

Mr. PASCRELL. I didn't come to speak on this issue tonight but another issue, but I can't help but look at the graphic message that's right there in front of everybody, in front of the country, about the financial, Great Recession, depression—who was charged and how many were convicted. This is a very, very, very sad omen.

If we go back into the nineties and into the first decade of this century, very, very specific, as we understood what was going to come, you need to have a Justice Department that's willing to stand up and fight the very people who many times fund our campaigns.

Now, if you can't say it, then you shouldn't be here.

AIG is a perfect example. They became the poster child of everything that was going wrong in our financial institutions. But AIG, in 2003 and 2005—rather, 2003 and 2005, got what are called deferred prosecutions. Deferred prosecutions to me are the very center, the very apex of what is corrupt about those moneylenders in the temple.

Now, what is AIG all about? They made and packaged many of these financial deals that we read about it for so many years. And people look at this and they read about it. They may not know all the specific definitions about every one of these packages, these financial products, as they were called, but they do understand that nobody ever pays for anything, and nobody ever is held accountable.

So how can people, the average person who is struggling, particularly now, see it's all right when things are going well, the AIGs become simply a fault, a sand pebble on the beach of our brains.

But the fact of the matter is, when things get tough, then you will wonder where this money is going. Because money doesn't disappear into the ocean, it doesn't disappear into the atmosphere, into the sky. It goes somewhere and it winds up in someone's pocket. It's simple one-on-one mathematics, beyond the course.

When you look at deferred prosecutions and how many corporations got deferred prosecutions, where the government said, where the Justice Department said, look, if you straighten out and fly right, and we will have a Federal monitor there to make sure that you don't do the financial practices that you did before, then we will let you go. No one will be prosecuted, and no one will be taken to task, and no one will go to trial, and no one will, therefore, ever be convicted. My friend, it did not work with AIG, and it hasn't worked with any of the large corporations.

You know what? I don't blame one party for this. We were part of the situation as well, and until we stand and tell the truth about our own implications in this thing, this is never going to be changed.

People want to be confident in their government and their Justice Depart-

ment, to get to those people who made money on the backs of the working men and women of this country.

Ms. SPEIER. The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Thank you very much. I think we all struggle with what phrase to use to describe the people that have been hurt by this. I think we use the words, the phrase working and middle class families, sometimes we say ordinary people. Sometimes we say regular people. But the phrase that keeps coming to me is people who are trying to make an honest living.

And I think my model for that was my own parents. I am a child of the middle class. My father worked for the post office. He managed, at the end of his life, he worked for the post office almost all of his life, almost all of his working life. He died in 1965. At the end of his life, when I was 12, he was a manager of a neighborhood branch of the post office.

After that I saw my mother support me on her own as a widow, when I was 12 forward. I remember my law school graduation, my mother trembling. I thought that she was overcome with pride since my generation was the first in our family to go to college. She later admitted to my sister that she had actually, after my father died, prayed that if her youngest, me, could just get through school, He could take her at any time. So she was expecting to be struck down at any moment and was trying to negotiate a new deal with God.

I am deeply offended by the suggestion that my parents, both of whom were public employees, my father worked for the post office, my mother was a bookkeeper for the local school system, were not making a contribution to society, that they were taking, that they were takers and not givers. I saw how hard they worked to do right by me and to do right by the people who were paying their salaries.

I am deeply offended by the arguments that public employees are people who are taking from our society and not giving back. The idea that they are takers, and the people who came up with this stuff, are the ones doing something useful to society, that they are the ones who are making a valuable contribution, offends me deeply.

Ms. SPEIER. It offends me as well.

As we conclude this half hour, I just want to say to our colleagues that this commission report must not gather dust. This commission report has got to be read by everyone, particularly our colleagues on the other side, and that we have got to take it to heart.

One of the points they make in this report was that \$2.7 billion was spent by the financial services industry over 10 years to lobby all of us, and another \$1 billion was given out in contributions to Members of Congress.

