

“America has a two-party system. This has many implications for us ordinary, “main street,” American citizens. This column is focused on one of our most fundamental rights guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution, the Second Amendment. Thus I will focus my comments on this right. For decades we have had one party that has mostly supported this right and one party that has worked to undermine, neuter or eliminate this right.

As such I will comment on the party that is a threat to our “Right to Keep and Bear Arms,” and that is the Democrat Party. Over the years this party has camouflaged their desires and knew that they would alienate too much of the citizenry if they stated out loud their intentions.

Sure there were gun control groups like the Brady Campaign, Mayors Against Illegal Guns, Moms Demand Action, Million Moms March, Everytown For Gun Safety, Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence, and the Violence Policy Center, that were very active to deny American’s their Second Amendment rights. Every one of these groups were lauded by the Democrat Party that quietly supported their efforts.

These groups promoted “common sense gun control” and “gun violence prevention.” The platforms from these groups ended up in various gun control legislation promoted by various members of the Democrat House or Senate. But this legislation never went anywhere because the Democrats didn’t have the majorities in the House and Senate and the White House. There was one exception to this during the first two years of Barack Obama. But thankfully they were focused on passing ObamaCare and gun control was thankfully below their radar.

Something has changed in the last four or five years in the Democrat Party where they now feel free to openly tell the American public what they intend to do regarding gun control. I have highlighted several gun control proposals coming out of the Democrat House and “promised” by the Democrat candidates for president. I hope all of these “promises” scare you – they certainly scare me. So what can we do? First we can express our concerns to our elected representatives in congress. We will have one of our Senate seats up for grabs this year. We need to look hard at the candidates, especially their views on the protecting the Second Amendment.

And finally there is the presidency. Joe Biden is the presumptive Democrat Candidate and I’ve written about his gun control position before. The absolute nightmare would be for a Democrat majority in both houses of Congress and a Democrat in the White House.

Look at the article below for more information about the importance of your vote this November.

And finally I’ve highlighted three new gun control proposals coming out of the Democrat controlled House.” Rich Stouder

HOW IMPORTANT WILL GUN OWNERS’ VOTES BE IN NOVEMBER?

Over the years, there’s been a lot of talk about how the National Rifle Association is just way too powerful, how it buys up politicians and makes it impossible to enact “common-sense gun reform” at the federal level. For many of us, this is just a trigger to roll our eyes. We all know the NRA isn’t “buying” anyone, at least not any more than Bloomberg-backed groups are buying anti-gun politicians. Probably less so.

The reason the NRA is powerful, though, is because they ultimately represent millions of gun owners’ voices, even if they’re not necessarily members of the organization.

Right about now, though, a lot of anti-gun voices are declaring that the embattled NRA is weakening and that this represents a golden opportunity for them.

That’s why Joe Biden apparently felt so confident going toe-to-toe with a Detroit autoworker on the topic of guns. This is supposedly their time. Biden’s assertive posture on guns recalls the 2000 election. And this worries Democrats.

In 2000, the Democrat Party Platform celebrated Al Gore’s record of standing up to the NRA, the legislative successes of the Clinton administration, namely the Brady Bill and the Assault Weapons Ban, and



called for mandatory gun locks and a host of federal programs regulating gun purchases.

Al Gore lost. Democrat leaders attributed the loss in part to gun owners support for George W. Bush, especially in states Gore was defeated including his home state of Tennessee. Public opinion surveys showed Bush won a historically large share of the gun owners vote – 66%, only Bush senior in 1988 attracted a greater proportion – 68%. To win elections, centrists Democratic strategists, concluded “Democrats need to reason with gun owners rather than insult them.”

Gun owners have long been a reliable GOP voting bloc. The General Social Surveys demonstrate that in 10 of the last 12 presidential elections,

a majority of gun owners supported Republican candidates. Even when the nation supported a Democrat, gun owners typically remained loyal to Republicans. And in 2016, Donald Trump garnered over 60% of gun owners, which was the largest share since Bush in 2004. In the 2018 midterms, 61% of gun owners voted for Republican candidates compared to just 26% of non-owners, a 35-point gap.

This is not a small or insignificant political group. Opinion surveys estimate a third to 40% of households have a gun. That percentage increases notably among the all-important rural voting population. Moreover, in several key swing states gun owners comprise a substantial proportion of voters, including Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Florida, Michigan, and Wisconsin. As Democrats remember, in a tight election, gun owners’ vote can be decisive.

