suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1266) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with nonprofit organizations to investigate medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs on which the veterans and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Roe) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yes 423, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 661]

YEAS—423

Abraham
Adams
Adner
Agual
Allen
Amash
Arrington
Arkans
Akin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barlett
Barr
Barrassin
Barton
Bernie
Besh
Biggs
Bilirakis
Biggs
Beyer
Bergman
Beware
Berger
Berman
Bishop (CA)
Bishop (NJ)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blacksburg
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonacic
Bost
Boyle, Brendan (NY)
Braday (TX)
Braday (NY)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (DC)
Brown (MD)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne (CT)
Calvert
Capuano
Carabajal
Cardenas
Cardenas
Carson (CA)
Carson (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clark (NY)
Clay
Clinton
Clayton
Collin
Cohen
Coles
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Combs (NY)
Comps

Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lokken
Long
Londrimer
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham. M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Mallory, Neal
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McAuliffe
McClintock
McCollum
McEwen
McGovern
McHenry
McKernan
McNairy
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nemec
Newhouse
Nguyen
Norris
Norman
O’Halleran
O’Rourke
O’ Sullivan
Palazuelos

Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lokken
Long
Londrimer
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham. M.
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Mallory, Neal
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Mast
McAuliffe
McClintock
McCollum
McEwen
McGovern
McHenry
McKernan
McNairy
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nemec
Newhouse
Nguyen
Norris
Norman
O’Halleran
O’Rourke
O’ Sullivan
Palazuelos

Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Specter
Stekel
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MI)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titts
Toennies
Turner
Upfal
Valladares
Vargas
Velasquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walczak
Walker
Waltorski
Walters, Mimi
Walters, Maxine
Waters, Maxine
Webber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Winkelman
Womack
Woodall
Woodall
Wu
Yoho
Young (AK)
Zeldin

H9685

There was no objection.

CONCEALED CARRY RECIPROCITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 645, I call up the bill (H.R. 38) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a means by which nonresidents of a State whose residents may carry concealed firearms may also do so in the State, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill provides, pursuant to House Resolution 645, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the subject of Rules Committee Print 115-45 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the amended bill as follows:

H.R. 38

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the "Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017".

TITLE I—CONCEALED CARRY RECIPROCITY ACT OF 2017

SEC. 101. RECIPROCITY FOR THE CARRYING OF CERTAIN CONCEALED FIREARMS.

(a) In General.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 926c the following:

"§926d. Reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms

"(a) Notwithstanding any provision of the law of any State or political subdivision thereof (except as provided in subsection (b) and subject only to the requirements of this section, a person who is not prohibited by Federal law from possessing, transporting, or shipping, or receiving a firearm, who is carrying a valid identification document containing a photograph of the person, and who is carrying a valid carry permit issued pursuant to the law of a State and which permits the person to carry a concealed firearm or is entitled to carry a concealed firearm in the State in which the person resides, may possess or transport to the possession of a handgun (other than a machinegun or destructive device) that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce, in any State that—

"(1) has a statute under which residents of the State may apply for a license or permit to carry a concealed firearm; or

"(2) does not prohibit the carrying of concealed firearms by residents of the State for lawful purposes.

"(b) This section shall not be construed to supersede or limit the laws of any State that—

"(1) permit private persons or entities to prohibit or restrict the possession of concealed firearms on property; or

"(2) prohibit or restrict the possession of firearms on any State or local government property, installation, building, base, or park.

"(c)(1) A person who carries or possesses a concealed handgun in accordance with subsections (a) and (b) may not be arrested or otherwise detained for violation of any law or any rule or regulation of a State or any political subdivision thereof relating to the possession, transportation, or carrying of firearms unless there is probable cause to believe that the person
is doing so in a manner not provided for by this section. Presentation of facially valid documents as specified in subsection (a) is prima facie evidence that the individual has a license or permit as required by this section.

(2) When a person asserts this section as a defense in a criminal proceeding, the prosecution shall bear the burden of proving, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the conduct of the person did not satisfy the conditions set forth in subsection (a) and (b).

(3) When a person successfully asserts this section as a defense in a criminal proceeding, the court shall award the prevailing defendant a reasonable attorney's fee.

(4) In subsection (a), the term "provisions of section 922(q)" shall mean that the term includes, but is not limited to, the following:

(A) by striking "or" at the end of clause (i); and

(B) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (i) and inserting after clause (i) the following:

(iii) a qualified law enforcement officer who is a qualified law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926B) and is authorized under such section to carry a concealed firearm, if the firearm is concealed; or

(iv) by a qualified retired law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926C) who is authorized under such section to carry a concealed firearm.

(c) In subsection (b), the term "firearms" means firearms that are not prohibited by Federal law from being received as a firearm.

(d)(1) A person who possesses or carries a concealed handgun under subsection (a) shall not be subject to the prohibitions of section 922(q) with respect to that handgun.

(2) A person possessing or carrying a concealed handgun in a State under subsection (a) may do so in any of the following areas in the State that are open to the public:

(A) A unit of the National Park System.

(B) A unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System.

(C) Public land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

(D) Land administered and managed by the Army Corps of Engineers.

(E) Land administered and managed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

(F) Land administered and managed by the Forest Service.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for this chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 926C the following:

"926D. Reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.".

(c) SEVERABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, if any provision of this section, or any amendment made by this section, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, this section and amendments made by this section and the application of such amendment to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall be in effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 102. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title prohibits a law enforcement officer with reasonable suspicion of a violation of any law of the United States who is conducting a brief investigative stop in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 103. CERTAIN OFF-DUTY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ALLOWED TO CARRY A CONCEALED FIREARM AND DISCHARGE A FIREARM IN A SCHOOL ZONE.

Section 926D of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) by striking "or" at the end of clause (vii); and

(B) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (vii) and inserting after clause (vii) the following:

(viii) a qualified retired law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926C) who is authorized under such section to carry a concealed firearm, if the firearm is concealed; or

(2) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(A) by striking "or" at the end of clause (iii); (B) by striking the period at the end of clause (iv); and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

(1) by an off-duty law enforcement officer who is a qualified law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926B) and is authorized under such section to carry a concealed firearm; or

(2) by a qualified retired law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926C) who is authorized under such section to carry a concealed firearm.

SEC. 104. INTERSTATE CARRYING OF FIREARMS BY FEDERAL JUDGES.

(a) In General.—Subtitle B of chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 101(a) of this Act, is amended by inserting after section 926D the following:

"§926E. Interstate carrying of firearms by Federal judges.—

(1) Notwithstanding any provision of the law of any State or political subdivision thereof, a Federal judge may carry a concealed firearm in any State if such judge is authorized under such section to carry a concealed firearm.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for this chapter, as amended by section 101(b) of this act, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 926D the following:

"926E. Interstate carrying of firearms by Federal judges.".

TITLE II—FIX NICS ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Fix NICS Act of 2017".

SEC. 202. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.

Section 1007 of title 34, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking the period at the end of clause (i) and adding in its place the following:

(2) after clause (i) the following:

(III) a needs assessment, including estimated compliance costs; and

(IV) an estimated date by which the Federal department or agency will fully comply with record submission requirements under subparagraph (C).

(b) BENCHMARK REQUIREMENTS.—Each plan established under clause (i) shall include annual benchmarks to enable the Attorney General to assess implementation of the plan, including—

(I) qualitative goals and quantitative measures;

(II) measures to monitor internal compliance, including any reporting failures and inaccuracies; and

(III) a needs assessment, including estimated compliance costs; and

(c) COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION.—Not later than the end of each fiscal year beginning after the date of the establishment of a plan under clause (i), the Attorney General shall determine whether the applicable Federal department or agency has achieved compliance with the benchmarks included in the plan.

(d) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Attorney General shall publish, including on the website of the Department of Justice, and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a biennial report on the activities and accomplishments of the Federal departments and agencies implementing this title.

(e) DETAILED SUMMARY.—The Attorney General may submit periodic summaries, including any reporting failures and inaccuracies, to the appropriate committees of Congress.
“(v) a detailed summary of the contents and status, broken down by department or agency, of the implementation plans established under subparagraph (G); and
“(vi) the reasons for which the Attorney General has determined that a Federal department or agency is not in substantial compliance with an implementation plan established under subparagraph (D)(ii)

“(J) NONCOMPLIANCE PENALTIES.—For each of fiscal years 2019 through 2022, the Attorney General shall impose a civil money penalty against the Department or agency that has failed to comply with the record submission requirements under subparagraph (C), and is not in substantial compliance with an implementation plan established under subparagraph (D)(ii), if the Department or agency is not in substantial compliance with all eligibility requirements; and

“(K) BIENNIAL ASSESSMENT.—Every 2 years, the Attorney General shall prepare a report, evaluated under subsection (G), which the actions taken under the title II of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993, as of the date of enactment of this Act, and including the initiative described in subparagraph (A); and

“(L) APPLICATION TO FEDERAL COURTS.—For purposes of this section—

“(i) the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall provide, for a Federal court, the functions assigned to the head of a department or agency; and

“(ii) the Attorney General shall—

“(A) establish an implementation plan under this section; and

“(B) provide technical assistance and training services to grantees under this section.

SEC. 204. NATIONAL CRIMINAL HISTORY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) STATE GRANT PROGRAM FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE IDENTIFICATION, INFORMATION, AND COMMUNICATION.—Section 102 of the Brady Criminal Identification Technology Act of 1998 (34 U.S.C. 40301) is amended—

“(1) in subsection (a)(3)—

“(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) as subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F), respectively; and

“(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) identification of all individuals who have been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term of at least 1 year; and

“(2) in subsection (b)(6)—

“(A) by striking ‘(18 USC 922 note)’ and inserting ‘(34 USC 40901(b))’; and

“(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ‘, including through increased efforts to pre-validate the contents of those records to expedite eligibility determinations’;

“(2) in subsection (e), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION INITIATIVE.—

“(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—For each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022, the Attorney General shall establish a Domestic Violence and Violence Prevention Initiative under the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (commonly known as ‘NARIP’) for a Domestic Abuse and Violence Prevention Initiative that emphasizes the need for improved coordination among Federal, State, and local government agencies to utilize the NICS database to prevent the issuance of firearms to domestic abuse and violent offenders.

“(B) FUNDING.—The Attorney General—

“(i) may use not more than 50 percent of the amounts made available under section 107 of the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to carry out the initiative described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) shall give a funding preference under NARIP to States that—

“(A) have established an implementation plan under section 107; and

“(B) will use amounts made available under this subsection to identify and upload all felony conviction records and domestic violence records described in clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) of subparagraph (A) of section 102(b)(1)(C) by not later than September 30, 2021.

