SC House General Laws Subcommittee Passes Amendment 1 to Destroy Your 2nd Amendment Rights! 2 NRA Praises General Laws Subcommittee for Passing 3 **Unconstitutional, Anti-Gun Amendment!** 4 5 6 History is filled with examples of people making absolutely horrible decisions. The indians sold Manhattan Island for beads and trinkets. Judas sold out Jesus for 30 pieces of silver. Esau sold 7 his birthright to Jacob for a bowl of porridge. Russia sold Alaska to the US for 2 cents an acre. 8 9 And now, NRA "leadership" is asking you to sell out the 2nd Amendment for even less than 10 beads and trinkets! 11 12 GrassRoots GunRights is asking you to protect the 2nd Amendment. 13 14 15 Politicians are waiting for you to tell them where you stand. 16 Do you stand with NRA "leadership" in their efforts to sell out the 2nd Amendment, or do 17 vou stand with GrassRoots GunRights in our uncompromising support of the 2nd 18 19 Amendment? 20 21 There has never been a better example of the difference between GrassRoots GunRights leadership and NRA "leadership." Politicians will be watching to see which side you 22 choose to stand with - NRA "leadership" or GrassRoots GunRights. (Please take the 23 24 "Action Steps" at the end of this article.) 25 The issue is quite simple - do YOU support selling out the 2nd Amendment? Yes or No. 26 27 28 On Thursday, February 24, the SC House General Laws subcommittee passed an amendment -29 the Viers amendment - to replace the original H. 3292. The Viers amendment will help destroy the Second Amendment to the US Constitution by denying the right to keep and bear arms to 30 people from out of state. The General Laws subcommittee would like you to think the Second 31 Amendment reads as follows: 32 33 34 "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 - except by the State 35 of South Carolina which claims the power to infringe the right to keep and 36 bear arms to people from out of state." 37 38 39 Every gun owner in every state should recoil in fear over what the SC House General Laws subcommittee is doing to your fundamental, God given, natural right to keep and bear arms - a 40 pre-existing right of *every person* in the United States of America, which the 2nd Amendment 41 prohibits government from infringing. If SC can legally infringe some peoples' rights protected 42

- by the 2nd Amendment now, what stops SC from infringing the 2nd Amendment rights of even
 more law abiding people later? Imagine what would happen to the 2nd Amendment if every state
 did as SC is trying to do. Sadly, NRA "leadership" supports this attack upon the 2nd
 Amendment.
- 4 5

6 The US Constitution protects the rights of all people in the United States from abuse by any level of government - regardless of which state the person is in or from at the time. Can you imagine 7 8 South Carolina passing a law denying people from out of state the right to attend church services 9 while in SC - a clear violation of your rights as protected by the 1st Amendment? Can you imagine South Carolina passing a law denying people from out of state the right to write news 10 articles not approved by the state of South Carolina - also a clear violation of your rights 11 protected by the 1st Amendment? Can you imagine South Carolina passing a law denying people 12 from out of state the right to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures - a clear 13 violation of your rights protected by the 4th Amendment? Can you imagine South Carolina 14 passing a law denying people from out of state the right to a fair trial - a clear violation of your 15 rights protected by the 6th Amendment? People would think it was time to tar and feather 16 17 politicians who did such things. But, that is exactly what the SC House General Laws subcommittee is doing to the rights protected by the 2nd Amendment! And sadly, NRA 18 "leadership" gave its blessing to the General Laws subcommittee's infringement of your 2nd 19 20 Amendment rights. 21

The politicians claim to have talked with interested parties on how to amend the original H.
3292. That is simply not the truth. The politicians failed to talk with GrassRoots GunRights,
even after GrassRoots Gunrights gave them a detailed legal analysis of the bill, and even though
GrassRoots Gunrights leaders repeatedly offered to meet with members of the subcommittee.
The politicians ignored the reasonable GrassRoots GunRights proposed amendments to H. 3292,
and instead took orders from the NRA.

