## **Gun Tax (Extortion) Bill Gets Attention, No Traction, but Still Reveals Totalitarian Mindset**

<u>0 0 0 1</u> <u>by David Codrea</u>, <u>November 5, 2015</u>



Opposite Day "progressive" Nydia Velasquez proposes using armed enforcement to bully gun owners into either paying extortion money or giving up their right to keep and bear arms altogether. (Nydia Velasquez Facebook photo)

"A new bill would tax gun owners at a rate of \$100 per firearm with proceeds going towards anti-violence and mental health programs," <u>AL.com is reporting</u>. "Rep. Nydia Velazquez, D-NY., said the measure would reduce the number of guns in circulation and providing needed funding for programs aimed at reducing violence. The legislation will be introduced in the U.S. House this week."

Taxing rights. What a "progressive" idea, right up (down) there with poll taxes. Aside from being offensive to all, that would make guns prohibitively expensive for people of lesser means to afford, effectively discriminating against vulnerable citizens who live in the most dangerous neighborhoods.

Funny, who the biggest opponents of true egalitarian power-sharing are...

And if \$100 is good, \$200 would be better, right? Once the precedent is established, the sky's the limit.

The presumption is that New York City and other urban areas have strict edicts, but unless we impose the same diktats on everyone everywhere in Everytown, why, people will still be able to get guns! But those "easy access" areas of lesser infringements present an inconvenient truth the antis would just as soon not see brought up: They always seem to be relatively more peaceable.

Velasquez's bill would also slap a \$10,000 fine on anyone who fails to report a stolen gun within 48 hours. What it can't do is impose such punishment on the violent criminals whose thuggish ways feed the "demand" for "gun control": A principle established by the ruling in <u>U.S. v. Haynes</u> is that you can't require a prohibited person to admit to having been in possession of a gun, because to do so would violate Fifth Amendment self-incrimination protections. So the bad guys get a free pass.

The first question might be why Alabama "Authorized Journalists" are making a big deal over the actions of a New York Congressthing. The next might be why a professional journalist is apparently ignorant of the fact that a bill she's now telling readers to expect this week was actually already <u>introduced a week-and-a-half ago</u>. And last, we might ask why so much energy is being focused on a bill that, <u>per the GovTrack legislative prognosis</u>, stands only a 1% chance of even making it out of committee and a 0% chance of being enacted.

One might also ask what bullet button workarounds to California gun owner harassment edicts have to do with the story being "reported," but they apparently needed a picture and the one they used at least had a gun in it. It's not like subject matter familiarity is a requirement for the media as long as there's an agenda-advancing narrative to publicize.

That's understood by political parasites nonetheless looking for press exposure. When you're dealing with a constituency dumb enough to elect totalitarian wannabes like Nydia, you have to constantly remind them of your name, which explains all the **Brooklyn and Queens DAs eager to share in the limelight**, not to mention the **12 cosponsors in Congress**. (As an aside, I see Keith Ellison and several other members of the Democrat Socialists of America-affiliated "Progressive Caucus" are backing the bill. Like a fictional predatory infiltrator said, **the better to kill you with...**)

In a way, proposing incremental Intolerable Acts like this does us a favor. It shows us there's no stone the gun-grabbers intend to leave unturned as they grind relentlessly toward their true goal, total control. And not just of guns.

That's why anyone ostensibly on "our side" who offers "compromise" is being foolish – at best. The enemy will never consider surrendered bits and pieces enough, and even when they have it all, that'll mean they're just getting started.

My standard response to the power-mad and their useful idiot enablers: No. Your move.

Categories: 2nd amendment, All

Tags: gun control, media

## **About Author**

## **David Codrea**

David Codrea blogs at The War on Guns: Notes from the Resistance (WarOnGuns.com), and is a field editor/columnist for GUNS Magazine. Named "Journalist of the Year" in 2011 by the Second Amendment Foundation for his groundbreaking work on the "Fast and Furious" ATF "gunwalking" scandal, he is a frequent event speaker and guest on national radio and television programs.