

If for some reason, you no longer wish to receive these e-mails please accept our apologies and respond to this message with REMOVE in the subject line and we will remove your name from the mailing list.

Citizens Association for Responsible Gun Ownership = CARGO

www.cargogunclub.org

=====

Hello Fellow CARGO Members,

The next CARGO meeting is:

Thursday, May 20th and

we are meeting!

We are meeting at Armadillo Guns in Lavon Texas.

We will meet from 5:45 to 8:00 (ish).

Show and tell will be any firearm with a split receiver OR any "ghost gun" OR any pistol with a brace.

Please use the CARGO@att.net email or the CARGO Facebook page if you need to get in touch with the club.

Take care and be safe,

Paul

When was the last time you visited our web site? Please take some time to go to the CARGO website at www.cargogunclub.org

Thank you,
Paul Curtis
President – CARGO
www.cargogunclub.org

"If you can read this, thank a teacher. For the fact that it is in English, thank a Veteran."

If for some reason, you no longer wish to receive these e-mails please accept our apologies and respond to this message with REMOVE in the subject line and we will remove your name from the mailing list.

After Texas House rejects Senate changes, bill allowing permitless carrying of handguns will get hashed out behind closed doors

BY [SAMI SPARBER](#) MAY 12, 2021 UPDATED: MAY 13, 2021

The Texas House on Wednesday rejected [changes the Senate made](#) to a Republican-backed proposal to allow Texans to carry handguns without a license, sending the bill behind closed doors for further negotiations.

Before the permitless carry bill can head to Gov. [Greg Abbott, who has said he would sign it into law](#), a conference committee made up of representatives and senators will have to reach a compromise that must get approval from both chambers.

[House Bill 1927](#) would nix the requirement for Texas residents to obtain a license to carry handguns if they're not prohibited by state or federal law from possessing a gun.

Among other changes, state senators last week approved an amendment barring permitless carry from people convicted in the past five years of making a terroristic threat, deadly conduct, assault that causes bodily injury or disorderly conduct with a firearm. The chamber also approved an amendment that enhances criminal penalties for illegal weapons carried by felons and those convicted of family violence offenses.

Bill author state Rep. [Matt Schaefer](#), R-Tyler, drew cheers Wednesday when he announced he was rejecting the Senate changes. House Speaker [Dade Phelan](#) said the House conferees for the committee that will negotiate the bill are Republican Reps. Schaefer, [James White](#) and [Dustin Burrows](#) and Democratic Reps. [Terry Canales](#) and [Ryan Guillen](#) – two of the seven Democrats who voted for the bill.

On Thursday, Republican Sens. [Charles Schwertner](#), [Brian Birdwell](#), [Bryan Hughes](#), [Donna Campbell](#) and [Brandon Creighton](#) were selected as the conferees for the upper chamber.

Afterward, Phelan [tweeted](#) that he and Patrick "are energized and optimistic" that the chambers will reach a compromise on the bill and get it to Abbott's desk "very soon." Patrick echoed that optimism in his own subsequent tweet, saying the legislation was close to the finish line "despite an avalanche of misinformation and just plain lies from outside agitators."

Earlier in the day, Texas GOP Chairman Allen West released a [video](#) in which he accused Patrick and the Senate of attaching "poison-pills amendments" to HB 1927. Two of Patrick's advisers, Allen Blakemore and Sherry Sylvester, pushed back on Twitter. Blakemore [said](#) West was "feeding his own political ambition" and "lying about HB1927 to divide conservatives and kill" the bill. Sylvester [also suggested](#) West was angling for another office and called him "clueless" on the legislative process.

Before the appointment of the conference committee, some supporters of permitless carry raised concerns that the Senate amended HB 1927 in a way that could make it vulnerable to procedural challenges. While

Rep. Chris Turner, D-Grand Prairie, called a point of order on HB 1927 when it came up Wednesday on the House floor, the point of order was ultimately withdrawn and it did not stop Schaefer from being able to request the conference committee a short time later.