GrassRoots GunRights leaders have been to every subcommittee meeting on every gun rights
related bill for over ten years. This was the first time we have ever seen a roll call vote in a
subcommittee meeting. Why now? Because the NRA ordered a roll call vote. Why? To use as
a weapon come election season against any politician who dared to oppose this NRA
"leadership" supported attack upon your 2nd Amendment rights!

Sometimes there is no substitute for seeing and hearing something with your own eyes and ears.
That is why GrassRoots GunRights videotaped the SC House General Laws subcommittee
meeting on February 24. Please note at about 38 seconds into the video where Rep. Viers has a
slip of the tongue and states the politicians have been "ordered" to have a roll call vote. Then,
realizing how bad it sounds to admit the politicians are taking orders from the NRA, Rep. Viers
quickly changes his story from "ordered" to "requested." You can - and should - view the video
clip at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QNTnkGAgLfs

42

34

For those who simply do not believe NRA "leadership" is supporting selling out the 2nd
 Amendment, please read the NRA-ILA alert dated February 25, wherein the NRA states:

"While this legislation was amended in subcommittee, it remains a solid, pro-gun reform bill. Please contact members of the House Judiciary Committee and urge them to pass H. 3292 without any further amendments."

5 NRA "leadership" wants the Viers amendment passed "without any further amendments." Why
 6 on earth would NRA "leadership" encourage the blatant infringement of your rights protected by
 7 the 2nd Amendment?

9 The politicians and NRA "leadership" worked together to come up with the Viers 10 amendment, which will help destroy your 2nd Amendment rights. They own it. But, are 11 you buying it?

12

15

19

27

33

36 37

38

39

40 41

42

43

44

8

1

2

3

4

GrassRoots GunRights believes H. 3292 MUST be amended to remove the attacks upon the 2nd
 Amendment. (Please take the "Action Steps" at the end of this article.)

The choice is simple and yours to make - support the NRA "leadership" in destroying the
 2nd Amendment or support GrassRoots GunRights in protecting the 2nd Amendment.
 (Please take the "Action Steps" at the end of this article.)

The unconstitutional, anti-gun Viers amendment passed by the House General Laws subcommittee repeatedly denies the right to possess a handgun to "non South Carolina residents and non United States citizens" unless they first get a CWP from either 1) SC, or 2) their home state and that home state must have reciprocity with SC (see page 1, lines 39 to 41; page 4, lines 4 to 7; and page 6, lines 14 to 17 of the Viers amendment). (The Viers amendment is not yet posted on the official legislative web site, but GrassRoots GunRights will post a copy on the GrassRoots GunRights web site.)

Imagine what would be left of our 2nd Amendment rights if every state infringed the 2nd
 Amendment just like SC is infringing the 2nd Amendment now. If we fail to protect the 2nd
 Amendment now, there may not be a 2nd Amendment left to protect later. Our children
 deserve better from us than to let this infringement upon the 2nd Amendment go
 unchallenged.

In addition to the harm done to the 2nd Amendment, there are real life harms to real people that the unconstitutional, anti-gun Viers amendment will cause. The Viers amendment will:

• Make it a crime for out of state gun owners to have a handgun in their glove box or console unless they have a concealed weapon permit (CWP) from their home state, and then only if that state has CWP reciprocity with SC. In addition to being unconstitutional, this will increase violent crimes against tourists here, just as it did in Florida years ago - which will then harm the SC tourism industry. Current SC law allows all adults not legally barred from possessing a firearm to keep a handgun in the glove box or console. Why does Rep. Viers, the General Laws subcommittee, and NRA "leadership" support this step backwards?

• Make it a crime for out of state gun owners - including NRA members - to shoot in competitive handgun matches - including NRA sanctioned matches - in SC unless they have a CWP from their home state, and then only if that state has CWP reciprocity with SC. In addition to being unconstitutional, this will harm SC gun ranges - including NRA affiliated ranges - that hold regional and national competitive handgun matches - and the tourism revenue from these events will be lost to us. Current SC law allows all adults not legally barred from possessing a firearm to shoot handguns in competition. Why does Rep. Viers, the General Laws subcommittee, and NRA "leadership" support this step backwards?

