



AFFILIATED WITH THE NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION

# D.S.S.A. NEWS

DELAWARE STATE SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION  
A PUBLICATION OF THE DELAWARE STATE SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Visit us on the web: DSSA.us  
P.O. Box 94, Lincoln, DE 19960



## WHY ARE DELAWARE'S LAW-ABIDING GUN OWNERS, HUNTERS AND SPORTSMEN SO ANGRY ABOUT THE CARNEY-TOWNSEND ANTI-GUN TRIFECTA?

BY John C. Sigler

I was recently asked by a member of Delaware's General Assembly "Why are gun owners so upset over the three gun bills currently being proposed by us Democrats?" That legislator was, of course, referring to Senate Bills #68, 69 & 70, the "Carney-Townsend Anti-Gun Trifecta." I explained to that legislator my most pressing concerns and then promised to report back after I had a chance to talk to other gun owners, hunters and sportsmen.

My survey of Delaware gun owners, sportsmen and hunters was anything but scientific, but it was enlightening and perhaps even instructive. Here is a list of the top 12 reasons why Delaware voters are angry with their legislators over these three bills. There are many more, but these are the twelve reasons at the top of the list.

1. They believe that SB68, SB82 & SB70 all clearly and severely infringe upon their God-given right to defend themselves, their families & their homes – and they know that these anti-gun zealots know it too, but just don't care.
2. They believe that SB68, SB82, & SB70 will do nothing to stop crime, reduce violence or make our communities safer – they know it, and they know that these anti-gun zealots know it too, but just don't care.
3. They know that criminals and the mentally ill will uniformly ignore and disobey SB68, SB69 & SB70 – and they know that these anti-gun zealots know that too, but just don't care.
4. They view SB68, SB82 & SB70 as a personal insult to them and their integrity as law-abiding citizens.
5. They view SB68, SB82 and SB70 as a collective insult to our history, our culture and our heritage, and to constitutional principles upon which this country and our State were founded.
6. They are offended because they see both SB69 and SB70 as having racist overtones as the result of their disproportionate adverse economic impact on the poor.

7. They view SB68, SB82 & SB70 as a blatant betrayal of them, personally, and a clear betrayal of their trust in their elected officials and in their government
8. They view SB68, SB82 & SB70 as examples of power-hungry politicians ignoring their oaths of office and betraying the people they have sworn to represent.
9. They know that SB68, SB69 and SB70 clearly violate multiple sections of Delaware's Bill of Rights and the United States Bill of Rights and they no longer entirely trust our courts to protect those rights.
10. Likewise, they know that SB68, SB69 and SB70 are patently unconstitutional on multiple levels and they know that many legislators know that too, but just don't care.
11. They know that a government that does not trust its people is a government that cannot be trusted by its people and that SB68, SB69 & SB70 stand as clear and undeniable evidence that at least some within our government do not trust the people they were elected to serve.
12. They fear the advent of an oppressive government that may someday use SB68, SB82 and SB70 as tools of oppression and they view these and similar measures as the foundation upon which a future oppressive dictatorship might one day be built.

---

## Ladies Night at Delaware Rifle and Pistol Club Shoots Up Teacups

By Barbara Boyce



Imagine shooting pretty, dainty teacups and matching saucers to **smithereens** from 50 feet with .22LR pistol or rifle. That is how Ladies Night at the Range kicked off its first meeting at DRPC in May 2018. Since then, about a dozen women meet about every six weeks on a Thursday evening to practice shooting or learn some aspect of self-defense.

Sometimes the women meet as one large group for discussions of two to three hours in length and other nights the women have up to 45 minutes one-on-one with an instructor, shooting a specific drill on the range. Not only are these women practicing their gun handling and marksmanship skills, but they are feeling empowered and having fun.



If you would like more information about DRPC's Ladies Night at the Range or have suggestions for upcoming classes, contact:

Barbara Boyce at [barbarab@systemsapproachltd.com](mailto:barbarab@systemsapproachltd.com)



Each ladies' skills were assessed by instructions to develop a base line.

Early on, the instructors conducted an assessment of each woman, identifying her needs and desires regarding firearms. The women have done skill building drills and a plate shoot from the 21-foot line. They've had discussions of home defense versus self-defense, including a discussion of the types of firearms needed, ammunition, and how to be prepared, both mentally and physically to defend themselves. They've even had a hands-on class on gun cleaning basics.

Ladies Night at the Range has been well supported by the club instructors and the DRPC Board. Ladies Night at the Range came about because there are an increasing number of women who want to become or have become DRPC members (approximately 25% of current members are women).



Ladies learn to clean guns and skill building drills.

Women like to practice and hone their shooting skills in a non-threatening, relaxed environment. DRPC does not require the women participating in Ladies Night to be members.

---

## "Guns and Ash Trays"

By Bill Walsh

I see our Legislators are again considering banning things that are symptoms rather than working on the underlying disease. It's sort of like banning cough syrup because of overdosing during a flu epidemic, instead of developing flu shots to contain the spread of the disease that caused the cough! This time it is the banning of guns instead of working on the root causes of gun violence.

Almost 100 years ago we tried the banning approach as a solution. It was alcohol back then, and we got bootleggers, speakeasies, gangsters, etc.; and we still have alcohol problems like abuse, DUI's, and fatal auto accidents.

When second hand tobacco smoke was recognized as an issue, we realized our culture was promoting cigarette smoking. We worked on the source of the problem instead of banning the device. We ended public promotion of smoking, we removed cigarette smoking from entertainment, movies and TV sitcoms, the evening news anchors stopped lighting-up during the broadcast, etc. Airlines stopped passing out free 4-packs to smoke on the plane, and Doctors even stopped taking money to promote one brand over another. The basis for an old joke even disappeared: "Nine out of ten doctors have switched to Camels – but they eventually went back to people!"

Cigarettes weren't banned and those who choose to smoke (appropriately) still can, but we don't have a significant second hand smoke problem.

Consider the amount of gratuitous violence we receive through our TV sets, the mayhem in popular films, and the electronic games that you "win" with maximum human kills. Then I would recommend you read some of Lt. Col. Dave Grossman's books, especially the "Assassination Generation." Grossman is a retired Professor of Psychology from the West

---

Point Military Academy who makes a case that some popular video games have reached the level that the US Military uses to train (temporarily brainwash?) soldiers to suppress normal human instincts, and to be willing to kill other human beings. He should know because that's what he did for a living!

Maybe we should take the tobacco approach to gun violence instead of banning devices that are only symptoms? It worked! When was the last time you saw an ash tray on a restaurant table?

