military, I believe the need is clear and pressing, the law supports immediate action, and ample funding exists to address this crisis.
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BACKGROUND CHECKS WORK

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. Speaker, today is a momentous day, one that makes me proud of this Chamber. After years of inaction, Congress is moving to address our country’s gun violence problem.

We have seen some of the worst mass shootings in our Nation’s history in just the past few years. Las Vegas, Thousand Oaks, Sutherland Springs, Parkland, Sandy Hook—these are only a few of the names that recently shocked us to the core. And, sadly, each time, Congress failed to act.

But today—today—we are offering more than thoughts and prayers. We are offering legislation. This bill has bipartisan support—finally, something we can all agree on.

Strengthening our background check system is a small but a very important first step. We simply cannot allow criminals to take advantage of loopholes.

Background checks work. They keep guns out of the hands of criminals, and background checks will save lives.

No more excuses. It is just common sense.

CLOSING BACKGROUND CHECK LOOPHOLE IS LIFE SUPPORT

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, selling a gun to a convicted felon, to a perpetrator of domestic violence, to a fugitive from justice, merits a jail term, but those who oppose this reasonable background check bill are enabling just that.

Someone who couldn’t buy a .22 inside a gun shop can, today, go outside that shop and buy a military-style killing machine and get away with it.

Doctors Seth Goldstein and Lisa Epstein, who visited my office this very week on behalf of Moms Demand Action, and 117 San Antonio physicians, they have a view that is different from Members of Congress concerning the result of gun violence. They witness this violence in the emergency room after young bodies are torn apart.

What a different view this debate would have if it were occurring amidst the pain, violence, and blood in a hospital emergency room, because closing this loophole is about life support.

We have to end the trauma. Let’s join the doctors who are out there seeking to save lives and do our part to save lives by passing this bill.

BACKGROUND CHECK BILL

(Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, more than 500 Pennsylvanians are murdered with guns each year, causing untold suffering and tearing our communities apart. Pennsylvanians are crying out for commonsense legislation to stop the bloodshed, legislation like H.R. 8, the bill before us today.

Now, nobody thinks that universal background checks would eliminate gun violence, but the facts suggest that they would reduce it.

In 2017, the Pennsylvania State Police ran over a million background checks on would-be gun purchasers. The vast majority of purchases were approved within a few minutes. But 13,000 were stopped, and the background checks led to the arrest of 150 wanted fugitives and the arrest and conviction of 500 other individuals for illegally attempting to obtain a firearm. Those background checks put some bad guys in jail, and they probably saved some lives as well.

Let’s help our police enforce the laws that keep guns out of dangerous hands. Vote for the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019.

BALANCING GUN RIGHTS WITH SAFE COMMUNITIES

(Ms. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take a stand in support of H.R. 8, which takes a critical first step to ensure that every person who purchases a gun undergoes a background check.

People should have the right to feel safe from gun violence in their community, including at home, at work, and at school. Unfortunately, that is not the case today in our country. Time and time again, our communities have experienced gun violence due to the absence of commonsense gun safety measures.

Only 12 days ago, five people, four of whom were my constituents, left their homes for work at the Henry Pratt Company in Aurora, Illinois, and never returned. Their lives were taken by an illegal gun. Those background checks would have kept some bad guys out of guns.

It is time to take immediate action to help safeguard our communities. I want all people to feel safe in their homes for work at the Henry Pratt Company in Aurora, Illinois, and never returned. Their lives were taken by an illegal gun. Those background checks would have kept some bad guys out of guns.

It is time to take immediate action to help safeguard our communities.

I want all adults to feel safe at work. I want all people to feel safe in their city. I think stronger gun laws will help and also make sure that everyone that buys a gun has to have a thorough background check.”

Well, Alex, you are absolutely right, and we are about to finally ensure that everyone who purchases a gun undergoes a comprehensive background check. The next step is banning assault weapons.

This fifth grader and students around the country are telling us to do something real to make them safer, and finally, at long last, the House of Representatives will take action today.

BEER CAN APPRECIATION/ALUMINUM BILL

(Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the critical role that brewers and beer importers play in our Nation’s economy.

American beverage companies and brewers employ more than 2.2 million people nationwide, providing more than $103 billion in wages and benefits. In my home State of Colorado, breweries have become a significant component of my State’s culture and economy.

But in order to compete, American beverage companies and brewers need a fair and transparent pricing system for aluminum. That is why I along with my friend, Mr. Lawson from Florida, are introducing legislation this week giving the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission oversight authority of the aluminum market. These unfair market practices have not only cost the beverage and brewing industries hundreds of millions of dollars, they have also had harmful effects on consumers.

With the help of the CFTC, I hope we can resolve these pricing irregularities that have been plaguing the market so our Nation’s beverage companies and brewers can continue to produce some of America’s most popular beverages.

BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members
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may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Cicilline). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 145 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 8.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. Blumenauer) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale, with Mr. Blumenauer in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. Nadler) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Collins) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Nadler. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that today we are considering H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. We have promised the American people that Congress would take steps to reduce gun violence, and this bill is a critical first step toward doing so.

During the past 4 weeks, as the Judiciary Committee, and now the full House, have discussed the issue of gun violence, we have heard from citizens and experts from all parts of our country.

Nearly 40,000 Americans lost their lives because of guns in 2017. In fact, every day in America, on average, 34 people are murdered with a firearm, and more than 183 people are injured in an attack.

Gun violence of this magnitude is a distinctly American problem. A country-to-country comparison is shocking. For example, in 2011, the United Kingdom had 146 deaths due to gun violence; Denmark, 7; Portugal, 142; and Japan, just 50. The United States, that year, about 35,000.

A recent 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 20 times higher. Even when you adjust for population differences, Americans are disproportionately killed by gun violence.

Nearly 25 years to the day after the Brady Act was first implemented, expanding current background check requirements to cover virtually all gun transfers is one of the steps we must take to address this crisis.

Under current law, only licensed firearm dealers are required to conduct a background check before transferring a gun to another person. This means that gun shows, online sales, and other private sales can completely evade this vital tool for checking whether buyers do not get into the wrong hands. It is time to close this dangerous loophole.

This bill would make it illegal for anyone who is not a licensed firearm importer, manufacturer, or dealer to transfer a firearm to a person who is not so licensed without a background check. Individuals seeking to transfer a firearm under this measure would be required to visit a licensed firearms dealer to run the necessary background check before the transfer could be finalized.

The bill also provides a number of exceptions to this requirement, including gifts to family members and transfers for hunting, target shooting, and instances of imminent death or great bodily harm. The FBI’s internal assessment demonstrated that checks processed through the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, often called NICS, are approximately 99.3 percent to 99.8 percent accurate, and in 90 percent of cases, the background checks are completed within 90 seconds.

H.R. 8 will provide an accurate and speedy mechanism to help ensure firearms do not end up in the wrong hands.

There is no reason to continue to make it easy for people who are legally prohibited from possessing firearms to acquire firearms, and this bill provides the first step toward giving everyone a chance to try and save lives.

Today I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8, the so-called Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. This is bad legislation that fails to make anyone safer in any regard.

I have been listening here, sitting on the floor for just the last few minutes and listening to those who came up and were happy about this bill coming forward today, and they mentioned many acts of mass violence and situations that have happened. The sad part about it is they claim this is the answer and the first step. In actuality, it is, at best, a side step, and it may actually be a step backwards and will not do what it is being claimed to do.

All this legislation will do is burden law-abiding citizens wishing to exercise their Second Amendment rights, including defending themselves from the gun-toting criminals this bill does nothing to combat.

H.R. 8 foolishly presumes criminals who flout existing laws will suddenly submit themselves to background checks.

Are Members who support this bill delusional enough to think a criminal trading cocaine to another criminal for a firearm will give consideration to H.R. 8 and go to the nearest gun store to submit it to a background check? That is absurd.

Most of us will agree that criminals are not going to do that anyway. My concern is what it actually does in practice to those who are not criminals.

Not only is it foolish to think they will start following the law, it is also foolish to think it is going to in any way make our country safer.

My Democratic friends have exploited every mass shooting, calling for universal background checks, but H.R. 8 would not have stopped a single mass shooting.

These strategies do, however, share one thing in common: Over and over, we see issues of mental health and missed opportunities for authorities to intercede.

Let me just say, Mr. Chair, I share the concern. I am going to share, in just a moment, actual, real things that actually could make a difference in helping to stem the tide of mass violence in our country. But doing this, we have to understand that this bill does not do that, and what may make you feel good may not heal you. That has to be understood.

Look at the recent workplace shooting in Illinois, where the gunman murdered five people. That could have been prevented, but not by H.R. 8. All law enforcement had to do was enforce existing law. The gunman was prohibited from possessing firearms.

In January 2014, he was issued an Illinois firearm owner’s identification card. That March, he applied to buy a handgun from a gun dealer. Five days later, he took possession of the gun, having inexplicably passed a background check. That month, he applied for a concealed carry permit. During a background check for the permit, his felony conviction was flagged.

Illinois police revoked his firearm card and sent him a letter telling him to relinquish the firearm. Not surprisingly, the felon did not comply. Had authorities seized the firearm between March 2014 and February 2019, they could have saved five lives.

Aurora, Illinois, is not the only missed opportunity to prevent tragedy. We know about missed opportunities in Parkland; Aurora, Colorado; Sutherland Springs; Virginia Tech; and others.

The common problem here, Mr. Chair, is clear. It is not a lack of background checks.

With H.R. 8, Democrats refuse to acknowledge the human factors leading to these events, but Republicans have a bill to help law enforcement coordinate responses to mental health concerns and other mass violent threat information.
Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Bass), the chairperson of the Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, which will extend the current Federal background check requirement to unlicensed sellers of guns.

It is about time that Congress takes this issue seriously, and I am pleased that this bipartisan bill has been brought to the floor with the urgency this issue deserves.

