

My name is Ed Vozek. I have been a resident of CT since 1949.

I was an Army officer during the Vietnam War, had a Top Secret clearance and was custodian of my atomic artillery unit's "Nuclear Release Authentication System".

I have a BS and MS in electrical engineering and have been a licensed professional engineer in CT for 30 years.

I tell you this not to brag, but to show to you I am a rational and stable individual.

I'd like to address the potential banning of high capacity magazines first.

When the question of "Who needs a high capacity magazine?" comes up, I say "I do." I own at least 4 firearms, one of which sells for about \$1800 used, that take high capacity magazines. During the 10-year Federal high capacity magazine ban, there were never any low capacity magazines made for them and there still aren't. Some of these firearms are from companies now out of business.

Are these guns to become very expensive paperweights if 10+ magazines are banned?

As for limiting magazine size; during the 1960's a gunsmith named Armand Swenson, using an Army-type 45 ACP semi-automatic pistol with 7 round magazines, placed 56 rounds on a target in 22.5 seconds. A remarkable revolver shooter named Jerry Miculek shot 6 rounds, reloaded his revolver and shot 6 more rounds in under 3 seconds. The fastest reload is called "the New York reload" and it means drawing a second gun to continue firing.

Next, addressing the issue of what the news media incorrectly calls "assault rifles".

The dozens of Secret Service agents guarding the president at any given time are armed with these rifles and high capacity magazines. Police also have "assault rifles" and high capacity magazines.

Do either of these groups expect "human wave" attacks like our military has experienced in the past, or do they just realize that these rifles and magazines are the most suitable for defending themselves and those under their protection. I'd like to retain the same ability to protect myself and mine as these agencies do. We citizens usually face the same criminals the police do, but face them first. Citizens don't have readily available armed "backup" just a radio call away.

There have been many examples of these kinds of firearms protecting citizens during times of civil unrest. The Asian shop owners during the Watts riots, and average citizens during the hurricane in Homestead, FL and the flooding in New Orleans come to mind.

I really don't expect to use my firearms to protect myself from my government, but my father told me the Japanese were afraid of invading the continental US after Pearl Harbor because they knew "The US gave trophies to civilians competing with military rifles."

At this same time England was begging the US to send them our civilian-owned weapons. Their soldiers were waiting for a Nazi invasion while patrolling their beaches armed with bayonets welded to pipes after they lost their rifles at Dunkirk.

It is apparent that strict gun control laws don't reduce crime. The 500+ murders last year in Chicago, a city with no gun stores and in a state with some of the most strict gun laws, proves that.

By definition, gun laws only effect the law-abiding, and we're not the ones causing the problem.

An interesting quote going around the internet is, "Gun control is like trying to reduce drunk driving by making it tougher for sober people to own cars".

I read recently that only one of the mass shootings that took place in the last 50 years took place outside a gun-free zone. This was the shooting of Congresswoman Giffords.

It seems apparent that reducing the number of gun free zones would reduce mass shootings.

I feel that, despite doctor-patient confidentiality, there ought to be a **requirement** for mental health professionals to report to a central data base the names of persons too unstable to own or buy guns. There should be a verification system setup, so this reporting is not abused.

Doctors already have to breach doctor-patient confidentiality by reporting gunshot wounds and signs of child abuse to authorities .

The violent video game explosion and its effect on our youth is self evident. Along with violent movies broadcast into our homes, both serve to desentize youths to the realities of killing and death.

It seems that a lot of what could be termed "losers" are responsible for these mass shootings. The more heinous the crime, the more airtime and column inches these shooters are given. Whether they live or die, they become legends for decades. I think the names of these mass murderers should not be released to take "fame" away as an incentive for mass shooting.

I know you have limited time, but I'm including a link to 2 five minute segments broadcast on "The View". It is an interview with a forensic psychiatrist. Please watch it to help understand the motivation of mass murders.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KU24i3Th27U>

Respectfully,
Ed Vozek