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THE CHAIRWOMAN: -- to House Bill 1224.

MR. MAJORS: House Bill 1224 by Representative Fields and Senator Hodge concerning prohibiting large-capacity ammunition magazines.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: And Senator Hodge is on her way.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move House Bill 1224 and I move the judiciary committee report.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: To the judiciary committee report, Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The committee report created a separate clear definition for high-capacity magazines for shotguns to make sure that future sales of common hunting shotguns with tube extenders are not outlawed.

Owners can have attachments and six magazines. Manufacturers can still make the same guns they've always made, but the combination of capacity between the fixed capacity of the gun and any extenders cannot be more than eight. As an aside, I have an amendment to fix this, but this is what the committee
It also makes clear that high-capacity magazines will be banned if they are specifically designed to be readily converted to accept more than 15 rounds of ammunition. It makes clear that it will be illegal to sell magazines that are smaller than 15 rounds but are designed to stack together like Lego's to make larger high-capacity magazines.

It also includes retailers that sell to the government and law enforcement agencies in the exception for legal sale of high-capacity magazines to government entities and law enforcement in Colorado.

It clarifies that only manufacturers who are specifically exempt from the penalties of the bill are allowed to transfer high-capacity magazines out of state. Thank you.

And finally, it clarifies that manufacturers of high-capacity magazines will not be required to put serial numbers on each magazine, but will be required to add a permanent stamp or marking that indicates the manufacture after the date of this bill.

This reduces the burden on the manufacturer, but also allows law enforcement to tell the difference between newly-manufactured and
grandfathered-in magazines. I ask for an aye vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further
discussion on the committee report? Seeing none, the
motion before the body is the adoption of the
judiciary -- Senator Brophy.

SENATOR BROPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Members, to the committee report, and we
can probably adopt it because it's better than -- well,
I don't even know if it's better than not adopting it,
but there was an attempt in the committee report to
change the bill so that the common shotgun wouldn't be
banned any longer in the state of Colorado.

As the bill passed the house and had
their clear stated support of other folks in this
building, this bill actually banned the common shotgun,
the shotgun that everybody uses to go pheasant hunting,
that everybody uses to go duck hunting in the state of
Colorado.

After July 1st you would not be able to
buy a new one. You wouldn't be able to give it to
someone to let them fix it for you, nothing. You were
just out of luck. If you brought a shotgun into the
state of Colorado from out of state that you had just
purchased for your fall hunt, you were risking, I
think, 12 months in jail for having violated this law,
and the amendment in committee didn't fix it.

So the committee passed the bill (inaudible) to the floor that still bans the common shotgun in Colorado starting July 1st. So you can either vote for or against this committee report, but it doesn't really make things better, it just clouds them up.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion on the judiciary committee report? Seeing none, the motion before the body is the adoption of the judiciary committee report. All those in favor, say aye. Those opposed, no. The ayes have it and the report is adopted. To the bill.

SENATOR HODGE: House Bill 1224 -- thank you, Mr. Chair --

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hodge --

SENATOR HODGE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is the amendment on the desk. Do you want to address the amendment before you move in --

SENATOR HODGE: I would like to, please.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Majors (phonetic), would you please read Amendment L.026.

MR. MAJORS: (Inaudible) 1224.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Amendment L.026 --

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hodge, can you move your amendment?

SENATOR HODGE: I move Amendment L.026.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

SENATOR HODGE: In kind of one of the ironies of living in the electronic age, I was sitting at my desk watching my twitter when I saw that Mr. Kopel said I had not fixed the shotgun problem.

So I asked him to help me, and this is -- he says it makes a bad bill better. He is not -- I'm not telling you that he supports the bill, but he worked very hard to help me fix this one issue. And I really do want to thank him for that.

What this does is it says that you can have a shotgun that has a tubular extension, it can have one that is less than 28 inches. That's basically what it does. I ask for an aye vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion on L.026. Senator Brophy.

SENATOR BROPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senator Hodge, and for everybody in the chamber and everybody in the state of Colorado. See what happens when you listen to a Coloradoan on a bill like this, as opposed to somebody from New York City.
This amendment does, indeed, make the common shotgun in Colorado -- the common hunting shotgun in Colorado legal. It significantly changes the way the bill came over, in that with a 28-inch magazine, tubular magazine on the bottom side of your shotgun, you would actually be able to put 19 of the shortest 12-gauge rounds in it, and eight of the three-and-a-half-inch super magnums, that's a new round, I've never even shot it, but I have a lot of the three-inch and two-and-three-quarter.

So this amendment definitely makes a bad bill better, and probably saves 50 jobs from leaving Colorado. So congratulations, we are starting to talk about jobs and the economy, more to come.

THE CHAIRMAN: Again, I'll remind the chamber of senate decorum, to not impugn the motives of a Colorado senator standing before you, a Coloradoan, and why this person may have chosen to run this bill. Please speak directly either to the amendment or to the bill at hand. But to continue to impugn the motives of our Colorado state senate colleagues is inappropriate per decorum rules.

So with that, is there any further discussion on L.026? Seeing none, the motion before the body is the adoption of Amendment L.026. All those
in favor, say aye.

(A response was heard.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Those opposed, no.

(No response was heard.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The ayes have it and the amendment is adopted. To the bill. Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I guess I should make it clear that we don't feel that we had ever banned shotguns. But I think this amendment that we have just passed makes a lot clearer what our intent was.

House Bill 1224 prohibits the sale, transfer, or possession of an ammunition feeding device that is capable of accepting more than 15 rounds of ammunition or more than 28 inches of shotgun shells. It grandfathers in those larger capacities currently in one's possession, but specifies that they must be kept with the current owner.

Violation is a Class 2 misdemeanor. A second offense is a Class 1 misdemeanor. And it's a Class 6 felony to have a larger than 15-round magazine or 28-inch tube in the commission of a felony or any crime of violence.

Manufacturers may continue to make larger-capacity magazines for transfer to a branch of
the armed forces, a governmental agency, a firearms retailer who sells outside of Colorado, a foreign national government approved by the United States government for such transfers.

High-capacity magazines can kill large numbers of people quickly. Many of those currently in use are larger in capacity than what we give our armed forces in battle.

The Department of Justice analyzed selected cities and found them to be used -- high-capacity magazines to be used in 14 to 26 percent of gun crimes, and 31 to 41 percent of fatal police shootings.

Mayors Against Illegal Guns conducted a comprehensive analysis of every mass shooting between January 2009 and January 2013 that was identifiable through FBI data and media reports. High-capacity magazines were used in 28 percent of the incidents. This is disproportionate to the use in overall crime, which was about 2 percent of the time.

Mass shootings in which they were used resulted in an average of 15.6 total people shot, 123 percent more than shot in other incidents, which is 7; and 8.3 deaths, 54 percent more than the five other occurrences.
Shootings involving these type of magazines include Newtown, Connecticut, December 14th, 2012, 26 people killed, including 20 1st grade children. The shooter had multiple 30-round magazines.

Oak Creek, Wisconsin, August 5th, 2012, six people killed, three wounded at a Sikh temple. The shooter had three 19-round magazines.

Aurora, Colorado, July 20th, 2012, 12 people dead, 58 injured, 100-round drum magazine was used. Tucson, Arizona, January 8th, 2011, six killed, 13 wounded, including Congresswoman Gabby Giffords.

Fort Hood, Texas, November 5, 2009, 13 people killed, 34 wounded, 20- and 30-round magazines. Binghamton, New York, April 3rd, 2009, 13 people killed, four injured. A 30-round capacity magazine was found at the scene. Virginia Tech, April 16th, 2007, 32 people were shot and killed, 17 others were wounded.

It's been argued that this would be an impossible legislation to enforce so we shouldn't even try to pass this bill. Well, during the time of the assault weapons ban from 1994 to 2004, a study in Virginia of guns recovered from crime scenes that had high-capacity magazines showed that immediately upon passing the ban, we had an uptick in the use of
high-capacity magazines, and you can see that right here.

But fairly soon, in 2000, the curve went down. And it continued going down through 2007, even after the ban ended in 2004. This shows that the effects won't be immediate, but banning these magazines will make a difference in the long run.

We've heard a great deal about the affect the loss of Magpul would have in our economy and in jobs in this economy. I respect their right to make a business decision and understand that they've been seeking incentives from a variety of states. I hope they respect our right to increase the safety of our citizens.

An amendment was added to this bill in the House that specifically addressed their ability to remain in Colorado if they so choose. This bill is merely an attempt to reduce the slaughter.

Frequently the people who commit these crimes are not familiar with guns and ammunition, and they have trouble reloading. In the Giffords case, it was at that point that someone was able to tackle the shooter and end the carnage.

Data from emergency rooms across the country suggest that home-defense gun use is relatively
rare. A competent defender should find 15-round
magazines adequate considering his or her ability to
reload quickly.

A friend here at the capitol talked to me
about this bill. He's an avid shooter, takes his kids
shooting frequently. His comment, I support the bill,
but it certainly makes things inconvenient. I'm asking
you to support a little inconvenience for a chance to
be in the process of keeping our constituents safer.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further
discussion? I see a head popping out of a (inaudible)
box. Senator Roberts.

SENATOR ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This one is a difficult one, all of them
are, but this one's difficult because no one, no one
thinks it's okay to massacre anybody, let alone,
kindergartners. It doesn't matter whether it's a
congresswoman in Arizona, children at Sandy Hook,
Aurora theatre, no one thinks that's okay.

And I can say, despite the thousands of
e-mails I have received, again, no one would say, turn
a blind eye to what has happened. What they do say,
though, is it is a fallacy to think passing this bill
will increase public safety. And there are many people
who are quite concerned that by passing this bill, we
will, in fact, increase the risk to their public
safety.

I'm going to actually talk more through
the words of my constituents. I had a town hall
meeting back in Durango a couple weekends ago. It was
at our public library. Maximum capacity in our public
library is 216 people. I'm lucky if we usually have
40. We had 400 people turn out for that town hall
meeting.

The reason I bring this up is, I told
those people, You know, if you make the trip to Denver,
if you come up and testify and tell the stories that
you have to tell, the legislators will take note,
because they know you've come seven hours over mountain
passes to communicate your story. While I can try, as
your representative in the legislature, to tell your
story, nobody can do it better than you.

Well, you know what, some of those people
took me up on that. I took the little pamphlet down,
how a citizen testifies in committee. They were
prepared. They had really prepared. They were
nervous, they got in their cars, and they came up.

And what happened? They didn't get to
testify. They, like many other people, not just those
in southwest Colorado, came here to a very crowded
building to find out that there were double bookings of
hearings on committees, that they wanted to be in both
rooms at the same time, they could not be. They had to
make choices.

And even when they made those choices,
even when they got their names on the list to testify
to tell us how these bills, this bill, in particular,
would affect them in their daily lives, they never got
a chance to speak.

They had to get back in their cars and
drive seven hours home. And I am deeply troubled and
disappointed by how that was handled because it didn't
have to be that way. That is not what we are supposed
to be about in terms of listening to people.

So as a second chance, not nearly as good
as if you had heard from them directly, I'm going to
give you some of their stories because I owe it to them
to have their voices heard.

The one that was most -- I wanted you
most to hear from is a young veteran who actually now
has moved up to this area because of services that are
available here that he cannot get at home. His name is
Tyler Wilson, and this is his story:

I am a native of Colorado and I served
honorably as a paratrooper with the 173rd Airborne Brigade. I was wounded in Afghanistan in 2005, where I was paralyzed from the waist down, receiving four gunshot wounds, and nearly died for the oath I swore to support and defend, the Constitution of the United States, against all enemies foreign and domestic. Those individuals who are elected to represent the people of this state swore to support the Constitution of the United States, as well.

After I was shot four times while serving this great country, do you think for one second that I blame the firearm? Absolutely not. I blame the individual who pulled the trigger and only them. I am concerned because many people have fallen victim to the fallacy of the false sense of security these bills provide, not to mention the gross intrusion on personal liberties and extreme oversteps in power from the government.

Instead of saying why not, we should be asking ourselves why. You cannot legislate away evil. No matter, are they reasonable, is there a reason for these bills? There has to be a reason for them to be reasonable. Or are they just another incremental step in the agenda of those who want to destroy the Second Amendment and destroy personal liberties.
Are they just a distraction from society doing the things that would really benefit us in the long run? On the magazine ban Tyler says, Civilians defending themselves from a violent attack do so under conditions similar to those experienced by police officers in shooting situations.

Most U.S. law enforcement agencies have shifted to firearms with larger capacity magazines because 75 to 80 percent of rounds fired by law enforcement officers in lethal-force encounters miss the intended target. Many rounds that do hit the target fail to achieve immediate incapacitation of the immediate threat.

New York police department officers fired 368 rounds in 2010 to stop 24 attackers, 6.5-percent effective hit rate. In an apartment, one encounter involved four officers who fired a total of 21 rounds, 16 rounds were fired by one officer and struck the individual only three times, 14-percent hit, 86-percent miss. August 2010, four officers fired 46 rounds, hitting one subject four times.

If armed with a firearm containing 16 rounds, 15 in a magazine and one in the chamber, and even having the training most law enforcement officers receive, 12 to 13 rounds may miss the target entirely.
Of the three to four rounds that hit some portion of the attacker's person, none may be effective in immediately stopping the attack. Hits to the vital areas may eventually cause death or incapacitation, but it's the effect on the attacker in the next few seconds of a fight that determines if the attacker is stopped.

Tyler winds up his testimony that he would have given saying, I find it even more troubling when lawmakers choose to infringe on my right to defend myself. Unlike most people, being in a wheelchair, I do not have the option to retreat or run away if my life is threatened by that of another. I have to sit where I am and fight for my life.

And those lawmakers want to dictate to me how I can do that or not do that. It should be what I deem necessary to defend my own life and those of my loved ones. According to FBI statistics, you are 110 times more likely to defend your life using a firearm than being killed by one. I will take those odds any day.

To those who argue, I have a greater chance of being shot with my own weapon, that is like saying I have a greater chance of getting into a car accident while driving my car than when I am not. It has no weight in reality.
And it is with my apologies that you didn't get to hear Tyler in person because he's a wonderful young man, and you're lucky to have him in the Metro area. His mother drove all the way from Durango to be here with him during the entire day. He waited 'til 4 o'clock in the afternoon before he gave up on having a chance to testify.

I also want to tell you about two other Durango young people who contacted me about this bill. Dear Senator Roberts, how are you? We are writing to you about our concerns for the proposed gun control bills that you will be voting on shortly and to thank you for your firm support of the Second Amendment.

We attended your town hall meeting in Durango a few weeks ago, and unfortunately, didn't get a chance to talk with you, but we wanted to give our story. My twin sister and I are Olympians in biathlon and participate in the only winter Olympic sport that involves the use of firearms.

We are also college students, concealed weapon permit holders, law-abiding citizens, and role models for many of the youth in Colorado and all around the country. As we make our final push to win the United States first ever medal in biathlon in the Olympics in 2014, we are worried about the effects the
current gun control bills will have on our ability to
compete in shooting competitions, as well as find
sponsors to help support our quest for gold.

We currently compete in three gun or
multigun competitions to improve our skills and help us
bring our shooting to a level that will enable us to
win internationally.

The gun bill, House Bill 1224, would make
requiring magazines that we use for this competition
illegal. We strongly believe in the existing gun
control laws and support a push to enforce these laws.
We do not, however, see how banning magazine capacities
will reduce the number of gun crimes.

These young ladies have, indeed, been
role models for the young people in my area. And, you
know, I am sure they are the unintended consequences of
this bill, but, in fact, they are going to be hurt by it.

I have other stories. I know there are
others who would like to speak. I will -- Mr. Chair,
had to make sure who was back there. Mr. Chair, I
would like to reserve the right to come back and give
you some more feedback from my constituents, but I
would yield my time right now to whoever's next.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Senator.
Senator Lundberg.

SENATOR LUNDBERG: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

There are several reasons to oppose

House Bill 1224. I want to point out what I think is
the most egregious part of this bill. And that is, its
unintended consequence, I will assume it's
unintended -- I wonder if somebody could give me that
card there, thank you -- just a little bit of an
example or a lesson of the extensions because -- this
is the way the amended bill reads, is: A
large-capacity magazine means a fixed or detachable
magazine, box, drum, feed strip or similar device
capable of accepting or that is designed to be readily
converted to accept more than 15 rounds of ammunition.

Now, this is a 10-round magazine. This
is a 30-round magazine. This is another 10-round
magazine that has an extension. In this case, it's a
20-round, but actually it could be another 10-round.

In any event, this 10-round is easily
converted to something more than 15 rounds. And the
way these work, here, I have a magazine here, and this
small plate is on the bottom, and, of course, this is
the top part that feeds into the weapon. And there's a
spring in here that feeds the bullets up.
And you have to be able to take these things apart and to clean them. And therefore, you have to be able to get to the inside. You have to be -- and on this one, it's got this little plate at the bottom that you can take off. It takes what appears to be a bullet point to push this little button in so I can't remove it, but -- at this point in time. But having done that, you can put an extension on. Oh, and these green extensions here that we're looking at were made with 3-D printers. Now, that's readily available, and it will be more and more readily available as 3-D printers become more available everywhere.

And that's the problem. That's the biggest problem that I want to point out right now, is this high-capacity magazine ban is banning virtually all magazines regardless of what their original manufactured capacity is because you can convert them. You can add an extension to them.

And they're designed to come apart easily. And there's where the conversion occurs, because you have to be able to field strip these things. You know, these are designed for the military in combat situations. And let me tell you, you need to be able to field strip your weapon, clean it out, put
it back together, and keep on moving.

And you can't afford for that one little piece of grit or sand to be jamming things up, you've got to be able to pop it out, clean it up, put it back together, and move back on. That's the way a magazine works.

Now, another thing to bear in mind is, there are many weapons for which they have to have the magazine to be functional. So this bill, House Bill 1224, ostensibly is banning high-capacity magazines. But if all-capacity magazines are convertible to high capacity, it's banning all of the magazines.

And if the magazines are necessary for the weapon, themselves, it's also banning the use of that weapon. The only exception is this grandfather clause for those that are out there today. Don't worry, there are only about -- what is it, 130 million throughout the country, and of this particular design, about 30 million available.

Now, so what we're doing is we're saying to the people of Colorado, No problems, if you've got one today, you can continue to operate it, but you cannot even transfer that to your family members. If I'm understanding this correctly, or if I'm incorrect,
I would like the sponsor to correct me, but as I understand it, it is a one-time ownership grandfather situation.

And that means that the magazine and the firearm for which that magazine fits becomes nonfunctional in any transfer whatsoever, unless, of course, you have enough gas to drive to Wyoming and buy one, which is where I expect much will occur.

What we're doing is we're setting up a black market system for honest citizens of today who wish to simply have what's necessary for their firearm to function. Again, the 10-round is not legal because it's readily converted, or convertible.

I trust this is an unintended consequence, but it is a fatal flaw to House Bill 1224. House Bill 1224 bans virtually all magazines that are commercially available. I'm told there are some military issue that are kind of a pressed steel that aren't readily convertible, but I am not aware of that being that common on the private market. For sure we're talking to everything that's out there today, stay out of Colorado.

Now, let's talk about Magpul, that particular company that employs around 200 people up in Erie, in Weld County. And in talking to them, they --
in committee, they came and spoke, and explained that it's not only them, but it's their suppliers, which are another, very conservatively speaking, 200 people, all employed in the state of Colorado.

The sponsor has said, Well, they can continue to do business. But they explained very clearly, their business is national, and, indeed, international. And their credibility among their clients would be severely eroded if they chose to continue to do business in the state that has outlawed their product.

This kind of goes back to the jobs, jobs, jobs that we talked about in previous bills. All of these bills are severely jeopardizing the economic health of Colorado. And this one, in particular, is telling one very successful business, that it's provided good jobs up in my part of the state, I'm from Larimer County, but that's right beside Weld, it's telling those people, You're out of a job, or at best, leave the state. And it's telling all of those suppliers, You're out of a job, you best leave the state, as well. It's a great message, isn't it?

So let's review a little bit. It's throwing several businesses out of business here in Colorado. It's banning virtually all magazines. And
it's rendering those firearms for which the magazine is an essential part of its function inoperable. This is not a ban on high-capacity magazines. This is a wholesale ban on firearms in the state of Colorado.

House Bill 1224 is fatally flawed, deeply misdirected, completely inappropriate, vote no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Brophy.

SENATOR BROPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members, I'll ask for a no vote on this bill, also. And we've heard from the proponents of the bill and the sponsor that the stated goal of the bill is to improve safety in Colorado, and that's obviously a (inaudible) goal.

I heard one of our other senators from southwest Colorado mention that we all care about safety, and we do. The problem is that this bill doesn't do anything at all to improve safety of the citizens of Colorado.

And I'm not just saying that, I'm reading that from the National Institute of Justice memo on the potential improvement of safety if there was a magazine ban put into place. And again, this is the branch of the Department of Justice. They just came out with this study because they're looking at all types of gun control measures.
And with regard to banning high-capacity magazines they very clearly state it will do nothing at all to improve safety, nothing at all to improve safety. In no small part because of some of the facts that senator -- that's really not in the rules, that's kind of made up. But 10 years, 59 days, take my word for it.

My friend from Berthoud mentioned that there are 130 million standard-capacity magazines floating around the United States of America. They are durable goods. They're not perishable. They're not going away.

And so the National Institute of Justice tells us in their study that the only way that a magazine ban would improve safety is if you did a confiscation of significant numbers of those 130 million magazines that are around the United States of America.

This bill doesn't do that. This bill doesn't improve safety. Now, let's talk about what this bill does in addition to what the senator from Berthoud mentioned. And it's important because I put on your desks earlier this evening a poll, a memo that tells you that the one thing that the people in Colorado want us to work the most on is jobs and the
57 percent of respondents say work on jobs and the economy. Well, this bill goes to jobs and the economy. The problem is, it takes it the wrong direction. This bill drives jobs out of the state of Colorado and has a negative impact on our economy, and we know that.

