

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 8 is postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), the whole number of the House is 431.

#### ENHANCED BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 188, I call up the bill (H.R. 1446) to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1446

*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 “Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2021”.

#### SEC. 2. STRENGTHENING OF BACKGROUND CHECK PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED BEFORE A FEDERAL FIREARMS LICENSEE MAY TRANSFER A FIREARM TO A PERSON WHO IS NOT SUCH A LICENSEE.

Section 922(t) of title 18, United States Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) in the event the system has not notified the licensee that the receipt of a firearm by such other person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section—

“(I) not fewer than 10 business days (meaning a day on which State offices are open) has elapsed since the licensee contacted the system, and the system has not notified the licensee that the receipt of a firearm by such other person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section, and the other person has submitted, electronically through a website established by the Attorney General or by first-class mail, a petition for review which—

“(aa) certifies that such other person has no reason to believe that such other person

is prohibited by Federal, State, or local law from purchasing or possessing a firearm; and

“(bb) requests that the system respond to the contact referred to in subparagraph (A) within 10 business days after the date the petition was submitted (or, if the petition is submitted by first-class mail, the date the letter containing the petition is postmarked); and

“(II) 10 business days have elapsed since the other person so submitted the petition, and the system has not notified the licensee that the receipt of a firearm by such other person would violate subsection (g) or (n) of this section; and”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) The Attorney General shall—

“(A) prescribe the form on which a petition shall be submitted pursuant to paragraph (1)(B)(ii);

“(B) make the form available electronically, and provide a copy of the form to all licensees referred to in paragraph (1);

“(C) provide the petitioner and the licensee involved written notice of receipt of the petition, either electronically or by first-class mail; and

“(D) respond on an expedited basis to any such petition received by the Attorney General.

“(8)(A) If, after 3 business days have elapsed since the licensee initially contacted the system about a firearm transaction, the system notifies the licensee that the receipt of a firearm by such other person would not violate subsection (g) or (n), the licensee may continue to rely on that notification for the longer of—

“(i) an additional 25 calendar days after the licensee receives the notification; or

“(ii) 30 calendar days after the date of the initial contact.

“(B) If such other person has met the requirements of paragraph (1)(B)(ii) before the system destroys the records related to the firearm transaction, the licensee may continue to rely on such other person having met the requirements for an additional 25 calendar days after the date such other person first met the requirements.”.

#### SEC. 3. GAO REPORTS.

Within 90 days after the end of each of the 1-year, 3-year, and 5-year periods that begin with the effective date of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a written report analyzing the extent to which, during the respective period, paragraphs (1)(B)(ii) and (7) of section 922(t) of title 18, United States Code, have prevented firearms from being transferred to prohibited persons, which report shall include but not be limited to the following—

(1) an assessment of the overall implementation of such subsections, including a description of the challenges faced in implementing such paragraphs; and

(2) an aggregate description of firearm purchase delays and denials, and an aggregate analysis of the petitions submitted pursuant to such paragraph (1)(B)(ii).

#### SEC. 4. REPORTS ON PETITIONS SUPPORTING FIREARM TRANSFERS NOT IMMEDIATELY APPROVED BY NICS SYSTEM, THAT WERE NOT RESPONDED TO IN A TIMELY MANNER.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make an annual report to the public on the number of petitions received by the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act that were submitted pursuant to subclause (I) of section 922(t)(1)(B)(ii) of title 18, United States Code, with respect to which a determination was not made

within the 10-day period referred to in subclause (II) of such section.

#### SEC. 5. REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.

Within 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence and Firearms, shall submit to the Congress a report analyzing the effect, if any, of this Act on the safety of victims of domestic violence, domestic abuse, dating partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and whether any further amendments to the background check process, including amendments to the conditions that must be met under this Act for a firearm to be transferred when the system has not notified the licensee that such transfer would not violate subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, would likely result in a reduction in the risk of death or great bodily harm to victims of domestic violence, domestic abuse, dating partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

#### SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1446.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1446, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2021, is a critical bill to provide law enforcement the necessary time to keep firearms out of the hands of those who are not legally eligible to own them.

The 2015 massacre at Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, which killed nine innocent people, stands as a tragic reminder of how current background check laws sometimes fall short.

Under current law, a licensed gun dealer conducting a background check on a prospective purchaser is permitted to sell the firearm to the purchaser if there has been no determination from the background check system, commonly called NICS, after 3 business days.

This is the case even if the system has not indicated that the person has actually passed the background check. Often, we refer to this as a default proceed transaction.

While 96 percent of background checks are processed within 3 business days, an analysis of FBI data showed that over 35,000 guns were transferred to prohibited purchasers between 2008

and 2017 because of the default proceed rule.

On average, over the course of the last decade, 10 prohibited individuals have been able to purchase guns at licensed firearms dealers through the default proceed rule every single day.

The cases in which there is a delay are the very cases that ought to be carefully investigated.

If NICS is unable to return an instant determination—and especially if there is no report after 3 days—there is cause for concern. There may be a good reason that these individuals should not own firearms, but the current system allows the transfer nonetheless.

Under this legislation, as under current law, a sale may proceed immediately once a background check clears a purchaser, which is the case in the vast majority of instances.

This bill provides, however, that for checks taking longer to complete, the FBI will have 10 business days for the initial background check investigation period. If the check is not completed during this time, an individual may submit a petition for expedited review. If a petition is submitted, unless NICS provides an answer within the next 10 business days, either clearing the transaction or stopping it, a gun dealer has the discretion to complete the sale and transfer the firearm.

We must ensure that firearms transfers are lawful, and in some instances, that requires additional time. That is why H.R. 1446 is needed, to prevent the sale of firearms to prohibited individuals by providing the FBI with additional time to complete background checks.

H.R. 1446 is a sensible and necessary approach to closing a dangerous loophole, and I commend our colleague, Congressman JIM CLYBURN, the distinguished Democratic whip, for introducing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today a retired law enforcement officer and the victim of two violent gun crimes.

While off duty, a repeat offender shot me through my car window while I was with my wife, Jodi. While on duty, another violent criminal pointed his gun at me and pulled the trigger. By the grace of God, his gun malfunctioned. Mr. Speaker, I was fighting for my life. I am lucky to be here today to speak to this body.

Criminals who are willing to take someone's life don't care about the gun legislation we debate in Congress. And the bills we are debating this week would not have prevented those two criminals from attempting to take my life.

So let's talk about who is going to be impacted by these bills. The law-abid-

ing citizens who are looking to protect themselves, their families, and their communities from death or great bodily harm. They will be the ones who are penalized for and prevented from exercising their Second Amendment rights.

Defending my constituents' constitutional rights will be something I do until my very last day in office, and I implore my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the sponsor of this legislation, and the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague on the other side. I still think about the night of June 17, 2015, when at about 9:00 in the evening, I received a phone call informing me that something had happened at Mother Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina, a church that I know very well and the members I know very well.

Much to my dismay, I learned later in the evening that a Bible study that was taking place at that church had welcomed in a stranger.

I grew up in a parsonage, and I grew up learning that which we find there in the book of Hebrew, the 11th chapter: Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen.

These people were practicing their faith, a faith that taught them to welcome in a stranger. A stranger came to their door, and they welcomed him into their Bible study. They sat down, and he sat with them for an hour. In the further practice of their faith, as they concluded their Bible study, they rose to pray, and with bowed heads, only to open their eyes to the sound of gunfire. The stranger that they had welcomed in opened fire and killed nine of them, one of whom was the pastor, a former intern of mine.

Now, we later found out that the gentleman who perpetrated this crime was a white supremacist that studied the history of that church; and because it was the most historic African-American church in South Carolina, he targeted that church and its worshippers. However, he should not have had the gun.

The reason he had the gun is because when he went to purchase it, and the 3 days expired, as current law allows, they had not been able to verify the information he had given them and, therefore, could not complete the background check. But under the law, they had to sell him the gun after the 3 days, only to find out several days later that the wrong information had been put into the record.

I sincerely believe that this gentleman's sophistication, he knew he was not to have a gun. Now, I ask: Did he give the wrong information intentionally?