In recent years, our Nation has experienced an increase in mass shootings, and our Nation is appropriately horrified. However, mass shootings are just one symptom of our gun violence epidemic. The daily toll of shootings occurs in communities across our country, on our streets, in our schools, and even in our houses of worship.

As Aalayah Eastmond testified before the Judiciary Committee earlier this month, the terrible Parkland shooting that took the lives of 17 students and staff and injured 17 others at her high school in Parkland, Florida: “Minority communities bear the heaviest burden of gun violence in this country.”

The impact on our young people is simply unacceptable. Every day, 47 children and teens are shot in this country. Eight of these young people die, and 38 are shot and survive.

Citizenship is a right, not a privilege. The right to bear arms is a right, not a license to engage in terror and murder. The right should be exercised responsibly, just as we exercise every other right.

There is a simple way to ensure that more of these tragedies do not happen. We known as universal background checks. If reducing gun violence, Mr. Chair, that is why I support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, this bill does not narrow—in fact, it continues the process of going further and further to disarm law-abiding citizens.

Certainly, there is no single change to our gun laws that will prevent every shooting, but enacting measures that will help prevent some of them is clearly the right thing to do.

Mr. Chair, that is why I support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair and others, it is about time that Congress takes this issue seriously, and I am pleased that this bipartisan bill has been brought to the floor with the urgency this issue deserves.

In recent years, our Nation has experienced an increase in mass shootings, and our Nation is appropriately horrified. However, mass shootings are just one symptom of our gun violence epidemic. The daily toll of shootings occurs in communities across our country, on our streets, in our schools, and even in our houses of worship.

As Aalayah Eastmond testified before the Judiciary Committee earlier this month, the terrible Parkland shooting that took the lives of 17 students and staff and injured 17 others at her high school in Parkland, Florida: “Minority communities bear the heaviest burden of gun violence in this country.”

The impact on our young people is simply unacceptable. Every day, 47 children and teens are shot in this country. Eight of these young people die, and 38 are shot and survive.

Citizenship is a right, not a privilege. The right to bear arms is a right, not a license to engage in terror and murder. The right should be exercised responsibly, just as we exercise every other right.

There is a simple way to ensure that more of these tragedies do not happen. We known as universal background checks. If reducing gun violence, Mr. Chair, that is why I support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, this bill does not narrow—in fact, it continues the process of going further and further to disarm law-abiding citizens.

Certainly, there is no single change to our gun laws that will prevent every shooting, but enacting measures that will help prevent some of them is clearly the right thing to do.

Mr. Chair, that is why I support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair and others, it is about time that Congress takes this issue seriously, and I am pleased that this bipartisan bill has been brought to the floor with the urgency this issue deserves.

In recent years, our Nation has experienced an increase in mass shootings, and our Nation is appropriately horrified. However, mass shootings are just one symptom of our gun violence epidemic. The daily toll of shootings occurs in communities across our country, on our streets, in our schools, and even in our houses of worship.

As Aalayah Eastmond testified before the Judiciary Committee earlier this month, the terrible Parkland shooting that took the lives of 17 students and staff and injured 17 others at her high school in Parkland, Florida: “Minority communities bear the heaviest burden of gun violence in this country.”

The impact on our young people is simply unacceptable. Every day, 47 children and teens are shot in this country. Eight of these young people die, and 38 are shot and survive.

Citizenship is a right, not a privilege. The right to bear arms is a right, not a license to engage in terror and murder. The right should be exercised responsibly, just as we exercise every other right.

There is a simple way to ensure that more of these tragedies do not happen. We known as universal background checks. If reducing gun violence, Mr. Chair, that is why I support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, this bill does not narrow—in fact, it continues the process of going further and further to disarm law-abiding citizens.

Certainly, there is no single change to our gun laws that will prevent every shooting, but enacting measures that will help prevent some of them is clearly the right thing to do.

Mr. Chair, that is why I support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair and others, it is about time that Congress takes this issue seriously, and I am pleased that this bipartisan bill has been brought to the floor with the urgency this issue deserves.

In recent years, our Nation has experienced an increase in mass shootings, and our Nation is appropriately horrified. However, mass shootings are just one symptom of our gun violence epidemic. The daily toll of shootings occurs in communities across our country, on our streets, in our schools, and even in our houses of worship.

As Aalayah Eastmond testified before the Judiciary Committee earlier this month, the terrible Parkland shooting that took the lives of 17 students and staff and injured 17 others at her high school in Parkland, Florida: “Minority communities bear the heaviest burden of gun violence in this country.”

The impact on our young people is simply unacceptable. Every day, 47 children and teens are shot in this country. Eight of these young people die, and 38 are shot and survive.

Citizenship is a right, not a privilege. The right to bear arms is a right, not a license to engage in terror and murder. The right should be exercised responsibly, just as we exercise every other right.

There is a simple way to ensure that more of these tragedies do not happen. We known as universal background checks. If reducing gun violence, Mr. Chair, that is why I support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, this bill does not narrow—in fact, it continues the process of going further and further to disarm law-abiding citizens.

Certainly, there is no single change to our gun laws that will prevent every shooting, but enacting measures that will help prevent some of them is clearly the right thing to do.

Mr. Chair, that is why I support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.
today, we are taking our first step to reduce gun violence in this country by passing H.R. 8. Finally, we will see Members of Congress standing up to the power of the gun lobby and doing what is right for the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I remind the Chair that we did pass Fix NICS last year. We did take into account—those things have been done. We just simply are not moving a bill that we don't feel works, and we actually have offered an alternative.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS). Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I tell you that H.R. 8 will do little more than further burden law-abiding gun owners. Without an unconstitutional Federal gun registry, this bill is impossible to enforce.

There is a sales loophole. Federal law is the same regardless of where a firearm sale takes place. Federal law requires all firearms dealers to be licensed and to initiate a background check before transferring a firearm to anyone, regardless of where that transfer takes place.

As for nondealers, Federal law prohibits transferring a firearm to anyone known or believed to be prohibited from possessing firearms. That is already the law. According to DOJ, less than 1 percent of criminals in State prison for firearm crimes get their firearms from dealers or nondealers at gun shows. According to ATF, 6 percent of Federal armed career criminals got their firearms from dealers or nondealers at gun shows.

Online sales loophole: There is no online sales loophole. The Federal law is the same regardless of how people communicate about selling or buying a firearm. Federal law prohibits anyone, licensed firearm dealer or not, from shipping a firearm to a person who lives in another State unless the receiver is also a dealer. Dealers must document all firearms they receive.

H.R. 8 also fails to include many of the realistic exceptions to the new background check requirements for private transfers, such as transfers between law enforcement officers outside of their duties, transfers to concealed carry permit holders, transfers to museums or licensed collectors, transfers to Active Duty military, and many more.

H.R. 8 includes an exception to the background check transfer if the transfer is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm. But that transfer is only allowed for the length of time that it is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm. It doesn't even define those terms. What is imminent death or great bodily harm? Does it extend to domestic violence fears if the person is not getting attacked immediately? Gun rights groups have argued that without a definition, this provision would only provide protection in instances where it is likely too late for the victim to make it out safely.

Finally, H.R. 8 would not have prevented any of the recent high-profile shootings. In those cases, the shooter either passed the Federal background check or stole the firearms they used.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), the chief author of this legislation and the chairman of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019.

Mr. Chair, first, I thank Speaker PELOSI and Chairman NADLER for their support. Gun violence is a true national emergency, and I am glad that we are moving in this Congress to address this crisis.

Mr. Chair, I also thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who recognize the importance of passing this legislation, Representatives KING, FITZPATRICK, MAST, UPTON, and SMITH, who stand with more than 90 percent of Americans who support universal background checks.

This bill will require a background check on all firearm sales and most transfers. Mr. Chairman, I am a lifelong gun owner. I am a hunter and I support the Second Amendment. If this bill did anything to erode the rights of lawful gun owners, I wouldn't support it and it wouldn't have my name on it.

Background checks work. Every day, they stop 170 felons and 50 domestic abusers from getting a gun from a licensed dealer. But, in some States, those same people can go into a gun show or go online and buy a gun without a background check. This bill will help stop them from doing so.

Some will argue that criminals won’t follow the law. If that is the case, then why do we have laws against murder? People still commit murder. Why do we have laws against stealing? People still steal. This is flawed logic, and don’t fall for it.

This bill is supported by law enforcement, medical professionals, veterans, gun owners, religious leaders, and the millions of Americans who took to the streets in support of H.R. 8.

Mr. Chair, I ask that my colleagues support this bill and honor the lives lost with action. No more moments of silence with no action to follow. Today, your thoughts and your prayers aren’t enough. Today, you can vote, “yes”.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose H.R. 8, a bill that criminalizes gun transfers between law-abiding citizens who have no criminal record and no criminal intent.

The bill includes several flawed and unworkable exceptions. Take the law enforcement exception. It allows the police to transfer a firearm, but criminalizes transfers to law enforcement.

Under this bill, a parent whose child finds a gun in a park commits a Federal crime if the parent surrenders the gun to police.

Under this bill, a citizen commits a Federal crime if they participate in a local gun buy-back program.

Under this bill, an attorney commits a Federal crime when they turn a client’s gun over to the police to clear the client through ballistics testing.

Will criminalizing cooperation with law enforcement make us safer? The majority apparently thinks so, and I think it is crazy.

The Democrats’ bill gives special privileges to the bodyguards of the wealthy elite, like former Mayor Bloomberg, who is funding the special interest advocacy for this bill. He can afford to hire bodyguards. But average Americans, who rely on the Second Amendment as their source of personal protection, are not given similar protections.

Nothing should be more offensive to this body than a bill that denies citizens their endowed rights while giving wealthy elites special protections, privileges, and dispensations. But that is H.R. 8.