- Make it a crime for out of state gun owners to shoot or even possess a handgun in SC unless they have a CWP from their home state, and then only if that state has CWP reciprocity with SC. In addition to being unconstitutional, this will stop out of state gun owners from being able to defend themselves or others while on private property even property owned by family members. It will be illegal at family reunions to enjoy a day at the range together if one of the family members is from out of state. Current SC law allows all adults not legally barred from possessing a firearm to possess a handgun on private property with permission. Why does Rep. Viers, the General Laws subcommittee, and NRA "leadership" support this step backwards?
- Make it a felony to help an out of state gun owner shoot a handgun in SC unless they have a CWP from their home state, which again must have CWP reciprocity with SC. Although the person doing the shooting would only be charged with a misdemeanor for possessing the handgun, both the person doing the shooting and the person who helps them shoot could be charged with a felony because conspiracy to commit a misdemeanor is a felony. A felony conviction brings on a lifetime federal firearms disability. It could take a life time and a small fortune for middle aged and older people to finally prevail in court to restore their rights lost as a result of the unconstitutional, anti-gun Viers amendment.
- Unconstitutionally deny young legal adults the right to possess a handgun in SC. If young adults can be denied their constitutional rights, then what is there to protect older adults from the same unconstitutional denial of rights? It is not hard to imagine anti-gun politicians denying older people the right to keep and bear arms because these older people are more prone to senility or dementia. See *State v. Bolin*, 378 S.C. 96, 100, 662 S.E.2d 38, 40 (2008), wherein the South Carolina Supreme Court held it was unconstitutional to prohibit young legal adults from possessing a handgun. Current SC law allows all adults not legally barred from possessing a firearm to possess a handgun. Why does Rep. Viers, the General Laws subcommittee, and NRA "leadership" support this step backwards?
- Repeal the current law that allows one to possess a handgun in certain locations if

1 2	given permission to do so, and replaces it with an absolute prohibition.	
2 3 4 5	• Fail to protect the state firearms pre-emption law from anti-gun politicians, and sets the stage for countless local gun control laws across SC.	
6 7 8 9 10	• Make it a crime for out of state gun owners to hunt with a handgun in SC unless they have a CWP from their home state, and then only if that state has CWP reciprocity with SC. In addition to being unconstitutional, this will harm the tourism industry as handgun hunters are forced to go to other states like Georgia. Current SC law allows all adults not legally barred from possessing a firearm to	
10 11 12 13	hunt with a handgun. Why does Rep. Viers, the General Laws subcommittee, and NRA "leadership" support this step backwards?	
14 15 16 17	• Make it a crime for a tourist to carry her self-defense handgun from her car into her hotel room. Existing law allows this, but obviously Rep. Viers, the General Laws subcommittee, and NRA "leadership" want to keep her defenseless.	
17 18 19 20 21	Sadly, NRA "leadership" supports all of the above harms to real people. As we have already shown, NRA "leadership" is on record as opposing any amendments to H. 3292 to fix any of these problems. Why?	
22 23 24 25 26 27	GrassRoots GunRights tried to help Rep. Thad Viers and the rest of the House General Laws subcommittee fix H. 3292. But, these politicians refused the GrassRoots GunRights offer of assistance. Instead, these politicians listened to NRA "leadership" tell them this attack upon the 2 nd Amendment was acceptable. So, instead of fixing H. 3292, the unconstitutional, anti-gun Viers amendment has made H. 3292 even worse.	
28 29 30 31 32	These SC politicians made a choice to destroy your 2 nd Amendment rights. Gun owners in South Carolina deserve better than politicians who claim to be pro-gun, but pass unconstitutional, anti-gun legislation! Any claim of ignorance or mistake is unacceptable and inexcusable when expert advice has been offered, but rejected.	
33 34	GrassRoots GunRights will never support destroying our 2 nd Amendment rights!	
35 36 37 38	There is nothing in H. 3292 that can justify destroying the 2^{nd} Amendment! It does not matter what trinkets and baubles may be placed into H. 3292 in an attempt to buy support for this unconstitutional infringement of the 2^{nd} Amendment. They can keep their 30 pieces of silver!	
39 40 41	GrassRoots GunRights stands strong in support of the 2 nd Amendment, and will not compromise away our inalienable rights!	
41 42 43 44	Any good Judas will argue there is some good - enough good - in H. 3292 to justify selling out our fundamental, God given, natural right to keep and bear arms. This unprincipled argument becomes easier to swallow when you are just selling away the rights of "someone	
	5	

