

01/25/2013

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

Subject: SB 501- AN ACT CONCERNING THE BAN ON ASSAULT WEAPONS.

While fully automatic firearms are already outlawed, limiting law abiding citizens from legally owning semi-automatic rifles, defined in this bill as “assault rifles”, also known as a “modern day sport rifle”, is unjust. There will be instances when a person may need to defend themselves and family from multiple attackers. If we are not properly protected, we will be at a severe disadvantage and risk loss of life.

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

*“This RFP (request for proposal) 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?

The solicitation mentioned in the above (RFP) is HSCEMS-12-R-00011 and in one paragraph, it refers to the firearms (or similar) that are being described and considered in SB 501 and reads as follows:

In paragraph 3.1 under requirements and testing standards one can read:
“DHS and its components have a requirement for a 5.56x45mm NATO, select-fire firearm **suitable for personal defense use in close quarters** and/or when maximum concealment is required.”

As mentioned, with the 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”. Nowhere in the cited solicitation does it refer to this firearm as an *assault rifle*. It is ironically concerning that these firearms are labeled “assault weapons” for civilian or public use and when the fully automatic version is labeled a *personal defense weapon* or *patrol rifle* for DHS, ICE or LEO’s use. Why the jaded terminology for the version available to the public?

“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⁾


My position is that prohibiting a law abiding citizen from having legal access to purchase this, or similar firearms is unjust and prevents a proper level of personal protection. This is not about “deer hunting”, this is about saving our lives with the firearms of our choosing, when necessary, without limitations!

There are many cases documented but in recent days, a Loganville, Ga. Mom, Mrs. Melinda Herman, barely defended herself and her two 9 year old twins with a single 6 shot revolver against one intruder. If there were multiple intruders the result could have been similar to the Petit family from Cheshire, CT.

Firearm choice should not be reduced any more than what current law allows for.

Criminals will still have access to these 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. **The Clinton ban was in place for 10 years and did not reduce crime, in fact, crime increased.**

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*.