

Internet-scare Rumors



The internet is a wonderful thing in that it makes abundant information available and easy to share. All information, be it good, bad, or ugly.

I believe many of the “scare” e-mails are crafted to be “scary”. Most are either completely false or take an itty-bit of truth and soak it in a caustic bucket of mis-information. Here are some of the ones I’ve checked out.

I first received this from a friend a couple of months ago. She thought it didn’t sound quite right as asked my, as an instructor, to check it out. It has to do with the VA asking three questions that, if any were answered yes, would immediately prevent you from obtaining or keeping your Concealed Carry License.

The email read:

Received this from a CID agent who is still on active duty. NOT SURE IF IT IS TRUE , BUT ---- If you have a friend or anyone in your home who is a Veteran, a Policeman/ex-Policeman, hunter, or gun owner, TELL THEM ABOUT THIS !!!!

I had a doctor's appointment at the local VA clinic yesterday and found out something very interesting that I would like to pass along. While going through triage before seeing the doctor, I was asked, at the end of the exam, three questions:

1. Did I feel stressed?
2. Did I feel threatened?
3. Did I feel like doing harm to someone?

The nurse then informed me, that if I had answered yes to any of the questions, I would have lost my concealed carry permit as it would have gone into my medical records and the VA would have reported it to Homeland Security. Looks like they are going after the vets first.

Other gun people like retired law enforcement will probably be next. Then when they go after the civilians, what argument will they have?

Be forewarned and be aware. The Obama administration has gone on record as considering veterans and gun owners potential terrorists. Whether you are a gun owner veteran or not, you've been warned. If you know veterans and gun owners, please pass this on to them. Be very cautious about what you say and to whom.

This is not true in Oklahoma according to Ginger at OSBI.

She told me that if the VA contacts them, or they find out through some other means that a SDA license holder has PTSD or some other disorder, OSBI will research the matter, likely send a letter to the license holder with a form for his/her doctor to fill out and return to the OSBI (the form has a place where the doctor can state that the patients condition does or does not indicate a likelihood that he/she will harm another). That's the standard form. We've known about that for a long time.

If they get contacted by [Homeland Security](#) (or some other agency, for that matter) with a concern, the OSBI licensing staff will research the situation and then send the results to their [legal department](#). It will be up to their legal staff make the decision.

So...NO. There is no automatic, three questions and you're out in Oklahoma. It takes much more than answering yes or no to a few simplistic/general questions. Rest assured, it ain't happenin' here.

This e-mail has many of the signs of being questionable. No specifics. No dates. No location where this occurred. And no way to verify. In short...100% unsupportable hearsay.



