

While I will lend my support to the legislation before us, I cannot continue to accept such abuses of procedure.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 674, repealing the requirement that all levels of government withhold 3 percent of payments owed to their contractors throughout the United States.

If not repealed, small businesses operating on the slimmest of margins would see their operating budgets once again taking a hit from the Federal Government.

It is important to remember that our neighbors and friends work at these businesses.

Their jobs depend on these businesses having the necessary cash flow to pay their wages so they can raise their families and pay their bills.

And we, as a country, are depending on these same businesses to create new jobs which will help our unemployed friends and neighbors, and move our economy forward.

I am also supportive of simplifying the process for employers to hire our unemployed and disabled veterans through the Work Opportunity Tax Credit program. The one-year extension and simplification will help bring more certainty to the hiring process for our job creators looking to hire veterans who have more than proven their worth to anyone looking for productive employees.

A vote in support of H.R. 674 is a vote to remove impediments to American job creation and expand opportunities for our veterans. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, three weeks ago, this House passed legislation to repeal the 3% withholding rule for contractors doing business with the federal government and an adjustment to the formula used to calculate Medicaid and tax credit eligibility under the Affordable Care Act.

Today's bill—sent back to us by the Senate—packages these two initiatives with the Veterans Hiring Tax Credit contained in the American Jobs Act and several other provisions designed to support veterans looking for work.

Madam Speaker, it's about time. Finally, if only in a small way, we are moving legislation to accelerate job creation in this Congress. With unemployment rates for today's returning veterans hovering above 12%, these steps are the least we can take to support our service members transitioning to civilian life. Frankly, I would go further and complete consideration of the rest of the American Jobs Act without further delay.

As regards the rest of the legislation, it is no secret that I would prefer savings from the adjustment to the Affordable Care Act formula be repurposed to other pressing health care needs. That being said, I support the adjustment and have long been a cosponsor of the bill to repeal the onerous 3% withholding requirement.

Accordingly, I will cast a "yes" vote to today's legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 674. The provisions contained in this amended legislation are a long time coming and I am pleased to see this body finally consider a measure that will have a tangible effect for Americans who are unemployed and underemployed. More importantly, these measures will help a particular group of Americans who I think we all agree deserve our full support: our Nation's veterans. Right

now, men and women returning stateside from Iraq and Afghanistan face an unemployment rate of over 12 percent. Nearly a quarter of a million of recently returned veterans are jobless. This is unconscionable. If we can give our men and women the tools they need to succeed in combat, then certainly we must help them succeed when they return home. Moreover, veterans make excellent employees—I know because I have two working for me. Helping our veterans find jobs will put some of the finest men and women in the country into the American workforce. It's a win-win situation.

This measure provides tax credits for businesses who hire veterans—up to \$5,600 if the veteran has been out of a job for more than six months. It also provides a \$9,600 tax credit if the veteran has a service-connected disability. It expands Montgomery G.I. benefits for education and training opportunities for older veterans. And it includes provisions to encourage separating service members to seek employment in civilian federal service.

Madam Speaker, it is worth noting that many of these are measures that President Obama proposed in the American Jobs Act. I am pleased that we are considering these specific provisions today, but dozens of other provisions in the Jobs Act would help put an even greater number of veterans back to work: small business tax cuts, supporting teachers and first responders, rebuilding and expanding our infrastructure. We must do more, and by advancing the proposals currently idling in this body, we can do more.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure to help put our Nation's veterans back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 674.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1340

NATIONAL RIGHT-TO-CARRY RECIPROCITY ACT OF 2011

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 822.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANKS of Arizona). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 463 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 822.

□ 1341

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 822) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State, with Mrs. MILLER of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 822, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011, was introduced by Mr. STEARNS of Florida and Mr. SHULER of North Carolina and is cosponsored by 245 Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle. This landmark legislation recognizes the importance of the Second Amendment and makes it easier for individuals with concealed carry permits to travel to other States. Forty-nine States now allow concealed carry permits, and 40 of these States also extend some degree of reciprocity to permit holders from other States.