I think so. When they found the error, it was too late. Nine souls had perished.

Now, the gentleman said that he is lucky that the gun didn't go off, and these laws would not have prevented that. This law would have prevented that gentleman from getting a gun.

Now, I don't know why the other side continues to misrepresent what we are trying to do here. All we are saying is if at the end of the 3 days, it ought to move to 10 days. And if the 10 days expire, you can ask for expedited search. And if that expires, you still have 10 days. The maximum is 30 days. Nobody is keeping a gun away. Everybody should be able to wait 30 days.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. I ask the other side: Is a wait of 30 days worth the death of nine unsuspecting souls?

That alone ought to instruct them on legislation like this.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker indicated that you have to ask the government to exercise your constitutional right. That is the problem. What happened in Charleston was terrible, it was wrong, and wrong as wrong can be. But this bill is not going to stop—the FBI had 2 months. It didn't do it. It didn't stop this guy. They had 2 months.

What this bill does is shift the burden. It takes it from 3 days to 10 days, and the burden now becomes on the American citizen to be able to exercise their constitutional right. That is not what the Second Amendment is supposed to be about. Unfortunately, it is where the Democrats want to take our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN).

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, if we lose the Second Amendment, then the First will fall. I want to remind my colleagues of a simple fact that is far too often swept under the rug by the left. Americans have a right to obtain a firearm for lawful purposes.

I will say it again louder for those on the left, sleeping in the back. Americans have a right to obtain firearms. This is my right. And, Mr. Speaker, this is your right. But let me be clear to everyone in this Chamber: You will not take this right away from us.

I know it is easy to be sucked into the D.C. bubble, but outside of here, in real America, when we say, "Come and take it," we damn well mean it.

This bill would unconstitutionally place the burden of proof for firearms purchases and transfers on American citizens instead of placing the burden firmly where it belongs, on the shoulders of the government.

But let us be clear. The left is not here today to debate this bill, nor are they here to legislate in the best interests of the American people. They are here to shove it down our throats. My colleagues and I on the right have been called here to defend one of our most

sacred rights because you, Mr. Speaker, think that the Constitution is just another piece of paper to tear down the middle of and toss aside.

I speak for millions of Americans. I specifically speak for 700,000-plus Americans in my district when I say that if you think this bastardization of the Constitution will be met with silence, then you know nothing of the America I know. You want my guns; I know it. We all know it. Well, Mr. Speaker, you can come and take them.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his great leadership of the Judiciary Committee. Thank you for bringing this important legislation to the floor, Mr. NADLER.

And, again, as an authority on the Constitution, you and I know that we do respect the right of the gentleman to have a gun. We just want to make sure that we are keeping people safe.

Mr. Speaker, the gun violence crisis in America is a challenge to the conscience of our country, one that demands that we act. We know what must be done. The solutions are clear. They have overwhelming bipartisan support across the country. These solutions will save lives.

That is why I am so pleased to rise on the floor to support Mr. CLYBURN's legislation, H.R. 1446, the Enhanced Background Checks Act to ensure that universal background checks do save lives. He explained so clearly the purpose of his legislation. I associate myself with his remarks. I know how painful it is because he had friends in that church whom we have met families of since then.

I also rise to support H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of Mr. MIKE THOMPSON. Mr. THOMPSON is a gun owner. He is a veteran. He respects the Second Amendment, and he is the chair of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force. I thank him for his decades of leadership on background checks and for the perspective he brings, again, as a gun owner and a veteran and a hunter.

We all salute the extraordinary work of Mr. CLYBURN, the leader of the Enhanced Background Checks Act, to close the Charleston loophole, and we respect him for the work he has done in his community to turn their agony into action, their pain into saving other people's lives.

I thank all the Members who have helped raise a drumbeat on these priorities, including our colleague, Representative LUCY MCBATH, who has been such an inspiration to all of us, bringing her great generosity of spirit in telling her story, sharing that story of Jordan with us.

Now, we also have a debt of gratitude to our former colleague, Gabby Giffords, who when she was having a neighborhood meeting, there was an at-

tempt on her life. Her courage is an inspiration to the country. Her leadership to end gun violence is something that is so remarkable. Under her leadership and that of the Bradys, we were able to meet with survivors over time to try to pass legislation to make gun laws clear and better and really adjusting to the realities of technology.

Another colleague, BOBBY RUSH, lost his son to gun violence as well. So, again, we hear about the big events that take place, and they are horrible, but every day people lose their lives.

In fact, let me just see what the statistics are. Since 1994, when background checks were first created, I had the privilege of being here at that time and actually serving as a whip for the legislation. Our leader on the bill was Senator SCHUMER. Well, right then he was a Member of Congress, CHUCK SCHUMER, on this legislation. Since 1994, when background checks were first created, the system has stopped more than 3 million dangerous people from getting firearms.

Every day, when background checks are used, they stop an estimated 170 felons, 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun. Every day, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1615

Yet, over the years, people have exploited and circumvented the system. Today, someone with a violent criminal record or a history of abuse can go to a gun show or go online or even to a stranger in person to purchase a firearm. No background check, no questions asked, all perfectly legal. It might be legal, but it is not perfect.

Even when a background check has been initiated, it is not always completed. That is what this legislation before us, Mr. CLYBURN's bill, is about; the horrific case that enabled a hate crime at Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston in which nine innocent people were murdered while peacefully worshipping.

Eighty percent of firearms—because of gun shows, online sales and the rest—80 percent of firearms are sold or transferred without completed background checks.

So it is in that spirit that I come to the floor, but when I come to the floor, I bring with me the thoughts of the survivors who we meet with regularly. We have said to them, We are not stopping until the job is done.

We respect our Constitution, but we also say that the Constitution talks about well-regulated.

Again, these bills that we are talking about have bipartisan support by a vast majority of the American people; over 90 percent of the public, including more than 90 percent of gun-owning households. Most of these folks who own guns have passed background checks, they support background checks, and they are supported by dozens of leading law enforcement, veterans, local government, public health, and other groups.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, representing the Nation's largest metropolitan law enforcement agencies writes: "The lack of a background check for private sales and gun shows completely contradicts the purpose for which NICS was established—to keep guns out of the hands of those who do harm."

For the benefit of those who don't know what NICS is, it is an important program. Mr. THOMPSON has been a champion in the funding of NICS. NICS is the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

Next, the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys states: "H.R. 8 will help the background check system catch up with changes in technology and ensure that individuals who are prohibited from purchasing or possessing a gun cannot easily buy guns online."

And the U.S. Conference of Mayors writes that H.R. 8 will "make our cities safer and in no way compromise gun owners' rights."

H.R. 8 is very important to us, and it is legislation that has broad support. It is called the Bipartisan Background Checks Act. That is Mr. THOMPSON's bill.

And this bill, H.R. 1446, Mr. CLYBURN's bill is the Enhanced Background Checks Act. So everything I say about one bill applies to the other in terms of its purpose, in terms of its urgency, and in terms of its honoring our promise to the survivors and the families who have lost their loved ones to gun violence, that we are not going away until this legislation passes and that we will meet the challenge of the conscience of the country when it comes to the gun violence crisis in our country.

And I say that with gratitude to Representative MIKE THOMPSON and our distinguished whip Mr. CLYBURN for their leadership, their determination, their persistence, and soon, hopefully, their success in turning their legislation into law, so that we can keep our promises to the survivors, and also, that we can make the world safer for all children and all people in our country and throughout the world, as we are an example to the world.

I urge an "aye" vote on both of these bills.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1446 and H.R. 8, a/k/a the gun-grabber bills.

Madam Speaker PELOSI, you were elected in 1987, and I was born in 1988. During that time, you say that background checks have saved millions of lives. But what about the more than 50 million babies that have been murdered through abortion? So I am just going to leave that there as we talk about the value of life.

These bills are not about gun safety, and they certainly aren't about reducing crime. These bills are about control.

Two weeks ago, Democrats voted to strip religious freedom. Last week, they voted to defund our police. Today, they are now taking our guns.

