

COALITION OF CONNECTICUT SPORTSMEN

P.O. Box 2506, Hartford, CT 06146, (203) 245-8076

www.ctsportsmen.com

ccsct@comcast.net

Testimony presented to the JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

IN OPPOSITION to S.B. No. 1094 (RAISED) AN ACT BANNING LARGE CAPACITY AMMUNITION MAGAZINES.

by Robert T. Crook, Director

03/24/11

Knee-jerk reactions are almost always wrong and ill-conceived. Proof: If this issue was of such concern to proponents why wasn't it introduced prior to the Arizona shooting? And

The issue is not new. The Federal Assault Weapons Ban, which was effective from 1994-2004, defined high capacity magazines as holding more than 10 rounds if removable, and 5 rounds if fixed. The law, including magazine provisions, was repealed as ineffective.

Where is ANY data that this proposal has reduced crime or gun violence? Or why is there not any reasoned standard for High Capacity magazines? Reason- Most are feel good, knee-jerk legislation. California law, from which this bill was probably copied, defines "large capacity magazine" as any feeding device with the capacity to accept more than ten rounds. Under litigation.

Hawaii: prohibits magazines in excess of **ten rounds** which are designed for use with a **pistol**.

Illinois: each municipality has their own statutes regarding high capacity magazines. Aurora, **15 rounds**; Chicago, **12 rounds**; Franklin Park, **16 rounds**; Oak Park, **10 rounds**; Riverdale, **35 rounds**.

Maryland: prohibits high capacity magazines of more than **20 rounds** of ammunition.

Massachusetts: Large capacity magazines for rifles & shotguns **may be possessed** by holders of a Class A or B license to carry; for handguns **may be possessed** by persons holding a Class A license to carry

New Jersey: **15 rounds** in a semiautomatic firearm.

New York: more than **ten rounds** manufactured after September 13, 1994 (Assault Weapon bill carryover)

This Bill does three things extraordinarily well:

- 1) It has ZERO EFFECT on CRIME and REAL Criminals.
- 2) It makes instant FELONS of law-abiding citizens with a stroke of the pen.
- 3) It will cost CT residents and the State money, restrict citizen rights, leave them defenseless, and turn many law abiding citizens into felons unless they forfeit their **rightfully owned and purchased property**.

What is the cost to the State for this bill if passed? State & local Police manpower to accept received property, evidence tag, logging, Chain of custody, Storage, plus overtime. Should there be a court case – law enforcement must maintain magazines and if the court rules against the statute then return the magazines to owners. **Enforce the laws we have. Reestablish the gang task force to get at the gangbangers and prosecute them. Reestablish The Gun Trafficking Task Force to determine who's selling guns and where the guns are coming from. Attacking gun owners who are law abiding is NOT the answer.**

As for the question "why would anyone need over a 10 round magazine," anyone who knows anything about firearm self defense knows that you want as many bullets loaded as you can carry in a practical manner. **Have you ever wondered why nobody carries a single shot self defense weapon?** He throws the most lead usually wins.

We strongly urge you to reject this bill as having no effect on crime; penalizes law abiding citizens; constitutes inappropriate costs to the state, police, and citizens; and has no data to demonstrate effectiveness.