Of course, the article goes on to repeat the claim that attitudes on guns are shifting.

And, to be fair, they probably were. After all, the media has played up every mass shooting and bombarded people with talking heads all regurgitating the same solutions to the point that it starts to have an impact. Even on gun owners. But up to a point.

While some gun owners have been swayed by things like red flag laws or universal background checks, they’re only swayed in the abstract. Sure, they sound good on the surface. The problem is that the nuts and bolts are usually more of an issue. Universal background check measures have been defeated in several states despite polling showing their popularity. The reason? People find out that it covers much more than they thought. At that point, they hit the eject button and vote against the measures.

Where Biden and the Democrats need to worry is that Biden’s not talking about closing loopholes that don’t really exist or supposedly trying to curb mass shootings with laws that aren’t really needed.

No, Biden is talking gun bans. He wants to ban the most popular firearm in the country because it makes him squeamish or whatever.

The problem is, once you ban a category of guns, what’s to stop lawmakers from going after another category? Then another? Then another?

Let’s be honest, a lot of gun owners are looking at that and thinking about how that doesn’t sound like such a good thing. That’s likely to hurt Biden in the long run.

Regardless, gun owners are likely to make a difference this year as they do most years.

https://bearingarms.com/tomk/2020/04/07/important-gun-owners-votes-be/?utm_source=badaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl&bcid=574425a31bab1eb14c0052fc18f4218e

PROPOSED LEGISLATION YOU SHOULD CARE ABOUT

H.R.5717 – 116th Congress (2019-2020)

Introduced in House (01/30/2020)

Gun Violence Prevention and Community Safety Act of 2020

This bill makes various changes to the federal framework governing the sale, transfer, and possession of firearms and ammunition. Among other things, the bill does the following:

- generally requires individuals to obtain a license to purchase, acquire, or possess a firearm or ammunition;

- raises the minimum age—from 18 years to 21 years—to purchase firearms and ammunition;
- establishes new background check requirements for firearm transfers between private parties;
- requires law enforcement agencies to be notified following a firearms-related background check that results in a denial;
- creates a statutory process for a family or household member to petition a court for an extreme risk protection order to remove firearms from an individual who poses a risk of committing violence;
- restricts the import, sale, manufacture, transfer, or possession of semiautomatic assault weapons and large capacity ammunition feeding devices;
- restricts the manufacture, sale, transfer, purchase, or receipt of ghost guns (i.e., guns without serial numbers);
- makes trafficking in firearms a stand-alone criminal offense;
- requires federally licensed gun dealers to submit and annually certify compliance with a security plan to detect and deter firearm theft;
- removes limitations on the civil liability of gun manufacturers;
- allows the Consumer Product Safety Commission to issue safety standards for firearms and firearm components;
- establishes a community violence intervention grant program; and
- promotes research on firearms safety and gun violence prevention. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/5717>

HR 6110 – THE DEFECTIVE FIREARMS PROTECTION ACT

One of the things that Second Amendment supporters have known for a long time is that the big threats don't have to come from elected officeholders. True, they can pass sweeping laws, but the conditions that would enable such passage are very rare. The best chance anti-Second Amendment extremists had was in the wake of the Sandy Hook shooting, and they failed to get a federal ban on modern multi-purpose semi-automatic firearms.

But then again, history teaches us that sweeping legislation is not the only threat. We can also face a threat from bureaucrats and the administrative state. In some ways, this threat is worse than that from lawmakers. Why? Because the bureaucrats and administrative state is always there... even as lawmakers come and go.

This is why HR 6110, The Defective Firearms Protection Act, introduced by Representative Debbie Dingell, should be a very big deal. This very short bill, two pages long in its official form. It has two very short sections and counting the labeling of the section titles, it is all of 79 words long.

But these 79 words mark a monumental shift in power from elected officials that the American people can hold accountable to the administrative state, with grave implications for the ability of Americans to exercise their Second Amendment rights. It's not what the law puts in place, it's the restriction that it lifts which Second Amendment supporters should worry about.

Under 15 USC 2052, firearms of all types are not considered consumer products, and under 15 USC 2079, firearms are generally excluded from the jurisdiction of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

According to a release from Representative Dingell's office, HR 6110 will give the Consumer Product Safety Commission power over our Second Amendment rights.