---

## **We need NRA and NRA needs us, more than ever now.**

**By Duane Liptak  
Executive Vice President of Magpul**

So, it's relatively popular to bash the NRA right now, and we have a lot of folks in our own community that are happy to jump on that bandwagon. I get it. I don't like where we are at with the 2A situation, either, and I wish the NRA could yell "Shall not be infringed," from the mountaintops. But, through my involvement with the org over the past years, and the insight into the DC and state level situations I've unfortunately had to gain while lobbying and managing lobbying efforts, I also understand some things that make me appreciate the strengths of what the NRA actually brings to us, and I felt compelled to share that as a comment on some posts that decried the current state of the NRA. Some folks urged me to make it sharable, so I'm doing so, with some cleaning up of my language. :) I get that some folks will call me full of it, or claim "the NRA is in full damage control" or whatever, but this isn't an NRA statement. This is a statement from me, a very, very zealous advocate for extreme libertarian gun rights, with an understanding of the current political landscape. Take it as you will, but please put aside your prejudices for just a moment to read, because if we can't get everyone pushing in the same direction, we can't beat the disarm America movement, because they are more than willing to get together to achieve our ruin.

In any of this commentary, I'm speaking for myself, not for the NRA. I have to use that disclaimer, as I'm speaking out of turn, and this is MY PERSONAL understanding of the events and information, not official NRA position. I suppose some of this information could also be potentially damaging to future efforts because it lays out some reasoning and strategy, but it's to a point right now where people need to understand some things. The NRA is not just your best defense, they are your ONLY defense. FPC does fantastic legal work, as does SAF. GOA is great at grass roots email activation and they file some amicus briefs and lawsuits. All of them have ZERO capability to interact with lawmakers in a meaningful way more than me running up to DC, which I do a couple times a year. No one else

does, period, and that's why I'm on board with helping to steer the NRA rather than bash it.

I'll start out by saying I'm about as hard core libertarian on gun laws as it gets, as in mail order suppressed FA belt feds for everyone. Let's also get out that pretty much everyone in the NRA building is pretty far along that line, as well. I was talking to Chris and crew about strategies to open the registry during the Bumpfire stock litigation while we talked about how to fight some of the things we know are coming. They're on board, really. Now, the other side of this is that it's Washington, D.C., and the number one priority of most congress-folk is getting re-elected. To some extent, that's fine, as they are supposed to be representing the will of their district or state, and votes support that. When they evaluate an issue, they look at how it will help or hurt their re-election, and...what else they can get for it. If they support A, can they get B as an amendment to help their state, can they count on attracting donors with a particular stance, etc. So let's take a look at the bumpfire stock thing.

After Vegas, bumpfire stock legislation was drafted, but NRA had the juice to kill it. Then we have Parkland, and the public outcry to the lawmakers is that we have to "do something for the children", even if it's meaningless and dumb—because it was kids this time instead of adults in a currently unsympathetic demographic like Vegas. A strong majority of both chambers were willing to pass a bumpfire stock ban as "something". The language in the legislative ban included binary triggers, cranks, etc., and could also at some point be interpreted by ATF to include ANY aftermarket trigger and even be mangled to include semi autos in general as having the capability to have rates of fire similar to machineguns and thus, be regulated. It would be a disaster. NRA pushed back hard, but guess what...the legislators were reacting to public sentiment, and they had more than enough votes to pass it. It was going to come out of committee.

We (Magpul) yelled at our lobbyists to kill it. NSSF was trying to kill it. NRA was trying to kill it. But...Trump apparently dislikes two things in the firearms world: bumpfire stocks and elephant hunting, for reasons that are his own. So a veto was not happening. So...what's your play? You can say "No bans, not one inch" and send out a fundraising email, and everyone would feel good about the NRA position, but the ban would have passed, and the dems would potentially have everything they needed for a semi-auto ban already in law, ready to be interpreted nefariously.

So, the decision to make the push to regulatory was hatched. NSSF was on board, as well, as everyone thought there was a better chance of killing it in regulatory, or at least fighting it as it would be a hell of a stretch to regulate like that. The NRA's wording was poor from my perspective. Even if they said, "you don't need legislation because this is a regulatory matter, and regulatory can take a look at it and clarify," that would have been better. But, they didn't...for a few reasons. One, I'm sure they hoped that their "support" of a regulatory fix could sour the legislative efforts and then cancel the regulatory look, too. In any case, the legislation was averted by

---

the push to regulatory, and the regulatory ban is narrow and also likely to be overturned.

FPC is making good authority arguments in their suit, and the NRA is arguing on “takings”. The Dems have reintroduced the legislative ban in the house this session, because they wanted the “other” stuff that was also intentionally included. As long as the regulatory ban lasts while legal arguments are happening, the bill can probably be killed. Is that a trade or a compromise? No. It’s not a trade if a dog turd sandwich is being forced down your throat, and it’s pretty much a done deal, but you manage to get away with only taking one bite instead of the whole thing. But, the left LOVES it when the NRA does such things because they have trolls that are helping to divide the gun community, although we do a great job of it ourselves.

The stronger the NRA is, the stronger the positions can be. The more members the NRA has, the more pressure they can bring in discussions about elections and the more support that stronger positions have when talking to politicians. The more money they have, the more we can spend in elections. Is the NRA perfect? Oh, heck no! No organization is. But they are our only real chance. The NRA, with the help of the NSSF, also, has killed an actual AWB and magazine restrictions on the national level several times in the past few years alone. I, or our lobbyists, have seen it. No one else was even considered part of the conversation, regardless of posturing. We also wouldn’t have FOPA, and if anyone wants to complain about Hughes, which I hate as much as anyone, if you were currently living under GCA ’68, and had the chance to get the FOPA protections, but someone slipped in the Hughes amendment at the last minute to try to poison the bill, you’d still support passing it.

The NRA didn’t give you GCA ’68. They tried to minimize damage in another time when overwhelming support for even worse gun control existed after Kennedy and King were assassinated. NFA originally included handguns, also, and was in a similar period of hysteria about mob violence. Without the NRA and also the NSSF, we wouldn’t have had the Lawful Commerce in Arms act of 2005, and the entire firearms industry in the US would be out of business by now—sued into bankruptcy just by fending off lawsuits from Bloomberg lawyers.

There are a lot of wins there, but make no mistake...I want more, too. However...please understand that even with the R majority we had for the last two years...soft Rs like Flake, Rubio, and the other purple district congressmen and senators had us in a bad spot even then. Repealing the NFA, as much as I want that to die, has about 5% support in congress right now. You’re not getting that legislatively unless you change out 95% of congress, no matter how hard we could push for it, or how many “strong statements” anyone makes. We are, in reality, barely hanging on to a slim majority of elected officials at the national level that even believes the 2A is an individual right! The only path to right this course, especially with states like CA, CO, NJ, MA, NY, WA, etc., is through judicial review. And...love Trump or hate him, regardless of anything else he

has done, if it were Hillary putting 2, possibly 3 judges on the USSC bench, the 2A would be dead in 10 years. That’s why NRA went all in with him. Not because he was a philosophically pure candidate on all of 2A, but because he was willing to put pro 2A judges on the bench, and because he could win. No one else on our side could, and the alternative—a Hillary presidency—would be disastrous.

