The proposed Bill is wanting for content and specificity. To allow passage of a tax in the absence of due diligence regarding the aims, method of implementation, uses and consequences is un-sound policy making.

The purpose of the Bill is unclear and is neither linked to nor logically follows from the funding source. “Gun violence prevention and reduction efforts” is not defined, is excessively broad and provides no clarity on what specific action efforts will be taken by whom and when and the factual evidence supporting the expected and measurable gun violence prevention and reduction effects resulting from such actions. The scope of any defined actions and results must be delineated including the expected impact of such actions on violence perpetrators as well as law abiding gun users and how the interests of the latter are protected from any consequences to the former. There is no clarity on this distinction.

The liberties of law abiding parties-should not be infringed by the implementation of undefined action efforts proposed by this Bill. There is great possibility that the rights of the many (law abiding gun users) will be materially impaired by passage of this Bill as proposed as actions (undefined) are taken. The Bill is silent on this potential infringement issue.

The Bill is incongruous. The impact of any tax paid by law abiding gun users should be used to enhance the enjoyment of the law abiding users paying the tax and not result in the potential limitation of such enjoyment that may arise from the actions (undefined) implemented to the intended detriment of violence perpetrators. How is this distinction to be achieved? The Bill is silent on this issue.

Specific Funding must match a specific use. The unclear purpose of Bill is neither linked to nor logically follows from the funding source. A soda bottle tax paid by a user is used to defray the cost of the bottle's disposal/reclamation. Non soda bottle users are not burdened with the tax. Likewise, the non violent law abiding gun users should not bear a tax used to eliminate violent gun users. Use costs must be match funded. This bill does not match revenues with the expected impact on only violence perpetrators and thereby will likely result in an inequity to law abiding gun users.

The reduction in the applied tax rate (proposed in the Bill while in committee) has no connection to the importance or applicability of the Bill. The reduction is clearly the sleeve of a vest put forward for the purpose of good faith appearances perhaps to gain committee passage. The rate might just as well have been doubled. This Bill clearly results in taxation without representation-an issue dealt with by our nation in the past.

The proposed Bill is hollow-it is lacking in thoughtful insight. It begs withdraw by thoughtful readers.

David Emott  
9 Grant Estate Drive  
West Simsbury, CT 06092  
(one of the many law abiding CT state licensed gun users)