

Frank C. DeFelice
32 Cherry Lane
Durham, Connecticut 06422
Telephone: 860-690-2400
fcdefelice@aol.com

March 2, 2012

Gun Violence Prevention Working Group
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106

RE: Gun Legislation Changes should be Prospective

Dear Senators and Representatives,

My name is Frank C. DeFelice, and I have served the Town of Durham as Chairman of its Public Safety Committee for more than eleven (11) years. Because of this background, I thought it appropriate to share my thoughts on possible changes to firearms legislation with you.

Any changes should be prospective. A prospective approach affords the only practical and cost-effective means for performing background checks and registering firearms. Attempts at “rear-view mirror” registrations and background checks will surely be problematic; from the kid who fails to register the .22 semi-automatic rifle he received from his parents when he turned 16 years of age; to the senior citizen who has long-forgotten about the semi-automatic shotgun in his attic. These persons are not criminals and society gains nothing by labeling them as such, for the failure to register their firearms.

We should not waste our limited police resources enforcing the registration of legacy firearms. The cost for the State of Connecticut to implement a registration system and conduct enforcement of all legacy firearms in existence would be staggering; and wasteful of our limited policing resources.

Allow the continued use of factory-supplied magazines. It can be hazardous to use magazines other than those originally supplied with a firearm. Allow the continued use of magazines originally shipped with legacy firearms (regardless of capacity); but ban the use of “oversized” after-market magazines.

Firearm transactions should be conducted only through Federally-Licensed Dealers (FFL’s). FFL-dealers have proven to be capable gatekeepers who are experienced in gauging customer intent and properly documenting firearm sales transactions. They should be the only conduit for the transfer of firearms.

Do not define firearms with 1 military feature as “assault weapons”. Many sporting rifles contain a singular feature which could be considered “military” in nature. This is why the current “two military features” stipulation was created. Changing the definition to include firearms with only 1 military feature would effectively re-classify many standard sporting rifles as “weapons of war”... they are not.

Looking backwards is not the solution. Prospective Gun Control is ultimately more effective, more enforceable, and far less costly. And it does not result in otherwise law-abiding citizens being listed as criminals. Thank you for taking the time to read my testimony.

Respectfully,
Frank C. DeFelice