□ 1930

So, it's no surprise that the enforcement hasn't been as strong as it should

be. Thank you for sharing this half hour with me, and let's hope that we can continue to shed light on this issue.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I want to talk tonight a little bit about, number one, why I even came to Congress and why I'm up here tonight talking about gun violence. I just want to give you a little history. On December 7, 1993, a deranged man named Colin Ferguson got on the Long Island Railroad train and changed my life and that of many others forever. As the train pulled into Merillon Avenue in Garden City, he took out a handgun and opened fire on those passengers in the train. He killed six people, including my husband. He injured 19, including my son, who was shot in the head at close range. Thankfully, my son did survive. And while it has been a difficult struggle for him, he has a rich life now with a wife and two children. I consider them my miracles. And I'm very grateful that he did survive.

What I did after that incident was become an advocate for reducing gun violence in this country, to see if I could help others not have to go through the same pain that my family and the other families of the Long Island Railroad massacre went through. As often happens when you become an advocate for a cause, any cause, that led me to work with elected officials and the government to try to change policies that I thought were hurting the American people.

And also as often happens when I discovered that there was only so much you could do outside the government, I ran for office myself. I was never a very political person, but I believed so strongly in this cause that people saw and gave me the chance to be their Congresswoman. The Members of this body embraced me also. That was in 1996. Even though I work hard on other issues like the economy and education, I'm still fighting that this struggle to reduce gun violence is the same battle I had back in 1993 and on.

So let's go fast forward now. From 1993 to January 8 of 2011, on that fateful day in Arizona, six lives were stolen from us, and 13 of our fellow Americans were injured, including one of our own,

Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS. Certainly it hit home for all of us, and it sends a chill down all of our spines. I know I'll never forget that day. The shootings had eerie similarities to our own incident in 1993. Six people were killed and over a dozen injured. Like my son, Gabby was shot in the head at close range. Like my son, she's looking like she's making a wonderful recovery. And we're all rooting for her.

There are a couple more similarities that bear mentioning. In both the shootings, the gunmen used high-capacity magazines that allowed them to maximize their carnage; and in both shootings, the gunman was tackled by unarmed witnesses while they stopped the shooting when he was trying to reload.

I ran for office and entered government to make a difference. I came to Congress to make our lives safer. I have a legislative proposal that I think should reduce the casualties in that supermarket parking lot on January 8.

H.R. 308 is a bill to ban high-capacity magazines like the ones used in Arizona and on the Long Island Railroad. These are devices designed to hold more than 10 rounds of ammunition and feed them into a gun. The State law in my State, New York, have already banned magazines holding more than 10 bullets, and that was also the Federal law between 1994 and 2004. So we know that there's precedent for this law on a State and a Federal level. There is no question about its constitutionality.

Unfortunately, most States, like Arizona, don't have limit on high-capacity magazines. This is what allowed the shooter to just walk into a common store and buy the weapon he did right off the shelf. This is a reasonable, commonsense bill that makes accommodations for public safety and gun owners' rights. This includes exemptions for our law enforcements and our military as well for testing purposes or for security guards looking after nuclear facilities.

As I noted, often shooters are tackled and stopped when they run out of bullets in a magazine and stop to reload. That was the case for my family in 1993, and that was the case of Arizona. Maybe if the shooter in Arizona had fewer bullets in the magazine, we wouldn't have had the carnage that we saw. Fewer people would have died. Fewer people would have been injured. We would be looking at one less funeral or a few less life-changing injuries.

Immediately after the shooting in Arizona, there was a lot of talk just about by everyone about putting partisanship and politics aside and working together for the common good. I see this bill as an opportunity to do that. This is not a partisan bill. There is no Democrat or Republican way to become a victim of gun violence. And there is no Democratic or Republican way to reduce it. In the absence of a perfect, nonviolent society, we must make laws to protect the public.