In reality, these bills do nothing to improve background checks, as noted by an Obama official in 2013: "The effectiveness of universal background checks depends on requiring gun registration."

Instead, it would increase our wait times and allow for endless delays for law-abiding citizens to purchase firearms.

Our communities have seen too many tragedies perpetuated by sick people intent on committing violence, no matter the weapon.

H.R. 1446 puts the onus on individuals to contact the government if their background check hasn't been completed in 10 days.

You know who cannot afford to wait? The single mom looking to protect herself and her children from a violent ex who has just been released from jail. You think this situation isn't real? It happened last month in Orlando. And there are thousands more like them.

You know that the more garbage that we find in these bills, the more I believe that the motto of these Chambers is changing from "We the People" to let's screw the people.

H.R. 8 and H.R. 1446 does nothing but make it more difficult for law-abiding citizens to protect themselves and their families. Under this legislation, criminals will do what they do best: Break the law and perpetuate crime.

So I ask my colleagues considering supporting these bills: Do you honestly think that punishing law-abiding constituents in your districts, stripping them of their constitutional rights will make them safer? Will you be able to look them in the eye as they are the next victim of crime?

As Members of Congress we swore an oath to defend the Constitution, and that includes the Second Amendment.

Shall not be infringed.

You and I both took that oath, Mr. Speaker.

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

Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding, and I also thank Representative CLYBURN, the author of this legislation, H.R. 1446, for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, domestic violence claims the lives of far too many, and it is especially deadly when it occurs in a household with a gun. Women, as we know, bear most of this violence.

In the United States there are one million women alive today who have reported being shot or shot at by an intimate partner, and there are many more who have been threatened or killed with a gun. And we haven't even

yet discussed what the additional stressors of COVID-19 have done exponentially around the country in households when there is a gun in the household.

Closing the Charleston loophole is a critical step to prevent abusers from obtaining a weapon. This is not about infringing upon anyone's Second Amendment rights. Law-abiding gun owners who are duly licensed and permitted, this is not about preventing them from being able to have a gun.

This is a critical step to prevent abusers from obtaining a weapon, a weapon that will likely be used to escalate their abuse and a weapon that may have deadly consequences. And as a survivor of gun violence, I know what I am talking about.

With this bill and with this amendment we can help prevent abuse, protect our families, and gather data to inform further steps to keep every American safe. That is our right. That is not a privilege.

In the next months, we will continue to remember those that we have lost to gun violence in Charleston and all across America.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, Newtown, Parkland, Las Vegas, Sutherland Springs, Charleston, the attack on our former colleague, Gabrielle Giffords, these are all tragedies that would not have been prevented by H.R. 8 or H.R. 1446.

My colleagues across the aisle don't want to admit it, but every commercial gun sale in America already requires a background check.

In Charleston, there was no loophole. The problem was information sharing. If the FBI had checked all available databases, then Dylan Roof wouldn't have been allowed to purchase a firearm. Congressman TOM RICE of South Carolina has a bill to fix that.

Republicans are serious about ending gun violence and have brought forward policies that protect public safety without eroding our Second Amendment rights.

That is why in recent years we have passed measures like the STOP School Violence Act, the Fix NICS Act, and 21st Century Cures Act.

The bills before us this week would not build upon this progress but strips away from law-abiding citizens their rights.

H.R. 8 would turn law-abiding citizens into criminals if you store a gun for a friend or loan a firearm to a neighbor with an abusive ex who wanted to borrow it for self-protection.

Even worse, H.R. 1446 would extend the waiting period for a firearms sale from 3 to 10 business days and allow the government to delay a transfer indefinitely, as in forever, if a government bureaucrat says so.

Instead of these gun-grabbing bills, House Republicans are bringing forward targeted solutions. That is why I

introduced the STOP II: Classrooms Over Conference Rooms Act to double funding for the STOP School Violence Act to harden schools, to get more mental health resources in schools, and increase active-shooter training for law enforcement. And we pay for it by taking money set aside for the Department of Education to rent conference rooms in Washington, D.C.

However, the left is determined to take away your rights, after voting to defund the police just last week.

It is no wonder gun sales and concealed carry permits are at all-time highs. These law-abiding Americans deserve to have their rights protected.

That is why today, I am calling on my colleagues across the aisle to stand up for law-abiding citizens and adopt H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act.

H.R. 38 is a bipartisan and common-sense bill that ensures people like Shaneen Allen, a single mother from south Philly, don't become criminals for carrying a legally owned firearm across an invisible State line.

We need H.R. 38 more than ever. And if my colleagues are determined to pass gun legislation, then let's help people protect themselves.

Mr. Speaker, if we adopt the motion to recommit today, we will instruct the Judiciary Committee to consider my amendment to H.R. 1446 to include my bill, H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, in 2015, a white supremacist with a criminal record was allowed to purchase a gun which he used to kill nine parishioners at Mother Emanuel AME Church in South Carolina.

That shooter, who was prohibited under Federal law from owning a gun, was able to purchase one because of a loophole that allows the sale of a gun to proceed if Federal investigators do not complete a background check within 3 days.

Through November of last year there were more than 5,800 incidents where people who are legally prohibited—criminals—legally prohibited from purchasing a firearm still obtained one because of this dangerous provision, which has come to be known as the "Charleston loophole."

H.R. 1446, the Enhanced Background Checks Act, closes the Charleston loophole. It strengthens background check procedures to ensure that Federal investigators have enough time to complete background checks before a gun is transferred to the buyer. Common sense.

But closing the Charleston loophole is not enough. Current Federal law only requires a background check for the sale of guns from licensed gun dealers.

Background checks work. Since the law was enacted, 3½ million gun sales were denied, which means 3½ million people who were prohibited under Federal law because of a criminal record or some other disqualifying information were denied the right to buy a gun. They work. The problem is more than 20 percent of gun sales or gun transfers happen without a background check.

And that is why H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act requires background checks on all gun sales, including guns sold by unlicensed dealers online or at trade shows.

Every day in this country more than 100 people in the United States are killed with guns. Gun violence is an epidemic that threatens the public safety in communities all across America. We must not wait for another tragedy to strike.

□ 1630

Requiring background checks on all gun sales is a commonsense gun violence prevention measure that serves as a first line of defense to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people.

I think we can all agree that dangerous criminals should not be able to get guns. There has been a lot of discussion today about Second Amendment gun rights, and we all respect that. But what about my constituents' right to live a life free from gun violence, to take a walk in the park, to go to a movie theater, to go to church and pray, and to be able to do so without the fear of being gunned down and killed? There is a competing interest here of public safety and protecting the security of people to live a life free from gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1446 and H.R. 8. Join us in supporting legislation supported by over 90 percent of the American people who have good common sense. Vote "yes." Help end the scourge of gun violence in this country.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, a bill trampling on the Second Amendment rights of the American people is a convenient distraction from the actual crisis in the United States. There are over almost 11,000 people killed by drunk drivers each year. There were more than 81,000 drug overdose deaths in the United States in the 12 months ending last May. But we are here today debating a bill to further restrict the rights of law-abiding citizens.

I just heard it mentioned about domestic violence. You could have a woman, threatened by an ex-boyfriend or a husband, who feels her life is being threatened, who would not be able to acquire a firearm once she needed it. She would have to wait at least 10 days.

The vast majority of illicit drugs, like heroin and fentanyl, leading to these 81,000 deaths are crossing our southern border. Instead of addressing these issues, President Biden has re-instituted catch and release, and now, we have an overwhelming surge of illegal crossings on our southern border.

According to the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, in 2018 alone, there were 1,641 illegal aliens convicted of homicide. How many more will it be now that the Democrats have signaled that our borders are wide open?

This bill reflects an obsession with gun restrictions by my Democrat colleagues. Meanwhile, in 2018, more than one in six homicides were committed without a firearm of any type: 1,500 were killed with knives or cutting instruments, more than 400 with blunt instruments, and more than 600 with hands and feet. Only 403 died as a result of a rifle of any kind.

