

I would like to submit my testimony and have it distributed to all members of the Gun Violence Prevention Workgroup. I would also hope you take the time to share this information with colleagues and constituents. This is not too long, includes links to reference information and I think it is valuable information for the workgroup to review and consider.

I look forward to hearing from anyone who would like to discuss.

Steve McGough
Windsor Locks, CT

Point 1: A personal defense weapon, semi-automatic rifle, sport rifle or patrol rifle (whatever you want to call it) is a reasonable choice for self-defense in your home.

These firearms – in the hands of the public – are referred to as “assault weapons” by the anti-gun crowd and yet *the same weapons* used by law enforcement are referred to as *patrol rifles*. As such, law enforcement and those who have taken the step to own one have found that – **along with** a being a good sporting rifle for target shooting and hunting rifle – *they are a reasonable choice for self-defense in the home.*

1. You can mount a light, red dot sight and/or a laser to the rifle to make it easy to used and aim during the day or night.
2. They have a reasonable recoil, making the gun - for many users – easier to shoot as compared to a defense-caliber shotgun or pistol.
3. They can be customized to “fit” a variety of body types and shooting styles. They can be configured and adjusted for different shooting distances (less than 5 yards to more than 200 yards).
4. The .223/5.56 **self-defense** round is appropriate for use within a home, even in an urban environment. Ballistic experts have found rounds from these calibers “dump energy” quickly and break apart or [begin to tumble after penetrating the first barrier](#). Will rifle rounds go through walls? **You bet**. Will pistol calibers like 9mm, .40 and .45 go through walls? **You bet**. Will shotgun rounds go through walls? **You bet**. That said, there is significant evidence the .223/5.56 self-defense rounds penetrate no more than, **and often less** than traditional handgun calibers and many shotgun rounds.
5. A rifle is **much** more capable of **stopping a threat** – *with fewer rounds on target* – as compared to a pistol.
6. Semi-automatic rifles are **more accurate** than a pistol or shotgun.
7. Ammunition is (normally) readily available and (normally) priced within reason. Present time excluded.
8. You can buy **high-capacity magazines** for many semi-automatic rifles.

Which brings us to the second topic.

Point 2: Ten rounds will probably not be enough in a self-defense situation.

Recent studies on self-defense shootings have shown hit rates of **less than 20 percent** [in many LEO self-defense situations](#). If a bad guy points a lethal weapon at a cop, the cop has every right

to stop the threat just like we have the right to defend ourselves. If only one-in-five rounds hit the target, and you are limited to 10 rounds, there is a good chance **you will not be able to stop the threat**. Of course, the bad guys will not be limited when it comes to their own magazine, putting those who want to do you harm at a significant advantage.

1. In a self-defense situation, you want to *avoid* manipulating the weapon at all except for pulling the trigger straight back. Law enforcement and civilians do not favor high-capacity magazines so they can shoot more rounds, **they favor them so they can manipulate their weapon less**.
2. Yes, reloading additional magazines is possible, but that is *manipulating the weapon* and even though it can be done quickly, it takes time you may not have.
3. There have been many documented instances where someone has been shot two, three, four or even eight times and they **continued to be a threat** to the person or persons defending themselves. Ask any EMT, nurse or ER physician who has dealt with a combative person who has been shot multiple times.

Point 3: A ten round magazine limit will not stop mass shootings.

The Columbine shooters used high-capacity magazines in their rifles *when they were banned*, but the Virginia Tech shooter used mostly 10-round capacity magazines for his **handgun** (not a rifle) and he was able to murder **32 students** and injure another 18. Even though he had access to 17, 19 and 30-round magazines (he could have purchased them) for his Glock 17 **pistol**, he chose to use 17, **standard capacity 10-round magazines**. (He did have a couple 15 round capacity magazines, but it is not clear he used them at all.)

From the official [Report of the Virginia Tech Review Panel](#), Chapter 6, page 74 ([PDF Link](#)), with my emphasis in bold.

The panel also considered whether the previous federal Assault Weapons Act of 1994 that banned 15-round magazines would have made a difference in the April 16 incidents. The law lapsed after 10 years, in October 2004, and had banned clips or magazines with over 10 rounds. The panel concluded that 10-round magazines that were legal **would have not made much difference** in the incident. Even pistols with rapid loaders **could have been about as deadly** in this situation.

If the Newtown shooter used a standard capacity 9mm Glock 17 pistol with 10-round magazines and murdered 20 children and six adults, what would be the gun-control discussion today?

Point 4: The 2nd Amendment *has nothing to do with hunting*, rather it's specific to the people's right to bear arms.

The 2nd Amendment is not exclusively about the right to defend yourself and your family either. From [Federalist 46](#).

Besides the **advantage of being armed**, which the Americans possess over the people of almost every other nation, the existence of subordinate governments, to which the people are attached,

and by which the militia officers are appointed, forms a barrier against the enterprises of ambition, more insurmountable than any which a simple government of any form can admit of. Notwithstanding the military establishments in the several kingdoms of Europe, which are carried as far as the public resources will bear, **the governments are afraid to trust the people with arms.**

Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.) and Sen. Chris Murphy (D-Conn.) and many other gun-control politicians are *afraid to trust the people*. Yes, the people's right to bear arms **forms a barrier** from government tyranny. Do I think citizens will need to "take up arms" against a tyrannical government during my lifetime? **No, I do not.** But for those of you who think this will never be a concern – and roll your eyes at the thought – may I borrow your crystal ball? It must be a comfort knowing your government **will never** exhibit outright tyrannical behavior 25, 50, or 100 years from now.

Thank you for your time.