I put up a map here of Magpul here in the middle and all of the suppliers that Magpul does business with in the state Colorado. Let me tell you a little bit about the company, first. It was founded in 1999 by a Marine who was out of the service, working in a software company.

He had an idea of a product to make for fellow Marines, and so he started his company. And then in addition to that wonderful product which started in 1999, over the course of the next about eight years, nine years, he started making all kinds of things that civilians like.

I've often characterized their products as bling for AR 15s. I have several of their products. I absolutely love them. They are of the highest quality. They are such great quality, we will hear how valuable they are at some point in the future tonight I am positive.
Well, I've got to tell you something about Marines. The Marines that I know, like Richard Fitzpatrick, when they tell you they are going to do something, they generally do it. And if they tell you they can't stay in business in the state of Colorado if this bill passes, I think you should take them at their word.

And let's examine, then, what are the consequences of taking them at their word that they would leave the state of Colorado. And I want to set the record straight. If you're not to impugn the motives of other senators, you probably shouldn't suggest what the motives are of other civilians in the state of Colorado, either.

They have not entered into any negotiations with anybody outside of the state of Colorado. Of course they've been contacted. This is making national news. Governor Perry has contacted them saying, Hey, come to Texas, we like jobs. They've been contacted from South Carolina, come to South Carolina, we like jobs. Apparently the people in Colorado don't want jobs.

And let's talk about the jobs. Magpul right now, 200 employees in Erie, Colorado. But for this bill, by the way, they'd probably be at
30 employees in Colorado by now, there is such great
demand for their products. In Denver, two different
businesses.

Jobs in Denver, two different businesses.

100 employees will have to leave the state of Colorado
or go down the street to Department of Labor and get an
unemployment check if this bill passes.

In Longmont, from one company, 60
employees; from another company, 3 and a half
employees; from another company, 12; from another
company, 3 and a half; from another company still in
Longmont, two and a half.

From the town of Hygiene, 36 people
likely to have their job relocated out of Colorado with
the passage of this bill; 14.4 in Superior; 7 in
Loveland; 10 in Arvada; 5 in Englewood; 6 in Aurora; 5
in Berthoud; 3.6 in Broomfield jobs in the economy.

And we risk so many hundreds of direct jobs, not
counting the indirect jobs, that will come with the
passage of this bill.

Lawrence Tool & Molding Company, their
story is fabulous. The success of the company is
directly tied to the success of Magpul. In 2008 they
had 15 employees, now they have 73, all due to working
with Magpul.
Alfred here located in Denver, and Greg came in and testified in front of the judiciary committee, it took him three generations to build their company -- well, through two generations I think he said their company was at 40 employees. Now he's the third generation, and because of his work with Magpul, they're up to 150 employees. He has said without question he has to follow Magpul if they leave the state.

And let me tell you why that is. Take a look at this map if you would again. What this map is is an example of the renaissance in American manufacturing. With relatively low and abundant energy supplies, manufacturing is coming back to the United States of America. We are not, if we defeat this bill, outsourcing jobs.

And what's really neat about the renaissance in manufacturing is, is that the companies that work in this manner are unbelievably nimble. They have a very short supply chain.

See, if you outsource any of these jobs to China, for instance, where they do plastics manufacturing, number one, the guys from Alfred will tell you your quality won't be as good because we do better work here in the United States of America and
right here in Colorado.

But the other problem with that is, is that your supply chain then stretches to about six months in length. So if your brilliant design engineers come up with a modification for one of your 200-some-odd products, you can't get it to the market for almost six months if you don't have this kind of a supply chain.

With this kind of a supply chain, you can put your newly-improved product on the market in six days instead of six months, giving you an incredible advantage over any of your competitors. And that's what's at jeopardy here. And that's why all of these companies will follow Magpul in leaving Colorado if this bill passes.

Is that really what you want to do? Is that really what you think the people of Colorado were thinking when they said jobs and the economy were the number-one priority for the legislature? Running jobs out of Colorado and harming the economy? Members, I don't think so.

I think we need to speedily defeat this bill, send a clear message to this great American success story of a company, We are so happy to have you in Colorado, we apologize, get your expansion underway,
build that new facility in Broomfield, hire and train another great hundred Colorado employees, stay here and make some more jobs for us. Members, vote no on this bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Crowder.

SENATOR CROWDER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

What I have is a letter from one of the businesses that's thinking about moving with Magpul I'd like to read, it's fairly brief.

Dated March 7th, 2013. Dear Colorado senator, I am the president of Advance Tooling Concepts located in Longmont, Colorado. We are a manufacturer that serves the plastics industry. We design, build, and run plastic injection molds for many different industries here in Colorado and across the country.

Some of the industries we serve locally are computer, medical, communications, and firearms. You may know of some of these companies, Oracle, Kobagin (phonetic), Autobox (phonetic), Magpul, and PharmaJet. I'm sending you this letter because I'm extremely concerned about the negative impact that I believe HB 1224 will have on our business and other businesses in Colorado.

I and two other partners started Advanced Tooling Concepts in 1999. By 2009 we had grown to
approximately 35 employees, purchased a
30,000-square-foot building in Longmont, and continued
to grow.

During that time, we also started working
with another local company, Magpul. As our
relationship with Magpul has grown, so has our
business. In the four years we have been working with
Magpul, we have been able to grow our business
substantially.

We are now leasing another
10,000-square-foot facility in Longmont that
specializes in medical molding. We now employ close to
90 people, and our molding facility runs 24/7. A large
percentage of our growth can be directly attributed to
Magpul.

If HB 1224 passes, Magpul has promised to
move out of the state and take with it all that it has
invested here. This move, if it happens, would
significantly impact our business and many more
businesses like ours around the state.

We, as a company, have been able to grow
in very trying economic times because of the companies
like Magpul. Without Magpul as a customer, we will
need to reduce our workforce and reconsider future
plans for the growth here in Colorado.
Gun violence is a very difficult problem to have to deal with, but I believe that HB 1224 is a feel-good answer that will not address the real problem. I urge you to look at everything that this bill impacts statewide if passed, and make the right decision by voting no on House Bill 1224. This is another business that could very well leave the state of Colorado.

I would like to comment on something my predecessor said. He indicated that South Carolina and Texas would be in line for these businesses. But I would not leave out this business going overseas to places like China and Taiwan.

You know, the president is in quite an uproar about businesses leaving the country, going overseas for cheaper labor. This Magpul could very well end up in China. And as I have heard, South Carolina and Texas are both offering incentives for these businesses. Please vote no on 1224. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Baumgardner.

SENATOR BAUMGARDNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I received a letter from the chief executive officer of Alfred Manufacturing Company
that's located here in Denver. He said that he was extremely concerned about House Bill 1224, that it would have a devastating impact on Colorado business and the 150 employees that we -- that they employ here in Colorado.

He has a third-generation company that has been committed to this state since his grandfather founded the company in 1948. If House Bill 24 passes, it's plain and simple, they have no voice, but they will relocate to another state. That's 150 jobs.

Because, you know what, that's all we talk about down here, or seem to talk about, is jobs, jobs, jobs. And like one of the previous senators said, That's what it is, it's jobs, jobs, jobs, that we're forcing those jobs to leave the state.

Alfred Manufacturing is proud of their growth. Even during the economic downturn, they grew. They went from 40 employees in 2008 to 150 employees currently. Their plan was to expand and employ an additional 25 employees so they could have 175 by the end of 2013.

The growth was due to the fact that their major supply -- they were a major supplier to Magpul Industries. They've manufactured and supplied parts and products for over six years to other partnering
Colorado companies, their company and many companies, that this bill will immediately harm in effect if this bill passes.

House Bill 1224 has caused me, him, not -- the executive officer of Alfred Manufacturing, to put an immediate hold on an expansion that they had planned here in Colorado. They own and operate four buildings and are currently working with the city to add a fifth building on the land that they own.

They froze that expansion when this bill was introduced. They will relocate. He says in this letter, If this bill passes, they will relocate. That's a possibility of 175 jobs. That's income to the state. It's for the kids, it's for education.

I understand state leaders want to find solutions to the recent gun tragedies. If House Bill 1224 would make Colorado safer, I would put my business interests aside and fully endorse it as a fourth-generation Colorado citizen.

The fact is, House Bill 1224 does absolutely nothing to improve or enhance public safety in Colorado. The only impact House Bill 1224 will have on Colorado, it will hurt Colorado's economy. It will destroy Colorado jobs and will significantly harm this Colorado business.
They urge all the state leaders to focus on the real solution to enhance public safety. They also urge state leaders to find ways to grow Colorado's economy and create jobs in the state that we live. House Bill 1224 will harm Colorado's economy, destroy Colorado jobs, and will have zero impact. I urge you to vote against House Bill 1224.

I figure that we will hear not only this testimony, but a lot more testimony on this specific piece of legislation. Again, these companies are reaching out to all of us. And these companies are not in my district. These companies are located here locally. But they're reaching out to all of us to make sure that if this legislation was to pass, that we understand what the repercussions could possibly be.

I'll stand with this gentleman and ask for a no vote on House Bill 1224 because it will affect our economy and it's just another bill in a group of bills that will affect our state and affect the way that our Constitution has guaranteed us, the right to keep these arms regardless of what they are.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Marble.

SENATOR MARBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Once again I want to reiterate the fact
that none of us are here to advocate for death, violence. All the tragedies, the deaths of our children, it's horrific. But one of the more horrific feelings is to be a victim again by bad legislation.

I'm going to reiterate what Vice President Joe Biden said, and I want to ingrain this in your minds. This came from the democrat vice president of the United States who said, Nothing we are going to do is going to fundamentally alter or eliminate the possibility of another mass shooting or guarantee that we will bring gun deaths down to a thousand a year from what it is now.

In my district I am so fortunate to have some of the greatest manufacturing in the state of Colorado. That includes Magpul, and also, Alpha Mold West, Incorporated, out of Broomfield. And I want to read you a letter from the president, owner, and veteran, Dane Whittington, from Alpha Mode West.

And he states: Dear Senator Vicki Marble, Reference, House Bill 1224. Alpha Mold West, Incorporated, opened in Broomfield in 1982 as a toolmaking facility, specializing in the designing and building of plastic injection molds.

We custom manufacture injection molds which then produce parts molded of all types of resin
and plastic. Our company's initial success came from working with the Hewlett Packard Corporation. We had a great relationship for many years until it became more profitable for them to move offshore. This happened at the end of the 1990s.

We then moved our focus over to the medical industry. And this became one of our major sources for work. After the initial passing of the Affordable Healthcare Act, many of these companies started setting up manufacturing offshore to avoid the medical device tax which went into effect on 01 January, 2013.

We have seen our work from these companies dwindle as a result. For the past four years we have been one of the many local toolmaking facilities who design and build plastic injection molds for Magpul's products. They have become an important customer to our company.

With the passage of House Bill 1224, I believe that jobs, many jobs will be lost to our community. I also believe that passage of House Bill 1224 will do nothing to improve the safety of the people of Colorado, only to harm the little manufacturing which is still remaining.

I would like to add that the Northern
Colorado Legislative Alliance, NCLA, does not support House Bill 1224. They have come forth saying that it ruins the economy, businesses, jobs, families, the list goes on. I think the state legislature so far has done quite a bit of damage to the small business owner here in the state of Colorado.

I have another letter from a veteran that was sent. And I think he pretty much sums up a lot of what was sent in many of the e-mails, many of the thousands of e-mails that we all received.

He states, Dear Sir or Madame, we cannot let ourselves fall down on this slippery slope. The right to self-defense is a natural individual right that preexists the government. It cannot morally or constitutionally be taken away absent individual consent or due process.

Kings and tyrants have taken this right away. We cannot let a popular majority take it away, for the tyranny of the majority can be as destructive to freedom as the tyranny of a madman. And that he took from a quote from Judge Andrew Napolitano.

The Bureau of Justice statistics' national crime victims crime survey states that 550 murders and 1,100 rapes are prevented every day by firearms. According to the FBI, Americans use firearms
in self-defense 2.1 million times annually.

Cases where firearms are used criminally amount to 579,000. 70 percent of those cases are carried out by criminal repeat offenders. I implore you to vote against turning law-abiding citizens into criminals. None of these bills do a thing to protect our children or stop criminals from going on rampages.

Vote no.

I am a patriot and a disabled veteran who swore an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America. You swore that same oath when elected to office. And with today's political climate, you might very well violate that oath and the oath you swore to the great state of Colorado.

Criminals are called criminals because they do not obey the law. So passing gun legislation only disarms the law-abiding people of Colorado and turns the innocent into criminals with the stroke of a pen. Once citizens are unarmed -- underarmed, the criminals grow emboldened and attack with impunity.

No numbers, no math, and no statistics show that any of your gun control measures reduce death by firearms. Actually, the opposite. FBI and CDC statistics show firearm-related deaths decreasing since the 1994 assault weapons ban ended.
As for mass shootings, those statistics have not changed in 50 years. Estimates show that a hundred-thousand-plus lives are saved each year due to firearms. Here are literally thousands of news accounts of guns saving people's lives. And he refers to a website which is called alwaysbecarrying.com.

Chicago, New York City, and DC are examples of complete gun regulation failures. The U.S. cities with the strongest gun laws have the highest rate of gun deaths. You disarm your citizens, the criminals have unarmed prey.

Let's focus on measures that actually reduce crime. Pass legislation that lets gun owners -- that gets guns out of criminals' hands and gets criminals off the streets. Armed security in schools, increased neighborhood watch groups create incentives for community involvement.

And for the love of God, end gun-free zones, since only law-abiding citizens will respect those signs, the criminals will not. We allow armed guards to protect our money, but not our children? Our priorities are really screwed up.

Please do not invalidate our Constitutional oath by violating law-abiding citizens' rights, vote against any restriction of our Second
Amendment rights. Sincerely, Richard Harnet

When you look at gun magazine capacity and you look at why our burglary rates are down in the United States, it's because we are a well-armed citizenry.

One of the things I want to tell you is -- that you might not know is that in Great Britain, are you aware that 60 percent of home invasions occur while the people are at home? That's because they know no one is armed. No one can protect their own home.

There is such compelling evidence against the fact that restricting magazine bans allude to a safer public. It isn't true. This bill is for nothing except to destroy jobs and give those criminals the ability to keep their magazines of whatever capacity they choose to use against the citizens who are now rendered, in a way, defenseless. Vote no on this Bill 1224.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lambert.

SENATOR LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Well, I come from a district that has a lot of military. You know, in Colorado Springs, we have a full Army division. We have four military -- or military bases affiliated with the Air Force, although
a lot of them are joint, including the United States northern command.

And, members, one of the mottos that we have in the military is you have to train the way you're going to fight. And I can guarantee you, with probably 20,000 soldiers, 20,000 airmen, Marines, Navy, Coast Guard, even Canadian forces in Colorado Springs, we have people who train the way they're going to fight. They are gun owners.

The bill sponsor said that a lot of the military weapons we have now in the U.S. military have less than what she called a high-capacity magazine, I don't know what that's all about. The only one I can think of is maybe a 50-caliber sniper rifle or something like that.

On my air crew we had guns with -- 450-caliber machine guns, we didn't even take off without 600 rounds in them. But the fact is, we have a lot of military people that are going to be affected by this.

We have a lot of retired military people who work on security. Heck, we've got a church down there where their training officer is a retired member of Delta Force. And yet, we don't respect them enough to think they have the judgment to know what ammunition
to put in their gun after they served 25, 30 years in
the U.S. military. That's outrageous.

We pass pro-military resolutions, maybe
that's lip service, but then we turn around and do not
listen to the military members and retirees who are
telling this body, this is an infringement upon their
rights. They are the ones who support your rights,
ladies and gentlemen.

Now, I think the bill sponsor also said
something about Virginia Tech. I don't think there was
any of what they would call a high-capacity magazine
down there because the shooter used two handguns. I
believe it was a 15-round Glock, a 10-round Walther.
But what happened in that case, did it have anything to
do with the size of the magazine?

One article about U.S. News seems to
indicate there might have been another cause to that
mass shooting. A senior university administrator
warned her own family nearly 90 minutes before the
all-campus alert was even issued.

University officials locked down the
president's office more than 30 minutes before the
campus-wide alert. The alert wasn't made for almost
two hours after Seung-Hui Cho shot the first of his two
victims, and then went on a rampage, of course,
reloading and reloading and reloading. It didn't make
any difference what size of the magazine was, but then
he saved one round to kill himself after he killed
32 other people and injured many more.

The real common denominator here is not
the size of the magazines, it's the fact that except
for the Tucson shooting, and maybe they should have had
somebody with a concealed carry there guarding
Congresswoman Giffords, but every single one of the
incidents the bill sponsor cited were in areas where
the law had banned citizens from arming and defending
themselves.

Now, I ran a bill this year to try to put
some liability on that because that is the cause, I
believe, of over 95 percent of the mass shootings since
the 1950s have been in so-called gun-free zones. Let's
get this right. Where people are disarmed, do not have
the Constitutional right to protect themselves, that's
where terrorists will look.

Now, a few minutes ago I had a visitor
here in the chambers. He's left, but he's the owner of
Lockburner Firearms, he's a gunsmith. And he and his
family came to visit today to tell us that they are
already planning to move to Arizona because their
parent company says, After these bills are passed in
Colorado, there's no reason for them to be here anymore.

I don't think it's a small company, I think it's a single family. And yet, they have been here for three generations in Colorado, and now because these bills may take away their livelihood, they're going to be moving.

I also got a letter from the owner of Machining Technology, Mr. Kevin Curtis. He said, Dear Senator, I presently own and operate Machining Technology located in Longmont, Colorado. We're in our fourth year of business and currently employee 25 employees. Typical small business.

We have experienced substantial growth in part due to our business relationship with Magpul. We want to express our explicit opposition to House Bill 1224. If House Bill 1224 passes, we will be forced to relocate our business.

We have owned and operated many businesses in Colorado, and have been Colorado residents since 1977. The taxable revenue we've generated over the years is in the tens of millions of dollars. Our hope is that true legislative leadership prevails, that is, if freedoms are being compromised and lives will be saved. Unfortunately,
House Bill 1224 is not the solution.

And I agree with Mr. Curtis. I don't think we've seen the economic damage that ill-advised bills like this are going to cause. We have a tourist industry that brings in, what, 20-, $25 billion, it's bigger than the budget of our state. And yet, we're callously disregarding everything that's been said here today about people who come here to hunt, the people that want to come to Colorado.

Even fishermen who don't want to go out maybe where there's bears or something in the woods, they want to have a little self-defense. And yet, we're creating an environment, a hostile environment to training, to possession of arms. And in summary, when all these things are totalled up, this is absolutely in the worst interest of the state of Colorado. Please vote no on 1224.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Senator Roberts.

SENATOR ROBERTS: Thank you, Madame Chair.

I'd like to touch on a couple of points. One thing that came up at my town hall meeting, where I, again, had over 400 people, was the concern that law-abiding citizens will turn into criminals under this bill.
And I know there are some who would dismiss that as tough luck, so what, I guess if you don't know better, so it goes. Well, let me tell you how tough luck that's going to be. If you go to the bill, we're talking about any person who violates subsection 1 of this is going to be -- have committed a Class 1 misdemeanor. That's the second time. The first time is a Class 2 misdemeanor.  

If you go to our fiscal note, and I know the fiscal note analysts are challenged in terms of trying to figure out some of these new things, but you have a clear reading here of how many new crimes are created under this bill. It creates three new misdemeanors and one new felony charge.  

This is at a time where as a state we've said, We should not be filling our prisons with people who are not criminals, and yet, we are creating four new crimes. And I can guarantee you that there are an awful lot of people in my district who will end up being criminals under this not for any crime other than possession of this magazine.  

The other thing I'd like to point out, again, in talking with my sheriffs, is the implementation issue. I know on the Front Range a lot of you, it's been a long time since you've been to
southwest Colorado. I have a visual aid, a map of southwest Colorado.

I'd like you to see that in less than 20 minutes, I'm in the state of New Mexico. There's Arizona, which is probably 40 minutes from Durango. And then Utah is over here. Every county of mine except two, so six out of eight counties border another state.

How are we asking our county sheriffs to figure out how to implement something like this? I mean, again, on the Front Range, you're insulated on the Front Range corridor. That's not the world I live in. I live in the world where you can go to the Four Corners Monument and be in four states in a single second.

So when we say that we're going to do this as the state of Colorado and it's not coming down as a federal law, wouldn't like it if it was, but as the state of Colorado, how is that going to work with the implementation piece?

I want to underscore the fact that if we were getting some serious public safety proposals here, it would be one of those things where we would not be talking about, so what happens to tourism or hunters? This doesn't increase public safety. That is what I've
heard. It's what anyone can sort of assess if you step back from it, you look at the people who will try and implement it.

But I would just say, the consequences of this are very concerning. I know I personally have tried many times to take a bipartisan approach in the seven years that I've been here. I think it is extremely noteworthy that the bill package, and this bill in particular, has nothing to do with bipartisanship.

In fact, there was no conversation, and some of the most informed people in this legislature on these kinds of issues would happen to be on the republican side of the aisle. Perhaps they still wouldn't vote, but they'd help shape your bills or help you know some of the definitions.

I guess I would just underscore that if you can't get any republican to support something like this, it is incredibly -- it's a disservice to our state. And I was asked a question whether this would have jurisdiction over Indian tribes, and no, it wouldn't, because state law and federal law -- federal law is -- rules on the Indian tribes.

So again, we just have more jurisdictional mess that my sheriffs will have to try
and figure out. And quite frankly, I think they will
throw up their hands and say, This is unenforceable.
Not because they don't care about public safety, but
because we've created a bill proposal here that doesn't
work in the real world and punishes people who are
actually law-abiding citizens, not criminals.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Members, dinner has
arrived. We will not be taking a break. But alongside
of the wall over on this side of the building is dinner
for members and staff. And we will, though, continue
the discussion.