Mr. Speaker, these numbers are dwarfed by the loss of life from the failure of the Democrats to enforce their laws.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, experts estimate that the Charleston loophole has allowed more than 75,000 guns to fall into the hands of prohibited gun owners.

The Enhanced Background Checks Act is a necessary and straightforward fix to close this loophole and allow the FBI to investigate potentially dangerous individuals.

This bill would simply increase the time Federal investigators have to complete background checks on gun sales from 3 to 10 days, 1 week's time. That is all we are asking for, an additional week for investigators to ensure that there is no reason the person who is buying a gun should not have one. Think of the lives that could be saved or could have been saved by allowing that extra 7 days.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can agree that gun ownership is a serious responsibility. There is no need to rush through a background check with so much at stake. This bill is an urgently needed tool in gun violence prevention.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to once again pass H.R. 1446 and close the Charleston loophole.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for engaging in this debate today.

Mr. Speaker, there is a higher authority than the law of man. Above the Speaker's podium are the words, in this great Chamber, "In God we trust."

Do we? Do we recognize that the Biblical record is replete with the violence of man?

Shall my colleagues on the other side of the aisle admit that law designed to restrict Second Amendment rights and

freedoms are but a veil to conceal the violence of man born since Adam? The firstborn son of Adam killed his brother in a violent rage. I am rather certain he did not use a firearm.

The Second Amendment protections that we have as American citizens shall not be infringed. Remember these words and that they are born of a nation that recognized our service to our Lord.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, improving background checks is common sense. Background checks simply make it harder for guns to end up in the hands of the wrong people—criminals.

Mr. Speaker, 75,000 guns have ended up in the hands of the wrong people. The Enhanced Background Checks Act gives the FBI more time to complete background checks. In doing so, it closes the loophole.

The Framers didn't think about carrying an AK-47 or a semiautomatic weapon. That is not what they thought about.

Mr. Speaker, these guns are dangerous. They leave a pool of blood on corners in cities across the United States of America, and having access to them too soon is a deadly decision. We must pass this legislation to ensure that communities are safe all over America.

Let me just end by saying that we have a new item, the ghost gun loopholes. Ghost guns are made to evade law enforcement. There are ghost guns. We should stop them now, dead in their tracks.

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

Mr. Speaker, the FBI tells us, in a 4-year time period, 18,000 people who exercised their Second Amendment liberties to get a firearm who were denied got that reversed. Those are just the ones who went there and said, "You know what, you guys screwed up. It is not really me." They had to work it out.

Mr. Speaker, 18,000 times, the system screwed up. In 2017, over 112,000 people were denied, but only 12 people were prosecuted, which means that, most likely, thousands of law-abiding people were falsely denied their right to exercise their Second Amendment liberty.

Now what do Democrats want to do? They want to say: Wait a minute. That all happened in a 3-day time period. We are going to extend that for 10 days because we know the government bureaucracy will get so much better in 10 days. We know it will work out if we just give them more time to screw up more things.

That is what is going to happen. Oh, by the way, that single lady who needs to protect herself, she is going to have to wait longer now for a system that had this many screwups to get the firearms she needs to exercise her Second Amendment liberties to protect herself and her family. That is what this legislation does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the dean of the House.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I watched this debate. I have to say, we have an old saying: "How do you eat an elephant? A bite at a time." We have had two bites today.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about what everybody is talking about. It is about the Second Amendment and—I won't call you Democrats. A lot of you are. Some of you are socialists that believe in taking the right to protect away—the Second Amendment—from the law-abiding citizens.

This is just a little step forward, the 10-day waiting period instead of the 3-day waiting period.

The FBI is controlled by the President. He, in fact, can say take 6 months or 6 years for a legal purchase of a weapon. That is what you are really saying.

Taking away the right to protect your home and your liberty, not just from criminals but those who would take away your rights as a government, the Second Amendment is what it is all about, to protect from the tyranny that could occur by the wrong leaders taking rights and freedoms away from you.

That is why I, as a board member, support this idea of the Second Amendment and ask for a "no" vote on both of these bills.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues are invoking the Second Amendment quite promiscuously today, but they obviously haven't read any of the relevant Supreme Court authority because Justice Scalia, in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, explicitly upheld reasonable, commonsense regulations to guarantee that violent criminals don't get guns.

So, everything that we are doing is perfectly in advance of, in pursuit of, Second Amendment rights that are exercised coextensively with the public safety and with the common good.

Here is a regulation that we need, that we have known we have needed ever since a violent white supremacist killed nine African-American Christian worshippers at a Bible class in Charleston, South Carolina. He should have been denied a gun, but he got it because the background check search wasn't completed in 3 days. He got it automatically, although he shouldn't have had it, and nine people are dead because of it.

We say, let's close that loophole. Just like with H.R. 8, let's make sure that the universal background check is universal.

Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of the American people support it.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is reasonable, commonsense gun safety legislation contemplated by Justice Scalia, by the Supreme Court, under the Second Amendment of the Constitution.

It is what America needs so that we don't have a rate of gun violence and gun deaths 25 times higher than everybody else in the industrialized world.

Yet, some people are so under the spell of the NRA, a deeply corrupt organization that is ripping off money from loyal gun owners around the country, that they are unwilling to stand with the common good.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker used the term "reasonable." This legislation shifts the burden, so you are now telling an American citizen the burden is on you to exercise your Second Amendment liberties. They deny the background check, deny you your ability to purchase a firearm, and the burden is on you.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that a professor of law would understand that you don't shift the burden when you are talking about a fundamental liberty that we enjoy under the Constitution. It doesn't seem reasonable at all to me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, one more time, address what is going on here and the perceived problem.

Here in the United States, the number of murders from the beginning of the 1990s until Ferguson had fallen repeatedly, and the murder rate was half of what it once was with a tough law enforcement stance.

At that time, in the Ferguson shooting, when Officer Wilson, who was eventually found entirely innocent by the Obama Justice Department, when that person died, we whipped people into an antipolice frenzy. Because of the antipolice frenzy, we had the murder rate in this country go up by 20 percent.

It then began to drop again until last year when we had the horrible events in Minneapolis. One more time, we whipped people up into a frenzy, and the number of murders in 1 year in Minneapolis went up 70 percent; in New York, 40 percent; in Chicago, 55 percent; and in Milwaukee, 95 percent, with the same gun control laws in cities that are run by mayors who are as antigun as you will find.

The problem here is we whipped the people into an antipolice frenzy. The police became passive, and a lot of people died. The people who were whipped into the antipolice frenzy ought to stop and consider the huge increase in murders.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1446.

This is a commonsense bill that would extend the time allowed for the completion of background checks for firearm sales from 3 to 10 days, giving time for a complete background check.

I want to be clear. I lived with a man who slept with a gun under his pillow until the day he died. He was a responsible gun owner. And I lived in a home with a man who shouldn't have had a gun, and I remember the fear that I could die any day and that my siblings would die. A gun in a household with someone emotionally unstable, angry, is plain and simply dangerous.

Mass shootings and tragic acts of gun violence have become far too common in the United States. I think my baby sister is not alive today because of the trauma of living with someone who should not have had a gun.

Yet, I don't want to take a gun away from a responsible gun owner. Every American deserves the right to live safely.

□ 1645

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1446, and in defense of the constitutional right to bear arms.

This right does not come with caveats, asterisks, or exceptions. It exists to make sure that the freedom to keep and bear arms is not unjustly infringed upon by the government.

It is the government that has the legal burden of explaining why it is restricting the natural rights of the citizen. H.R. 1446 would reverse that burden and require the law-abiding American to petition for the right to bear arms if they don't hear back from government after 10 business days, 7 more than the current law provides.

In response to this unconstitutional action, I will introduce a bill to allow a Federal firearms licensee to transfer a purchased firearm to a legitimate buyer within 3 calendar days of contacting the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, as opposed to the current law, which requires 3 State government business days.

As a Federal firearms licensee myself, I saw firsthand during the pandemic how the closure of State government offices across the country easily infringed upon our right keep and bear arms. With these offices closed, or purported closed, 3 business days can turn into weeks and even months before a firearm transfer is allowed to be completed by government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1446.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want us to be very quiet in this Chamber, almost to the extent of hearing a pin drop. That is what happens when you are in prayer: Muslims, Catholics, those of the Jewish faith, Christians.