“(C) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Attorney General shall—

“(i) assist States that are not currently eligible for grants under this section to achieve compliance with all eligibility requirements; and

“(ii) provide technical assistance and training services to grantees under this section.

(b) GRANTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CRIMINAL HISTORY IDENTIFICATION, INFORMATION, AND COMMUNICATION.—(1) in subsection (b)(3), by inserting before the date of enactment of this Act—

“(A) the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993 (34 U.S.C. 40911 et seq.) is amended by adding the following:

“(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Attorney General shall provide technical assistance and training services to grantees under this section.

“(2) in subsection (b)(6)—

“(A) by striking ‘(18 USC 922 note)’ and inserting ‘(34 USC 40901(b))’; and

“(B) by inserting after paragraph (B) the following:

“(C) identification of all individuals who have been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term of at least 1 year; and

“(2) in subsection (c)—

“(A) by striking ‘immediately correct the applicable record’ and inserting ‘the State or Indian tribal government has achieved substantial compliance with the benchmarks included in the plan’; and

“(B) by striking ‘immediately correct the applicable record’ and inserting ‘the State or Indian tribal government has achieved substantial compliance with the benchmarks included in the plan’; and

“(3) in subparagraph (C)—

“(A) by striking “upon establishment of the national system,” and

“(B) by striking “and the period at the end and inserting “; and

“(4) by adding at the end the following—

“(D) to establish and achieve compliance with an implementation plan under section 107 of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007.”

SEC. 205. IMPROVING INFORMATION SHARING WITH THE STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title I of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (34 U.S.C. 40911 et seq.) is amended by adding the following:

“(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Attorney General shall—

“(I) have established an implementation plan under section 107 of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007; and

“(J) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Attorney General may fund any programs, projects, activities, or initiatives of the States that are not in substantial compliance with an implementation plan established under subsection (b) to—

“(1) submit a plan to improve efforts to identify and upload all felony conviction records and domestic violence records described in clauses (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) of subparagraph (A) of section 102(b)(1)(C) by not later than September 30, 2021.

“(2) identify any government that has not been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term of at least 1 year;

“(3) provide technical assistance and training services to State and Indian tribal government agencies.

“(3) in subsection (d), by inserting after “un-
a determination of substantial compliance under subsection (c) for the fiscal year in which the grant was solicited. 

"(f) BIENNIAL ASSESSMENT.—Every 2 years, the Attorney General shall assess the extent to which the actions taken under title II of the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017 have resulted in improvements in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40903).

SEC. 106. NOTIFICATION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES OF PROHIBITED PURCHASE OF PROHIBITED FIREARMS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a background check conducted by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System pursuant to the request of a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer of firearms (as such terms are defined in section 921 of title 18, United States Code), which background check determines that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, and such determination is made after 3 business days have elapsed since the licensee contacted the System and a firearm has been transferred to that person, the System shall notify the law enforcement agencies described in this subsection are the law enforcement agencies that have jurisdiction over the location of the residence of the person for which the background check was conducted, as follows:

"(1) The field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"(2) The local law enforcement agency.

"(3) The State law enforcement agency.

"(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–180; 121 Stat. 2559) is amended by inserting after the heading of the subsection "Sec. 107. Implementation plan.

"Sec. 107. Implementation plan.

"Sec. 108. Notification to law enforcement agencies of prohibited purchase of a firearm.".

SEC. 206. ATTORNEY GENERAL REPORT ON USE OF CONCEALED CARRY PERMITS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Using amounts made available for research, evaluation, or statistical purposes, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a written report that:

"(1) specifies the number of instances in which a bump stock has been used in the commission of a crime in the United States;

"(2) specifies the types of firearms with which a bump stock has been so used; and

"(3) contains the opinion of the Attorney General as to whether subparagraphs (B)(i) and (C)(i) of section 921(c)(1) of title 18, United States Code, apply to all instances in which a bump stock has been used in the commission of a crime of violence in the United States.

"(b) DEFINITION OF BUMP STOCK.—In this section, the term ‘bump stock’ means a device that—

"(1) attaches to a semiautomatic rifle (as defined in section 921(a)(28) of title 18, United States Code);

"(2) is designed and intended to repeatedly activate the trigger without the deliberate and volitional act of the user pulling the trigger each time the firearm is fired; and

"(3) functions by continuous forward pressure applied to the rifle's fore end in conjunction with a fixed or backward sliding motion of the mechanism utilizing the recoil energy when the rifle is discharged.

SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to carry out, in accordance with the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 1998, the National Criminal History Improvement Program, and the National Criminal History Improvement Program, the activities under—

"(1) section 102 of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 1998; and

"(2) section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

"(b) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—Section 1001(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)) is amended—

"(1) in paragraph (1)—

"(A) by striking "33,000,000": and inserting "33,000,000":

"(B) by striking "1994 and 1995" and inserting "2018 through 2022";

"(2) in paragraph (2)—

"(A) by striking "33,000,000": and inserting "27,000,000":

"(B) by striking "1994 and 1995" and inserting "2018 through 2022";

"(3) by inserting , in addition to any amounts otherwise made available for research, evaluation or statistical purposes in a fiscal year before the period, among.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be detable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 38.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, throughout my career in elected office, I have believed in and adhered to two fundamental principles regarding firearms policy: first, the right guaranteed to law-abiding Americans by the Second Amendment must be aggressively protected and preserved; second, the laws we have on the books need to be enforced to the fullest extent possible. The bipartisan bill before us today does both.

H.R. 38 ensures that law-abiding citizens' Second Amendment right does not end when they cross State lines. The bill allows law-abiding gun owners with valid State-issued concealed carry firearm permits or those who live in so-called constitutional carry States to carry a concealed firearm in any other State that also allows concealed carry.

We know that citizens who carry a concealed firearm are not only better prepared to act in their own self-defense but also in the defense of others. Take, for instance an incident that occurred just last November on a highway in Florida. Lee County Sheriff's Deputy Dean Bardes had just concluded a high-speed chase just off Interstate 75. As Deputy Bardes approached to apprehend the suspect, Edward Strother, violently attacked Deputy Bardes.

A witness on the scene told reporters that the attacker “just started punching him and hitting and hitting and hitting. I was afraid for the police officer. I thought he was going to kill him.”

Fortunately, for Deputy Bardes, Ashad Russell, a Florida concealed carry permit holder, was also watching the attack unfold. Mr. Russell pulled his gun and approached the altercation. He told Strother he would shoot him if he didn’t stop beating the deputy. The State Attorney’s Office said Strother ignored Russell’s commands to stop beating the deputy, so Russell fired his gun three times, hitting and fatally wounding the assailant. Lee County Sheriff Mike Scott has hailed Russell as a hero.

Importantly, this bill also contains the Fix NICS Act of 2017. This is a bipartisan and bicameral measure. The Fix NICS Act takes steps to ensure that State and Federal agencies enter all relevant records into the FBI’s National Instant Criminal Background Check System. This bill will help ensure people who are legally prohibited from having guns, like those with violent felony convictions, do not obtain them.

The shooting at Virginia Tech and the church shooting in Charleston, South Carolina, and Sutherland Springs, Texas, are tragic reminders of what can happen when all relevant records are not entered into the system.

Our NICS system is only as good as the information within it. This important piece of legislation will ensure that more of the information already required to be uploaded to NICS under current law is actually placed in the NICS system.

Taken together, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act and the Fix NICS Act preserve and protect the right guaranteed to us by the Second Amendment and ensure that those prohibited by existing law from receiving a firearm are prevented from doing so.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I want to thank the lead sponsor, Mr. HUDSON of North Carolina, for his hard work on this bill. I would also like to thank the authors of the Fix NICS provisions, Mr. CULBERTSON and Mr. CUELLAR, for their important contributions to the legislation before us today.
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act. This bill would not protect us from gun violence, but it would make us far less safe.

Under current law, each State makes its own determination about who may carry a concealed firearm in public, including deciding which other States’ concealed carry permits to recognize. This bill would eviscerate the core public safety determinations that each State makes concerning the concealed carrying of guns in public based on the unique circumstances of each State and the desires of its citizens. In fact, the standards and requirements adopted in the States vary dramatically:

Thirty-one States and D.C. require gun safety training to carry concealed guns in public, and 21 of those States require live-fire training; 27 States and the District of Columbia prohibit individuals convicted of misdemeanor crimes of violence from concealed carry; 28 States and D.C. prohibit convicted stalkers from carrying concealed guns; 34 States and D.C. prohibit those under 21 years of age from carrying concealed guns. Many States prohibit gun possession and concealed carry by abusive dating partners, exceeding Federal protections against abuse.

All of these States would have their carefully considered laws governing concealed carry overridden by this bill.

The obvious solution to the varying State laws is to continue to do what is currently done by many States, which is to choose which other State permits they will recognize. Some States, including my State of New York, have chosen not to recognize permits issued by any other State. Most States, however, have chosen to recognize permits from other States, basing the choice on the strength and standards employed by the other States.

We should not disregard these determinations, which is what this bill would do. Instead, this bill would say that every State must honor the concealed carry permit of every other State. About 10 States don’t have any requirements and issue a concealed carry permit upon request to anyone.

What this bill would do, in effect, is to say that if New York or Illinois have strict requirements for concealed carry, if someone comes in from a State that allows, they have got to let that person have concealed carry in their State. In effect, it uses the power of the Federal Government to import the laws of one State and make them enforceable in the other State.

In addition, I am deeply disappointed that this bill before us today includes the bipartisan Fix NICS Act, a measure that should be enacted as a stand-alone bill without delay, and that was reported as a separate bill by the Judiciary Committee.

That bill would take steps to address shortcomings with the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, or what we often call the NICS. As the DoD auditor at the church in Sutherland Springs, Texas, illustrates, we must do more to ensure all relevant prohibiting records are submitted to the databases that comprise the NICS. No one should pass a firearm background check that he or she should have failed simply because their record of a felony conviction, or domestic violence record, or some other prohibition under Federal law was not included in the system.

There is broad bipartisan support for the Fix NICS bill here in the House and in the Senate. That proposal, which would actually save lives, should not be tethered to the forced concealed carry reciprocity provisions of this bill, which would only serve to endanger our citizens.

The answer to our national problem of gun violence is not that we need more people carrying concealed firearms on our streets. More than 33,000 Americans lose their lives to gun violence every year, while, in some other countries, this figure barely exceeds 100. In 2011, the United Kingdom had 146 deaths due to gun violence; Denmark, 71; Portugal, 142; Japan, just 30; the United States, over 30,000.