Take the family exception; the rule allows a vote on an amendment to ensure that transfers between parent and child include stepparents and stepchildren. What about transferring a foster parent and foster child? This bill says foster relationships are not worthy of the same respect and equal treatment. Every Member of this body should be ashamed to vote for this bill that reflects such terrible policy and discrimination.

Take the Good Samaritan exception, allowing transfers where a threat of death or harm is imminent. Imminent means death is menacingly near, a standard so strict that it is, frankly, too late to transfer a gun once it is obvious a gun is needed for protection.

Under this standard, it is illegal to loan a gun to a victim of domestic violence for her protection until the transferor is practically witnessing a murder in progress.

This standard would also prevent a gun owner who has intermittent suicidal thoughts, a known side-effect of certain prescription medications, from legally transferring a gun—his own gun—to a friend for safekeeping.

Because this bill criminalizes transfers between law-abiding Americans, while doing nothing to curb criminals’ access to guns, this bill provides the American public with a false sense of security.

Because this bill includes unworkable exceptions that will mislead people...
into thinking a gun transfer is legal when it is not, this bill provides law-abiding gun owners with a false sense of immunity.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on this totally and completely unconstitutional legislation that would deprive people of their constitutional rights to keep and bear arms.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. WILSON), a member of the committee.

Ms. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. STEUBE for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today marks a very pivotal moment in our flight to prevent gun violence and to ensure the safety of every community across our Nation. I thank the more than 230 of my colleagues who have cosponsored H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. I thank Chairman NADLER, Speaker PELOSI, Congressman THOMPSON, and Congressman KING for making gun violence prevention a priority in this Congress. I am so proud to be an original cosponsor of this historic legislation.

As many of you may know, gun violence is an issue that is deeply personal for me. My son, Jordan Davis, was shot and killed by a man who opened fire on a car of unarmed teenagers at a gas station in Jacksonville, Florida. My son was only 17 years of age. Jordan would have turned 24 this month. After my son’s death, I dedicated my entire life to advocating for commonsense gun safety solutions, but it was the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, last year, that finally motivated me to join this legislative body.

The bipartisanship and support for universal background checks symbolizes the power of advocacy and the incredible power of the survivors, family members, and students who have shared their stories as they advocate for commonsense gun safety solutions and demand that we act to address gun violence.

Today, we are truly taking this action. H.R. 8 will ensure that mothers and fathers have one less reason to worry. It will give students one less thing to fear when they walk into a school. Most importantly, it will make our communities and our Nation a safer place to live, and every human being in America deserves such.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. It is time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation claims to be a solution to gun violence, yet does nothing to actually solve the real problems that contribute to this crisis. As it stands now, this legislation does nothing to make our schools, churches, or communities safer. In fact, it only infringes on the constitutionally guaranteed Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens, something I cannot support.

This bill will criminalize the private transfer of firearms and will make exercising basic constitutional rights impossible for millions of law-abiding Americans. As Congressman KING mentioned, it is essentially unenforceable without a national gun registry. But, let’s be honest, that is where my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to end up: registering firearms so they can systematically take them away. We must stop our Nation from falling down this slippery slope.

I think we can all agree that something needs to be done to stop the illegal ownership and misuse of firearms, but let’s be honest. This legislation would have done nothing to prevent many of the prominent tragedies that occurred in my home State of Florida.

The shooter at Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland passed a background check. The shooter at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando passed a background check. And, just weeks ago, a man who murdered five women in my district passed a background check.

H.R. 8 would have done nothing to stop these violent acts, just like the previous attempts to require universal background checks have done nothing to prevent actual crimes.

If Democrats are serious about gun violence, they would have voted for my amendment. I filed an amendment in committee that would have required law enforcement to be notified upon the attempt of someone to purchase a firearm and failed a background check. Law enforcement would have been notified. But instead of supporting policies that curtail legal possession of firearms, the Democrats on both the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee rejected my proposal. How is that unreasonable?

Mr. Chairman, I stand for the Constitution. I stand for freedom. And I stand for the Second Amendment. That is why I am not voting for this proposal.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I point out that the bill says: Nothing in this act . . . shall be construed to authorize the establishment, directly or indirectly, of a national firearms registry.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank him for his leadership as chair of the Judiciary Committee for bringing us to this place promptly. It is an historic day in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I thank our distinguished colleague from California, Mr. MIKE THOMPSON, for his relentless, persistent leadership to make America safer by bringing forth commonsense background check legislation. He is a gun owner and a veteran. He has been on both sides of the aisle and he is a fearless hunter. He is an advocate for the Second Amendment. And, as he said, if this had anything to diminish that, he would not have his name on it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this strong, bipartisan bill and join Mr. THOMPSON in commending Mr. KING of New York for making this initiative bipartisan from the start, in the previous Congress and now. It is a long, overdue commonsense action to end this epidemic of gun violence in America.

Let us salute, again, the persistent leadership of so many in this body. And, again, Mr. THOMPSON, as chair of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force, he has worked tirelessly in an unselfish way to protect our communities, and we are grateful to him for that.

We can do all the inside maneuvering that we want, and that is really important. But the essential to outside mobilization, we cannot enjoy the success of saving lives and making progress. So I want to thank the courageous advocates who are here today, in the gallery, including March for Our Lives and Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, and so many more. They have made a complete difference.

As President Lincoln said: “Public sentiment is everything. With it you can accomplish almost anything, without it almost nothing.”

I thank them for building public sentiment to a point where now about 90 percent of the American people support commonsense background check legislation, including many members, courageously, of the National Rifle Association.

This bill is proudly bipartisan because gun violence prevention should not be a Democratic or Republican issue. Gun violence does not discriminate by party or politics. It reaches into all of our communities, our schools, our places of worship, our workplaces, and our streets, and it will require all of our courage to defeat it.

Last night, we were at an occasion to mark the 25th anniversary of the Brady Bill. Some of us were in Congress at that time. Many of us here, then or now, have the courage of Sarah and Jim Brady to make the country a safer place by reducing gun violence.

Twenty-five years ago, we enacted the Brady background check system, which has denied millions of sales to potentially dangerous individuals. Yet, the Brady Bill does not stop people from purchasing guns from unlicensed sellers without a background check at gun shows and online. We must pass H.R. 8 to close this dangerous loophole and keep our communities safe from gun violence. That is what we are intending to do today.
George Bernard Shaw said that: “It is the mark of a truly intelligent person to be moved by statistics,” and here are the facts:

Nearly 40,000 lives are cut short every year from gun violence.

An average of 4,761 children and teenagers are killed by guns every single day. As I said, it is all about the children, the children, the children.

We read about the tragic mass murders that have happened in our country, and they stir us to action, hopefully so where it has been they stir us to a moment of silence, and now, finally, to action.

But it is every day. Every day 47 children and teenagers killed by guns.

And, again, another figure, heartening back to 90 percent of the American people want commonsense universal background checks.

“The bill tells us the stories, but it is the human personal stories that change minds.

How moving it was to hear our colleague, Congresswoman McNAB, with her generosity of spirit tell her personal story of losing her son, Jordan—how she can’t even imagine carrying that burden—but turning her grief and her tragedy into action and courage to run for Congress, to stand on this floor and share her personal story with us. That takes real courage.

Let’s hope that we all have the courage to save children’s lives, everyone’s lives in our country whose deaths can be avoided.

There is no person in this body whose political survival is more important than the survival of our children.

We are grateful, again, to the young people, parents, survivors across America who have told their stories, marched for their lives, and demanded change. This bill delivers that change. This bill is nothing more than an attempt to advance the agenda of radical gun-grabbers and lay the foundation for a national gun registration scheme.

Mr. Chair, I urge the House to reject this misguided legislation so we can begin having real discussions about ways to reduce crime across this great Nation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), a member of the committee.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I rise today to express my strong support for this bill, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act.

Since the Brady law was enacted in 1994, many American lives have been saved, murders have fallen by at least 32 percent, and our community streets are safer and stronger as a result. But our work is not done. In Houston alone, we see an average of 550 acts of gun violence per year.

Too many of our loved ones are lost to senseless gun violence that could be prevented by keeping firearms out of dangerous hands. We know expanded background checks work.

States requiring background checks on all handgun sales see half as many mass shootings as States without the added requirements. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 8. This commonsense bill will prevent private firearm sales to prohibited purchasers and close online and gun show loopholes.

While this bill does not cover everything, it is a step in the right direction that will make my district—Houston, Texas—and this country safer.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE). Mr. CLINE of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the previous speaker, the Speaker of the House, reminding us all that it is California where Michael Bloomberg and the gun control advocates have established their utopia of a land without gun stories that has it led us to? With some of the strictest gun control laws in the land, we have some of the worst incidents of gun violence in the country.

Gun control measures do not address the problems of gun violence, and this bill will not address gun violence.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8. The legislation is an attempt to take away our Second Amendment rights, hidden under the guise that we will see a reduction in violent crime.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim the bill would save lives, but nothing in this bill would have stopped any of the recent mass casual shootings that have occurred in our country. The only thing this bill does is limit the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

They will tell you this bill closes loopholes; however, the loophole that they believe is the gun control loophole, and what they really want is to regulate the private transfer of firearms. If my neighbor is in trouble and needs to borrow a firearm to protect his family, I should be allowed to loan that firearm so that he can protect himself and his family. This is not something we should need to go to the Federal Government to get permission to do. The Second Amendment does not say that, after you get permission from the government, your right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution to protect us from the government and gave individuals the Second Amendment to protect themselves.

I carry this Constitution every day on the campaign trail asphalt. I carry it with me every day now to remind myself of those protections that were given to us—not by government, but by God.

This bill is nothing more than an attempt to advance the agenda of radical gun-grabbers and lay the foundation for a national gun registration scheme. Mr. Chair, I urge the House to reject this misguided legislation so we can begin having real discussions about ways to reduce crime across this great Nation.

Mr. Collin's name is PETE STAUBER, and I was a law enforcement officer for 23 years in the great State of Minnesota, the city of Duluth.