Someone is going to bring up salaries and expenditures and mail solicitations, and such, so let me hit that for a second. Executive salaries in the NRA are not shabby. Agreed. They are, however, less than organizations like the Red Cross, AARP, and other not-for-profit orgs of similar size, and you have to understand that NRA execs are limiting their future options by taking that job. You’re not going from the NRA to Patagonia, REI, or ANY politically sensitive company. But... we can still do better, I think. There is a compensation review coming.

The organization has already slashed budgets by increasing efficiencies, cutting funding to major habitual contractors, tightening up contracts in general, and all around tightening up the ship. The new Treasurer is a stud. Good things are happening as far as a fiduciary responsibility to the members, as the org knows there is a BIG fight coming in 2020. And rumors of things like cutting off coffee to staff are BS. They just went from a vendor, like many offices use, to a self-administered coffee mess...like many offices use. We have that here. I hate getting junk mail, but they produce results. I’d love to streamline the opt out process for that, plus maybe knock off the renewal notices a month after you renew and things like that, and those are goals of mine, but we also need the cash and members to keep up the fight, and the mailings produce results. Is it enough to offset people who don’t renew to avoid the harassment? I don’t know...but I’d like to look at it. Help to recruit a few new members yourself, and that will help cut down on calls and mailings.

Anyway, this is a heck of a rant, but I’ve seen too much NRA bashing lately by those who don’t know what’s even going on in DC. It’s a mess. I hate going there. But, the NRA is actually our best advocate there, regardless of what you think about some of the publicly stated positions. Making a press release that says, “We support repealing the NFA and doing away with the 4473 and all other remnants of GCA ’68,” doesn’t actually accomplish anything if you can’t produce results. It actually damages the ability to explain the real down sides of the issues that are at hand, with support, that need to be killed, because you won’t even get to talk to the people on the fence to make your case. Dems tend to ask for “common sense gun reform”, which we know means disarm America. Consider looking at NRA public statements through the same lens, in reverse. Maneuvering the swamp requires talking in less than absolute terms, even when behind the scenes, your goal is absolute. I have friends on the NRA staff. You’re not going to find more ardent supporters of the absolute, not to be infringed 2A than those people.

One last note on red flag laws...If you take a look at the terms the NRA is talking about, it’s adding the poison pills that make it less appealing to Dems—you know, like due process,

---

and penalties for false reports, which they are really trying to get around with these. There's not a single person in the NRA building that wants red flag laws--because of the risk of abuse. But...saying "not one inch" and sending out emails saying how strong someone's stance is (that doesn't actually accomplish anything legislatively) gives the left free reign to build whatever narrative and language they want. With NRA "supporting" a full due process version, it actually drives hard core Dems sour on an "NRA supported bill"—because they don't actually want a bill to keep guns out of the hands of mentally ill or dangerous people...there are trying to disarm regular Americans. You may also see attempts to tie reciprocity or HPA to it, whether NRA supported, or just through the actions of Republicans. That's not a "compromise" or "deal"—it's trying to pull a Hughes amendment on the Dems. To kill just enough support from their hard core that it starts to falter—while they work moderates and weak republicans behind the scenes on the real issues. We're actually in a really shitty spot with support for UBC and red flag laws in Congress, and without mechanisms like this, they'd pass a horrible version pretty handily in the house, and it is dangerously close in the senate. If we have—God forbid—another shooting, it would sail through.

I don't like any of this any more than the next guy, but people bash the NRA a lot without understanding the reality of how the silly reindeer games get played on the hill. Try to at least understand the value that the organization provides, because it is big and very real, and critically important. I want a live tank in my front yard and mail order Solothurn S-18/1000's from Bannerman's. But the path to get there isn't exactly a clear one in the current legislative environment, and without the strength of the NRA helping to pack the courts, shape elections the best we can, fight off bad legislation wherever possible and pave the way to improve rights through the judiciary (we've confirmed 85 federal judges in addition to the 2 Supremes with 130 more to go), I fear we won't have a path to it at all. That's why I'm a member, and helping to make the organization as right as we can get it is why I got involved.

I get the frustration. I'm mad that we're even in this situation. How could we, a republic, born from free men taking up arms against oppression, even be considering some of this nonsense? It baffles me. And, I used to be super frustrated with the NRA, also. Until...I was forced into being involved in politics and seeing how this whole mess works. Now I know what I have to do, and I hope everyone out there who cares about gun rights can get on board, too.

So, if you want to support GOA or FPC or FPC, or JPFO...that's fantastic. Join your state organization, also. Be active locally. Let your elected representatives know how you feel on these issues regularly. But...be a member of the NRA, and be active. Vote. Let the board and the staff know where you stand on issues. Help to be a part of the solution. If we, as gun owners, can't stick together and take advantage of the strengths of all of our organizations where they can do the most good, we will lose this fight. I'm not willing to lose.

-----

## Mother May I

By Frank Nedza,  
DSSA Board Member

*We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.*

And with that introduction, the foundation and the framework of our Nation was laid. As important as that framework is, it is the first 10 Amendments that are the real Bedrock of our nation—the Bill of Rights, as those first 10 amendments are known, does not grant freedom in any way, shape or form, but their power comes by recognizing and acknowledging that these very human rights arise not from any government but instead came from our Creator. Based on my reading and understanding of the volumes of information available, it seems clear to me that the limitations on Government power inherent in the Bill of Rights were seen as inviolate by the Founders of our nation 228 years ago.

You might notice that none of the first 10 enumerated rights depend upon denying any other person in any way. There is no one citizen responsible for paying for the exercise of these rights by another individual—unlike some of the 'rights' we hear about on a near-daily basis.

There have been other, very necessary amendments to our Constitution in the intervening 228 years, but today I am going to compare and contrast just two, the Second Amendment, and the Fifteenth Amendment. For those unfamiliar with the Second Amendment, here is a refresher.

*A well-regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.*

To get ahead of those who will focus on two terms, 'regulated' and 'Militia', keep in mind that 'regulated' as used at the time meant 'well trained' in other words, a familiarity gained with weapons (including obviously firearms) in private pursuits could be used to form a militia that could be mobilized when needed. And then we have 'Militia'. Don't take my word for it, but the definition of Militia was more than adequately addressed at the time by James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and many others of note in a variety of media, including the Federalist Papers. Their definition; and it is truly the only one that matters, stated that 'it is the whole of the people' and by my thinking should include every able-bodied man and woman of good character.

And now, the Fifteenth Amendment:

**Section 1.** *The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any*

---

state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

**Section 2.** *The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.*

The fifteenth amendment was ratified in 1870, not long after a bloody Civil War came to an end, and insured that the recently freed slaves as well as other Citizens regardless of race or color had the right to vote. Unfortunately, Jim Crow laws sprang up in an attempt to marginalize the recent gains of Black Americans as well as others of differing races and colors. In the Jim Crow south, Democrats promulgated laws and regulations to make voting more difficult if not impossible, by enacting poll taxes, literacy tests, and comprehension tests among other barriers to participation in the processes of a Democratic Republic. These laws were despicable then, and they are even more despicable to contemplate now. Fortunately and finally, Jim Crow laws were seen for what they are and are now a thing of the past. Or are they?