Senator Lundberg.

SENATOR LUNDBERG: Thank you, Madame
Chair.

Members, I rise again in opposition to
House Bill 1224. And there are just so many things to
be said about this bill that are so important. The
good senator from southwestern Colorado pointed out
some of the issues on the criminal law that's created
through this, as well as the economic issues. I'm
following up on that at this point in time.

However, first let me remind you of the
main point. At least in my opinion the main point of
House Bill 1224 is it does not simply ban high-capacity
magazines. It bans every magazine that can be, quote,
readily converted to high-capacity magazines, which
means virtually every magazine. So this is what it
does. It bans magazines.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) tell
me twice they (inaudible).

SENATOR LUNDBERG: And it functionally
renders any weapon that's fed with that magazine to be
legally inoperable. Now, there is a grandfather
clause. So you can keep your magazine, but you cannot
pass that on even through inheritance.

So if you have this firearm that's fed
with this magazine, regardless of its size because they
are all banned by this bill, then you can pass on to
your heirs this inoperable piece of steel and plastic,
but it's no longer functional.

And I received an interesting observation
from a gentleman from Longmont who actually is a
defense attorney, a criminal defense attorney. And he
said -- this is his analysis of it. He says, I can
tell you, it will be impossible for the DA to prove the
date of possession.

Because if you buy something after this
bill becomes law, then it is illegal. Hence, his
analysis is, therefore, the gun will be confiscated as
evidence. And most charges are not brought to trial,
they are settled through a plea bargain.

Here's his analysis: Plea bargain will be to dismiss, but destroy. So the gun gets destroyed. At an absolute minimum, this is a confiscation of all of these weapons through at least the course of the generation.

Now, that's some observations on the dysfunctionality of House Bill 1224 on the criminal law side. I also have before me a letter sent from a gentleman, Bryan Owens, the vice president of operations for Parkway Products from Loveland, a part of my district.

This is concerning House Bill 1224. He states: I write as a Colorado businessperson who is very concerned with the upcoming vote on House Bill 1224. For it appears that our state's and our nation's recent horrible experience with gun violence has enticed us to find emotionally gratifying, but ultimately ineffective potential solutions to a serious and complex set of issues that our society currently faces.

What is not complex, however, is the impact on Colorado citizens, taxpayers, and voters that are attempting to clean up a perceived image problem by racing to be on the vanguard of a movement without
considering the immediate and practical impact of that action.

Please understand that Coloradans will lose jobs making products that will continue to be legally sold and produced in other states. Magpul Industries is one of the few local manufacturers left in this state that have consistently supported what was once a thriving manufacturing industry in Colorado.

And that's most notably in northern Colorado, which is where Magpul is, and my district up in Larimer County is, as well. Their decision to actively source from local business wherever possible has saved a number of our regional competitors and has contributed to healthy growth in numerous other local businesses over the past decade, including our Loveland, Colorado, facility.

If Magpul pulls their business from Colorado, the immediate impact on our Loveland facility will be a loss of jobs in manufacturing, logistics, engineering, and administration. I know of several manufacturers who are likely to close their Colorado facilities completely.

Given that green energy is proving increasingly unlikely to come to the rescue of Colorado manufacturers, do we really wish to punish Colorado
businesses and workers only to make a primarily
cosmetic point with no real social benefit?

Please consider the real and practical
impact you will have on your constituents as you decide
how to vote on this bill. I cannot believe that the
hollow reward of purely symbolic response will outweigh
the real harm to the numerous families affected by this
course of action.

Please, vote no on House Bill 1224.

Thank you for your consideration. Thank you for your
service to our wonderful state. Respectfully,
Bryan Owens, vice president operations, Parkway
Products, Loveland, Colorado.

You've heard so many letters from so many
manufacturers telling you the very same thing, this is
bad for business, this is bad for jobs, this is bad for
the people of Colorado. It would appear to me that
this is a part of a new economic reality for the state
of Colorado. Any questions?

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Renfroe.

SENATOR RENFROE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just didn't realize where we were at in the order in
time.

Members, this bill, we can go so many
directions to talk about the problems and the things
that it doesn't fix. And I know we're trying to fix something. That's what we seem to want to do down here. We feel something, we want to fix it.

When the sponsor gave her opening remarks on this bill, she talked about people needing to accept some inconvenience. I think that is unacceptable to ask the law-abiding citizens of this state.

I'd also like to mention another thing she talked a lot about. She talked a lot about how with these standard-capacity magazines, they're truly not high, that's political rhetoric to try to scare people, they are standard-capacity magazines in that they kill quickly, that you have access to more rounds, that the killer has access to more rounds, the criminal.

But that's only half the story. The law-abiding citizen would have access to more rounds quickly to defend themselves, which is why we have firearms in the first place. Let us not ever forget that or leave that out of the debate because that is what this should be about.

Criminals are always going to break the law. We can make as many laws as we want. Until we change the hearts of man, they're going to continue to do evil things and cause tragedies.
A lot of the testimony the sponsor gave also talked a lot about all these different criminals that used standard-capacity magazines. Why don't we want our citizens, our law-abiding citizens defending themselves to have that same firepower?

I think I heard the sheriffs, or maybe it was even the senator from Grand Junction, when he was quizzing on how much -- he was quizzing I think a sheriff or a police chief, I don't recall, he was quizzing, How much ammo, ammunition should we have? How many rounds should we have?

And I hope he comes up and explains and talks to that specifically on this because that was powerful testimony in committee. My answer is always, not just one more than whoever would be coming at you, but plenty more because I don't want to get down to where there's only one left. I don't think anybody wants that. And by banning the amount that you can have in a magazine, that's exactly what you're doing to law-abiding citizens trying to defend themselves.

You know, I was sitting in my office the other day, and my aide was there working. And some of you might know my aide David or seen him around, you know, he's physically impaired. He's confined to a wheelchair, you know, tough motor skills, you know,
very hard for him to do a lot of things.

And he -- we were working, and he just
kind of turned his wheelchair over to my desk and sat
there real quietly while I was doing something and
wanted to wait for me to pause to notice that he was
there. And so I stopped and kind of looked up to him
and kind of, What's going on? What do you need? What
did I not do yet that I'm supposed to? You know, one
of those things your aide keeps track of it.

And he says, No, I just wanted to talk to
you about the assault weapons ban if I may and give you
some of my thoughts. And he sat there and he told me,
he said, I can't load a magazine. I can put them in my
weapon, but I can't load them. And if you're going to
restrict what I can have, I'm already at a disadvantage
because of the physical challenges that I face, is
basically what he said.

So what do you want me to tell him? What
message is this senate, this legislature sending to
people out there like David? Accept some inconvenience
is I think the words that were used to start this.
That's unacceptable.

A sheriff testified to this bill also.
And one thing I thought was very powerful, I'm sure
you've seen a picture of it, maybe you haven't, but you
had one sheriff testifying with, at times, up to 
30 sheriffs standing behind him, opposed to every 
single bill that was heard on Monday. 
They testified in this bill that this was 
something that they had no idea how they could enforce. 
And I think you've heard that said over and over in 
here. How are we going to enforce this? Manufacturers 
don't put a born-on date or a manufactured date on 
their magazines, there's no way they could cost-wise. 
Now, obviously in the future you're going 
to know by a new generation of technology, you could 
probably figure it out if it is. So what you're 
basically doing is you're politely confiscating my 
weapon, my firearm to defend myself with this bill. 
That's truly what you're doing. You're 
saying, Oh, we're going to allow you to keep it, we're 
going to allow you to keep all the magazines that you 
have, we're going to grandfather those in. You can't 
transfer them to somebody else, so we're willing to 
wait you out. 
That's exactly what you're saying to the 
law-abiding citizens of this state, we're willing to 
wait you out. We'll get your guns, we'll get your 
magazines. It might take us 30 years, I pray 40, 50, 
but at some point in time, that day will come.
And then my children will have to make
the choice, are they going to obey the law and turn
them in? Confiscation, that's what's coming with this
bill at some point in time. There's no way around
that. If there is, I'd love to hear how -- oh, I guess
I could voluntarily sell them out of state where
they'll still be legal. Or I could -- I don't even
know.

I guess a question for the sponsor or the
chair in this bill is, Could I sell them to a police
officer in our state since they have immunity and they
can keep them and they can use them privately? That's
a great question.

Then along that same -- oh, the great
senator from Mesa is volunteering. But that raises
even another question. So the bill allows for off-duty
police officers to purchase and use these banned
magazines. What if their spouse has the vehicle that
day that they're stored in? How are the police going
to handle that?

Now, the sheriffs say they don't know how
they'll enforce it. But again, we're going to wait
this out and we'll see in the future. And then you'll
be in court trying to defend your innocence. That's
what will happen with this bill.
It breaks my heart how many letters we have received from businesses talking about their future with this package of bills, this bill, in particular, but I think it's the package. It's the message that we're sending.

I think some of the companies like Outdoor World, the messages that they've sent are that we are already sending that message. We have a chance to stop it, and I pray we do.

Here's another company that has been in this state a very, very, very long time, 36 years. I can't believe the thought of having to write a letter like this after being in business in Colorado for 36 years. This is from the president, Lloyd Lawrence, of Lawrence Tool & Molding. Sounds like a family-owned business to me. My father started our company 40 years ago. And to write a letter like this I know would break him.

To where somebody that's been in business for 36 years, I can't imagine -- actually, I can. I actually -- I know exactly where this man is coming from. For 36 years Lawrence Tool & Molding has served Colorado with pride and efficiency. But if House Bill 13-1224 passes, we will draw this relationship to a close.
36 years. It breaks my heart. It absolutely breaks my heart. 36 years in the state of Colorado. We are a veteran-owned plastic injection molding company supporting dozens of local businesses. We manufacture components for ice machines, solar panels -- wow, solar panels. We're having an industry that supports the solar industry move out of our state if this passes -- frisbees, medical suppliers, and the construction industry.

Our parts have been used in DIA, RTD's Light Rail, Children's Hospital, Union Station, and numerous other projects around the state. Since 1977 we've driven nearly a hundred million dollars into the local economy and offered hundreds of stable jobs to its citizens.

And they're located on 7th Avenue here in Denver. 36 years. We've always been profitable, but business really took off when we teamed up with Magpul. This partnership has allowed us to expand operation into a second location and invest hundreds of thousands of dollars into equipment, employees, and new product lines. Now we're at a crossroads.

Yes, we are at a crossroads, aren't we. We talk about jobs, jobs, jobs, and here they are leaving Colorado. Jobs, jobs, jobs, leaving Colorado.
36 years, unbelievable. We are at a crossroads.

Magpul has promised to move out of state if this legislation passes. They feel it would be wrong to give the benefit of their laborers to a community that has banned their product. If you would ban my product in Colorado, I can tell you, even though we've been here 40 years, we would move, too.

It says here, We agree, and with this letter, we're going to join them. You shouldn't view this loss as negotiable. The wealth our company produces is very significant. Our production rates are higher than ever, and we expect 2013 will be our strongest year yet in 36 years for a bill that everybody says is unenforceable, at least in this generation.

So I guess you don't want this company to say they've been here 70 years is what we're saying. Jobs, jobs, jobs. Early estimates suggest we'll add hundreds of new jobs contributing upwards of 200 million to the Colorado economy as we move forward.

And that's just the business end of the discussion. The truth is, there is far more at risk. Wages we pay are immediately disbursed throughout the community. Each of our employees has a family, and they have families, we are their lifeline.
I think the senator from Wray earlier said, instead of them collecting the check at their business over an 7th Avenue, they're going to go right down the street and collect a different type of check. Jobs, jobs, jobs leaving Colorado.

Now, consider the number of businesses that rely on us for earnings, and the number of dependents climbs in a hurry. The effects will even be felt by people we've never met, doctors, grocers, mechanics, and those relying on public services.

Overall losses are hard to project, but collectively, we're talking about more than 1,100 jobs and several million dollars leaving Colorado. Calculating what we'll lose in tax revenue alone is enough to make your head spin.

We urge you to consider the outcomes. This bill is not a solution for problems at hand and only would undermine our economy. If you'd like to visit our facility and meet some of the people that will suffer the impact, please call to arrange a time.

Lloyd Lawrence.

I pray, Lloyd, that you don't have to leave because of a bill that can't be implemented for generations. Vote no on this bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hill.
SENATOR SCHEFFEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First order of business, promise made, promise kept to Dan. I spent the entire day at the capitol building Monday, March 4th, waiting for my chance to speak against House Bill 1224. I sat patiently for over seven hours as I watched testimony after testimony.

After waiting all those hours, the audience was told that expert testimony had taken all the time allotted and there was no time left for public comment, and that there would, therefore, be no public testimony.

Hundreds of citizens were prevented from speaking. And I believe that this severely undermines the democratic process. The following is what I would have said to the committee.

From Dan. The proponents of House Bill 1224 point out that a study conducted during the 1994 to 2004 assault weapon ban showed a decrease in the number of high-capacity magazines recovered in crimes in Virginia during the ban. They use this fact to say that the ban was successful, however, this is nothing more than circular logic.
It is not surprising that banning an item will reduce its prevalence. Despite a reduction of the number of recovered magazines, a study done by the National Institute of Justice in 1999 said that the ban failed to reduce the average number of victims per gun murder or multiple gunshot wound victims.

The previous magazine ban did not save lives and did not reduce the number of victims per shooting incident, even though it did reduce the number of high-capacity magazines recovered in crimes.

Let me restate that. Reducing the use of high-capacity magazines did not reduce the number of overall deaths, nor did it reduce the number of deaths per shooting incident. This proves that having high-capacity magazines available to the public does not increase harm to society.

People also like to point out anecdotal stories about murders being stopped during reloads. But anecdote is not a valid basis for making law, especially when the law is opposed by so many. Freedom should not be curtailed unless there is solid evidence that doing so would help society. There is no such evidence in this case.

Proponents of House Bill 1224 made many emotionally-based calls to do something. However noble
that may sound, there's no evidence that this bill will save lives. If we really want to save lives, we need to focus on mental health services and keeping weapons away from those who should not have them.

Blanket bans on certain types of equipment are not the answer. Please do not support House Bill 1224. Thank you, Dan, for taking the time to contact me so that your voice could be heard today.

A similar note, I don't know if anybody's had time to see this cartoon. It is funny. It draws a chuckle. It has a sad truth behind it. The car behind it is tragic. These are all the businesses that we've been talking about and reading letters from that will be affected by this bill.

If you haven't taken time, you ought to take a closer look at this. It references contract manufacturers, mold and tooling suppliers, packaging suppliers, contract warehouses, I actually know that individual, marketing, and soft goods suppliers, and industrial equipment reflected here as mere dots on a map.

Let me tell you about one of the dots. It's not just a dot on a map, it represents a real industry making real products, employing real people who will be hurt by this bill. The story of
Technologies, LLC, is as follows:

My name is Tim O'Hayre. And I'm the president of the two employee-owned manufacturing companies in Colorado, Techniques, LLC, in Louisville; and Colorado Fabricators in Broomfield. We've been manufacturing in Colorado since the early '70s. We've seen some good years and we've seen some bad years. Sounds like a regular business.

For the last four years we have been digging our way out of the recession. How many times have we spoken at this mike about the recession. Our business has grown in the last two years in part due to companies such as Magpul Industries. Magpul has chosen to manufacture in the United States, and more importantly, in Colorado.

Because of their commitment to Colorado companies like mine, we have been able to grow and create jobs. In the last 12 months, we invested several million dollars in new equipment. We have added 20 percent to our workforce in Louisville.

In November of 2012 we purchased Colorado Fabrication in Broomfield. This company was on the verge of closing its doors. Since the purchase we have been able to retain the original workforce, add equipment, and add new jobs. More jobs and equipment
were planned for 2013 in both locations. But those
plans are on hold at this time.

As Magpul supports our business, we, in
turn, support other Colorado businesses that depend on
us to make their payrolls. We purchase our raw
materials and other support services from these
companies. One of these companies recently told me
that we were a godsend to his business, as he was going
to have to shut down for lack of work. Our secondary
work has kept his doors open, and he has added to his
workforce.

We are not a billion-dollar company. We
are a collection of people, of families of fellow
Coloradoans who want to continue to manufacture in
Colorado. If House Bill 1224 passes and companies like
Magpul are forced out of Colorado, we, in turn, would
be forced to leave, taking all of our jobs and our
support to the local economy with us.

We make goods for companies all over the
United States and some places around the world, so we
can manufacturer our products from any state. Magpul
is our largest customer. If they choose to leave for
whatever reason, we will need to follow them.

There's a lot of debate on both sides of
this issue, but there's an extreme amount of
uncertainty as to the effectiveness of this bill. House Bill 1224 will do nothing to improve the safety of the people of Colorado. This bill will only hurt Colorado business and the Colorado economy. There will be a terrible domino effect if this bill passes. It will not only impact Magpul and their Colorado suppliers, but it will impact the Colorado businesses that rely on those companies' employees to shop in their stores and eat in their restaurants.

My family came to Colorado in the 1860s. My parents still live on some of the original homestead in Lakewood. I'm a fourth-generation Coloradoan. I urge you, as our leader, to focus on solutions that can enhance our safety and without crushing our economy.

Colorado is a wonderful state to live in, raise our families in and work in. Please help protect all aspects of our health, safety, and welfare. Signed respectfully, Tim O'Hayre, president, Techniques, LLC, and Colorado Fabrication, LLC.

Thank you, Tim, and thank you, Dan, for taking the time to contact me. Your words resonate with me, and I will be a no vote on 1224. Colleagues, to be sure, the heinous acts of criminals has deeply hurt and driven to the core of the people in our
communities, our state, our nation. But the answer is not House Bill 1224.

I have seen demonstrations about these magazines. I wish we could have them here, evidently it's not permissible. I wish we could have a demonstration here to show the interchangeability and how fast these turn from to this many to that many, and a reducer, and increaser, and a spring attenuator, and all the different things that these do, it is not the answer to go after these magazines. This will directly hurt Colorado companies. Please vote no on 1224.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Marble.

SENATOR MARBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We are here tonight discussing House Bill 1224 and the other gun bills due to the very misguided focused on an inanimate object instead of the perpetrator of truly evil acts. I've been given another letter from a woman who was here to testify on Monday, but due to time constraints, could not have her voice heard. And I am here to read her letter. And I hope you will listen, as it is from a woman's perspective regarding the limits on magazines.

My name is Laura Carno, and I am from El Paso County. I run a political media company that communicates with women. And it's on behalf of myself
and these women that I am urging you to vote against House Bill 1224 because it desperately affects women. And the reason that this affects women more than men is women are smaller in stature than their assailant. We never know if we are going to have a larger assailant, multiple assailants. Maybe it's a home invasion. Maybe I have to protect my children's lives, as well as my own life.

What if the bad guy is hopped up on drugs, and even if I land a shot, he doesn't go down because he's not feeling pain? The point is, I need to be the one to decide how much firepower I need to be able to protect myself.

You know, women in my mother's generation used to say, I don't need a man to take care of me. And that generation of women raised my generation of women to be independent. I can take care of myself in every way, including my own self-defense.

So when my government says, No, I'm sorry, I understand that you think you're independent, but you need to wait for a man with a uniform and a gun to come help you, so just hang in there until he gets there.

I'm not okay with that. I think we've come too far in too many decades to go backward on
that. You know, I am delighted to live in a free
country where I, the citizen, am created equal to you,
the legislator. You're not the king and I didn't come
here to ask for your permission on how to defend
myself.

And I know that some of you up there
don't think that this size magazine is necessary. And
my suggestion is, if you don't think it's necessary,
then you don't have to own one. But your opinion about
magazine size has nothing to do with my ability as a
law-abiding citizen and independent woman who can take
care of herself whether or not I own that magazine. So
I ask you, as somebody created equal to you, to say no
to House Bill 1224.

I heard my colleague speak that these gun
bills are a precursor to true confiscation. And I want
to read a quote, a very amazing man who I know you all
will recognize. But he said, Among the many misdeeds
of British rule in India, history will look upon the
act of depriving a whole nation of arms as the
blackest. Mahatma Gandhi.

I believe the takeaway from this letter
and from this quote can be summed up as follows: There
is nothing virtuous or dignified in a death due to lack
of self-defense. Give the people their dignity of
self-defense in the way they choose. Vote no. Just vote no on this bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Baumgardner.

SENATOR BAUMGARDNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You know, I didn't know if I was going to come back up here again or not, but -- well, I had planned to come back. You know, the senator from Douglas County made a few comments about these businesses on this map. They're just not businesses, those are people's lives, those are people's income, those are people's houses, those are people's kids that how are we going to send them to school now? How am I going to get my kids to school, I don't have a job because the company I worked for pulled out and went to another state or another country because of House Bill 1224 that restricted size of magazines.

Hundreds and hundreds of people out of work. For how long? Who knows. I mean, they can draw unemployment for a while till they drop off if they can't find work. You know, we're supposed to be recovering. We're supposed to be coming out of this recession. And with these bills, we're going to go right back into part of it because we chose to drive
business out of the state of Colorado.

I have a letter that I'd like to proceed with, Mr. Chair, that does speak to House Bill 1224, if I may proceed, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BAUMGARDNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would strongly encourage you to vote no on House Bill 1224. The magazine capacity limit bill will not make one single U.S. resident safer, not one single law enforcement officer safer.

Today it's the 15-round limit. Tomorrow, the 10-round limit. Down the road, six rounds. There is no end to the goals that people, like President Obama, Mayor Bloomberg, and George Soros will do. You can easily bet their body guards will not be constrained even if they are private guards.

This bill is not morally wrong, but extremely flawed. My goal and your goal should be public safety. The bill does not make that leap. With just 15 minutes of practice, I can have you doing a magazine change in less than two seconds. This bill is about fluff and feel good. Please do not support it.