The Senate changes were mainly made to accommodate law enforcement concerns. In a [letter Thursday to the conference committee](#), the Sheriffs' Association of Texas said it had "nothing to do" with the issue that prompted the point of order and urged the negotiators to keep the Senate amendments the association supported "regarding maintaining the Unlawful Carrying a Weapon (UCW) offense, the elimination of the automatic expungements of UCW convictions, and the temporary prohibitors for convictions of violent misdemeanor offenses like Terrorist Threat and Assault."

Proponents of what Republicans call "constitutional carry" argue that Texas should follow the lead of at least 20 other states with similar laws on the books. Meanwhile, gun control advocates are sounding the alarm about making it easier to carry firearms after repeated instances of gun violence — including [2019's massacres in El Paso and Midland-Odessa that left 30 people dead](#).

Under current state law, Texans must generally be licensed to carry handguns openly or concealed. Applicants must submit fingerprints, complete four to six hours of training and pass a written exam and a shooting proficiency test. Texas does not require a license to openly carry a rifle in public.

Lt. Gov. [Dan Patrick](#) and other Republicans who were initially noncommittal about the bill were under [immense political pressure](#) this session from conservatives and gun rights advocates, who have long lobbied the Texas Legislature for permitless carry but [historically struggled to win support](#).

[The cause quickly gained momentum this year](#) despite objection from gun control groups, Democrats and some members of law enforcement. A solid majority of Texas voters don't think permitless carry should be allowed, according to the latest [University of Texas/Texas Tribune poll](#).

Patrick Svitek contributed reporting.

Definition of “Frame or Receiver” and Identification of Firearms

On May 7, 2021, the Attorney General signed ATF proposed rule 2021R-05, **Definition of “Frame or Receiver” and Identification of Firearms**. The goal of the proposed rule is to ensure the proper marking, recordkeeping, and traceability of all firearms manufactured, imported, acquired and disposed by federal firearms licensees.

Please note that this is the text of the proposed rule as signed by the Attorney General, but the official version of the proposed rule will be as it is published in the Federal Register.

[Download the proposed rule \(PDF, 1.3 MB\)](#)



2021r-05.definition_of_receiver.nprm_0_0_0

Summary

This proposed rule would:

- Provide new definitions of “firearm frame or receiver” and “frame or receiver”
- Amend the definition of:
 - “firearm” to clarify when a firearm parts kit is considered a “firearm,” and
 - “gunsmith” to clarify the meaning of that term and to explain that gunsmiths may be licensed solely to mark firearms for unlicensed persons.
- Provide definitions for:
 - “complete weapon,”
 - “complete muffler or silencer device,”
 - “privately made firearm (PMF),” and
 - “readily” for purposes of clarity given advancements in firearms technology.
- Provide a definition of “importer’s or manufacturer’s serial number”
- Provide a deadline for marking firearms manufactured.
- Clarify marking requirements for firearm mufflers and silencers.
- Amend the format for records of manufacture/acquisition and disposition by manufacturers and importers.
- Amend the time period records must be retained at the licensed premises.

[Read the full summary](#)

Submit a Comment

ATF is receiving comments on the proposed rule for **90 days** from the date the proposed rule is posted in the Federal Register.

You may submit comments by mail, fax or the Federal eRulemaking Portal at www.regulations.gov.

How to submit

[Submit a Comment on Proposed Rule 2021R-05 | Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives \(atf.gov\)](#)

Submit a Comment on Proposed Rule 2021R-05

ATF requests comments on the proposed rule, [Definition of “Frame or Receiver” and Identification of Firearms](#), from all interested persons.

ATF specifically requests comments on the feasibility of implementing the new definition of firearm “frame or receiver” in 27 CFR 478.11 and 27 CFR 479.11, and related definitions and amendments that ensure the proper marking, recordkeeping, and traceability of all firearms manufactured, imported, acquired and disposed by federal firearms licensees. ATF also requests comments on the costs or benefits of the proposed rule and on the appropriate methodology and data for calculating those costs and benefits.

Deadline

Written comments must be postmarked and electronic comments must be submitted **on or before 90 days from the date the proposed rule is posted in the Federal Register**.

Commenters should be aware that the electronic Federal Docket Management System will not accept comments after **midnight Eastern Time** on the last day of the comment period.

