

Kenyon
East Haven, CT 06512

3/3/2013

I With the onslaught of bills that have been introduced into this year's Legislative session along with the many I am sure will come I wanted to write and share my views on various topics. I will say, as a parent and grandparent incidents like Sandy Hook are a horrific, heart ratting reminder of the dangers that surround the most innocent of our society, children. Whether it was family, co-workers, fellow shooters, I don't know of anyone that didn't shed a tear and think of how this could happen to 20 children whose biggest stress that day was wondering what they were getting from Santa Claus. It hits even closer when you have a child or grandchild that age and you can put a face to it.

First and foremost, I am against many of these suggestions. I believe many target the non-criminal, taxpaying citizens of our state.

Special taxes- are unacceptable, firearms ownership is not a privilege extended to me, and it is a right, no different than voting. Poll taxes and fees are illegal and I see a special ammunition tax or frequent excessive fees not only unfair, but in my opinion constitutional violations. Connecticut, as with taxes and fees in most areas are the highest in the country for firearms permits and applications. To add on to this is unacceptable. I see proposals such as Senator Byes as disgusting and an insult. To try and profit off of Newtown is a horrible act and disrespectful of every victims memory. The excuse of the money will be used to pay for mental health treatments etc are also not acceptable to me. I work 2 jobs, 7 days a week; to pay my living expenses, as well as some of the highest taxes and cost of living amounts in the county, a lot of which already goes towards government entitlements to pay for other peoples medical and costs of living. To add to my expenses is not something I will accept. To put this in a different prospective, why aren't voters charged to cast a ballot? Why aren't the accused charged for attorneys?

Magazine limits- you and I have had this discussion in great, my position has not changed, I feel the 10 round limits only targets people who obey the law. a lot of literature from no biased studies and reports that showed most shootings involve less than 4 rounds fired. The 10 round theory was and is an arbitrary number pulled from the sky, almost all common production firearms come "standard" with 13-17 round magazine capacities. There is nothing extraordinary about them. The theory that a lower capacity will slow down shooting sprees is a theory, in the Gifford's shooting, that may have played a role, but our laws should not be based on an isolated event. Most home invasions involve on average 3 assailants. Single shot stops are almost non- existent. In a majority of police involved shootings, officers have shot suspects 5-8 times before stopping the threat, using the lower number of 5, and figuring all 5 hit, just having 2 perpetrators already has the "victiim" at a disadvantage. Recently, in Georgia a lone woman shot a home invader 5 times in the face and neck, she had a revolver which she emptied (5 or 6 rounds) the perpetrator "ASKED HER" to stop shooting him before

fleeing. On a personal note, I work armed security, the proposed bills that I've seen makes no provision for Bail Enforcement or Armed Security Officers. We are both tasked with extremely dangerous tasks and job requirements, we are also in many circumstances the first responders to many incidents, and a 10 round provision is now putting me in a dangerous predicament professionally. Some of our clients include municipal and federal buildings and properties which are already sensitive targets, banks, ATM service calls and Bail enforcement are tasked with apprehending dangerous criminals. This is punishing us, the good guys. I think you may see some compromise, if the handgun magazine limit was raised to 15 that would cover a overwhelming majority of modern firearms. At the very least, there should be an exemption for the certain professions.

Criminals are not going to care about magazine limits, taxes or other laws. A criminal is already breaking the law, that's why they are criminals. Instead, these proposals will make honest, hardworking taxpayer's instant felons. These proposals will be legally challenged.

Semi-Auto Rifles- Are used as you have seen to kill less people than hammers and baseball bats. Just because something looks like a "military" weapon, doesn't make it one. I had a Buick Regal when I was younger, it sure wasn't a Buick Grand National even though they looked the same, and their performance was far from similar. If this was truly about these weapons, maybe the magazine issue should've been with the rifles. I am also in favor of background checks for all firearms purchases, whether private or via dealer. I don't think (as with private rifle and shotgun sales) anyone should be able to take possession of any firearm with no paperwork or questions asked.

Criminal possession of ammunition -Senator Looney did make a great proposal- Criminal possession of ammunition. There is no legal reason that I can come up with that would justify someone who is barred from having a firearm to be in possession of ammunition. I do not see it as realistic to "background check" every ammunition purchase however. That would be a huge undertaking. If you spent any time at just one local gun range on a Saturday morning you would certainly understand.

Gun free zones- also need to be looked at closely. They have not stopped gun crimes at schools nor will they. Again, as with any other proposal, this only affects people who obey the law, someone who is going to shoot someone is not going to be phased by breaking ANY law. They are already doing so. All that this areas ensure to a shooter is they won't face their one fear, confrontation from an equal force. In effect, the law which was made to protect kids, made easy killing fields.

