

David Perry
Glastonbury Ct

Connecticut General Assembly Public Hearing On Violence March 14, 13

I am here today to express opposition to the following gun bills SB , 505, 506, 710, 897 and 1076 as well as HB 6162, 6251, 6595 and 6598.

I strongly oppose ANY bill that specifically limits either A) What firearm I may own and B) how many rounds a magazine or firearm may legally contain.

This recent push on gun control is simply an emotional response to the attack at Sandy Hook; Prior to that day public opinion of semi automatic sporting rifles was positive. Many of the Discovery and History channels most popular shows such as Sons of Guns, and American guns were based around such firearms. Those shows have since been canceled as an emotional response to a tragedy, not due to a lack of audience.

According to the FBI website in Connecticut in 2011 only one person was killed with a rifle, whether or not that rifle would have been banned in pending legislation is unclear. What is clear is that even if recently proposed bills were 100 percent effective they may save one or two lives a year. What is harder to tell is how many lives banning semi automatic sporting rifles might cost us, since the shooting at Sandy Hook there have been numerous incidents where people have defended their own lives with the same type of rifle used in the shooting in Newtown.

My solution to the debate on what firearms Connecticut's citizens may own is simple. ENFORCE EXISTING LAWS! As a state, we already have some of the strictest gun laws in the country, if you insist that these laws work then let's enforce them more strictly. Increase penalties and sentences of criminals that use guns in crimes, make increase the punishment for people that own guns that are stolen. If we want to get illegal guns off the streets we need to get the criminals off the streets.

My second objection today is to any bill that limits the capacity of my firearm or magazine.

Simply limiting the amount of bullets my gun can carry by using some arbitrary number has got to be one of the most ridiculous arguments I have ever heard. If I am ever put into a situation where I need to defend myself, law so should not limit my family and my property the ability to do.

I will argue this with an example; the United States marine core has recently changed the issued side arm from a 9mm berretta 92fs to a Colt rail gun 1911 that shoots a .45 caliber bullet. Their justification is that although the berretta holds

more rounds (15) the stopping power of the Colts larger bullets trumps its low capacity (8 rounds). As you can tell by the Marine Corps decision not all bullets are created equal.

The gun I carry most often shoots the same .45 calibers round as the Marine's new Colts. It's a powerful round with a lot of recoil, so much that for people of smaller stature it is difficult to control. That is why in our home we have a 9mm Ruger. That gun shots the same ammo as the Berretta the Marines used to use. Our gun holds 15 rounds and if my girlfriend (a pistol permit holder) is ever in a situation where she needs to defend herself she is going to need all 15 rounds in order to defend herself with the same potency as my 8.

As you can see it is unfair and unsafe to limit the capacity of a magazine by some made up number that some politicians (many who have never shot a gun) have decided makes people feel safe.

Thank you for your consideration of my position if you have any questions you may fell free to call or email me. I would also like to extend the invitation to any of the members of the general assembly to take you out shooting at a secure, safe shooting range. I also have many friends who are licensed NRA instructors who would be more than willing to donate a fee gun safety class to all of you

860 316 8142

DavidPerry@137Fabrication.com