Let us consider the recent Senate Bill proposed by Senator Laura Sturgeon, Senate Bill 69, a "Permit to Purchase Bill". This bill would require that a person interested in purchasing a firearm (exercising their Creator Given Second Amendment Rights and in Delaware Article 1 Section 20 Rights), obtain a State Approved 'Permit to Purchase'. To obtain this permit, you must have;

1. Completed a firearms training course within the last two years that comprehensively covers a whole litany of instruction in 11 different areas.
2. Submit to fingerprinting by the State.
3. Submit to a background search conducted by the State.
4. Submit those fingerprints to the Federal Government.
5. Submit to the Secretary inquiring about you to your local law enforcement office.

After all that, if you pass these tests you will get your 'permission slip'.

But, just like those late night commercials on TV, 'Wait, There's More'!

Within 72 hours of you actually purchasing that firearm (that has taken you weeks or months to get as you were busily fulfilling the requirements for the newly required permit), as well as another background check (NICS), your dealer must submit a written record of the transaction to the State! This written record includes;

1. Date of sale
2. Your name and address
3. The make model and serial number of the firearm
4. ID number of the 'permit to purchase'
5. A 'mode of identification'

6. ANY OTHER INFORMATION required as required by State law and regulation. Perhaps someday soon this will include a 'reason' or justification to purchase that must also be State approved.

All of this information will then be placed in a 'Searchable Database' i.e. REGISTRATION!

If all this sounds onerous, well, that is because it IS ONEROUS. And it is designed to make buying a firearm so difficult, and so expensive that many will just give up on the entire process. If you think about it, the whole 'permit to purchase' thing sounds a lot like the Jim Crow laws of the post-war south, doesn't it.

If you want some verification that it is EXACTLY like the Jim Crow laws, keep reading.

Consider a hypothetical situation for a moment –Bonnie Smith, an ordinary law abiding American Citizen, who wants to exercise her 15th Amendment right to vote finds that she must complete a three day voting responsibility class where she must learn all manner of things related to voting. She must take a class at her own expense to learn about the Constitution and pass a knowledge test on it. She must learn how the voting machine operates, including how the digital security works. She must also learn how to properly close the curtain, so as not to reveal her vote. In addition she must learn how to line up and sign in among other inanities. After that, she must then pass a state mandated check of her 'voting knowledge'. She then must be fingerprinted, and obtain an up-to-date voting license that is good for one National election or three local elections. After that, she must undergo a background check before every election if she wants her vote to be counted. After voting, her vote is suspended (only temporarily) for ten days after filling out the ballot but prior to turning it in, lest she mark her ballot in anger. Oh, and the icing on the cake; –her ACTUAL vote is recorded by the government. Not THAT she voted, but WHO she voted for! All this information is placed in a searchable database, and is available to anyone to see. Perhaps in an effort to determine if she voted 'correctly'. Of course a scenario such as this disenfranchisement of MS Smith's voting rights would be outrageous, yet with Senator Sturgeon's 'Permit to Purchase' bill here we are disenfranchising the 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment (and Article 1 Section 20) rights **OF THAT SAME LAW-ABIDING AMERICAN CITIZEN WHO CHOOSES TO OWN A FIREARM AND EXERCISE HER CREATOR-GIVEN RIGHT!**

**If upon reflection and comparison of our hypothetical situation to that proposed by Senator Sturgeon's Senate Bill 69 sounds like a relapse of Jim Crow, you are not alone in that thinking.** Our Constitutional Rights are **WHOLE** rights; you cannot pick and choose which ones to allow or which parts of an individual right you allow based on what you like or agree with. Much like freedom of speech means that I as a US Army veteran must allow someone to burn our Flag in protest, or that the Jewish population of Skokie, Illinois had to allow the Nazi's to march in years gone by. These Creator granted and

---

Constitutionally guaranteed rights MUST be protected or the Constitution itself, and Delaware, the First State to ratify that Constitution of these United States will surely fail.

It is my contention that requiring law-abiding ordinary Americans to acquire a State issued permit to own a firearm is only a hop, skip, and jump away from re-instituting Jim Crow laws regarding the right to vote. And that, my friends is unacceptable in either case.

-----

### **Senate Bill 82 – A Potentially Fatal Mistake**

Senator Laura Sturgeon, the darling of Michael Bloomberg’s “Mom’s Demand” and “Everytown” anti-freedom organizations, has introduced SB 82 (as a replacement for the earlier bill, SB 69), an Act to amend Title 11 and Title 24 of the Delaware Code relating to deadly weapons. This bill, if enacted into law, would require law-abiding citizens to obtain permits to purchase handguns and long guns, through application to the Secretary of the State Department of Safety and Homeland Security.

The application process is onerous, to say the least, and can take 30 days (or maybe longer). The supporters of this bill will tell you that it will help keep firearms out of the hands of people who should not have them. Clearly, this is fallacious on its face since criminals will not go through this process in order to obtain the firearms which they use to commit their crimes. Therefore, it only affects the law-abiding citizens, whose guns are almost never used in crimes unless they are first stolen. Of even greater significance, the process that this bill would put in place is very similar to a permitting process that has been in effect in our neighboring state of New Jersey for several years now.

New Jersey's gun laws are among the strictest in the nation. To purchase a firearm, law-abiding citizens must first fill out forms available at their local police stations, submit to a background check on any possible criminal history or mental health issues, give fingerprints and pay a fee. Once those steps are taken, local police conduct a 14-point investigation and the chief is supposed to approve or deny the application, for cause, within 30 days. When you read SB 82, it is very clear that the proposed Delaware law is designed on this model. Thus, the true intent of Senator Sturgeon and the other supporters of this bill, is to make the purchase of firearms by law-abiding citizens as difficult, costly and time-consuming as possible. It is a major delaying tactic, and as the saying goes, a right delayed is a right denied. It can also be fatal. Anyone remember the case of Carol Bowne?

Carol Bowne was a petite and attractive 39-year old woman, who lived in Berlin Township, New Jersey. She was a widow, having lost her husband three years earlier in a motorcycle accident. She lived alone in a nice, suburban home and worked as a hair stylist at a salon in Somerdale, New Jersey. She was an outgoing, well-liked person, and in the

spring of 2015, she was looking forward to celebrating her 40th birthday with friends, during a vacation at a resort in the Dominican Republic. Unfortunately, she never made it to her milestone birthday and she never got to take the trip to which she had been eagerly looking forward. Her life was violently ended one night in June, 2015, by an ex-boyfriend, who brutally attacked and stabbed her to death in the driveway of her home as she returned from work. The restraining order which she had against her attacker could not save her. Her security cameras could not save her, although they did clearly record the time and manner of her death, which allowed police to make an arrest of her murderer. She died a victim not just of her attacker, but also a victim of the permit-to-purchase a gun laws of the State of New Jersey.

