

I have watched the gun control debate. I have been impressed by the civility, given the horrific event in Newtown.

I too have wondered what we can do to prevent these acts. Even as gun owner I have to search my soul.

I do have a CT "carry" permit. I have read Connecticut's "Assault Weapon" ban.

I think we all agree (whether stated or not) that absolutes like "preventing" a Newtown massacre are not possible. I think we all agree that certain measures can make it less likely. The debate should be centered around what are "reasonable" controls and what measures pass not only constitutional muster but do not abridge the very foundation of this great country (I am sorry if that offends some of those addressed in this email, but there are thoughts, ideas and concepts that are more important than you).

The media and politicians are now massaging the message and pushing the debate towards ideas and concepts that further "their" agendas. We know that many do not think 2nd amendment or Section 15 of the Connecticut Constitution is applicable today or they want us to think they is not applicable. I personally believe both are as relevant today as they were when they were written and neither limits the type of arms we can bear.

Having said that I accept that certain firearms should be regulated. No one would (should) argue that the 4th amendment to the US constitution or the section 7 of the CT Constitution are irrelevant just because we feel threatened by the possibility of terrorism.

I urge you not to join in with the "we have to do something" "do anything" mob and I urge you to do what you can to use a rational, reasonable approach.

We have many tools already on the books, both federal and state. Are we to believe that these tools are not enough?

I have listened to some of the hearing testimony. One thing that was explored was how technology could be applied. There are numerous examples of technology in use to limit access to authorized users. This technology can be applied to firearms. Laptops are fitted with fingerprint readers, motorcycles have FOBs, cars have chips embedded in the key, RFID devices are used under the skin of pets this list is enormous. Aftermarket devices are available for firearms are available.

<http://www.taurususa.com/security-system.cfm>,

<http://www.triggermart.com/Pages/TriggerSmart.aspx>. I know manufacturers are reluctant to make this technology widely available. Is there a legitimate reason? Liability? Reliability? I don't know. It seems to me that this is an avenue ripe for exploration.

So here are my thoughts.

1. Our handgun carry permit system could be extended to the purchase of "assault weapons" and detachable magazines with a capacity over 20 rounds.

2. Connecticut has a rich history of firearms manufacturing. Why not use some of the state largess currently being handed out to encourage our firearms manufacturers to refine and adopt technology to prevent unauthorized use of a firearm and provide them with the necessary cover should this

technology fail for no reason of theirs. We are giving money away to build bus routes nobody will use and now apparently more money for Uconn to increase enrollment when the MDC is running into a roadblock getting water to the campus. Has anybody asked Mansfield and the surrounding towns what they think of a larger campus? Maybe 195 will be made into the 4 lane spur that was intended?

I digress.

It would seem to me that producing a safer gun would be a win win (except for those who just want them gone from law abiding citizens). The technology is available and I would imagine the technology is mature and reliable. I believe we should consult with in state firearm manufacturers and ask them why systems that prevent unauthorized use hasn't been widely adopted and what it would take to make it more widely used.

Thank you for your time. feel free to contact me should you wish to discuss this further.

Wayne Kasacek  
Andover, CT

This e-mail is intended for the recipient only. If you received this in error please ignore and delete immediately. This e-mail does not constitute a consent to the use of sender's contact information for direct marketing purposes or for transfers of data to third parties.