This is a very simple bill, a bill about our public health and our safety. We also have a moral imperative to protect innocent and law-abiding Americans from the threat of dangerous weapons in the wrong hands. In America, we believe in life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To me, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness include being able to go grocery shopping on a Saturday or attend a public event on a Saturday afternoon without being gunned down.

This bill does not take away anyone's right to own a gun. Let me make that very, very clear. This bill does nothing to take away anyone's right to own a gun. I believe in this Second Amendment, and I support law-abiding hunters and sportsmen. But common sense dictates there is no need for the kinds of devices that this bill is addressing other than for killing as many people as possible in the shortest possible time.

Almost 100,000 people a year are shot in this country, suicides, homicides, accidental deaths and on and on. That's over 260 people a day. Every single one of those people have families and friends. Think of how many millions of Americans are affected by gun violence every single year. I want to remind us all that we can help lower these awful statistics. We can help save lives, and we can help prevent lives from being shattered.

Now, this bill is getting more and more support every single day. We have over 90 cosponsors in the House and 10 in the Senate. And every day there's another newspaper editorial or a columnist supporting this bill. There are a lot of coalitions, organizations, and leaders out there working to support this bill to reduce gun violence in our country—the Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence; the Violence Policy Center; the Coalition to Stop Gun Violence; New Yorkers Against Gun Violence; New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg; the United States Conference of Mayors; Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter; Richard Aborn, who was a former president of Brady; Mothers Against Guns; Faiths United to Prevent Gun Violence; States United to Prevent Gun Violence; and many, many more.

Even pro-gun conservatives like Vice President Dick Cheney say that it would be reasonable to discuss reinstating the restriction that was in the assault weapons bill and to do away with the large magazines.

□ 1940

We are also hearing word that President Obama will publicly address the issue of gun violence soon. We don't know whether he will talk about this bill or other measures that I also support, like strengthening our background check system, or closing the gun show loophole, which allows you to buy guns at gun shows without a background check.

But the good news is that people across the country are uniting in an ef-

fort to do something to reduce gun violence. I think one of the most important things I can do while I'm here with you is to ask for your help and ask the American people for their help.

We all saw recently from the world events the kind of change that you can make happen when you have the power of the people behind you. And certainly we have done this before. We have come together as a Nation, Democrat and Republican, to pass sensible gun laws in order to save lives and reduce injuries. If you are not a cosponsor on this legislation yet, please become one. If you are still not sure if you want to support this legislation or not, please feel free to talk to me or anyone on staff. Go on my Web site and read the bill. Basically, this is a very narrow bill.

Finally, no matter what we do, whether you support this bill or not, please let's look at ourselves in the mirror and ask ourselves: After the shooting in Arizona, will we sit by helplessly and do absolutely nothing or will we do everything we can to save lives and protect innocent people for the future?

I want to thank you again for listening to me tonight, and I want to say that even if we can save one life, one life, with all of our efforts, than to me it has been well worth it.

My good friend and colleague from New Jersey, BILL PASCRELL, who has been outspoken on this issue for many, many years, I appreciate him being with me tonight.

Mr. PASCRELL. I appreciate the gentledady for yielding. Madam Speaker, it is good to see you in the seat this evening.

I support the Second Amendment. I was lucky enough to come into this Congress with my friend from New York, CAROLYN MCCARTHY. She has been a champion for the issue against gun violence.

I am proud to be here tonight supporting her legislation, H.R. 308, the Large Capacity Ammunition Feeding Device Act. The McCarthy bill will reinstate the ban on large capacity ammunition feeding devices that existed for quite some time, from 1994 to 2004, as the gentledady from Long Island has said.

As has already been stated, this bill bans the sale or transfer of high capacity magazines, those holding more than 10 rounds, by non-law enforcement civilians. I state that right now, Madam Speaker, to make it very, very clear, this is an issue close to my heart because I came to this Congress in January 1997 pledging my support to defend law enforcement officials throughout the United States of America.

