

Larry Skidmore

As we witness wholesale destruction of businesses and lives in communities across Texas and the US, and as local government bodies reduce and / or eliminate local police budgets, the responsibility for protecting family members and personal property has become paramount for law abiding individuals. As previously decided by the US Supreme Court, local police are not held responsible for any individual's protection. As such, I am in support of strengthening laws that support individual rights for firearm ownership regardless if the use is personal protection, legal hunting, shooting sports, collecting, or simply for personal enjoyment.

When the local and state lawmakers are ready to get serious about crime and killings and murders, then these lawmakers will begin to evaluate the real issue: inanimate objects do not commit crimes, killings, and murders. It is violent people doing these things. For the past 50 years, our laws and regulations have progressively reduced consequences for bad behavior in homes, classrooms, offices, and even by elected government officials. This week people in our nation are engaged in peaceful demonstrations and exercising a Constitutional Right. This week also other people are violently rioting, destroying public and private property, and harming and killing their fellow man without fear of consequence, no fear because there was never consequence for bad behavior in their past.

I am writing to express my opposition to any calls by any party for additional gun control legislation in the State of Texas or within the boundaries of the United States.

I am writing to express my support of legislative reforms which are pro-gun reforms of prior legislative actions.

I am against so called red flag laws allowing gun confiscation from gun owners without strict court procedures.

I am against laws which ban certain, or any, semi-automatic firearms (handguns or long guns) which have been legal for individual ownership for longer than I have been alive. It is a silly notion on the part of lawmakers to believe that the criminals using semi-automatic weapons will suddenly stop using these after a law is enacted. It is not the weapon, rate of fire, or magazine capacity that define criminal behavior. There is no such thing as "gun violence", there are only people acting violently. Take away access to guns and violent people will still be violent, even if they have to resort to rocks, sticks, frozen water bottles, boards, fire, automobiles, swords, knives, spears, etc.

I am against laws that limit standard capacity of firearm magazines.

I am against so-called universal background checks. The existing laws for businesses selling firearms should be sufficient. There is no criminal who cares about following this type of restriction. I am against the government being involved in private exchanges between law-abiding individuals. Taken to extreme, which can illustrate the absurdity of some actions, the government getting involved in private firearms transactions could just as easily become involved in transactions involving other personal items (garage sales, automobiles, homes, etc.) Although it may be a reform to consider if we could restrict car sales if the buyer's background check shows he is a DWI repeat offender, or restrict a home sale if the buyer has convictions of domestic abuse; or restrict the sales of alcohol to buyers with DWI, spousal abuse, or gambling addiction backgrounds.

Larry Skidmore

I am against any and all forms of firearms registration by any level of government. Have we learned nothing from history showing despotic leaders confiscating firearms to enforce their demented behaviors and ideas in countries around the world? "Politicians prefer unarmed peasants".

Criminals are not deterred by gun-free zones. On the contrary, criminals are pleased to ply their criminal ways in locations where there are no armed law-abiding citizens to get in their way.

I am in support of actions that speed the process allowing citizens to obtain permits for concealed carry of handguns. Add staff, update technology, and take other actions or reforms that enable law-abiding citizens to be armed if they choose.

"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."

If my state government cannot be trusted to respect this right as stated in the Second Amendment to our US Constitution, which other rights are in jeopardy?