In December of 1995, at 10:32 p.m., at the intersection of 6th Avenue East and 4th Street in Duluth, Minnesota, a criminal who should not have had a
firearm tried to take my life. I was shot in the head, and by the grace of God, I survived.

A few years after that, while on duty in a hostage situation, another criminal pulled a gun on me. Face-to-face, I was aiming down the barrel of a handgun. The criminal pulled the trigger. The gun malfunctioned, and I was in a fight for my life. When it was all over, by the grace of God, I was alive. The individual was handcuffed. Both those individuals were career criminals.

Back to when I was shot in the head, Mr. Chair: I begged the U.S. attorney, along with our police department, to charge the individual with possession of a handgun by a felon. They didn’t do it. That individual was allowed to circumvent our community for another 8 years before he was finally put in prison, where he belonged. No more harming other people.

Representative COLLINS’ Mass Violence Prevention Act gets the county attorneys and our Federal attorneys present to prosecute these individuals who have no respect for life.

I carried a handgun for 23 years. Mr. Chair, as a tool to defend my life or someone else’s. When it comes from a law-abiding, I support the individual right of harm. I support the individual right of law-abiding citizens, the right to keep and bear arms.

Both my wife and I live in rural Minnesota. When we need to protect ourselves, when it takes awhile for law enforcement to get there, we have the ability.

There is nobody I know who wants somebody who is going through a mental health issue or a career criminal or a drug dealer to have these.

We need to start respecting life. Life is precious, from conception to natural death. I am a very proud husband of an Iraq war veteran who understands the value of life.

Mr. Chair, I rise against this. There are better ways to get mothers and fathers, county attorneys, Federal prosecutors, local police departments, and sheriff departments to work together to have a fusion center so, when a young individual types into a computer “I want to be a mass school shooter,” there is an instant response to identify the individual and work through it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

LIST OF MASS SHOOTINGS SINCE COLUMBINE MASSACRE

(By Zayed Abdalla, Feb 20, 2018)

Below is a list of all mass shootings in the United States which occurred after the Columbine High School Massacre. Dates and death tolls (excluding the shooter) are included. Although many other mass shootings have occurred, for the sake of time and physical space, only shootings involving the death of five or more people have been included in this article.

1. Columbine High School Shooting, Littleton, Colorado—April 1999: 13 Dead
2. Atlanta Shootings, Atlanta, Georgia—July 1999: 12 Dead
3. Wedgewood Baptist Church shooting, Fort Worth, Texas—September 1999: 7 Dead
4. Xerox Killings, Honolulu, Hawaii—November 1999: 7 Dead
5. Tampa Hotel Shootings, Tampa, Florida—December 1999: 5 Dead
6. Wakefield Massacre, Wakefield, Massachusetts—December 2000: 7 Dead
7. Lockhead Martin Shooting, Median, Mississippi—July 2003: 6 Dead
8. Living Church of God Shooting, Brookfield, Wisconsin—March 2005: 7 Dead
9. Red Lake High School, Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minnesota—March 2005: 9 Dead
10. Goleta Postal Shootings, Goleta, California—January 2006: 7 Dead
13. Tolley Square Shooting, Salt Lake City, Utah—February 2007: 5 Dead
14. Virginia Tech University, Blacksburg, Virginia—April 2007: 32 Dead
15. Crandon Shooting, Crandon Wisconsin—October 2007: 6 Dead
16. Westroads Mall Shooting, Omaha Nebraska—December 2007: 5 Dead
17. Kirkwood City Council Shooting, Kirkwood, Missouri—February 2008: 6 Dead
18. Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois—February 2008: 5 Dead
19. Atlantic Plastics Shootings, Henderson Kentucky—June 2008: 5 Dead
22. Ringhamp Knives Shootings, Binghampton—April 2009: 13 Dead
23. Fort Hood Shooting, Fort Hood, Texas—November 2009: 13 Dead
24. Hartford Beer Distributor Shooting, Manchester, Connecticut—August 2010: 8 Dead
26. Seal Beach Shooting, Seal Beach, California—October 2011: 8 Dead
27. Oikos University, Oakland, California—April 2012: 7 Dead
29. Aurora Shooting, Aurora, Colorado—July 2012: 12 Dead
30. Sikh Temple Shooting, Oak Creek, Wisconsin—August 2012: 6 Dead

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman, and I certainly thank the ranking member for being present here today. I hold up in my pages and pages of mass shootings, which I will include in the RECORD.
By no means do I want you not to.

It says that you have to have a check, a background check. It closes the gun show loophole. It gives exemptions for the issues of domestic violence and sexual assault. It allows families to transfer firearms to farmers, ranchers, and fishers to transfer.

My God, what more do we want? People have died. Are we not going to show that we are committed to saving lives, not to abusing the Second Amendment to misuse it? We can bear arms. But the question is whether or not we will recognize that there are 350-plus million Americans, and there are more guns in this country than there are citizens.

I beg of my colleagues: Stop the violence.

Vote for this bill.

Mr. Chair, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and an original co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8, the "Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019." legislation that strengthens the background check system that is already in place to purchase a firearm.

A 2013 study found that approximately 80 percent of all firearms acquired for criminal purposes were obtained from sources who were not required to run a background check and that 96 percent of inmates who were not prohibited from possessing a firearm at the time they committed their crime obtained their gun this way.

This loophole exists largely because unlicensed sellers need not conduct any background check under current law, even if the sellers sell a large number of guns.

H.R. 8, the "Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019," would make it illegal for any person who is not a licensed firearm importer, manufacturer, or dealer to transfer a firearm to any other person who is not licensed without a background check.

Individuals seeking to transfer a firearm under this measure would be required to visit a licensed firearms dealer to run the necessary background check before the transfer could be finalized.

H.R. 8 is intended to provide an accurate and speedy means of ensuring firearms do not end up in the wrong hands.

An internal assessment by the Federal Bureau of investigation (FBI) demonstrated that the National Instant Criminal Background Checks System ("NICS") yields results that are approximately 99.9 percent to 99.8 percent accurate and in 90 percent of cases, are processed within 90 seconds.

Every day, on average, 92 Americans are victims of gun violence, resulting in more than 33,000 deaths annually.

States with higher gun ownership rates have higher gun murder rates—as much as 114 percent higher than other states.

A recent study by the CDC looking at 30 years of homicide data found that for every 1 percent increase in a state’s gun ownership rate, there is a nearly 1 percent increase in its firearm homicide rate.

Gun death rates are generally lower in states with restrictions such as safe storage requirements or assault weapons bans.

Mass shootings stopped by armed civilians in the past 33 years: 0.

This is why legislation put forward to arm teachers is not the solution.

Stronger legislation is needed to prevent guns from getting into the wrong hands because unfortunately, more than 75 percent of the weapons used in mass shootings between 1982 and 2012 were obtained legally.

We must look at gun violence in its totality to determine what are the root causes of the alarming rates of lives cut short.

We are elected by our constituents to lead in resolving the issues that plague our country, and the issue of gun violence is a definite plague across the nation.

My good friend, Houston Police Chief Art Acevedo, gave a statement after four of his officers were shot while on duty.

He rightfully admonished us elected officials who, so far, have accomplished absolutely nothing about the public-health epidemic of gun violence.

Thanks to the new Democratic majority in Congress, we had a long overdue Gun Safety Hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

That hearing is the first step in the legislative process of addressing the epidemic.
Chief Acevedo was a witness at that hearing, testifying that if the proposed legislation on background checks is enacted and saves at least one life, then it is worth it.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, Congressman Mike Thompson, for his leadership as the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force and for introducing this timely and important legislation.

Congressman Thompson sat in the audience during the entirety of the Gun Safety Hearing on February 13, 2019, demonstrating his longstanding commitment to the issue.

Also helping to bring us to this point today is Congresswoman Robin Kelly of Illinois, who represents one of the most affected districts when it comes to gun violence.

She is a valiant leader who will not rest until the Congress finds solutions for communities like hers and others all over this country.

I want to thank Aalayah Eastmond, a survivor from the Parkland School Shooting, for testifying as a witness at the House Judiciary Gun Safety Hearing.

Her heartfelt and vivid testimony was met with a standing ovation by the crowded audience in the hearing.

Back in my state, despite incident after incident of rampant gun violence, Texas Governor Greg Abbott and Attorney General Ken Paxton, both prominent Republican opponents of gun control, issued the usual statements offering the usual thoughts and prayers.

Chief Acevedo said, “I appreciate your prayers . . . but the question is, what are policymakers willing to do, besides prayers, to address a public-health epidemic?”

I want to answer his question—“What are we going to do?”

We are going to overcome the fierce opposition from House minority members.

We are going to overcome a recalcitrant and reluctant Senate.

And finally, we are going to overcome the opposition of the President and the gun lobby.

I am a defender and supporter of the Constitution.

I appreciate the Second Amendment and the right that it provides our citizens.

However, I am also a defender of the right to live, the greatest divine right of all.

I want all Americans to enjoy their Second Amendment right, but not at the expense of the lives of our children, students, communities, and law enforcement officials.

Imagine going to grade school in this day and age and having to undergo “active shooter” drills.

Imagine having children in grade school today.

Imagine the anxiety parents feel knowing that any day the precious lives of their children may be interrupted by someone with an AK-47 or AR-15.

Imagine a brighter future for America’s children, one that does not include active shooter drills and funerals for adolescents.

We can help make that future a reality and we can start by voting to pass H.R. 8, the “ Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019.”

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Byrne).

Mr. BYRNE of Alabama. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this bill.

What H.R. 8 will do is violate the constitutional rights of millions of Americans.

Under this bill, almost every time a lawful gun owner wants to transfer or sell a gun, he or she will have to go through a government-sanctioned, paid intermediary. Under this bill, no longer could I let my cousin or my neighbor borrow my gun. If this bill becomes law, overnight, millions of gun-owning gun owners could suddenly be subject to Federal prosecution. Of course, we all know that criminals are going to do what they already do: make illegal transfers of firearms.