And he encourages us to not support it.

This is from a former highway patrol trooper of 28 years, also works for the sheriff's
department. May I proceed, Mr. Chair, with another letter?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SENATOR BAUMGARDNER: Thank you.

I don't know if there's any connection here, I don't think so, but I'm going to proceed. It says, I support protecting law-abiding Americans' Second Amendment rights to keep and bear arms for self-defense. And I am a law-abiding citizen opposed to a law that guts our Constitutional rights.

The idea to ban a magazine with capacity over 15 rounds is flawed. The high-capacity magazines are much greater than 15 rounds, greater than 30 rounds for many rifles sold today, including 30-round magazines. And the vast majority of the pistols use magazines greater than 10 rounds, and even 15 rounds.

The rules set forth in District of Columbia versus Heller, A gun in common use cannot be banned as the often used estimate of high-capacity, standard-capacity magazines in the United States is over at this time, at the decision of District of Columbia versus Heller, was about 80 million, and today it's approximately 130 million said magazines are in common use.

Again, the rule set forth says this
common use cannot be banned. If you pass the high-capacity magazine ban and Magpul does leave the state and does continue to produce these magazines -- and I'd like to stop there just a second and kind of elaborate on that a little bit.

Something I heard early on in testimony about an amendment that was put on in the House. And if this has been talked about before, I apologize. But in case you were out of the room and didn't hear it, I think it's very important, that we, as the state of Colorado legislature, would support keeping Magpul here, telling them, you cannot sell these magazines in our state, but you can sell them in every other 49 states, places like Sandy Hook, Connecticut, New York, California.

We'll take the income, we'll take the taxes, we'll make sure you stay in business, and it's okay, you can sell those magazines in every other state, but you can't sell them here. So is that what it's about? Are we concerned about safety or are we concerned about money? Are we concerned about revenue for the state?

It's important to keep these businesses here, but at what cost? If we're really concerned about this, then let's look at this and do something
different. But to tell a company, We don't want you to
make them and sell them here, but you can make them and
stay in the state, and we'll keep the revenue coming in
here.

This gentleman said, continued to say
that if that happened, he wouldn't buy another product
of theirs, and he said that a lot of Americans agree
with him. We stand to lose hundreds of jobs if Magpul
pulls out.

He would also like to bring to your
attention the increasing number of firearm
manufacturers and other companies in that industry that
will not sell any goods to a state that cannot be sold
in the state. So these other companies, they're not
going to sell anything to us, either, or sell anything
in this state that would benefit the state.

The more companies join in a larger firm
will placate this boycott. Supporters of the Second
Amendment, this, again, is just another chunk, another
small step. We're all concerned about safety. We're
all concerned about our kids. We're all concerned
about our citizens.

But we've heard by this gentleman that I
spoke about prior that was a trooper that can teach you
how to change these magazines out in two seconds,
that's not a lot of time.

You know, I'd like to see business flourish in this state. I'd like to see us continue to make these accessories for firearms in our state. As well as many of the people of the state of Colorado, his last comment was, I hope that the people at the state capitol listen to the people of the state of Colorado.

He's asking you to vote no on House Bill 1224. I'm asking you to vote no on House Bill 1224.

THE CHAIRMAN: Minority Leader Cadman.

MR. CADMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A lot of companies, a lot of Colorado employees, a lot of business. I want to share a statement on this bill that was sent to us by Richard Dorans, the vice president of operations for PTA Plastics.

PTA has operations in Longmont, Colorado, and Oxford, Connecticut. PTA has been in business 60 years. And on March 1st we celebrated our one-year anniversary as an employee-owned company. I thought that was pretty amazing, 59 years, and then they figured out how to give their employees ownership share of their business.
(Inaudible) management made a conscious decision in 2000 to focus our marketing on the medical, defense, and security markets. We thought these markets were less likely to use manufacturing to low-cost countries.

PTA was fortunate to begin a partnership with Magpul in 2010. Magpul's business philosophy is unique and extremely uncommon today. Their goal is to source as much as they can on the Front Range of Colorado. There's the proof.

Their presence and growth has made a significant impact to the injection molding community in Colorado. PTA has grown with Magpul. We have increased staffing by 20 percent, added five molding machines, and two machining centers used to build tooling. Over $2 million in capital expenditure investment in the last two years.

It's unfortunate that PTA's 175 employee owners are faced with the threat of losing a significant piece of our business due to our top customer leaving the state of Colorado, not to mention the adverse impact to Magpul's Colorado supply chain of toolmakers, packaging companies, polishers, texture suppliers, welders, and on and on, that are required to support Magpul's orders.
While the gun control issue is emotionally and politically charged, we must be cognizant of this and any legislation that has near and long-term negative impacts on our tenuous economy.

It's about Colorado jobs, PTA's employees and their families. Magpul has been loyal to Colorado since their inception. And it would be unjust to see them leave and stimulate the economy of another state.

On behalf of our 175 employee owners, I urge you not to put our Colorado jobs and our Colorado company at risk. I urge you to stop 1224 from going forward.

I think what's interesting about some of these people that are pleading for their very survival of their businesses and their employees is they are also, many of them, incredibly cognizant of the issues before us that are supposedly being addressed in these proposals. At the same time I've written on most of these letters, this is probably their business epitaph.

And what are we talking about, magazines, pieces of plastic, some springs, some metal. Most of these are going to be -- the discussion around these has been around the 223 AR 15s. You've heard some citations from the Supreme Court case, Heller, that provides a restrictive standard for what types of arms
may be banned, only those, and this is the important part, not typically possessed by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes.

Things can be banned that are not the following: Not typically possessed by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes. The estimate currently is there's 30 million ARs in existence. I may or may not have a couple that look like them. Law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes own these arms.

When these topics were first brought up, I kept hearing the word assault, assault weapons, and high-capacity magazines. And I thought, No big deal, those don't apply to me. I used to have an assault weapon. I used to have a weapon that went fully automatic, but the government gave me all the ammunition I needed. I was in the Army.

They gave us assault weapons to use. M 16s, fully automatic, 30 rounds in, what, 1.2 seconds or something like that. I don't even remember it's been so long since I had one. And I kept hearing, high-capacity magazines, and I thought, That can't apply to me, I only have normal-capacity magazines. I don't have anything larger than 30 rounds.

If you start going to 50 or larger, they get very expensive, they're incredibly unreliable. And
now at 65 cents a round, going on a dollar a round, no
way. You know what I make. I can't afford a
paycheck -- to use a whole paycheck for an hour at the
range, that's how fast those things go through them.

So what do we have to do to feed the
rhetoric? We have to change the definitions. We have
to change what is normal. We have to change what is
common. We have to call it something different. It
has to be labeled different or we can't feed this
rhetoric. We can't buy into this emotional argument
that somehow a piece of plastic and a spring and a box
is responsible for these horrible incidents, because
they're not.

You know what we're talking about? We're
talking about parts, let me show you. Even under this
bill that's been changed, this 10-round capacity -- I
think this 15-round capacity, would almost be legal
except since you can take the plate off so that you can
clean it, it now becomes easily alterable.

You could easily -- this is a 10? Here's
the legal, illegal magazine now, somewhat confusing.
Here's the illegal spring, real scary. Here's the
illegal base plate, real scary. The follower, I think
that's what this is called. I guess I should take mine
apart more often and clean them because I've never
actually seen all these parts out of the inside before.  

So while you're banning these, you're also banning the folks that we're talking about here.  

You keep hearing about the jobs. Go look at one of these places and you will see a guy that literally takes a stack of these, puts one of these on it, and sets it over here. You're banning his job.  

So the moral assertion now is, well, we think these things are lethal, we think they're deadly, we think they're dangerous, but we'll go ahead and allow you to build them as long as you ship them out of state. Does that make sense to you?  

Do we get a pass on anything else that we think is dangerous to Colorado to ship it out of state? If so, maybe we should start doing nuclear power plants as long as we can ship the waste, the toxic waste out of state.  

So now, I may or may not have some of these, and they're currently legal for me, but would be illegal for me to sell or to give away to my kids or somebody else.  

The sponsor mentioned Mayors Against Illegal Guns. You know, if you look at what they've done, they've done some pretty good work. But why are we turning this into mayors against legal plastic? I
thought we were talking about Mayors Against Illegal
Guns, not legal parts, which is what we have, illegal
guns. Nobody wants guns in the hands of criminals
obviously. As a matter of fact, we ought to lock them
up, the criminals.

There's a lot of people in this building,
I'm assuming some of this, there are probably people in
this building that think we shouldn't have any guns,
that's okay. Free society, we're welcome to have our
own opinions. There's probably people that think you
should have as many as you can hold and you should be
able to get virtually anything. Somewhere in the
middle in society we find a balance.

There's people outside this building,
probably outside this state, that think all guns should
be banned by all people. Some of these people are
supporting these bills. Some of the people that
believe we should have no weapons are supporting these
bills. Why? Because they know they can't get that
passed anywhere, anywhere. They can't get the guns, so
they're trying to get the parts.

But I'll tell you, it's effectively
already happening. Maybe you don't even need to run
this bill. Why? Because you can't even buy this stuff
here now. Have you gone shopping lately? Have you
tried to buy a $20 box of ammunition for your 22? It's nowhere to be found.

The other day I heard about some somewhere, by the time I got there, it was too late. And when I found out that they were selling it for $60, for 22 ammunition that we used to buy a box of 50 for 50 cents, that tells you how old I am, gallon of gas, box of ammo, 50 cents. It doesn't exist.

Just the discussion of the government, the government, whether it's the federal government or the state government, clamping down on any component of what people were normally used to accessing has changed the marketplace all across the country. Want to bring one of those over to me?

This is a store in Colorado Springs, I believe this was -- it was a couple -- it was right after Christmas, it was between Christmas and New Years. This is about 10 feet of a wall of Specialty Sports. And these are those old Rite Aid's, so you can imagine how big they are, you know how long those walls were, this is only one part of one wall of Specialty Sports of the weapons that they had sold in the last couple days.

They said they sold enough weapons in four days to equate to an entire year of business. So
these are all stacked up. These are all handguns, handguns, handguns, handguns, revolvers, semiautomatics. These are all long guns. Can't really see what they are. Oh, there's some AR's in there, there's some shotguns in there, there's some 22s in there.

Another picture just around that corner, the same thing, literally panic-buying. Why? Because people thought there was going to be a rash of people breaking into their houses, no. Because there was a rash of government breaking into their Constitution.

That's what happened. That's what's still happening. That's why what we were buying a couple, literally several weeks ago for a few pennies around are now impossible to get, and if you can find them, extremely expensive. So I hope you stocked up. I hope you stocked up.

You pass this bill, there's still 130 million of the 30-round capacity magazines out there. Typical value, what, 14- to $20? Well over a hundred after that. So congratulations if you have them. Enjoy your summer trip, because the minute you leave the border, you can legally sell them for their new value, 120 bucks.

Remember, this is people that aren't
buying weapons because they're afraid of being broken into. Person after person I talked to at Specialty Sports said these were people that were buying because they were afraid of their government from proposals like this.

And we keep hearing, This is just the first step. We keep hearing, I heard it in the house. I sat there and I listened to this on that long Friday over there as long as I could, I stayed there 'til 4 o'clock, and I kept hearing, We have to do something, we have to do something, we have to do something.

But does that mean you have to do the wrong thing? Does that mean you have to put a ban on something that's not going to do one thing for public safety, not one thing? Does doing something mean driving hundreds and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of jobs producing legal products out of Colorado? Is that what doing something means?

Then back to the premise of, they're so immoral, they're so dangerous, they're so deadly, we should stop making them unless we can sell them to somebody outside the border. That doesn't make sense. It just doesn't make sense.

We can't even figure out a way how to make this bill let these things be legal in any
capacity. All magazines are now illegal under this
bill if you can alter them. If you can clean them so
you can keep reusing them, they are now illegal, which
virtually makes all hunting illegal because you have to
use these magazines. Good luck.

I guess we can shut down the DNR because
revenues are going to dry up. Millions of dollars of
hunting licenses will no longer be purchased in
Colorado because you can't bring your weapon here, you
can't get a magazine here. Don't get caught with a
magazine. How's that message work? You know, bring
all the weapons you want, don't get caught with a
magazine.

All right. All right. Maybe the goal is
to turn us all into something similar to a poster in
the president's office, Barney Fife had the bullet in
the pocket? No magazine, keep your bullet in your
pocket so when you're hunting, you're ready. Take your
bullet out.

We have to stop trying to create this new
definition of assault anything because it's not
accurate. As a matter of fact, when I joined the Army
and they showed us what an M 16 round was, I said, Why
is it so small? As someone who had been brought up
hunting, we use 30.06, 308, pretty big rounds.
When you see the size of a 223, it's pretty small. As a matter of fact, it's about the size of a 22 with a little bit more powder. We hear these assertions that they're designed to kill, they're not actually. Specifically in the battle zone, they're designed to wound, right?

So the more dangerous weapons are the ones that are bigger with more powder, the 308s, the 30.06s. But if we label them assault something, we can scare people. We can scare people. We can turn up the rhetoric and turn down the reality and we can scare people.

Let's stop scaring people. You know what, people are scared enough in Colorado. These are real people in our state that are scared of what's happening here, and this is how they're showing it. A year's worth of weapons purchased by our neighbors because they are afraid of what we're doing here. And I think they should be.

These aren't assault anything. They're not designed to do anything different than any other defense weapon. They're small, they're compact. On the ranch, they're tools. Ax, bucket, shovel, AR, be ready, probably a fencing tool. But be able to put a magazine in or it's just an empty piece of metal that's
virtually useless unless you need a pry bar.

You know, there's another story that hasn't been told here yet. We've talked about the Second Amendment. We've talked about the economic impact. We've talked about the fear of government that this assembly is putting into Coloradans, and here's the picture, you don't have to believe it, you can shake your head, but this is real.

And I have a message yesterday from the owner of Specialty Sports that says they will close their doors in Colorado and move out. So congratulations, all you folks that want no guns in Colorado are about to accomplish at least part of your mission, because the sales of these items will not happen here, nor will the parts be sold here either. If we can scare people, though, we can get them to support us.

You know, people are pretty scared after 9-11. We had a couple, several, many, we had many planes, some full of people that some of you knew, used to attack our institutions, and people died. A significant point in history. We probably all remember where we were and what that day was like.

Not too long ago the person responsible for that was found and he was killed by Seal Team 6.
This is something -- I want to share with you something
that this company doesn't share with folks. And I'm
going to show you a picture, I wish I had a bigger one.

We've talked about the economic impact of
all these companies, and certainly a lot about the
economic impact of the company that's being fed by all
these companies, Magpul. I'm going to share an excerpt
here from this book. I encourage you to read it or
borrow it from me.

The firsthand account of the mission that
killed Osama Bin Laden, No Easy Day, the auto-biography
of a Navy seal. For the first time anywhere, the first
person account of the planning and execution of the
Bin Laden raid from a Navy seal who confronted the
terrorist, master mind, and witnessed his final
moments.

From the streets of Iraq, to the rescue
of Captain Richard Phillips in the Indian Ocean, and
from the mountaintops of Afghanistan, to the third
floor of Osama Bin Laden's compound, operator Mark Owen
of the U.S. Naval Special Warfare Development Group,
commonly known as Seal Team 6, has been part of some of
the most memorable special operations in history, as
well as countless missions that never made headlines.

No Easy Day puts readers alongside Owen
and the other handpicked members of the 24-man team as they trained for the biggest mission of their lives.

The blow-by-blow narrative of the assault, beginning with the helicopter crash that could have ended Owen's life, straight through to the radio call confirming Bin Laden's death is an essential piece of modern history.

The little Colorado company played a major part in that history started by a Marine who was probably in similar situations in combat that had a better idea. And on the day that that raid happened, when they marched in there and took down truly one of the most evil men of our time, those men, this man, Mark Owen, was carrying a Colorado-made product from Magpul, Magpul.

Is that really the kind of company that we want to drive out? Pass this bill and say good-bye to Magpul and everybody that supports them, and turn your back on a part of history that was made from things made by people here in Colorado. For what? For what? Vote no.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Senator Grantham.

SENATOR GRANTHAM: Thank you, Madame Chair.

We've already heard from several, several
industries that are impacted by this. These are --
this is -- these are not some phantom assertions. You
hear whispers and doubts. Folks, this is -- this is
real. This is real life for these folks that are going
to be put in this position by this legislation.

Byers Industries in Longmont, Longmont,
they're in jeopardy here. It says, I am the chief
executive officer -- this is coming from them.

Dear Senator, I am the chief executive
officer of Byers Industries located in Longmont,
Colorado. I founded Byers Industries in 1976. We have
had a steady growth ever since. 2007 we were employing
over 70 employees. 2008, several of our larger
customers sent their work offshore.

At that time Magpul was expanding their
product lines, and we were able to avoid a major
layoff. Byers Industries will be severely impacted if
Magpul moves their business out of the state. It makes
me feel sad when I think of all the pain and suffering
that has been caused by the recent shootings.

I know that state leaders are trying
their best to prevent such tragedies. I feel there are
better ways than HB 1224 to prevent such shootings.

HB 1224 will do considerable harm to the Colorado
economy. And I urge our state leaders to find a better
answer. Sincerely, Harold Byers.

WP Manufacturing: Dear Senators, thank you for reading this letter. I own WP Manufacturing in Longmont. We are family owned, and WP has been in business since 1970. We have over 45,000 square feet of manufacturing space.

Although our company is a contributor to the Colorado economy through the work we do, we are not insensitive to the issue of public safety. In fact, we are supportive of measures that would protect our community. Making sure weapons do not make it into the hands of those with malintent or mental illness is a very responsible goal.

However, HB 1224 will not get us any closer to achieving that goal, as multiple studies have shown. Although it has good intent behind it, this bill will not keep criminals from obtaining magazines, as there are just too many out there as standard equipment. An in-state criminal black market would immediately form, which would only supply those without regard to law. Collectively, we can produce a much wiser solution.

As the manufacturing market has slowly returned to our state, firearms accessories have become a majority of our revenues here at WP. If 1224 passes,
WP will be forced to relocate its growing operations out of state before we complete our 44th year of business in Colorado. That would be an absolute shame.

But from what I understand, we would not be alone. There are many small businesses that would be forced to leave Colorado if you pass this bill.

The saddest part is the unintended consequence, that so many Colorado employees, my employees, would be forced to make a difficult decision. Either they must become unemployed in Colorado during these tough economic times or uproot their family and move to another state.

I humbly ask that you do not force me to put my employees and their families through this. I ask the committee to -- and this committee of the whole, to consider studying this proposal in a more thoughtful manner.

Analyze data whether a state magazine capacity limit would really do anything significant to enhance public safety. And look at whether there are other more effective solutions that will not cost Colorado jobs, companies, and the state so dearly, in-state revenue estimated to be in excess of $1 billion over the next decade.

I believe we can find actual solutions
rather than passing such a speculative law in a hurried fashion. Voting this bill down with the intent of arriving at a better solution will not be a defeat for any legislator, it would be a thoughtful and prudent process.

We have elected you to take this type of measured approach in passing any new laws. As a proud Colorado small business owner, I am asking this committee for that prudence. It should not be this bill or nothing. We can do better. Sincerely, Steve McLean, president, WP Manufacturing.

Folks, it's not just the manufacturers, it's not just the small businesses, it's not just Magpul. There are a lot of folks concerned about what's going on here today and what's going on with 1224.

Probably of all the legislation that we're hearing today, this is bringing about the widest concern from my constituents who aren't even attached to any of the -- any of the manufacturers up on the Front Range area, they don't have any direct connection to those, but they are most worried about the effects of this bill.

We have folks in the shooting clubs that are worried about, how is this going to affect them?
The 4-H shooters, I've got many good friends in that, and I know many of you do, too. In fact, I look across the chambers here today and I see many of the little bears sitting on the desk still, 4-H.

One of the biggest activities that we see in 4-H is the shooting clubs. And that's a statewide thing, it's not just out in the rural areas. You know, I learn something new every day, sometimes more than one thing.

But it's a -- its -- I had a 4-H parent, a 4-H activist call me up and tell me about the shooting sports and the activity around the state with this. And they've got really great clubs. They've got a great club down in Fremont County. In fact, they hold some of the competitions down there. They've got a great club in Douglas County. And I think there's some direct involvement with the Douglas County 4-H right in this room right now.

But he said, Interestingly enough, some of the most competitive clubs for the shooting clubs actually come from the Denver and Boulder clubs. How will this affect them? They're scared. Because, folks, when you start talking about the kind of magazine capacity, the kind of weapons they need to use in these competitions, it's not just a simple matter of
writing a check and replacing your weapon. We're
talking about sometimes in cases of certain guns, a
thousand dollars or more for some of these shotguns.

They are scared about the fact that they
may have to shut down their shooting clubs because of
some of these new pieces of legislation. We got
letters from Edward Kiley (phonetic).

He just simply states, My son is in 4-H
in the shooting area, trap and skeet. I'm asking you
not to support this house bill. It will impact the 4-H
shooting program. I hope that's not true. But folks,
they are worried, they are worried.

A good friend of mine, Anne, Anne Vinnola
down in Florence, also, Fremont County, she says she's
a 4-H parent. She's a 4-H shotgun coach from Fremont
County. She says she's heartbroken.

Each one of my kids were in the 4-H
shooting sports program from the time they could hold a
gun until they graduated from 4-H. I have many years
of happy memories watching them shoot, learn
sportsmanship, make lifelong friends, and learn how to
be moral, productive Colorado citizens.

4-H shooting sports programs include
shotgun, 22 rifle, and others that are now in the line
of bills that would seriously inhibit kids from
pursuing these programs. Frankly, in rural counties, 4-H shooting sports give large amounts of kids something important to do that they can excel it.

Each Thursday night from March through Labor Day weekend, I, with other 4-H parents, sponsors, and leaders guide these kids through proper gun safety, sporting behavior, how to treat others with respect and kindness, and so much more.

