

Michael J. Butler  
3 Wellsweep Lane  
Killingworth, CT 06419  
860-663-2231  
[mbutler23@comcast.net](mailto:mbutler23@comcast.net)

## Testimony to Judiciary Committee Public Hearing March 23, 2011

Co-Chairs, Ranking Members and Distinguished Members:

I am a longtime holder of a State Permit to Carry Pistols and Revolvers, a longtime Life Member of NRA, a charter member of CCDL and candidate for NRA Certified Pistol Instructor.

Today I would like to express my complete and immutable opposition to the unconstitutional and unconscionable Raised S.B. No. 1094, An Act Banning Large Capacity Ammunition Magazines. First, this is a misnomer. For many popular firearms, eleven rounds and up is actually *standard* capacity, and is the magazine that the gun is designed for and is supplied with. In fact, there are some firearms for which no lower capacity magazine is even available—imagine having just spent \$700 on a Springfield XDm and having it turned into an expensive paperweight by legislative decree and yourself turned into a felon in the same moment! And even for owners of those guns for which restricted-capacity magazines are available, this is confiscation of private property without compensation, which is an arbitrary unjust taking of legally purchased, legally owned, commercial firearm parts for which the State has benefited from sales tax revenues.

I am not just nitpicking—many of my law-abiding gun owner friends have a very substantial investment in magazines for multiple different firearms they own. This bill would penalize them but produce absolutely zero public safety benefit. Standard capacity, full capacity, typical 20-to-30-round magazines for modern sport rifles—along with their 13-to-19-round pistol counterparts—are important to recreational shooters because using these allows shooters to stay on target without having to interrupt their practice session every 10 rounds, plus it allows them to preload their magazines at home without wasting valuable range time frequently reloading. And for personal defense pistols, the full capacity magazine for which the gun was designed can spell the difference between life and death when defending against assault. Despite the lurid headlines of a lone mad “gunman” shooting multiple victims, real life is usually different. A solo victim gets surprised by a gang of thugs or multiple home invaders, often better armed than he or she is, and must rely on exceptional marksmanship skills—which go out the window under deadly stress—or sheer luck to fight them off. The double-stack magazine that comes with the most popular self-defense firearms, whether it is for 15, 17 or 19 rounds, is an important asset.

This bill is out of step with most of the United States of America, as only three states out of 50 impose 10-round magazine limits. Looking closer to home, not even the notorious gun-control mecca of Massachusetts has as draconian an across-the-board ban as this, and none of the remaining New England states have any magazine capacity bans at all. In a time when gun owners' rights everywhere in this country are being more broadly respected and supported both by legislation and by high court decisions, Connecticut must not veer off in the wrong direction.

This bill, apart from its obvious flaws of: (1) having no impact whatsoever on violent criminals, (2) criminalizing law-abiding citizens, and (3) waste of law enforcement resources on an unenforceable law, is dangerous because of its new precedent: the confiscation of property that some people in government feel we should not own, at the threat of charging us with a felony. What's next? Five-round magazines? Single-shot firearms? Kitchen knives? Alcohol? Tobacco? Potato Chips?

This bill does nothing but to create a whole new class of criminals out of law-abiding citizens at the stroke of the legislative pen while unjustly confiscating their property.

This bill should be rejected, and in my opinion anyone who votes in favor of it should not be re-elected.

Respectfully,  
Michael J. Butler