We have heard a lot about how this is going to be the most open Congress in history. We have filed an amendment that would strip out the text of H.R. 8 and replace it with a nationwide concealed carry reciprocity.

Mr. Chair, the Democratic leadership blocked a vote on my amendment. What are they so afraid of? I guess they think they can shield their Members from votes to protect the Second Amendment and benefit our Nation’s law-abiding gun owners.

Mr. Chair, for the majority. Gun owners of America are watching this debate. They know what H.R. 8 is all about, and they know that this is just a sham to chip away at the Second Amendment and our Constitution.

I will oppose this bill and any bill that goes against the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Americans.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ‘no’ and fighting against this assault on the Second Amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Lewis).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend, the chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan bill.

At Atlanta, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Parkland, Charleston, Oak Creek, Newtown, Orlando, Las Vegas, and many other places, how many more must suffer? How many more must die?

For years, the people spoke up. Mothers called. Fathers cried. Students marched, working to end gun violence. How many more must suffer? How many more must die?

For years, the people spoke up. Mothers called. Fathers cried. Students marched, working to end gun violence.

Today, we say to those who begged and pleaded for us to act that we see you. We feel your pain. We heard your cries, and we are going to answer you today.

We sat in on this floor. I want to thank the chair of our task force, Mike Thompson, for never giving up, for never giving in, for keeping the faith, for keeping us on the prize. We are doing the right thing today.

We have a mission. We have an obligation and a mandate to pass this bipartisan bill that must become public law.

Today, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ‘yes.’ It is good. It is the right thing to do to save lives and to stop this madness.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Johnson).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 8. I commend the efforts of Congressman Mike Thompson from California for introducing this commonsense legislation.

What it simply does is require that all sales of firearms go through a licensed firearms dealer who has to run a background check. Current law mandates that all licensed gun dealers, before transferring a weapon, have to perform a background check.

The problem we have in this country is the law allows unlicensed firearms dealers competing with licensed firearms dealers to sell just as many firearms as a licensed gun dealer, but without doing the background check. That enables criminals and people who should not have weapons to have firearms, and that contributes to the proliferation of weaponry on our streets in the hands of those who should not have them.

It produces violence, and we are looking to stop the violence with this legislation, and so I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. Swalwell).

Mr. Swalwell of California. Mr. Chair, today, we tell our fellow Americans that their children’s right to learn without fear; that their right to dance at a concert, worship at a synagogue, shop at the mall; that all those rights to come home, to live, and to love are greater than any other right in the Constitution.

This bill puts in place an expansion of violent history checks on firearm purchases where there were too many gaps before.

It will not end every gun violence death in America, but we should try. It will not get rid of all gun violence. Well, no, we are only as safe as the lowest common denominator. If our States like Nevada and Arizona have low restrictions when it comes to purchasing a firearm, we are only as safe as they are.

We will have a nationwide background check that will make sure that all of us are safe. We are here, Mr. Chair, because of Mr. Thompson, because of Moms Demand Action, because of Everytown for Gun Safety, and because of March For Our Lives.

Keep marching. You got us to this point.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Chair. The gentleman from New York has 9 1/4 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Brown).
Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 8. This bill is long overdue. For too long, Congress has failed to end the cycle of gun violence and death that too many families are now familiar with.

In 2017 alone, 40,000 people died from gun violence. Congress did nothing. Last year, five reporters at the Capital Gazette in my district were murdered in cold blood in a mass shooting that took place in their newsroom. Congress did nothing.

Gun violence is a crisis in our communities and a real national emergency that will no longer be met with inaction.

For the first time since Congress passed the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1994, we will pass a bill in pursuit of our effort to protect our communities and end this scourge of gun violence.

The American people overwhelmingly want us to act. For the people, we are pursuing universal background checks out of the House as our first piece of comprehensive gun safety reform.

Mr. Chair, today is only the beginning.

I, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a member of the committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, just 2 weeks ago in my district, six lives and six families were forever changed by gun violence in a 6-day period. Four people were killed and four were injured in six different shootings. One person was 28. The other five were 16, 17, and 18. They were teenagers. My heart goes out to all of those victims’ families.

Thoughts and prayers are no longer enough. It is long past time that our actions match our words. No matter which State we are from, with over 40,000 gun violence deaths last year, every State has been severely impacted by gun violence.

The public health crisis has been politicized and weaponized as a means to divide us, despite the fact that it is a crisis that should bind us together, and we must come together.

Background checks are the foundation of commonsense gun policy, and they are supported by the overwhelming majority of Americans. Our current system fails us in two ways, but the bills we are looking at this week are designed to address that.

Under current law, firearm sales can proceed regardless if a good background check comes back within a 3-day period, and it doesn’t capture all the sales. So this puts an incredible burden on law enforcement and an incredible burden on ATF agents who have to go and reclaim guns that are sold, despite the owner of the gun not being able to pass the background check. So for too long those in a position to act have failed to do so. But that ends now.

I strongly support the commonsense gun legislation in H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, again, I agree with the sentiment that we actually stand on something that will work. Unfortunately, this, for many reasons we have already stated, will not.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My friend, the gentleman from Georgia, just rose and said that this won’t work. We have risen on this floor time after time after time and had a moment of silence followed by no action.

As I said time after time, we have had a moment of silence. I will tell my friend from Georgia that it hasn’t worked. It has been appropriate, but it has not worked.

Can we guarantee that this will work to make every person safe? It cannot be said. But I rise in strong support of doing something, and in this case doing something that 90 percent of America supports.

Mr. Chairman, this House is finally going to do its job and take action—not just a moment of silence, but action—to address the epidemic of gun violence in our country.

After the tragedies at Sandy Hook, Orlando, Las Vegas, Charleston, Tree of Life, synagogue, and Great Mills High School in my district, the House, under the previous leadership, did nothing. It didn’t work.

After the shooting just down the street at the Washington Navy Yard, the Republican-controlled House did nothing. Three of the victims of that attack were constituents of mine living in southern Maryland. Dr. Wendy Edmonds and Wanda Wallace are in the gallery. Mr. Chairman. They are the sisters of Sylvia Fraser, a Navy Yard shooting victim.

Montana Geimer, daughter of Wendi Winters, a writer for the Capital Gazette of which my colleague, Mr. BROWN, just spoke; and Mackenzie Lee, a high school student who organized a March for Our Lives rally in Anne Arundel County, are here with us today not to have a moment of silence, but to have a moment of action.

Many of our districts have been painfully affected by gun violence. In St. Mary’s County in Maryland, as I told you, Mr. Chairman, a student was killed by a shooter at Great Mills High School, and a courageous school resources officer there saved countless other lives. In Annapolis, five staff members of the Capital Gazette were gunned down in their newsroom.

For years, the American people have demanded action to address gun violence. After the Parkland shooting, just over a year ago, students marched in cities from coast to coast to demand that Congress protect them in the classroom, in the streets, in houses of worship, and in all public gathering places.

As I am sure many of you have, had the opportunity to meet with many of the students who participated in the March for Our Lives and heard the determination in their voices as they spoke about working to achieve a future where students would no longer have to practice active-shooter drills in their schools. I found their courage and persistence deeply inspiring.

Now, with a change in the majority control, we are bringing to the floor legislation supported by nine out of ten Americans, including a majority of responsible gun owners to expand criminal background checks to make sure that those who have a criminal past, a past of violence—domestic or otherwise—a mental health problem, or are on the no-fly list because they are perceived as possibly terrorists, won’t be able to buy a gun.

Does that mean they won’t get a gun? No, it does not. I understand that. But as I told my friend from Georgia, the moments of silence have not worked. They were appropriate, I understand, but they didn’t work.
We will also be voting this week on legislation offered by our whip, Mr. CLYBURN, to close the loophole that contributed to the horrific mass shooting at Mother Emanuel AME Church in Charleston in 2015.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Senate to follow the House and pass the legislation we advance, and I call on the President to sign it without delay.

Mr. Chairman, let us not have a moment of silence for this legislation. Do not let it serve only to remind us of the pain and suffering that it provides to victims and their families. Do not let us stand by one more time to lament the death of a constituent, a friend, a neighbor, a fellow citizen, who dies at the hand of a gun purchased illegally or by someone who should not have a gun.

This is not about taking away guns. It is about preventing guns getting in the hands of people who do bad things, and we can predict that they are a danger to others. Let us not have a moment of silence for this bill. Let us pass it. Let us pass it now. Let's make an effort at least to stop the carnage.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the words of the majority leader. However, I will say that in the previous Congress, this Congress did pass Fix NICS. It also passed the STOP School Violence Act. Congress did pass Fix NICS. It also passed the STOP School Violence Act. It is about preventing guns getting in the hands of people who do bad things, and we can predict that they are a danger to others. Let us not have a moment of silence for this bill. Let us pass it now. Let's make an effort at least to stop the carnage.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to these gun control bills that are being brought forward. They are brought forward under the guise of background checks.

Let's look at what these bills would actually do. We had identified any number of problems with this bill that we were trying to improve, and every one of those was shut out, shut out by the Democratic majority who wanted to try to stifle the opposing side's debate because they think just saying background checks makes this a good bill.

Let's talk about what this bill will do to make criminals—felons—out of law-abiding citizens. If you loan your gun to a friend under this bill, maybe they are thinking of buying a similar gun to protect themselves and they want to go to a shooting range to see if this gun is the right kind of gun to protect themselves with, which they have a right to do under the Second Amendment of this Constitution, loaning your gun to that friend in that act would make you a felon subject to a year in jail and subject to a $100,000 fine, Mr. Chairman.