Boys and girls alike learn side by side. And to watch the transformation of a small child hoisting their parents' shotgun to their shoulder to take aim at clay pigeons for the first time, missing each target, to a self-assured and skilled shooter winning a national championship is an incredible journey.

Misguided emotion and ignorance wants law-abiding American children penalized because of the horrible deeds of deranged people. Do we really want our children to view guns as bad and the pursuits they love and excel at as dangerous?

How could you want to strip the freedom from law-abiding young people and send them a message that they are bad people because they like to legally and safely shoot guns?

In over 30 years since the 4-H shooting
sports have been around, there have been no fatalities and very few minor injuries to the thousands, thousands of kids on the range or anyone affiliated with them. Why are we penalizing them?

They get good grades. They learn leadership skills. They learn how to work as a team. They get many other great skills. I would be very hard-pressed to even find one of these kids committing gun-related crimes as adults. In fact, I was not able to even find one.

These kids are not your problem. They are the fine, upstanding citizens we in the state of Colorado and our nation need more of, and our Colorado senate needs to encourage and stand behind them.

I echo those sentiments. Her daughter Jenny also wrote and gave many of the same sentiments as her mother. Thank you for all your support for us 4-H shooting sports kids. Shooting sports is one of the things that made me who I am. It gave me more respect for firearms. It really taught me to be much safer with a gun. Without shooting sports, 4-H would not be the same. It gives us all something to work towards and focus our time on, and it gives us something positive to work toward.

I have built so many strong relationships
with people in Fremont County through the shooting
sports. People that I know, I have such a connection
with because of the shotgun. We learned how to pull
our own weight in order to help the team, we grew a
team that was more like a family. Without these sports
we wouldn't have the unbreakable friendships that we
have now.

Jacob Yslas, same thing. I've been in
4-H my whole life. I followed my brother into shooting
sports as soon as I could carry a shotgun. Shooting
sports impacted my life in many different ways, in many
different areas. The biggest impact was teaching me
gun safety at a very young age.

Children learn safety and are monitored
so closely that with time, gun safety and
responsibility comes naturally. People are afraid of
guns because they don't understand them. Shooting
sport programs through 4-H teaches you that guns are a
tool and should be used with respect and confidence
just like using a car.

Shooting sports and hunting have taught
me to be aware of my surroundings and cautious of other
people's safety. Being able to shoot a firearm is our
Second Amendment right and 4-H has preserved that right
and passed on gun safety and responsibility. If these
laws are passed, many children will not be allowed to have these rights, and that is wrong.

Tony. Tony wrote that, I'm 19 years old, I was in 4-H from age 7 until I graduated from high school. And I'm a former Fremont County 4-H shotgun competitor. I competed in the shotgun shooting events, and won in the top five positions at the state 4-H competitions many times.

Shooting sports had an impact on my life because not only did it help keep me out of trouble growing up, it also gave me an exciting hobby that I enjoyed doing and excelled at. I was also required to have good grades in order to compete in 4-H.

4-H shooting sports is also where I met the majority of the friends I still have. It also taught me what being a leader meant. I am still an active 4-H shooting coach, and shoot shotgun events around the state in other competitions.

I enjoy the fellowship I have with my friends and family. I know what it means to be a team player, how to lead a team. We all learned what it meant to better ourselves in life by not quitting and trying harder to meet a goal.

By taking away anything that has to do with our guns, the Second Amendment, my freedom; my
nephews, my future children will not get to experience
all of the fun and knowledge about shooting and hunting
that I did, and that is not fair.

Shooting and hunting are a way of life.
And in your statistics, how many law-abiding citizens
that went through 4-H have committed the crimes that we
are being attacked for? Please do not vote yes on
these bills. They will destroy 4-H shooting sports and
penalize thousands of great kids throughout Colorado.

That's also Tony Vinnola. This is a
family affair. Jenny, Anne, Tony, the Vinnolas, good
friends of mine. Casey Myers, a 4-H shotgun
instructor, has been a Fremont County 4-H shotgun
leader for eight years. He says, During that time, I
have had the honor of coaching many wonderful kids. I
have had the privilege of watching many of them grow
from young children to upstanding productive members of
our state.

More than one youth shooter from our
program has competed and won at the state 4-H
competitions, as well as nationals. Colorado has a
state program that is one of the very best in the
nation. This proud tradition, this wonderful program,
one that has touched the lives of thousands of kids
over the last 30 years is now in jeopardy due to
legislation that could render 4-H shooting sports and Coloradoans too risky to field.

4-H is the best (inaudible) shooting sport program for many reasons. Most importantly, we are safe, ethical, legal, and right. It is not just a theory, it is the very foundation from which all 4-H has built an active, strong, positive youth organization that has lasted for more than 100 years.

4-H shooting sports is (inaudible) one-half of the overall organization and growing. By passing laws forcing us to choose between compromising the very high standards we have set or ending a successful shooting sports discipline out of caution and abiding by a nonsensical law, I, as a 4-H volunteer, fully expect Colorado 4-H shooting sports to begin ending programs.

Passing a law creating limited conditions in which youth would be allowed to have access to the guns commonly used in their disciplines would create hardship financially and legally for the kids, and the fine tradition of shooting sports will die.

Casey Myers, Fremont County.

Like I said, folks, they are worried, worried about the nuances of this bill, worried about the actual implications, not just for those of us who
may or may not like to have the 30-round mags, we're
talking about -- we're talking about kids, we're
talking about shootings sports, we're talking about
shotgun capacities, what are they going to be allowed
to do and what are they not going to be allowed to do,
how is this going to affect their competitions, their
shooting sports; they're worried and they have a right
to be.

We see so much fallout in businesses, but
what about other fallout, when we see the reaction of
people across this country right now in this
legislation, and what they're planning to do, what
they're planning not to do in relation to Colorado
because of what we're seeing here.

We got an interesting e-mail from someone
in Iowa. They actually own a home just south of me in
Westcliffe down in Custer County, but their main home
is in Iowa. It says, I live in Iowa, own a home near
Westcliffe. In a time of economic uncertainty, it
would be unwise to alienate the hunters and
firearm-friendly people that travel to your state
annually to spend vast quantities of money; from game
tags, to lodging, for dining and groceries, to all
kinds of local purchases, as well as discrimination of
local businesses.
I'm wondering if you have managed to hurt your pocketbook in ways you've never imagined. I took some of the people that work for me and spent February 8th through 10th in your lovely state looking at ranches and property. My wife and I had decided to buy land we looked at not far from Canon City.

Today -- this is from February 18th -- we have halted that purchase. Try that again. Today, back on February 18th, we have halted that purchase. There is no way -- there is no way we're going to support a state that believes our rights to self-defense should be limited.

We won't buy your elk tags. We won't use your outfitters. We won't buy our gear in your stores. We won't buy your gasoline and diesel for our vehicles. We won't shop in your stores, stay in your hotels, and we won't be eating in your restaurants, your local businesses won't enjoy revenue earned from our purchases, and the state won't collect a nickel of the associated tax.

Opting to alienate the primary group of people that visit your state for tourism, hunting, and vacationing seems inherently foolish and ill-advised. I'm encouraging others to approach your decision to ban weapon magazines to do the same. Congratulations,
Colorado. Be careful what you wish for, you may just get it.

The exact same story, folks. Folks from Kansas. My name is Fred Hagerman (phonetic). My wife and myself have been looking at homes in the Woodland Park area in hopes of moving our family and my automotive restoration parts business. We have located a couple of homes to look at and had appointments to do so this upcoming week with ReMax there in Woodland Park.

However, as of this afternoon, I have canceled those appointments. I am put in a position of having to wait to see if the firearms legislation is passed. Unfortunately, if this passes, I will not be continuing our search for a new location in Woodland Park or any other part of Colorado for either our family or my business. I cannot give up any of my freedoms, liberties, or rights to move there.

Fred Hagerman, Kansas.

I have several other letters, folks. I'm going to reserve the right to come back and talk about some of those a little bit later and give some of my comrades the opportunity to speak here and so I can get a drink of water. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
SENATOR LUNDBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chair, I was expecting today to see some interesting debate and discussion as we went back and forth on the merits or the demerits of these bills. Mr. Chair, I've been a bit surprised that it's been a one-sided argument against the bills, particularly on 1224. I wonder, Mr. Chair, if there is any redeemable argument for passing this bill. I haven't heard much here.

But I also stand before you today to point out once again how deceptively comprehensive 1224 is. Because it states that a large-capacity magazine means a fixed or detachable magazine, box, drum, feed strip, or similar device capable of accepting or that is designed to be readily converted to accept more than 15 rounds of ammunition.

This is the basic case for a PMAG 10, it holds 10 rounds. Now, it also has a spring, a baseplate, and a couple of pieces around the spring to hold it in place and to feed the ammunition out. But this is it. It holds 10 rounds.

So is this a high-capacity magazine or not? One would think it is not. And you have to have this in order to operate the firearm. Without it, the
firearm is, as the good senator from Colorado Springs pointed out some time ago, maybe good for a pry bar.

Well, is this readily converted -- or convertible to a larger-capacity magazine than 10 or is it not? Now, we've talked about it, but I thought it would be much more appropriate if we demonstrated exactly what we mean by "readily convertible."

This is the basic piece. We've removed the baseplate that's right here and the spring and the other two pieces involved. So we take the baseplate off, we take an extension, and again, this was an extension that was printed out on a 3-D printer, so I'd call that readily available, as well.

Here's the 10-round magazine, here's the extension. There it is, converted. Your spring, your baseplate, you're in business. That, ladies and gentlemen of the senate, is, in fact, something that is readily convertible. Hence, this is a high-capacity magazine. This, according to the terms of House Bill 1224, is illegal.

Is anybody listening out there who is going to be voting? Are you going to be voting to make this illegal? 1224 makes the standard smaller-capacity -- actually, if they have a smaller one, it doesn't take much to clip on enough to put more
than 15 rounds in, they're all illegal, that's the way 1224 works.

Don't fool me with some rhetoric that the smaller magazines are acceptable, they are not. This bill makes all of these magazines illegal. It renders the weapons completely inoperable by legal standards for the state of Colorado.

And I would also point out, the counsel I got from a -- a criminal defense attorney from Longmont who noted that there's no way a DA could establish when you built this. Hence, as evidence, they take the weapon.

And by the practice of the law here in Colorado, you don't go to court, you plea bargain. And by his analysis, the most normal standard expected plea bargain would be they drop the charges, they destroy the weapon, the totally legal weapon, except they just couldn't figure it out because you didn't have that receipt for this piece that you built on your own. Is this really the kind of law we are expecting the people of Colorado to accept?

Let me speak a little more -- let me raise my eyes to the people of Colorado. Is this the type of legislation you expect from your senators? Is 1224 acceptable law for your day-to-day life? Well, if
this senate passes this legislation and it becomes law,
the good people of Colorado need to support those of us
who will repeal this as soon as we possibly can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Baumgardner.
SENATOR BAUMGARDNER: Thank you,
Mr. Chair.

I'm back again. Got a couple more things
here that I wanted to bring out, a couple more pieces
of mail that I just received. One's from a retired law
enforcement officer that wrote me at 4:59 p.m. today
and asked me if I'd please read this at the well, and I
told him I would.

Can I proceed, Mr. Chair?
THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir, you may proceed.
SENATOR BAUMGARDNER: Thank you. Thank
you.

Senators, in regard to the proposed gun
laws before the senate, please vote no on all these
laws now being considered. In regard to the 15-round
cap for magazines, I am a retired law enforcement
officer with 25 years of service. The weapon I carried
and trained with for over 25 years holds 17 to 19
rounds each.

If House Bill 1224 passes, I would be
carrying an illegal weapon. I believe all of us who
have retired in good standing from law enforcement
reserve the right to protect ourselves from the many
enemies that we have made over the years while serving
in public.

In regard to the bill, making
manufacturers and sellers liable, again, vote no. This
is a knee-jerk reaction to a problem caused by only a
few individuals. Only about a dozen persons are
responsible for the mass shootings which have taken
place in the last few years, most of who have been
mentally ill.

The millions of people, citizens, who do
not break the law of the land should not be punished by
the very few who commit these crimes. I am sure that
since we get a good many products from China, that we
will not be able to go back to China to recoup damages
from these manufacturers.

I was at Columbine and know that only two
persons were involved in those shootings. In regard to
guns at colleges, how many rapes have occurred over the
last number of years that may have been prevented had
weapons been allowed?

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Baumgardner, are
you focusing on House Bill 1224, the magazine bill?

Senator Baumgardner: Thank you,
Mr. Chair. I asked for permission to read a letter
from someone that had sent it to me. I will try to
stay away from issues that might possibly address other
pieces of legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Senator
Baumgardner, please proceed.

SENATOR BAUMGARDNER: Thank you.

Over 100,000 people are killed and
injured each year in automobile -- in vehicle
accidents, many of those children, many times those
killed in school shootings. Yet, where is the outcry
to ban vehicles from the roads?

In just the last few months we have had
several hit-and-run accidents in the Denver area in
which people have died. It's sad when children die,
yet, this is another reaction that only harms
law-abiding citizens.

Having worked with many major lawbreakers
in the past, I can only say that they would be most
happy to see the public disarmed. It would give them
free reign to commit their crimes without fear of
meeting any armed citizens.

They don't buy their weapons, they steal
them. They rob them from owners who have them legally.

Guns by themselves don't kill, only people kill, and
many of those need mental help. Thank you,

Terry Powell, retired law enforcement officer. He told
me I could use his name.

I have one final letter, Mr. Chair, if I
may proceed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Senator, you may.

SENATOR BAUMGARDNER: Thank you.

While I am not a resident of the state of
Colorado, I do enjoy coming to the state to hunt, fish,
and ski. I have been a longtime visitor to your state,
averaging two to three trips a year.

If House Bill 1224 passes, you can take
any money I might have spent and kiss it good-bye. I
will boycott your state and encourage everyone I know
to do the same.

This bill is bad policy. It will not
only cost Colorado jobs with businesses picking up and
leaving, and have no doubt, they will leave ... The
men that own Magpul are honorable and actually do what
they say, quite unlike most politicians.

I am sure you've heard all the statistics
and dollar values that will leave the state. But I
personally think that it will be much higher, as folks
like myself will totally boycott your state.

This bill also will have zero affect on
crime of any sort. It is unenforceable as its current language is written. All this bill does is to turn law-abiding citizens into criminals by taking those standard magazines and adapting to them to make them larger. The criminal element will still be able to do and get what they want.

This bill will hamstring law-abiding citizens into the fence of their homes and property.

He asks once again if we would oppose House Bill 1224.

It's just not people in this state, it's people outside this state that say, You know what, if this group of legislation, gun bills pass, we won't come anymore. We'll tell our friends not to come anymore. We won't spend money in your state anymore. Business will leave the state. Unemployment will go up. Then we will be figuring out how we're going to fund more people on unemployment.

One final thing here. You know, I, myself, have been getting a lot of these little cards. And they're not just from my district, they're from all over the state. Some of them are from my district.

Craig, Colorado; Lakewood, Colorado; Fort Collins; Greenwood Village. Most of these that I've gotten are not in my district, they're here. They're in the cities, they're in the areas where most
of the population lives. Grand Lake, Fort Garland,
Fort Collins, Littleton, Loveland, Deer Trail,
Lakewood, Englewood, Aurora, Greeley, Evergreen,
Wellington, Wheat Ridge. Thousands came to me.

Am I the only one that are getting these,
asking that we seriously consider what we do here at
the state legislature? These are the citizens. These
are the people that elected us. They're asking us to
make a good decision here. They're asking us to vote
no on this gun legislation.

We're elected to represent our districts.

These are -- a lot of these are not in my district.
These are the people of the state of Colorado saying,
You know what, we need to think about what we're going
to do here. We need to think about what's going to
happen in the future.

These are an outcry not just from my
constituents, but constituents of everybody in this
chamber from all over the state asking us to make good
decisions here. They've asked that we vote no on
House Bill 1224.

I'll ask you again myself, vote no on
1224. This legislation will not address what we're
expecting and solve the problems that we expect it to
solve.
Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, members.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lambert.

SENATOR LAMBERT: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I would just like to maybe ask a question of the distinguished senator from northwest Colorado in senate District 8. You know, I take high offense when you come up here to the well and talk about knee-jerk reactions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Baumgardner.

SENATOR BAUMGARDNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And distinguished colleague, whose name I shall not mention, I -- I'll try to refrain from making any more comments about those knee things, knee-jerk reactions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lambert.

(Inaudible.)

SENATOR LAMBERT: Well, thank you. Thank you.

Yeah, I'm not sure if he was talking about the knee or the jerk. But, you know, our good senator from Berthoud made an absolutely compelling argument, that this type of technology in this bill is defined as any magazine in Colorado, possession of any
magazine is illegal. And therefore, any rifle, any
pistol, anything you use that can be adapted with this
technology is also illegal.

So we’re not making too much progress on
that, so I think maybe -- let's turn and talk about
exemptions. I came up here a little while ago and
asked about how -- I mean, this is a question of trust.

Let's play a little game here. Who do you trust? You
trust people that protect our country, that are trained
with military equipment to protect us overseas and to
protect us here in Colorado.

Do you honestly trust or do you not trust
members of our military and former members that have
been trained with standard-capacity weapons, even
automatic weapons that we're not talking about today,
we're talking about semiautomatic, but if they're
trained to use exactly the same magazines in fully
automatic military weapons, why should they not be
allowed to maintain their readiness for our country
here within the United States? I move amendment L.032,
ask that it be read at length.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment on
the desk. Mr. Majors, would you please read
amendment L.032.

MR. MAJORS: Amendment L.032 to House
Bill 1224 by Senator Lambert. (Inaudible) page 4, 
strike line 16 and substitute subsection 5, "An active 
duty, reserve, National Guard, or Coast Guard member, 
or honorably-discharged veteran of the United States 
Armed Forces, reserves, National Guard, or Coast Guard, 
or members of their families or," and "renumber 
succeeding subparagraph accordingly."

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lambert.

SENATOR LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I move L.032 again.

Members, this does not take out the 
current exemptions, it adds one more exemption that 
says, if you're on active duty in this state, even in a 
private capacity, if you've been trained with these 
weapons, you should be able to have at least a magazine 
that's compatible with the legal rifles, legal pistols 
that you already own.

I also added members of our National 
Guard which are not currently exempted in this bill 
because it's talking about active duty military forces, 
and I don't think the way it's defined, I don't 
believe, covers the Colorado National Guard, who should 
always be ready.

Plus, our discharged, honorably 
discharged veterans of the United States armed forces
and their families, it's a simple amendment, and I ask for an aye vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I ask for a no vote. Yes, these are all great and wonderful people, but some of them come back with significant mental health problems, and I think we need to check (inaudible) that first.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lambert.

SENATOR LAMBERT: Mr. Chair, I really object to the -- this stereotypical viewpoint that all military veterans, all military returnees have mental health problems. Yes, there is --

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hodge.

SENATOR LAMBERT: Excuse me, I have the floor, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was a long pause, I apologize. Senator Lambert.

SENATOR LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Of course our active-duty military people suffer from traumas of war. They have since the Civil War. They have -- they've gone through battle fatigue. They've gone through soldier's disease in the Civil War is what they called it.

But to stereotypically say, you know,
we're just going to have a blanket policy in this state saying that military veterans who, if they have mentally deficient problems or if they have traumatic stress and they have been diagnosed, they're not eligible to get weapons anyway. It's already part of the law.

It does raise the point, are we doing enough for our veterans? Maybe not, but that's not part of this bill. But please don't stereotypically identify military veterans and active-duty members as being disqualified for arms ownership simply because they've served our country.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I did not say all had mental problems, I said some.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lambert.

SENATOR LAMBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And, of course, those -- that exemption is understandable, again, not part of this resolution. Let's start out with people we should trust in our country. If the bill sponsor would like to put in another clause or put in an amendment, I'd be glad to have that. If by law people have been suffering from combat stress of some sort that is a disqualifying
problem in this bill, maybe we should consider that.

However, think of the chilling effect on active-duty members living in the state. If the state's going to say, any time that you may come back from overseas with posttraumatic stress syndrome, we're not going to let you have a weapon.

They will never self-identify for counseling, for mental health counseling or anything else in the state of Colorado or perhaps anywhere else in the United States. Let's have a little more enlightened viewpoint about our veterans.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you.

I would be happy to work on that amendment with you, kind esteemed senator from Colorado Springs. In the meantime, I ask for a no vote on this one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Balmer.

SENATOR BALMER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members, I am profoundly disappointed with the way this discussion has turned. Remember that a lot of military personnel that return from a deployment where there are people every single day trying to kill them, the enemy trying to kill them, they come home, they are often not home for very long
before our country calls them back to the same
battlefield or to a different battlefield.

So if it's -- if they are sane enough to
fight for our country again on another deployment, why
wouldn't they be able to be trusted with a weapon here
in the United States of America where we are supposed
to have the right to have a weapon?

So our military personnel come back to
Fort Carson or they come back to one of the other
installations in our state, they're often not here for
very long before our country calls them back again.

So if you want to say that some of our
military personnel have mental problems, I believe that
was the quote that we're going to settle on, I'm not
comfortable with that quote. I think we should
completely back up this conversation. We are going
down a bad road here.

We should have nothing but enormous
respect for our military personnel, and understand the
fact that they are supremely qualified to handle a
weapon because they have received hundreds of thousands
of dollars from our country, from our government, from
our Department of Defense on how to use weapons
properly.

No one knows more about weapons than
those that have served in the military. So they're the only ones that we could say are completely qualified in every respect on every weapons system that they were trained to be qualified on. There are many people that become qualified in the civilian world, we should be protecting the Second Amendment rights for all of them.

This amendment is simply trying to help military personnel. Remember that their families had to withstand the awful separation while they were gone, wondering every night whether or not they're going to be killed.