E-mail scare about President Obama forcing anti-gun measures through UN treaty agreements

~~~~~

Lately there's been an e-mail circulating around the internet spreading concern about Obama signing a UN treaty and effectively coming in through a "back door" with his anti-gun agenda. While it is understood that his past stance on gun control is extreme and that he very well may make such agreement(s), it would be a legislative battle for such a sweeping change to take hold.

A few weeks ago I talked with the NRA/ILA about this. According to them, it's not an issue that is sneaking up on the NRA.

Yes, Obama may sign a treaty with the UN (or anyone else for that matter). In order for an agreement in a signed treaty to become effective, it must be ratified by the Senate in a 2/3rds majority vote. The Senate can ratify treaties line by line. So parts of a treaty may be ratified while other parts may not.

This is one of many situations in which Obama can assert his political

leanings. But he cannot sign a treaty and simply have it enforceable the next day. This sort of thing will not be happening without us hearing a lot more about it.

Currently Democrats well remember the 1994 Crime Bill which placed huge restrictions on guns and gun ownership. They lost control of both the House and the Senate afterward.

Few, if any, Republicans will vote anti-gun and quite a few Democrats will want to be well insulated if they vote anti-gun. On a deal like this, there would have to be all Senate Democrats on board and six Senate Republicans as well. That, realistically, would probably not happen with the current legislative membership.

It's good to be aware of what's going on with the President and possible treaties, but, according to the NRA, this is not currently a reasonable concern.

No reason to be in "panic mode" at this time.

---

---

## **Clearing Up the Rumors: The Truth About The "Gun Tax Bill"**

Over the past few months, NRA-ILA has received hundreds of e-mails warning us about "SB-2099," a bill that would supposedly require you to report all your guns on your income tax return every April 15.

Like many rumors, there's just a grain of truth to this one. Someone is recycling an old alert, which wasn't even very accurate when it was new.

There actually was a U.S. Senate bill with that number that would have taxed handguns nine years ago. It was introduced by anti-gun Sen. Jack Reed (D-R.I.), and it would have included handguns under the National Firearms Act's tax and registration scheme. This has nothing to do with anyone's Form 1040, of course.

Fortunately, S. 2099 disappeared without any action by the Senate, back when Bill Clinton was still in the White House. We reported about it back then, just as we report about new anti-gun bills every week. Now, it's time for gun owners to drop this old distraction and focus on the real threats at hand.

---

---

## **Legislative Updates**

Like many of you, I have heard through the rumor mill that there are some things going on, legislatively, that may be of concern. And like many gun owners, when these issues affect my right to defend myself and my family, not to mention my country, I pay particular attention.

Addressed below are four issues:

1. Blair Holt's Firearm Licensing and Record of Sale Act of 2009 (HR 45)
2. Ammunition Accountability Legislation
3. Primer chemical change that would shorten the usable life of ammo
4. Ammunition Shortage

### **Blair Holt Act**

Basically this amends the Brady Act and requires licensing in order for a person to possess a firearm. In short, it would be like a driver's license for handguns. You have to be licensed to buy or possess a handgun.

Also it would prohibit anyone from transferring (selling, buying, or giving) a qualifying firearm to another without the license being shown, verified, and a tracking number kept by the seller. Ahead of time a national instant criminal background check must be made.

In addition it directs the Attorney General to maintain some injury information records, conduct studies, and maintain a database of manufacturers and their activity.

You can read the wording of this bill and get a much better idea of it's implications by going to <http://www.opencongress.org/bill/111-h45/text>.

After looking around the internet and talking with a representative from the Institute for Legislative Action of the National Rifle Association, I am not so concerned about this, at this time. The bill was introduced into the House by Rep. Bobby Rush (D, IL-1) and currently has no co-sponsors. At this time it is in committee (House Judiciary) and is not expected (by the ILA) to move anywhere soon.

I believe that we must remain vigilant and keep an eye on it, but there is little chance of this bill, in its current form, getting the support that it needs to be heard.

Blair Holt's Firearms and Record of Sale Act (HR45)

It is H.R. 45: Blair Holt's Firearm Licensing and Record of Sale Act of 2009. This bill was introduced in the 111th Congress by U. S. Rep. Bobby Rush (D IL) on Jan. 6, 2009. Failing to attract any co sponsors, it was referred for consideration to the House Committee on the Judiciary, where it now rests awaiting further action.

Currently the bill has no co-sponsors. Few legislators will touch it knowing what happened after the passage of 1994's Crime Bill that placed severe restrictions on "assault weapons" and magazines of more that 10-round capacity. In the very next election Democrats lost control of both House and Senate. So far, that bill is going nowhere!

If it was passed Blair Holt would (according to <http://www.snopes.com/politics/guns/blairholt.asp>):

"Prohibit possession of any handguns or semiautomatic firearms that can accept detachable ammunition-feeding devices (excluding atiques) by anyone who has not been issued a firearm license.

Require all sales of those types of firearms to go through licensed dealers.

Direct the Attorney General to establish a run a federal record-of-sale system.

Require the possessors of firearms to secure them (by secure gun storage or safety

devices when they are kept in locales where children might be capable of gaining access to those firearms.

In order to be issued a firearm license under the provisions of the Blair Holt legislation, applicants would be required to submit the following information to the Attorney General.

1. a current passport-sized photograph of the applicant that provides a clear, accurate likeness of the applicant.
2. The name, address, and date and place of birth of the applicant.
3. any other name that the applicant has ever used or by which the applicant has ever been known.
4. a clear thumb print of the applicant, which shall be made when, and in the presence of the entity to whom, the application is submitted.
