

Tsarkov, Alex

From: Mr mrs Vitale [vitale165@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2011 3:49 AM
To: Tsarkov, Alex
Subject: oppose sb1094 testimony- please provide to jud commitee

Oppose SB 1094

Good morning, I am writing in regards to sb 1094 the act banning magazines with a capacity larger than ten rounds. I urge you in the strongest possible terms to oppose this bill. It is little more than a misguided attempt to control the actions of people who already have no intentions to follow our laws.

The bill proponents would have you believe that banning magazines larger than ten rounds might somehow limit the damage done during a mass shooting, but I would like to remind you that no legislation would prevent such a person from carrying more than one gun, obtaining a magazine from a state that allows their sale, or simply become proficient in the act of reloading his or her gun (which can be done in as little as one or two seconds with surprisingly little training).

I have no doubt that in the course of your consideration of this bill that the recent tragedies in Arizona and Virginia tech will weigh heavily upon you. Please keep in mind that these awful happenings could not have taken place in our state due to laws already in place. Each of the gunmen would have been precluded from the purchase of a firearm on the account of their mental illness. This is an example of proper gun control, as it continues to preserve the rights of the law abiding public, while disallowing those who should not have access to guns from obtaining one. The bill in question does not do this. It makes no distinction between people who have a legitimate need for a gun with a capacity larger than ten rounds and those who would only use such a weapon for criminal purposes.

In the course of my research I became aware of the fact that during an officer related shooting a hit ratio of 15-20% (www.theppsc.org/staff_views/aveni/ois.pdf) would be expected. We could only assume that a private citizen would do no better defending his or herself during an attack, such as, a home invasion. With a magazine capacity of ten rounds this would amount to two hits per ten round magazine. Should a citizen be forced to defend his or herself against more than one attacker it is obvious that to be limited to ten rounds may be a fatal disadvantage.

Some other considerations that need to be addressed are the lack of due compensation for magazines purchased prior to the ban (as there is no grandfather clause). Should this bill become law certain guns that have no ten

3/23/2011

round magazines available would become inoperable, thus, resulting in a defacto ban of such weapons. A result expressly forbidden by McDonald vs. Chicago, and Heller vs. Washington DC.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jeffrey Vitale