

I am a retired Police Officer with 31 years of service. I was shot in the line of duty by a mentally deranged individual and sustained four gun shot wounds. I have a family member and many close friends in Law Enforcement. I worry every day about their safety. My wife works in a school and I am also concerned for her safety. I am for reasonable gun control which keeps firearms out of the hands of criminals and the mentally ill. I am also a supporter of the Second Amendment.

I feel that a "Long Gun Permit System" should be implemented requiring anyone who does not have a State Pistol/Revolver Permit to obtain such Long Gun Permit to allow them to purchase Long Guns i.e. rifles or shotguns. I would also support a system requiring anyone who sells, delivers or transfers a long gun to call the State Police Weapons unit and obtain an Authorization Number and complete a Transfer Form, as is presently required for handguns. I also feel that a Handgun Permit or [Long Gun] Firearms Permit should be required for the purchase or possession of any magazine or ammunition. The Permit would have to be presented before any purchase could be made.

I also feel that a data base should be kept to prevent mentally ill individuals from receiving firearms or ammunition.

I am also opposed to any additional bans on so called "Assault Weapons" which are often called "Patrol Rifles" by Law Enforcement. These firearms could be regulated by the "Firearms (Long Gun) Permit". In 1986 four FBI agents were shot and two were killed in a shootout in Miami with two serial bank robbers. The FBI did an extensive study on the effectiveness of handgun ammunition after one of the bank robbers sustained a gunshot which severed his aorta by an FBI agent with a 9mm Silvertip Hollow point Bullet. Though suffering a mortal wound, the suspect continued shooting FBI agents.

The FBI study reported "The handgun is the primary weapon for defense against an unexpected attack... no law enforcement officer should ever plan to meet an expected attack armed only with a handgun." (The study can be found at FirearmsTactical.com) This suggests if an armed encounter is expected one should choose a rifle or shotgun. Though often used for self defense, over-penetration and discharge of multiple projectiles are issues with shotguns. A .223/5.56mm semi-automatic rifle with proper ammunition has been shown to penetrate less than shotgun rounds (i.e. buckshot or slugs), and many handgun rounds including hollow points (which have a tendency to plug up and act as full metal jacket ammunition) reducing risk to bystanders.

The semi-automatic rifle provides better accuracy, less recoil, a safer platform that can require fewer shots being discharged, and less risk of over-penetration than handguns. The semi-auto rifle can also provide deterrence, sometimes requiring only being displayed to repel a threat of violence. During the Rodney King Riots in L.A., I recall seeing a photo in a national magazine of a Korean business owner displaying an AR15 type rifle with from the rooftop of his business pointing his rifle at a crowd setting fires and looting businesses. His business was neither burned nor looted.

I am also opposed to any legislation limiting magazine capacity. I feel any such legislation would do nothing to prevent a criminal or mentally deranged individual from killing innocent individuals but would only inhibit law abiding citizens from defending themselves. A criminal or mentally deranged individual attempting to shoot unarmed victims would need only a second or two to reload with a full magazine. The argument that he/she could be jumped while reloading, would only hold true if one were close enough and only if the shooter fired the gun until it was empty. If the shooter stopped to reload while one round was still in the chamber he would only have to pull the trigger to discharge a shot at anyone attempting to overpower him while changing magazines. Limiting magazine capacity would only put law abiding citizens at risk while attempting to reload their firearm (if they had another magazine) while trying to defend themselves and their family members from armed individuals.

The FBI study mentioned earlier concluded "no caliber or bullet is certain to incapacitate an individual unless the brain is hit." It further stated "Even if the heart is instantly destroyed, there is sufficient oxygen in the brain to support full and complete voluntary action for 10-15 seconds." A law abiding citizen may have to discharge multiple rounds because of failure to stop an individual or because of multiple assailants.

Given the fact that a Law abiding citizen may not stop an armed attacker with one shot, multiple shots may be needed to stop the assailant or assailants. Even trained Law Enforcement Officers have low hit rates under stressful situations. A New York Times Article in 2007 reported a hit rate of 17.4% in 2005 and 28.3% in 2006 for NYPD and 40% in 2006 for LAPD. I am aware of a shooting in Connecticut where two Officers were involved in a shooting. One Officer had to fire 7 shots from a 45 caliber pistol (many of which were torso shots) while another fired 5 from a 9mm pistol to stop their attacker. What if this had been a Citizen with a 7 or 10 round magazine? Though Law Enforcement Officers have better training, often respond with more than one Officer, and can radio for help when confronting armed individuals, we would never think of limiting their magazine capacity. Why would we do so for law abiding citizens who are usually alone in the defense of themselves and their family members?

As I mentioned earlier, I was in a shootout during my career as a Police Officer and I knew if I was ever in another armed encounter, I wanted to have as many rounds as I could available to me in my firearm. I don't know of any law abiding citizen or Police Officer who ever had too many rounds in their firearm in a shooting situation.

I am opposed to proposals limiting the purchase of firearms to one gun per month, the mandatory registration of firearms, and "Firearms Registration Cards". I don't see how any of these proposals would make anyone safer. The State Police already have a Firearms Database which can be accessed 24 hours every day of the week by any police officer in the State. All handgun purchases and all long gun purchases through licensed dealers are entered into this data base. Requiring the same be done for private long gun sales would enter those transactions into the State Police Data base as well. I feel these "Registration Cards" and registration proposals would only harass law abiding citizens. I feel they are only an attempt to deter law abiding citizens from purchasing firearms.

I am also opposed to the proposal requiring fingerprints be submitted for the purchase of any firearm. If a citizen had a Long Gun or Handgun Permit they would have already been fingerprinted and a fingerprint background check would have already been conducted on the individual. Requiring another fingerprint check, particularly for each firearm purchase would only cause the citizen to incur unnecessary costs to purchase a firearm as well as unnecessarily delay the purchase of the gun. Fingerprint checks can take weeks or months because of backlogs, and sometimes require the person to be re-printed due to poor quality prints. This would cause the citizen to wait months to purchase a firearm when they already have a permit. It is my understanding that when a person is arrested under the present Handgun Permit System, the State Police are notified giving the State Police Firearms Unit an opportunity to revoke that person's Handgun permit causing them to surrender their Permit and Firearms and preventing them from purchasing other firearms. This mechanism could also be put in place if a Long Gun Permit System were instituted.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Edward J. Banasiak". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Edward Banasiak  
Windsor Locks, CT