Requirements

All comments must reference this document’s docket number ATF 2021R-05, be legible, and include the commenter’s complete first and last name and full mailing address. ATF may not consider, or respond to, comments that do not meet these requirements or comments containing profanity.

ATF will retain all comments as part of this rulemaking’s administrative record. ATF will treat all comments as originals and will not acknowledge receipt of comments. In addition, if ATF cannot read your comment due to technical difficulties and cannot contact you for clarification, ATF may not be able to consider your comment.

ATF will carefully consider all comments, as appropriate, received on or before the closing date, and will give comments after that date the same consideration if practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given except as to comments received on or before the closing date.

How to Submit

Submit comments in any of three ways (but do not submit the same comment multiple times or by more than one method). Hand-delivered comments will not be accepted.

Federal eRulemaking Portal

ATF recommends that you submit your comments to ATF via the Federal eRulemaking portal at www.regulations.gov and follow the instructions.

Comments will be posted within a few days of being submitted. However, if large volumes of comments are being processed simultaneously, your comment may not be viewable for up to several weeks. Please keep the comment tracking number that is provided after you have successfully uploaded your comment.

[Submit your comment online](#)

ATF's new Proposed Rules on Redefining "Ghost Guns"



Date: [May 13, 2021](#) Author: [5D Tactical](#) [0 Comments](#)

On May 7th, the DOJ released the official new proposed rules, per Biden's 30 day deadline, on what the ATF would aim to do in terms of redefining 80 percent lower receivers and several other firearm parts. Previously, a leaked copy of this PDF

document was made public online only a few weeks ago on April 20th and is very similar to the official copy as it's only eight pages shorter than what was most recently published. Today, we'll be summarizing what we've found to be most pertinent in the 115 pages of asinine tyranny.

They're Calling Us "PMF's" Now

First section provides a lot of definitions and context with legal precedence in past cases that ruled on what parts were considered as firearms by various courts. The ATF is essentially making the point that the legal definitions currently in place for firearms and firearm parts are outdated; as the definitions were set in place 50 years ago when revolvers, break-open shotguns were more prevalent in civilian ownership (single-framed firearms).

Now that split/multi piece receiver firearms are much more popular with both military and civilian usage, the ATF blames the proliferation of striker fired handguns due to the popularity of Glocks which started in the mid-1980s. None of this is false, but the ATF's point here feels kind of moot and out of context. They provide several past cases and suggest that if those courts' decisions, such as *United States v. Rowold* or *United States v. Jimenez*, 191 F. Supp. 3d 1038, 1041 (N.D. Cal 2016) (“[A] receiver must have the housing for three elements; hammer, bolt, or breechblock, and firing mechanism”) were broadly followed on a federal level then technically “up to 90 percent of all firearms now in the United States would not have any frame or receiver subject to regulation” simply because many handguns are now striker-fired and don't include a hammer. This is simply not the case because striker-fired handguns are clearly still subject to ATF regulations and millions of buyers across the country fill out 4473 forms to legally purchase these guns in stores every year. Not to mention, the technology was first invented in the late 1800s and early 1900s.

They're also now calling 80 percent builds as "PMF's" or, "privately made firearms." From what we can tell this is a brand new term and previously the closest thing to it was simply a "homemade firearm." The official language reads as "a firearm, including a frame or receiver, assembled or otherwise produced by a person other than a licensed manufacturer, and without a serial number or other identifying marking laced by a licensed manufacturer at the time the firearm was produced." Give it a three-letter acronym though, and for sure it sounds way more menacing. They don't call them the alphabet boys for no reason!

In all honesty, the term was most likely coined for convenience purpose in shortening the length of the 115 page document. However, since the document's release, the term has been seen used publicly and widely in Senate hearings and by high ranking law enforcement officials nationwide. It's very likely that "PMF" is going to be the newest term to be conflated into a politically charged term through the mainstream media.

New Proposed Rules and Redefinitions of Parts

It's best and more easily understood to see all these new legal definitions simply as desired laws that the anti-gunners would love to see passed into effect. If these new legal definitions are applied to firearm parts that previously were not as strictly regulated, they create new rules that directly affect us, the manufacturer, you, the consumer and all of us as Americans by lump sum:

1. **Updating the definition of a firearm.** – From what we can tell so far, lone 80% receivers are not mentioned specifically. It would appear that the build kits are what is being targeted but the language focuses on basically

“anything that is designed to or may readily be assembled, completed, converted, or restored to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive.”