Many times those who illegally have these guns or have illegal guns, many times they are better armed than our police forces. Just think about it? When we raise our hands, if we are fortunate enough to be elected or re-elected, we swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States and life,

liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as you heard the gentlewoman just mention. Part of that pledge, or a reflection of that pledge, is how we treat our law enforcement officials besides just patting them on the back. So we want to not only have a law enforcement person, a police officer out there who is well equipped, who is well trained, but is in a better position to defend us than those who seek to destroy property or limb.

It does not make sense. The failure of Congress in recent years to shoulder the ultimate responsibility of safeguarding our communities from gun violence is inexcusable. This is not rhetoric. This is common sense. These magazines, which contain so many bullets that can kill so many people, have no place in our towns, have no place in our cities.

The tragedy in Arizona was a gut-wrenching reminder of what can happen when these weapons are legally available. We are not suggesting taking guns away from anyone who legally possesses them, and I can't emphasize that enough. And I know those who are very close to the gun community are very suspect of anything that will lead to a graduated taking of guns away from the people. That has never been the intent of the gentlelady from Long Island, and certainly that is not my intent whatsoever. And that is not simply an assuaging of the argument; that is the fact. This is not about guns. This is about reason. This is about sanity. This is about peace of mind.

That tragedy will always remain in our minds. Our sister is hurting, and we pray for her recovery. The perpetrator of that heinous crime fired 32 bullets in only 16 seconds. He killed 6 people and injured 13. That did not happen that long ago, and yet, it is out of the country's culture mind. It is not there. It is not discussed. It is almost as if it didn't happen.

Some people have said that it is not the gun but the person who commits the act of violence. While that may be the case, the shooter was taken down while reloading his weapon after those 32 bullets. If there had been fewer bullets in the magazine, he may have been thwarted earlier, saving other lives.

So we are talking about this magazine that we want to take out of anyone's hands. We are talking about possibilities. We are talking about risk, and giving more of a chance to protect ourselves. And for a police officer, if a police officer was there, could have been in the crowd, should have been—all valued lives. And those are not the only numbers that are chilling.

Nearly 100,000 people are killed by guns every year. Over 260 people will be killed today by a gun. This results in \$100 billion annually in medical, security, and criminal justice costs. There is a reason that local enforcement and the U.S. Conference of Mayors supports this legislation: Because the ban worked when it was in effect for those

10 years. If it didn't work, we wouldn't be here tonight. Records show that while the Federal assault weapons ban was in effect, the number of high capacity magazines collected by police fell dramatically.

This is a return to the same standard we have in many States, including my home State of New Jersey, and the law of the land from 1994 to 2004. There is no question that it is constitutional. This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. Let's not make it that. This is not about taking all guns away from law-abiding citizens. It has nothing to do with that, either. This is about saving lives. And right now we pray for our own buddy, our own sister, who was just here not too long ago. Where is she? I didn't see her the last few days. She's healing. We thank God she is in the position to heal.

We can do something about this reckless nonsense without violating the Constitution of the United States of America which we have all pledged to adhere to.

I yield back to the gentlelady from Long Island, and I thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. And I thank my good friend.

You know, a lot of times there is a lot of propaganda out there that gun owners don't want to go anywhere with this, but the support for this bill and gun restrictions in general, from organizations and members of the media, are also reflected in public polls.

The Mayors Against Illegal Guns showed that almost 60 percent of all Americans and even 49 percent of gun owners support this bill.

A public policy poll found that 55 percent of the people in Arizona, a State where gun rights are dearly cherished, support more restrictions on guns.

A USA Today poll found that a majority of Americans do support stricter gun controls.

Here is one of the issues that we face all of the time: That the American people support what we are trying to do, but we are not hearing their voices. And I think that is something that the American people can do to make a difference.

I also want to note that Arizona and the Long Island Railroad are not the only recent incidents in which high capacity magazines were used. In Manchester, Connecticut, at a beer distributor, on August 3, 2010, a shooter with a large magazine killed eight and wounded two.

Fort Hood, we all remember that day: November 5, 2009. The shooter killed 13 and wounded 34.