We tried to fix this. They shut that amendment out. In this bill, if you loan your gun to a friend who may have been a victim of domestic violence—and one of my colleagues who oppose this bill is one of those victims of domestic violence. She had an amendment to fix this bill to say, if she has got a temporary restraining order against her boyfriend who has been beating her and she is afraid he is going to come back tonight, under one of the bills, if she goes to buy a gun tonight and the Fix NICS system isn’t working, she may have 20 business days to get that gun.

Now, good luck if the boyfriend shows up to beat her up that night and she says: Don’t worry, I am on day 8, I only have another 12 days before I can buy the gun. Will you come back so I can defend myself then?

Do you really think that is going to happen?

You know what that means to her. So in the bill we said: What if you can loan your gun to her? She goes to a friend and says: I know you have a gun. I don’t have a gun. I am trying to protect myself because I have got a TRO, but I know he is probably going to come back.

Under this bill, you will be a felon, a year in jail and $100,000 fine. We tried to fix that, too, Mr. Chairman, and they shut that amendment out. That is what this bill does.

Oh, by the way, we are talking about law-abiding citizens here. If you go hunting with a buddy and you try to loan your gun to a buddy, Mr. Chairman, they say there is an exemption in this bill. That other side. It is $1,000, as was pointed out. If you loan your gun to a friend and you try to loan your gun to a buddy, Mr. Chairman, they say there is an exemption in this bill. But it is written so vaguely that you not only need to bring your hunting partner, you might need to bring your attorney to find out if loaning your shotgun to your friend makes you a felon under this bill.

These are law-abiding citizens. These are people who use guns to defend themselves, which is the basis of the Second Amendment. Our Founding Fathers believed every American has the right to defend themselves, because every day, on average, in this country guns are used by good people to defend themselves against bad people, and it is going to make it harder for them to get access to these guns to defend themselves. So, again, we tried to fix some of these problems.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you about another problem we tried to identify and fix. If you loan your gun, you will be a felon.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. Chairman, I request of the chairman: Does the gentleman from Louisiana have any more speakers at this time?

Mr. NADLER. Yes, I have one more. Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I request of the chairman: Does the gentleman from Louisiana have any more speakers at this time?

Mr. NADLER. Yes, I have one more.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. 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.

Members are reminded to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the distinguished author of the bill.

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

I was asked to talk about some of the outrageous allegations that were made about this bill, and the chairman already cleared one up, and that is the $100,000 fine that we are hearing from the other side. It is $1,000, as was pointed out.

We also heard that this isn’t constitutional. Well, the Constitution is pretty clear: Individuals have a right to bear arms. Nobody is disputing that. As a matter of fact, in District of Columbia v. Heller, the Supreme Court settled that issue.

But also in that opinion were Justice Scalia’s remarks that stated that government also has a responsibility and a right to regulate firearms. That is all we are doing.

We are saying that people who are felons, domestic abusers, dangerously mentally ill, a danger to themselves or others shouldn’t be able to have guns, I don’t think anybody can dispute that. And how do you find out if you don’t do a background check?

My friends on the other side of the aisle said this won’t work. We have
heard it a hundred times: This won’t work. Well, we have been working on this for 6½ years, ever since Sandy Hook. We have pleaded with the other side to work with us, have a hearing.

What are your ideas?

Absolute silence from them. Absolute silence.

This does work. We know that licensed dealers stop the sale of firearms to felons every day and 50 domestic abusers every day because they are required to conduct background checks. But in some States, that same individual can be found to be prohibited, walk outside and go to a gun show or go online and buy a gun without the benefit of a background check—and that is wrong.

Countless speakers from the other side of the aisle said this wouldn’t have stopped this crime, this wouldn’t have stopped this mass shooting, this wouldn’t have stopped that mass shooting. Well, my friends, if that is your standard, if you will only support a bill that will stop every mass shooting, that will stop every death by a firearm, that means you want to get rid of all guns, and no one on this side of the aisle is saying this.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chair, I urge your “aye” vote.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, before I close, I would like to say that I agree with the statement from the gentleman just now that there are maybe the ones turned away every day. The problem is there are only 60 a year prosecuted for what is a crime. This doesn’t address that.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), a licensed firearms dealer.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for allowing me the time.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8 and want to lay out a couple of reasons for my opposition.

Before I do, I think it is important to acknowledge how polarizing this debate has become over the last several years. More specifically, I want this body to know that, as a human being, as an American, as a father, when I see the heartbreaking news of a mass shooting like the one we saw just 54 weeks ago in Parkland, it just breaks my heart.

With that being said, this bill that we are voting on today would not have done anything to stop that tragedy from happening, nor would it have prevented any of those recent mass shootings.

The 19-year-old murderer in Parkland passed a background check.

The man who murdered 26 innocent people at First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs also passed a background check, although he wouldn’t have if the Air Force had passed along his criminal information like they were supposed to have done.

And the evil that took place in Sandy Hook wouldn’t have been stopped by this bill either. The killer used his mother’s guns to kill her and 26 others. They were bought legally.

Mr. Chairman, the simple fact is that criminals don’t abide by the law, and this would only create traps for law-abiding gun owners.

However, there are actions that we can take, actions that we can do, that would make meaningful strides in combating the violence that we see today.

One example of something we could do, improve information sharing between law enforcement officials across this country.

Mr. Chair, to close, I disagree with the policy of this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, we have heard the other side here say that some people lie on the forms; they are not prosecuted. Well, that may be, and maybe law enforcement ought to prosecute more people.

That doesn’t negate the necessity for the bill. It doesn’t negate the fact that too many people who shouldn’t have guns, who are mentally unstable, who have committed crimes, and who are background check fraudsters, that they buy a gun at a gun show or not from a registered gun dealer and, therefore, do not have to undergo a background check.

Everyone who gets a gun should have to undergo a background check, with the few exceptions we put in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8 is legislation that is long overdue for passage by this Congress.

To mitigate gun violence in America, H.R. 8 expands Brady background checks to transactions by private sellers not currently covered by the law. Multiple school shootings have led to robust, comprehensive action at every level to make classrooms safer. I have visited many schools in my district—and I have found that while the threat is being taken seriously, no one policy, program or initiative can ensure the level of protection our students need and deserve.

Mr. Chair, no constitutional right is absolute including the Second Amendment. The First Amendment’s freedom of speech, for example, has reasonable limits including the promulgation of slander and libel law.

To preserve public order, we accept reasonable restrictions on the freedom to assemble. Even freedom of religion isn’t without some modest boundaries.

In like manner, universal background checks don’t erode Second Amendment rights but do help ensure much needed protection from gun violence for everyone.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act.

This year, my State of the Union guest was Alexandria Goddard, a young activist who helped organize Portland’s March for Our Lives.

Alexandria led thousands of Oregonians in a march to demand that Congress take action to prevent gun violence.

By passing this bill we are heeding the call of the hundreds of thousands of students who marched for their lives.

They know—and we know—that this bill will save lives because it requires a background check for nearly all firearm sales and transfers.

The evidence shows that Oregon and the other states that have already passed comprehensive background checks have 35 percent fewer gun deaths, and 47 percent fewer women shot by their intimate partners.

Congress is finally doing more than offering thoughts and prayers.

We are acting. We are acting for Parkland, for Sandy Hook, for Umpqua Community College, and for the hundreds of thousands of victims and survivors around the country.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 8.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 8, The Bipartisan Background Check Act of 2019. This
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 “Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.  The purpose of this Act is to utilize the current background checks process in the United States to ensure individuals prohibited from gun possession are not able to obtain firearms.

SEC. 3. FIREARMS TRANSFERS.  Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (s);

(2) by redesignating subsection (t) as subsection (s); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (s), as redesignated, the following:

"(t) In a transfer of a firearm described in subsection (s) to a person other than a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to transfer a firearm to any person other than a person described in clause (2) of section 922(w)(5)(B), and (s)(5)(B)(iv) and inserting ‘‘(i), and’’ and inserting ‘‘(g)(5)(B),’’.

(b) CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012.—Section 511 of title V of division B of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (12 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by striking “subsection 922(w)(5)(B)(iv) and inserting ‘‘(t)’’.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.  Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to—

(1) authorize the establishment, directly or indirectly, of a national firearms registry; or

(2) interfere with the authority of a State, under section 927 of title 18, United States Code, to enact a law on the same subject matter as this Act.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.  The amendments made by this Act shall take effect 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR.  No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 116-14. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The CHAIR.  It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 116-14.

Mrs. LESKO.  Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR.  The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 17, strike “or”.
Page 4, line 15, strike the period and insert “;”.
Page 4, after line 15, insert the following:

“(d) a transfer to a participant in the Pre-check or successor trusted traveler program of the Department of Homeland Security;”.

The CHAIR.  Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentleman from Arizona (Mrs. Lesko), and an opponent each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO.  Mr. Chairman, this amendment would allow gun owners to legally transfer their firearms to individuals who have been approved and are participants in TSA’s Precheck program.

TSA Precheck identifies trusted travelers and, thus, allows expedited movement through airport security. In order to receive Precheck, one must submit an application, have an in-person interview, and go through a background check and fingerprinting.
Fingerprinting is not required, currently, to purchase a gun; thus, a TSA PreCheck background check is more stringent. If an individual can pass this background check and be admitted to this Federal Government program, there is no reason why they shouldn’t be able to carry a firearm given as a friend. They have already gone through a more extensive background check system than to acquire a weapon. The current background check does not require fingerprints; a TSA PreCheck does.

Membership to TSA PreCheck must be renewed every 5 years. Again, the TSA PreCheck process requires fingerprints and an in-person interview. The process, currently, for purchasing a gun requires neither of those under Federal law. It appears, then, that the TSA PreCheck process is a more extensive process.

H.R. 8 restricts not only the purchase, but also the everyday gun transfers for law-abiding citizens. This amendment and many other Republican amendments—I think I had five others that were not made in order—seek to give some relief to law-abiding citizens from this overbearing and burdensome legislation.