A study in The American Journal of Medicine found that, compared to 22 other high-income countries, the gun-related murder rate in the United States is 25 times higher. The common factor in all of these other countries is the lack of such easy availability of guns. Our country, however, is awash in guns, and we have the shameful death toll to show for it. Sadly, this bill will only increase it.

We must change our approach to gun violence. Unfortunately, the dangers posed by the concealed carry reciprocity portion of this bill greatly outweigh the benefits of the NICS improvements; therefore, I oppose H.R. 38, and urge my colleagues to reject it today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), the lead sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you a story. It is a story about an African-American single mother, two kids, living in south Philly. After twice being the victim of muggings, she decides to go out and legally purchase a firearm to protect herself, gets trained with her concealed carry permit and applies for a concealed carry permit.

Sometime thereafter, she crossed the State line into New Jersey and, at a routine traffic stop, did exactly as she was trained; handed her driver’s license and her concealed carry permit to the police officer and let him know that she had a pistol in her purse.

What she didn’t know is that the State of New Jersey doesn’t recognize the concealed carry permits of their neighbor in Pennsylvania. So this poor single mother, who has never had a brush with the law, spent almost 50 days in jail and was looking at 10 years in prison.

Are you serious? We have to make sure that never happens again.

The other side today is going to argue that we are violating States’ rights with this legislation; but Article IV, section 1, the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution, says very clearly that every State should give the full faith and credit to the judicial proceedings and documents of every other State, and that Congress has a responsibility to determine how those documents will be recognized.

That is why a driver’s license is recognized in every State. That is why, if I get married in North Carolina but I move to Arizona, I am not a single man again. They recognize that marriage. They recognize that divorce. They recognize that marriage or divorce will be recognized in every State. The concealed carry permit should be recognized the same way.

But this is not trampling States’ rights, because States can still determine what can be carried, where it can be carried. They can set any kind of limits they want about how weapons are carried in their municipalities or their States.

For example, if you visit the State of New York, they have a limit on the size of a magazine on a pistol. You have got to follow that law. If they want to set restrictions about places where you can’t carry, even with this legislation, that law would have to be followed. The States retain this right, just like a driver’s license.

The other side is also going to stand up and claim all kinds of doomsday scenarios about how we are going to increase crime; we are going to increase the number of weapons out there; we are going to turn the cities into the Wild West.

I find it ironic that we are being lectured to by people from big cities with a lot of gun control measures but have some of the worst crime in the Nation. They are worried about people coming from other places where we don’t have crime. I think that is ironic.

But the truth is, over half the States already recognize permits from every other State; 19 States, in fact, already do this. States and municipalities, as I mentioned, retain the right to restrict where guns are carried in their communities, even under this legislation.

And if you look at the empirical evidence, places where you have concealed carry have the lowest crime. They have got to follow that law. When you instituted this right, violent crime went down. Gun crime went down. You have seen less crime, not more crime.
Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the problems that my good friend just mentioned on the floor can be solved by real, sensible gun safety legislation. Unfortunately, H.R. 38 is not that, and it is not that because it has ignored the pleas of law enforcement, and it has ignored the rational addition of amendments that would save lives.

H.R. 38 is dangerous, it is reckless, and it is secretly packaged as a fix to gun violence, but, instead, it is laced with lethal elements of catastrophic proportion. Then, in the midnight hour, it matches the NICS Fix, dealing with the background checks, with the concealed carry reciprocity. That is patently unfair, Mr. Speaker.

Then it would not allow reasonable amendments, exposing victims of domestic violence to the danger of a bill. Then it would add it. It would have exposed them, victims of domestic violence, to stalkers, and those who have been involved in domestic violence to gun violence or death.

It will entice those who perpetrate hate crimes. It will add to the current alarming death rate. Unfortunately, where we could have fixed the NICS, it does not do that.

Approximately, 556 women have been murdered this year alone by intimate partners with firearms. My amendment would have made this bill safer on the concealed carry permit holders. Think about that. Police officers don’t commit crimes very often, but when they commit crimes, more than concealed carry permit holders. These are not the people we are worried about. These are not the violent criminals that we are worried about in our cities.

This is a commonsense measure that upholds our constitutional right. It makes sure that a law-abiding citizen trying to do the right thing doesn’t become a criminal simply because they cross that line.

So for every freedom-loving American who exercises their Second Amendment right, today is your day. To the 73 percent of Americans who support concealed carry, today is your day. To the 15 million concealed carry permit holders out there, today is your day. And finally, to the single mothers out there who just want to protect themselves and their families, today is your day.

I thank the chairman for his leadership on this. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the problems that my good friend just mentioned on the floor can be solved by real, sensible gun safety legislation. Unfortunately, H.R. 38 is not that, and it is not that because it has ignored the pleas of law enforcement, and it has ignored the rational addition of amendments that would save lives.

H.R. 38 is dangerous, it is reckless, and it is secretly packaged as a fix to gun violence, but, instead, it is laced with lethal elements of catastrophic proportion. Then, in the midnight hour, it matches the NICS Fix, dealing with the background checks, with the concealed carry reciprocity. That is patently unfair, Mr. Speaker.

Then it would not allow reasonable amendments, exposing victims of domestic violence to the danger of a bill. Then it would add it. It would have exposed them, victims of domestic violence, to stalkers, and those who have been involved in domestic violence to gun violence or death.

It will entice those who perpetrate hate crimes. It will add to the current alarming death rate. Unfortunately, where we could have fixed the NICS, it does not do that.

Approximately, 556 women have been murdered this year alone by intimate partners with firearms. My amendment would have made this bill safer on the concealed carry permit holders. Think about that. Police officers don’t commit crimes very often, but when they commit crimes, more than concealed carry permit holders. These are not the people we are worried about. These are not the violent criminals that we are worried about in our cities.

This is a commonsense measure that upholds our constitutional right. It makes sure that a law-abiding citizen trying to do the right thing doesn’t become a criminal simply because they cross that line.

So for every freedom-loving American who exercises their Second Amendment right, today is your day. To the 73 percent of Americans who support concealed carry, today is your day. To the 15 million concealed carry permit holders out there, today is your day. And finally, to the single mothers out there who just want to protect themselves and their families, today is your day.

I thank the chairman for his leadership on this. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense legislation.
Every year on average, 114,994 people are shot, of which 33,880 people die from gun violence and of those shot, 17,012 of those victims are children and teens. Therefore, we lose at least 2,647 of our children a year to senseless gun violence.

There is no reasonable argument or claim that we should be devoting our efforts to saving lives, not opening up the flood gate to more carnage by snuffing innocent lives in passing H.R. 38.

This bill will amplify tragedies such as Sandy Hook Elementary, Charleston, SC, Florida’s Pulse night club, San Bernardino, Las Vegas bump stocks killings, Texas recent church massacre, and the countless lives lost on our streets across this country daily.

Although the NRA argues that the United States is a dangerous place and that owning and carrying a gun is in only way to protect oneself and one’s family, there are over 30,000 dead.

Removing safeguards intended to protect the public against potential harm or deadly force by private individuals jeopardizes universally recognized human rights—including the right to life.

H.R. 38 prohibits Congress’ ability to address gun violence in a constructive and realistic manner? Adding more guns to our streets and loosening existing laws is extremely dangerous and counterproductive to ensuring public safety.

Disguising the danger in this bill, by wrapping it in the cloth of H.R. 4477, a more sensible measure, does not negate the toxicity level of H.R. 38.

In response to the TX recent church shooting, my amendment strengthened H.R. 4477 by requiring DoD to conduct a more comprehensive review of the procedures used by each branch of the Armed Forces to ensure that there is substantial compliance with the DoD instruction 5505.11 entitled, “Fingerprint Card and Final Disposition Report Submission Requirements”, dated December 1, 1998. But again, these amendments were blocked.

Unlike H.R. 4477, the Fix NICS Act, a bipartisan measure and good first step, which aims to improve key elements in the submission of information by federal and state agencies to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) and which I supported, H.R. 38 is not designed to serve.

For the reasons stated above, I oppose this Rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds, and I include in the RECORD an article entitled, "‘Good Samaritan’ Kills Active Shooter in Texas Sports Bar," in which a shooter with two guns and two knives entered a sports bar and was shot by an individual that the police labeled a Good Samaritan who happened to be eating at the restaurant with his wife. He was a concealed carry permit holder. He told his wife to get down on the ground, and then he shot the assailant.

At the time of negotiations, I insisted on the inclusion of the NICS program. Under this system, firearms dealers use the FBI’s NICS system to cross-reference with a list of known convicted felons, drug users, illegal aliens, and those convicted of domestic violence.

As I have stated many times, the NICS system is only as good as the records that are put into it. Too often, people who otherwise would not pass a background check can slip through the cracks and buy guns.

After the recent shooting in Sutherland Springs, Texas, the U.S. Air Force disclosed that it had failed to report the gunman’s history of domestic assault to the database, which should have prevented him from purchasing a firearm in the first place.

This legislation will provide a much-needed push to speed implementation of the NICS system used in conducting instant background checks prior to gun purchases. At the Federal level, it would require Federal agency cooperation and provide relevant records to the Attorney General for inclusion into the NICS. It holds firearms accountable if they fail to upload relevant records to the background check system through public reporting and prohibiting bonus pay for political appointees.

At the State level, it will incentivize them to make sure that their reporting is up to date by giving Federal grant preferences to States which comply.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. This bill is not about expanding background checks. This is about ensuring that the existing law is working. There is strong bipartisan support for improving what has become the systemic problem of missing information in the database. Accurate reporting is essential to ensuring that the system works as intended.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article by Mark Kelly entitled ‘‘Good Guys With Guns Can Be Dangerous, Too. Don’t Gut Conceal Carry Laws. Why is Congress about to Vote to Loose Gun Laws Again?’’ a letter from Major Cities Chiefs Association opposing H.R. 38; a letter from the Chief of Police from the City of Houston; and, finally, a report from the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence.
‘GOOD GUYS WITH GUNS’ CAN BE DANGEROUS, TOO. DON’T GUT CONCEALED CARRY LAWS
WHY IS CONGRESS ABOUT TO VOTE TO LOOSEN GUN LAWS AGAIN?
(By Mark Kelly)

That day in Tucson, amid a gun tragedy, one shot got shot. It was Saturday, Jan. 8, 2011, and a mentally ill young man who’d gotten his hand on a gun opened fire on my wife, then-Rep. Gabrielle Giffords (D-Ariz.), and her constituents at an event in a Safeway parking lot. He shot my wife in the head at close range, injured 12 others and took the lives of six people as he ran across a Safeway parking lot.