I will say, as many others, Mental Health needs to be the focus. Connecticut has some of the strictest firearms laws in the country, and already costly. It is easy to focus on guns. As I have seen the talk will start broad, but when the anti-gun crowd gets new laws passed, the conversation and proposals on the actual problems "END". Gun control laws are easy window dressing, they cost nothing, accomplish a political agenda. Mental Health costs money, as you already said, it's also the first thing to be

cut at budget time. You as a legislator are the only one who can fix that. In these mass shootings, Mental Health issues have been the common denominator. Should Adam Lanza have had access to any type of weapon? Absolutely not! The Virginia Tech shooter slipped through a loop hole that we have here in Connecticut as well. That is something that needs to be fixed. However, the task is how do you close it without trampling the privacy rights of the 99.9% of firearms owners who do not have mental health issues. To bar people from possessing firearms based on certain meds or diagnoses is also not an answer, millions of Americans, including police officers take certain medications for anxiety/panic attacks for job related stress or biological issues. Is the government willing to accept the financial cost of workers compensation/Disability because they are removed from the work force?

As we recently saw with the Stonington double murder suicide, the woman here had a reported lengthy criminal and mental illness history, yet, she had a firearm. I question whether this was possessed legally due to our current laws, but obviously, we do need to work on the mentally ill and access to guns. With that said, how do you allow let's say a police officer to have a weapon at home if their spouse is mentally ill? How do you ensure or prevent access? These are the points the focus should be on. Not magazines and ammunition taxes.

Prosecution - there needs to be stricter enforcement and judicial accountability for criminals and the lack of prosecution for gun crimes. To many people who have previous convictions for firearms violations are walking free and committing new crimes. That needs to be fixed. Lives are lost every day at the hands of animals that should be in jail.

School Security - Last but certainly not least, there also needs to be a very immediate focused addressing of school security. As we just saw announced by Mayor Maturo, random stops, at multiple schools for an officer is neither an acceptable nor effective for security purposes. Locked doors are merely a road block. There needs to be multiple levels of security. One being the immediate response to an active shooter from within a school. Lanza spent 7 minutes firing 100 plus shots (something that could easily be done with a 6 shot revolver in that time). 7 minutes is a very fast response. Yet, the damage was done. Should school security be dressed in tactical gear or prison uniforms, no. Professional security in a school setting blends in, blazers, tie etc. The same way most hotels operate. Most people pay them no mind.

Best Regards,

George Kenyon

130 Coe Ave #68
East Haven, CT 06512

3/3/2013

Representative James Albis – 99th
Legislative Office Building, Room 5005
Hartford, CT 06106-1591

Hi James,

I hope this letter finds you well. With the onslaught of bills that have been introduced into this year's Legislative session along with the many I am sure will come I wanted to write and share my views on various topics. I will say, as a parent and grandparent incidents like Sandy Hook are a horrific, heart raving reminder of the dangers that surround the most innocent of our society, children. Whether it was family, co-workers, fellow shooters, I don't know of anyone that didn't shed a tear and think of how this could happen to 20 children whose biggest stress that day was wondering what they were getting from Santa Claus. It hits even closer when you have a child or grandchild that age and you can put a face to it.

First and foremost, I am against many of these suggestions. I believe many target the non-criminal, taxpaying citizens of our state.

Special taxes- are unacceptable, firearms ownership is not a privilege extended to me, and it is a right, no different than voting. Poll taxes and fees are illegal and I see a special ammunition tax or frequent excessive fees not only unfair, but in my opinion constitutional violations. Connecticut, as with taxes and fees in most areas are the highest in the country for firearms permits and applications. To add on to this is unacceptable. I see proposals such as Senator Byes as disgusting and an insult. To try and profit off of Newtown is a horrible act and disrespectful of every victims memory. The excuse of the money will be used to pay for mental health treatments etc are also not acceptable to me. I work 2 jobs, 7 days a week; to pay my living expenses, as well as some of the highest taxes and cost of living amounts in the county, a lot of which already goes towards government entitlements to pay for other peoples medical and costs of living. To add to my expenses is not something I will accept. To put this in a

different perspective, why aren't voters charged to cast a ballot? Why aren't the accused charged for attorneys?

Magazine limits- you and I have had this discussion in great, my position has not changed, I feel the 10 round limits only targets people who obey the law. When I first met you I gave you a lot of literature from no biased studies and reports that showed most shootings involve less than 4 rounds fired. The 10 round theory was and is an arbitrary number pulled from the sky, almost all common production firearms come "standard" with 13-17 round magazine capacities. There is nothing extraordinary about them. The theory that a lower capacity will slow down shooting sprees is a theory, in the Gifford's shooting, that may have played a role, but our laws should not be based on an isolated event. Most home invasions involve on average 3 assailants. Single shot stops are almost non-existent. In a majority of police involved shootings, officers have shot suspects 5-8 times before stopping the threat, using the lower number of 5, and figuring all 5 hit, just having 2 perpetrators already has the "victim" at a disadvantage. Recently, in Georgia a lone woman shot a home invader 5 times in the face and neck, she had a revolver which she emptied (5 or 6 rounds) the perpetrator "ASKED HER" to stop shooting him before fleeing. On a personal note, I work armed security, the proposed bills that I've seen makes no provision for Bail Enforcement or Armed Security Officers. We are both tasked with extremely dangerous tasks and job requirements, we are also in many circumstances the first responders to many incidents, and a 10 round provision is now putting me in a dangerous predicament professionally. Some of our clients include municipal and federal buildings and properties which are already sensitive targets, banks, ATM service calls and Bail enforcement are tasked with apprehending dangerous criminals. This is punishing us, the good guys. I think you may see some compromise, if the handgun magazine limit was raised to 15 that would cover a overwhelming majority of modern firearms. At the very least, there should be an exemption for the certain professions.