In H.R. 8, we are not only talking about the purchase of firearms, we are talking about the transfer of firearms, which includes lending your firearm. The Democrats have proposed a bill that would criminalize millions of law-abiding citizens. This amendment and many other Republican amendments—I think I had five others that were not made in order—seek to give some relief to law-abiding citizens from this overbearing and burdensome legislation.

If we are going to allow Americans to be given expedited and reduced screening in our most sensitive and secure environments in the U.S. airport getting on a plane, why wouldn’t we allow them to lend a gun to their friend?

H.R. 8 criminalizes me and others just for handing someone a firearm who isn’t a direct family member or in other very narrow situations. In fact, as I said yesterday, the language in this bill is so ambiguous, it encompasses so many potential situations. This amendment seeks to give some relief.

The amendment would add an exception to the background check requirement for anyone who is a participant in the TSA PreCheck program by the Department of Homeland Security.

By exempting those who have obtained a TSA PreCheck from the background check requirement, this amendment would allow many dangerous people, including people with disqualifying mental health conditions and some criminal convictions, to obtain firearms without a background check.

The current background system, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, was designed specifically for background checks pursuant to the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

The system, often called the NICS, contains the information that no other Federal database contains, and the TSA does not check NICS when determining a person’s eligibility for the TSA PreCheck program.

Although participants in the TSA PreCheck program have had their criminal backgrounds vetted, the standards for approval and participation in the TSA PreCheck program are not the same and, in many cases, are more lenient than those which prohibit firearm possession and purchase.

For example, the NICS searches the background check requirement for mental health reasons during a firearms background check. These mental health reasons, though, are not part of the TSA PreCheck search.

As of January 2019, there are more than 5.7 million of these mental health records in the NICS indexes, making it the second most populous category of prohibited records for firearm purchase.

Because the Department of Homeland Security does not have access to these mental health records for TSA PreCheck program purposes, individuals who have been adjudicated to be disqualified to own firearms for reasons of mental health during the background check but are not legally able to possess a gun. Under this amendment, they would be legally exempted from the background check requirement and would be able to get a gun, despite being legally prohibited from doing so.

The TSA bars people convicted of certain criminal offenses, such as rape or aggravated assault, from participating in the TSA PreCheck program only temporarily. It doesn’t restrict people convicted of these serious crimes for more than 7 years, and it wouldn’t bar people released from prison for these crimes within the last 5 years.

Under current law, these felony convictions prohibit possession or purchase of a weapon, but, under this amendment, people released from prison within the last 5 years for these crimes could get the weapons—could get the weapons.

The TSA PreCheck program does not have a minimum age requirement, and this amendment would allow people between the ages of 18 and 21 to purchase firearms illegally and without a NICS background check.

Furthermore, the TSA PreCheck program only requires a background check every 5 years, and the PreCheck system does not disqualify offenses that have taken place after the initial PreCheck background check has occurred.

In other words, you get the TSA PreCheck, and if you are convicted afterwards, within 5 years, for a very serious crime, under this amendment, you could get the gun, although, legally, you shouldn’t without a background check, and the TSA PreCheck program would not have picked it up.

These shortcomings of the TSA PreCheck system make it an inadequate and dangerous substitute for a NICS background check. To prevent potentially prohibited purchasers from obtaining firearms, licensed dealers should conduct background checks on participants in the PreCheck program as they would with any other member of the public.

The blanket exception of this amendment for anyone who participates in the TSA PreCheck program would undermine the bill’s ability to enhance public safety because it would enable people convicted of serious crimes, people adjudicated to have serious mental illnesses, to purchase guns without a background check, even though the TSA system would not pick them up.

The TSA system is a substitute for the background check system. It doesn’t pick up many of the crimes. It doesn’t carry it forward. And it is not a substitute for this system.

To pass this amendment, which would allow people who have been convicted under the TSA PreCheck program not to have background checks, would allow a lot of people who shouldn’t have guns to have them. Therefore, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I ask that my colleagues vote “no” on this amendment.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Collins). Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I won’t take even the 30 seconds. I just support the amendment. I think it is good. Many of the flaws that we have seen in this bill so far, this is an amendment that actually works.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. NADLER, in his statement, said that my amendment would allow dangerous people to get guns. I have to say I disagree.

As the ranking member on the Committee on Homeland Security subcommittee that deals with TSA, and the TSA PreCheck system is more stringent than the background check currently required to obtain a gun, when you purchase it. Again, it requires a fingerprint background check and an individual interview. Neither of those is required right now.

We had offered a number of amendments to help this bill become less burdensome on law-abiding citizens, and it is good. Many of the flaws that we have seen in this bill so far, this is an amendment that actually works.
Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. Price of North Carolina). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona.

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LÉSKO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DEAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 116–14.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will deprecate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, after "harm," insert "including harm to self, family, household members, or others.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, with this amendment, will keep guns out of the hands of those who legally should not have them and also gives those who need a safe way to separate themselves from their guns a way to do so.

If we have the courage to pass this legislation, the courage here in the House and in the Senate and in the White House, it will do just that. It will save lives.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the willingness of the amendment, I think, but I rise in that, again, this is something discussed at committee. It was an attempt to—it is basically a failed attempt to fix one of the shortcomings of this legislation.

I understand why they would bring it. I understand why would want to fix it, because its existence indicates what we have been saying about the flaws in the bill, which we discussed at committee.

Like other floor amendments that are going to be offered, this is nothing more than trying to basically change the appearance of what is a flawed perception. The problem here is it address es the undefined term of ‘imminent’ used in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known, and I have spoken about it many times, that I am still currently serving as a United States Air Force chaplain. I have pastored for many years, and I have been on the other end of phone calls from those who were struggling and thinking of taking their lives.

Suicide is not something that we can define very easily. It is not something that we can simply limit to: Yes, guns are effective. But any method that someone uses to choose to end their life is sad and a struggle for those of us who have dealt with this.

The term ‘imminent’ here is problematic for those of us who have dealt with those who are struggling with suicide because imminent to them and imminent to a judge and imminent to someone who wants to take his life, and to law enforcement, indicates a very precipitous time in the life of someone who wants to take his life in a very short amount of time, a very imminent act, something that is maybe going to happen, Mr. Chairman, even before I finish my speech. That is an imminent kind of act.

Imminent does not extend to 12 hours or 24 hours or even 46 hours. That would not fall under the definition of ‘imminent.’ And I am not willing to let a prosecutor or a judge who may not like guns, who would actually say there is an imminent threat by transferring it for more than a short amount of time, you have then fallen under and fall under this.

Now, I would hope that would never happen. Mr. Chairman, I think that we have to be serious about this issue of imminence. For those of us who have dealt with this, there may be, and I have had times when people would come to me and they were thinking about harming themselves, but the imminence factor was not there. They were just trying to see if they could clear their head. It may be a week that would pass, and they came back and would say it was fine.

But in this issue, I understand the intent and the heart here, but it is a very weak attempt to fix problems that we had already pointed out in this bill. And it will still not fix the problem, because the problem is the imminence standard. That is the part that we are struggling with.

We can disagree about this, and I will respect the gentlewoman if she disagrees, and would expect her to. But let me remember, Mr. Chairman, that is very important, Mr. Chairman, is important that we have to remember that our actions here, we vote on words on paper, not aspirational ideas. Those are happy thoughts, not words on paper. The only thing that the courts can do is vote on words on paper.

I appreciate the gentlewoman bringing this. I support the intent, especially dealing with suicide, which many of us have worked on, and the tragedy that it leaves in the wake of so many. But please realize the position of opposition to this is it is still a flawed product because we have not dealt with the very issue of imminence in this legislation and this amendment.

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).
Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, which clarifies the bill's exemption for the background check requirement in instances of imminent threats or great bodily harm would apply to someone who is at risk of committing suicide.

The people deserve to know that the limited number of exemptions to the background check requirement include circumstances in which someone feels that they are a danger to themselves. They may temporarily transfer a firearm to another person for personal protection until the danger has passed. This is a limited and reasonable exception that only applies to those who fear they will harm themselves, so that they may temporary surrender their weapon.

I listened to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN). I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the author of this bill, Representative THOMPSON, and I thank all the tireless advocates who have worked to bring us to this day.

I yield the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, again, I understand the need or want to do this is to make many things that actually came in discussions in our committee about some of the problems that we found here at the Federal level and the mere submission is another tacit admission that the Democrats understand the flaws in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is not something that I am going to reiterate here, but also, when debate is cut short, this is what happens when you get to the floor. When debate is cut short in committee, this is what happens.

They realize that good products were brought, but yet they chose to push through a bill because they had a timeline.

We went through this in the Rules Committee. I get it. This is what is coming up. But, again, to put this in, "great bodily harm," it is minimally helpful at this point. It goes back to the problem we had with "imminent" in the last one.

These are all things, frankly, that could have been—even in a bill that I would disagree with at the end of the day on this—this is, again, not something that is going to fix it. A victim of domestic abuse can live in constant fear of her abuser and feel threatened at all times.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I understand at least the attempt to fix something, because they understand that there were problems and they don't want to make it worse, but I have advocated all along that what this does help, it also hurts. And this is, again, just another attempt to do this.

I appreciate that they are figuring out the problems now; I just would oppose this amendment, because, again, it does not completely fix the problems that we have seen, and would not in the bigger picture.

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

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as I may consume.

When I talked to Oklahomans across my district last year, they confided in me their concerns about gun violence. I promised to work towards policies that would protect them.

We need to protect our Second Amendment right, but there is no credible reason why we as a state and nation can't acknowledge there are steps we can take to save lives and find a path forward.

H.R. 8 does just that. It increases safety without limiting our Second Amendment rights by implementing commonsense policy.

But when we take these commonsense steps, we need to acknowledge our power to create unintended consequences, and to prevent them.

That is why I am offering this amendment. In addition to my commitment to gun safety, I have talked about my devotion to helping protect women and families.

