

I am sending this as an e-mail and an attachment.

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this because with so many proposals before this committee and I wanted to take the time to rebut quite a few of them. I have organized this based on the concepts instead of the actual bill numbers because many are the subject of both house and senate bills but may be viewed together. Some of the bills address the same issues and concepts with minor differences and can also be easily addressed together. Most of these bills adversely affect me as a citizen, but many also adversely affect me in my work as a security officer here in Connecticut.

The first proposal I am rebutting is the making available by way of the FOIA of the names and addresses of gun owners. I am sure that nobody in this room has escaped hearing of how this has played out in our neighboring state of New York where this information is available. However the fact is that this in effect vilifies legal gun owners and brands us with a sort of scarlet letter, as if to say we are all just waiting for our chance to commit some horrific act, when in fact nothing is further from the truth. There have been reports of multiple criminal acts resulting from the publication of the lists that have not been by people who were named on that list but by others seeking to do them harm. The Newspaper that published that list, has in fact hired armed security officers to protect various locations in the area, as all of those security officers must by default have gun permits, they likely appear on that list and their homes and families are placed at risk while they are at work, ironically protecting that very newspaper. I do not know of anyone who has said that making these names available has helped the common welfare of the community or in any way made the community safer, in fact the opposite may be true.

The next proposed bill that I would like to speak against is the one proposing a 50% sales tax on ammunition unless bought and used on the same day at the range. This same act seeks to impose a requirement on gun owners that they maintain liability insurance. There are so many things wrong with this proposal; I hardly know where to start. First of all, even in Connecticut where citizens have suffered through the largest tax increase in our history and the largest tax increase of all the states, we still have no tax as high as 50%. This is insulting to people and frankly shows nothing but contempt for the citizens on the part of those who proposed and are

considering supporting such a measure. As for the insurance requirement, this is just a retread of the same issues that tore our country apart over health care, that of forcing citizens to buy a commodity, which is just plain wrong. This bill also presumes that gun owners will do something that will incur liability which when added to the exemption of ammunition sales at certain locations creates inherent inequalities among our states citizens and businesses, which goes against the basic premise of our country.

Next we have one of the proposed limitations on so called high capacity weapons. Others here will probably speak of the misleading nature of the terms coined for certain weapons and accessories. One thing I think we can all agree with is that proposals like these are made emotionally after tragic incidents. However as the federal laws emotionally passed after the attempted assassination of President Ronald Reagan have demonstrated such provisions have little or no effect on safety or crime. No one can even agree on what high capacity even means, Connecticut has two proposals one saying more than 10, and one saying more than one. New York seems to think this means more than seven. However in each and every case that brings forth this type of emotional but useless law, the amounts of ammunition is later found to be in the hundreds not the tens or ones, and frankly you could set the limit at no more than two hundred and it would still be just as useless in stopping a criminal from breaking the law. The exemptions in these proposals do not include Security Officers, so in effect passage of these bills will ensure that those guarding banks and businesses and even schools will automatically be outgunned by those seeking to do harm. What these bills might prevent is someone else from stopping that same criminal from breaking many more laws. Last year 112 security officers were killed in the line of duty, 65 of them by gunshots. This past weekend a security officer was shot and killed while trying to stop a robbery in Chicago a city that has a nearly complete gun ban yet had over 500 murders last year. This security officer was one of 5 innocent victims killed in Chicago over the weekend; numerous other people were shot there also.

Related to this is the idea is the ludicrous that possessing a gun that fires more than a single bullet be made a felony. This brings to mind images of Barney Fife from Mayberry, a Deputy Sherriff who had to keep his bullet in his shirt pocket. This past weekend in California an off duty security officer was the victim of an attempted robbery where an unarmed criminal pretended to have a gun and demanded the security officer's money and property. The security

officer who was armed shot the criminal once, thereby preventing the robbery, the criminal is in the hospital in stable condition. Recently in Georgia a mother who was able to protect her family is probably thankful that such a law was not in place. The only people I can think of who would benefit from such a law would be those who invade homes, rob banks and shoot complete strangers, as they know in such a scenario the likelihood of anyone stopping their crime is so low that they have been handed a gift by lawmakers who would pass such a bill. The proposal linking a citizen's gun permit to driving under the influence is an odd one, as it seeks to further punish someone for a crime that does not involve guns simply because they are a gun owner. I should further note that the same crime involving a motor vehicle that this bill seeks to punish by permanently revoking a citizens gun permit only results in a one year revocation of their drivers license. So within a year they are free to drink and drive again but they better not show up at a shooting range. The relevant motor vehicle statutes do not contain a permanent revocation of a driver's license until the third offense and even then, those subsequent offenses must be within ten years of the first offense. Once again gun owners are branded with a scarlet letter.

One proposal would require gun owners to register their guns every two years. This is nothing more than harassment and intimidation of law abiding citizens. In Connecticut we already have to register guns, the transfer of guns is also reported and the new owner would then have to register the gun. The only reason I can see to register the same gun over and over again is to give the state a chance to say no, you cannot own property that you legally bought and have never used in a crime, just because we feel like it. I also fear that this will place an undue burden on the state police who have already suffered through layoffs and force reductions but will be responsible for all these new regulations.

While reading through a list of all the proposed gun control proposals, it was nearly at the bottom that I finally got to two that actually address the problem, and that is crimes being committed with guns. I am not sure what it says about us as a society that this was not the first thing to come to mind, but I personally find it sad that it was so far down on the list. Unfortunately on the list I was looking at preparing these remarks, these bills were followed by one that seeks to add more guns to the list of banned guns. This shows why many people feel that measures like we are talking about here today give an unfair advantage to the criminals.

I realize this was long and I want to thank the committee for taking the time to read this and consider my opinion in these matters. I am glad that the public had the chance to comment on this important topic and these numerous proposals. It is my sincere hope that this not be rushed into emotionally in an effort to do something but that instead time and care is taken to address what needs to be addressed without restricting the rights of any law abiding citizen.

Respectfully Submitted,

Alan Shaw

Stamford, CT