

YES, THE NEWTOWN TRAGEDY SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED AND LOOKED INTO BY BIPARTISAN TASK FORCE OR COMMITTEE ONCE THE INVESTIGATION AN CONCLUDED. NOT BEFORE A THOROUGH INVESTIGATION ON VARIOUS ISSUES INCLUDING MENTAL HEALTH, VIDEO GAME AND THEIR USE, FAMILY ENVIRONMENT AND LAST FIREARMS.

MY BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE:

POLICE FIREARMS INSTRUCTOR, EXPERT WITNESS IN CONNECTICUT COURTS ON FIREARM RELATED DEATHS, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION FIREARMS SAFETY REPRESENTATIVE FOR 20 YEARS(RETIRED), EXPERT ON ALL MODERN AND PRIMITIVE FIREARMS, SERVED ON INTERNATIONAL BOARDS INVOLVING FIREARMS ACCIDENTS, INJURIES AND DEATH, CHAIR INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEES ON FIREARMS EDUCATION, TESTIFIED ON GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE(1990) INVOLVING FIREARMS SAFETY, STATE OF CONNECTICUT LIAISON(RANGE SAFETY), SUMMARIZED HUNTING RELATED FIREARM INCIDENTS IN CONNECTICUT-1976 THRU 2003, US ARMY INFANTRYMAN SERVED 1967 THRU 1969(VIET NAM ERA).....

I OWNED FIREARM(S) FOR 55+ YEARS AND HAVE SHOT THEM FOR 60 YEARS. I AM FAMILIAR WITH THE MAJORITY OF FIREARMS ON THE MARKET TODAY.

STATISTICS REVEAL THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 65 TO 70 PER CENT OF THE HOMES IN THE UNITED STATES THAT HAVE A FIREARM WITHIN THE HOUSE(CIRCA 1988). TO SPEAK CONSERVITIVELY-SINCE THERE ARE OVER 300 MILLION LEGAL CT CITIZENS, THEN 7 OUT OF 10 OR APPROXIMATELY **210 MILLION CONNECTICUT RESIDENTS HAVE A FIREARM.**

SOME 60 YEARS AGO ANY US RESIDENT COULD OWN A FIREARM AND IN MANY CASES A **FULLY AUTOMATIC FIREARM WITHOUT A PERMIT OR BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION. MOST OF US ARE FAMILIAR WITH THE ROARING TWENTIES AND THE KINDS OF FIREARMS USED THEN AND SOME 20 YEARS LATER.** I DO NOT RECALL OR HAVE RESEARCHED A MASS KILLING WHERE CHILDREN IN SCHOOLS WERE SLAUGHTERED, YET MANY KINDS OF AUTO AND SEMI-AUTO FIREARMS WERE READILY AVAILABLE. THE MINDSET OF THIS COUNTRY HAS CHANGED.

CURRENTLY CONNECTICUT HAS SOME OF THE STRICTEST LAWS ON FIREARM OWNERSHIP.

I FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT THE INDIVIDUAL USING A FIREARM IS TOTALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS/HER ACTIONS WHETHER SANE OR INSANE. I'M SURE A PSYCHIATRIST MAY QUESTION THAT STATEMENT. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT ANY PERSON WHO ALLOWS THE USE OF HIS/HER FIREARM WITH OR WITHOUT PERMISSION IS PARTIALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ACTION THAT RESULTS IN

INJURY OR DEATH TO ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL - IF PRECAUTIONS ARE MADE BY THE FIREARM OWNER(WE CURRENTLY HAVE LAWS ON THE BOOKS FOR THESE ACTION).

I AS AN EXPERT WITH FIREARMS FIRMLY BELIEVE WE CURRENTLY HAVE ADEQUATE LAWS AND REGULATIONS IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT TO PROTECT CITIZENS IF SUCH LAWS ARE ENFORCED.