After Gabby’s will-be assassin dropped the full magazine as he sought to reload his gun and continued his rampage, people tackled him. He was eventually subdued as they waited for law enforcement to arrive and brought an end to the chaos. They were heroes.

The chaos nearly continued, though. Because the man who murdered those innocent people wasn’t the only one there with a loaded, concealed gun.

Joe Zamudio was shopping at a drugstore nearby when he heard the shots. Allowed to carry a concealed weapon under Arizona law, Zamudio recognized the sound of gunfire and rushed to the scene with his gun in his jack- et pocket, his hand on his weapon and ready to fire. But then Zamudio—a good guy trying to do the right thing—almost shot another good guy.

As he rounded the corner, he saw a man holding a gun. Zamudio confronted him: “Drop it, drop it!” he yelled.

But that man with a gun was a good guy, too. He was one of the heroes who had wrestled the shooter to the ground. And he was moments away from being shot for the wrong reason.

To his credit, Zamudio held his fire—just barely. As he recounted to reporters later, “It was a matter of seconds. . . . I was really wrong reason.

In other states, concealed carry laws have much lower standards. The 12 states with the weakest laws, permitless carry states, do not even require a permit. That means a resident of those states may carry concealed, concealed guns in public spaces without ever having passed a background check.

The bill would allow people who have a permit issued by any state—including permitless carry states—to carry loaded, concealed handguns in any other state that recognizes concealed carry. Even though they might not meet local public safety standards. This would mean an 18-year-old high school student from West Virginia would have a loaded, concealed firearm in New York City, where residents must be 21 to own a handgun.

And what would it mean for law enforcement officers by allowing anyone whose ability to carry a concealed weapon is questionably questioned by law enforcement to personally sue the officer. This bill would also effectively require them to be an expert on nationwide gun laws as they work to deter-

mine if it’s legal for someone from out of state to be carrying a gun in whatever state they might be visiting. Just as concerning, it would endow people will carry loaded, concealed guns will have to confront more people with guns. And think back to the tragedy in Tuc-

son: When law enforcement officers arrive at a crime scene, people are holding guns, how do they even know who the good guy is?

We need politicians to show courage and listen to the American people, who want stronger laws to make them safer, not give-

aways to gun lobbyists that threaten the safety of our school children. That’s exactly what this irresponsible bill would do. As members of Congress consider this bill, they have to ask themselves if they want to be remembered as voting to help the Wash-

ington gun lobby instead of supporting law enforcement and public safety. And they should know that their constituents are watching their decision closely.
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MAYOR CITIES CHIEFS ASSOCIATION
November 2, 2017
Hon. Paul Ryan,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Dear Speaker Ryan: On behalf of the Major Cities Chiefs, representing the Na-
tion’s largest metropolitan law enforcement agencies in the country, we are writing to voice our strong opposition to the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017, HR 38. Because we are responsible for public safety in juris-
dictions across the Nation, we recognize that this legislation would be an enormous mis-
take.

This measure is both impractical and con-
trary to the rights of States. Moreover, it raises Constitutional questions about the au-
-thority of Congress to direct State officers.

Concealed weapon permit laws have been tailoring the regulations and local com-munities over a period of many years.

An attempt by Congress to preempt these State laws forces States to accept the lowest minimum standard for concealed carry across the Nation, and creates a contradic-
tion between the standards required for Concealed carry and State laws.

The thousands of local permit formats will make enforcement impossible, because police officers would not be able to deter-
-mine if a person holding a permit issued in another State or locality. It would be impos-
sible for law enforcement to distinguish true permit carriers from criminals and illegal guns.

We are confident that members of Congress will respect the Constitutional sovereignty of the States and will not act with disregard for the many reasonable and prudent laws already in place across the Nation.

Sincerely,
J. Thomas Manger,
Chief of Police, Montgomery County Po-
ce Department, President.

City of Houston,
Houston Police Department,
Houston, TX, November 29, 2017.

Hon. Chuck Grassley,
Chairman,
Dear Chairman Grassley,
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Houston, TX, November 29, 2017.
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invented for killing and stealth. Once widespread, hunters would be unable to hear nearby gunfire and thus be endangered. Gun-shot detection systems in urban areas would be threatened if the proposed legislation would permit criminals to purchase and possess silencers without any screening requirements, which would be simply no legitimate justification for a measure that would further endanger the public.

Our Duty to Protect: Like those of us who wear a badge, members of Congress share our solemn duty to protect the public. The recent tragedies in Texas and Nevada should be recognized by Congress as cries for help from past and future innocent victims of gun violence. Chiefs of Police and Sheriffs join these victims in asking you to act now to prevent more death and bloodshed. We turn to you for courage and leadership to consider multiple steps and measures to curb the ongoing threat of gun violence in America.

Sincerely,

ART ACEVEDO,
Chief of Police.

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END SEXUAL & DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

December 1, 2017.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: As we enter the winter holiday season, we grieve for the approximately 556 women who will not celebrate the holidays with their families. The 556 women who have been murdered this year by intimate partners with firearms. As a country, we can and must do more to prevent the daily mass shootings that plague our nation, most of which are related to family violence.

Accordingly, we, the member organizations of the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence (NPDF), comprising national organizations working to end gender-based violence and representing hundreds of member programs and hundreds of thousands of survivors and advocates, write to you today to oppose the package containing both the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017, H.R. 38, and the Fix NICS Act of 2017, H.R.4434.

While the Fix NICS Act of 2017, H.R.4434, will protect victims of domestic violence by ensuring domestic violence records are properly and expeditiously submitted to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS), the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017 undermines the protections of victims of domestic violence, dating violence and stalking by destabilizing protections for victims of abuse and allowing domestic abusers to follow their victims across state lines with loaded, concealed firearms. This combined measure is incredibly dangerous and will negate any protections offered by the Fix NICS Act.

Firearms are regularly used as tools of power and control. A 2016 meta-analysis of existing literature found that approximately 4.5 million American women alive today have been threatened by abusers with firearms; of those, one million had either been shot or shot at by a partner. Firearms are also the weapon of choice for domestic violence homicides. An abuser’s mere access to a firearm increases the risk of intimate partner homicide by five times. Stalking is also a strong indicator of lethality, with one study of female murder victims in ten cities finding that 70% of women who were murdered by an intimate partner were threatened by firearms the previous year. Lawmakers have enacted strong, commonsense protections to prevent domestic violence homicides in states and localities across the nation and such protections must not be undermined by federally mandating concealed carry reciprocity.

States and Reciprocity Agreements: Currently, each state determines who can legally carry concealed, loaded firearms in public. Many states have enacted strong laws to protect victims and survivors of gun-enabled abuse beyond the vital but limited protections that come into existence when states enter into reciprocity agreements at their own discretion. The proposal before the Committee would take away this local control by requiring every state to allow the carry of state’s concealed weapons permits, thereby undermining states’ authority to make their own decisions as to what measures will provide the best protection for their citizens.

Victim Relocation: Often, victims of domestic violence, dating violence and stalking relocate to escape their abusers and seek refuge in states with stronger firearms protections. H.R. 38 would require states with strong protections for victims to accept the permits of states with weaker protections and allow domestic violence offenders to travel across state lines with loaded, concealed firearms. Domestic violence offenders could shop around for “out of state” permits, which are granted by ten states to non-residents, even if they do not meet the requirements to obtain a permit in their home state. Even if domestic abusers are prohibited from possessing firearms from their state of residence, they could obtain “out of state” permits and cross state lines to threaten, harass and harm their victims with firearms.

Law Enforcement and Background Checks: The CCR Act assumes that law enforcement need only look at an individual’s out-of-state concealed carry license to verify their eligibility to carry a firearm. Twelve states no longer require permits to carry loaded, concealed firearms; individuals from those states would not be able to produce a state- issued permit to prove their eligibility to carry a concealed firearm, as required by the bill. The bill also assumes that federal firearms prohibitors apply to all individuals, including non-citizens, who are prohibited from possessing firearms. Hence, any gun violence offender who has been threatened by abusers with firearms would be able to travel across state lines with a concealed firearm, increasing the risk of gun violence.

Sincerely,

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act. It is outrageous that today, of all days, 1 week before the 5-year anniversary of the horrific murder of 20 schoolchildren and 6 educators in my district of Newtown, 2 months after the slaughter of 50 Americans watching a concert, that we are about to act on a bill to put more guns in the hands of more dangerous people.

Rather than helping raise the standards nationally for gun safety, this bill would empower and protect domestic abusers and violent criminals to carry across state lines loaded hidden guns. This bill should be called the “Act to Carry Armed Gun Anywhere Anytime by Anyone.”

The Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act is an outrage and an insult to the families in Newtown and to the hundreds of families who have lost loved ones to gun violence who are gathered here today at the Capitol for the fifth annual Vigil to End Gun Violence.

In the 5 years since Sandy Hook, this is the very first bill we have been allowed to vote on this week, and it is a reckless giveaway to the moneyed gun interests.

Mr. Speaker, since 2012, gun violence has killed over 170,000 Americans. It is time for this House to truly honor the fallen. This week, six bills on gun violence bills with action instead of caving in to the gun lobby yet again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this dangerous bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poe), a member of the Judiciary Committee.
Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, history is the great educator. We remember in American history the War of Independence started when the British tried to take away the firearms of Americans, and we had the Battles of Lexington and Concord. That revolution was successful and because Americans were able to be armed.

The Texas War of Independence started when the Mexican Government tried to take away the firearms of Texans. That started in Gonzales, Texas, and it was successful and we became an independent country.

The Second Amendment is a constitutional right that Americans have. My friends on the other side don’t like the Second Amendment. They wish it wasn’t there. They do everything in their power to restrict the privilege and the right that we have under the Second Amendment, and we get it because of our history, to protect us from government and also for self-defense.

My position is about gun violence. They have got to remember that gun violence happens many times where people are disarmed, and it usually takes a gun to stop that gun, just like it did at the church in Sutherland Springs, Texas, and killed 26 worshipers, while wounding 20.

The majority’s response? Bring to the floor a bill that makes America less safe, more replete with people carrying and concealing weapons on our communities. This bill says: If you want to carry a concealed weapon in a State that doesn’t allow it constitutionally, no problem. Get your concealed carry license in another State that does.

In other words, every State, no matter their own judgment, talk about States’ rights, no matter their own judgment, must be subjected to the policies of the least protective State in the Nation.

