

Connecticut already has among the toughest gun laws in the country and making them more restrictive would only have negative effects. Some of the radical restrictions proposed would turn otherwise law abiding citizens into criminals. There are 170,000 carry permit holders and probably at least 250,000 more gun owners (you don't need a permit to own) in the state which represent a significant voting block. Since about 1.5 Million voted in the last election this might be as much of one third of electorate. They may be very angry in the next election.

Mandatory registration of all firearms would cost the state a fortune, be completely unenforceable and a bookkeeping nightmare. In addition the state has already had major problems just maintaining records on what is required now. Many otherwise honest law abiding people would not comply.

Most likely all the gun makers like Colt and Ruger would move to another state creating a loss of thousands of Union jobs and possibly up to a Billion dollars in lost revenues for Connecticut.

Where I live if someone breaks in, even if I had time to call the police it would take them at least 10 minutes to get here. I need to be able to defend my family immediately. A larger magazine is important as not every shot may hit the intruder and may even not stop him. At the recent home invasion in Georgia the wife defending her children shot the attacker 5 times but he was still able to get up and drive away

Any legislation should grandfather previously owned weapons and magazines before the enactment of the legislation. Confiscation of privately owned property might be unconstitutional and the state may have to compensate owners for weapons and magazines seized. With a potential of up to 500,000 weapons this would not be realistic. This was tried in Canada and eventually overturned after costing a fortune to the government.

Radical gun legislation would almost assuredly invite major legal action that could easily go to the Supreme Court.

I feel the 1898 date for antique firearms should be moved up to 1946. The 1898 date was arrived at 35 years ago but has not changed with the passage of time. With only a few exceptions this pre dates the modern assault rifle. The legislation now proposed would make difficult for the many collectors of World War guns as some take a few more than ten rounds in a magazine. Most of these are valuable collector items and rarely if ever used in any kind of shootings.

I don't have problem with armed security at schools, apparently a number of High Schools in the state have had it for a while, so why not at the elementary levels? Children should be taught to trust the police and look upon them as friends and protectors. Armed guards are already at Malls, banks, jewelry stores and children are used to seeing them. We always looked up to the neighborhood police when I was young.