The justification for this proposed tax is to raise an estimated "$7 million for gun violence prevention in Connecticut's four largest cities."

I find this justification offensive for all victims of any and all violence, whether victimized by fists, blunt objects, sharp objects, firearms, etc.

To effectively and properly fund violence prevention, without burdening the very subset of our population, permit holders and hunters, who are obligated to undergo various levels of safety and knowledge training, and who are to various degrees vetted by law enforcement, and who are also a smaller subset of the general population who are not permit holders or licenses, the legislature should focus on a specific tax on Connecticut's population who are either non-permit holders or non-licensed hunters.

Permit holders and hunters already pay fees to obtain their licensing and permits, and thus are already contributing to the general fund of our government. To levy an additional tax on them is a disproportionate application of taxation.

Since firearms permit holders and hunters already contribute significantly to the state's general fund, and since these are a smaller subset of the general population than non-firearm-permit holders and non-licensed hunters, understanding that purchasers of firearms for hunting, sport, or self-defense, along with ammunition purchases, already pay sales tax that contribute to the state's general fund, it would make logical sense to add a tax to those in Connecticut who do not pay fees for firearms permits or hunting licenses, who do not purchase firearms, and who do not purchase ammunition.

What I suggest is adding a $35 flat-tax, or other amount calculated to raise the $7 million, that will simultaneously be required to go directly to prevention of ALL violence in ALL our towns and cities, on all residents of Connecticut. In addition, along with this automatic flat-tax, those who DO POSSESS a firearm permit or hunting permit will be able to claim a credit equal to that flat-tax.

Since obtaining a firearm permit or hunting licensing requires some degree of safety training, not to mention these people are also known to law enforcement, those with neither a firearm permit or hunting license are unknowns and unvetted.

This suggested proposal of a flat-tax with credit if one is a firearm permit holder or licensed hunter, will encourage people to undergo a firearm permit or hunting license application, which will require safety training and the state will raise money from those respective fees.

With this, we would have a more knowledgeable population with regards to, specifically, firearms safety, vetted by the process, and contributing to the state's general fund.

As it stands, H.B. 5040 AN ACT ESTABLISHING AN EXCISE TAX ON AMMUNITION, is a barely veiled infringement on our rights, unfairly impacting low-income people, not seriously
addressing all violence, and unfairly and unequally burdening a minority group for only certain victims of violence while ignoring all victims of any and all violence.

Inferring that people who engage in hunting, shooting sports, or self-defense training are inherently more prone to, or are the perpetrators, of violence is insulting and divisive.

Regards,

Robert Kwasnicki
Enfield, CT 06082