else." But, everywhere you go, you are that "someone else" to others. So, when you sell out 1 2 the rights of others, you are really selling out your own rights. 3

It does not matter how much "good stuff" they add to H. 3292 - when they take away any of our 4 rights - WE LOSE! GrassRoots GunRights will NOT compromise or give away any of our 5 rights to gain something else. 6

Any good found in H. 3292 can be enacted into law in other legislation. Gun owners do NOT 8 need to accept the seeds of destruction of the 2nd Amendment as the price to pay to get some of 9 our other rights restored. 10

11 GrassRoots GunRights and all defenders of the 2nd Amendment must oppose H. 3292 as 12 currently amended by the House General Laws subcommittee. Everyone at the only public 13 hearing on H. 3292 agreed that H. 3292 in its original form needed to be amended. So, simply 14 refusing to accept the Viers amendment does not fix the problem because then gun owners would 15 be saddled with the poorly drafted original version of H. 3292. 16

17

7

The original version of H. 3292 failed gun owners in too many ways. GrassRoots GunRights 18 19 proposed amendments to H. 3292 to fix the problems identified in the original draft of H. 3292. GrassRoots GunRights detailed those problems at the first General Laws subcommittee meeting. 20 GrassRoots GunRights hand delivered the GrassRoots GunRights analysis to each member of the 21

- General Laws subcommittee and each primary sponsor of H. 3292. Thus, not one of these 22
- politicians can honestly claim ignorance of the problems found in H. 3292. Please re-read the 23
- original GrassRoots GunRights analysis of H. 3292 at: 24 http://www.scfirearms.org/Legislative/H3292 analysis.pdf.
- 25

26 27 Unfortunately, not a single improvement suggested by GrassRoots GunRights was included by the General Laws subcommittee. Instead, the General Laws subcommittee elected to pass the 28

unconstitutional, anti-gun Viers amendment with the support of NRA "leadership." 29 30

31 The General Laws subcommittee decided to continue to allow innocent gun owners to risk becoming felons for entering private businesses housed in publicly owned buildings. The failure 32 to fix this is deplorable. Please re-read the example of the SC Aquarium in the original 33 GrassRoots GunRights analysis of H. 3292 (which can be found at the URL above) to 34 understand why. 35

36

37 The General Laws subcommittee decided to continue to allow innocent hunters to risk becoming 38 felons for a simple trespass on rural property owned by an educational institution, even if the boundaries were not marked and the property was not posted. The failure to fix this is 39 deplorable, too. Please re-read the GrassRoots GunRights analysis of H. 3292 to understand 40 why.

41 42

Probably the single biggest indicator of the General Laws subcommittee's disdain for gun 43 owners is their failure to delete the words "full time" from Section 16-23-420, which would have 44

- protected innocent gun owners from becoming felons simply for driving a vehicle on a road near
 a school that had, unbeknownst to the driver, been closed at any time in the past. This would
 have been a simple change. But, the House General Laws subcommittee was not willing to do
 something even this simple to protect innocent gun owners!
- We the gun owners in SC deserve to have our rights restored, not bandied about like trading
 cards.

What needs to be done now is to have the House Judiciary Committee send H. 3292 back to
the House General Laws subcommittee for more study. Then, the House General Laws
subcommittee needs to meet with GrassRoots GunRights leaders to honestly discuss how to
fix H. 3292. No more of these surprise amendments should be tolerated by gun owners.
(Please take the "Action Steps" at the end of this article.)