2. **Updating the definition of “frame or receiver.”** – Any externally visible structure that is designed to provide housing or integrate any fire control component which includes, the hammer, bolt, bolt carrier, breechblock, cylinder, trigger mechanism, firing pin, or slide rails. This is an extremely broad definition which is concerning because there could easily be future changes that further expand this definition — making this an ever growing list.
3. **Updating markings required on silencers** – Silencers and parts that make up silencers such as baffles, baffling materials, or the expansion chamber would need to be serialized even though silencers are already regulated by the National Firearms Act... However, for parts that make up a silencer and are all part of a complete device that was made by the original manufacturer; they would not require individual markings.
4. **Updating what requires serialization** – The legalese and long verbiage also alludes that upper receivers will need to be serialized as well and would also be considered as firearms.
5. **Serializing 80 percent lower receivers** – As builders complete their 80 percent lower receiver or frame, a period of 7 days is given to engrave a serialized number. FFL’s are allowed to offer engraving services and would be required to engrave a serial number within 7 days of receiving a privately made firearm.
6. **For FFL’s** – Whether you are a retailer or a manufacturer with a 07/02 SOT designation, if you are selling 80 percent lower receivers or other firearm parts deemed in the future by the ATF as fully functioning firearms... it appears you would have to begin selling these products along

with 4473 forms and background checks just as you would in a brick and mortar gun shop.

7. **Gunsmithing** – In their newly defined terms, gunsmiths would be people or companies who work on guns and parts that are not necessarily FFL holders and, or not in direct employment of original manufacturers. In order for these gunsmiths to continue their businesses legally, the ATF would require a one-time fee of about \$181k.

The new proposed rules begin in the second section on page 20 and goes on until page 78.

New Rules For Record Keeping

These can be found from pages 50 to 57 and briefly on page 63.

At this time, FFL's are required to maintain 4473 and other records for 20 years. In the ATF's proposed rule they want that record to be kept indefinitely. Funny that the ATF would want more paperwork to look after considering one of the floor's at [the agency's gun-tracing center caved in under the weight of paper in 2019](#) (we're aware that they have an out-dated electronic system in use as well).

Executive Orders

There are two Executive Orders (12866 and 13563) noted from pages 57- 74. Order 12866 is regarding "Regulatory Planning and Review" which comes out to a flimsy cost benefit analysis with incomplete sets of data. See the figure below:

Table 1 Summary of Affected Population, Costs, and Benefits

Category	NPRM
Applicability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Definition of Receiver • Update Marking Requirements • New Gunsmithing Definition • Update Record Retention • Other Technical Amendments
Affected Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 113,204 FFLs (Record Retention) • Unknown number of FFLs manufacturers and importers (Definition of Receiver) • 35 Non-FFL manufacturers (Definition of Receiver) • 6,044 FFL retailers (PMFs) • 36 Non-FFL retailers (PMFs) • Unknown number of Individual Owners
Total Costs to Industry, Public, and Government (7% Discount Rate)	\$1.1 million; \$149,995 7% annualized
Benefits (7% Discount Rate)	N/A
Benefits (Qualitative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clarity to courts on what constitutes a firearm frame or receiver • Applies to new technology • Makes consistent marking requirements • Eases certain marking requirements • Increases tracing of crime scene firearms to prosecute criminals

The ATF literally admits themselves here that they do not know how many manufacturers, FFLs and individual owners they would be affecting with these overstepping and broad new measures. How then, did they reach the conclusion that the total cost to industry, the public and government was less than \$1.3 million? We'd really like to know.

Executive Order 13132 is like an oxymoron. It states that the ATF's proposed rule would not have direct effects on States or the relationship between the Federal Government and the States... "unless there is a direct and positive conflict between them such that they cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together."

In layman's terms, if a state declared itself a 2A Sanctuary and told the Feds to take a hike, well then this Executive Order is here to say "hey, you're in direct violation of this ATF ruling." But, if states want to go ahead and require their own versions of marking and serialized engravings for firearm parts and "ghost guns" then this won't affect them at all! Wow. Our eyes were rolling back into our skulls as we reviewed this.