□ 1950

Northern Illinois University on February 14, 2008: The shooter killed five and wounded 21.

Virginia Tech, right here in our neighborhood, on April 16: The shooter killed 32 and wounded 17.

We can go on and on and on, all the way back to Columbine High School,

where the shooter killed 13—13 students and teachers—and wounded 23.

Going back to California, a shooter killed eight and wounded six. At Luby's Cafeteria in Texas, the shooter killed 23 and wounded 20.

These were all done by large capacity clips.

My colleague, Congressman PASCARELL, talked about health care. My son was shot 17 years ago. His medical bills within a couple of years were over \$1 million, but there is the pain that he still has to go through every single day, which our friend GABBY is going to have to go through just to be able to do normal day things: tie your shoes, get dressed. My colleague mentioned \$100 billion a year in health care costs.

We know that we can't save every life. I know that. I spent over 30 years as a nurse. I couldn't save every life, but we sure did our best to do everything that we possibly could to make a difference. That's why I stand here tonight and talk about why I feel so passionately about this. Unless you're a victim, unless you're a family member or a friend who has lost a loved one or someone who was injured, it's very hard to describe the pain that goes on for many, many, many years. For those who survive, there is not only the mental trauma that they go through; there is also the physical trauma that they go through, which some will carry for the rest of their lives.

Again, I say there are supporters, and I want to read off a few. They're mainly from newspapers across the country. Here in Congress, everybody talks about red States and blue States. Yet these are States that have people in them. We can disagree, certainly, on where we're going on certain issues, but there are newspapers around the country and editorial boards, which usually would not support any kind of gun legislation, that say it's time, that it's time to have a debate on how we reduce gun violence in this country.

The New York Times reads: As lawmakers in Washington engage this week in moments of silence and tributes to Representative GIFFORDS and the other casualties, they should realize that they have the power—we have the power—to reduce the number of these sorts of horrors and the pain and suffering.

The Daily News noted that the shooter in Arizona squeezed the trigger again, again, again, and again—over 32 times—and that's just the half of it—as blood flowed and as people screamed and dropped to the ground.

Where I live on Long Island, we have gun violence. It's a suburban area, but unfortunately so many guns and large magazine clips are coming into our communities, and they're bringing with them death and pain. I know gun control of any sort is a tough sell in Congress these days, but commonsense restrictions should be enacted as such large capacity clips play such an obvious role in turning angry outbreaks of violence into massacres.

The Washington Post reads: Lawmakers should also endorse the sensible legislation introduced by myself to outlaw the sales of high-capacity ammunition clips that enabled Mr. Loughner to shoot some 30 bullets in a matter of seconds. A drug abuse history or not, no one, in my opinion, should be able to have the possession of a weapon that could so easily and senselessly be used to slaughter so many of our citizens, our neighbors, in such a short period of time.

The Seattle Times, The Denver Post, The Salt Lake Tribune, the Charlotte Observer, the Louisville, Kentucky Courier-Journal, and The Tennessean are all basically saying it's time to look at reducing the violence that is in our cities, our communities, our towns. One of the ways we can do that is by getting rid of the large capacity clips.

The Arizona Daily Star noted that no one outside of law enforcement and the military needs to fire 30-plus rounds without interruption. Hunters do not. Neither do target shooters or those who carry guns for self-defense.

Let me remind people that a gun that anyone uses that has a clip will still have 10 bullets and one in the chamber. That's 11 bullets that someone can use for self-defense. There is no question that fewer people would have been killed and injured on January 8 if the shooter had possessed a magazine with a capacity of just 10 rounds.

Gail Collins said Congress should have an actual debate about Representative McCARTHY's bill to reduce gun violence.

Even traditional, conservative, pro-gun advocate Nick Kristof talks about the contrast of guns with automobiles. He turned it upside down to argue that, in reality—and this is true—for a long time, motor vehicles were dangerous, but slowly, slowly we made them quite safe. The trade-off is that we have modestly curbed individual freedom, but we can save tens of thousands of lives every year. That's a model for how we should approach guns and a public health concern.

