

Attn: Gun Violence Work Group, (This is Public Testimony)

Dear Representatives and Senators of the Gun Violence Work Group:

I appreciate the opportunity to provide this public comment on the legislature's proposals affecting gun owners.

SB-161 Concerning the Reduction of Gun Violence

I oppose every subparagraph of this legislation for the following reasons:

- 1) Unless you can assure me that ever criminal will have only 10 rds, then I believe lawful citizens should be capable of defending themselves as effectively as the police defend themselves and the citizens of this State. Given the slow response time to Sandy Hook, and the longer than 5 min average policed response time to nearly any shooting incident, the killer at Sandy Hook could have easily committed the same tragedy with 10 rd magazines. Why are these unrelated and ineffectual changes being proposed? Using the blood of innocents to push irrelevant legislation is shameful.
- 2) Following the lead of CA on the definition of assault rifles is questionable at best. The FBI Crime statistics for 2011 show CA having a 50% higher violent crime rate and a 33% higher murder rate than CT. If anything, CA should adopt the laws of CT. Isn't it better to be a leader...and our current laws have proven to be that. Again, I would add, this provision would have had no effect on Sandy Hook so why is it being considered.
- 3) Requiring a permit for a pistol grip rifle is the "camel's nose." Who issues these permits? Who manages the permits? Jump forward to para 8), registration of all firearms. The State of CT cannot adequately manage the current database of firearms registered through dealer sales and pistols through NICS. Point of fact, a 2009 register of my personal firearms had an error rate of 10% and omission rate (non-critical details, e.g. gun type) of nearly 30%. Requiring registration of all firearms will increase the size of the database by at least 10X. Errors in the database could have serious consequences for gun owners. More importantly, since CT legislators have propose banning possession of certain firearms, proceeding with a registration scheme would appear a prelude to that eventuality. I suspect many individuals would opt out of this requirement with possible serious but intended consequences. Criminals will not register their firearms. Lawfully owned firearms purchased through dealers, as well as all handgun transfers in CT are already registered.
- 4) Exemptions of this nature are an interesting twist but fall short of need. Firearms registered under section 53-202 should also be included in the exemption. No greater vetting of gun owners is performed in the US than for those holding NFA firearms.
- 5) Requiring a permit to buy ammunition would exceed by a 3X factor the size and detail of the current pistol permit database and encompass all hunters, sport rifle and pistol shooters, 22 plinkers, skeet/trap shooters, etc. Applying a fee for this

permit adds to the “punishment” effect for lawful firearms owners and does NOTHING to affect criminal activity.

- 6) Banning internet purchases of ammunition penalizes lawful gun owners far more than criminals and does not affect criminal use of ammunition. What are the statistics showing criminals have obtained their ammunition through the internet? Or, is this just another harassment of lawful gun owners. The only way most of us can afford to continue our hobby and sport is to pursue the lowest prices for ammunition. Often the price from large wholesalers is 60% of that found in local retail stores. This provision would nicely dovetail with your harassing proposal to require permits for ammunition purposes but it serves NO public safety purpose.
- 7) Changing storage requirements is again targeting legitimate gun owners. The current law is adequate...or perhaps the legislature has statistics on where the current law has failed to provide for public safety. The Sandy Hook tragedy would not have been affected by this. The vagueness of the requirements allow for prosecution and persecution of gun owners if the prosecutor or judge choose to use different criteria. Measurable and clearly defined criteria must be used in any legislation.
- 8) The practice of registration leading to confiscation is well documented. CA has done it. NYC did it. It is only “common sense” to believe that is the only purpose for it.

A charismatic leader said “The state must declare the child to be the most precious treasure of the people. As long as the government is perceived as working for the benefit of the children, the people will happily endure almost any curtailment of liberty...” I believe this is the motivation of much of the current legislation. Sacrificing liberties in hopes that these measures, that common sense dictate are irrelevant to future evil acts, is NOT a respectful epitaph for the children of Sandy Hook. If you agree with the leader you should read the rest of his ideas in Mein Kampf.

Thank you for your time and consideration
Respectfully submitted,
Darryl Conner
54 Laurel Leaf Dr.
Gales Ferry, CT 06335