And those families live right here in our communities, whether they be out in Aurora with families that are at Buckley, or Colorado Springs with Peterson and everything down there, with Fort Carson. Those families are here, they're all Coloradoans. They're Americans and they've served our country, let's show them some respect.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lambert.

SENATOR LAMBERT: Ask for an aye vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the body is the adoption of Amendment L.032. A division has been called. All of those in the chamber not entitled to vote, please be seated. The motion before the body is the adoption of Amendment L.032. All of those in
favor, please stand.

Please be seated.

All those opposed, please stand.

The motion fails. Back to the bill. I have Senator King in the queue.

SENATOR KING: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Wow, where do I start here? You know, it's been said that democracy is two wolves and a lamb voting on what's for lunch, and liberty is a well-armed lamb contesting the vote. I'm here on behalf of the lambs because I have seen that the wolves are at the door.

You know, one of my -- one of my favorite quotes is, Government is not reason, it is not eloquence, it is force; like fire, a troublesome servant and a fearful master; never for a moment should be left to irresponsible action. President George Washington.

It is irresponsible to infringe on law-abiding citizens' rights to self-defense and personal safety. And this administration and the majority party should be held strictly liable for any citizen's inability to protect themselves and their families as a result of this irresponsible action.

Another favorite quote. Though defensive
violence will always be a sad necessity in the eyes of men and women of principle, it would be more unfortunate if wrongdoers should dominate just men and women. Saint Augustine.

We all bring life experience to this chamber. Mine is of violence. Like firemen know fire, I know violence. My whole adult life has been focused on violence: The study of it, the research of it, the investigation of it, the prevention of it, the teaching of it, the litigating of it, the training of it, and in some cases, the use of it.

Whether it was Michael Blagg shooting his wife in the head and suffocating his daughter and putting their bodies in the Mesa County landfill for 54 days, her body was recovered, the daughter's body was never recovered; or James Richard Drake, who cut the throat of Regina Drake while she slept next to her children, and the list goes on and on and on.

And in 30 years of violent crime investigation, I can tell you this: That the amount of rounds for law-abiding citizens, their need to protect themselves and their families, is always one more than the bad guy's got.

We should not be limiting law-abiding citizens' abilities to protect themselves and their
families. I think to prove my point, or at least make
my point, please relax because I want to share
information that could save you, could save your
family, could save your friends, information about
critical incidents.

What is a critical incident? A critical incident is any situation where there is a strong possibility of serious bodily injury or death for you. We're going to talk about that and we're going to talk about that what someone goes through during a critical incident.

Raise your hand if you've ever been shot at. You know, on TV it's deceiving because you hear the bang -- thank you, sir. That's not what I hear. You hear (indicated), bang. And the (indicating) is the bullet.

I heard that sound about 20 years ago. Rookie cop sent to a simple burglary of Rainbow Roller Rink. And as a rookie cop, I did what rookie cops do, you go to the back. You don't go in, you're not going in with the dog, you're not doing anything that's exciting at all, you go to the back and watch the door. And that's what I did.

Little did I know that the same two young people that broke into Rainbow Roller Rink had decided
that they would leave and go up on a hill in the back
of that business. And that's when a 13-year-old
gang-banger from Phoenix decided that he was going to
impress his cousin by trying to shoot me in the head.

You know, during a critical incident, a
lot of thing happen. The average person takes in
2,000 bits of information a second. You're doing it
right now. You're thinking about what I'm saying.
You're thinking about how long we've been going.
You're thinking about your family. You're thinking
about whether the weather is going to change all in a
second.

During a critical incident, one of two
things happens. You drop to 500 bits of information a
second. 500 bits of information a second is
(indicating) so scared. Or you go to 6,000 bits of
information a second. And 6,000 bits of information a
second is, you know, it was so weird, I drove up to the
intersection, four-way stop, I stopped, and I start to
go through it, and I see out of the corner of my eye
another car going right through the stop sign. And it
was almost like it was all in slow motion all of a
sudden.

I watched the front of the car collapse.
And I'm looking at the windshield and there's just
spider webs in front. That is someone that is taking
in 6,000 bits of information a second. And that is
something that we're going to talk about.

I want to talk about rounds and how many
rounds a law-abiding citizen should have. You know, I
asked the chiefs of police who were in favor of this
that very same question. And they said, Well, you
know, I don't know. That is a very good question. Do
you know that the average police officer today carries
52 rounds around his waist? Three 17-round magazines
and one in the pipe, 52 rounds.

How many people here, raise your hand if
you've ever shot someone else, shot someone else. Not
a pleasant experience. Pepe Mow (phonetic) was drunk
and he was out in front of his girlfriend's house after
a domestic violence disturbance. Girlfriend called the
police, I showed up, he was gone.

Everybody else left after I talked with
her, and I left. Not five minutes later the girlfriend
calls back and says, He's back and he's got a gun and
he's standing out next to my trailer saying how he is
going to come in and kill me and the guy that's in the
trailer with me.

I turn around, I park probably 200 yards
from where the trailer's at. And there is this huge
dark field that I need to cross to be able to get to a
position of advantage. So I start across the field,
and every time he stopped yelling, I thought he saw me
and I thought I was in fear of losing my life.

It's dark, and yet, I can see that he's
standing in front of the trailer, he has a gun in his
right hand. It's amazing the things you think about as
you're going through that. There was a small dirt
hill, and he's probably 40 yards -- 25, 30, 40 yards
away from me.

I go up behind him and tell him to drop
the gun. And it was like it was in slow motion. I saw
him turn, look at the trailer, look over his shoulder
at me, look back at the trailer, start to lift the gun
and turn towards me.

I fire one shot, uh-oh, muzzle flash, I
can't see. Sound distortion, sounds like my gun just
misfired, just a pop, and yet, I could hear the brush
under his feet, still all in slow motion. Fire four
more times. Back then police officers carried
18 rounds, and you're supposed to count your rounds. I
didn't, I was scared.

And I'm thinking, I hope I don't have to
reload in the dark after muzzle flash. Please, God,
don't make me reload. Fortunately for me, one of those
rounds hit him and he went down. Fortunately for me, and dealing with PTSD, he lived. And he was nice enough to tell the paramedics that if I'd have come out from behind the hill that I was standing behind, that he would have shot me. So that takes away all of my guilt of shooting him.

And I'd start to wonder -- and the reason I'm sharing this story with you is because that was a critical incident. And can you imagine what an untrained law-abiding citizen would be going through if they had to deal with something like that?

You know, I've had the distinct honor of working with Lieutenant Dave Grossman. In fact, let me give you a little bit of background so that you understand why we're talking about this in reference to the amount of rounds that law-abiding citizens should be able to carry.

Lieutenant Dave Grossman is a former West Point psychology professor, professor of military science, an Army Ranger who has combined his experience to make revolutionary new contributions to our understanding of killing in combat, the psychological costs of combat, and the root cause of the current virus of violent crime in our society.

He is the author of "On killing," which
was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize. He on the
U.S. Marine Corps commander's required reading list.
And it's required reading for the FBI academy and
numerous other academies and colleges.

Colonel Grossman's most recent book, "On
Combat," has also been placed on the U.S. Marine Corps
commandant's required reading list. He has presented
papers before the national convention of the American
Medical Association, the American Psychiatric
Association, the American Physiological Association,
the American Academy of Pediatrics.

He has presented at over a hundred
different college and universities worldwide, and has
trained educators and law enforcement professionals in
the field of school safety -- and that's where I met
him, debriefing a school shooting -- in all 50 states,
and just finished his last book, "Stop Teaching Our
Kids to Kill: A Call to Action Against TV, Movie, and
Video Game Violence."

I want to talk a little bit about
phobias. You know, there hasn't been a ton of research
done on phobia. But what we have found is that
15 percent of the population, 15 percent of the
people -- thank you, sir -- 15 percent of the people in
this room would have a phobia if I dropped a large
bucket of snakes right there. 15 percent of the people in this room would have an immediate response, eyes to feet to door. I'm outta here. I'm outta here.

And that message shoots directly to their eyes and their feet. No conscious thought, running to the door, probably leaving a trail of unnecessary body mass right behind them.

However, we have found that there is one universal phobia that we all have, a universal phobia, and that is violence, human to human, corrosive, destructive violence. 98 percent of the people in this room, if someone walked through that door and shot me in the chest, would have a phobic response. And the other 2 percent are mentally ill.

Human-to-human violence is devastating. It devastates us. It shatters us. It causes us, as humans, to be broken people. So what happens during a critical incident. If you've ever been through one, you know what happens for you, heart rate immediately goes from 80 beats a minute to 120 bets a minute to 140 beats a minute. Over 140 beats a minute your complex motor skills start to go away. You can't do things because your complex motor skills are gone.

Think about that in reference to loading a magazine, to defending yourself. 160 beats a minute,
you have auditory exclusion. You don't hear things as well at 160 beats a minute. You have loss of near vision. You can't see very good up close. That could be a problem trying to reload a magazine. That could be a problem trying to get a sight picture to defend yourself.

170 beats a minute, you lose depth perception, you lose peripheral vision. In other words, you get tunnel vision. You can see straight ahead, that's it. You have vasoconstriction. Think about that. They were as white as a ghost. That's because your body is responding by drawing all of that blood into the internal organs and away from the skin. White as a ghost, vasoconstriction. And at 200 beats a minute you lose your cognitive processes, they deteriorate.

Now, this is where I would really like you to listen because I care about you and I care about your family. There's no one in this room that can make their heart rate go to 180 beats a minute, can't do it. But can you bring it down?

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Senator King?

SENATOR KING: Yes, ma'am.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Is this relevant to --

SENATOR KING: Absolutely, ma'am.
Absolutely relevant to the idea that citizens should not be limited in their ability to protect themselves no matter how many rounds they feel they need to protect themselves. And I will continue because it's relevant to your life and your safety.

The only way that you can overcome a critical incident -- and that doesn't mean it's a shooting. That could be a fire. That could be a heart attack by the person right next to you. That could be someone choking, a chemical spill, you name it. SIDS, critical incident for your child.

So you're right, Madame Chair, in reference to those others, it is not relevant. In reference to the idea that you need to reload a gun for your own personal safety and the safety of your family, it is absolutely relevant.

Your able to lower your heart rate, your ability to get over the fact that you're in the middle of a critical incident is the difference between you living and you dying, the difference between someone you care about living or them dying, the difference between (indicating) so scared and taking action.

In 2011 there were three homicides in the state of Colorado from semiautomatic rifles with these type of magazines. There were 22 homicides with an
edged weapon. There were 20 homicides with a hammer. And yet, we are looking at telling law-abiding citizens that you can't decide. Cops can have 52 rounds around their waste, we're going to limit you to 15.

You start thinking about all of the things involved in a critical incident when it comes to saving your family and your life during -- well, let's talk about home invasion. You're outnumbered, maybe they have weapons. You know, I really do think an edged weapon is a great personal safety tool.

But what if that bad guy has made the mistake and brought a knife to a gun fight, but he does happen to cut you. What if it happens to be on your hand, your right hand? The idea of reloading your weapon now that you've been injured, along with 180 beats a minute, along with the fact that probably this is in low-light conditions, along with the fact that you've never been through this before, along with the fact that you're worried about your family, along with the fact that you're worried about dying, along with the fact that if you've fired a round, you now have a visual problem, you might have a hearing problem, you might have a tunnel vision problem.

That is just one of your problems. The other would be, what if there's more than one? These
cowards don't run by themselves. Like hyenas, they go in packs. The idea here is that you need to do the things that you need to do to feel safe and secure, to be able to defend yourself and your family.

Let's take it one step further. What if -- what if they are like the California bank robbers, well planned, well executed, but it's a home invasion. What if -- what if they've got one of these? Then how many rounds do you need? What if they're wearing body armor? That's why cops carry 52 rounds around their waist.

And should our citizens be any less able to protect themselves and their family?

I say no. I say that citizens, like police officers in this country, should have every right to have as many rounds as they possibly could want to make themselves feel safe and secure. They should have as many semiautomatic rifles, 22 -- oh, wait, that's an assault -- oh, wait -- 22 through M 16.

I think that that is not only good common sense, but that is your right. And the idea that we are starting to limit the ability of our law-abiding citizens to do that, here we go again, is dysfunctional.

The idea that we're making an argument
with I don't know how many millions of these magazines in the United States -- and ladies and gentlemen, I'm 32 miles from Utah. The ability to just go across that border and go into Green River, Utah -- and to think that we're doing anything other than making a political statement, that's what's going on here, it's a political statement, because it's dysfunctional, it doesn't work.

Millions of these magazines, we're surrounded by them, and yet, we want to tell our citizens, oh, no, no, no, we're going to limit your ability to protect yourself and your family, you're law abiding. And these animals, these wolves at the door who don't play by the rules, who go out of their way to make it hard for you, that are cowards, that will take every advantage against women and children, they don't have rules, there are no rules.

That type of violence is what I've spent my life studying, what I have spent my life dealing with. That is the reason that I am up here sharing with you my life's work, so that you don't have to and so that you have that life experience. Because in my world, good gun control is two to the body and one to the head. That is sad, but that is what violence is.

Our citizens should be able to protect
themselves and their families, they're law abiding, they have done nothing wrong. And this idea that we're making a political statement at the expense of our citizens is unconscionable.

It's sad and it is a situation where we will rue the day that we started down this road, this political statement road of dysfunctional laws that don't work, that are nothing more than talk, that don't reduce violent crime, that don't make our citizens safer from domestic violence, from other types of violence, from home invasions, from robberies, from rapes.

Ladies and gentlemen, we've got choices here. The nation's watching us. And quite frankly, the world is watching us, our gun battles. Well, I hope I didn't just wreck my political career there. Our gun battles. You know, it ...

And if we had any evidence-based information to say, Oh, yeah, this will reduce violent crime by this amount, but it's not, it's hype. It's a political statement. It has no -- no basis in reality that you think that we outlaw these in Colorado, that anyone will be safer. Millions, we're surrounded by them.

Sad, it's sad that we've come to this
because we're not solving problems. It's almost 12 hours and we've solved one problem, and it has to do with the ability to use video to get a concealed carry permit, or TV, 12 hours.

Evidence-based decision-making,
evidence-based problem-solving, we're not doing that.
We're doing emotional-based decision-making. I'm so scared based decision-making, I want you to be scared based decision-making instead of telling our citizens, You do what you need to do to protect yourself and your family.

You're a law-abiding citizen, you deserve that respect. You know what's best for you and your children and your wife and those people you care about. You, not the government, not the state of Colorado, and not the senators in this room. And all for a political statement. Vote no on this legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? Senator Harvey. There wasn't one listed.

Senator Hill.

SENATOR HILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chair, I move Amendment L.031.

THE CHAIRMAN: There's an amendment on the desk. Mr. Majors, would you please read amendment

L.031.
MR. MAJORS: Amendment L.031 to House Bill 1224 by Senator Hill. Amend (inaudible) bill, page 4, strike lines 19 through 24, (inaudible) paragraph accordingly.

SENATOR HILL: Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hill.

SENATOR HILL: This is a pretty simple bill -- or pretty simple amendment. We have a real problem growing here, that if -- as I started to look at the these exemptions, as I started to look at the many different legitimate cases where this was going to restrict someone's opportunity, I realized we have a growing divide.

We have a growing divide between what the average citizen of Colorado is going to have to abide by and what the military industrial complex is going to have to abide by. This is absolutely a threat to our civil liberties going forward. We've had many talks about this. If it's good for the goose, it's good for the gander. If it's good for the goose, it's good for the military industrial complex, as well.

This will remove exemptions from this bill and ensure that if we are going to limit the citizens of Colorado, we are going to limit everybody in Colorado. I ask for an aye vote.
THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you. I just ask for a no vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion?

Seeing none, the motion before the body -- oh, Senator Brophy. Senator Brophy.

SENATOR BROPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I really think that the people of Colorado deserve to hear from the proponents of this bill why this amendment is a bad idea. Because it appears to those who are still watching that the proponents must think that law enforcement officers would need more than 15 rounds in a dangerous situation with one or more bad guys challenging them, threatening their lives, threatening the lives of the citizens that they are sworn to protect. It makes sense to me they do. They may face more threats than you can handle with 15 rounds.

But guess what, so can every other law-abiding citizen in the state of Colorado if they're faced with more threats than 15 rounds can handle. It seems that the people of Colorado need to hear from the proponents of this bill why the law enforcement community can justify 15 rounds and 16 rounds and the
rest of us cannot.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lundberg.

SENATOR LUNDBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I believe this amendment, and I'm supporting this amendment, I believe it makes as much sense as the bill does. And so if you're going to support the bill, you have no reason to not support the amendment.

But I would also point out that the way the bill reads is, the PMAG 10 is illegal because it's readily converted. I commend the senator from El Paso for bringing this before us to point out how much sense this bill makes.

So do you think that there should be a limit? Okay, make it a limit. Either that or tell the people of Colorado, you're second class. Tell that to the constituent that came to me who's from Livermore up in northern Larimer County who told me that he's about an hour away from any emergency services.

And he told me specifically, he said, I'll tell you how many rounds I want in my magazine, that's one more than the guy who's facing me. If it's good for him, it's good for the cop who shows up defending him.

I think the senator from Wray is quite
correct, if there's any reason to vote no other than raw political power, let's hear it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Marble.

SENATOR MARBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I believe this is an appropriate amendment. And I would definitely vote yes. What's good for the people are good for everyone. It stands to reason that we should all be treated equally.

And I am a Marine mom. I do have friends who are in law enforcement, best friends. But I think we all stand together when it comes to the audacity of this bill and its genesis. At some point we have to make the statement that it's just wrong.

When we look at Colorado as one of the lowest ranking gun murder death rates in the nation, it's ranked 13th, compared to the District of Columbia that's ranked 50th with 16.5 gun murders per hundred thousand, compared to our 1.3. I mean, even 1.3 is way too many, but I think we all stand together on this, and I urge your support for this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Renfroe.

SENATOR RENFROE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Members, I rise in support of this amendment. And a lot of times when we do things here, we look at how things are done around the country and
we hear all the time, We do this because, well, other
states are doing this, other states are proposing this.
This is the way this bill I think was
originally drafted, not having a law enforcement
exemption in it. If you go back and look at what
New York did and what Mayor Bloomberg wanted in his
bill, that's exactly what they did. They didn't exempt
their police from having high-capacity or
standard-capacity magazines.

And the uproar came and the police
screamed, We need to be able to protect ourselves,
self-defense. Why is it good for law enforcement and
not good for a law-abiding citizen? This is exactly
the way this bill was probably supposed to be drafted,
or should have been, shouldn't it have? I ask you to
support this amendment, Mayor Bloomberg would.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Scheffel.

SENATOR SCHEFFEL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

Colleagues, I'm going to support this
amendment, as well. You know, it was just a little bit
ago that we tried to expand the exemption, that didn't
work. And so now the argument that what's good for the
goose is good for the gander, that resonates with me.
Let's level the playing field.
If there is a legitimate basis for the magazine limitation, then this endorses that view, and let's level the playing field. Let's not give a special exemption. If the limit is good for the regular citizenry, then it ought to be good for military, et cetera, and let's make it even-handed across the board.

I somehow think that this vote will belie the inconsistency on how we're thinking about this, but that's worth doing. I ask for an aye vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion before the body is the adoption of Amendment L.031. A division has been requested. All of those in the chamber who are not entitled to vote, please be seated.

The motion before the body is the adoption of Amendment L.031. All those in favor, please stand.

Please be seated.

All those opposed, please stand.

The motion fails. Back to the bill. I have Senator Lundberg in the queue.

SENATOR LUNDBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Members, on Monday in the judiciary committee we had a very limited amount of time.

Hundreds of citizens came to speak their mind, very few
were allowed to because of the time constraints. And I
bring to you the testimony of a lady who I could see
she was incredibly frustrated in the audience, and I
went and talked to her, and she said, Here's my
testimony.

Well, Senate, here's the testimony: My
name is Karen Murray. I am here representing my family
and all of my freedom-loving friends who couldn't be
here today. I'm here to speak out in opposition to all
of these bills.

I'm a mom, who under the Second
Amendment, has the right to protect myself and my
family. I don't believe any law should limit what
types of firearms I can use for that purpose or how
many rounds of ammunition I might need in any given
scenario.

I, too, was shocked and saddened by the
tragedy of Sandy Hook and too many others like it. You
believe that tighter gun laws are the answer, I do not.
Our actions must be focused on the root of the problem,
the erosion of our moral fiber, kids that have been
desensitized through hours of violent video games, and
a complete failure of our system to recognize and deal
with people who show signs of dangerous behavior are
all contributing factors in this ongoing debate. But
somehow it end up being about guns and high-capacity
magazines.

The term "slippery slope" that is often
used on this side of the issue refers to what doors are
being opened or what precedents will be set in the
future. But what about now? Magpul has made it very
clear that they will pull out of the state of Colorado,
taking revenue and jobs with them. And other companies
will follow suit in not doing business here.

Will it also create more division within
our communities? Will it cause Coloradans to move to
more gun-friendly states where they can still use their
favorite shotgun when they go hunting? Will it mean
loss of revenue from tuition at public universities
where concealed carry is not permitted? No one knows
for sure.

But the sentiment among my friends and
family is that, and this one is in quotes, This is the
last straw. Most of the people in my life have said
that they've have enough of this gun-grab mentality and
are moving out of Colorado -- and moving out of
Colorado is a viable option for them.

This is not about guns. This is about
control. This is about an antigun agenda where the end
game is to completely disarm every American citizen.
Aren't the 20,000 gun laws that are already on the books enough? If this were all about public safety, wouldn't our speed limits be lowered again to 55 miles an hour so we could save just one life? Speed-related highway fatalities far outnumber those killed in mass shootings each year.

I am a conservative. I speak out. I change minds. And most importantly, I vote. I urge a no vote on all of these bills. Thank you.