You see, several months prior to her death, Carol had gone to court to get a restraining order against her ex-boyfriend, a 45-year old convicted felon, with a history of violence, including aggravated assault with bodily injury and weapons offenses during an assault on a former girlfriend. Shortly after the order was granted, her car windows were broken out. Now even more afraid, she had a security system and cameras installed at her home, but she still did not feel safe. Carol recognized that she needed something more than a restraining order to protect herself from her violent ex. She decided that she needed a handgun.

On April 21, 2015, Carol filed for her state permit to purchase a gun. More than six weeks later, she was still waiting for it. As a consequence, she bled out from her wounds, denied possession of the one tool that might have given her a chance to save her own life. The “common sense gun laws” of the State of New Jersey delayed her in the exercise of her Constitutionally-protected right to have a gun to defend herself. In her case, a right delayed was not only a right denied, it was fatal.

Now, Senator Sturgeon wants to bring essentially that same law to Delaware. Right now, if there is a law-abiding woman (or man, for that matter) in our state who finds herself in a position similar to Carol Bowne, she can walk into any federally-licensed gun store, select a firearm, fill out a form 4473, have her background check processed through the National Instant Check System (NICS) operated by the FBI, and once approved, pay for her purchase and leave the store with a tool that gives her the capability to defend herself against a violent attacker. The whole process can take as little as 15 minutes to an hour. But if SB 82 becomes law, you can add at least 30 days to that timeline. And as Carol Bowne’s tragic experience confirms, that delay can cost someone their life.

So, as you call your State Representatives and State Senators, ask them to vote NO on SB 82. Tell them the story of Carol Bowne. Remind them that a right delayed is a right denied. And finally, respectfully and sincerely ask them, how will they feel when one of their constituents becomes the first Carol Bowne of Delaware – the first victim of SB 82?

---

## Bridgeville Rifle and Pistol Club High Power

### Season Opener

By Frank Nedza  
DSSA Board Member

#### Across-The-Course (XTC)

Saturday March 23rd dawned ~~cool~~ COLD and quite windy, but 10 hardy souls ventured out for the first XTC Match of the season at Bridgeville. Match director Jeff Hague decided to make this first match an organized practice, which given the winds was a welcome idea. The winds were howling, making 'awful hand' (offhand), just a bit more of a challenge (even more so for the tall skinny guys ☺). As the day progressed, the winds just didn't let up, but there were some pretty good scores in each of the 4 stages anyway. I think that folks welcomed the chance to 'blow out the winter cobwebs' and have some fun hanging out with friends. For those who are interested, scores for the practice can be found here:

<http://shooting.hexsystems.com.au/competition/view-in-club-by-date?clubId=329&day=23&month=3&year=2019>

#### Mid-Range Prone

Sunday March 24<sup>th</sup> was a LOT more pleasant weather wise! A total of 40 shooters (26 sling, and 14 F-Class) braved the mild conditions to come out and shoot. Included in those 40 shooters was a double handful of Midshipmen from the Naval Academy. As always, it is nice to see some young folks on the firing line.

On the Sling Side, there were three shooters who turned in double cleans – Jon Howell, Joe Fogg, and Jeff Hague all turned in 200/200 scores in the first and second matches. For match three, Jon and Joe each dropped a single point, with Jon besting Joe by X-Count alone for the day's win with a 599-37X versus 599-33X. Jon and Joe were both shooting Palma rifles today.

In the Master/Expert/Sharpshooter class, your author turned in a 591-28X (confirming once again that even a blind squirrel finds an acorn every once in a while), with Chad Hanson following up with a 588-26X. In Unclassified/Marksman class, 10 year old Shannon Moriarty fired a 543-12X for the win in her class. Nicely done Shannon!! I know that we are going to see more of this young lady in the future! Shannon also shot XTC on Saturday.

In F-Open, Steve Singleton fired a nice 596-34X, for the win followed by Hugh Cropper with a 596-32X. In the Master/Expert class, Zac Donovan fired a 591-26X. Over in F-T/R, Ramesy Abid lead the way with a 585-17X, with James Autry firing a 557-10X in Expert/Sharpshooter class. The only clean of the day in F-Class went to Hugh Cropper, with a 200-9X in the first match. Nice shooting gents!!

A breakdown of individual scores for the Mid-Range match may be found here:

<http://shooting.hexsystems.com.au/competition/view-in-club-by-date?clubId=329&day=24&month=3&year=2019>

This was the first match of the season at Bridgeville, and I am hoping to see many more of you out on the line in future matches –our next XTC is April 13<sup>th</sup>, with the next Mid-Range match scheduled for April 14<sup>th</sup>.

#### HEXTA Electronic Targets

This is the beginning of the third season that Bridgeville will be using the Hexta electronic targets. These targets have eliminated pit duty entirely, and have made matches quite a bit more efficient as well. Four relay mid-range matches that start at 9 AM are typically done by about 2:30 PM, so that leaves time for folks to go home and work on the 'Honey Do' list or just take a well-earned nap after the match. As always, I also want to put in a huge **Thank You** to all the shooters who continually help set-up and tear down the targets for every match. There is no way we could do all this without your help!

-----

## First State to Ratify Constitution Now Wants to Abolish It: Anti-gun Bills Are Back in Delaware

by Justin Opinion on April 11, 2019  
GunsAmerica Digest

The small state of Delaware isn't known for much. But one of the things it has long celebrated is that it was the first state to ratify the U.S. Constitution, making it "The First State," as our license plates proudly display.

But in recent years, governor after governor has scrambled to create new slogans for the state, possibly because they are ashamed of any affiliation to the Constitution and what it stands for. Gov. John Carney, Delaware's current gubernatorial leader, would like to see the state become more like New Jersey – if one could even consider that an aspiration.



Hundreds of pro-gun citizens showed up to raise their voices against these new unconstitutional bills. (Photo: Facebook)

After being unable to pass several anti-gun bills in the General Assembly in 2018, Delaware's liberals are back at it again. And as if to display a "we'll show you" attitude, this year's bills are even more egregious than those squashed in 2018.

Three new anti-gun bills were introduced this week in Delaware's Senate:

- [SB-68](#) would ban nearly every semi-auto firearm in existence, once again focusing the abolitionists' blind rage on the general description of the objects they hate;
- [SB-82](#) would establish a requirement for every law-abiding citizen to acquire (at their own expense) a purchase permit to obtain any firearm. They might as well nickname the bill "Jim Crow," because it will certainly have a devastating effect on low-income families. But wait, there's more – it would also establish a searchable database of registered gun owners;
- [SB-70](#) is the cookie-cutter magazine ban that would make any standard capacity magazine capable of holding more than 15 rounds illegal – even though there is no evidence to suggest that magazine capacity and crime are related in any way. It works retroactively which means current owners would have to turn them over or else face misdemeanor (for the first offense) or felony (for each subsequent offense) charges. SB-70 is confiscation of lawfully owned property without compensation which seemingly runs [afoul of the Fifth Amendment](#).

