



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on November 26, 2018

New Bill Bans Building AR-15s and Buying, Selling Parts for Firearms

Representative Frank Pallone, Jr. (D-N.J.) has submitted a bill that, if passed into law, would be one of the most expansive restrictions on firearms and firearm accessories ever enacted in the United States.

Pallone's legislation, H.R. 7115, mandates the prohibition of all the following:



- prohibit the sale, acquisition, distribution in commerce, or import into the United States of certain firearm receiver castings or blanks, assault weapon parts kits, and machinegun [sic] parts kits and the marketing or advertising of such castings or blanks and kits on any medium of electronic communications, to require homemade firearms to have serial numbers, and for other purposes.

Beyond the obvious congressional overreach and oath-breaking that is central to every provision in this gun grab, the title itself is purposefully misleading, amounting to nothing more than "click bait."

Titled the "3D Firearms Prohibition Act," 3D printed firearms or firearm accessories are only the tip of this totalitarian iceberg.

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

Consider, for example, that if you build guns for a hobby and this bill passes, you'd better look for another hobby.

I know many of you are saying, "There's no way a bill like this passes." Yes, you'd think that, wouldn't you?

Reading the bill closely, it is obvious that the bill has nearly nothing to do with 3D printing of guns, but anyone aware of the fact that congressmen rarely read the bills they vote on also realizes that this broad ban could actually make it through the House and the Senate relying on nothing more than its name.

Does anyone reading this article doubt that there are scores of lawmakers in D.C. who would vote for a "ban on 3D printing of guns" even if the bill has very little to do with that subject? How many bills claiming to be one thing are actually nothing more than tyrannical Trojan Horses, hiding betrayal of the Constitution?

Here's [Ammoland's summary](#) of just how huge an impact on the right to keep and bear arms



Representative Pallone's bill would make:

The bill will ban the selling and all forms of advertising of parts kits for modern sporting rifles. Upper and Lower parts kit allow a user to build their own guns using a stripped lower or upper receiver.

In a vast majority of these situations, the user buys a serialized lower receiver from a gun dealer. These serialized lower receivers are considered firearms and fall under all state and federal firearms laws. They require a background check like any other firearm.

By preventing the sale of parts kits, the bill would make it almost impossible to repair a rifle. When something breaks, the gun would be useless. The bill doesn't seem to exempt licensed gunsmiths from the law. It would make all semi-automatic rifles impossible to repair even by a licensed gunsmith.

The writers of the bill also did not specify their definition of a parts kit. A drop-in trigger could run afoul of this new law if the federal government decides to define such a device as a "parts kit." It leaves the door wide open for more gun bans by redefining "parts kit."

Now, there are many ways for Americans to actively oppose this attempt to leave them less prepared to prevent being left disarmed and disadvantaged against criminals and congressman.

First, and perhaps the most obvious and least effective, is for Americans to contact their federal representatives and senators, reminding them of the sacred oath they took upon taking office. Any congressman or senator who would vote in favor of reducing the scope of the Second Amendment is an oath breaker, and a tyrant. Period.

Now, if Americans are serious about walling themselves off from any and all attempts by agents of the federal government — including regulations issued by any of the scores of executive branch bureaucrats — they must rebuild and buttress the barricades of federalism, namely state governments.

Every state in this union retains this right of refusal owing to their role as creators of the federal government because they, the states, created the federal government and reserve the right to resist the exercise by Congress of any powers not specifically granted to it by the states in the Constitution.

States are, it is true, bound by the terms of their agreement (the Constitution) that created the federal government, but they have no obligation to sustain acts of the central government that go beyond the boundaries of that agreement.

This principle is easy to understand by answering the following question: Would anyone enter into an agreement with others to create an entity that would have unlimited authority over them?

A better question is: Could they create a government with greater power than they themselves possessed?

State governments could not create a central authority with any degree of power unless they held that power in at least an equal degree prior to the latter's creation. Put another way, could the states give the central government something they themselves did not already possess? The very thought is ludicrous!

To better appreciate this concept, take it down to the personal level. It is logical and apparent to anyone that I can't give one of my neighbors permission to rummage through the garage of another neighbor because I don't have that power myself. I can't give my neighbor permission to paint another neighbor's



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on November 26, 2018

house because I don't have that right, either. I could, on the other hand, give my neighbor permission to paint my own house because I have that authority. Why do we fail to breakdown these questions of sovereignty and power into more manageable questions that every man, woman, and child could understand and give correct and rational answers?

Fortunately, when it comes to the right to keep and bear arms, not only did the states give no power to the federal government to interfere in it, but they explicitly prohibited it from infringing whatsoever on this critical liberty.

The Second Amendment states, "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."

James Madison, in *Federalist*, No. 46, reminds states that their best defense against federal despotism would be the "refusal to cooperate with officers of the Union" when those officers are attempting to enforce unconstitutional acts.

Finally, you may wonder why I didn't defend the right to use a 3D printer to manufacture weapons in an article about a bill called "3D Firearms Prohibition Act."

Well, there's a simple answer: Representative Pallone's bill has nothing to do with 3D printing and everything to do with the despotic disarmament of the American people.

Photo: TheAlphaWolf via [Wikimedia](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.