



PO BOX 329
WAUPACA, WI 54981
888.202.1645
WISCONSINGUNOWNERS.ORG



Assembly Committee on Judiciary
Chair Ron Tusler
Room 22 West
State Capitol
PO Box 8953
Madison, WI 53708
Rep.Tusler@legis.wisconsin.gov

January 1, 2026

Cc: Committee Clerk Nick Schultz
Nick.Schultz@legis.wisconsin.gov

Re: AJR112

Dear Chair Tusler:

Please find below and enter into the record my testimony on behalf of Wisconsin Gun Owners, Inc. (WGO) in the matter of Assembly Joint Resolution 112.

Best regards,

Corey Graff
Executive Director

Testimony on AJR112—Constitutional Amendment

Position: SUPPORT

Thank you, Chair, and members of the committee, for holding an important hearing on Assembly Joint Resolution 112, which the members of Wisconsin Gun Owners, Inc. (WGO) support as proposed.

There is an urgent need to revise the State Constitution Right to Keep and Bear Arms, which, while well-intentioned in its current wording in our State Constitution, falls far short of the strong, bulletproof checks and balances required of a Constitutional amendment (the purpose of which is to protect We the People from having our rights infringed). The current language in Section 25 of the Wisconsin Constitution, "... the right of the people to keep and bear arms for security, defense, hunting, recreation, or any other lawful purpose" is mealy-mouthed and virtually meaningless.

Issue 1: Inalienable rights don't require a list of approved activities—security, defense, hunting, recreation—(can you imagine if the State said the people have the right to free speech for public speaking, talking on the telephone, and conversing with neighbors? Or ... The people have the right to exercise religion in an official church building, at a park, or in their home. There would, justifiably, be outrage at the imposition of State-approved activities under State-defined conditions.

Issue 2: "Lawful purpose"—Placing a right under purposes deemed lawful by the State reduces that right to a privilege. What if a future legislature outlaws gun ownership? It'll no longer be ... lawful.

PAGE 2

Issue 3: The current language in our State Constitution does not define or express the right as “inalienable.” The implication is that the State Constitution itself grants the right ... when in reality it should enumerate or state a pre-existing natural, or inalienable, right.

I will keep my summary remarks concise, because we believe the above three points take the argument and are self-evident. Experience shows that the current wording of Wisconsin’s State Constitution Right to Keep and Bear Arms has not served as a deterrent against frivolous attacks on the rights of Wisconsin’s gun owners.

For example, currently before the Wisconsin legislature, several bills threaten our rights; these are bills that gun owners have strongly voiced opposition to and range from so-called “red-flag” or extreme risk protection orders to lock-up-your-gun schemes and more. While proponents of these failed gun control ideas continually assert that their ideas are “common sense” and “reasonable,” the people who are true experts in firearms and firearm safety (gun owners) have consistently refuted them and rebutted these gun control attacks as infringements of our right to keep and bear arms.

Given the insistence by some groups and individuals to continue their assaults on our right to keep and bear arms at the state level—against experience, logic, history, and data—WGO supports the high threshold of strict scrutiny as applied to Wisconsin’s right to keep and bear arms amendment.

AJR112, as proposed by its authors, should provide a strong deterrence against ongoing attempts to stomp on Wisconsin citizens’ inalienable right to be armed.

Thank you.

Submitted by Corey Graff