Criminals are not going to care about magazine limits, taxes or other laws. A criminal is already breaking the law, that's why they are criminals. Instead, these proposals will make honest, hardworking taxpayer's instant felons. These proposals will be legally challenged.

Semi-Auto Rifles- Are used as you have seen to kill less people than hammers and baseball bats. Just because something looks like a "military" weapon, doesn't make it one. I had a Buick Regal when I was younger, it sure wasn't a Buick Grand National even though they looked the same, and their performance was far from similar. If this was truly about these weapons, maybe the magazine issue should've been with the rifles. I am also in favor of background checks for all firearms purchases, whether private or via dealer. I don't think (as with private rifle and shotgun sales) anyone should be able to take possession of any firearm with no paperwork or questions asked.

Criminal possession of ammunition -Senator Looney did make a great proposal- Criminal possession of ammunition. There is no legal reason that I can come up with that would justify someone who is barred from having a firearm to be in possession of

ammunition. I do not see it as realistic to "background check" every ammunition purchase however. That would be a huge undertaking. If you spent any time at just one local gun range on a Saturday morning you would certainly understand.

Gun free zones- also need to be looked at closely. They have not stopped gun crimes at schools nor will they. Again, as with any other proposal, this only affects people who obey the law, someone who is going to shoot someone is not going to be phased by breaking ANY law. They are already doing so. All that this areas ensure to a shooter is they won't face their one fear, confrontation from an equal force. In effect, the law which was made to protect kids, made easy killing fields.

James, I will say, as many others, Mental Health needs to be the focus. Connecticut has some of the strictest firearms laws in the country, and already costly. It is easy to focus on guns. As I have seen the talk will start broad, but when the anti-gun crowd gets new laws passed, the conversation and proposals on the actual problems "END". Gun control laws are easy window dressing, they cost nothing, accomplish a political agenda. Mental Health costs money, as you already told me, it's also the first thing to be cut at budget time. You as a legislator are the only one who can fix that. In these mass shootings, Mental Health issues have been the common denominator. Should Adam Lanza have had access to any type of weapon? Absolutely not! The Virginia Tech shooter slipped through a loop hole that we have here in Connecticut as well. That is something that needs to be fixed. However, the task is how do you close it without trampling the privacy rights of the 99.9% of firearms owners who do not have mental health issues. To bar people from possessing firearms based on certain meds or diagnoses is also not an answer, millions of Americans, including police officers take certain medications for anxiety/panic attacks for job related stress or biological issues. Is the government willing to accept the financial cost of workers compensation/Disability because they are removed from the work force?

As we recently saw with the Stonington double murder suicide, the woman here had a reported lengthy criminal and mental illness history, yet, she had a firearm. I question whether this was possessed legally due to our current laws, but obviously, we do need to work on the mentally ill and access to guns. With that said, how do you allow let's say a police officer to have a weapon at home if their spouse is mentally ill? How do you ensure or prevent access? These are the points the focus should be on. Not magazines and ammunition taxes.

Prosecution -Last but certainly not least, there needs to be stricter enforcement and judicial accountability for criminals and the lack of prosecution for gun crimes. To many people who have previous convictions for firearms violations are walking free and committing new crimes. That needs to be fixed. Lives are lost every day at the hands of animals that should be in jail. There also needs to be a very immediate focused addressing of school security. As we just saw announced by Mayor Maturo, random stops, at multiple schools for an officer is neither an acceptable nor effective for security purposes. Locked doors are merely a road block. There needs to be multiple levels of security. One being the immediate response to an active shooter from within a school.

Lanza spent 7 minutes firing 100 plus shots (something that could easily be done with a 6 shot revolver in that time). 7 minutes is a very fast response. Yet, the damage was done. Should school security be dressed in tactical gear or prison uniforms, no. Professional security in a school setting blends in, blazers, tie etc. The same way most hotels operate. Most people pay them no mind.

As always James, you know my position, at the same time; I will always give you an honest answer. Even if it's not something I agree with. If you have any questions I will always answer them. I've always thought you were a good guy, I just don't like where your parties agenda sits on certain topics (the same goes for the other side). I'm always available for coffee if you would like to discuss in further detail.

Best Regards,

George Kenyon
(203) 619-3947