

To Whom it May Concern,

I am unable to be present for the public hearing, so I thank you for the opportunity to submit my Testimony on this matter. I'll start by going over some information, followed by personal thoughts on the matter.

First and foremost I would like to remind you that upon your acceptance to office you swore an oath to defend our United States Constitution and our Constitution of the State of Connecticut, of which respectively state:

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Sec. 17. Every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the state.

I also feel the need to provide you with the definition of a few words, seeing as how several of you seem to have forgotten them when publicly speaking and/or while .

Infringe: to encroach upon in a way that violates law or the rights of another

Encroach: 1) to enter by gradual steps or by stealth into the possessions or rights of another. 2) to advance beyond the usual or proper limits.

Treason: In law, treason is the crime that covers some of the more extreme acts against one's sovereign or nation. By definition, literally and historically, especially when sworn to an oath thereof, defying either of our Constitutions would be a direct crime of treason.

Below is cited Supreme Court cases:

District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008)

The Supreme Court held:

(1) The Second Amendment protects an individual right to possess a firearm unconnected with service in a militia, and to use that arm for traditionally lawful purposes. Pp. 2-53

(b) The prefatory clause comports with the Court's interpretation of the operative clause. The "militia" comprised all males physically capable of acting in concert for the common defense.

(f) None of the Court's precedents forecloses the Court's interpretation. *United States v. Miller* 307 U. S. 174 , does not limit the right to keep and bear arms to militia purposes, but rather limits the type of weapon to which the right applies to those used by the militia, i.e., those in common use for lawful purposes. Pp. 47-54.

United States v. Miller, 307 U.S. 174 (1939)

The Court looked to historical sources to explain the meaning of "militia" as set down by the authors of the Constitution:

"The significance attributed to the term Militia appears from the debates in the Convention, the history and legislation of Colonies and States, and the writings of approved commentators. These show plainly enough that the Militia comprised all males physically capable of acting in concert for the common defense. 'A body of citizens enrolled for military discipline.' And further, that ordinarily when called for service these men were expected to appear bearing arms supplied by themselves and of the kind in common use at the time."

Printz v. United States (1997)

In *Miller*, we determined that the Second Amendment did not guarantee a citizen's right to possess a sawed off shotgun because that weapon had not been shown to be "ordinary military equipment" that could "contribute to the common defense." *Id.*, at 178.

Now that the above is out of the way, I would like to remind you that the Revolutionary War was sparked by the British attempting to restrict personal firearms use and possession, as well as increasing taxes. Current political figures like to refer to gun rights activists as "extremists" said in a negative fashion. The only relation of that word is that they are extremely dedicated to preserving our country and constitution. "Extremists" would be better described as Patriots. Our founding

fathers were extreme patriots, who gave birth to our country by risking life and limb. Our country's flag is made from the blood of these "extremists", who gave their lives to ensuring our 2nd Amendment would survive, allowing for all of our other Constitutional rights to exist. Any infringement to our 2nd Amendment rights would be equal to spitting on our flag and setting it on fire, and government declaring war on We The People.

I have reviewed all of the "Gun Control" related bills that have been submitted, and one thing stands out about every one of them; they are quite directly UnConstitutional. Many of them are impossible to enforce, and to actually implement a few of them would quite literally cost the state millions upon millions of dollars which previously the state has already deemed it can not afford when similar bills have been proposed.

In regards to increased taxes on ammunition or anything else firearms related, the percentages suggested are absolutely absurd. Criminals, whether buying ammunition legally or illegally will not have a care in the world about the cost of ammunition, as they more than likely are committing the crime for some type of monetary or psychological benefit of which in value to them would exceed the costs incurred. The only effect these taxes would have would be to put an extreme burden on law abiding citizens in how they can carry out their lawful uses of firearms. Almost all ammunition discharged by law abiding citizens is done so while safely practicing the use of their legal firearms, aka mostly personal training and occasionally professional training. Raising the cost of ammunition will only have 1 single effect; it will reduce the amount of training an individual can submit themselves to, thus heavily increasing the potential for disaster when the individual is compelled to use their firearm in an emergency type event. I strongly oppose any law that would implement any type of increase in taxes on ammunition or anything else firearms related.