To create the illusion of support for the legislation that their out-of-state masters have prescribed, Delaware Dems bussed in a handful of redshirt Bloomberg-funded "Moms," who are demanding that good people be stripped of their freedom. They literally arrived in a bus that was arranged for them. It is estimated that there were about 30 or so "moms" supporting these bills.



Tiny Delaware is once again under siege by Bloomberg and his minions. (Photo: Facebook)

In sharp contrast, a true grassroots army arrived on the scene. Hundreds of pro-gun citizens showed up at Legislative Hall in Dover Wednesday to protest and oppose these bills. These people arrived on their own dime, many taking time from their jobs and busy schedules on a weekday. And yet, the anti-gun legislators and their partners in media will insist that there is a groundswell of support for their unconstitutional plans.

Legislation like this is spreading from state to state, funded by Bloomberg and others like him. Your country is literally being bought and sold from underneath you. Stop looking at the national level for threats to your freedom, because while you are, it is being taken from you by those in your own backyard.

Keeping it classy. The bussed-in "Moms" weren't exactly June Cleaver as they openly showed their hatred for those who came to oppose the new anti-gun bills. (Photo: Facebook)

Many of those in power view overwhelming opposition to anti-gun legislation as an obstacle to be overcome, rather than a mandate to follow. This, in a nutshell, is the new government that has been propped up by New York billionaires with Napoleon complexes, and agendas. If your state government hasn't yet been bought and paid for by these tyrants – don't worry, it will be soon.

---

## The Orange Blossom Regional Mid-Range Match

By Frank Nedza,  
DSSA Board Member

Several members of the Bridgeville Rifle and Pistol Club recently attended the Orange Blossom Mid-Range Regional, held at the Port Malabar rifle and Pistol Club near Melbourne, Florida –this is one participant’s account of that week. The match format is two days of team matches (2-man team on one day and 4-man team the next), followed by 4 days of mid-range matches, which in this case means 20 records shots each day at 300, 500, and 600 yards for a total of 240 shots or 2400 possible points. This match is shot entirely on Silver Mountain electronic targets, so there is very little pit duty –only a little bit of help with setup and takedown each day.

**Sunday, March 10<sup>th</sup>; Departure Day!** I have been looking forward to this trip for months. The cool rainy weather that we had in Delaware this winter only made me more determined to ‘get out of Dodge’ and be somewhere warm and sunny. Departure time was “O” four hundred hours, and you already know that the “O” stands for ‘-oh my God it’s early!’ The trip went well, and we were having dinner in Florida before 9 PM. Not bad for a nearly thousand mile trip. The temperatures were in the 30’s when we left Delaware, but over ninety by the time we hit Florida –whew!

**Monday, March 11<sup>th</sup>; Practice day.** After signing in, and greeting old friends, we were able to have a bit of organized practice and shake out the cobwebs, as this would be the first opportunity for some folks to shoot in quite a while. This was a good opportunity to confirm (or get) zero’s at each of the yard lines we would be firing in the match (300, 500, and 600 yards). It was brutally hot (at least to us northern folks), and we were all sweating bullets by the time we got back to 600. All ready for tomorrow now!

**Tuesday, March 12<sup>th</sup>; 2-Man Team Matches!** Team matches are a certified hoot –in the two man format, each member takes turns acting as wind coach and shooting the match. We shot 2 sighting shots at each yardline (300, 500, 600 yards) with 20 shots for record. The Bridgeville Rifle and Pistol Club, with some help from a couple of good friends, was able to field 4 teams for this match, including new team shooter Madonna Nedza. There were a total of 29 two-man teams entered. The Bridgeville ‘A’ Team of Rich Kussman and Jeff Hague posted a very nice 1195-64X and came in 7<sup>th</sup> shooting Palma rifles against other teams shooting scoped rifles. The winning team of Larry Sollars and Kimberly Rowe dropped a total of ONE point for the day, posting 1199-87X!! It was still VERY warm, (I believe it had been setting records for high temperatures this week), and somewhat breezy.

**Wednesday, March 13<sup>th</sup>; 4-Man Team Matches!** In this format, there are generally two people who act as wind

coaches, with all 4 team members rotating through firing 2 sighter shots and 20 record shots at each yardline. Each team is given a ‘block time’ of 97 minutes to rotate all four members of the team through firing each yardline, so not only do you have to have a good wind coach, but the coaches also need to be OK at time management, as any rounds not fired in the time allotted would be counted as misses (minus 10 points each). The Bridgeville club was able to field 2 teams for this match. The Bridgeville ‘A’ team took third place in this event posting a very nice combined score of 2368-112X, again shooting Palma rifles against the scoped rifles used by most other teams. They only lost to the winning team by TWO points!! Pretty nice work guys!

**Thursday, March 14<sup>th</sup>; Regional Match Day 1.** Thursday saw the start of the Regional matches where we would be firing 20 record shots each at 300, 500, and 600 yards. The rifle classes are Any Rifle/Any Sight, AR-Tactical Rifle, Service Rifle, and Palma Rifle. In Any Rifle, our own Jeff Hague posted the winning score at 599-34X! Dropping only 5 points in 60 shots got you ...seventh place. In AR-Tactical, Maureen Largay posted a nice 589-20X for the win (see, girls can shoot well too!). Army Guard member Garrett Miller posted the win for Service Rifle with a 589-30X shooting mag length ammo all the way back. In the Palma category, Chuck Rowe posted a 596-26X for the win (iron sights and all).

**Friday, March 15<sup>th</sup>; Regional Match Day 2.** Winds started out pretty light, but built a bit by the time the later relays were called to the line. If you haven’t noticed yet, there were some darned good shooters present at this match. In Any rifle, Larry Sollars put up a perfect score of 600-43X –and he was followed closely by Army Guard member John Coggshall at 600-37X! Dropping three points today got you ...eighth place. One notable achievement was Kimberly Rowe putting up a perfect 200-20X at the 300 yard line –that gal can shoot for sure! David Blouin (a Grand Senior) was the winner in AR-Tactical with a 598-35X, with Garrett Miller posting a 594-36X with the Service Rifle. In the Palma rifle category, Kent Reeve posted a 598-36X for the win shooting clean at the 300 and 500 yard lines.