Instead of addressing the very serious problem of rampant gun violence in a constructive way, the Republican majority is bringing to the floor a bill that makes it easier to hide dangerous weapons in public.

Second, the registration of my Jeep in California would pass in California, even though the laws in California are different on a driver's license. And then they would let me drive, even though the laws in California are different from a driver’s license.

Second, the registration of my Jeep in Texas would pass in California, even though if I had to get it done in California, it probably wouldn’t pass. But they recognize that because we have laws that recognize that.

My marriage license would be accepted as well.

The right to bear arms, the right to have a concealed carry weapon, is based on the Second Amendment of the Constitution. All this law does is allow us to exercise that right in every State.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Hoyer), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. NADLER for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, that is just the way it is. Since the start of 2017, more than 14,340 people have been killed by gun violence in the United States, more than any other country on Earth. That is just the way it is.

More than 29,150 have been wounded. More than 680 of those have been children.

In October, 56 people were killed and 515 wounded in Las Vegas in the worst mass shooting in our Nation’s history.

But we don’t have a bill on the floor to prevent the creation of machine guns which are illegal, by bump stocks.

Just 5 weeks later, a gunman entered a church in Sutherland Springs, Texas,
the denial of certiorari) (collecting cases); e.g., Williams v. State, 10 A.3d 1167, 1177 (Md. 2011); Mack v. United States, 6 A.3d 1224, 1296 (D.C. 2010). Further, ten states refuse to recognize concealed carry permits, and many more refuse to recognize out-of-state concealed carry permits unless certain conditions are met. The right to carry in self-defense, supported and protected by the Second Amendment, is called into serious question by such blanket refusals to honor firearms permits in self-defense outside the home or to allow non-resident visitors to carry concealed weapons. Because some States refuse to give the same rights of our law-abiding residents and non-residents alike to carry arms for defense promote public safety. Our states and non-residents alike to carry arms for defense promote public safety. Our states should not be able to deny citizens the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. That is not in keeping with what they said. They said: “We must ensure that antigun jurisdictions do not harass travelers.”

Mr. Speaker, if a citizen is currently prohibited from purchasing or possessing a firearm, this bill does nothing to change that.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, others will tell you that we are making it harder for law-abiding Americans to exercise their Second Amendment right. That is not true either. H.R. 38 does nothing to infringe upon anyone’s right to keep and bear arms. The bill simply ensures that our current background check system works properly.

Those of us who respect the Second Amendment and dedicate our careers to defending it will always fight to protect this fundamental right from those who would erode it. Mr. Speaker, we also have a responsibility to uphold and enforce our current laws to ensure dangerous people can’t obtain weapons. In fact, it is precisely because we want to preserve our Second Amendment right that we must ensure our criminal background check system works properly.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill in order that those who obtain a concealed carry permit in one State are able to enjoy the freedom in any State and to make sure our current background check system is working the way it was intended to work.

Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of this bill from the NRA, that nine antigun jurisdictions, State legislatures that have restrictive gun laws, cannot harass travelers, cannot see the rights of our States have the same laws that their citizens have from people out of State.

When my friends on the other side talk about being concerned about the Second Amendment and dedicating their lives to it and seeing that irresponsible people don’t get guns, when we tried to bring a no fly, no buy law, they weren’t for it. They talked about due process.

But have they brought a due process bill? They don’t care about the floor for people who are on the no-fly list?

No.

People who are on Social Security who can’t manage their own affairs, they passed a law that said they should get guns when they couldn’t before. That is not in keeping with what they are saying.

This bill violates States’ rights, puts guns in the hands of people that States don’t want them to have. There are several States that don’t allow people under 21 unless they are in the military, to have a gun permit. This Federal law would override those seven States.

As the Supreme Court held in McDonald, it is “imminently true” that the “Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms” is “fundamental to our scheme of ordered liberty” and “deeply rooted in this Nation’s history and tradition.” McDonald, 561 U.S. at 767–68. Congress should act to safeguard and implement this deeply rooted right for those traveling across state lines.

Thank you for the opportunity to address this legislation. As the chief legal and law enforcement officers of our respective States, we urge Congress to pass this important legislation that will allow us to protect the most basic American freedoms, the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms.

Very truly yours,
Joshua D. Hawley, Missouri Attorney General; Steve Marshall, Alabama Attorney General; Mark Brnovich, Arizona Attorney General; Dennis M. Weier, Colorado Attorney General; Pamela J. Bondi, Florida Attorney General; Chris Carr, Georgia Attorney General; Lawrence Wasden, Idaho Attorney General; Curtis T. Hill, Jr., Indiana Attorney General; Derek Schmidt, Kansas Attorney General; Jeff Landry, Louisiana Attorney General; Bill Schuette, Michigan Attorney General; Timothy C. Fox, Montana Attorney General; Doug Peterson, Nebraska Attorney General; Adam Paul Laxalt, Nevada Attorney General; Wayne Stenehjem, North Dakota Attorney General; Mike DeWine, Ohio Attorney General; Alan Wilson, South Carolina Attorney General; Marty J. Jackley, South Dakota Attorney General; Ken Paxton, Texas Attorney General; Sean Reyes, Utah Attorney General; Patrick Morrissey, West Virginia Attorney General; Brad D. Schimel, Wisconsin Attorney General; Peter K. Michael, Wyoming Attorney General.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2017.

Mr. Speaker, our Founders laid out certain rights in our Constitution, not to empower the government, but to empower the people to defend their lives to it and seeing that irresponsible people don’t get guns, when we tried to bring a no fly, no buy law, they weren’t for it. They talked about due process.

But have they brought a due process bill? They don’t care about the floor for people who are on the no-fly list?

No.

People who are on Social Security who can’t manage their own affairs, they passed a law that said they should get guns when they couldn’t before. That is not in keeping with what they are saying.

This bill violates States’ rights, puts guns in the hands of people that States don’t want them to have. There are several States that don’t allow people under 21 unless they are in the military, to have a gun permit. This Federal law would override those seven States.
Mr. Speaker, this is a bad law. It is the NRA’s law. We should have had amendments considered in committee, but we didn’t because the NRA didn’t want them.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to support the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, which will allow a person who is licensed in one State to carry their firearm to carry it in other States. It works just like your driver’s license. My Texas driver’s license lets me drive in Virginia; it lets me drive in Florida; it lets me drive in California.

When I was a child growing up in Texas, my family taught me the importance of marksmanship, gun safety, and the Amendment. And I have long said that, when it comes to reducing violence, it is the individual, not the weapon, that we need to be focused on.

This bill helps ensure an American’s right to carry is not infringed when crossing State lines, enhancing public safety. In fact, as the chairman stated earlier today, a peer-reviewed study shows that States with more restrictive concealed carry laws had higher gun-related murder rates. That is why we need an armed citizenry to protect ourselves and each other.

As we saw in the terrible Texas church shooting in Sutherland Springs just recently, the death toll could have been much higher had not an armed citizen been there to confront the gunman. There are those who insist the bill will arm the criminals, but those claims are far from true, as gun laws restricting criminals from access to weapons are already there in their home States. They are going to remain undisturbed.

I am a strong supporter of the Second Amendment and the Constitution, as I suspect most of you all are, Mr. Speaker, and I believe gun control is hitting you what you aim at and nothing else.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 5 years to the day that 20 6- and 7-year-old babies were slaughtered in Newtown. It has been about a year-and-a-half since 49 people were killed in my home State of Florida, 58 more being injured. In October, 39 people were killed and 500 injured at an outdoor concert in Las Vegas. And in November, 26 people were killed and injured as they worshiped in Sutherland Springs, Texas. The response to all of this tragedy is a bill to make it easier for people to carry concealed weapons in every corner of this country.

I don’t know whose idea—other than the gun corporations, I don’t know whose idea it was that this would be the way that we honor the memories of those who have been killed, that instead of commonsense gun safety legislation that the overwhelming majority of people in this country support, we get a bill to make it possible to carry concealed weapons in every State, in every corner of this country.

When my friends on the other side say this doesn’t override any laws, that is absolutely untrue. In States that have State laws where you can and can’t carry a gun, this bill overrides that and says you can bring any gun into the State, whatever your regulations are about what you can carry.

This is a bill that doesn’t make us safer. It doesn’t make us stronger. But make no mistake, it makes the bottom line, the profits of the gun makers in this country, a little bit healthier.

As we enter the Christmas season and we think about the 20 6- and 7-year-old kids whose lives were taken 5 years ago today, whose parents, whose families suffer every day with that loss, whose kids aren’t there to receive Christmas presents, I ask my friends on the other side: Why is it that we respond to that by giving this enormous Christmas gift to the NRA?

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to include in the RECORD two articles, one from Tennessee and one from Florida, in which concealed carry permit holders stopped dead in their tracks people who were going to commit murder.

[FROM WWW.WSMY.COM, OCT. 8, 2017]

**USHER BEING CALLED “HERO” FOR HELPING TO STOP ANTIOCH CHURCH SHOOTER**

**ANTIOCH, TN.—Robert Caleb Engle is being hailed as a hero after helping to stop the accu- sed gunman during the shooting at the Burnette Chapel Church of Christ in Antioch on Sunday.**

According to police and witnesses at the scene, Engle, who is an usher at the church, heard a commotion and confronted the suspect, Emanuel Kidega Samson. Engle was then pistol-whipped by Samson. The two got into a scuffle before Samson shot himself in the chest.

Engle, who has a carry permit, went out to his car to get a gun, despite suffering a head injury.

Engle then went back inside the church to confront Samson and held him at gunpoint until authorities arrived.

Engle, 22, declined an on-camera interview but did send a statement.

When complimented about his heroism, Engle said, “I do not want to be labeled a hero. The real heroes are the police, first responders, medical staff and doctors who have helped me and everyone affected.”

“I’ve been going to this church my whole life,” Engle said. “I have never, ever, thought something like this would have happened.”

(He’s) just an outstanding young man, even before today,” said Tyrone Clark, one of Engle’s neighbors. “Today just proved his character.”

Engle also asked for prayers for not just the victims, but for the shooter and the shooter’s family.

“They are hurting as well,” Engle said.

Engle and his wife, Danielle Dickerson, were taken to Skyline Medical Center with non-life-threatening injuries.

Both Engle and Dickerson have since been released from the hospital.

[From Florida Today, Nov. 7, 2017]

**SCHLENKER SHOOTING: ROCKLEDGE GUNMAN RECOVERING, WROKED AT BREVDEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.**

(By J.D. Gallop)

The 28-year-old man suspected of carrying out a shooting at a Rockledge auto shop last that left one person dead and another paralyzed, also worked as a part-time custodian at an elementary school, authorities said.

