



PRESS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Response to Magazine Ban Proposals

The legislature fails to take into account rights, responsibilities or common sense

Hartford, Connecticut, March 9th, 2013:

Serious questions about the sobriety of the discussions taking place in the Connecticut Legislature are being asked by our members and by the public at large. One of the main focuses of these questions is why the legislature is even considering the topic of magazine bans or magazine limitations.

Proposing magazine bans in this state brings forth a huge variety of questions that need to be answered **before even considering a proposal**, but it is clear that the legislators supporting and proposing these kinds of bills are not considering these questions and the impacts that will follow. They have instead made it a point to propose every ridiculous manner of gun ban that they could dream up with no consideration of the impacts of such bills.

The legislature needs to consider:

- If they think the citizens do not need certain weapons or certain sized magazines in their possession, why does Law Enforcement? If these are 'weapons of war', then what war is Law Enforcement waging and against whom? Will those Law Enforcement officers turn in their magazines and abide by the same laws when they are not on duty?
- How many rounds in a magazine or in your home defense weapon is 'enough' when multiple attackers enter your home with firearms and [start shooting you](#)?
- How can a 30 round magazine be too much in a single person's hands against [home invaders](#) when multiple police officers commonly need well over thirty rounds ([in some cases 41 rounds](#)) to stop a criminal with a fake gun?
- Why has violent crime continued to [decrease steadily](#) nationwide since the 1994-2004 Federal Assault Weapons Ban sun-setted? Why was there no appreciable effect on violent crime during the Federal 'Assault Weapons Ban'?
- Why do these magazines suddenly need to be limited when they have existed for many decades and [violent crime has been decreasing](#) since the 80's?
- Why did school shootings [become more common](#) after the Federal government implemented an 'Assault Weapon Ban' and the 'Gun Free School Zone' laws? Why continue failed policies?

- Will the legislators take personal responsibility and legal liability if they pass a magazine capacity limitation law and someone is found dead with their firearm empty after trying to defend themselves against an attacker who did not follow the law?
- Do criminals commonly follow laws? Why would a criminal bent on invading a home, committing a rape or murdering someone care more about a law against their firearm magazine than the violent felony they are committing?
- Why would **anyone** place a premium on following a law that restricts their magazine capacity and seeks to make them less capable of their defense against criminals than their life or the lives of their loved ones?
- Since the DC v Heller decision in 2008, when SCOTUS ruled that firearms in 'common use' such as M16s (the select-fire, full auto version of the civilian AR-15) could not be banned constitutionally, and the McDonald v Chicago case in 2010 incorporated this into applying equally to the states, what gives the Connecticut legislature the idea that they have the power to implement such legislation?
- Where does the State of Connecticut, which is in a financial crisis, plan to obtain the financing necessary to defend the legal challenges that will come if they were to pass these laws?
- Where will State of Connecticut get the money to enforce these overreaching laws when the Connecticut State Police are underfunded and understaffed and their background checks are **heavily** backlogged?
- Are the legislators who are supporting such proposals ready to be honest with their constituents that they are pushing an agenda and willing to make the tax payers of Connecticut pay for their mistakes through court decisions? Do they have any shame in gambling with other people's money to push an agenda that hurts people?

If the legislature would like to discuss these issues or get answers to these questions, Connecticut Carry would be happy to assist.

More information on this issue can be found on <http://ctcarry.com>.

Connecticut Carry is dedicated to advancing and protecting the fundamental civil rights of the men and women of Connecticut to keep and bear arms for defense of themselves and the state as guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Constitution of Connecticut.

Contact:

Richard Burgess

President

Connecticut Carry, Inc

Ph: 203-208-9577

Email: rich@ctcarry.com

<http://ctcarry.com>