

Honorable members of the Committee,

I am a citizen of Connecticut, residing here for over 35 years and parent of two beautiful children. I would like to express my sincere **opposition** to the many new gun control measures that have been proposed as a solution to gun violence. So far, I have not seen anything that would stop criminals from committing future acts of violence, especially acts of mass murder. However, what I have seen is a vast array of legislation designed to harass, intimidate, inconvenience, tax, and disarm the peaceable, law-abiding citizens of Connecticut. This is not acceptable, nor is it productive or even reasonable.

In a study performed by an FBI team of researchers, criminal investigative instructor and member of the Bureau's Behavioral Science Unit, Edward Davis came to a very telling conclusion: "In a presentation and discussion for the International Assn. of Chiefs of Police, [he] noted that none of the attackers interviewed was 'hindered by any law—federal, state or local—that has ever been established to prevent gun ownership. They just laughed at gun laws.'"¹ Mentally ill mass-murderers and other criminals will be emboldened by the newly proposed gun laws since they know their intended victims will be less likely to be properly equipped to defend themselves.

I would like to speak specifically to a few of the proposed new laws aimed at controlling gun owners:

OPPOSE - Magazine Bans: The proposed limits are completely arbitrary and meaningless. The STANDARD capacity for many firearms, including handguns and rifles used for self-defense, is commonly greater than seven or ten rounds. This legislation would effectively ban many firearms currently owned by citizens in CT. It would not have mattered if the assailant in Newtown had ten 10-round magazines or several 30-round magazines. Unfortunately, the results would have been equally tragic since there was nobody there equipped to stop him. However, if the citizens of CT are barred from carrying or possessing magazines larger than seven or ten rounds, it could make the difference in a self-defense situation. Take for example, the recent case of self defense in Georgia where a woman defended herself and two children against a home invader using a handgun. She fired six rounds at the invader, hitting him five times. His attack only stopped because *he* decided to disengage, fearing he would be shot again. If it takes six shots to stop one attacker, what if there had been two, three or four invaders as is becoming more common these days? How many rounds would have been necessary to stop them - 10, 15, 20, 25? **Six rounds, or ten rounds for that matter, in the hands of a woman defending her children simply may not be enough.** Citizens should be able to decide what magazine size is appropriate to defend their families!

OPPOSE - Semi-automatic Firearm Bans and Ammunition Restrictions: Banning certain semi-automatic firearms and imposing punitive ammunition taxes and restrictions also will not prevent another mass-murder incident. The proponents of the semi-auto ban even admit it won't work. However, they do state it's only a first step. What is the last step though - banning all firearms? One outrageous bill has already been proposed in this session that would ban 99%, if not 100% of all firearms (SB-122)! Is this what is considered a "reasonable gun law?"

If I honestly thought any of the newly-proposed gun control measures would protect my children, I would be all for them. Quite simply though, the facts do not support the assertion that these laws will make us safer. Numerous studies have shown that disarming peaceable citizens increases crime and the chances of a mass-murder event being committed. It is no coincidence that all but one of the recent cases of mass murder have occurred in so-called "gun-free zones" where the intended victims have been disarmed as a matter of policy or law.

In summary, the solutions to this problem should be well reasoned and supported by facts, not emotions. The answer to the problem of violence is certainly complex. If we focus on the objects used to commit acts of violence, this problem will never be solved. Unfortunately, a mentally-ill person or determined criminal will always find a way to commit heinous acts even if a firearm is not available. Ensuring victims are unarmed or less equipped to respond to such an attack is the best way to guarantee success by the assailant. Every day in CT, there are hundreds of thousands of gun owners who do not harm anyone. We should not be trying to punish them for the acts of a few people. For these reasons, I **oppose** arbitrary magazine limits, bans on certain firearms, additional taxes and restrictions on ammunition, registration requirements, mandatory storage laws and mandatory liability insurance.

I thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Kurt Weisheit

Terryville, CT

1 Force Science Research Center, "Force Science News #62: New Findings from FBI About Cop Attackers & Their Weapons", Dec. 28, 2006, <http://www.forcescience.org/fsinews/2006/12/new-findings-from-fbi-about-cop-attackers-their-weapons> (accessed January 27, 2013)