

I would like to provide my input on the attached topics that are being considered by the Committee. First and foremost, however, the Committee should be bound to prove that any actions forwarded for approval as law will improve public safety in light of the tragedy in Newtown. It is apparent that many proposals and recommendations appearing after that tragedy reach far beyond addressing the actual causes of that event. The events in Newtown were and are horrible to envision, but our response must preserve the honor and respect of the good people in our society.

Issue #1- Ban on modern sporting rifles determined to be assault rifles

The past shows much disparity on classification and definition of 'assault' rifles. Past actions on creating some form of definition resulted in conflict, disinformation, and manipulation by most involved parties. Defining a rifle based upon looks is irresponsible. Defining an 'assault' firearm by current military terms is appropriate. Regardless, banning a large class of sporting firearms does not truly resolve the conditions leading to the Newtown tragedy. Disturbed individuals can carry out criminal mass attacks using knives or axes. If one type of weapon is removed, then another would be selected. Consider the mass attack reported in China, which was carried out with knives! A ban of select firearms will have limited impact on the root of this type of crime.

Issue #2- Ban on magazines greater than 10 rounds in capacity

Banning magazines with greater than 10 rounds of capacity may have the effect of providing a beneficial time factor for law enforcement to take action.

Issue #3- Confiscation of magazines with greater than 10 round capacity

Confiscation of the above magazines is a sad precedent. It puzzles me how this can be enforced. Without a crime involved, how can the State confiscate private property? What is the basis for confiscating legally obtained personal property without remuneration? There is no eminent domain issue here. This is the kind of activity we've been taught occurs in areas of the world where people are controlled and suppressed. Confiscation in this regard should not even be considered and discouraged.

Issue #4- Statewide firearm registration

Registration of firearms is simply a failure of leadership. Consider the lessons learned in Canada. How many millions of dollars were spent trying to initiate and maintain a registration system? What was the result? Did the system in Canada achieve the advertised results? It would appear to have failed. I don't think the current budget (or in the foreseeable future) is in any condition to support and operate a program bound to failure while invading the privacy of law-abiding citizens. Above all, criminals don't register firearms so the assertion that public safety will be improved is a misrepresentation.

Issue #5- Re-registration of firearms on a periodic basis

See my response to Issue #4. Periodic re-registration will do nothing for public safety. History and examples do not support the premise that criminals or disillusioned people consider this type of action as an impediment to committing crime.

Issue #6- Permit requirement for rifles with pistol grips

Permits for all firearms may provide the opportunity to perform the checks needed to preclude certain individuals from obtaining firearms. **However, criminals do not apply for permits.** The current pistol permitting process appears to be reasonable to establishing the qualification of an individual to own and use firearms. Note: The permitting process could be normalized (each town has a process) to support a goal such as this.

Issue #7- Limits on ammunition for purchase and possess

Limits on ammunition purchases and possession are unenforceable and unreasonable. The only way to enforce this is to have law enforcement personnel perform house-to-house searches. I am a certified firearms instructor and a law-abiding citizen. There is no prescription regarding how much ammunition is necessary to instruct an individual on the proper and safe use of a firearm. Arbitrary limits may even create a less safe environment. Would it be wise to pass an individual in a safety class after firing only five rounds (because of an established limit on the student or instructor)? Who is qualified to say how much ammunition is reasonable and for who? The government should not be in the business of making this type of imposition. As a private citizen, an arbitrary limit is an imposition on my freedom to pursue my sport, competition, and teaching goals. NRA certified instructors, police officers, security personnel and others have reasonable pursuit of ammunition as the need arises. There should be no such imposition of arbitrary limits to these or other permit carrying citizens who've already proven their worthiness and background checks.

Issue #8- Registration of ammunition purchases

There is no reasonable standard for assessing the reasonableness of ammunition sales. The government should not have the ability to say that an ammunition sale is acceptable or not. Many examples can be conceived to challenge the efficacy of such legislation. Will Boy Scout of America be investigated or prohibited for buying enough ammunition to teach Scouts how to use firearms at Summer Camp? If registering ammunition sales in the name of public safety is the standard, then we should be registering the sale of alcohol as well.

Issue #9- Ban on the internet sales of ammunition

Ditto the above response to Issue #8.

Issue #10- Mandatory gun storage laws

There are already storage laws on the books. Common sense must prevail. How will even more strict controls be monitored and verified or enforced? It is sad that some individuals choose to not follow access restrictions, but restrictions already exist and are acceptable. Education and reaching out to help people achieve this is likely to be much more favorable and effective than a heavy hand.

Respectfully,

David B. Owens

3 Lindsay Lane

Broad Brook, CT 06016