Brevard County Public School officials confirmed that Robert Lorenzo Bailey Jr. was employed with the district since 2014, working at Lewis Carroll Elementary on Merritt Island.

“He’s a part-time custodian.,” said Jennifer Wolfinger, spokeswoman for the school district, adding that Bailey remains on the payroll. Officials are reviewing his employment records.

Bailey wandered onto the Schlenker Auto- motive property on Friday, and using a .49- caliber handgun, started firing on workers, killing 50-year-old Schlenker employee Roger Lee Smith, Rockledge police said. Smith had stepped inside after he heard a shot that paralyzed a 25-year-old, unidentified co-worker, according to police. Police have not released the identity.

The shooter worked at concealed weap- ons permit holders—confronted the gunman and engaged in a shootout that left the sus- pect wounded, Bailey continues to recover at Holmes Regional Medical Center in Melbourne.

The shooting—which happened the day after Thanksgiving—left family members of the victim, a husband, father and grand- father, devastated.

“He would do anything . . . anything for anybody. It hurts that somebody would hurt him,” said Buckcool Smith, a 27-year-old nephew of the victim. “That man took from us a longtime husband, a father figure and a grandfather. He loved being with his family and was such a fun, outgoing person. Person- ally, it’s just destroyed me.”

Bailey, known to friends as a bouncer and a regular in the Cocoa Village pub scene, did not have any connection to the auto shop, police said. Police have not yet confirmed any criminal or medical history that might give insight into a possible motive.

Others who knew Bailey described a man- ager at the Dog and Bone British Pub, said he seemed to be acting differently lately. The manager said Bailey was fired from his job at the pub after Bailey confronted a pa- tron. Another manager suggested Bailey see a doctor after Bailey aired thoughts that he believed the patron had a gun and was at- tempting to kill him.

“Yesterday he couldn’t have gone through some type of stress or disorder. He kept to him- self,” said 26-year-old Paul Lyal, who learned about the shooting late Sunday. Lyal said he met Bailey at the Dog and Bone British Pub several years ago.

“Sometimes he would be quiet, other times out laughing with everyone. He would even do karaoke or just go upstairs and dance for hours,” Lyal recalled. “I’m just shocked everyone else.”

Rockledge detectives did not comment on Bailey’s injuries or surgery over the weekend to treat his wounds.

Lou Schelker, owner of the business that has operated in Rockledge for 36 years, re- leased a statement to Florida Today on Sun- day evening:

“Sometimes he would be quiet, other times out laughing with everyone. He would even do karaoke or just go upstairs and dance for hours,” Lyal recalled. “I’m just shocked everyone else.”

Rockledge detectives did not comment on Bailey’s injuries or surgery over the weekend to treat his wounds.

Lou Schelker, owner of the business that has operated in Rockledge for 36 years, re- leased a statement to Florida Today on Sun- day evening:

“Sometimes he would be quiet, other times out laughing with everyone. He would even do karaoke or just go upstairs and dance for hours,” Lyal recalled. “I’m just shocked everyone else.”

Rockledge detectives did not comment on Bailey’s injuries or surgery over the weekend to treat his wounds.
to thank all of the community for the overwhelming support and prayers we have received. We know there will be a long healing process ahead of us but we want to reassure everyone that this is an organization full of dedicated, courageous, and heroic individuals serving this community,” the statement read.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t know why Democrats have failed to allow people to exercise the full extent of their constitutional rights. In my State, we have got 1.7 million concealed carry permit holders. Concealed carry permit holders in Florida are eight times less likely to commit crimes than members of law enforcement.

I think the American people see that, if they had their way, we would take the bad acts of people who break the law and we would use that as an excuse to disallowing people of the full exercise of their rights.

So I rise in support of the Constitution and to correct a common mistake. The rights that are enumerated in the Constitution are not granted to the American people by government. These are God-given rights, and it is the government’s duty to protect them for all citizens.

For too long, the government has failed to protect the Constitution and has abridged citizens of their freedom. States recognize driver’s licenses from other States, but nowhere in the Constitution are they mentioned; yet States routinely deny carry permits from other States, including neighboring States, even though the Constitution explicitly states that the right of people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Mr. HUDSON’s good bill restores constitutional liberty. I am proud to join in sponsoring this legislation and to stand with the Constitution and against those who wish to dismantle it.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to remember the oath that they swore to uphold and defend the Constitution, and I would encourage them to vote “yes” on H.R. 38.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle made a number of arguments about how, if everyone has a concealed weapon, America will be safer.

Mr. Speaker, I have two studies here which directly rebut that:

A 2017 study by researchers at Boston University found that States with shall-issue laws had a 10.6 percent higher handgun homicide rate, consistent with the results of the Stanford study.

Both of those empirical studies disprove the claim that we make America safer if everyone carries a hidden, loaded firearm.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the distinguished chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I must have missed something in my religious training. Were there 11 Commandments by God? I know about the first 10, but I missed that 11th one that thou shalt have the ability to bear arms. I missed that one, that God-given right.

Was it a God-given right for someone to take that God-given right and execute 58 people at a concert? Was that a God-given right?

Mr. Speaker, the American people have spoken with nearly a unanimous voice. They want Congress to keep their families safe by passing common-sense gun safety legislation, legislation that will keep guns out of the hands of criminals; protections that will keep those who want to cause terror in our churches, in our schools, at concerts, and in our communities from getting those firearms.

The bill before us does the exact opposite. It would force States like New York to weaken their own gun safety laws and allow concealed carry. It puts families like yours and mine at risk. And for what? To appease the NRA? That is shameful.

In the 66 days since the Las Vegas massacre, Congress has done nothing, absolutely nothing, to address the clear loopholes in our laws that allowed one man to kill and injure so many.

It has been 66 days since numerous Republicans denounced the bump stocks and promised a fix, only to turn around and do this bill. At a time when we have seen one horrific mass shooting after another, Republicans are forcing through a bill that will put each and every American in harm’s way.

What is more, this egregious proposal comes days before the fifth anniversary of the tragic shooting at Sandy Hook. This plan is in further danger of another Las Vegas, another Orlando, and another Sandy Hook. The American people are sick and tired of this. They want this Congress to protect them, not enable criminals.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). The gentleman from Virginia has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 13 minutes remaining.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. RUTHERFORD, a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in my 41 years of law enforcement, 12 years as a sheriff of Duval County, Florida, I can tell you I have seen many times where good, law-abiding citizens used legal firearms to stop dangerous people from harming them, their loved ones, and even their neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, as a law enforcement professional, I want good people carrying firearms.

The Fraternal Order of Police that represents thousands of officers all across the United States of America supports good people carrying firearms. Do you know why? Because we know, as law enforcement officers we understand that, at our agencies, our priority one response time target is 7 minutes.

In a life-and-death situation, we target getting there in 7 minutes. That is in a well-policed community. I want to put Republicans, Democrats, and everyone on notice that, for that 7 minutes, you better be prepared to protect yourself.

If an active shooter in a mall, in a school, in a church like we just saw in Sutherland Springs, Texas, is killing people, let’s say to the tune of five people per minute, that is an average of 35 dead, unarmed citizens before the police can even arrive at the scene.

Believe me, we want good, law-abiding citizens who are authorized to carry firearms to have the ability to intervene in a violent situation before law enforcement can even arrive at the scene. We need the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act to ensure that these good, law-abiding citizens can retain their constitutional right to bear arms legally across State lines and hopefully be able to stop a violent incident.

Mr. Speaker, none of our other constitutional rights stop at a State line. Our Second Amendment rights should not stop at that line either.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 38 and save lives.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We just heard some of our other colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak about the God-given right to apparently carry a concealed, loaded firearm across State lines. What about the God-given right to live, to stay alive, and to be free from gun violence in this country?
We now have seen the two deadliest shootings in American history, 20 children slaughtered 5 years ago at Sandy Hook, and the list goes on and on.

Our Republican colleagues will do nothing about it. They won't pass universal background checks. They won't pass no fly, no buy to keep terrorists from being able to buy a gun. They won't prevent bump stocks. But they are finally rising up to do something, and what is their answer? Let everyone in America carry a concealed, loaded firearm. Even people who are violent criminals, stalkers, and domestic abusers can carry a concealed firearm.

Make no mistake about it. This legislation allows someone to go online. You don't have to be a resident of the State, a State that has no protections. You don't have to have training. You could be a criminal. You can go online and you get a permit in that State. You don't have to be a resident. You only have to go there, and you can then travel America with a loaded, concealed firearm and overrule the will of the people of that State through their legislature to impose responsible limitations on it.

It also endangers police officers who can be sued for having the audacity to ask someone if they actually have a permit and detain them. They have a cause of action against the police officer and attorneys' fees—unprecedented. This is the response to a country that is pleading for responsible gun safety legislation that is living with the carnage of gun violence and asking this Congress: Do something about it; protect us from this violence.

Our Republican colleagues muster up the courage to pay homage to the NRA and make it easier to sell guns so that people can carry concealed loaded fire-arms all across this country.

Shame on you. Shame on you. You have a responsibility to work with us to protect our constituents from gun violence. You enact sensible gun safety legislation that will reduce the incidence of gun violence. This will make it worse.

The claim that somehow it makes it safer is refuted by all of the empirical evidence. You know it is. Shame on the Republicans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman and other Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, there have been 914 cases of non-self-defense killings by private citizens holding permits to carry loaded handguns in the last 10 years, which translates into 1,119 Americans dead by homicide, mass shooting, suicide, and murder of police officers under concealed carry permit laws in the States.

In Florida, for example—I saw my friend, Mr. RUTHERFORD, up there—in August, concealed handgun permit holder, Everett Miller, shot and killed two Kissimme, Florida, police officers. Now, if you want to give everybody the right to a concealed carry permit in your States, fine. But don't impose that on the people of Maryland. We have got our own laws, thank you. Since we have had 397 gun massacres in America defined as a slaying of four people or more. Two of them—Las Vegas, which left 58 people dead, and Sutherland Springs, which left 26 people dead—are among the 10 worst massacres in American history by gun.

The American people want to end this reign of terror. But what do our friends do on the other side? Do they bring us the universal criminal background check legislation favored by more than 90 percent of the American people of every political party to plug the gun show loophole, the internet loophole, and the 7-Eleven parking lot loophole? No.

Do they bring to the floor the bill to criminalize bump stocks which they promised to us? No. No such luck. Instead, they bring forward a bill that would wipe out the vast majority of state concealed carry laws in the United States of America, trampling States' rights and wrecking all of the painstaking work of legislatures all over the land dragging this down to the most lax and permissive State laws in the country. It is not a race to the bottom, it is a plunge to the bottom they have engineered here.