**Saturday, March 16<sup>th</sup>; Regional Match Day 3.** Winds were workable pretty much all day today, but that sure didn’t mean you could ignore them. Larry Sollars was on top of his game today, posting a 600-50X for the win in Any Rifle. Note that of 60 record shots, 50 of them were X’s!! Holy Cow! Maureen Largay was the winner in AR-Tactical class posting a 596-35X. In Service Rifle, Garrett Miller came through again posting a 600-50X! Like Larry, 50 of his 60 shots were X’s. Unlike Larry, he did it with a Service Rifle, firing mag-length 77 grain ammo, using a 4.5 power scope! That is some hard holding for sure! In Palma Rifle, Chuck Rowe fired a 598-26X, including cleans at 300 and 500 yards.

**Sunday, March 17<sup>th</sup>; Regional Match Day 4.** If you thought competition was fierce on the previous days, it just got better today. In Any Rifle, John Coggshall was the winner with a 600-50X, Creedmooring (tie breaker) Larry Sollars who also posted a 600-50X. In fact, the top five finishers in Any Rifle today all shot 600 scores! Dropping three points today got you ...ninth place. In AR-Tactical, David Blouin scored a 600-43X for the win with Maureen Largay hot on his heels with a 599-35X. In Service Rifle, Army Guard member Scott Tolley came out of the Expert Class (not an expert for too much longer) to post a score of 600-41X. Well done Scott! In Palma, Kent Reeve took the win with a 599-41X.

After all that work, the hungry (and tired) shooters headed to the Pavilion for a well-earned Bar-B-Que, and the Stats folks got to work figuring out where everyone stood. I won't remember everyone who walked up to the winners circle, but here is at least a partial list. My sincere apologies to anyone I missed.

Category	Classification	Name	Score
Any Rifle/Any Sight	High Master	Larry Sollars	2398-182X
Any Rifle/Any Sight	Master	Michael Hester	2385-147X
Any Rifle/Any Sight	Expert	Mike Schunemann	2319-71X
AR-Tactical	High Master	Maureen Largay	2398-182X
AR-Tactical	Master	David Blouin	2379-134X
Service Rifle	High Master	Garrett Miller	2381-151X
Service Rifle	Master	Garrett Miller	2381-151X
Service Rifle	Expert	Scott Tolley	2368-138X
Palma Rifle	High Master	Chuck Rowe	2384-119X
Palma Rifle	Master	Frank Nedza	2368-104X
High Senior	High Master	Jeff Hague	2388-135X
High Woman	High Master	Kimberly Rowe	2394-187X

Anyone who is interested can get more detailed information about scores here;

<http://www.orangeblossomregional.com/match-scores/>

**Summary** –What a great time, and what a well-run match! Seven straight days of shooting in nice, warm (at times too warm) conditions with old and new friends –who could ask for anything more? My sincere thanks to the folks that ran this match –the Match Director, Stats Officer, all the line help, and all the folks keeping things running in the pits –you all made this a great experience, and I will definitely be back next year for sure. This was an amazing match in a lot of ways, but one thing that stands out is the sheer number of National Records set and broken, and re-set this week. There were records set this week that stood less than an hour before being broken again!! It is a neat experience being around SO MANY great shooters –it shows us what is possible, and gives us all something to work towards. If you ever have the itch to get out shooting in early March, you couldn't find a better place to do it than the Orange Blossom Regional! I know that I will be going again next year!

**Here is a partial list of some of the records that will be submitted to the NRA. My sincere apologies to anyone I missed.**

Kent Reeve; 200-19X holder Palma Rifle	20 shots 300 yards prone; Senior co holder
Garrett Miller; 200-18X Service Rifle	20 shots 600 yards prone; any sights
Kimberly Rowe; 200-20X sights Woman	20 shots 300 yards slow-fire prone; any sights
Kimberly Rowe; 200-16X Woman	20 shots 500 yards prone; any sights
Kimberly Rowe; 600-47X Woman	60 shots Mid-Range prone; any sights
John Coggshall; 200-18X prone; any sights Service	coholder 20 shots 300 yards slow-fire
John Coggshall; 200-17X Service	20 shots 500 yards prone; any sights
Garrett Miller, John Coggshall; 600-50X mid-range prone; any sights	60 shots Service and Open Co holders
Larry Sollars; 200-30X sights Open Civilian	20 shots 300 yards slow fire prone; any sights
Larry Sollars; 200-18X Open and Civilian	20 shots 500 yards prone; any sights
Larry Sollars; 600-50X Open Civilian	mid-range prone; any sights 60 shots
Larry Sollars; 2398-182X course; any sights Open Civilian	National Championship Aggregate
Kenny Lankford; 200-18X	20 shots 300 yards slow fire prone; co-holder any sight Senior
Kenny Lankford 2392-178X National Championship Aggregate course; any sights Senior	
Jeff Clark; 200-19X 300 yards slow fire prone; any sights Police	
Jeff Clark; 200-16X 20 shots 500 yards prone; any sights Police	
Jeff Clark; 2390-168X National Championship Aggregate course; any sight Police	
Alan Summers 600-49X mid-range prone; any sights 60 shot Senior	

## PRESIDENTS'S CORNER

This issue of the bi-monthly newsletter is a few days late, but for a very good reason. As you all know, not only from the articles in the newsletter, but from the alerts you received from our email system, there are three really onerous pieces of legislation that have been introduced that would greatly infringe on your right to keep and bear arms.

On Wednesday, May 8<sup>th</sup>, the Senate conducted a hearing for all three bills. Not knowing what the format would be for the conduct of the hearing we, meaning DSSA, NRA, NSSF and others, had to plan for as many eventualities as possible. We had Francis Pileggi on standby as a witness. John Commerford and Dave Weber from NRA-ILA were also present to testify as was Jake McWiggin from NSSF.

It turns out Sen. McBride was going to go right into public testimony and forego statements from the sponsors of the bills concerning their legislation. However, Sen. Hocker had other plans. He proceeded to ask questions of each sponsor about the legislation. His questioning was on point and extremely effective in bringing out the true magnitude of the legislation on our rights. After 45 minutes Sen. McBride persuaded Sen. Hocker to stop and let the public weigh in.

The first person to give a statement was the Attorney General Kathleen Jennings. She voiced her support for the various pieces of legislation during her 5 minutes of testimony.

---

Others then had an opportunity to voice their opinions. At least 125 people had signed up to speak. When it was all said and done, 2 hours later, only 25 or so people were able to express their opinions, both for and against the legislation. There were only about 7 or 8 people that spoke in favor with the rest, 17 or 18, against the bills.

The only representative of either the DSSA, NRA or NSSF that was able to speak was me. Sen. McBride called me next to last. My remarks did not repeat what many had said except to declare the bills unconstitutional. I focused on the fact that we are not talking about “gun violence”. The gun is not violent. The person is. We are talking about violence committed with a firearm, or any other weapon.

I mentioned that we have to get to the root causes of violence, drugs, lack of a family unit, missing educational opportunities, gang activity. Only then will the rate of violence begin to decrease. Several years ago the city of Wilmington commissioned the Centers for Disease Control to conduct a study of the violence in the city. The recommendations that came out of that study did not mention more restrictions on firearms as one of the solutions. I repeat, DID NOT.

