

## Testimony of Chris Kalkreuth 3/14/2013

Honorable members of the Public Safety and Security Committee, my name is Chris Kalkreuth of Middlefield. I am a lifelong resident of CT, long-time firearm owner, pistol permit holder, range safety officer, hunter and competitive shooter.

I am here today in opposition numerous gun control bills SB505, SB710, SB299, SB1071, HB6162, HB6595, HB6598, and especially SB1076

SB505 Rifle Minimum age limit... Consider the following scenario, a young child grows up in a household with guns, understands guns and gun safety, respects them, hunts and target shoots. Turns 18, graduates high school and moves out of their parents' home. Possibly even having a child by now, for all intents and purposes they are an adult. But you are saying to this adult "I'm sorry for the next 3 years you will continue to be barred from buying or possessing all forms of the most effective survival tool available to a human. Preventing 18-20 year olds from buying long guns will not prevent them from gaining access. After all Lanza didn't buy his guns they were given to him... Or maybe they were stolen? Maybe he threatened his mother to give them over? Maybe he just had access to them? We don't know do we? We don't know all we can about the Lanzas house, how the guns were stored or what happened with him and his mother, or with him inside that school. We only know the people that were killed. We have more questions than answers and I believe acting on a large portion of gun control legislation before we learn what the state police concludes from their investigation is extremely unwise and a massive disservice to ALL victims of gun crime. Especially the victims of Sandy Hook!

SB710 OPPOSE: I don't understand how requiring a permit for a gun show prevents people from getting killed.

Regarding SB299, I am unfamiliar with the capabilities of the CT State-wide Police Emergency Network but this to me seems like a good idea but consider expanding this system to communicate more than just what you are proposing in this bill. Is a law even necessary to do this?

SB1071 OPPOSE: Contrary to what Governor Malloy states on TV and in his letters to the manufacturers clearly this sector of industry is not welcome here, this gives them even more reason to leave taking their jobs and tax revenue with them!

HB6162 OPPOSE: The idea of increasing the waiting time here may be prudent but including the language of "or a person in the household of such applicant" is likely to discourage anyone from seeking this kind of help first place. I don't want to discourage that and it will certainly not help relieve the stigma associated with mental issues.

HB6595 OPPOSE: Hunting with firearms already has this restriction, but I believe this bill threatens my gun club. The existence of the gun club I belong to could be threatened if one of the neighbors decided to improve their property by building an addition to their home or a secondary structure that could be defined as a residence or by removing their permission to let us continue our lawful activities. Judging from what I saw using GIS my club is not the only range that would be at risk, others look like they might be shut down or severely restricted the day this bill becomes law!

HB6598 OPPOSE: If a citizen has their arms seized assuming the rest of requirements of this bill are satisfied and such order expires, the citizens arms should be automatically returned. This isn't supposed to be a punishment but rather a precaution.

SB1076 STRONGLY OPPOSE:

- 1076 bans more types of guns than we already do, based on the flawed principal that banning certain types of semi-automatic guns based on what they look like saves lives. It doesn't, there's no proof that it does.
- It also prevents my future children from inheriting any gun meeting your criteria

- We all agree on what a long gun is, what a hand gun is or what a machine gun is. But what's an assault weapon? Whatever you say it is. It's arbitrary and misguided. If this is how you choose how to go about protecting the public you will find yourself here again and again trying to tweak this law. This is A LOT of effort for something that is RARELY used in crimes ANYWHERE and unfortunately looks like it applies to a lot of firearms that CT citizens rely on for self-defense as this is not just applicable to rifles but handguns and shotguns.
- The system we have in place for background checks is heavily overburdened right now, requiring that essentially the entire application process start over again just for a renewal of a permit or firearm registration card will be extremely expensive and inefficient. I don't know what the backlogs are like for this process normally but I'm hearing this is taking longer and longer.
- Body armor has many practical nonaggressive uses and a CT civilian is likely to face body armor on the streets, but you would remove their ability to keep it? Not that everyone walks around with body armor on but keeping it in your home handy in-case of home invasion is just one highly legitimate use for this life saving device. A safe backstop to point at when loading / unloading firearms or dry practice in your home is very useful especially if you live in a very densely populated building. Also many times body armor saves a life it is not because it stopped a bullet. Severe car crashes are much more survivable just as one example.
- Mandatory gun registration is a very dangerous proposition. Many people will not follow this leading law enforcement to jump to conclusions that may be very dangerous about gun ownership! This database in the wrong hands could be a shopping list for criminals. Also consider CT requires the registration of assault weapons and most handguns in the state are De-Facto registered. Adding long guns to this list adds a HUGE amount of data to this project.
- Even Canada recently abandoned the long gun registry because of how costly the project was and what little if any impact the database had on crime. The goal of these types of legislation should be to reduce and prevent crime. This doesn't do that and criminals are certainly not registering their guns. I also need to point out that registration is a necessary step towards confiscation which the registry in Canada WAS used for, another reason it was recently abandoned!
- Some guns I own do not have serial #'s as they are old and were made without them!
- Your restrictions on ammunition purchasing will make it impossible for a large portion of visiting gun owners and hunters to buy ammo and severely restricts where CT citizens can obtain theirs. It also does not stop crime.
- Requiring me to carry my registration card with the firearm makes me very likely to lose it.
- Reregistering every firearm in the state annually will be one heck of a burden on gun owners and the state and serves as a system that will trip up law abiding citizens if they lose a card or miss a firearm or fail to renew every last firearm in time. **IT WILL NOT STOP CRIMINALS FROM OBTAINING GUNS AND THEY WON'T REGISTER THEIRS!**
- Background checks for each renewal..? Now you are asking for trouble... How large a department are you going to create to manage this process? I know for a fact no department currently exists in such a capacity to take this on at any level! Consider a collector if they move and owned 50+ firearms what happens if they change their address? What happens if I store firearms at another secure location that is not my home? What do I do with the card?