I talked about individual leaders who support H.R. 308. It is a long list, and many people have stood up: Mayor Bloomberg from New York City, my great city; Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter, another member of Mayors Against Illegal Guns, also expressed support; I had mentioned Vice President Dick Cheney, of all people, who said it would be appropriate to reinstate a ban on high-capacity magazines like we had before.

Other public officials and individuals around the country also support this bill: The New York Police Department said that a legislative solution to eliminating extended magazines would be best; the President of the Alabama Sheriffs' Association is a supporter; the Minneapolis police chief is a supporter; the Palm Beach County commissioner; the Montana Secretary of State; President Bob Brown, an NRA member and hunter who owns 18 guns, supports my

legislation; the nurse who treated Ronald Reagan after he was shot supports this; the fiancée and family of Gabe Zimmerman, one of our own staffers who was killed in Arizona, support this bill.

You mentioned our police officers, BILL. If anybody would be interested, we've had more police officers killed since January of this year until now than we've had in the last number of years. We say that we are there for our police officers. You were a mayor, and I know you stood by your police officers. I know that police officers around the country know when they're facing these large capacity clips and they're outgunned, as they were when we passed the assault weapons bill.

So, BILL, I know you are where I am, and I thank you for the support that you have given me, because we did come in together, but it's people like yourself who are willing to speak out.

Mr. PASCARELL. Will the gentle lady yield?

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Please.

Mr. PASCARELL. Madam Speaker, I would like you to take back to your side—and I'll take back to my side—that I know this has been a great leverage issue for the Republican Party. It has been a third rail for the Democratic Party. We were told basically, in so many words, to stay away from it. Look, let's lay our cards on the table.

I think that this is something we can agree to come together on common ground and be a little bit more reasonable about our approach.

I thank you, Congresswoman McCARTHY, for leading the way, as usual. You know I will always be there in support of what I think is very important legislation for the sanity of our country.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. And I thank you again.

I just want to remind the American people who might be listening tonight, I need your help. I can do the battles here. It's so easy to email your Member of Congress or your Senator to say it's time to get rid of the large magazines, because there is no place in America anymore that is safe. This can happen anytime, any place. So I thank you for listening to me tonight, and I thank my friend for standing here with me and talking about it.

I will say, in closing, it's 17 years since the incident happened to my family. There is not a day that goes by that I don't remember what happened, and that's why I continue to fight for this issue. I don't want another family to go through the pain. I don't want to see another person die. I don't want to see someone injured for the rest of their life, and to fight those battles.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, in the wake of the horrible tragedy in Arizona, Members of Congress were united in condemning the violence. We expressed our prayers and hopes for the recovery of our colleague, Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, and the others injured in the attack, and we praised the heroic actions of ordinary Americans on that day.

But for our words to have meaning, Madam Speaker, we also must act.

I'm proud to join Representative CAROLYN McCARTHY in introducing the Large Capacity Ammunition Feeding Device Act, to eliminate access to clips that enable the kind of shooting spree that took place in Arizona. No one can say that the ability to shoot more than ten times—without pausing to reload—makes our cities or our citizens any safer. The Assault Weapons Ban of 1994 addressed this issue, but perversely, by allowing it to expire in 2004, we lost critical ground.

The importance of the ban was tangible in each of our communities. When I first came to Congress, East Palo Alto, a city in my district, bore the awful distinction of being the "Murder Capital of the Country." Today, the crime rate has subsided. The ability to take these murderous assault weapons off the street played a major role in that turnaround, and we should not turn back the clock.

Madam Speaker, we all honor our Constitution and the Second Amendment. I, however, see no connection between the primitive muskets our Founding Fathers contemplated and the sophisticated, deadly weapons that plague our streets today. The United States continues to have the most per-capita gun deaths of any developed nation. This is not a symbol of our freedom. It's a capacity to kill, and this must not eclipse our capacity to care. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this sensible gun legislation which we are grateful to Representative McCARTHY for authoring to better protect our communities.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to join the vast majority of Americans, on both sides of the gun debate, who want a safe and sensible gun policy for their families and for the United States of America.

