

From: drbenn1755@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, March 18, 2013 9:35 PM
To: INSTestimony
Subject: HB 6656

Chairperson and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Insurance and Real Estate Committee, I thank you for this opportunity to testify.

To say that I object to HB 6656 is a gross understatement. I am APPALLED by this travesty of legislation. The given reason for this bill is to cover the costs of people that are injured by MY guns? You are assuming that someone will be hurt by MY guns? My guns have hurt no one. It was said by a state official, "We require insurance for cars, we might as well require it for guns." What kind of convoluted logic is that? Using that logic, you might as well require insurance for speech, because you might slander someone.

There is an ENORMOUS difference between ownership of a car and ownership of firearms. Driving is a privilege, granted by the state. Ownership of a firearm is a right, guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. A state cannot require a citizen to pay to exercise a constitutional right. The 24th amendment showed that. This bill is discriminatory. A poor person will not be entitled to the same self-defense as a rich person. I guarantee that this bill will not hold up to the constitutional challenge that will surely follow.

Insurance is required while driving due to risk. Few can say that they have never been in an accident in a car and never used their insurance. But a fraction of one percent of firearms owned by people in this country has ever injured anybody. Most of those that have are owned by criminals, who would follow no law anyway.

You've heard figures thrown about by the lobby against the second amendment regarding the chances of being hurt by a gun in the home versus use against an intruder; I can't cite a number, quite an assortment of numbers are used. These numbers are taken from emergency room statistics. But, according to the Kleck study, 70-80% of the time in self-defense, the firearm is never discharged; merely showing a firearm repels an intruder; no one goes to the emergency room. It has also been proven that NON firearm use vs. injury in the home yields similar or higher numbers.

There is nothing to be accomplished with this bill, no crime will be stopped, and nobody will be saved. Let's face it; the sole purpose of this legislation is to make it too expensive to own a firearm. I will NOT pay for the crimes of a deranged madman. There are hundreds of thousands of gun owners in this state. Many will not comply. What will the state do? Do you realize how many MILLIONS that it will cost for enforcement, how clogged the judicial system will become? What about the prisons, will you let out a serial rapist to put me in?

I am an engineer in research here in CT. The company that I work for researches and develops new technologies to help bring water to deserts, to reclaim wasted energy, and to develop new energy technologies to make a greener planet. I would seriously consider selling my house, taking my guns and moving out of this state should this legislation pass. I don't want to live in a state that is trying to make a criminal of me. There are many other states that can use my talents. There are at least 4 or 5 other engineers and technicians in my company that will also leave. At thousands of other companies across Connecticut the same thing will happen. Most have professional spouses that will leave with them. For a state that is planning for research and high tech manufacturing to help them in economic recovery, can they handle the brain drain that will surely follow?

Anti- second amendment people say, fine them, make them pay, forget their precious rights, that will reduce gun violence. Then when these laws inevitably don't work, we'll pass other ones. They can theorize all they want ad infinitum, it won't cost them. They have no "skin in the game." It is the law abiding firearms owner that will have to pay the price. I will NOT pay for the crimes of a madman.

Consider the true costs of the proposed firearms legislation. It will stop no crime. Is it worth it? Traditionally the gauge of a law is that, if a law-abiding citizen does nothing and the law makes him a criminal, it is a bad law. Please, don't pass a bad law.

Thank You for your time and consideration,

Dale Bennett