Well, I have this to say to Karen, Karen Murray, who wrote that, Amen. And I move amendment 27.

THE CHAIRMAN: There's an amendment on desk. Mr. Majors, would you please read Amendment L.027.


THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lundberg.

SENATOR LUNDBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This one's kind of simple. It takes out one line.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lundberg, would you like to move your amendment?

SENATOR LUNDBERG: I did, but I will move
it again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you.

SENATOR LUNDBERG: I move Amendment L.027, which removes the enacting clause, it kills the bill. And this is a straight-up vote, yes or no.

We have listened for the last, what, five hours, and we have heard an overwhelming preponderance of the evidence that this bill is a bad bill. This bill is poorly written. It somehow captures all of the magazines out there or virtually all and declares them illegal, thus, rendering all of the firearms that require these magazines to be legally inoperable. It makes exemptions for some, but not for the people of Colorado.

And hour after hour after hour after hour we have passionately argued these points. And we've essentially heard a deafening silence from the proponents of this legislation. They have only one strong argument, and it might be 20 votes. And I call that raw political power.

I'd like to hear some legitimate arguments as to why this bill should not die right here and right now by accepting Amendment 27. You're on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I ask for a no vote. This kills the bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Lundberg.

SENATOR LUNDBERG: Thank you, Mr. Lundberg (sic), Mr. Chairman, whoever it is, it's almost 12 hours now.

I think the argument is clear, there is none, only raw political power. Exercise it while you've got it, but it won't last.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion on L.027? Seeing none, the motion before the body is the adoption of the amendment. A division has been requested. All those not entitled to vote in the chamber, please be seated.

The motion before the body is the adoption of amendment L.027. All those in favor, please stand.

Please be seated.

All those opposed, please stand.

The motion fails. Back to the bill.

Senator Harvey.

SENATOR HARVEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank all of my colleagues who have been up here and have spoken so eloquently, especially Senator King.
We've been up here talking about how this bill is going to impact businesses, how it's going to impact the economy. We have a chart here showing all of the businesses that are going to be impacted by this bill. Look at them.

But what does that represent, those dots on this map up here? It's more than just companies, it's people, it's families. And I have a letter here from a gentleman in Colorado who has asked me to give his two cents from the employees' perspective.

It says: Hello, my name is Edgar Entelione (phonetic), however you pronounce it. I will start by writing a little bit about my background. Both of my parents came to Colorado in 1980 from Chihuahua, Mexico.

My parents came to this country not to leave a tyrannical country, nor to escape communism. My parents came to this great nation because of its economic opportunities. A large part of my family soon followed my parents. I suspect that many Hispanic families came to Colorado for economic prosperity.

I do know a large group of Mexican immigrants that are gun enthusiasts, but I will concede the fact that guns are not the reason they came to the United States. They're here to work.
I've seen many news reports about Magpul, the Colorado-based company that will leave if House Bill 1224 is passed. In these news reports, I couldn't help but notice the amount of Hispanic faces I've seen working for Magpul.

After seeing the video clips of the hard-working Hispanics, it reminds me of my mother, my cousins, uncles, and aunts who came to Colorado to become successful, success many Hispanics may not see if House Bill 1224 passes.

I'm a first-generation born American, a Colorado native, a gun enthusiast and a Hispanic.

Let's step away from the impact 1224 will have on my gun rights, and let's focused on how House Bill 1224 will put on hold many Hispanic dreams.

I know I am preaching to the choir when I say that Hispanic families often work harder and earn less, but I always maintain focus -- but they always maintain focus on their goals.

House Bill 1224 will force many Hispanic families to put their goals aside. Those working to buy a house, a new car, pay for college will now have to fill out an unemployment form when all of these businesses on this map leave the state.

Many of you have supported lower tuition
fees for undocumented students. And now that support
will be in vain if you push a company as big as Magpul
away. This year President Obama has finally
acknowledged the need for immigration reform. But this
year, Colorado's legislature could potentially render
that reform useless, as immigrants will have no
incentive to be in Colorado.

Your push for driver's licenses for those
who are undocumented, your push for access to higher
education for those who are undocumented, and your
support for immigration reform will have little effect
if at the same time you create a higher Hispanic
unemployment rate. Some reports state that current
Hispanic unemployment is above 10 percent.

The Hispanic community cannot afford to
lose more jobs. Hispanic children cannot afford to see
their parents lose another job. Hispanic families
cannot afford to live in economic uncertainties.

I cannot ask you to forget my gun rights,
but I ask you to remember those who will suffer from
your yes vote. Folks like your mothers, fathers,
grandparents, cousins, uncles, remember the Hispanic
families that will live in deeper poverty because of
political agendas. Please keep Hispanic families
employed, keep Hispanic dreams alive. Please vote no
on House Bill 1224. I couldn't agree more.

      THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Baumgardner.

      SENATOR BAUMGARDNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

      Earlier this evening the -- I received a text from one of my constituents and was reminded that even though it had been touched on a little bit, maybe we need to talk about it a little more is, out in rural Colorado when someone gets in trouble, sometimes it takes a little longer than a couple of seconds or a couple of minutes for law enforcement to respond.

      Has anyone in the room ever been to Massadona, Colorado? What's there? Never mind. Massadona is about halfway between Craig, Colorado, and Dinosaur. There's a couple of houses there. There used to be a restaurant/bar there. That Massadona, yes.

      So I guess if you want to look at a situation, hypothetical situation that someone was trying to break in to one of those houses in Massadona and they had to wait for law enforcement to respond, that's about 45 miles from Craig, Colorado. It's also about 45 miles from Dinosaur, which does have a sheriff's office annex. But the time to get there is going to be a little longer than a couple of minutes or
10 minutes or 15 minutes.

Do not the people that live in these remote areas have the right to protect their-self? As the senator from Grand Junction said at one point in time, How many more rounds do you need to protect yourself, that's one.

If that's all you have to protect yourself is a weapon that has more than 10 rounds, knowing that it's going to take law enforcement time to get there, do they not have the right to have as many rounds as they need to protect their-self?

The other thing that was touched on a little, but was not touched on a lot, was farmers and ranchers that possibly might have a type of firearm that has more than a 10-round magazine or 15-round magazine.

These guys go out to check their cattle miles from home. And when they're calving, the coyotes are out there, and sometimes it may take more than one shot. I'm a fair shot, but you get three or four or five of them out there trying to get your calves, you need something that you may need more than 15 rounds to take care of those predators.

Just something to consider when we're talking about banning magazines that hold more than
15 rounds, or if you want to call them standard magazines because that's what they are for certain types of firearms that are out there.

So are you going to take that farmer's or rancher's right away from them to protect their livelihood? This is how they make their living. This is what they're doing, is protecting their flock. Is that what we want to do, is to say, You know what, we appreciate the produce that you bring to Colorado, but you know what, if it takes more than 15 rounds to protect that, that's okay.

Do you know what a cow is worth right now? It's worth a lot of money. It's worth about a dollar and 83 a pound. You lose very many of that -- very many of those, you can lose thousands of dollars.

And there's predators out there, there's mountain lions, there's coyotes. You have the right to protect what is yours. And sometimes you need more than 15 rounds to protect that.

So that's just another aspect that we need to think about. When you do this, you're not only affecting people that just want to have this as a constitutional right, because it is their right, but you're also taking away the availability to protect your family and to protect your animals.
But again, I had somebody ask me to bring that up. Didn't know if it had been brought up a lot or not, but thought that we would just reinforce that. Thank you, Mr. Chair and members.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Renfroe.

SENATOR RENFROE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this bill. And I think it's pretty clear where we are after our last division vote, but that just gives us the chance to move forward from here and see if we can make some arguments to change a few minds and save a few jobs in the state of Colorado.

Earlier I came up and read a letter from a company that has been here for 36 years. When we were out getting dinner later on, I met someone associated to the company, and I didn't know they were here.

And they said, You know, that is truly a family-owned business, this Lawrence Tool. The dad started it, his daughter is working there, son-in-law working there, it is truly a family-owned business.

36 years.

And by passing a bill that can't be enforced except for, I guess unless you take it to what it truly is doing, in banning every single magazine in
the state, that should make it pretty easy to enforce, you would think, except we're grandfathering existing in, so back to that, it's a circular argument of how do you enforce.

The question becomes why? What's the motive? What's the goal? Is it about safety? We sure haven't heard very many people come up here and talk about safety except from people opposed to the bill talking about how having the opportunity to defend yourself is what increases safety. Not restricting you to less than what, as the senator from Mesa said, a wolf would have.

Let me talk to you about another company since we're looking at another long list of companies that will leave. This is one we haven't talked about, this is another one. US Precision Mold is a small tool and die manufacturing facility that builds plastic injection molds. In the past few weeks we have become very -- the past few weeks has become very uncertain for us.

You know, the senator from Boulder talks about being in business a long time, and I know that he has been in business a long time. Uncertainty is not what a business wants. It's not what our market wants. Whenever we hear uncertainty, it seems the market's
dropped. That's what we're creating with this bill.

They are continuing in a path of uncertainty.

They have a relationship with Magpul.

They provide products to them. As a result of that relationship, they've purchased more than $525,000 in manufacturing equipment to meet the needs of Magpul and other customers.

I bet that we could figure out what the business personal property tax is on that equipment.

Look what that's doing to Arvada. That's where this company is located, the city of Arvada.

With the passage of this bill, we will be forced to lay off 50 percent of our current workforce.

There we go, jobs, jobs, jobs leaving Colorado again.

And these are very highly skilled jobs, earning between 65- to $80,000 a year.

I don't think the governor would laugh about $65,000-jobs leaving the state. I would hope he would not laugh about that. I would hope he wouldn't laugh about any job leaving the state.

US Precision Mold is a home-grown company. They write in here, this is kind of amazing,

There have been many sleepless nights, long hours, and lost weekends to create our business out of nothing.

I've seen those nights with my father in our business,
and I'm sure this is true for them in their business.

But, of course, there's some -- maybe we shouldn't even read this letter because obviously, there's some out there that would say they didn't build that. So let's just disregard this company, we can let them go because they didn't build it. And we could sit up here and we could make jokes like that all we want. But the reality is, this is a real company with real jobs.

We would consider the passage of this bill and a front to the business community while producing yet more dependence on government handouts with people losing their jobs. Thank you for taking the time to listen to our voice in your final decision.

I hope you listen to that and their voice, because what I have here is, this is the list of citizens that signed up to speak in judiciary committee on Monday. And I know we've been reading testimonies of people that didn't get the opportunity to speak because of the pace that these were heard.

On the signup sheets here, 34 people showed up in support of this measure, with 16 testifying. In opposition there were 238 people that came to the capitol and waited hours and hours. Out of this list, there's three that got to testify.
According to the Shooting Sports Foundation, they're a trade group in the firearms industry. The industry, as a whole, in Colorado directly creates 2,676 jobs, 84 million in wages, 259 million in economic impact. The overall impact of the firearms industry -- direct and indirect is 4,765 jobs, 190 million in wages, and 590 million in economic impact.

So what message are we sending the business community for a bill that is unenforceable? Our sheriffs admit that, it's, leave Colorado. Vote no on this bill.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Senator Brophy.

SENATOR BROPHY: We have a new chair.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

Members, I want to join the rural caucus that we heard from the senator from northwest Colorado. And I appreciate his words so much and it speaks so much to the heart of my constituents.

But before I do that, I want to remind you that this bill as drafted, because of its language, effectively bans every detachable magazine in existence in America, or every style. So you won't be able to purchase any new ones after July 1st of this year because they are all readily convertible.
When you do that it's a de facto ban on all of the modern sporting rifles that are becoming ubiquitous across this country. They tell us that there are almost 12 million of these things in the country.

And so I'm going to tell you some stories about how they are typically used and typically owned by citizens for lawful purposes in rural eastern Colorado.

First, I heard from a constituent of mine near Holyoke, which is, you know, the next town north of Wray, great little community. She lives on a ranch about 30 miles out of town. And she says, you know, Goodness, we might be, best case scenario, 45 minutes from law enforcement showing up to help us if we ever have a problem. Worst case scenario is more like an hour and a half.

How would you like to be on your own for an hour and a half? Doesn't sound like a lot of fun. That's hopefully an atypical use. You know, I own a life insurance policy, even though I have every intention of living to be 140 years old, I hope I don't have to use my life insurance policy. I hope I never have to use one of my standard-capacity magazines for home defense.
My buddy, Kenny Rogers, that's really his name and he really is a cowboy, most of you have probably met him, he lives by Yuma, he's the past president of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, e-mailed me over the weekend after I'd spoken on a radio show with Ross Kaminsky on Sunday.

And Kenny said, Just this morning, and this is a typical lawful use by a citizen in eastern Colorado, just this morning Kenny said, I had four coyotes harassing my newly-born baby calves, four. So I grabbed my modern sporting rifle, it's an AR style, and dispatched some of those coyotes and the others off. And it took more than 15 rounds to do the job that day.

Typical lawful use of what has really become the utility rifle. It's found in almost every ranch pickup in eastern Colorado right in the gun rack, right above the pliers and the leather gloves, tools.

And I'll tell you about another typical lawful use by citizens in eastern Colorado for modern sporting rifles. Ever since I was a little boy I have been shooting watermelons on my dad's farm with him. I have a scar right between my eyes from a scope when I was too close to it at the age of about 6 or 7, on what was then the common rifle owned by my dad, a standard
deer hunting rifle.

Now, again, most of us out there own the modern sporting rifle just like this one. And yeah, you might recognize that, gentlemen. He's been there twice. And if you observe the ear-to-ear grin on his face, you might come to realize that he's having a good time. That is a typical lawful use of a modern sporting rifle in eastern Colorado. And that is a 20-round Magpul PMAG.

And that event is called Brophy's Bike and Blast. It's what my dad's little fun watermelon shoot has morphed into. I've been using it as a fund-raiser. I don't make any money off of it because we spend about a thousand dollars on ammo and almost that much on adult beverages, the night before.

This bill makes the event illegal. This bill makes no provision for the temporary transfer of a standard-capacity magazine, no provision at all. I have to maintain continuous possession. None of you, none of you can have possession of one of those if you didn't own it before July 1st. This bill makes this fun event illegal.

Is that what you want to do, make it illegal to do something that people have been doing for -- as long as there are rifles and watermelons, I
guarantee you people have always shot watermelons
because it's so darned much fun.

They go kerplunk, blow up all over the
place, and they're biodegradable, you don't have to
clean up the mess. I was going to disk them under
anyway. I disk them under the next week and drill it
all to wheat.

This September, on the third Friday in
September, I would plan to do this again. And if my
friend comes out there and this bill passes, my sheriff
might arrest him. Even though my sheriff is shoulder
to shoulder with all of the other sheriffs in the state
of Colorado -- the Sheriffs Association unanimously
opposes this legislation.

They think it's unconstitutional because
it bans typically-owned weapons that are used for
lawful purposes. They think it's absolutely
unenforceable. And they can't believe that it's
advanced this far in the state of Colorado.

Sheriffs of both parties were at the
capitol Monday to stand in opposition to this bill, and
you're willfully ignoring them, ignoring the fact that
the bill bans an event this guy participated in, that
the governor begged me for an invitation to.

It's going to drive a lot of jobs out of
Colorado. They're probably going to have to leave even if the bill is ultimately found unconstitutional because their political risk exists because of the attitude exhibited by the majority party in this legislative body.

If you're operating a business and you've got that great problem that everybody wants when they're operating a business, more work than your people can do, you need to expand, you have to have a bigger building, how can you, in good conscience, sign a long-term lease on a building in a state where your product is about to be banned? You can't. You can't take that risk. It's way too great of a risk.

If we kill this bill tonight, we might save those jobs, we might save that Colorado company, we might save a fun event like this, and we might save the taxpayers of Colorado a lot of money defending an unconstitutional bill, vote no.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Senator Lundberg.

SENATOR LUNDBERG: Thank you, Madame Chair.

To the good senator from Wray, Colorado, it was 50 years ago last October that I got my scar right here from my dad's 300 H&H magnum, it slipped off the shoulder. The deer got worse, though.
I have a letter from a councilman from Loveland. Honorable Senators, I appear before you --

he wanted to give this in person, but wasn't able to.

I appear before you as a fellow elected official, a
councilman from the town of Loveland, where we are
wrestling with the question of mixed jurisdiction, as I
believe you are, as well.

In Loveland we will be discussing and
determining whether to follow a course of action in
establishing rules and regulations for the production
of oil and gas reserves that align with the state and
the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission in
order to develop rules and regulations that apply in
the face of the established process in Colorado.

It is with a great deal of humility that
I consider such a decision. The humility that the
state of Colorado has spoken to the nature and scope of
oil and gas permitting and regulation, and the humility
that the city of Loveland, in my opinion, should
acquiesce to the guidance of the State.

In similar fashion, I believe that the
United States Constitution has spoken to
House Bill 1224 and other measures, seeking to limit
the people's right to keep and bear arms, and that the
senate should exhibit that same humility. It is the
right of free people of this nation to keep and bear arms, to defend their associated unalienable rights and to protect their rights from a tyrannical government.

To abridge that right by the limiting of arbitrary components of various firearms, the capricious restriction of when and where citizens can exercise their right to protect themselves and the indiscriminate association of liability for those who choose to engage in the commerce of firearms products is not only wrong, but it is being discussed without consideration of the overriding jurisdiction of our most important founding document, the United States Constitution. I implore you to defeat these measures and not send them on. Thank you. Hugh McKean, Loveland City Council.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Senator King.

Senator King is first.

SENATOR KING: Thank you, Madame Chair.

So how do we make decisions, evidence-based decision-making, hysteria-based decision-making. As part of a 1994 and badly named assault weapon ban, the production of high-capacity magazines was halted. A comprehensive study by the Center of Disease Control nine years later looked at 51 studies covering the full range of gun control
measures, including this ban, and concluded that none could be proven to reduce crime, none could be proven to reduce crime. Now, that sounds like evidence to me.

In 2005, the American Journal of Preventative Medicine did a similar survey and came up largely to the same conclusion. Evidence-based decision-making, hysteria-based decision-making. Come down and debate. Come down to the well and let's debate. The people of Colorado deserve that.

If you've got a point to make that isn't hysteria and is actually facts, then there's a spot right here. And there's nobody here. Then I take it you concede.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Senator Renfroe.

SENATOR RENFROE: Thank you, Madame Chair.

Madame Chair, I wish you could see the picture, so when you come down, you'll need to take a little time and take a peek at this to see what Senator Brophy is talking about. I've been out to the Bike and Blast, and I would encourage you all to come out, but it won't be as much fun this next year.

I guess I can take my magazine and still have fun for (sic) my rifles, and Senator Brophy -- excuse me, the senator from Wray can have his fun with
his, and a few other members can have fun with their magazines, but that would be about it, isn't it? It'll change.

One thing Senator Brophy didn't bring up with this picture, is this is an AR 10 that's actually being shot in this picture, having fun with, which it could be an AR 15. It could have an upper on it that would shoot a 22, and there are magazines that can do that.

And actually, that's what people are -- the senator from Wray has one of those, and that's on my list, because the price of ammo these days, that's what people are liking to shoot in the AR style of a firearm. And those, just like everything else, will be banned, the 22.

Again, it looks like a lot of fun with that smile. I know I have a lot of pictures of me with smiles. I have pictures of my kids, I have pictures of friends at different shoots that we've been at. Amazing, amazing amount of fun. That's all.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Senator Crowder.

SENATOR CROWDER: Thank you, Madame Chair.

Senator Brophy, or the senator from Wray, brought up an idea that I'd like to talk to you about
briefly about this bill.

Recently I went against my caucus and voted for a different bill, it's called the asset bill. And after I did that -- I had no problem doing that because I believed in it. But I had people stopping me in the hallway, democrats, and individuals shaking my hand and saying what an amazing amount of courage that took.

And I did not think it was any courage at all because I thought it was the right thing to do. But I guess I would ask now if, in fact, you believe in this, if you believe this would hurt this state economically, would you have the courage to stand up against your caucus and do the same thing?

What my idea of doing up here is what is right for the state of Colorado, as well as your district. But I think this goes a little bit beyond partisan politics. I think this is actually a very real issue. But again, I would ask you if you had the courage or if you had the inclination to stand up for this or against this, if you could do the same thing.

I -- personally, I slept very well all the nights past that asset bill, and I still sleep well. But I think that's the biggest thing about this job here, you need to do what you think is right so you
can go home and sleep and look at yourself in the
mirror and be very comfortable with yourself. Thank
you very much.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Thank you. Senator
Harvey.

SENATOR HARVEY: Thank you, Madame Chair.
I just wanted to take a minute to come
back to this picture. I've been at this watermelon
shoot two times. Many of you all saw my son here
earlier today, he was here for most of the day on the
other side of the room, and he has gone with me to the
event on many times.

We didn't go on this one because as you
can see, it's pretty darned cold, and he was in school
and I didn't want to pull him out of school to come out
to a gross, muddy farm three and half hours away from
our house.

But this is great fun. This is great
fun. Actually, Adam and I were at the one previous to
this. Adam is the gentleman shooting the gun here.
We'd been to the one prior to that with my son, the
three of us were out there shooting. And it was a lot
of fun, as you can seen on his face, he's smiling.

But I'm not smiling anymore. Awkward.

MAIG, Mayors Against Illegal Guns, a lobbying
organization to push gun control all across the country
and here in Colorado. Adam is the lobbyist for Mayors
Against Illegal Guns. Look at the smile. He's taken
away me and my son and Senator Brophy and his son's
ability to enjoy an afternoon in the mud on a farm in
eastern Colorado. Ironic? I ask for a no vote.

THE CHAIRWOMAN: Senator Grantham.

SENATOR GRANTHAM: Thank you, Madame
Chair.

