

I am submitting this testimony today because I feel my rights are in great danger. I certainly understand the need to make sure sickening events like the murders at Sandy Hook never happen again, but it seems many have wrongly decided that taking away the rights of law abiding gun owners is the solution.

The lessons I take from this tragedy are very different from those who are pushing for even more, stricter, gun control. First, I feel like Connecticut's gun control laws worked. Lanza attempted to purchase a firearm and was denied. Second, when the law denied him he was willing to murder his mother to steal her firearms. To me this says evil people will not heed laws, and will find a way to do their evil. Third, there is no doubt in my mind every law enforcement officer who heard the call moved Heaven and Earth to get to the scene as fast as possible. However, in the short time it took them to get there, unspeakable acts were committed. The police simply can't be everywhere at once. This is why it's important to me to own firearms. It gives me piece of mind to know I can protect myself and my family until the police arrive.

A vast array of gun control measures have been proposed already for this session, none of which, I believe, will have any impact on crime, or make the residents of Connecticut safer. Several bills seek to limit the number of rounds a magazine can hold to ten or less, and call for the confiscation of those that can hold more. What I don't think many lawmakers are aware of is that the magazines they label as high capacity are actually, in many cases, the standard capacity magazines that the manufacturer designed the firearm to use. In some cases, lower capacity magazines that hold ten or less rounds don't exist for certain firearms. In 2011 the Connecticut Office of Legislative Research did a study focusing on firearm magazines in Connecticut. According to their study at that time there were an estimated 2.4 million firearm feeding devices in the state that hold more than ten rounds. ([www.cga.ct.gov/20011/rpt/2011-R-0158.htm](http://www.cga.ct.gov/20011/rpt/2011-R-0158.htm)) As this data was derived from the numbers of legal firearm purchases this means these are the legally-owned property of law abiding gun owners. It makes no sense to me that law abiding citizens will face having their legally purchased property confiscated if these magazine ban laws pass.

Unfortunately, this is not the only attack on our rights gun owners face. Some proposed laws, seek to make gun ownership cost prohibitive through insurance requirements and increasingly frequent and expensive permit renewals. I don't understand how burdening legal gun owners with these added expenses will make our state a safer place. Other proposals call for firearm registration, or publishing lists of permit holders. None of these laws will do anything to keep guns out of the hands of a mad man or criminal.

I know that this will be a highly charged topic throughout this legislative session but I hope this committee and others can put the emotion surrounding this topic aside and look at the logic, or lack thereof, behind each of the proposals.

Jason Szczesniak

Burlington, CT