I also mentioned that any new legislation dealing with firearms requires that the legislator admit that whatever they have been trying in the past does not work. If past restrictions, such as semi-auto bans and magazine bans, did work then why are the violent crime rates in places such as Chicago, Philadelphia and Baltimore failing to decline?

The last thing I mentioned was that I was willing to work with any legislator on solutions that work. But I would not work with anyone that was attempting to infringe on our right to keep and bear arms for the defense of self, family, home and State, and for hunting and recreational use.

At the conclusion of the hearing Sen. McBride thanked everyone for attending. He then adjourned the hearing. The next step in the process would be for the members of the committee to either sign the backer or not. A majority of the members of the committee must sign the backer for the release of the bill.

Rest assured that the next 24 hours was stressful. We believed there was disagreement not only within the committee but also within the entire caucus over the legislation.

Late Thursday evening May 9<sup>th</sup>, an article appeared in the Delaware State News announcing that the bills would not be released from the Executive Committee. It was also stated in the article that Sen. Poore, Vice-Chair of the committee and Senate Majority Leader, did not anticipate any further action on these particular bills, or other “anti-gun” legislation through the end of June of 2020.

This result is as good as it gets. I would like to thank everyone from the myriad of groups that helped keep these bills from moving through the legislative process. The list is long, but it goes to show that when we all hang together and fight for our rights, good things will eventually happen.

As we all know the leftist liberals went ballistic. Perhaps the following statement by “Delaware Dem” who is Jason Melrath, is indicative of the future. In a post he stated;

“I look forward to Michael Bloomberg fully funding the primary campaigns against all four of these horrid pieces of NRA trash.

He is of course referring to Senators McBride, Poore, Ennis and Paradee.

That my friends, is what we are up against. The unlimited funds of Michael Bloomberg. However, what we lack in funds we can more than make up with in grit and fight. When right is on your side, you can persevere.

There are other measures that will undoubtedly surface in the coming weeks. Look for information about them on the website, DSSA.US.

Jeff Hague, President

---

## **THE THREAT IN 2020**

### **SEN. CORY BOOKER (D-N.J.) PUSHES MAY-ISSUE FEDERAL FIREARM OWNER LICENSING AND GUN CONFISCATION**

**NRA-ILA, Friday, May 10, 2019**

On Monday, in an obvious and desperate attempt to garner attention in an overcrowded 2020 Democratic presidential field, Sen. Cory Booker (D-N.J.) threw long-cultivated anti-gun strategy and messaging to the wind and further exposed the gun control endgame when he released his “Plan To End the Gun Violence Epidemic.” The document is a slapdash gun control advocate wish list, at the core of which is a plan to create a may-issue federal gun owner licensing scheme and confiscate millions of commonly-owned semi-automatic firearms.

As intended, Booker’s senseless gun control declaration garnered the serial grandstander modest media attention. Elaborating on his anti-gun agenda during an interview with CNN, Booker made clear his intent to imprison those who do not comply with his confiscation plan. Anchor Poppy Harlow asked the senator,

Your competitor in the 2020 race... has also, like you, proposed an assault weapons ban, but he’s proposing a buyback program. Where Americans that currently have those guns could sell them essentially to the government. But if they don’t within a certain period of time they would be prosecuted, so subject to be thrown in jail perhaps. Are you supportive of the same measure?

At first Booker equivocated, but Harlow continued to press the candidate, reiterating, “Would you prosecute people? Do you support the government buying them back, and if not, potentially people could go to jail if they don’t want

---

to sell them back; yes or no?" While failing to directly acknowledge the logical penal consequences of his proposal, Booker responded to Harlow's question by stating, "We should have a law that bans these weapons and we should have a reasonable period in which people can turn in these weapons."

Booker's proposal does not provide a definition of "assault weapon," so it is unclear the exact firearms that would be implicated under his plan. However, given that Booker is a cosponsor of S.66, Sen. Dianne Feinstein's (D-Calif.) "Assault Weapons Ban of 2019," it can be deduced that the senator from New Jersey seeks to prohibit an even larger category of commonly-owned semi-automatic firearms than Bill Clinton's 1994 ban.

For a candidate that has made criminal justice reform a focal point of his campaign, Booker's indifference to the incarceration of nonviolent and otherwise law-abiding gun owners makes clear that his compassion does not extend to those who defy his political sensibilities. And there is ample evidence that many would defy Booker's preferred policies.

Enacted in 2013, the New York SAFE Act required owners of commonly-owned semi-automatic firearms to register their guns with the state. An estimated 1-1.2 million firearms were implicated under the measure. Data released in 2015 revealed that 23,847 people had registered a total of 44,485 guns.

A 2013 Connecticut measure required gun owners to register certain configurations of commonly-owned semi-automatic firearms and individual magazines that could hold more than 10 rounds of ammunition. According to a 2011 report, there were an estimated 2.4 million such magazines in the state. Gun owners had registered 38,290 magazines at the registration deadline.

Booker need only to look at his home state of New Jersey to understand the folly of his proposal. An April 17, 1992 New York Times article, "Owners of Assault Guns Slow to Obey Law," noted, "In New Jersey, which enacted an assault weapon ban in 1990, 2,000 weapons have been surrendered, made inoperable or registered as collectors' items, according to the State Police. The state Attorney General's office estimates that there are between 20,000 and 50,000 assault weapons in New Jersey."

Aside from the impracticality and hypocrisy of Booker's proposal, it would also be ineffective and unconstitutional. A congressionally-mandated study of the 1994 semi-automatic ban determined that "the ban's effects on gun violence are likely to be small at best and perhaps too small for reliable measurement," in part because, "[assault weapons] and [large capacity magazines] were used in only a minority of gun crimes prior to the 1994 federal ban." In joining Justice Clarence Thomas in a dissent from a denial of certiorari in *Friedman v. Highland Park*, which concerned a local ban on commonly-owned semi-automatics, Justice Antonin Scalia made clear that existing Supreme Court precedent (which he authored in *District of Columbia v. Heller*) precluded bans on such firearms. In the dissent, Justice Thomas explained that "several Courts of Appeals... have upheld categorical bans on firearms that millions of Americans commonly own for lawful purposes,"

which he noted was "noncompliance with our Second Amendment precedents."

The other core aspect of Booker's gun control agenda is federal firearm owner licensing, which he likens to a driver's license, complete with a firearms version of the DMV. Such a license would be required to merely own a firearm.

Americans should not be required to obtain a license that serves as a prior restraint on the exercise of a constitutional right. That aside, this lazy analogy is flawed.

---

## Call for Articles

Would you like to be published in the DSSA News Letter? Publicize your Club's activities or special events. Found a great article that you want to share with Delaware Sportsmen?

**Please send your article or special event to:**

**Roger T. Boyce**

**Vice President**

**DSSA**

**[Roger.boyce@dssa.us](mailto:Roger.boyce@dssa.us)**