This fraudulently named bill has nothing to do with reciprocity because States already have the power to negotiate reciprocity agreements, and 22 of them have it.

Your bill destroys reciprocity. Your bill brings us down to the level of the lowest, most permissive laws in the country. My State doesn't give concealed carry permits to domestic abusers, to violent offenders, and to dangerously unstable people. Don't drag us down to the lowest level. Protect States' rights.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the difference of opinion on this bill vividly illustrates the profoundly different world view of Democrats versus Republicans. Democrats instinctively trust the government and instinctively distrust individuals. Republicans instinctively trust the government and trust the good hearts and good sense of individual Americans to be the best stewards of protecting themselves, their family, their property, and their freedoms.

Our Founders understood this, and this is why the First Amendment protects our freedom of conscience and the Second Amendment follows it immediately so that we, as free people, have the ability to protect ourselves—our freedom of conscience—against the overpowering force of the government.

We in Texas enacted in 1995, while I was a member of the Legislature, a concealed carry law, and we have had over 20 years of data. People can go to the Department of Texas Public Safety website and look under conviction rates and see that the concealed carry permit holders in Texas, over the last 22 years, are 7 times less likely to commit a crime than the average Texans.

The 7 minutes Sheriff Rutherford just mentioned to us are a lifetime, if you or your family or neighbors are at risk. The individual law-abiding American who is carrying a concealed weapon has had a background check, they have been trained in the...
use of the weapon, and they know the law. We all, as Americans, should work together to preserve the Second Amendment right of every American to keep and bear arms no matter what State they are in.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this important legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. O’ROURKE).

Mr. O’ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Like so many Texans, I grew up in a household that honored a tradition of gun ownership for hunting, for collection, and for sportsmanship, and also honored gun safety. I was taught to shoot by my uncle. Raymond O’Rourke, jail captain and the chief marksman in the El Paso County Sheriff’s Office.

I also live in a State that has a license to carry process which requires safety training, though 18 States do not. Texas requires that someone who has a license to carry be 21 years or older, though 15 States do not. Texas requires that those who abuse their partners not be allowed to have a license to carry, though 14 States do not. Texas requires licenses to violent offenders, though 22 States do. Texas does not grant licenses to people convicted of stalking, though 21 other States do.

What H.R. 38 does, Mr. Speaker, is it subjects every Texan and every El Pasoan whom I represent to the lowest common denominator in the United States. It will make our State less—not more—safe. That is why I oppose H.R. 38, and I ask all my colleagues to join me in doing the same.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to point out that the attorney general of the State of Texas has signed a letter, along with 22 other State attorneys general, in support of this legislation and pointing out that authorized permit holders to carry across State lines will not result in an increased risk of crime. Further, strong evidence indicates that concealed carry permit holders actually deter and reduce crime.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), who is the lead Democratic cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. Goodlatte for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the lead sponsors for the Fix NICS Act of 2017, I rise in support of this legislation which has been combined with the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, which is, again, another section that I support, also.

On the Fix NICS Act, I certainly want to thank Senator CORNYN, Representatives CULBerson, ESTY, Costello, and AGUILAR for their leadership on this particular issue that we have been working on.

A few weeks ago, 26 members of the Sutherland Springs community, which is in my district, were killed by someone who should have never had access to firearms. The investigation into the shooter revealed that the shooter had a criminal history. The Defense Department and the Air Force missed six times—six times—where the criminal justice process should have reported the missing information to NICS.

As of 2016, the Air Force, which should have entered the Sutherland Springs shooter’s criminal information, entered a total of one active record in the NICS record. If the Air Force would have met the minimum standards, the gunman never would have been able to legally purchase a firearm. This is why we introduced the Fix NICS Act of 2017.

This legislation ensures that Federal and State authorities comply with existing laws to accurately report relevant criminal history—accurately report these records to the NICS. It also provides consequences for Federal agencies who fail to report the relevant records and ensure that States improve their own reporting. The Fix NICS Act is an important step to ensure that people like the Sutherland Springs shooter never slip through the cracks of the NICS database again.

As to the reciprocity part of it, again, Texas and 22 other States have spoken on that, but, again, as a supporter of the Second Amendment, I believe that the Second Amendment doesn’t stop at political State lines. It is part of the U.S. Constitution and should apply across.

So, again, I rise in support of this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the chairman of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this dangerous bill. I asked my local law enforcement what they thought of folks from out of State who don’t meet our local requirements coming into our communities with loaded concealed firearms. These are the folks who are on the front lines of fighting gun violence, and we should listen to what they have to say.

Our Sonoma County sheriff opposes this bill and says it would negatively affect our community and put citizens and his deputies in greater danger.

The chief of police from my hometown in St. Helena said: As a lifelong proponent of the ability to own, possess, and carry firearms within the provisions of the law, I am wholeheartedly against H.R. 38.

Like many of us, he asks: How long will it take before someone who can’t meet the legal requirements to concealed carry in California goes to some other State with little or no standards and gets a permit from that State? Our chief of police in Martinez opposes this bill and says that it is a race to the bottom.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have a gun violence epidemic in this country. It is glaringly obvious to anyone paying attention that our Federal gun safety laws are pathetically weak and in major need of improvement.

Overwhelmingly, law enforcement in my district strongly oppose this bill. Moreover, there is a reason no major law enforcement organizations have come out in support of this bill. It is dangerous, and it is unnecessary.

As many of my colleagues should stand with law enforcement—the people that keep us and our families safe—and oppose this bill. Every example that was given from my friends across the aisle doesn’t pertain to this bill. They talk about, in their State, concealed carry. This is bad policy, and it should be opposed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Dunn).

Mr. DUNN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act. This commonsense legislation ensures that our Second Amendment rights don’t end when we cross State lines.

We are all aware of the story of Shaneen Allen, a mother of three who was pulled over in New Jersey after committing a minor traffic violation. She told the police legally that she had a handgun on her person and a concealed carry permit. She was unaware that the permit was not transferable to New Jersey, and she had no prior criminal record. Nonetheless, she spent 40 days in a jail cell.

Americans like Shaneen are exposed to real risks of accidentally breaking the law of another State simply by exercising their constitutional right. This bill ensures that valid concealed carry permits from one State are valid in all other States.

It creates legal protections for law-abiding gun owners against States that violate this statute.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation and to show the American people the Second Amendment is safe with us.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Carolyn B. Maloney).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have a gun violence epidemic in this country. It is glaringly obvious to anyone paying attention that our Federal gun safety laws are pathetically weak and in major need of improvement.
So what is this House doing about it? Working to pass a bill that completely undermines gun safety laws and puts more guns on the street and more lives at risk.

Believe me, if more guns made this country safer, we would be the safest country on Earth. We are far from it.

Under this bill, someone who couldn’t get a concealed carry permit in New York would now be able to carry concealed guns into New York State, as long as they have a permit from another State. This completely eviscerates State-level gun safety laws and puts us all at the mercy of the weakest gun safety laws in the country.

This bill is opposed by major law enforcement organizations across this country. I urge this body to listen to their advice and vote against this reckless assault on State and local gun safety laws.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD).

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Mr. HUDSON’S Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act.

As things stand, each State currently determines who among the law-abiding citizens of that State can carry concealed carry permits from other States. This forces lawful gun owners to sometimes surrender their Second Amendment rights when they are traveling.

The current system has created accidents, ruined lives, and punished gun owners simply because they fell victim to complexity and uncertainty in the law.

My colleague’s bill addresses this problem by bringing much-needed clarity to the system. H.R. 38 is a simple proposal, but a necessary one. If enacted, it will allow lawful gun owners to carry their firearm into other States that have valid concealed carry permits. This interstate recognition of concealed carry would be very similar to a driver’s license.

H.R. 38 would not create national standards for concealed carry or take away a State’s right to govern their own concealed carry laws, like some might claim. No. This bill simply uses Congress’ 14th Amendment power to protect people’s constitutional rights from State abuse.

Sam Adams once said: “The Constitution shall never be construed…to prevent the people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms.”

This powerful line from Mr. Adams sums up my feelings on this bill much better than I can.

I thank Mr. HUDSON for his steadfast leadership on this issue.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle from Florida talked about the 1.7 million concealed weapons permits that are issued in Florida. Let me make it quite clear that those permits are issued to Floridians for Floridians, not to any person from any State at any time who wants to bring a gun into Florida.

Different from my colleague, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advocate for the safety of every American and for the safety of our first responders, who are entrusted with that awesome responsibility.

As Members of Congress, our question should be: What can we all do to make living in America safer?

Every day, law enforcement officers risk their lives to keep our communities safe. Last week, I was honored that the House passed the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act unanimously. Police officers have a tough job, and I think we can all agree on this point: the job is getting tougher.

Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves: Why would any Member, Republican or Democrat, support this legislation that would make a police officer’s job harder, more dangerous, and open our officers up to personal liability for simply doing their jobs?

This reckless piece of legislation would allow persons from outside your State to bring their firearms anywhere, including school zones, without applying the guidelines, laws, restrictions, or oversight of your State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to envision this situation from the perspective of a law enforcement officer. An out-of-state, armed individual is stopped by that officer. Maybe that individual’s license is legitimate, maybe it is not. The officer is on the side of the road, facing an armed individual, trying to figure out whether the individual’s permit is authentic, which the officer is obligated to do.

If the permit is fake, failing to stop that individual is a considerable risk. If the permit is real, stopping the individual has opened the officer up to potential personal liability.

In the last year, I have heard my colleagues on the other side talk about how we should better empower States to decide what is in their own best interest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, this legislation strips individual States of their power and puts our public safety officers in legal and personal jeopardy. Supporting this legislation is reckless and irresponsible. As a former chief of police, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 38.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time do I have remaining?

Mr. NADLER. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 2 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is advanced I am not sure in the name of what, but whatever it is going to do is make us less safe and to overrule all our States.

Under this bill, someone who lives in New York could go to another State—doesn’t even have to go to another State; just apply to the other State, get a concealed carry permit from that State, never set foot in that State, and then use it in New York; thus, overriding New York’s laws.

We have heard it said that this bill is necessary to protect the Second Amendment constitutional rights of gun owners. But the fact is, there is no Second Amendment constitutional right to concealed carry.

In the District of Columbia v. Heller case in which the Supreme Court said that the Second Amendment established a personal right, Justice Scalia’s
opinion held that the Second Amendment was not unlimited, a variety of gun regulations were entirely consistent with the Constitution, and he said:

The majority of American courts to consider the question have held that prohibitions on carrying concealed weapons were lawful under the Second Amendment for State analogues.

