

I am a resident of Hamden, CT and I would like to state that I am completely against new Connecticut legislation that places further restrictions on lawful gun owners. Connecticut has some of the strictest gun laws in the nation and we do not need further restrictions on our ability to defend ourselves. We have already gone beyond what an average person would consider reasonable gun control.

Concerning HB 5268, the bill that would require gun owners to purchase liability insurance and would add a 50% tax on ammunition: there are two major problems with this bill. The first problem is that this would prevent low income families from being able to purchase a firearm and ammunition. The Second Amendment of the Constitution applies to everyone, not just those who are wealthy enough to be able to afford expensive ammunition and liability insurance. This bill can be compared to instituting a poll tax on voters.

The second issue with this bill is that it would restrict a gun owner's ability to practice with their firearm. Being safe and effective with one's firearm will require time at the range becoming comfortable with the operation of their gun and improving their marksmanship. You can compare this to owning a car but not being able to have enough gas to operate it. If someone does not drive regularly, this will impair their ability to safely operate the vehicle.

Nearly all Americans feel comfortable with police officers carrying firearms and the reason for this is that they practice with them and we assume that they are proficient with their usage. In addition to basic pistol training, practice is one of the most important components of gun safety and this should be encouraged by our legislators. If we make it less economical to practice with our pistols and rifles, then we are creating a gun safety problem. If someone has to use a firearm for self defense, we do not want them to miss their intended target and cause harm to bystanders. Practicing would avoid this.

Concerning HB 5647, the bill that would ban semiautomatic firearms and standard capacity magazines, there are several problems with this bill. The language of this bill includes some misused terms and phrases. First, and most importantly it uses the term "assault weapon." This term does not convey meaning and is designed to scare people. "Assault weapon" does nothing to describe the action or operation of the rifle or pistol. The proper descriptor would be "semiautomatic" rifle or pistol. When we use incorrect terminology it causes confusion and would make it more difficult for an average person to understand these bills. Another term that I do not understand is "high capacity firearm."

Secondly, when we talk about banning magazines this creates several problems. First, it assumes the State of Connecticut should have the ability to limit one's means to protect themselves. How can we assign a limit to the number of ammunition that a person can have on hand to protect themselves? Limiting a magazine to ten cartridges, may not allow a person enough ammunition to stop their attackers. It can be assumed that home invaders and those that intend harm on others are often on some sort of illegal drug, such as PCP, LSD or heroin. These substances, limit a person's ability to feel pain and 7-10 rounds of ammunition may not be enough to stop them. When you consider, having multiple attackers, this demonstrates a real problem with limiting magazine size.

This also would not allow retired police officers to use their standard issued firearm when they retire. This problem is evident in New York right now. The Glock Model 22, as well as many other standard issue firearms, contains magazines that hold 15 rounds. We cannot exempt former police officers from these laws, as that would demonstrate that they are above the law and do not have to follow the same laws that the rest of Connecticut does.

Another problem is that of reimbursement to those that would be required to hand in their magazines according to this bill. Connecticut makes up 1% of the U.S. population and we assume that the U.S. contains 300,000,000 firearms (the actual number of firearms is probably higher). This would mean that we could expect 3 million firearms, each having 2-4 magazines that would be illegal if this bill passes. If these firearm owners are paid market price at about \$50 a magazine, the state would owe CT residents about \$600 million dollars for the magazines alone. This is a low-ball estimate as I believe that there are more than 12 million magazines out there in our state. Add to this years of legal fees, as this will definitely be challenged in court, and we can assume that we will be spending several billion dollars on this Anti-Second amendment campaign in the State of Connecticut alone. I think most people would like their tax dollars to be put to better use.

I oppose the following proposed bills: HB-5112, HB-5268, HB-5452, HB-5647, SB-122, SB-124, SB-140, SB-161, SB-377, SB-501, SB-504, and SB-506.

I would encourage bills that would make it economical for gun owners to purchase gun safes such as a tax credit for purchasing a safe. I would also encourage actions that encourage gun owners to practice with their firearms such as making ammunition more affordable and not restricting affordable ammunition that can be found online. We can make ammunition more affordable by not restriction it as this would increase the price due to supply and demand. We also can avoid increased cost by not instituting tax on ammunition purchase.

Thank you for considering my viewpoint on these proposed bills.

Sincerely,
Adam Veneziano
Hamden, CT