BEFORE PASSING ANY LAW OR REGULATION, I ASK THAT EACH REPRESENTATIVE EDUCATE THEMSELVES IN THE SAFE USE OF FIREARMS. WE HAVE SOME IGNORANT(UNEDUCATED ON ISSUES) ELECTED OFFICIALS WHO DO NOT KNOW AND WILL NOT KNOW WHAT IS THE BEST ACTION TO TAKE TO ENSURE PUBLIC SAFETY UNLESS THEY ARE EDUCATED IN THE USE OR STUDY ON EACH INCIDENT. ESPECIALLY IF IT INVOLVES THE USE OF A FIREARM. I DO BELIEVE WE HAVE OFFICIALS THAT USE A TRAGIC INCIDENT AS NEWTOWN TO FURTHER THERE POLITICAL ASPIRATIONS AND USE THESE EVENTS FOR THERE OWN PERSONAL GAIN. IF INDIVIDUALS WOULD RESPONSIBLY EXAMINE THEIR CONSCIENCE AND ASK THEMSELVES" WHY I AM MAKING A DECISION TO BAN ITEMS"? IS THIS THE RIGHT WAY TO GO? ARE THERE OTHER CIRCUMSTACES INVOLVED? , I WOULD EXPECT AN INTELLIGENT INDIVIDUAL WOULD COME UP WITH SOMETHING MORE. NOT TO REACT IMMEDIATELY IS COMMON SENSE. REACTION ON THE SANDY HOOK TRADGEDY WAS NOT COMMON SENSE. IT WAS CLEARLY A ONE SIDED REACTION BY THE IGNORANT. BY IGNORANT I MEAN THE NON INFORMED OR EDUCATED ON FIREARMS SAFETY.

MY FIRST REACTION: WHEN THIS EVENT OCCURRED, MY WIFE WAS WATCHING THE NEWS AND I WAS ON MY WAY TO SOME ERRANDS. I WAS PHYSICALLY ILL THINKING ABOUT THOSE CHILDREN AND FAMILIES. I THOUGHT ABOUT THE CHRISTMAS SEASON AND THE LOSS SUFFERED. I PRAYED FIRST AND GAVE THANKS MY FAMILY IS SAFE. I GRIEVED. I STILL GRIEVE.

THE INVESTIGATION IN THE NEWTOWN TRAGEDY HAS NOT BEEN COMPLETED YET THERE ARE THOSE WHO JUMPED ON THIS EVENT. I DEEPLY FEEL THE PAIN OF THE RESIDENTS OF NEWTOWN WHEN THE MEDIA AND POLITICIANS DID NOT GIVE ADEQUATE TIME FOR INDIVIDUALS TO GRIEVE. I RESPECT THE FIREARM OWNERS FOR WAITING TO GET INVOLVED EVEN THOUGH OTHERS RUSHED IN TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS TERRIBLE TRAGEDY. THE RESIDENTS AND FAMILIES MUST HAVE GONE THROUGH HELL WITH ALL THE CROWDS AND PUBLICITY.

I HAVE READ MANY BOOKS AND ARTICLES, SOME AS FAR BACK AS THE 1940'S. I HAVE ALSO RESEARCHED SHOOTINGS IN CONNECTICUT. MY CONCLUSION IS THAT MANY FIREARM INJURIES OR DEATHS FALL INTO THREE CATEGORIES. **GREED, RECKLESSNESS OR INSANITY.** THESE ARE THE ISSUES THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED. A BAN ON FIREARMS OR ANY LEGALLY FIREARM PRESENTLY OWNED IN CONNECTICUT IS NOT THE ANSWER.

I FERVENTLY SEE A SERIOUS FLAW SINCE THE TRAGEDY OCCURRED. IF YOU WERE DOING AN INVESTIGATION, WOULD ANY YOU LOOK INTO THE **MENTAL**

STATE OR HOME ENVIRONMENT THE SHOOTER MAY HAVE HAD FIRST? OR FAMILY PROBLEMS? ASK NEIGHBORS OR FRIENDS? MISUSE OF VIDEO GAMES? NO THE FIREARM WAS FIRST. HOW SAD AND WRONG! I BELIEVE THE ISSUE OF MENTAL ILLNESS AND THE SHOOTERS PAST BE INVESTIGATED FIRST. NOT THE BANNING FIREARMS. THAT IS THE POLITICIANS AND MEDIAS FAULT. IF ANY REASONABLE INVESTIGATION OR PROPOSALS FROM OUR REPRESENTATIVES WOULD ADDRESS THESE ISSUES, HE/SHE WOULD MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL CITIZENS IN THE COUNTRY. FIREARM OWNERS AND THOSE THAT DO NOT OWN A FIREARM WOULD APPRECIATE THIS.

AS I READ THE AGENDAS ON TESTIMONY AND PROPOSALS REGARDING THIS TERRIBLE TRAGEDY, I FEEL MORE POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP THAN EVER BEFORE ON ISSUES OF PUBLIC SAFETY. THE PLANNED HEARINGS APPEAR TO BE ONE SIDED AND USING THE DEATHS OF INNOCENT CHILDREN AND OTHERS IS HEARTLESS. IT APPEARS YOU ARE LOOKING FOR PUBLIC SENTIMENT AND MEDIA SENSATIONALISM, NOT COMMON SENSE TO PUSH AN AGENDA.

RESPECTFULLY,

ROBERT KALINOWSKI
JOHNSON RD
COLUMBIA, CT.