Other Considered Alternatives

Can be found on pages 64 – 65. These were actually pretty funny.

Alt 1- No change. Don't do anything and keep everything the way it currently is (we support this).

Alt 2- Use a set of rules that were submitted in a petition from the Everytown for Gun Safety organization. Their focus was on proposing new definitions based on parts that house trigger groups but the ATF decided it was too loose of a definition that didn't capture enough "firearms."

Alt 3- Grandfather all existing firearms and receivers. We love this idea, but even the ATF is aware that it would then be difficult to enforce any following regulations because owners could simply claim they own grandfathered parts or firearms. The ATF was specifically concerned that manufacturers would continue to produce non-compliant frames or receivers and market them as grandfathered items.

Alt 4- Require serialization of all partially complete firearms or receivers. This would be very costly — is backwards thinking and would require existing owners to

retroactively serialize their firearms' components even if they were initially purchased legally; impossible to enforce.

TL;DR (Literally) [too long, didn't read ... editor]

If you'd like to see only the main points, pages 58 to 66 summarize the entirety of the new proposed rule pretty well.

From page 80 to 106 the document provides an appendix of gathered term definitions and includes figures of various firearms to explain what the receiver or frame of a firearm may look like.

Pages 107 to 115 summarize some more meanings of terms and reiterate what changes would be made to the "new proposed rules."

It all feels incredibly misleading. What they're doing here is marrying historical context with the ATF's false narrative that they're propagating. If you watched the recent [Senate hearing on ghost guns](#) historian Ashley Hlebinsky destroyed the anti-gunner narrative and provided much context of how the ATF's new proposed rule and definitions disregards historical context that predates the legal precedents that were referenced.

[Supreme Court Unanimously Rebuffs Biden Administration on Warrantless Searches for Handguns \(theepochtimes.com\)](https://theepochtimes.com)

Supreme Court Unanimously Rebuffs Biden Administration on Warrantless Searches for Handguns

BY MATTHEW VADUM

May 17, 2021 Updated: May 17, 2021

The Supreme Court unanimously rejected Biden administration arguments in a case from Rhode Island that police should be allowed to enter homes without a warrant to seize handguns.

The ruling in the case, *Caniglia v. Strom*, court file 20-157, came May 17.

Erich Pratt, Senior Vice President of Gun Owners of America and the affiliated Gun Owners Foundation, praised the new decision.

“The Supreme Court today smacked down the hopes of gun grabbers across the nation,” Pratt said.

“The Michael Bloombergs of the world would have loved to see the Supreme Court grant police the authority to confiscate firearms without a warrant. But the Supreme Court unanimously ruled that the Fourth Amendment protections in the Bill of Rights protect gun owners from such invasions into their homes.”

Bloomberg, the billionaire former New York mayor, is an activist and major funder of gun-control groups.

The case came before the high court for oral argument two months ago as President Joe Biden and congressional Democrats began pressing for aggressive new restrictions on Second Amendment gun ownership rights, including controversial “red flag” laws, which allow gun seizures from law-abiding gun owners with limited due process, in the wake of highly publicized deadly mass shootings in March at a Boulder, Colorado, supermarket and at Atlanta-area spas.

Police generally cannot conduct searches of private property without consent or a warrant.

In *Cady v. Dombrowski* the Supreme Court held in 1973 that police may conduct warrantless searches related to “community caretaking functions,” but only for “vehicle accidents.” Since then, the principle has become “a catchall for a wide range of responsibilities that police officers must discharge aside from their criminal enforcement activities,” the 1st Circuit Court of Appeals stated in the Caniglia case.

The community caretaking doctrine holds that police don’t always operate as law enforcement officials investigating wrongdoing, but sometimes as caretakers to prevent harm in emergency situations.

Edward Caniglia has no criminal history and no record of violence. He had been married to his wife for 22 years when, on Aug. 20, 2015, they had a disagreement inside their Cranston, Rhode Island, home.

The argument escalated. He produced an unloaded gun and said, “Why don’t you just shoot me and get me out of my misery?”

