like IPSC/USPSA and Steel Challenge which use larger capacity magazines routinely. If this bill passes, those who shoot these sporting matches from CT are out of luck and there certainly won't be any more sanctioned matches here - equaling a loss of revenue for this state. Additionally, there are some firearms where there is no such thing as a ten round or less magazine available. This bill would make the owners of these firearms owners of expensive paperweights.

The National "assault weapons ban" took effect in 1994 and ran through 2004. The infamous Columbine shooting occurred in 1999. There were 5 other mass shootings during the ban period. Obviously, these bans do not prevent or hinder people intent on doing harm to others. So, I ask: Who does this bill benefit?

After the expiration of that ban in 2004 a comprehensive study by the Centers for Disease Control - which could hardly be called a pro-gun entity - looked at the full range of gun-control measures, including the ban on magazines over 10 rounds. It concluded that none, *not one*, could be proven to reduce crime. Another study, commissioned by Congress and released in March 1997 found that the banned weapons and magazines "were never involved in more than a modest fraction of all gun murders." The study also "failed to produce any evidence that the ban reduced the number of victims per gun homicide incident" and that "the average number of gunshot wounds per victim [about two] did not decrease" during the ban.

Furthermore, if passed, this bill would turn law-abiding citizens into felons overnight. Personally, I think a much better course of action would be to strengthen the punishments and minimum sentences for gun-related crimes. That way criminals convicted of these horrible crimes would get stiffer penalties and law abiding citizens would be unaffected and their rights would remain intact. This is the way our criminal and legal system is *supposed* to work.

I am all for creating and more importantly enforcing laws that punish criminals and create a safer society. This bill does not accomplish that; it makes criminals out of ordinary people who choose to exercise a fundamental right that a minority of the US population disagrees with.

I ask that you oppose this bill and support the law-abiding firearm owners of Connecticut. It would do nothing to combat crime and only serves to infringe upon the second amendment rights of Connecticut's citizens.

Thank You all for your time.

Glenn Frankfurter

Member and Representative, MRPC
Howe Ave
Shelton, CT 06484
203-455-7918
glennfrank@comcast.net