Between 1998 and 2017, the Oklahoma Domestic Violence Fatality Review Board found nearly 1,700 people were killed in our State because of domestic violence. In 2017 alone, 91 Oklahomans were murdered.

The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that nearly two in five Oklahoma women will face some form of domestic abuse or sexual violence during their lifetimes.

Oklahoma is consistently ranked in the top five States for women killed by men in one-on-one homicides.
may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for this amendment to H.R. 8 introduced by Representatives HORN and MURPHY.

This amendment protects people facing the threat of domestic violence, dating partner violence, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic abuse. I am the daughter of a military veteran, and like most Kansans, I respect the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. But also, like most Kansans, I am tired of politicians doing nothing to stop senseless killings.

That is why I support commonsense solutions to keep our communities safe, like expanding background checks and closing dangerous loopholes in our laws.

In our effort to ensure the safety of our communities, however, we can’t forget the needs of those at risk of domestic violence to protect themselves from abuse.

According to the Kansas Bureau of Investigation, in 2017 a domestic violence incident was reported every 23 minutes and a domestic violence murder occurred every 9 days in the State of Kansas.

In the United States, more than 12 million people experience some form of domestic violence by a current or former domestic partner every year.

These men and women deserve our support, which means we also need to reauthorize and strengthen the Violence Against Women Act.

These women and men deserve to be protected. I cannot emphasize that enough.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

The Acting CHAIR. The question was taken; and the Acting CHAIR announced that the ayes appeared to have it. Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. VAN DREW.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 116–14.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 3, after “children,” insert “including step-parents and their step-children”.

Page 3, line 5, insert “, if the transferee has no reason to believe that the transferee will use or intends to use the firearm in a crime or is prohibited from possessing firearms under State or Federal law” before the semicolon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment clarifies that the exceptions for gifts and loans of firearms between parents and their children applies to stepparents and stepchildren.

The reason I offer this amendment is to recognize that the relationship between stepparents and stepchildren is sometimes stronger than or as strong as that of the biological parent-child relationship.

The parents of one of my closest friends are technically stepparents, but you would never know it, because they are all so close and love each other so much.

The amendment also clarifies that gifts and loans of firearms among family members are still subject to the existing legal standard for all transfers.

Existing law states that no person may deliver a firearm to someone if he or she has a reason to believe that the person is prohibited from possessing a firearm.

Consequently, even gifts and loans among family members are not permissible if the transferee has a reason to believe that the transferee may use the firearm in a crime or is prohibited from possessing firearms.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, again, I have opposed this amendment, but like the previous amendment, again, it is proof that this bill is still not ready for prime time and should have spent more time instead of moving a very ill-timed previous question because of a timing deadline that they had to get to the floor. It fixes one of the many flaws in the bill.

Again, Republicans had solutions to these loose ends all over the bill, but our debate time was stopped. But I do have just a question here. Although I am not opposing this amendment, it merely adds the exchange between stepparents and their stepchildren.

What about stepsiblings who also love each other dearly? But this doesn’t include that. Stepgrandparents and stepgrandchildren? What about foster families or adoptive families?

It is a simple fix that, again, goes forward and, again, struggles.

But I do want to go back and address something. Mr. Chairman, that came up earlier, and it seemed to get an interesting response from my friends across the aisle, my colleague stated that the appropriate fine is $1,000, not $100,000. They cite the U.S. sentencing guidelines for this number, but I do have to remind the chairman that since the Booker decision, of course, the guidelines are only advisory. And we need not look to the advisory guidelines, but look at the statute the bill amends.

Remember, we do not vote on aspirations in this Chamber; we vote on words on paper.

18 USC 924(a)(5) contains the penalty for violating part “b” of section 922 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

18 USC 3571(b)(5) “for a Class A misdemeanor”, which this is, “that does not result in death, not more than $10,000.”

So it could be $1,000 or it could be up to $100,000.

I appreciate our confusion over this issue, but unfortunately, as I stated before, this is what happens when a bill is rushed to the floor; and it is why we oppose this legislation.

When we understand this, Mr. Chairman, again, you can offer amendments that make Members feel good, but feeling good doesn’t heal you and feeling good will not make matters better.

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, again, I am the cosponsor of this amendment, as well as Congresswoman DAVIDS and Congressman NADLER for their remarks.

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.
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The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
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Mr. CHABOT changed his vote from no to aye. So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended. The amendment was agreed to.
Madam Speaker, I have been here all afternoon, and we have heard time and time again how we have had the problem of mass violence. We have talked about how to solve it, and, unfortunately, this underlying bill, as I have brought out many times already, will not do this. We have heard that we have to do something basically even if it won’t work.

Madam Speaker, I will remind this House one more time that what makes you run out the door is not always heal you. When we understand that, then we can begin to move forward.

What we have found this day is that this bill has many problems because we choose to rush it to the floor because we had a deadline, and we cut off debate in committee.

We found amendments offered to fix parts of this bill that do not fix them but actually make them worse.

We simply found out that the authors of the bill did not even know how much was going to be fined in the bill until we actually pointed it out.

Now we come to the biggest part: I have been listening to how we have to keep criminals from having firearms. We have to keep criminals from having firearms.

I will say it once more, Madam Speaker: We must keep criminals from having firearms.

I am glad to let you know, Madam Speaker, we are now giving everyone in this body a chance to do just that.

A similar measure was promoted. What we are saying is that if you have someone who is a criminal who came into our country illegally—criminal time number one—if they then try to buy or purchase a firearm which they are unable to do, that is the second strike as a criminal, and what we are simply saying is, if they do that, they will be reported to ICE.

Now, which Members in this body are opposed to notifying law enforcement when a person prohibited from purchasing a firearm attempts to do so? Are we against that? No.

I believe my friends across the aisle are not. I have heard it all day: We don’t want criminals to have firearms.

But my question to you now, Madam Speaker, is: be very careful. If you vote “no” on this motion to recommit, you cannot go back to your constituency, no matter what is said, and say: I voted to keep illegal aliens, those who should not have a firearm, from having a firearm.

We have heard it all day. And you can moan, you can talk, you can think about it, but, again, Madam Speaker, I understand the sympathy and the concern and the pain upon this bill, but let’s not be duped by this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back balance of time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, let’s remember what we are dealing with. We are dealing with the fact that current Federal law with respect to firearm background checks is dangerously limited and flawed because background checks required for sales by licensed gun dealers and that many, many people get a gun at a gun show or from someone else. Something like 20 percent, I think the figure is, or 25 percent of gun sales escape background checks.

So all kinds of people may be criminals, who may be mentally ill, and who may be domestic abusers who shouldn’t have guns get guns, and that results in lives forfeited. It results in people killed.

This bill goes a long way toward solving that by saying we are going to require background checks of everyone who gets a gun, with some exceptions, with some reasonable exceptions which are in this bill.

Now, along comes this motion to recommit, which is a total red herring having nothing to do with the purpose of the bill, and says that, if someone fails a background check because he is illegitimately in the country, you should report that to ICE.

First of all, if he fails a background check because he is illegitimately in the country, that means the system knows he is illegally in the country. It means they already know that.

So what is the point of reporting him? He has to be in the system as illegally in the country in order to fail the background check because of section (g)(5). So we already know that, and this is totally circular, number one.

Number two, this is just a red herring to try to mix up the immigration issue with the gun violence issue, and they really have nothing to do with each other.

Number three, for 8 years, we couldn’t get a hearing—not a hearing in a committee—on this bill or on any real bill to stop the plague of handgun violence in this country.

Madam Speaker, 150 people killed in Great Britain, 95 in Austria or wherever, 39,000 in the United States—no one will tell me that Americans are 10,000 times as mentally ill as Europeans or Japanese. The problem is we don’t have adequate sections on guns. This bill goes in the direction of doing it, and they want to sabotage the bill with a phony issue raised by this MTR.

Now, there is an issue. If people fail the background check for various reasons, then you can make a case it should be reported to local law enforcement agencies. Mr. CICILLINE has a bill to do just that. I am going to yield to him in a second. But the fact is it has to do with wanting to do this is just an attempt to sabotage this bill.

If you believe that we ought to cut down on the plague of gun violence in this country, that we ought to save lives, that we ought to get rid of all these people who shouldn’t have guns having guns, and that we ought to have background checks in sensible situations, then vote against the motion to recommit and for the bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

We are on the precipice of passing the first commonsense gun safety bill in this Congress in 28 years. I have been here for 8 years. We begged and pleaded and had a sit-in to try to force Republicans to take up some measure to reduce gun violence in this country.

There are women, men, and families across America who are demanding that Congress do something. We are about to do this, and you raise a motion to recommit on a phony issue to try to muck this up with this gimmick.

If you were concerned about reducing gun violence in this country and passing commonsense gun safety legislation, you had 8 years to bring a bill to the floor.

But if you are really concerned about this, I have good news for you. I have legislation, because, in fact, if someone buys a gun who is a prohibited pur- chaser, whatever their immigration status is, if they have committed a crime, then they should be arrested
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in response to a parliamentary inquiry, if that amendment is defeated if the bill is defeated?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, I would violate subsection (g)(5), a requirement that the receipt of a firearm by a person who has been convicted of a violent felony or misdemeanor crime of violence, so the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. NADLER, Madam Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, I report the amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER: Page 5, after line 4, insert the following: Page 5, after line 4, insert the following: ‘‘(E) Regulations promulgated under this subsection shall not apply to a firearm received by a law enforcement officer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed importer, in the course of carrying out his or her duties.’’

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, I report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: [Roll No. 98] YEAS—220

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, I report the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment. The Clerk will put the question on the amendment and then ask for a roll call vote on passage of the bill.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, in order for the amendment that was just passed to be considered, am I correct that you would have to vote for this bill with that amendment now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the question on the amendment and then ask for a roll call vote on that amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House, I report the amendment.

The question is on the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.
Mrs. BEATTY changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That the Chair will remind all persons in the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.