Worried he might be suicidal, his wife asked police to conduct a welfare check. The husband went to a local hospital briefly after police assured him they wouldn’t take his two handguns.

After he left, they seized his guns without a warrant, telling the wife his life and others could be in danger if they left the guns in the home. The police refused to return the weapons and Caniglia sued, arguing the community caretaking exception should not apply inside “the home—the most protected of all private spaces.”

During telephonic oral arguments March 24, Department of Justice lawyer Morgan Ratner supported the city of Cranston’s position, arguing police have to be free to act in potential emergencies.

“Although there have been a lot of questions this morning about whether this is emergency aid or exigent circumstances or community caretaking or something else, the label you give it is not nearly as important as the principle. And the key principle is if someone is at risk of serious harm and it’s reasonable for officials to intervene now, that is enough,” Ratner said.

Writing the Supreme Court's short, 4-page opinion in the case, Justice Clarence Thomas noted the *Cady v. Dombrowski* precedent, which he indicated applied to police "responding to disabled vehicles or investigating accidents."

"The question today is whether Cady's acknowledgment of these 'caretaking' duties creates a standalone doctrine that justifies warrantless searches and seizures in the home," Thomas wrote.

"It does not," he added.

Thomas wrote that the federal district court ruled in favor of the police and the 1st Circuit expanded on this, stating that police "often have noncriminal reasons to interact with motorists" on public highways. The appeals court "extrapolated" from the Cady ruling "a freestanding community-caretaking exception that applies to both cars and homes."

The appeals court's community caretaking rule "goes beyond anything this Court has recognized," Thomas wrote.

The acknowledgement that "police officers perform many civic tasks in modern society was just that—a recognition that these tasks exist, and not an open-ended license to perform them anywhere."

In a separate concurring opinion, Justice Samuel Alito wrote that the Supreme Court is "properly reject[ing] the broad 'community caretaking' theory."

At the same time, he noted that the case implicates "another body of law that petitioner glossed over: the so-called 'red flag' laws that some States are now enacting."

Such laws, he wrote, "enable the police to seize guns pursuant to a court order to prevent their use for suicide or the infliction of harm on innocent persons."

Although this particular decision does not address those issues, "provisions of red flag laws may be challenged under the Fourth Amendment, and those cases may come before us."

At press time, Acting U.S. Solicitor General Elizabeth Prelogar and Marc DeSisto, attorney for Cranston, had not responded to requests for comment from *The Epoch Times*.

[Dozens of U.S. House Members Encourage Senate Leaders to Block](https://firearmsnews.com) (firearmsnews.com)

Dozens of U.S. House Members Encourage Senate Leaders to Block Chipman Confirmation

May 10, 2021 By Mark Chesnut

Calling him an “enemy of the Second Amendment,” 69 members of the U.S. House of Representatives have sent a letter to Senate leaders asking them to block the confirmation of David Chipman, President Joe Biden’s choice for head of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF).

The letter, penned by U.S. Rep. Jim Banks, R-Indiana, and also signed by 68 other Republican Congressmen, was sent to Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell.

“If confirmed, David Chipman would use every tool at his disposal to attack American gun owners,” the letter read. “We respectfully ask you to oppose any and all action that would advance his confirmation in the Senate.”

As we [reported a few weeks ago](#), Chipman, a longtime ATF agent, was involved in the Waco, Texas, debacle where 76 people, including women and children, were killed. More recently he has been a shill and lobbyist for anti-gun groups, and currently serves as the senior policy adviser for gun-ban group Giffords.

While [proclaiming himself last year](#) to be a “proud gun owner” who is “mischaracterized as a gun grabber,” Chipman spent the last five years working for an organization that favors nearly every anti-gun scheme imaginable. He most recently mocked those Americans choosing to buy guns for the first time in the midst of the pandemic, widespread social unrest and a growing “defund the police” movement.

The letter from the 69 congressmen specifically mentioned Chipman's involvement with the Giffords organization and other gun-ban groups as being especially problematic.

"Mr. Chipman has consistently worked to advance a radical gun control agenda," the letter said. "Since leaving ATF, Mr. Chipman has worked for extreme organizations, including Everytown for Gun Safety and the Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. These groups have supported the dangerous notion that the Second Amendment does not protect a private right of gun ownership."