5. with respect to each category of person prohibited by Federal law, or by the law of the State of residence of the applicant, from obtaining a firearm, a statement that the individual is not a person prohibited from obtaining a firearm.
6. a certification by the applicant that the applicant will keep any firearm owned by the applicant safely stored and out of the possession of persons who have not attained 18 years of age.
7. a certificate attesting to the completion at the time of application of a written firearms examination, which shall test the knowledge and ability of the applicant regarding:
  - A. the safe storage of firearms, particularly in the vicinity of persons who have not attained 18 years of age.
  - B. the safe handling of firearms
  - C. the use of firearms in the home and the risks associated with such use
  - D. the legal responsibilities of firearms owners, including Federal, State, and local laws relating to requirements for the possession and storage of firearms, and relating to reporting requirements with respect to firearms.
  - E. any other subjects, as the Attorney General determines to be appropriate.
8. an authorization by the applicant to release the Attorney General or an authorized representative of the Attorney General any mental health records pertaining to the applicant.

9. the date on which the application was submitted.
10. the signature of the applicant"

Blair Holt is not an issue at this time.

### **Ammunition Accountability Legislation**

According to: <http://ammunitionaccountability.org/Legislation.htm>, currently there is proposed legislation afoot in Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Washington.

This is the legislation that would enforce coding technology on ammunition. The claim is that it works by laser etching the back of each bullet with a serial number. Then when the bad guys go to buy their ammo, it can be traced back to them.

As of yet, no States have come close to passing such legislation and there is nothing in the works federally. Oklahoma is not among those who have jumped on this band wagon.

If you've received an e-mail or heard rumors that as of June 1, 2009 you will not be able to purchase non-coded ammunition... that is false. There is nothing in place for that to occur at this time.

### **Time-sensitive Primer Chemical Change**

Also there is a rumor that, past a certain point, you will not be able to buy primers that will last for more than a couple of years. The rumor is that, by law, the chemical used will become inert after a period of time. (Unlike today's primers which last for decades)

Again, after checking with NRA's ILA and the internet, I could find nothing to substantiate this rumor. That being the case, if you can find them, buy them.



## **Ammunition Shortage**

There are also rumors that the ammo shortage is by design in an attempt to keep ammo out of the hands of American citizens. Conversely, it seems to be that the shortage is due to many of us buying everything we can get our hands on. The November election caught many gun owners off guard. With the subsequent frenzied buying spree, the effect it had on gun and ammo availability is widespread.

Rather than it being an orchestrated move on the part of anti-gunners, the ammunition shortage appears to be more of a supply and demand issue.

## **"Encoded Ammunition"/Bullet Serialization**

"Encoded Ammunition" (Bullet and Cartridge Case Serialization) Means:

- \* Forfeiture of Currently-Owned Ammunition
- \* A Separate Registration for Every Box of New Ammunition
- \* Outrageously Expensive Ammunition Costs for Police & Private Citizens Alike
- \* A Waste of Taxpayer Money, Better Spent on Traditional Police Programs

Currently there is no federal legislation introduced which would put this practice into place. It is my understanding that around 17 or 18 states (None of which is Oklahoma) have legislation introduced that proposes such measures.

According to a phone call with NRA/ILA folks last summer (2009), the legislation in these states was not moving. So there's no reason for concern here either.

In 2007, the sponsor of "encoded ammunition" legislation in Maryland urged lawmakers across the country to introduce the same kind of legislation in their states. The bill would require ammunition manufacturers to engrave a serial number on "the base of the bullet and the inside of the cartridge casing of each round" of ammunition for popular sporting caliber center-fire rifles, all center-fire pistols, all .22 rimfire rifles and pistols, and all 12 gauge shotguns.

Reasons to Strenuously Oppose This Legislation

People would be required to forfeit all personally-owned non-encoded ammunition. After a certain date, it would be illegal to possess non-encoded ammunition. Gun owners possess hundreds of millions of rounds of ammunition for target shooting, hunting and personal protection. Consider that American manufacturers produce 8 billion rounds each year.

Reloading (re-using cartridge cases multiple times) would be abolished. There would be no way to correspond serial numbers on cartridge cases, and different sets and quantities of bullets.

People would be required to separately register every box of "encoded ammunition." This information would be supplied to the police. Most states do not even require registration of guns. Each box of ammunition would have a unique serial number, thus a separate registration.

Private citizens would have to maintain records, if they sold ammunition to anyone, including family members or friends.

The cost of ammunition would soar, for police and private citizens alike. The Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturing Institute estimates it would take three weeks to produce ammunition currently produced in a single day. For reason of cost, manufacturers would produce only ultra-expensive encoded ammunition, which police would have to buy, just like everyone else.

A tax of five cents a round would be imposed on private citizens, not only upon initial sale, but every time the ammunition changes hands thereafter.

Shotgun ammunition cannot be engraved. Shotgun pellets are too small to be individually engraved. Shotgun cartridge cases are made of plastic, which would be difficult to engrave.

Criminals could beat the system. A large percentage of criminals' ammunition (and guns) is stolen. Criminals could also collect ammunition cases from shooting ranges, and reload them with molten lead bullets made without serial numbers.

Congress eliminated a similar requirement in the 1980s, because there was no law enforcement benefit. Federal law had required purchasers of handgun ammunition to sign a ledger, but Congress repealed that requirement in 1983 (.22 rimfire) and 1986 (center-fire handguns), because it burdened purchasers, vendors and police, with no law enforcement benefit.

Compiled by Don Roberts