

the murder rate by more than 50 percent. You would cut the number of accidents, accidental shootings, purportedly accidental shootings, by more than 50 percent. And if that occurred, then it would be a situation where, oh, if you took away all guns then you wouldn't have any accidental shootings, none whatsoever. I was thinking about those between strangers, but you wouldn't have any. So that in itself would be an argument in favor of taking all firearms. But that is never going to happen. You can look at a different argument which is not given by anybody and that is the argument that a felon should not automatically be prohibited from owning a firearm. Even if a person has been convicted of a felony, if somebody has been convicted of a felony involving a violent crime, that person still is entitled to exercise the right of self-defense. Since the use of guns and defending one's self or others is considered a right protected by the Constitution and recognized by the laws and the courts, then a felon should not be denied the use of any legal means to defend himself or herself. So the kinds of arguments that are given throughout the discussion of the issue of firearm regulation are not well thought out. They are emotional, they skim the surface, and they don't get to the real problems. Now there are people in this Legislature and probably Legislatures throughout the country who would look at a fellow like Oliver North and say, oh, Ollie certainly ought to have the right to own a firearm or two, short guns, pistols. I read this morning where he and that other criminal have gone into the bullet proof vest business and now they are going to make a living. And Ollie said he wears his bullet proof vest all the time and the comfort is amazing. It's light weight, gives you the best protection imaginable. So if you wear one of his vests then you're safe from all those people toting the guns that he feels ought to have the right to tote the guns. And the NRA I'm sure would say Ollie should have the right to tote a gun. So should G. Gordon Liddy and all those Watergaters. So what they do is look at the individual who is the felon and the type of felony committed and make a determination that after all not all felons should be denied the right to own and use firearms. Either all felons should not use them or all felons should be allowed to use them. The mere fact that a person is a felon is no indication that he or she is violent. If they were going to restrict the ownership of guns based on the commission of a crime to a crime that involved a firearm, that is one thing. But to just say for public relations purposes that anybody convicted of a felony should not be allowed to own a pistol doesn't make sense at all if you're going to adopt the