Prayer is the most sacred moment in many faiths, in all faiths.

Imagine that moment in Mother Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church, friends of ours across the Nation. That weekday prayer service for some is a lifeline for their survival. They are huddled in prayer, maybe taking care of what they call a broken heart, a bad day at the office, a need to take care of a wayward child, and in comes this young man that they saw only as a person in need of prayer.

That is a song we sing. That we are in need of prayer. Just imagine this pristine, white, old church symbolizing the freedom of slaves, just imagine these precious souls who were doing nothing but praying.

I want to acknowledge the pain that Whip CLYBURN experienced. I saw him in the aftermath of those days. These were not just his fellow Americans, they were his neighbors and his friends and interns.

How many remember when the commander in healing, the commander of bringing people together, President Obama, sang the song Amazing Grace?

That is what life in the midst of a storm is about, and that is what we are in, in the proliferation of guns.

And my friends on the other side keep throwing darts and bombs about undermining the Second Amendment. I say it again. From the early stages of the Founding Fathers in the Bill of Rights, gun usage in America was regulated. The Heller case does not deny regulation. In fact, there are aspects that allow it.

So this is a legitimate regulation for safety, not control. Because Dylann, who went to a gun store and manipulated a gun owner to go and give him the gun after 3 days because there was something funny about his information, this will save lives. Ten days is not too long to stop the loss of life and the bloodshed that was in Mother Emanuel.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 1446 to save lives.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, what is the so-called Charleston Loop-hole?

It is a provision that gives the FBI 3 days to provide a background check for a citizen to buy a gun. Now, 3 days for a background check doesn't seem unreasonable since a credit card check takes about 3 seconds.

Now, if the FBI fails to give a clear "yes" or "no" in 3 days, the sale can proceed. That protects our Second Amendment right from arbitrary denial by inaction, and the clearance is good for 30 days from when you begin that transaction.

Now, this bill repeals the 3-day limit and replaces it with a multistage bureaucratic review process that can span up to 20 business days.

It is really quite clever. Your clearance is good for 30 calendar days from

the day you begin the transaction, but the clearance can be delayed for up to 20 business days. So if you applied on January 15 of this year, 20 business days takes you to February 16. By then, your purchase window will have expired 2 days earlier, on February 14. You have to start the process over, applying for a new background check in a perpetual cycle. They never have to say "approved."

Would a government abuse its citizens like that?

I don't know. Maybe we should ask Lois Lerner or Andrew McCabe.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1446 and the last bill we spoke about, H.R. 8.

These bills continue the systematic and coordinated attempt by the Democratic Party to undermine our Second Amendment rights.

I was sent to Washington by my constituents to uphold and defend the Constitution. I will not stand by and allow our rights to be stripped away. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that these bills will save lives. However, nothing in them would have stopped any of the recent mass casualty shootings that have occurred in our country.

Rather than go after criminals who break the law, Democrats want to create a false narrative that will criminalize private gun ownership. Democrats will tell you that these bills close loopholes, but the loophole they believe exists is that law-abiding Americans are even able to own guns in the first place.

The sole objective of this gun control package is to remove constitutional safeguards and put in place criminal penalties that would unjustly go after responsible gun owners.

The Second Amendment is crystal clear, the right to bear arms shall not be infringed. Our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution to protect us from a tyrannical government, and wrote the Second Amendment to ensure that the rights of Americans to protect themselves was secured.

These outrageous proposals put government between the American people and their constitutional freedoms to protect themselves, protect their families, and protect their communities, and I vote "no."

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is no gun violence problem from legal gun owners. And this bill, as well as the prior bill, will do nothing to stop gun violence because it unnecessarily regulates law-abiding citizens. And we don't have to

define that term, I would think, because they are not criminals.

The problem is with criminals. And because criminals could care less about the bills we are talking about today, innocent people will die.

I can think of neighbors of mine out in the country where I live, who have an ex who would want to cause violence to them. That lady could come to me and say: I can't get a gun because I have got to wait 10 days, but he could come this weekend. Would you loan me a gun?

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing today wouldn't allow that. This lady is put at severe risk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider what they are doing. This will not work. Vote against H.R. 1446 and support the Second Amendment made by people sometimes wiser than us.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Earlier, we had a couple of the folks who spoke on our side. Earlier they said the Second Amendment is right next to the First because it is pretty darn important. I think some of our folks said that.

But it struck me that, you know what, I don't know that the other side actually cares all that much about the First Amendment.

Think about what has happened this past year. Democrats have told Americans they can't go to church, can't go to work, can't go to school, can't go to a loved one's funeral.

Of course, the rules never apply to them. We had a Governor of one of our largest States—a Governor of our largest State—out at a 5-star restaurant, having dinner with friends and lobbyists at the same time he is telling folks in his State that they can't even have Thanksgiving dinner with their family.

We see the attack on free speech. I mean, just to laugh at this whole cancel culture phenomena. First it was Kermit the Frog and the Muppets, then it was Dr. Seuss. I think yesterday it was cartoon characters from the Looney Tunes. Tack on your right to speak, specifically to speak in any type of political nature.

We have had Democrat Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, send a letter to carriers, asking those carriers not to have certain news networks on their system. That is frightening. You talk about chilling speech. That is as scary as it gets—just because they don't like what is being said on certain news networks? Scary.

And now they are coming after your Second Amendment liberties as well. I mean, think about your First Amendment rights, your right to practice your faith, your right to assemble, your right to petition your government, freedom of the press, freedom of speech. And then the very next right the Founders mention, your Second Amendment liberties, they are coming after that, too.

It wasn't enough to go after your right to practice your faith. It wasn't enough to go after your right to assemble and be with people you wanted. Think about some of the things we saw this year. We had Democrat leaders in States telling Americans you had to be in your home at a certain time with curfews. You had to be in your home by 10.

We had another State say, when you are in your home, you have to wear a mask. And then we had States say, well, when you are in your home, you don't have to wear a mask because you are not allowed to have anybody over.

Government was limiting your First Amendment right to practice your religion, your First Amendment right to assemble. And now they are coming after your First Amendment right to speak and speak in a political nature. And here we are today, coming after your Second Amendment liberties.

The Democratic Party is the party that says defund the police, open the border, attack people's Second Amendment rights to defend themselves while they are defunding the police and opening the border, and all the while they are undermining American's First Amendment liberties as well.

This should frighten everyone.

□ 1700

This should frighten everyone. This should frighten everyone wherever they want to go. It is scary. I certainly hope we defeat both of these bills today when they are offered.

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

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

I have never heard such pernicious nonsense as we have heard today from our Republican friends.

They say that this legislation will violate gun rights. But all this legislation does is close a dangerous loophole that puts weapons in the hands of individuals who should not legally be permitted to purchase them merely because the FBI is not able to complete the background check in time.

The FBI under this legislation will have 10 days maybe instead of 3 days to complete the background check and decide whether someone is too dangerous to have access to guns. That is all this legislation does.

To say that it infringes on the Second Amendment, Mr. RASKIN pointed out that Justice Scalia in the Heller decision upheld this kind of legislation.

So stop with the nonsense, pass this legislation, and make the American people safe.

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

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment and to the underlying legislation which is another attack on our 2nd amendment rights. This bill trampling on the 2nd Amendment rights of the American people is a convenient distraction from the other actual crises in the United States.

There were almost 11,000 people killed by drunk drivers in 2018. There were more than

81,000 drug overdose deaths in the United States in the 12 months ending last May . . . but we are here today debating a bill to further restrict the rights of law-abiding citizens.

This bill endangers women threatened by domestic violence from an ex-boyfriend or ex-husband. A woman who feels her life is threatened would not be able to acquire a firearm when she needed one, under this bill she would have to wait at least 10 days.

