

Dear Representatives,

Tomorrow you will be meeting to discuss what measures to take in order to ensure the future safety of the citizens of Connecticut in regards to firearms, because of recent tragic events. As a citizen of Connecticut and your constituent, I would like to submit my testimony to be considered during your decision making. To put it clearly, I am opposed to the suggestion that we ban magazines that hold a certain amount of ammunition along with other types of guns in particular. Not only will this have absolutely no effect on future crimes but it will also punish those citizens in the state who lawfully hold firearm permits and own firearms.

Let me explain why I think that the limitation of certain magazines will have no effect. The Virginia Tech massacre, in which 33 people were killed is the worst school shooting in history, and yet the murderer did not use an assault weapon or large magazines to commit the crime.. The murderer did not use an assault weapon or large magazines, he used 2 handguns, one with 10 round magazines and one with a mix of 10 and 15 round magazines. During his murder spree he fired 174 rounds and reloaded his weapons 17 times, almost exactly 10 rounds per reload. The commission tasked with investigating the murders determined that a ban on magazines over 10 rounds would have had no effect what so ever on the crime.

Senator Meyer has proposed in Senate Bill 122, a ban on the possession of any firearm that holds more than 1 round. While he may have thought that in so doing he would be preventing more deaths related to firearms by having a limit of how many rounds a firearm can fire, history shows, if one was so inclined to actually research this subject, that this is in fact absolutely not true. In 1966, Charles Whitman climbed a tower at the University of Texas. He killed 14 people and wounded 32 with a **single** shot bolt action rifle, the only type of weapon this bill would allow.

I am also opposed to the ban on what you may define as assault rifles, simply because it will not be effective either. Criminals have not historically used assault weapons as their means of harming and killing others during mass shootings. Based off of looking back into our own history not too long ago, it is evident that merely banning a weapon does not mean that shootings will still not occur.

In 1999 during an Federal Assault weapons Ban, 2 killers at Columbine used only 4 guns to commit their crime. Only one of which would be considered an assault weapon. Even by the newly proposed expanded definition of what an assault weapon is, and that gun is already illegal in Connecticut. Moreover, the majority of fatalities and injuries were caused by a 2 shot shotgun that the killer reloaded over 20 times during his crime.

Criminals who commit these sorts of crimes do not care if they break the laws to obtain the weapons they need, what makes you think that by passing more laws that ban firearms that it will make even a little difference to a criminal? By passing your proposed laws it only hurts citizens who are lawful owners of firearms.

Instead of proposing legislation that bans certain firearms and magazines and in fact

punishes lawful citizens, we should instead look to heightening the punishments for crimes with a firearm. A law that would punish **criminals** who illegally use firearms for deadly purposes. Make the deterrent for using a firearm illegally so high that it affects those who might commit those crimes. Why not also create task forces in police departments across the state, that are specifically used for determining which gangs, criminals, and other criminal groups have access to illegal firearms and then once they obtain evidence perform a raid to confiscate those firearms. We have vice squads already that perform sting operations in order to do drug busts, why can't we also do the same thing for illegal firearms?

In conclusion, it is my opinion as your constituent that passing a law or laws that ban certain firearms and magazines would be ineffective because, quite simply criminals do not care about laws.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to voice my opinion in this matter. I hope that you view all sides of this issue and come to the best conclusion which helps all citizens of Connecticut. It is blatantly clear that we need to do something to prevent future crimes like the one that occurred at Sandy Hook, we are all in agreement of this. All I would ask is that you would please consider this viewpoint as well, and look at other avenues that could be used.

Rachael Levy