

To the honored members of the Judiciary Committee:

I write you as a concerned citizen and lawful firearm owner in strong opposition to SB 1047 - An Act Banning Large Capacity Ammunition Magazines.

This bill would only affect law abiding gun owners and strip them of their legally owned property - or turn them into Class D Felons. Class D Felons! I fail to understand how the simple owning of a magazine that comes standard with a firearm equates to any of the following:

**CLASS D FELONIES**

- Attempt or conspiracy to commit any class D felony 53a-51
- Misconduct with a motor vehicle 53a-57
- Assault in the second degree 53a-60
- Assault in the second degree with a firearm (m. m. 1 year) 53a-60a
- Assault or larceny of an elderly, blind, disabled, pregnant, or mentally retarded
- Person in the second degree (m. m. 2 years) 53a-60b
- Assault of an elderly, blind, disabled, pregnant, or mentally retarded person in
- The second degree with a firearm (m. m. 3 years) 53a-60c
- Assault in the second degree with a motor vehicle while intoxicated 53a-60d
- Threatening in the first degree 53a-61aa
- Sexual assault in the third degree 53a-72a\*
- Sexual assault in the fourth degree of victim under age 16 53a-73a

This bill will not stop criminals from obtaining these magazines as they are readily available out of state, through mail order, or online. Therefore, the only people affected by this bill are the law abiding firearm owners in the state. The same people that would be made felons at the stroke of a pen. The same people who would be placed at a disadvantage when confronted by criminals who will continue to use these banned magazines.

I urge you please to vote no on SB 1047. One third of all assaults involve more than one aggressor. It could take three or more shots to effectively stop an aggressor. To extend that, if someone were assaulted on the street by 3 assailants and only had a 10 round magazine he or she can not miss a shot. If the defender did miss he or she would likely end up dead and there would be an additional illegal gun on the street. By the same token - If he or she was attempting to defend their home against four armed intruders... well it probably wouldn't end up good for the homeowner or his or her family.

Again, these magazines are standard issue. 90% of the firearms made within the last 20 years come with magazines with capacities of over 10 rounds. I am sure if this bill were to pass there would, rightfully, be class action lawsuits against the state involving seizure of personal property - which is against the Fifth Amendment.

A few points:

"Large Capacity" Is Not New

SB 1047 diminishes a person's right to adequate self-protection using modern firearms. When we consider that the 1860 Henry Rifle carried 15 cartridges we can better understand just how out of touch SB 1047 is with its' 10 shot limitation.

Past Mistakes -Connecticut Residents' were already subject to similar magazine restrictions from 1994-2004 under provisions of the Federal Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. This bill which includes the High Capacity Magazine Ban and Assault Weapons ban has been proven a failure. Violent Crime Totals and per capita Violent Crime Rates were higher during this period (1994-2004) and lower from 2004-2009 according to FBI Uniform Crime Report Statistics.

Federal Studies Prove Uselessness of Ban - A comprehensive study by the Centers for Disease Control looked at the full range of gun-control measures, including the 1994 High Capacity Magazine Ban, and concluded that none could be proven to reduce crime. Another study, commissioned by Congress, found that bans were not effective since "the banned weapons and magazines were never used in more than a modest fraction of all gun murders." Yet another, more recent study showed that Magazine limitations would not have saved any lives at Virginia Tech. And lastly, it has been shown that it would not have saved any lives at Sandy Hook. The madmen who committed these acts frequently changed magazines before they were even empty. The simple truth is that magazine restrictions would not save lives.

Why Turn Average Citizens into Criminals? There are certainly worse things to be in possession of than a magazine that holds more than 10 rounds. Why aren't we starting with legislation addressed at criminals, instead of again targeting law abiding gun owners?

#### Safety and Reliability Concerns

Firearms are designed to be used with the specific magazine supplied by the manufacturer for purposes of safety and reliability. Have you ever heard of a Police department using aftermarket magazines?

SB 1047 puts law abiding residents at a tactical disadvantage, stacking the odds against them in the case of a home invasion or violent assault. It does nothing to prevent violent repeat offenders - the source of most homicides, from using any magazine they wish with impunity and without punishment.

#### Financial Impact is HUGE

- 1.SB 1047 calls forfeiture & confiscation of Connecticut Residents' personal property by Police totaling many millions of dollars without reparations by the state.
- 2.Conservative estimates on the cost to replace only pistol magazines supplied by manufacturers' over the last 10 years, with the firearm purchased typically 2, to be 29 Million Dollars.
- 3.Considering that "Large Capacity" Magazines have been manufactured since the 1930's and people typically purchase additional magazines beyond those supplied; the State of Connecticut could be subject to reparations of \$250-\$500 Million Dollars. I assure you - there will be lawsuits. Which leads us to...

#### Cost of Implementation

1. There is no doubt that if SB 1047 is passed there will be an unprecedented law suit. Legal costs to the tax payer to implement already failed legislation will be substantial.
2. Police departments will be forced to retain the millions of currently legally owned magazines pending outcome of this civil action. The cost of storage alone will be staggering.
3. The firearms industry in Connecticut produces 1.3 billion dollars in sales annually.
4. Hundreds of jobs and tax revenue will be lost when magazine and gun manufacturers leave Connecticut for more gun friendly locales. Colorado is seeing this already as Magpul is preparing to pick up and leave the state if similar legislation passes there. Taking it's jobs and over 85 million annually in Revenue to a state that won't limit a citizen's rights. Ruger, COLT, STAG and many other firearms manufacturers currently have holdings here, employ CT citizens and contribute to our economy. I can assure you that many will pick up and leave just as MAGPUL is planning on doing.

#### Laws for Gun Owners- Not for Criminals!

Connecticut does not have any legislation which provides mandatory minimum sentencing for violent felons in possession of any magazine regardless of capacity. Why are the lawful firearm owner's constantly under attack from the State Legislature but career criminals and gang members not even prosecuted for the laws they are already in violation of.

Thank You.

Eric Tucker  
Shelton, CT 06484