The vast majority of the most deadly illicit drugs like heroin and fentanyl are smuggled across our southern border. Instead of addressing these issues President Biden has re-instituted catch and release and we now have an overwhelming surge of illegals crossing our southern border. According to a report from the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency, in 2018 there were 1,641 illegal aliens convicted of homicide. How many more will it be now that the Democrats have signaled that our borders are wide open?

Yet we are here debating a bill to take away the rights of law-abiding men and women to acquire firearms to protect themselves.

This bill reflects an obsession with gun restrictions by my Democrat colleagues. In terms of homicides, more than 1 in 6 do not involve a firearm of any type. According to the FBI, in 2017 over 1,500 people were killed with knives or cutting instruments, more than 400 were killed with blunt instruments and more than 600 killed with hands, fists and feet. There were only 403 homicides committed with a rifle of any type, including a semi-automatic AR-15 that is the target of many Democrat anti-gun activists.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and the underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HAYES). All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part D of House Report 117-10 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 9 of House Resolution 188, shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time after debate for the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part D of House Report 117-10, not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. NADLER OF NEW YORK

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 188, I offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, printed in part D of House Report 117-10, offered by Mr. NADLER of New York:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS OF TEXAS

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. —. REPORT ON FIREARM TRANSFERS DENIED AS A RESULT OF A NICS CHECK.**

Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General, Department of Justice, shall prepare and submit to the Congress a written report on the number of firearm transactions with respect to which the national instant criminal background check system established under the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act has determined that receipt of a firearm by the prospective firearm transferee would violate Federal or State law, and which have been referred to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives for investigation.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN OF CALIFORNIA

Page 5, strike line 16.

Page 5, beginning on line 18, strike “and an aggregate” and all that follows through line 20 and insert “with a description of denials, disaggregated by State and by the basis for the denial; and”.

Page 5, after line 20, insert the following:

(3) an aggregate analysis of the petitions submitted pursuant to such paragraph (1)(B)(ii).

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. MCBATH OF GEORGIA

Page 6, line 15, insert “disaggregated by State,” before “and whether”.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

Page 5, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 6, line 7 and insert the following:

**SEC. 4. REPORTS ON PETITIONS SUPPORTING FIREARMS TRANSFERS NOT IMMEDIATELY APPROVED BY NICS SYSTEM, THAT WERE NOT RESPONDED TO IN A TIMELY MANNER.**

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall make an annual report to the public on the number of petitions received by the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act that were submitted pursuant to subclause (I) of section 922(t)(1)(B)(ii) of title 18, United States Code, with respect to which a determination was not made within the 10-day period referred to in subclause (II) of such section 922(t)(1)(B)(ii). The report shall include the following, which shall be disaggregated by State:

(1) The number of petitions submitted under such section that were received by the national instant criminal background check system established under section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

(2) The number of petitioners who were discovered to be ineligible under Federal or State law during that 10-day period.

(3) The number of petitioners who were discovered to be ineligible under Federal or State law after that 10-day period.

(4) The basis of the ineligibility of the petitioners discovered to be ineligible under Federal or State law during that 10-day period, and the basis of the ineligibility of the petitioners discovered to be ineligible under Federal or State law after that 10-day period.

(5) The number of the petitioners whose petitions were denied and who, within 12



months after the denial, were prosecuted under Federal, State, or local law for receiving or attempting to receive a firearm.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Madam Speaker, the amendments contained in this en bloc amendment include important changes to the bill that will provide Congress additional information to inform our future decisionmaking.

Representative BURGESS' amendment would require reporting to Congress on the number of NICS denials referred for investigation after a firearm was sold to a person who was later found to be ineligible.

Representative LEVIN's amendment adds State-level data tracking which will facilitate our review of which State gun safety measures have been effective and which should be considered on the Federal level.

Representative MCBATH's amendment would require critical reporting on the impact of the bill on victims of domestic abuse.

Lastly, Representative NEGUSE's amendment makes data available to the public regarding NICS denials.

These are valuable additions to H.R. 1446.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support them, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I am going to attempt to address the hearts and minds of some of my dear friends across the aisle, and I do have friends: I respect you, I love you, and I admire you.

I recognize that we have all lived different lives, but let me clarify that I have a very personal knowledge of the way the street works. Criminals are not going to follow these laws.

Madam Speaker, you are talking about 10 days—I can have a 10-minute override from right here and bring you back an illegal gun.

Do you want one?

A couple of hundred bucks, Madam Speaker, I can get you one.

Madam Speaker, it is not intellectually sound to actually believe in your heart that restricting the Second Amendment rights and freedoms to purchase, own, and bear firearms of Americans that will follow the laws you intend to pass is going to impact the decisions that are made by criminals on the streets. It is just not reality.

This realm is bizarre. Americans are watching this right now. They get it. They know the criminals are not going to follow the law. This is not going to impact the criminal realm.

We have deterioration of our society because of the failure to embrace core principles and American family values. This is what has happened over the course of a generation on my watch. I am 59. This has happened to America as I have matured. I am concerned about the future, but I am certainly recognizing the core freedoms and principled protections of the constitutional rights of my children and grandchildren.

We must not allow that to be deteriorated under the guise of protecting our citizens from crime. Criminals are not going to recognize these laws.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Enhanced Background Checks Act.

In order to truly prevent bad actors from purchasing guns, we need more transparency. My amendment to this legislation demands transparency from government at both the State and Federal level and ensures that we have complete information about prohibited individuals attempting to get their hands on guns.

Right now, the background check system relies heavy on States uploading accurate records. And with this amendment we can better understand which States are doing a good job of uploading records to the system and which are not. Without good and reliable information and without transparency, background checks are much more likely to be delayed resulting in a higher risk of more tragedies like the one at Mother Emanuel Church.

With this amendment we can ensure that prohibited individuals won't be sold a gun before their background check is fully completed. If we truly want to keep guns out of the hands of violent individuals, my amendment will get it done.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, what we are saying here is that the American people have to beg their government to avail themselves of their rights: Oh, Federal Government, can I speak now?

Can I defend myself now, or should I wait a little longer?

That is what we are saying now.

The Constitution says, "shall not be infringed." In Pennsylvania where I come from, our constitution says, "shall not be questioned."

Madam Speaker, we are questioning it today. We are putting our constituents and we are putting the American people who have the Constitution enshrining their rights on the defensive, begging their government to avail themselves of their rights.

Now, my colleagues and my good friends on the other side of the aisle keep on bringing up the horrific tragedy and the events that happened at the church. We can't bring that up and

say that this is the solution when this doesn't fix that.

Madam Speaker, you can't say that the FBI couldn't check all the databases. It chose not to. It could have checked them in those 3 days, but it chose not to.

Now, those are tragic events for sure, but it is not the American people's fault that the FBI didn't do their job. Do not punish the American people. Do not abridge their rights because the FBI and because the government couldn't get it right. Let's fix the government and allow the people to be free and enjoy their constitutional rights and defend themselves when they want to defend themselves.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1446, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2021.

Under current Federal law, unlicensed sellers can sell guns at gun shows, online, and person to person without conducting any background check on the purchaser. This loophole has dangerous consequences for our communities. In fact, up to 80 percent of firearms used for criminal purposes are obtained without a background check.

I am reminded of my time on the New York City Council where I witnessed the murder of my colleague and dear friend, Councilman James E. Davis.

Just earlier this week, a gunman opened fire on two police officers in my district, hitting one officer in the chest and another in the leg. Guns are not manufactured in Brooklyn, New York.

Time and time again we have been shaken to the core and heartbroken by the news of another shooting in our communities that we call home.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, I sit here and listen to my colleagues, and that is what I want to do; but I become more frustrated with the fact that I think, Madam Speaker, we are in parallel universes.

We are talking about gun crime. We all agree that gun crime is wrong. We all agree that the murders that go on with gun crime are horrendous and we don't want them to continue. But they are not happening as a result of law-abiding gun owners.

We have background checks now that work. I have gone through those myself. We have dealt with them.

I grew up on the south side of Chicago. I love Chicago. It pains me to see that become the murder center that it has become. And now I hear the report that the reason it is this is because people from Chicago can come to Michigan, buy illegal guns, and bring them back, that is the fault.

No, it is a heart problem.