In the aftermath of the recent tragedy in Tucson, one eminently reasonable place to start—one place where gun rights advocates and gun control advocates should be able to find common ground—is the Large Capacity Ammunition Feeding Device Act (H.R. 308), introduced by my colleague Rep. CAROLYN McCARTHY (D-NY).

H.R. 308 is not about gun control. Instead, it's about commonsense ammunition control. The Large Capacity Ammunition Feeding Device Act sets aside all of the historically contentious debate around gun ownership and instead asks every American a very simple question: Is it really necessary for non-law enforcement civilians to have access to high capacity, 33-round magazines like the one Jared Lee Loughner used to shoot our colleague GABBY GIFFORDS and his other victims in Tucson?

I would submit that it is not. And I would further submit that the overwhelming majority of Americans and law abiding gun owners would agree that it is not. Consistent with that commonsense conclusion, the Large Capacity Ammunition Feeding Device Act would simply ban the sale or transfer of high-capacity magazines holding more than ten rounds. Law enforcement records show that the number of high capacity magazines retrieved by police at crime scenes dropped significantly the last time this kind of restriction was in effect, and common sense tells you that smaller magazines with less bullets will lead to less fatalities and injuries during these kinds of horrific attacks.

Madam Speaker, this is not a partisan issue. This is an American issue. The Large

Capacity Ammunition Feeding Device Act is a commonsense step all of us can and should take to eliminate the senseless threat posed by these high capacity magazines while protecting the legitimate rights of law-abiding gun owners.

I thank Congresswoman MCCARTHY for her leadership on this issue.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARCHANT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of personal reasons.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution recognizing women serving in the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 2, 2011, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

597. A letter from the Regulatory Officer, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Adjustment of Appendices to the Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing Regulation for the 2010 Tariff-Rate Quota Year received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

598. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mefenoxam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0713; FRL-8855-1] received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

599. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No.: FEMA-7913] received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

600. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No.: FEMA-7917] received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

601. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — List of

Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance [Docket No.: FEMA-7784] received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

602. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No.: FEMA-7915] received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

603. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No.: FEMA-D-7581] received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

604. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No.: FEMA-P-7650] received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

605. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

606. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No.: FEMA-7933] received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

607. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No.: FEMA-7923] received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

608. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No.: FEMA-7921] received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

609. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2010-0003] received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

610. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received January 31, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

611. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received January 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

612. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Orderly Liquidation Authority Provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

613. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Deposit Insurance

Regulations; Unlimited Coverage for Non-interest-Bearing Transaction Accounts; Inclusion of Interest on Lawyers Trust Accounts (RIN: 3064-AD37) received February 8, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

614. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Designated Reserve Ratio (RIN: 3064-AD69) received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

615. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Uniform Compliance Date for Food Labeling Regulations [Docket No.: FDA-2000-N-0011] received January 19, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

616. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of One-year Extension for Attaining the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the New Jersey Portion of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City Moderate Nonattainment Area [EPA-R02-OAR-2010-0688; FRL-9255-5] received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

617. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of One-year Extension for Attaining the 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania Portions of the Philadelphia-Wilmington-Atlantic City Moderate Nonattainment Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0574; FRL-9251-7] received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

618. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Re-Issuance of the Prevention of Significant Deterioration Applicability Determination for the Carlsbad Energy Center Project, Carlsbad, CA [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0024; FRL-9256-9] received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

619. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0731; FRL-9250-6] received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

620. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisons to Regulation 1 [EPA-R08-OAR-2007-1033; A-1-FRL-9209-3] received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

621. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Adoption of the Revised Lead Standards and Related Reference Conditions, and Update of Appendices [EPA-R03-OAR-2010-0882; FRL-9255-9] received January 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

622. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's