

3/18/11

SB 1094 An Act Banning Large Capacity Ammunition Magazines

Members of the Judiciary Committee, Good morning.

I'm writing you today to voice my strong **opposition** of SB 1094. This piece of legislation is totally unnecessary and a further restriction that only affects law abiding gun owners. Almost every magazine for magazine fed firearms has a capacity over 10 rounds. I for one will have to forfeit all of the magazines I possess and it will leave me effectively defenseless. I would be defenseless to defend myself and my family against acts such as the Petit family home invasion and murders that took place in Cheshire. I see no reason or factual evidence to prove a high capacity magazine ban will do any good. Legal action is currently underway in CA to repeal their high capacity magazine ban. All this bill will do is cost CT residents money, restrict their rights, leave them defenseless, and turn many law abiding citizens into felons unless they forfeit their rightfully owned and purchased property. Standard capacity magazines are in common use in the state of CT and elsewhere in the U.S. They are in common use because they have been in continuous circulation, they wear out (gun owners buy replacements) and they are often provided with new guns. If gun ownership is around 16.7% in CT, that puts around 580,000+ gun owners in CT and therefore a lot of magazines. The proposed bill is draconian in that it will make hundreds of thousands of otherwise law-abiding gun owners in CT Class D felons - with the stroke of a pen. The proposed bill is a taking of private property, particularly for those of us who have invested hundreds or even thousands of dollars in magazines. Article 1, Section 9, Clause 3 of The Constitution specifically makes ex post facto laws – literally, after the fact – unconstitutional. The proposed bill will hamstring law abiding citizens more than it will stop violent criminals. Connecticut in general has very strict firearms laws already on the books; they also have some of the most stringent laws in order to legally purchase firearms. Only well intentioned, law abiding citizens would comply with this proposed law, which would put them at a disadvantage against violent criminals who most certainly would not abide by such legislation. Criminals will still be able to obtain magazines from out of state.

Likewise, I **OPPOSE: SB 1096 An Act Concerning The Criminal Possession And Seizure of Firearm Ammunition**

This makes no sense on the simple fact that the sale of ammunition is for the most part unrestricted. Ammunition could be reacquired after seizure. I cannot see any benefit in this legislation.

I would like to **FULLY SUPPORT: SB 1210 An Act Concerning The Use Of Deadly Physical Force To Defend The Residents Of A Home.**

This makes perfect sense to me. Why would I not be allowed to stop someone from entering my home to may do me or my family physical harm? There is already some provision for this in the CT code but, allowing people to defend their homes without the fear of prosecution is always a good idea. Many States have enacted some sort of "Castle Doctrine" and there has not been "blood in the streets" as many have feared.

Thank you,

Ryan Dubey

Meriden, CT