It is a problem of criminals who are not being prosecuted.

We have FBI who don't follow the background checks and don't do it in a timely fashion. We have a Justice Department that doesn't prosecute gun crimes. And we blame it on law-abiding citizens.

What we will do today—as we have attempted other times—is to put law-abiding citizens under the gun—and I use that word specifically—further who will not commit a crime, but have to go through onerous legislation that allegedly makes more transparent gun laws that stomp on the Second Amendment liberties that we have.

Madam Speaker, that is wrong. That is wrong, and it will not end the gun problem. We have had a War on Poverty for years and poverty has increased. Government programs don't work.

Madam Speaker, I appeal to my friends on the other side of the aisle: I know your hearts are right, but this won't do the job.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, the gun violence epidemic has robbed us of our loved ones; our safety in schools, our places of worship and public spaces; and our children. It has ravaged our communities across America and touched the Halls of Congress.

It is also very personal to me. I am one of the few Members on this floor who has been a victim of gun violence, and we know what this is all about.

This is all about making sure felons don't get guns. It is making sure that those who are mentally ill don't get guns. And it is making sure that those who have committed domestic violence don't get guns. That is all this bill is doing.

But what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing is bowing to the NRA that contributes to their campaigns and kissing the rings of those who are the gun manufacturers who contribute to the NRA anywhere from \$10 to \$60 million over the course of 5 years. That is what this is all about.

The American people want to be safe, and we are going to make them safe.

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

□ 1715

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership, and I thank Whip CLYBURN for letting us fix the problem of criminals getting guns.

Do my friends on the other side of the aisle not understand that Dylann Roof had a criminal background? What happened is that the storekeeper, in essence, violated the law. He viewed it as

not violating the law because, after 3 days, there was no answer.

Dylann Roof took a gun and became a mass shooter in America. Yes, if he had not gotten a gun illegally, these souls would be alive today.

In 2018, there were 355 mass shootings. We have evidence that people with guns have not stopped a mass shooting. So if there was a person armed with a gun inside Mother Emanuel praying with a gun, I don't believe that lives could have been saved.

What I do know is that if this bill, H.R. 1446, had been in place, that would have allowed a 10-day window to be able to determine whether Dylann Roof needed to have a gun. It is a simple context, simple facts, and it should be done to save lives.

I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 1446. I thank Whip CLYBURN for his long years of persistence. And our sympathy goes to those who lost their lives at Mother Emanuel in 2015.

We have come now to be able to say no, criminals should not have guns, and we should have a NICS system that allowed the full review background check so that he could not have had a gun. What is wrong with that?

Are we interested in saving lives the right way?

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1446, the "Enhanced Background Check Act of 2021," which strengthens the background check procedures federal firearms licensees or dealers follow before selling or transferring a firearm.

Under current law, firearms dealers are required to run a background check on prospective buyers using the NICS.

Over 90 percent of checks are completed within 90 seconds so if the NICS system has not returned an answer to the licensed firearms dealer within ten days, the prospective firearms purchaser may file a petition with the Attorney General for review.

After another 10-day period has expired, the licensed firearms dealer may sell or transfer the firearm to the prospective purchaser if it has not received a response through the NICS system and the dealer has no reason to believe that the purchaser is prohibited from obtaining a firearm under Federal, state, or local law.

Thus, under this measure, licensed firearms dealers could not sell or transfer under the "default proceed" provision until at least 20 days have passed since the initial background check.

Madam Speaker, the American people are demanding effective action to reduce, if not prevent altogether, the countless mass shootings and gun violence in our country that continue to claim so many innocent lives.

Newly released data from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention found firearm-related deaths rose for the second-straight year in 2016, largely due to spikes in gun violence.

In 2016, the new CDC report on preliminary mortality data shows that there were more than 38,000 gun-related deaths in the U.S.—4,000 more than 2015.

An Associated Press analysis of FBI data shows there were about 11,000 gun-related homicides in 2016, up from 9,600 in 2015.

Congress must act to keep our country safe through gun safety and violence deterrence.

There was nearly one mass shooting per day in the United States—355 mass shootings in 2018.

In December 2012, a gunman walked into Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, and killed 20 children, 6 adults, and himself.

Since December 2012, there have been at least 1,518 mass shootings, with at least 1,715 people killed and 6,089 wounded.

On the night of October 1, 2017, a gunman opened fire on a large crowd of concertgoers at the Route 91 Harvest music festival on the Las Vegas Strip, leaving 58 people dead and 527 injured.

And on November 5, 2017, a mass shooting occurred at the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, Texas, where the gunman, 26-year-old Devin Patrick Kelley, killed 26 and injured 20 others.

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 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 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.

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

Madam Speaker, enhancing the gun transfer background check system has consistently garnered broad public support, as high as 92 percent, because the American people know that the status quo is simply intolerable and action must be taken to reduce gun violence by keeping dangerous persons from obtaining deadly weapons.

That begins with passing H.R. 1446, the "Enhanced Background Check Act of 2021," and I urge all members to join me in voting for its passage.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, let's save a life. I am going to share with my colleagues an actual story going on right now, because my citizens have my phone number. I have had the same phone number since 2004. They know they can reach out to me for help.

A young lady, right now, whose property, her yard, her garage, has been invaded night after night after night by a strange man. He moves fast. She is a single mom, a 30-year-old woman, hard-working woman, American.

Many, many years ago, she pled guilty to a minor drug charge. It is still on her record. She can't buy a gun, but, by God, she is going to get one. She is going to get one illegally to defend herself and her young child.

Your bill would make this story commonplace from sea to shining sea. I beg for you to stand for the people who we serve and recognize what you are attempting to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I oppose both bills and the amendments for all the reasons we have stated today. I think my colleague from Pennsylvania said it best. We are now going to have to wait 10 days to exercise your Second Amendment rights.

One of the previous speakers, Madam Speaker, on the Democrat side said that felons don't get guns. They are felons. They are not going to follow the law.

We all know what this is. This is going to make it more difficult for law-abiding Americans to exercise a fundamental liberty guaranteed in the United States Constitution, the second right they have, the Second Amendment to the Constitution. It is going to make it more difficult for them to exercise their fundamental liberty. That is what this is about.

The FBI had 2 months in the Charleston situation to get it right. They couldn't. Somehow we think now extending it from 3 days to 10 days, a system that messed up as much as it has, somehow that is going to help, and then shifting the burden so that if this system that has falsely denied people their right to purchase a firearm, time and time again, if the system does it again, the burden is on you.

Since when do we ever do that? When are you presumed guilty by the government? Only now. Only now are you presumed guilty. You are not going to be able to exercise your rights.

Those are our concerns with both of these bills and the amendments that are in front of us today.

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

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

Our Republican friends insist on misreading the bill. They insist on talking about things that aren't in the bill.

The bill takes away the rights of nobody except those who have threatened their wives, threatened their former wives, threatened other people in the community. Those are all the people who are affected.

Yes, we extend the NICS system from 3 days to 10 days. That means that if the NICS system hasn't reported back within 3 days, the FBI gets up to 10 days. At the end of 10 days, they can't stop you from getting a weapon unless the records show that you are not entitled to get the weapon because you are a danger to the community. That is what this bill does.

To misread it and say it gives any rights to felons, or to gun buyers, or to

people who are criminals because they disobey the law, of course people who disobey the law are criminals. But that is not what the bill deals with.