Shift gears just a little bit. We've
heard lot of testimony from some of those that couldn't
speak for themselves the other day. And there's some
unique stories that come out of the woodwork on this.
When it comes to those that are in our districts and
those across the state that are going to be affected
directly or indirectly by this legislation. I think
we'll all be affected directly in one sense or another.

But this one comes from a man by the name
of Mitali Korichic (phonetic), and I know you're
watching tonight, Mitali, and I hope I do this justice.
But he says that, My message to us, to all of us here,
my message would be this: My family emigrated to this
country from USSR Russia in 1996. I was still young.

This country gave us all opportunity to
grow and live. We came with a few bags of clothes,
some pictures, had to start life anew. My parents worked hard. My mom worked three jobs, and worked for us.

I was a bit young to understand and appreciate all of it. This country was founded upon the notion that the person is free to make choices, and their lives reflect those choices. The Constitution puts limits on government so they do not take away our rights and put us back to Russia-like times.

I served my country because I believe in giving back. The part of the oath that every enlisted member goes -- when taking the oath goes something like this: I, state your name, do solemnly swear or affirm that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same.

The Army, Marines, Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard protect the Constitution of the United States. The document that places restrictions and limits on government, they don't protect our government, they protect the people.

Coming from someone who has been in those other countries, seen what it's like, seen where we're heading, he also says that, The First Amendment gives
us the right to speak, believe, and publish what we
want, that is human nature to us. But many countries
do or did not have this right, my family included.

The Second Amendment protects this
fundamental human right or God-given right and protects
those that follow. The first 10 are inalienable
rights. Look the term up, bill of rights, not needs.
This being said, all of the laws being proposed are
limits on law-abiding free people.

Some very important remarks also come
from John Arndt. And John, I know you're listening
tonight, too. It says, I had prepared testimony to
speak, and the limited time for testimony of opponents
did not allow for me to speak.

My testimony follows: Please let me know
if there's any other way in which I can assist. He
says, the Department of Homeland Security currently has
a request for proposal for self-defense weapons.
Self-defense weapons in quotes. Even though DHS is not
in a theatre of war. DHS agents are not soldiers.

The RF P describes these weapons as,
quote, personal defense weapons, unquote, and states
they are, quote, suitable for personal defense used in
close quarters, unquote.

The weapon being purchased under those
guidelines contains a magazine capable of holding 30 rounds, personal defense weapon, personal defense used in close quarters, that's how DHS defines it.

He continues: On January 20th of this year, college students stopped two armed intruders when the attacker saw one resident had a rifle which had a 30-round magazine. The gun and included magazine is a tool. Tools are used properly or improperly.

Individuals deciding to break laws harm people, rape, and still do not follow laws. Banning magazines with a capacity larger than 10 rounds will not stop criminals from using them illegally.

On January 4th a Georgia mother defending her children shot an attacker using a six-shot handgun her husband had trained her to use, hitting the attacker five times out of six. But if there are multiple intruders, as is increasingly common in home invasion attacks, the mother would not have been able to continue to defend herself and her young children. She likely would have been beaten or worse. He goes on and on with similar stories. Thank you, John, for sharing all of your testimony.

Another one comes from a Chris Gonzalez from right here in Denver. It says, I've been a lifelong democrat, and I am deeply disappointed in the
party's gun control package. Yes, national polls suggest Americans may want it, but these polls ask very broad questions.

National polls don't reflect Coloradans' positions on specific policy proposals, like a 15-round magazine limit. 15 rounds have banned many types of nonassault weapons which I wish to protect my family with. Coloradans deserve more than an arbitrary policy.

Reverend Tracy Hinkel. 1224 -- House Bill 1224 to limit the number of rounds in a magazine is ridiculous. First, there's no such thing as a high-capacity magazine. A magazine is built to hold a certain number of bullets and that is it. The use of the term is only meant to cause an emotional reaction by people who are not familiar with guns.

Second, if someone has to use a weapon for self-defense, they need all the rounds they can shoot. If a fire-fight law enforcement officer's average accuracy -- they average an accuracy rate of about 40 percent. That rate would probably be lower for the average citizen, with training, possibly maybe around 30 percent, he speculates.

If a legally-armed citizen has fewer rounds, they are more likely to suffer injury or be
killed by their assailant. Recently a mother in 
Georgia protected herself and her daughter -- and this 
is the same story that was relayed by Mr. Arndt in the 
previous, the five shots -- or the six shots and the 
five hits for one person.

He was still able to follow her 
downstairs and next door to a neighbor's house after 
being shot five times. He finally collapsed and then 
was taken into custody. What if there had been more 
than one? What if there had been more than one?

There are many more letters such as this.

David Smith is from Canon City, where I live, draws the 
analogy between these magazines and vehicles. The 
madman can kill with one or the other, why are we 
focussing on these particular tools?

Gary Griego (phonetic) says: I have been 
in corrections at -- it's home for those of us down in 
my neck of the woods. I've been in corrections for 
22 years, and I'm currently a case manager. And I 
don't see how limiting the number of rounds or type of 
guns I can possess as a law-abiding citizen will stop 
criminals or the mentally ill from committing crimes.

I exercise my Second Amendment rights 
responsibly, as does the majority of the gun owners in 
the country, yet, my elected officials want to punish
me and ban the weapons I have, which are not assault
weapons, but semiautomatic rifles. Assault weapons are
military weapons with a selector switch that allow for
full automatic operation or three-round spurts.

As a corrections officer I see violent
offenders enter the system all the time. These
offenders victimized others, other law-abiding citizens
that they saw as weak and as easy prey.

There are as many laws in place now that
tell all citizens they cannot commit violent acts
against other citizens, yet, they do. For the
criminal, the laws do not apply. For the mentally ill,
the laws do not apply. So how is banning my weapons
and magazine capabilities going to stop a criminal or
mentally ill person from committing crimes against
another?

Laws are just words on paper that don't
apply to these criminals. And taking or banning my
weapons only makes me a better and less resistant
target for criminals. Criminals will find weapons and
ways to victimize the weak regardless of what laws are
in place. And punishing me and taking my rights is not
the answer.

In my profession, when I have to carry a
Glock, I am issued a handgun and three 15-round
mer magazines. And I've been trained to stand and fight to
protect myself or a third party. And while I've never
been in a fire fight, and hope to never be, I can tell
you that 15 rounds can go very quickly. And I'm sure
even quicker when fighting for your life.

Why shouldn't I have the same
capabilities as a citizen to protect myself or my
family. As for my M4 AR-style rifle and automatic
rifle, I use this rifle for hunting prairie dogs and
recreational target practice, fun shooting. Some
people golf, I shoot my M4, and I do so responsibly.

So to say that there's no legitimate use
for this rifle is just like saying I don't need a
14-inch kitchen knife. It is also one of the first
go-to rifles in my safe, as well as a Glock 9
millimeter should I need it for home defense.

The vice president goes to his dove
hunting shotgun -- well, I won't continue that
sentence. I live in a safe community, but a rural
community, too. Calling the sheriff has taken as much
as 15 to 20 minutes for a deputy to arrive.

So while I hope and pray that I would
never need to, I know that if I needed it, I have an
AR M4 to defend my family should I have to stand my
ground waiting for police help. I know some will say
it's just a fantasy or something that would never
happen, million-to-one odds. My reply, it's no
fantasy. Only a -- as Mr. Griego puts it, only a
sicko, he says, would fantasize about a horrible
scenario like that.

And I also say, remember the Stovall
brothers. Now, many in here may not remember that
name. If you live down in Canon City and Fremont
County, you definitely remember the Stovall name. They
grew on a shooting spree, killed a deputy, severely
wounded a Florence police officer, who is now confined
to a wheelchair for the rest of his life.

They went through the country -- the
county on a shooting spree, and nobody knew where they
were or where they might strike next. I stood ready to
defend my family this night alongside my neighbors.
The police were horribly outgunned by these criminals,
and it cost our law enforcement community dearly. I
was not outgunned had they attempted to victimize my
family. Again, thank God they didn't come down my
street looking for victims to shoot.

He just wants to protect his own family,
folks. How many rounds does it take? More than the
bad guy. And who are we limiting? We're limiting the
good guy. We're limiting the law abiding. The bad
guys, the Stovall brothers, many of these others that are committing these home invasions, are they checking state statute to make sure that they don't have too many rounds in their magazines? Of course they're not.

But we are. The law abiding, we're the ones that make sure that we're compliant, make sure we're doing things right. The family down the street that enjoys their weekend shooting trips, that enjoys target shooting, but also is aware that they need these for self-defense, why, why would we purposefully put them at a disadvantage?

Why would we do that? It's unfathomable to me that someone else is making the choice for me what is necessary to defend my home, my family, my property.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Scheffel.

SENATOR SCHEFFEL: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to thank PJ for taking the time to contact me, specifically with respect to this bill. He starts by saying he's against the current battery of anti-Second Amendment bills, and then specifically discusses that the magazine ban is unenforceable, does not contribute to public safety and restricts law-abiding citizens who have done nothing wrong.
We've certainly heard about that.

This bill is directed at disarming Americans and is diminishing our freedoms. In addition, the bill will destroy competitive, something I was not aware of, competitive IPSC/USPSA shooting in Colorado. Not only does it limit the state shooters entering the sport, but restricts shooters from other states coming to Colorado for major matches and state championships.

PJ believes that that, alone, would cost somewhere around $4 million a year in tourist revenue. In addition, it will drive Magpul and most of the molded injection plastics industry out of the state. This will lower state corporate income tax revenue by over 15 percent, he believes. The Colorado economy is not large enough to sustain this blow.

Most other small firearm manufacturers will at least consider leaving the state, and PJ states, he's one of them. He states that, I own a specialty equipment company, a small shop, a licensed FFL 07 class 2 SOT manufacturer, and he employs five people.

He states that he builds USPSA and IPSC specific match pistols, rifles, and shotguns. And if the bill passes, he will leave. He states that
South Dakota is a much better environment for business.

Thank you, PJ, for taking the time to contact me. Your argument resonates, as does that of Tom, who commented on the various bills. He stated that the following is a summary -- Dear Senator Scheffel, the following is a summary of my views on the six bills now before the state senate.

I'll skip specifically to 1224, the magazine limitation. Tom states that this bill is a red herring. The bad guys will have all the magazines they want at whatever capacity they want. The good guys, the law-abiding citizens, will be relatively disarmed.

Most 9-millimeter pistols are designed for -- and sold with magazines larger than 15 rounds. Pass this law and Magpul leaves, a sad result for a bill that will have absolutely no effect on reducing gun violence.

To those who know little or nothing about firearms, this bill feels good, but in Tom's views, it is bogus. In any event, what right does the government have to tell me how many rounds I need. This is purely an emotion-based arbitrary bill.

Thank you, Tom, for taking the time to contact me, as well. In the case of PJ, who's a small
business, he didn't even make -- glad this map is still
up here with the dots, PJ doesn't have a dot up here,
he didn't even make this map. He employs five people,
but he states he'll be out of here.

Worked on many business bills since I
came to this place. I remember when I first came, I
was appointed with some of my colleagues to something
called the joint select committee on jobs in the
economy. We heard from business after business after
business after business in a suffering economy that
what they wanted most was an elusive thing called
regulatory certainty.

Tell us the rules of the game and we will
try to make lemonade out of lemons. This bill injects,
infuses a huge amount of regulatory uncertainty into
the business environment. We've heard colleague after
colleague after colleague read testimony after
testimony after testimony which only delivered on top
of the testimony that was delivered on Monday that
says, this bill is unpredictable.

We've seen magazines and springs and caps
and tops and all the different things, the end result
seems to be it's all illegal. It's all adjustable,
it's all kind of fungible, and so it's all going to be
illegal, notwithstanding what the bill sponsors
indirectly are saying, that it's limited.

Besides that, there is no evidentiary proof that this will reduce crime, that this will have a public safety effect. We've heard that over and over again. And thanks again to PJ and Tom for contacting me. Your arguments resonate. This bill misses the mark on what it intends to accomplish. I urge a no vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Marble.

SENATOR MARBLE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I know all of you are looking at your e-mails and scrolling through and seeing what's coming in. And I want to read you something that I think is very important. Remember that little amendment, that little equalizer on this that we were trying to get passed here?

Well, I just got an e-mail, and it is signed by around 15 manufacturers of guns and ammo, and also, magazines. And I'm going to read you a little bit of what they said. And then I'm going to read off all of them who believe that this is fair for restricting the Second Amendment rights of the people of Colorado.

It's just amazing. Here we go, I'll start with this one. Recently companies such as
LaRue Tactical and Olympic Arms announced they will no longer sell prohibited items to government agencies and personnel in states denying civilians to own those same items. I guess we do have an equalizer, and it's called small business.

I think you better look and listen to what they're saying. This isn't just in Colorado, this is around our nation. I'm going to read you the names of these companies. Maybe you'll recognize them, probably a lot of you won't. 2A Armament, Ryan Jacobson, co-owner, operator; American Spirit Arms; BCM; Bravo Company USA; Bowater Enterprise, LLC; Cheaper Than Dirt; CMMG, Incorporated; Doublestar and Doublestar Training Academy, they're in -- in a letter to us, republicans, be victorious. Extreme Firepower; Hunteertown Arms; J & G Sales; LaRue Tactical; Lauer Custom Weaponry; Liberty Suppressors; Midway USA; OFA Tactical; Quality Arms; Tier One Arms; Top Gun Supply; and Top Gun Police; Trident Armory; West Fork Armory, York Arms. It's pretty sad.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? Senator Renfroe.

SENATOR RENFROE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I know we talked a little bit about it earlier, but I wanted to bring it up again, because I
think it is such an important part of this bill and the
absolute absurdity of the bill to rationally believe
that this bill will do anything.

This right here was made on a three 3-D
printer. If you don't know what a 3-D printer is
today, Google it right now. Everybody's got their
computer out doing something. A three 3-D printer.
And we're allowing people to keep every magazine that
they already have.

I realize I'm saying that someone could
illegally make this in the future and you would never
know when it was made. But that's what you're doing
with this bill if you vote yes, is you're taking
honest, law-abiding citizens and making them choose
between the choice of breaking the law or potentially
protecting themselves, defending themselves with what
this and other magazines, the standard-capacity ones
that hold 30 rounds, are meant to do.

Senator Grantham brought it up, the
senator from Canon City, about Department of Homeland
Security and their recent request for firearms. And
they were wanting the AR 15, and their definition of it
was the defense, for the defensive qualities of the
gun.

I talked a little earlier about Supreme
Court Justice Joseph Story. Let me just end with a couple things from him again. There can be no freedom where there is no safety to property or personal rights. Whenever legislation breaks in upon personal liberty or compels a surrender of personal privileges, it is, in its essence, tyranny.

That's what you're forcing honest law-abiding citizens to choose between. There can be no freedom where there is no safety to property or personal rights. This bill takes my property and allows me to not pass it on to my children, therefore, it takes my freedom, it takes our liberty. And when that happens, tyranny can't be far behind.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion? Seeing none, the motion before the body is the adoption of house bill -- Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It stopped before I was ready. I'd like to thank you all, all my colleagues, for your passion, your commitment, and your perseverance. I appreciate the courteous discourse that has happened here tonight.

To reiterate what House Bill 1224 does, is it bans high-capacity magazines of over 15 rounds or
28 inches of shotgun shells. It grandfathers in all of these items currently owned.

We had an amendment added that says that those that manufacture these items can continue to do so legally, they just can't sell over 15-round magazines and 28-inch shotgun shells in the state of Colorado. We heard a lot of talk about how this will hurt hunters.

Hunters in Colorado are allowed three shots for water fowl, six shots for big game.

This bill doesn't touch hunters. And there is at least a fourth story to be told tonight. We've heard a lot of stories. Fox 31 Denver has confirmed that Magpul -- this is an item posted last night. Eli Stokols, Fox 31 Denver, has confirmed that Magpul had discussions last year with the state's Office of Economic Development and International Trade in which they asked about tax incentives and credits that might be available to them as they looked to consolidate their two facilities into a single space at North Park in Broomfield.

They wanted some state support, said Kathy Green, OEDIT's spokeswoman. We had some job training tax credits, but there was never any follow-up. According to Green, job training incentives would have been available only if the company was
adding new jobs.

Last summer, Fitzpatrick reportedly told the governor's office and Sam Bailey, the business development manager for OEDIT, who toured Magpul's facility, that Texas and Wyoming had lots of incentives for them should the company decide to relocate.

That was not a threat. We never made any threat to leave, Doug Smith, Magpul's chief operating officer, told Fox 31 Denver late Thursday afternoon. We were just mentioning, Hey, these other states have approached us, they have something to offer.

According to Smith and Fitzpatrick, the conversations with the state started at a business roundtable lunch hosted by the Governor's office where companies were asked about how the state can be more supportive and help them grow.

Bailey's visit to Magpul's Erie manufacturing plant followed the initial meeting at the capitol. We were planning to move forward with the developer at North Park, but we put those plans on hold in December based on a change in the legislative environment, Smith said."

This bill was not even a concept in December.

I would like to read again some of the
victims. Shootings involving these types of magazines includes Newtown, Connecticut, December 14th, 2012, 26 people killed, including 20 1st-grade children. The shooter had multiple 30-round magazines. Oak Creek Wisconsin, August 5th, 2012, six people killed, three wounded at a Sikh temple. The shooter had three 19-round magazines.

I'm not going to continue, but I think we need to consider doing -- helping our citizens remain safe. I ask for an aye vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Minority Leader Cadman.

Senator Brophy, he was first. Senator Brophy.

SENATOR BROPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, I read Eli's article on the Fox 31 website myself today, I also read the whole thing. And my immediate thought was, So it has come down to this: The Governor's office will leak information about a business to try to make that business uncomfortable in the state of Colorado because that business is standing up to that governor.

Is that what it's come down to? Is that the abuse of power that we're going to see in the state of Colorado? The people of Colorado and the companies in Colorado deserve better than that. Vote no.
THE CHAIRMAN: Minority Leader Cadman.

MR. CADMAN: You can't talk about tragedies without getting emotional. They're tragedies, of course we're emotional. But using the deaths of the innocent to take away the rights of the innocent doesn't do anything to bring them back. It doesn't leave us any safer in our homes, in our businesses, in our vehicles.

That's real blood really spilled by our innocent neighbors and friends, those of you who had family members. And I think using these tragedies to take away the rights that were protected by the sacrifice of the blood that was shed by veterans who paid the ultimate price is a disservice to them, it's a disservice to all of us.

In spite of those tragedies and in spite of the next one that we're going to read about, and God help us that it affects any of us. But we aren't changing the human condition, and we will move forward, and we will face these again in the future. I would much rather take my chances living and dying in a country that's free than living in a country that isn't.

We keep hearing that this bill is just one step, one step, one step, the package, one package,
bill after bill after bill after bill. We know where this is taking us. We don't want to go there. We don't want to go there.

These tactics are being modeled after nations that are ruled by governments that are no longer serving their citizens, but enslaving them. Disarming citizens means we are not being governed, we are being ruled.

I like most of you. I enjoy serving with you. I don't want to be ruled by you. It's not personal. I move for a review of the fiscal note on this. We have the signatures, gone, gone, gone, gone, gone, gone, gone, gone; the products that they manufacture and the people that pay for them, the millions of dollars that go into the Department of Natural Resources, gone; licenses, gone; hunters, gone.

I just got an e-mail earlier from a group of folks that do tourism in Colorado, gone. Not one reference in the fiscal note to the revenues that are gone. Once they're gone, and now that no new magazines can be sold in Colorado, that's what this bill says.

THE CHAIRMAN: Majority Leader Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Members, in order to give staff a moment to review the request for fiscal note and see what
comes of that, I move that we lay over right now
Senate (sic) Bill 1224, one bill, and so I'll go ahead
and make that motion at this time and then have a
second motion.

THE CHAIRMAN:  Is there any discussion?
The motion before the body is to lay over
House Bill 1224, one bill. All those in favor, say
aye? Those opposed, no. The ayes have it and the
motion is adopted.

Majority Leader Carroll.

MS. CARROLL:  Thank you, Mr. Chair.
I move that we proceed out of order to
take up House Bill 1226 at this time.

(Pause in the proceedings.)

THE CHAIRMAN:  Back to House Bill 1224.

Upon review of the fiscal note, the fiscal note is up
to date and is valid, so we will continue into our
conversation about House Bill 1224.

Is there any further discussion?

House Bill 1224 concerning -- Minority Leader Cadman.

Mr. Majors, will you please read the
title to House Bill 1224.

MR. MAJORS:  House Bill 1224 by
Representative Fields and Senator Hodge concerning
prohibiting large-capacity ammunition magazines.
THE CHAIRMAN: Minority Leader Cadman.

MR. CADMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm concerned that the fiscal note has no opportunity for revision. I think there's a pretty clearcut case that this will have an impact in Colorado. An $800 million industry has been jeopardized or will be jeopardized when this becomes law.

A million people from one channel alone across the country are now being told, Don't come here. It will have an impact. I'd ask for a no vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion for House Bill 1224? Senator Lundberg.

SENATOR LUNDBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And I, too, am deeply disappointed that our fiscal note system seems to become just a rote procedure rather than a real statement. The minority leader pointed out some significant financial issues. And I want confidence in my fiscal notes. This doesn't build confidence. This just makes it a process.

I find that deeply disappointing because it's quite true, as we've had our debate and discussion, we've actually uncovered a lot of issues that actually I didn't see clearly enough in committee for all the consideration that was given then.
And if five members cannot actually request a real review in light of new information, I find that deeply disappointing. But I think the train has already left the station, so let us proceed with the process.

THE CHAIRMAN: Senator Hodge.

SENATOR HODGE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I renew my motion for House Bill 1224 and ask for an aye vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? Seeing none, a division has been requested. All of those in the chamber not entitled to vote, please be seated.

The motion before the body is the adoption of House Bill 1224. All those in favor, please stand.

Please be seated.

All those opposed, please stand.

The motion is adopted.

(Whereupon, the audio recording was concluded.)
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