

From: Peter Brown <pbrown1024@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2013 12:21 AM
To: INSTestimony
Cc: Buddy Altobello; pbrown1024@att.net
Subject: Testimony: Oppose Raised Bill No. 6656

Dear Members of the Insurance and Real Estate Committee,
Re: Raised Bill No. 6656, AN ACT CONCERNING LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR FIREARM POSSESSORS OR OWNERS.

Dear Committee Members,

I ask that you OPPOSE passage of RB 6656.

I believe the enactment of this bill into law would be the first in the country, and as such, will be walking on untested grounds. As such, I believe the tenor and purpose of this bill is ONLY to punish gun owners, and to price gun ownership punitively out of existence.

If EVERY SINGLE PERSON in the State, or Country were required to have such insurance, regardless if they claimed to own guns or not, perhaps then it would be more equitable for everyone, and could possibly work. But, why make "non gun-owners" buy gun liability insurance? Because, one never really knows who owns a gun and who doesn't own a gun. Furthermore, many adults don't have children but are forced to burden the cost of educating OTHER PEOPLES CHILDREN, so the idea of forcing people to pay for something they don't use is not unprecedented.

Besides, I seriously doubt that the inner city drug lords, and gang members who account for the vast majority of firearm offenses, street shootings, and mayhem, will bother to purchase any gun liability insurance, mainly due to it being a tacit admission of gun ownership which, if they are a felon or prohibited person, would be a violation of their 5th amendment rights against self incrimination. This issue has already been decided by the US Supreme Court.

Please see Haynes V. US

1968 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Haynes_v._United_States

In light of all these facts, I ask that you please oppose Raised Bill No. 6656.

Thank you,

Peter Brown
93 Baileyville Rd.
Middlefield, CT. 06455