

I am writing to oppose all the firearms restrictions and laws that are being proposed in the State of Connecticut.

The lawful citizens of Connecticut are not responsible for the atrocious act of one madman last year, and should not be punished for his actions.

Restricting the firearms that lawful citizens have access to does not make anyone safer. It actually makes them less safe. If criminals will continue to have access to these weapons - and we know they will - then lawful citizens should as well.

All of the firearms being proposed to be banned (by features or name) shoot the same ammunition as other, less "evil looking" firearms. People are trying to ban these firearms based only based on their looks.

Pistol grips do not aid in "spraying a crowd" - Some people just find them more comfortable.

Muzzle breaks and flash hidere do not do anything to hurt others - Again, they simply make the firearm more comfortable to shoot at the range.

Banning bayonets is just plain silly, especially since kitchen knives are readily available. I have never heard of a random bayonetting or bayonett murder.

Barrel shrouds do not "cool the barrel allowing it to shoot faster". Barrel shrouds just make it harder for someone to get a burn if they brush up against a barrel.

Collapsible stocks? I would like one so I don't have to buy my wife ANOTHER rifle. We could share one of them if she could adjust the rifle to fit her smaller size.

I could go on, but the main thing I would like to say is this:

All of the guns we are talking about shoot once per pull of the trigger. They are not machine guns or automatic weapons. They are the same gun your grandfather or uncle used for target practice or hunting - only the looked have changed. In many cases they actually use the same bullets. These are not weapons of mass murder. These are tools for self-defense and target practice.

Restricting the magazine capacity to be lower than the firearms are designed to hold makes them less effective for home defense. I would surely hate to need 12 shots to defend my family if but only have access to 10. 10 bullets may be enough to stop 1 intruder but how about 2 or 3? I ask would any of you who vote for a magazine restriction feel badly if someone died because they needed 1 or 2 more bullets to stop an attacker? How would you even know about it? You probably wouldn't.. but that would not make any difference to the victim.

As for all the proposed fees, taxes and additional permits for buying ammunition (or owning a rifle with a pistol grip or buying new rifles etc).. All this does is make it impossible for the poor to defend themselves and exercise their second amendment rights. The Constitution's rights and liberties are for all citizens - not just the wealthy. I'd love to see what would happen if someone

said you needed a permit to speak, or pay a tax on their right to assemble for a party. The people would be outraged - Why then is it "Ok" to propose these same things on the Second Amendment?

The proposal for mandatory insurance is an outright insult. Again, lawful gun owners are NOT the problem. We do not intend, or plan to go on a shooting rampage. No one will have to sue us for the wrongful deaths of others. I really question the legality of this as well. It is, at the root, basically a tax on a fundamental right.

Please stop treating all gun owners as if we the source of all evil in society. We are not. We are doctors, lawyers, carpenters, landscapers, clerks and customer service reps. We are shop owners, schoolteachers and fisherman. We are citizens.. and we have our rights, we just choose to exercise one that some others do not.

Thank You.

Eric Tucker

erictucker780@gmail.com

Howe Ave

Shelton, CT 06484