

Public Hearing Date: Monday, January 28th, 2013
Committee: Gun Violence Prevention Working Group
Location: Legislative Office Building Room 2C

Honored Senators and Representatives,

Thank you for receiving my testimony. What I offer is from the perspective of a responsible, law-abiding citizen and participating member of society.

Firearms are mechanisms that are designed to do one thing, and that is not to maim or kill, but rather send a projectile. It is the intent and purpose of the individual that wields this tool that determines what it is to do. In responsible and lawful hands this is a tool that does not do evil, but functions to protect the sanctity of life and liberty. The existence of evil, distraught, and mentally deranged individuals should not be cause to condition the rights and liberties of the just...nor restrict their means to preserve their life.

When people with evil intent are determined to render harm upon the defenseless, a magazine change after one, five, or five hundred rounds is effectively meaningless. In contrast, an intrusion upon one's abode requires the ability to respond with overwhelming force to repel the assailants. When being awoken during the course of an intrusion the dexterity required to change a magazine is diminished, added to the stresses presented by the very nature of the situation, the requirement to change a magazine after an arbitrarily determined amount of bullets will prove to be a determining factor in the outcome.

I would also like to point out the firearms at the heated heart of these discussions are not, nor are they even suitable to be, military firearms. They only have cosmetic resemblance and offer some similar ergonomics. They are not fit for a battlefield, but they do provide the means to defend one's self in a controlled manner that can eliminate risk of collateral destruction.

I present an ethical argument against any legislation that introduces new restrictions upon the selection and availability of firearms for all responsible and law-abiding citizens that choose to exercise their rights, as well as their functional capacity thereof. Taxes and insurance requirements are financially prohibitive, especially to those of little means who may require the ability of defense the most. In defense of home, life, liberty, and family there can be placed no quantitative value. Limiting the selection of firearm available to a just person is to determine that their life is not worth all means possible to protect it. By placing a limit upon the capacity of a magazine, is to create a currency of the value of one's life; a civilian's life is worth x bullets, a law enforcement officer's life is worth y bullets, an official's life is worth z bullets. Could you assign a bullet quantity value to your life when presented with a situation where you need the resolve to protect it? Assessing taxes, or requiring insurance, effectively say that only those of sufficient means can exercise