So the Second Amendment argument is simply wrong or disingenuous.

But let me say also that we are living in an epidemic of gun violence. 33,000 Americans are killed every year, and 30,000 more every year. No other country approaches this. No country—other than those at war—in peacetime has more than 300 or 400, or even 100 or 72, and we have 33,000. It is not because of mental illness. It is because of the presence of large numbers of gun.

A 2017 Stanford University study found a direct correlation with the most permissive concealed carry laws and the most violent use of firearms. General studies have shown a direct correlation of the presence of the number of guns and murder rates by guns.

So this is a bill that is a death sentence for many Americans. That is what this bill is. It is a death sentence without trial for many Americans by increasing the danger of guns by overruling States that fear and that we don’t want concealed weapons on the New York City subway or the Chicago metric, other places of great concentrations of people.

But no, we, in our wisdom, are going to say the States with the least restrictive, perhaps most rural, maybe sensible restrictions for them, will impose those restrictions on other States.

It is wrong. It is a death sentence for many Americans. It ought not pass.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for the purpose of closing the argument.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, we all have subjects that we find fascinating.

For 25 years, I have actually kept at these data abstracts of crime statistics in the United States on the misuse of firearms, it turns out that States that have adopted concealed carry compared to States that have gone other directions, States that adopted have gotten safer.

There is actually some brilliant articles when you compare Florida and Illinois: big, populated, demographically complex States. Florida has gotten dramatically safer. Illinois has not.

If you really love our families, love our communities in this, this needs to be an intellectually sound discussion of what factors make us safer as a society. I believe this bill leads us in that direction.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act.

While I am opposed to restricting law abiding citizens’ access to firearms, I feel that this bill does not adequately address many of the requirements that States have instituted in passing their own concealed carry laws.

I am a big supporter of concealed carry and was the lead author of a bill in 1991 in the State Senate to create local concealed carry. The State of Texas has written the most protections that are currently afforded to Texans.

Texas has many requirements for a person to be able to get that license including live-fire training. As a state, we also bar convicted domestic abusers and those convicted of violent crimes and stalking. Under this bill, an individual who had committed those crimes could conceal carry their weapon in Texas if they got their permit from a neighboring state that lacked these requirements for concealed carry like Mississippi. It is for these reasons that I do not support this bill as it is currently written.

If we are going to create a federal reciprocity standard for concealed carry it should be a standard that takes into account many of the protections individual states have created.

I would proudly vote in support of a bill that protects individual states have created. If you really love our families, love our communities, this needs to be an intellectually sound discussion of what factors make us safer as a society. I believe this bill leads us in that direction.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill, which will not kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, next week will be the fifth anniversary of the hideous mass murder at Sandy Hook Elementary, where 20 kids and six educators were slaughtered in their classroom.

This year, we have witnessed two of the worst mass shootings in recent American history: in Las Vegas, Nevada, and in Sutherland Springs, Texas. Every day more than 30 people are killed by someone using a gun. This should be a call to action for everyone to work together to help prevent gun violence. That is why 90 percent of Americans support strengthening our gun laws, not weakening them.

Let’s be clear about what this Congress is going to do today. Instead of taking serious action on bump stocks or expanding background checks, the majority party is undermining the very laws that work to prevent gun violence.

For example, some States allow people who have been convicted of some violent crimes to carry a loaded, concealed firearm.

Thirty States and the District of Columbia currently deny permits to people convicted of those violent crimes, such as assault and battery, threatening, or crimes committed with a weapon. So if you are from any of these States—Alaska, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana,
Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, or the District of Columbia—a vote on this underlying bill is a vote to undermine your own State gun violence prevention policy, because this bill says that, even if your State prohibits its own residents who have been convicted of violent crimes, you can’t prohibit someone from another State with the same criminal record from carrying a loaded, concealed firearm if their State allows it.

This motion to recommit would state that a person who has been convicted of a violent crime within the preceding 3 years may not possess or carry a concealed handgun in a State that prohibits a person from doing so on the basis of a conviction for that very same offense. That would be people convicted of crimes such as resisting arrest, assault, permitting sexual abuse of a minor, aggravated assault, or violation of a criminal sexual assault protection order or violent crimes.

An ‘aye’ vote on this motion to recommit is a pro-States’ rights, pro-Second Amendment, and anticriminal vote.

I am a gun owner. I have not been concealed of my life, I am not opposed to concealed carry, but I am opposed to violent criminals having guns, and Members should be, too.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this motion to recommit; and if they vote against it, they are voting to allow violent criminals, convicted criminals, to carry loaded, concealed firearms in their community, in their State, and in their district. That is wrong. We should prohibit that from happening.

It is a real easy fix. It could have been fixed in committee. It could have been fixed in committee. They could have taken care of the concerns that they have with the restrictions on concealed carry, and they could have stopped criminals, convicted criminals, from carrying loaded, concealed firearms. But the committee didn’t do it.

We have a chance now. It is the last chance to do it before this bill comes to a vote. I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to vote for this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, with this motion to recommit, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to vote in vain to hamper the passage of this important legislation. H.R. 38 seeks to allow law-abiding citizens the ability to exercise their Second Amendment right when they cross State lines.

The Supreme Court held in District of Columbia v. Heller that the Second Amendment right to possess a firearm unconnected with service in a militia and to use that firearm for traditionally lawful purposes, such as self-defense. Further, the Court concluded that the Second Amendment guarantees the individual right to possess and carry weapons in case of confrontation, and that central to this right is the ‘inherent right of self-defense’.

In McDonnell v. City of Chicago, the Supreme Court ruled that the right of an individual to ‘keep and bear arms,’ as protected under the Second Amendment, is incorporated by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment against the States.

An individual’s Second Amendment right is no different than the First Amendment’s protections on speech and free exercise of religious expression and the Fourth Amendment’s protection against unreasonable search and seizure or the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment.

Can you imagine my colleagues’ outrage if any of the aforementioned rights stopped at their State’s borders? Believe me, I can. They would be loud and boisterous about it, and justifiably so. Despite that fact, here they are trying to derail a bill that affords the Second Amendment the same respect.

New gun control attempts to extend the law, the Federal law, which already bars people from having firearms if they have been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor domestic violence crimes, by saying any violent crime be covered. And they define violent crime by saying it means ‘any offense that involves injury or the threat of injury to the person of another.’

Well, in my State of Virginia and in most other States, it is up to the police officer to make a traffic accident, if you reach end somebody and injure them, whether or not you are simply charged with a traffic offense or you are charged with a criminal offense. That should not be the basis of denying somebody their Second Amendment rights under the United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and support the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of the bill, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 90.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 236, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 662]

YEAS—190

Georgia: Napolitano, Noel
Arkansas: Garamendi, Nolan
Oregon: Nussman, O’Halleran
Indiana: O’Rourke, Pallone
South Carolina: Palmetta
Pennsylvania: Pascrell
Florida: Panetta
New Jersey: Pallone
Ohio: Pelosi
Kentucky: Perlmutter
Delaware: Pingree
North Carolina: Polis
California: Price (NC)
Wisconsin: Rankin
Hawaii: Rabbit
Ohio: Rich
Virginia: Richmond
Massachusetts: Rosen
Maryland: Rosenthal
Connecticut: Roybal-Allard
Texas: Ruiz
Mississippi: Ruggeri
New York: Ryan (OH)
Washington: Sainz
Indiana: Sarbanes
North Dakota: Schakowsky
North Carolina: Schiff
Florida: Schneider
Nebraska: Schrader
Texas: Scott, David
South Carolina: Serrano
Rhode Island: Sewell (AL)
California: Sheehy-Porter
New Jersey: Sherman
South Carolina: Sires
South Dakota: Slaughter
Tennessee: Smith (WA)
South Carolina: Soto
California: Spier
Ohio: Swalwell (CA)
Virginia: Takano
Rhode Island: Thomas (CA)
Texas: Thompson (MS)
Virginia: Titus
Oregon: Torres
Illinois: Torres Small
Washington: Vargas
Washington: Vassey
Texas: Vela
California: Velázquez
New York: Vielcosky
New Jersey: Visclosky
New York: Waite
New York: Wasserman
New York: Schultz
Washington, Maxine
Washington: Waters
California: Waters, Coleman
New Mexico: Weil
New York: Wilson (FL)
North Carolina: Yarmuth

NAYS—236

Alabama: Black
Alaska: Blackburn
Arizona: Bost
Arkansas: Brady (TX)
California: Amodei
Colorado: Angle
Connecticut: Arrington
District of Columbia: Bacon
Delaware: Banks (IN)
Florida: Benefield
Georgia: Beatty
Hawaii: Bishop (GA)
Idaho: Bishop (MI)
Illinois: Bishop (UT)
Indiana: Binkley
Iowa: Blank
Kansas: Bishop (GA)
Kentucky: Binkley
Louisiana: Bishop (GA)
Maine: Bishop (GA)
Maryland: Bishop (GA)
Massachusetts: Bishop (GA)
Michigan: Bishop (GA)
Minnesota: Bishop (GA)
Mississippi: Bishop (GA)
Missouri: Bishop (GA)
Montana: Bishop (GA)
Nebraska: Bishop (GA)
Nevada: Bishop (GA)
New Hampshire: Bishop (GA)
New Jersey: Bishop (GA)
New Mexico: Bishop (GA)
New York: Bishop (GA)
North Carolina: Bishop (GA)
North Dakota: Bishop (GA)
Ohio: Bishop (GA)
Oklahoma: Bishop (GA)
Oregon: Bishop (GA)
Pennsylvania: Bishop (GA)
Rhode Island: Bishop (GA)
South Carolina: Bishop (GA)
South Dakota: Bishop (GA)
Tennessee: Bishop (GA)
Texas: Bishop (GA)
Utah: Bishop (GA)
Vermont: Bishop (GA)
Virginia: Bishop (GA)
Washington: Bishop (GA)
West Virginia: Bishop (GA)
Wisconsin: Bishop (GA)
Wyoming: Bishop (GA)

[End of roll call]
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 198, not voting 4, as follows:

[Vote list]

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING ETHNIC CLEANSING OF ROHINGYA AND CALLING FOR AN END TO ATTACKS IN AND AN IMMEDIATE RESTORATION OF HUMANITARIAN ACCESS TO RAKHINE, BURMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) condemning ethnic cleansing of the Rohingya and calling for an end to the attacks in and an immediate restoration of humanitarian access to the state of Rakhine in Burma, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.