

Comments from:
Michael Aron
40 North Quaker Lane,
West Hartford CT 06119
860-523-7257

PUBLIC HEARING
Joint Committee on the Judiciary
Wednesday, March 23, 2011
Room 2C LOB.

To Members of the Joint Committee on the Judiciary:

I am sending this testimony to you to **OPPOSE H.B. No. 1094** - AN ACT BANNING LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION MAGAZINES.

I am opposed to this bill for three reasons:

First, this bill is “feel good legislation” that does nothing to prevent crime. Someone intent on committing a crime with a firearm does not care whether large capacity magazines are banned or not. That person will use them anyway. If that person can’t get a hold of high capacity magazines, they will just get more ten-round magazines. Do you know how easy it is to drop an empty magazine and reload another one into a weapon? It takes less time that it just took me to talk about it. So banning 15-20 round magazines will do nothing to prevent mass killings.

Second, today, Connecticut gun owners who own such magazines as are proposed to be banned by this bill are law abiding citizens. If this bill passes, they will become criminals overnight, without having done anything. This clearly falls under the definition of an ex post facto law. An ex post facto law was defined by Supreme Court Justice Samuel Chase in *Calder v. Bull* (1798) as “Every law that makes an action done before the passing of the law, and which was innocent when done, criminal, and punishes such action.” Ex post facto laws are expressly forbidden by the US Constitution in Article I, Section 9, Clause 3 – “No...ex post facto Law shall be passed”. This applies to the Federal Government. The prohibition of ex post facto state laws is found in Article I Section 10, Clause 1 – “No State shall...pass any Bill of Attainder or ex post facto law...”

Given all that, this bill is unconstitutional and should never have gotten to this point.

Third, this bill imposes economic hardships on gun owners, gun shops and gun manufacturers who do business in this State. With our State’s weak economy, and businesses leaving the state in droves, we should be doing everything to encourage more business to come to Connecticut, not driving more businesses away.

In summary, I am opposed to this bill because it will not prevent crime; it makes ordinary citizens into criminals overnight and is therefore an unconstitutional ex post facto law; and it imposes undue economic hardships to citizens and businesses in this state. Please kill this bill.

Thank you for your time,
Michael Aron