

To: All members of the Gun Violence Prevention Working Group

My name is Robert Drew. I live at 518 Route 81, Killingworth, CT.

Following the Sandy Hook tragedy, a flurry of bills has been proposed to reduce gun violence. In my opinion, although some of those bills are worth investigating, most are useless, or even counter-productive. To make gun ownership illegal or complicated by regulations would only have the effect of disarming responsible citizens or turning law-abiding citizens into criminals. They would, however, have no effect on law breaking criminals, who will still be able to obtain weapons on the black market. The eighteenth amendment, intended to solve the scourge of alcoholism, was a total failure, necessitating the twenty first amendment. Laws against substances such as cocaine have not worked. How, then, would the banning of weapons be expected to work?

Addressing specific bills:

HB-5112 **Oppose** Would subject firearms owners to harassment, or even confiscation eventually, and would serve no positive purpose.

HB-5165 **Support** Would support the idea that firearms are appropriate to protect life and property and that self-defense is a constitutional right

HB-5176 **Support** Would help insure that persons who do not qualify to get a pistol permit don't, without undue hardship for legitimate persons to obtain a permit and would provide for a uniform procedure to receive a permit across the state.

HB-5179 **Support** Would help expedite legal sales of firearms.

HB-5268 **Oppose** Would make it more difficult for legitimate purchasers to obtain ammunition, while having no effect on illegal acquisitions. A person buying black-market ammunition would not need the insurance and would not have to pay the exorbitant tax. It would also create a black market, with ammunition being smuggled in from less restrictive states, the way alcohol is currently being brought in to evade taxes.

HB-5269 **Support** Would deter illegal use of weapons without having any effect on legitimate use of same.

SB-1 **Oppose** Too vague, focuses on trying to prevent sales of weapons, which is futile, rather than providing defenses against attackers.

SB-122 **Oppose** A misguided attempt to make guns incapable of offering any real protection. Unless the victim is a crack shot and has plenty of time to set up a shot, a single round will not be enough. Even if it hits the target, in many cases more than one round is required to stop an assailant. Useless if there is more than one assailant.

SB-124 **Oppose** As Senator Mayer pointed out recently, it is too easy to switch magazines to make this restriction of any value.

SB-140 **Oppose** Would make it more difficult for legitimate purchasers to obtain ammunition, while having no effect on illegal acquisitions. A person buying black-market ammunition would not need the insurance and would not have to pay the exorbitant tax. It would also create a black market, with ammunition being smuggled in from less restrictive states, the way alcohol is currently being brought in to evade taxes.