The bill simply says that it effectuates a system that says that people who are threats to the community may not get guns. And it does not limit the time beyond 10 days to make that decision.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 202, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—225

Adams	Demings	Kirkpatrick
Agullar	DeSaunier	Krishnamoorthi
Allred	Deutch	Kuster
Auchincloss	Dingell	Lamb
Axne	Doggett	Langevin
Barragán	Doyle, Michael	Larsen (WA)
Bass	F.	Larson (CT)
Beatty	Escobar	Lawrence
Bera	Eshoo	Lawson (FL)
Beyer	Españillat	Lee (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Lee (NV)
Blumenauer	Fitzpatrick	Leger Fernandez
Blunt Rochester	Fletcher	Levin (CA)
Bonamici	Poster	Levin (MI)
Bourdeaux	Frankel, Lois	Lieu
Bowman	Galleo	Lofgren
Boyle, Brendan	Garamendi	Lowenthal
F.	Garcia (IL)	Luria
Brown	Garcia (TX)	Lynch
Brownley	Gimenez	Malinowski
Bush	Golden	Malliotakis
Bustos	Gomez	Maloney.
Butterfield	Gonzalez,	Carolyn B.
Carbajal	Vicente	Maloney, Sean
Cárdenas	Gottheimer	Manning
Carson	Green, Al (TX)	Matsui
Cartwright	Grijalva	McBath
Case	Grothman	McCollum
Casten	Haaland	McEachin
Castor (FL)	Harder (CA)	McGovern
Castro (TX)	Hastings	McNerney
Chu	Hayes	Meeks
Cicilline	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Clark (MA)	Himes	Mfume
Clarke (NY)	Horsford	Moore (WI)
Cleaver	Houlahan	Morelle
Clyburn	Hoyer	Moulton
Cohen	Huffman	Mrvan
Connolly	Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)
Cooper	Jacobs (CA)	Nadler
Correa	Jayapal	Napolitano
Costa	Jeffries	Neal
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Neguse
Craig	Johnson (TX)	Newman
Crist	Jones	Norcross
Crow	Kahale	O'Halleran
Cuellar	Kaptur	Ocasio-Cortez
Davids (KS)	Katko	Omar
Davis, Danny K.	Keating	Pallone
Dean	Kelly (IL)	Panetta
DeFazio	Khanna	Pappas
DeGette	Kildee	Pascarell
DeLauro	Kilmer	Payne
DelBene	Kim (NJ)	Perlmutter
Delgado	Kind	Peters

Phillips	Schrader	Titus
Pingree	Schrier	Tlaib
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Tonko
Porter	Scott, David	Torres (CA)
Pressley	Sewell	Torres (NY)
Price (NC)	Sherman	Trahan
Quigley	Sherrill	Trone
Raskin	Sires	Underwood
Reed	Slotkin	Vargas
Rice (NY)	Smith (NJ)	Veasey
Ross	Smith (WA)	Vela
Roybal-Allard	Soto	Velázquez
Ruiz	Spanberger	Wasserman
Ruppersberger	Speier	Schultz
Rush	Stanton	Watson Coleman
Ryan	Stevens	Welch
Sánchez	Strickland	Wexton
Sarbanes	Suozzi	Wild
Scanlon	Swalwell	Williams (GA)
Schakowsky	Takano	Wilson (FL)
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Yarmuth
Schneider	Thompson (MS)	

NAYS—202

Aderholt	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Allen	Gonzalez (OH)	Moore (AL)
Amodei	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Armstrong	Gooden (TX)	Mullin
Arrington	Gosar	Murphy (NC)
Babin	Granger	Nehls
Bacon	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Baird	Graves (MO)	Norman
Balderson	Green (TN)	Nunes
Banks	Greene (GA)	Oberholte
Barr	Griffith	Owens
Bentz	Guthrie	Palazzo
Bergman	Hagedorn	Palmer
Bice (OK)	Harris	Pence
Biggs	Harshbarger	Perry
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Pfleger
Bishop (NC)	Hern	Posey
Boebert	Herrell	Reschenthaler
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Brady	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Brooks	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Buck	Hinson	Rose
Bushon	Hollingsworth	Rosendale
Budd	Hudson	Rouzer
Burchett	Huizenga	Roy
Burgess	Issa	Rutherford
Calvert	Jackson	Salazar
Cammack	Jacobs (NY)	Scalise
Carl	Johnson (LA)	Schweikert
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Scott, Austin
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Cawthorn	Jordan	Simpson
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Smith (MO)
Cheney	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NE)
Cline	Keller	Smucker
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Spartz
Clyde	Kelly (PA)	Stauber
Cole	Kim (CA)	Steel
Comer	Kinzinger	Stefanik
Crawford	Kustoff	Steil
Crenshaw	LaHood	Steube
Curtis	LaMalfa	Stewart
Davidson	Lamborn	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Taylor
DesJarlais	LaTurner	Tenney
Diaz-Balart	Lesko	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Long	Timmons
Dunn	Loudermilk	Turner
Emmer	Lucas	Upton
Estes	Luetkemeyer	Valadao
Fallon	Mace	Van Drew
Feenstra	Mann	Van Duyne
Ferguson	Massie	Wagner
Fischbach	Mast	Walberg
Fitzgerald	McCarthy	Walorski
Fleischmann	McCaul	Waltz
Fortenberry	McClain	Weber (TX)
Fox	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Franklin, C.	McHenry	Wenstrup
Scott	McKinley	Westerman
Fulcher	Meijer	Williams (TX)
Gaetz	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Miller (IL)	Wittman
Garbarino	Miller (WV)	Womack
Garcia (CA)	Miller-Meeks	Young
Gibbs	Moolenaar	Zeldin
Gohmert		

NOT VOTING—3

Tiffany Waters

□ 1808

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably delayed by a constituent on the phone. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 73.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS))	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Napolitano (Correa)
Amodi (Kelly (PA))	Kahele (Case) Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Babin (Norman)	Langevin (Lynch)	Pingree (Kuster)
Baird (Walorski)		Porter (Wexton)
Barragán (Beyer)		Roybal-Allard
Beatty (Lawrence)	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Leger Fernandez
Bush (Ocasio- Cortez)	Lieu (Beyer) Lofgren (Jeffries)	Ruiz (Aguilar) Rush
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	(Underwood) Steube
Cleaver (Davids (KS))	McEachin (Wexton)	(Franklin, C. Scott)
Cohen (Beyer)	McHenry (Banks)	Strickland
DeFazio (Davids (KS))	Meng (Clark (MA))	(DelBene) Thompson (MS)
Grijalva (García (IL))	Moore (WI) (Beyer)	(Butterfield) Watson Coleman
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Morelle (Tonko) Moulton (Rice (NY))	(Pallone) Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HAYES). The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hudson moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1446 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HUDSON is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_. RECIPROCITY FOR THE CARRYING OF  
CERTAIN CONCEALED FIREARMS.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"(d)(1) A person who is deprived of any right, privilege, or immunity secured by this section, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of any State or any political subdivision thereof, may bring an action in any appropriate court against any other person, including a State or political subdivision thereof, who causes the person to be subject to the deprivation, for damages or other appropriate relief.

"(2) The court shall award a plaintiff prevailing in an action brought under paragraph (1) damages and such other relief as the court deems appropriate, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

"(e) In subsection (a):

"(1) The term 'identification document' means a document made or issued by or under the authority of the United States Government, a State, or a political subdivision of a State which, when completed with information concerning a particular individual, is of a type intended or commonly accepted for the purpose of identification of individuals.

"(2) The term 'handgun' includes any magazine for use in a handgun and any ammunition loaded into the handgun or its magazine.

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

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

"(A) A unit of the National Park System.

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

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

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

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

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

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter is amended by in-

serting after the item relating to section 926C the following:

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1446 is postponed.

CONGRESS MUST CARE FOR ALL

(Mr. BOWMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to discuss the introduction of our Care for All Agenda.

Just as our physical infrastructure is crumbling, we suffer from lack of care infrastructure. In America today, millions of people cannot get care for themselves or their loved ones. We are failing children, older adults, people with disabilities, and all Americans.

And we don't care for the people who take care of us. Millions of care and domestic workers, disproportionately women of color, are exploited and paid poverty wages.

With bold, holistic public investments in the care economy, we can heal these wounds. We can substantially raise wages and benefits for workers. We can create millions of new zero-carbon care jobs. And we can create universal programs to guarantee care to all people. These investments are a crucial part of the Green New Deal. We cannot have a truly just, sustainable America without a healthy foundation of care.

The Care for All Agenda, introduced with 30 of my colleagues, and with the support of over 90 movement partners, lays out how centering care can be the rebirth of our Nation.

Join us in building a care community and society based on care for people, communities and the planet we all share.