

01/28/2013

To: Bipartisan Task Force on Gun Violence, Senators and State Representatives

Subject: SB 161 - AN ACT CONCERNING THE REDUCTION OF GUN VIOLENCE.

I do not agree that there any provisions in this bill that will sufficiently reduce gun violence. These laws mostly apply to individuals that already diligently go out of their way to follow the currently enacted laws.

Criminal go out of their way to break many of, or all of, the currently enacted laws.

Limiting the number bullets a person can legally have at their disposal in one magazine is very concerning as there have been, and will be instances when a person will need to defend themselves from multiple attackers. A magazine that is only capable of containing 10 rounds, in most cases, will not be sufficient. There are many cases documented that prove this, but in recent days, a Loganville, Ga. Mom, Mrs. Melinda Herman, barely defended herself and her two 9 year old twins against one intruder using 5 rounds. If there were multiple intruders the result could have been fatally similar to the Petit family from Cheshire, CT.

*“The United States Department of Homeland Security has stated a rifle chambered in 5.56 NATO (compatible with .223) **with a magazine capacity of 30 rounds is “suitable for personal defense use in close quarters...”*** (McGough)⁽¹⁾

Assault rifle? With understanding the civilian version of this firearm is already prohibited from being capable of the “fully automatic mode”, the semi-auto version available to civilians is sold as a “modern sporting rifle”. It is ironically concerning that these firearms are labeled “*assault weapons*” for civilian or public use when the fully automatic version is labeled a *personal defense weapon* or *patrol rifle* for DHS, ICE or LEO’s use. In the *Department of Homeland Security* requisition for proposal, (RFP) HSCEMS-12-R-00011, nowhere in this document does it refer to these firearms as “assault weapons”. Why the difference in use of terminology for the version available to the public?

There will be instances when a person may need to defend themselves and family from multiple attackers. If law abiding civilians are not properly protected, they will be at a severe disadvantage and risk loss of life.

In an excerpt from an article found related to the fundamentals of this bill, the following was observed. The article is again about a request from DHS (Department of Homeland Security) for the requisition of similar firearms cited above:

*“This RFP is not for the traditional armed forces. This solicitation is specific to law enforcement who almost exclusively works within and along the borders of the United States. Certainly the threats ICE officers may be subject to **are the same exact threats law-abiding residents could be subject to.**”* (McGough)

Why should a citizen be barred access from the same or similar level of protection?

If the legal process was followed to purchase this type of firearm, what benefit would there be to forcing a law abiding citizen to have a special permit to own such firearm.

This seems excessively redundant for those who own this style firearm or with any pistol grip type firearm and will do very little, to nothing, to keep these firearms out of the hands of criminals.

Additionally concerning, the bill specifies obtaining a permit to purchase ammunition, does this mean an additional permit? This would not keep ammunition out of the hands of criminal's as they could just go to another state to make their purchases. Just as ammunition purchased through the internet would be very difficult to control with regard to the criminal. If he wants to purchase it, not being able to buy it online is not going to be a deterrent to prevent him from executing his carnage.

Responsible storage of firearms should always be in accordance with the need at hand. Education is very important to all family members living in the household. If there is reason to believe improper access can occur, then it should be the responsibility of the firearm owner to determine this. It is currently unlawful to leave a loaded firearm or ammunition where it could be accessed by a child or person deemed unsuitable to have access to the firearm.

Additional registration of all firearms with the State Law enforcement agency would be an unnecessary redundant issue. When a firearm is purchased, several forms are filled out (such as the 4473 form) and should provide all the information necessary to compile this data base. Doing this as an original effort, and then to subsequently require biennial renewal for the same registration seems wasteful of taxpayer resource. Again, this will do nothing to deter the criminal because his firearms are obtained in unlawful ways and will not be registered and will only further penalize the law abiding citizen.

Criminals will still have access to firearms and will use whatever means at their disposal to commit their crimes. They will not obey the law. Only citizens that follow the law will be affected by this bill. As an example, the Clinton *assault weapons ban* was in place for 10 years and did not reduce crime, in fact, crime increased. Increased efficiency with current laws and mechanisms already in place would increase the likely hood of eliminating further tragedies.

Sincerely;
Michael Faucher



475 Liberty Hwy
Putnam, CT 06260
860-428-5049

Works Cited

- 1)McGough, S. (n.d.). Department of Homeland Security: Sport rifle (AR-15) “suitable for personal defense. *Radioadviceonline*.