

I strongly oppose any additional legislation that inhibits the ability for me to protect my family and myself.

There are some facts that you just don't hear about, here are two of them:

* A 1993 nationwide survey of 4,977 households found that over the previous five years, at least 0.5% of households had members who had used a **gun for defense** during a situation in which they thought someone "almost certainly would have been killed" if they "had not used a gun for protection." Applied to the U.S. population, **this amounts to 162,000 such incidents per year**. This figure excludes all "military service, police work, or work as a security guard."[\[12\]](#)

* Based on survey data from a 2000 study published in the *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*,[\[17\]](#) **U.S. civilians use guns to defend themselves and others from crime at least 989,883 times per year.**[\[18\]](#)

THAT IS NEARLY 1 MILLION TIMES IN A YEAR THAT GUNS HAVE SAVED LOVED ONES.

We have seen what devastating unintended consequences can happen when people think they are doing the right thing - see Chicago gun murder rate given their current laws.

Given that most home owners use compact sized guns (with larger than 14 round capacity magazines), an imposition of magazine capacity severely cripples our ability to defend ourselves.

This is not Hollywood where every person shooting their guns hits their target, criminals will move. They won't stand still so that we have the best chance to defend ourselves. What is the limit? Should you say 10 is the limit, when the 11th would have stopped the intruder? Should you say 14 is the limit when the 15th would have stopped the intruder?

By now we all know that a woman in Georgia recently shot at her assailant 6 times protecting her children, hitting him 5 - HE STILL WALKED AWAY. What if he didn't decide to walk away? What if he decided he wanted to continue to and try to rape and murder those people?

Also, please let us NOT follow in the footsteps of New York. Attorney James Tresmond of New York is in the process of asking to enjoin the law as he (and many others in the Law industry) claim that the new law is unconstitutional. <http://www.wktv.com/news/local/Attorneys-to-challenge-constitutionality-of-NY-gun-control-laws-187151321.html>

If you limit the number of magazine capacity (of which most home owners own magazines of high capacity), you will in fact make those firearms unusable, and that is unconstitutional - that is a clear infringement of the 2nd amendment.

Let us make a statement, let Connecticut be the first state to make a common sense law - lets make it so that CRIMINALS can not get their hands on guns. Lets close purchasing loopholes, lets create NEW laws as it pertains to dealing with mental health. Let us show the nation that we care.

Thank you.

Joe Morabito
Rocky Hill, CT