Signers of the letter also expressed their concern that Chipman has spoken out in favor of banning semi-auto rifles like the AR-15. In fact, he once even called the AR-15 a "weapon of war," as if it were a full-auto firearm—not a semi-auto that fires one bullet with each press of the trigger.

"Mr. Chipman has a long history of advocating against Americans' Second Amendment rights," the letter said. "He supports limiting magazine capacity, holding gun manufacturers liable if one of their products is used by a criminal in a crime, and banning certain types of rifles—including America's most popular rifle the AR-15."

Chipman also once lied about the Waco standoff to such an extent that even some in "mainstream" media began questioning his nomination. In a 2019 question-and-answer forum on Reddit, he wrote, "At Waco, cult members used two .50-caliber Barretts to shoot down two Texas Air National Guard helicopters. It is true we are fortunate they are not used in crime more often." In fact, that was not even remotely true. The boldface lie prompted the *New York Post* [to run a story](#) headlined, "Biden ATF pick Chipman made false claims about shot-down choppers at Waco massacre."

Freelance writer and editor Mark Chesnut is the owner/editorial director at Red Setter Communications LLC. An avid hunter, shooter and political observer, he has been covering Second Amendment issues and politics on a near-daily basis for the past 20 years.

Kansas Legislators Override Governor's Veto of Carry Measure for Those Aged 18-20

May 05, 2021 By Mark Chesnut

The Kansas legislature on Monday voted to override [Gov. Laura Kelly's veto](#) of a measure that will now make it possible for more adults—including those aged 18 to 20—to carry a firearm for self-defense in the Sunflower State.

The Kansas legislature had overwhelmingly passed [HR 2058](#), a measure greatly expanding the right of self-defense, but Kelly, a Democrat, abruptly vetoed the bill late last week, seemingly ending hope for the measure. On Monday, after only five minutes of debate supporters had garnered the 84 votes they needed for the override. The override also passed the Senate by a vote of 31-8.

Among other things, the legislation will allow all people licensed to carry a firearm in other states to carry one in Kansas, allow 18- to 20-year-olds to apply for a concealed carry permit and authorized the state attorney general to issue an alternative license to carry a concealed handgun to qualified applicants during a declared state of disaster emergency.

Three Republican representatives who originally voted against the measure supported the veto override effort. Another, who was absent from the first vote for health reasons, gave supporters the exact margin they needed to override the veto.

“The governor in her message indicated that she has always supported the Second Amendment,” said Abilene Rep. John Barker, who carried the bill on the House floor. “Well, I find that hard to believe sometimes, because we already have 18-year-olds that can carry a gun (openly) in the state of Kansas. This requires them, if they’re going to carry a concealed weapon, to get training and to get a permit and to have a background investigation.

“I think that’s a positive move. Any time people can get training, that’s a good thing.”

As we reported last week, in her veto message Kelly did say she had always been a supporter of the Second Amendment. However, she followed that statement by saying, *“But we can respect and defend the rights of Kansas gun owners while also taking effective steps to keep our children and families safe. Legislation that allows more guns on campus is neither safe nor effective, and it will drive prospective students away from our schools.”*

Kelly’s statement was questioned even by many in the education groups who don’t support carry on school property. As the Kansas Association of School Boards pointed out, the measure wouldn’t have changed current laws that allow high schools to prohibit guns on school grounds. So, in fact, it would not have “allowed more guns on campus” as the governor insinuated.

Freelance writer and editor Mark Chesnut is the owner/editorial director at Red Setter Communications LLC. An avid hunter, shooter and political observer, he has been covering Second Amendment issues and politics on a near-daily basis for the past 20 years.

When was the last time you visited our web site? Please take some time to go to the CARGO website at www.cargogunclub.org

Thank you,

Paul Curtis

President - CARGO

www.cargogunclub.org

"If you can read this, thank a teacher. For the fact that it is in English, thank a Veteran."

If for some reason, you no longer wish to receive these e-mails please accept our apologies and respond to this message with REMOVE in the subject line and we will remove your name from the mailing list.