

Mike Agnifilo

Woodbury

For the record I oppose bill proposals 505, 897, 1071, 1076, 6162, 6251, 6595, and 6598

I am here as a licensed firearm owner today not to stand on one side or another of the political line that has been drawn in the sand concerning the proposed regulation of firearms.

I am here to stand united with everyone either gun owner or not, to support laws of common sense and meaning, not ones of emotion or political agenda.

On December 14th 2012 a mentally disturbed individual took everything from 26 innocent souls in Newtown and took a little bit from all of us here today. Gun owner or not we all lost a piece of our hearts that day.

Gun owners by nature are protective people. We made the ultimate commitment to protecting ourselves, our loved ones and other innocent victims by the single act of choosing to arm ourselves.

My first feeling after hearing the news of the tragedy in Sandyhook elementary school was one of guilt. The guilt of not being there with my firearm to somehow protect those poor 26 souls from evil. That's just my nature as a protector and I'm sure I share that trait with just about every single gun owner in this room. Family, loved ones and the desire to protect them is the fabric woven into our being.

After reading the above referenced proposals in their entirety, I did not see common sense solutions to the issue of gun violence committed by criminals or the mentally ill. When I read of a proposed tax, a ban on a firearm because it has a handle on it and its painted black but functions exactly the same as any other semi-automatic firearm or even a requirement for registration with yearly fees for even a 150 year old single shot rifle that has sat on a fireplace mantle for 30 years, I have to conclude that not much rational thought went into the drafting of these bills. How could any of these bills have prevented the evil acts committed in Sandyhook elementary school? They couldn't possibly. Stolen registered firearms and half empty magazines were found in that school as stated by the Connecticut state troopers. Restrictive laws only restrict someone that abides by the law in the first place. Criminals do not abide by existing laws. How could we expect them to abide to stronger ones? Stricter penalties for gun related crimes and stronger enforcement of current laws are common sense solutions.

To take guns out of the conversation as they seem to cloud some people's judgment, I will use an analogy with something everyone can relate to. I'll use the automobile as an example.

If mothers against drunk driving demanded stricter laws to reduce the amount of alcohol related deaths and the bills drafted included a ban of all black cars, a reduction in the size of cup holders to fit only a shot glass and an annual registration with associated fees on any set of high performance tires installed. Those laws would only restrict the car as a tool and not restrict the behavior of the operator. We would then have to conclude that there was no common sense used in drafting these laws. We would think that these laws were set in place to say that at

least we did “something” That would be a disservice to all the innocent lives lost due to drunk driving every year.

If we enact laws that limit law abiding gun owners their constitutional right to protect themselves, their loved ones and other innocent victims from evil and not enact laws to better aid the mentally ill or further deter criminals from acts of violence, then we did a disservice as human beings to the 26 souls lost in Newtown.

In closing, a distinguished veteran once told me that the measure of a truly great politician is their willingness to cross party lines to enact legislation that’s good for all.

I ask all of you now to be that great politician.

Thank you for your time.