"Because the Consumer Product Safety Commission lacks the authority to recall firearms, faulty guns remain on the market and pose a risk to public and household safety," said Dingell in the release. She went on to press the nonsense claim that more is done to regulate products like highchairs and bicycles than firearms.

Now, we know that is bunk. There are plenty of laws covering firearms. And like any other product, the owner of a firearm can sue if the firearm is truly defective. And no Second Amendment supporter wants unsafe firearms out there. Then again, the trick is, how do you define an "unsafe" firearm? Anti-Second Amendment extremists are certain to have a very... expansive definition.

Keep in mind, the Violence Policy Center long held the position

that handguns and modern multi-purpose long guns should be banned as inherently unsafe. The transfer of power to the CPSC could give anti-Second Amendment extremists a chance to achieve sweeping gun bans, and there would be few options to hold them accountable.

Imagine the CPSC telling Rock River Arms to stop making all of their modern multi-purpose semi-automatic firearms. The company would have to comply or face civil and criminal penalties. Litigation would also be much more difficult than in challenging a law.

The Defective Firearms Protection Act is an extremely dangerous piece of legislation. Second Amendment supporters should be contacting their Representatives and Senators and politely urging them to oppose HR 6110. Instead, urge them to back firearms safety education and training, like that provided by the National Rifle Association. Read more: <https://www.ammoland.com/2020/04/below-the-radar-the-defective-firearms-protection-act/#ixzz6JVh9wzC6>

HR 4080 - THE KIMBERLY VAUGHAN FIREARM SAFE STORAGE ACT

Sometimes, when legislation is targeting your Second Amendment rights, it doesn't necessarily come in the form of a ban or licensing and registration. Sometimes, the worst infringements are those that literally make it impossible for people to exercise their Second Amendment rights in one way or another without risking arrest (and worse).

It could be anything from closing land used for hunting. It could be a noise ordinance that shuts the range you went to for years. It could even be something as simple as making it impossible to defend yourself without entering a state of legal jeopardy.

This last item is what HR 4080, the Kimberly Vaughan Firearm Safe Storage Act, that is the third part of a three-bill package introduced by Sheila Jackson Lee (the others are HR 4081 and HR 4082), does to Americans who are exercising their Second Amendment rights. In a very real sense, it makes having your firearm ready for perhaps its most important role – personal protection in your home – a federal crime.

Literally if you have a home firearm, the only safe harbor to avoid prosecution if your firearm (s) is stolen and misused is to have your firearms and ammo "secured, unloaded, and separately, in a safe certified by the Attorney General" while the firearm itself is "locked with a trigger lock certified by the Attorney General."

How viable is that firearm as an option for self-defense? The short answer is that the firearm is NOT viable. But if you don't render the firearm non-viable as an option, you could face 20 years in prison. Felons in possession of firearms only face a maximum of ten years under 18 USC 922 and 18 USC 924. Jackson Lee's proposal is worse. If you do get convicted, the Attorney General keeps the firearm and ammo at your expense.

There are no provisions for the return of the firearm and ammo. Eventually, the expenses will just mount until you decide to give it up. Which is part of the idea. The other nasty provision is that one self-defense scenario that has emerged at times can also lead to that 20-year sentence.

So, imagine if there is a situation where a 16-year-old grabs a firearm and used it to protect their family. During that moment, they fire shots and send the assailants fleeing. Under an anti-Second Amendment president, we could very well see an appointed U.S. Attorney order a prosecution.

Like HR 4081, the Sabika Sheikh Firearm Licensing and Registration Act, this bill is named for a victim of the Santa Fe High School shooting. Again, Sheila Jackson Lee wants to try to deflect criticism from those with legitimate objections to this legislation.

The fact is that there are laws on the books punishing the theft of firearms. There are laws that handle those who willingly hand over firearms to felons and other prohibited persons. HR 4082 simply attacks the right to self-defense. Second Amendment supporters should contact their Representative and Senators and politely urge them to defeat this bill. <https://www.ammoland.com/2020/03/below-the-radar-the-kimberly-vaughan-firearm-safe-storage-act/#ixzz6J32PHEFU>

RICHARD STOUER – oakridger48@msn.com