15 There is only one continuing legal education (CLE) class certified by the SC Supreme Court for 16 teaching judges, magistrates, and attorneys about SC gun laws. Obviously, the General Laws subcommittee members should have attended this CLE class. It would be reasonable to expect 17 the House General Laws subcommittee to consult with the instructors of that class when trying 18 19 to draft amendments to H. 3292. But, the House General Laws subcommittee has refused to do 20 so up until now. It is time the House General Laws started getting advice from certified experts on SC gun law instead of relying upon those who obviously either 1) do not know what they are 21 doing, 2) are extremely anti-gun, or 3) both. 22 23

24 Gun owners in SC need to demand more from our elected representatives.

5

8

14

25

31

32 33

37

Decision time is now. Where do you stand? Do you stand with GrassRoots GunRights because you unwilling to compromise away your 2nd Amendment rights? Or, do you stand with NRA "leadership" because you are willing to sell out the 2nd Amendment rights of others? The politicians need to know ASAP because the House Judiciary Committee meets on Tuesday March 1, 2011.

ACTION STEPS:

Call the Judiciary Committee at (803) 734-3120 and tell them either 1) "GrassRoots
 GunRights speaks for me! Send H. 3292 back to subcommittee.", or 2) "The NRA speaks
 for me. I will sell my 2nd Amendment rights to the highest bidder."

2. Email each member of the Judiciary Committee - email addresses are below - and tell
them the same thing, either 1) "GrassRoots GunRights speaks for me! Send H. 3292 back to
subcommittee.", or 2) "The NRA speaks for me. I will sell my 2nd Amendment rights to the
highest bidder."

43 3. Call each member of the Judiciary Committee at (803) 734-3120 and ask to be transferred

1 to whichever member you are calling from the list of email addresses below.

4. Forward this to everyone you know who is concerned about protecting our Constitutional rights, and ask them to take action too.

- 6 Thank you,
- 8 Robert D. Butler, J.D.
- 9 V.P

2 3

4 5

7

11

14

- 10 GrassRoots GunRights
- The following email addresses should allow you to send an email to each member of the HouseJudiciary Committee with a simple "cut and paste" into your email "To" field:
- 15 "James Harrison" <JimHarrison@schouse.gov>, "James Smith" <JamesSmith@schouse.gov>,
- 16 "George Hearn" <GeorgeHearn@schouse.gov>, "Karl Allen" <KarlAllen@schouse.gov>,
- 17 "Bruce Bannister" <BruceBannister@schouse.gov>, "Boyd Brown"
- 18 <BoydBrown@schouse.gov>, "Alan Clemmons" <Clemmons1@aol.com>, "Derham Cole"
- 19 <DerhamCole@schouse.gov>, "Greg Delleney" <GregDelleney@schouse.gov>, "Laurie Slade
- 20 Funderburk" <LaurieFunderburk@schouse.gov>, "Daniel Hamilton"
- 21 <DanHamilton@schouse.gov>, "Jenny Horne" <JennyHorne@schouse.gov>, "Peter McCoy"
- 22 <PeterMcCoy@schouse.gov>, "Walt McLeod" <WaltMcLeod@schouse.gov>, "Wendy
- 23 Nanney" <WendyNanney@schouse.gov>, "Todd Rutherford" <ToddRutherford@schouse.gov>,
- 24 "Bakari Sellers" <BakariSellers@schouse.gov>, "Garry Smith" <GarrySmith@schouse.gov>,
- 25 "Mike Sottile" <MikeSottile@schouse.gov>, "Leon Stavrinakis"
- 26 <leonStavrinakis@schouse.gov>, "Eddie Tallon" <EddieTallon@schouse.gov>, "Thad Viers"
- 27 <tviers@yahoo.com>, "David Weeks" <DavidWeeks@schouse.gov>, "Seth Whipper"
- 28 <SethWhipper@schouse.gov>, "Tom Young" <TomYoung@schouse.gov>,