In regards to any form of ban on "assault weapons" or "military style weapons"; well the mere use of these two terms is just plain ignorant. They are terms developed by the media and by anti-gunners to portray some form of negative thought process towards guns. By definition, assault is a criminal act of rage or violence, and thus an assault weapon would only appropriately be deemed as such in a specific event where it was used by someone committing a crime of rage or violence, and any physical object can be used as a weapon. For example, if a person throws a rock at another person's head and cracks their skull, the rock would be an assault weapon. Or in the case of the vast majority of violent crimes throughout our nation, standard tools and common sports objects are used such as hammers and bats and knives. Firearms are developed for defensive purposes, and should be treated as such. It is the INDIVIDUAL who would decide to use the firearm in an offensive manner considered assault. The blame should be on the individual, not the firearm. And to ridicule a specific type of firearm as "military style" is even more obnoxious, because every firearm that has ever been privately owned in our country is of military style. Revolvers were the vast majority of handguns carried by LEO's and military in the 1800's and early 1900's. After the invention of the Colt 1911 in 1911 (over 100 years ago), magazine fed semi-automatic pistols became the vast majority of handguns carried by LEO's and military. Bolt action rifles, whether single shot or magazine fed, were the vast majority used in military through the 1800's and on up to WWI, and are still commonly used today in the military. Shortly before WWII, magazine fed semi-automatic rifles became largely used by military and LEO's, and not just AR-platform rifles, but many many other types as well. Shotguns both pump-action and semi-automatic have been heavily carried and used by LEO's and military since the late 1800's. And as stated in MULTIPLE Supreme Court cases, it would be unConstitutional to ban any firearm that is in common use, whether it be by military, LEO, or civilian use. Current statistics show that there is currently an estimated 18 MILLION AR-style rifles in the hands of law abiding civilians throughout the U.S., and that figure has been rapidly growing in recent months. It is THE most common and popular firearm in the entire country, and is THE most applicable to SCOTUS cases throughout history. Also refer back to the mention in the

beginning about militia participants being required to supply their own personally owned firearms. If militia was ever called into duty, would you really want the people defending our state or nation to only have single-shot guns? Or would you want them to be armed with firearms capable of actually defeating the enemy, instead of just pissing them off? And to further expand; your definition of an "assault weapon" is limited completely to mere cosmetic features of the gun that have absolutely NO effect on functionality nor lethality of the firearm. The "legal" definition of an assault weapon has to be among the stupidest things I have ever heard come out of the mouth of any politician, and shows obvious lack of education, knowledge, and experience with such a firearm. If you haven't figured it out by now, I am very deeply opposed to any form of assault weapon ban, and anyone who votes in favor of such a ban I will work my absolute hardest using every resource available to me to ensure ejection from office, as well as having the law overturned.

Limiting magazine capacity to 10 rounds, or 7 rounds, or 1 single round is yet another law that would have zero effect on criminal activity. It would only affect law abiding citizens in that it would largely decrease their potential for self defense. Roughly HALF of all semi-automatic HANDGUNS are equipped FROM THE FACTORY with magazine capacities ranging from 12-15 rounds, and often even more. There is a reason for this; sometimes that many rounds really is necessary to defend yourself or others. Say for example there is a home invasion by four armed men (which has happened on multiple occasions in recent years in CT). A gun of any type in the hands of the homeowner has say 12 rounds in the magazine. This allows for an average of 3 bullets per violent invader. In a high stress situation like this, the homeowner is unlikely to be able to accurately place every shot fired, several of the shots fired may miss completely, or only graze the intruder and piss him off more. When the mere presence of a gun doesn't stop the threat, sometimes 1 single shot will stop it, sometimes. When the first shot doesn't stop the threat, the intruders will typically fight to the death or at least until incapacitated. When this occurs, it typically takes 3-6 HITS to stop the intruder. Now count in the potential for shots missing or grazing. To stop an intrusion of 4 armed invaders, this could equate to the necessity of 20+ bullets! I want to legally be capable of defending myself to the best of my ability, and have the highest likelihood of surviving should such an event ever occur. Lowering the number of rounds I can have in my magazine at one time, whether it be a handgun or a rifle, will have no effect but decreasing my ability of defense. And again, criminals are criminals because they do not follow laws, they do whatever they want, including putting additional rounds in their magazines than what potential laws could state. An magazine capacity limit would have absolutely zero effect on criminal activity. And banning such magazines, considering there are hundreds of thousands of them in CT alone, would cost the state millions of dollars.

As for laws pertaining to background checks, I am not against requiring a background check at a gun show to purchase/sell a firearm. I AM against requiring a background check for private party sales. And I am DEEPLY opposed to requiring a background check when the transaction is occurring between close friends or family members. I believe our current laws are more than reasonable enough, and anyone who chooses to abide by the law will respect our current laws, whereas anyone who ignores the current law is a criminal, and will continue to ignore any future additional law implemented in regards to background checks.

Thank you for your consideration of my opinions, and statement of facts and previous Supreme Court cases. I pray you do the right thing and oppose any proposed gun control legislation. Our citizens and our future depend on our ability to properly and completely defend ourselves to the fullest extent; from criminals, terrorists, foreign invaders, and most importantly tyrannical politicians and government figures.

Sincerely,

Steve B

Middletown, CT

