

To the Esteemed Gun Violence Task Force,

I write to you today as a law abiding gun owner, husband and father of 3 children, with grave concern regarding the tone and direction the "debate" about "Gun Violence" is taking. I believe that if this task force was to honestly approach this subject with the intent of a meaningful outcome, they would be exploring the root causes of violence in our society and the issue of inadequate mental health support and services. Should there be debate for "Gun Control"? I would answer yes and I believe there are a few areas to consider. The first being so called gun shows and the reported ability for anyone to attend one and purchase a long gun, pistol or revolver. I have never attended one of these shows so I cannot testify to the procedures allowed for purchasing a gun. However, as a law abiding citizen of the State of CT, I had to adhere to the laws on the books which required me to attend and pass a gun safety class and submit to an FBI background check. I would be in favor of all potential gun owners having to adhere to the same standard. Therefore, no gun purchases at gun shows without a background check and a safety course completed. Secondly I do not agree with the limiting of magazine capacity to the extent that has been discussed. I would agree to a compromise of limiting magazines to a maximum of 15 rounds regardless of the weapon. My reasoning behind this is rooted in the logic that we should not be looking at this from the perspective of the weapon in the hands of a criminal, rather, the weapon in the hand of a law abiding gun owner in need of protecting themselves. After all, there are many, many more law abiding gun owners than there are criminals. I recall the horrible situation in Cheshire and the Petit home invasion. The reporting of home invasions is on the increase and seem to occur all too often and I would venture to say usually involve more than one perpetrator. If I am to defend myself and my family in that situation, I need more magazine capacity not less. It is a known fact that in the heat of a situation like that, accuracy as far as consistently hitting the invader with every round is diminished and add (2) invaders to the mix and you require more rounds to defend yourself not less. I don't think I have to remind you but I will, the criminal does not abide by our gun laws, he/she does not acquire the gun legally and will not be concerned about whether they are carrying a weapon that adheres to the eventual magazine capacity limit. Why as a society, do we want to have laws that hurt the law abiding gun owner who is concerned about defending themselves while actually giving the criminal the tactical advantage? It defies logic. Lastly, I ask that you approach these very difficult issues as the complex subjects they are. There are no easy fixes that will actually have a meaningful impact on the problems of societal violence, mental health problems and common sense gun laws. My request of you as a commission is to do the hard work required, using factual information and refraining from acting out of emotion. I do not envy the task you have at hand but I believe you all can make a difference by working together for the common good and remembering, the decisions you make will potentially adversely affect more law abiding gun owners than the criminals who will never abide by our laws. The 2nd Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of CT both ensure our Constitutional Right to Bear Arms. Please keep that in mind as our Constitutions are the blueprint for our society, our laws and the rights of our citizens, it should not and can not be taken lightly.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

Edward F. Ryle III
Litchfield, CT