This bill simply applies the States' reciprocal agreements nationwide. This legislation requires States that currently allow people to carry concealed firearms to recognize other States' valid concealed carry permits, much like States recognize driver's licenses issued by other States. The bill recognizes the right of States to determine eligibility requirements for their own residents.

State, local, and Federal laws and regulations regarding how, when, and where a concealed firearm can be carried that apply to a resident will apply equally to a nonresident. For example, many States bar individuals from carrying firearms in a bar, at a sporting event, or in a State park. Under this legislation, all of these restrictions will apply to nonresidents as well.

H.R. 822 also addresses concerns regarding the ability of law enforcement agencies to confirm the validity of an out-of-state concealed carry permit. The bill requires a person to show both a valid government-issued identification document, such as a license or passport, and a valid concealed carry license or permit.

State law enforcement agencies can verify the validity of an out-of-state concealed permit through the Nlets system. Nlets is available to law enforcement officials in all 50 States 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Data from the FBI's annual Uniform Crime Report shows that right-to-carry States, or those that widely allow concealed

carry, have 22 percent lower total violent crime rates, 30 percent lower murder rates, 46 percent lower robbery rates, and 12 percent lower aggravated assault rates, as compared to the rest of the country.

Opponents of this bill have noted that some States would be required to recognize concealed carry permits issued by States with different standards of eligibility. However, 40 States already grant reciprocity to other States, including to States with different eligibility requirements. The States would not do this if different eligibility requirements were a concern.

The Second Amendment is a fundamental right to bear arms that should not be constrained by State boundary lines. Opposition to this legislation comes from those who believe concealed carry permit holders often commit violent crimes, which is demonstrably false, or from those who want to restrict the right of law-abiding citizens to bear arms. This legislation enhances public safety and protects the right to bear arms under the Second Amendment. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 822.

Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Members of the House, the measure that we have under consideration today is a very curious one in that there is some misunderstanding of what the constitutional right to carry loaded, hidden guns in public is really all about.

I would begin our discussion pointing out that under the proposal before us, a concealed firearm permit issued by any State would be valid in every State that allows a concealed carry provision. So, for example, a visitor to my home State of Michigan would be allowed to carry a loaded, hidden weapon in public, even if he has not met the minimum requirements to do so mandated by our State law.

Different States have enacted different requirements for carrying concealed weapons within their borders. And although Federal law prohibits individuals with Federal convictions from possessing a weapon, 38 of our States have chosen to deny concealed carry licenses to individuals with convictions for certain misdemeanor offenses.

I would like to start our discussion off with the fact that there are so many members of law enforcement, so many members of the government, so many members of our editorials—please consider with me, my colleagues in the House, that every major law enforcement organization in the United States of America opposes the measure that is on the floor today, H.R. 822. Every single organization. These organizations include the International Association of Chiefs of Police; the Major Cities Chiefs Association, which in-

cludes the 56 largest cities in the United States of America; the Police Foundation; the National Latino Peace Officers Association; and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives.

□ 1350

We have letters from 600 mayors of the cities in the United States. The National Network to End Domestic Violence has sent us letters. There have been editorials in the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the St. Petersburg Times, and they have all submitted letters.

I conclude my opening remarks by observing that there is no constitutional right to carry loaded, hidden guns in public. One of the things I hope we will be able to persuade you on is that the Supreme Court case of 2008, entitled, District of Columbia v. Heller is the case that the majority of the Court ruled, and Justice Scalia wrote this decision, that while the Second Amendment protects the right of law-abiding citizens to use arms in defense of their home and bans on carrying in public were presumptively lawful, it went on to say that the question held that prohibitions on carrying concealed weapons were lawful under the Second Amendment, that the prohibitions were lawful; and Justice Scalia's majority decision in that landmark case rendered 3 years ago stated the Second Amendment is not unlimited and not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever or for whatever purpose. I cite the Supreme Court decision 128 2783 of 2008, the District of Columbia v. Heller.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution states: "The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

In this modern age when it is very common for people to travel to work or for pleasure, it has really become routine, and the National Right-to-Carry Act is a commonsense solution to adapt to today's needs.

This legislation allows people with valid, State-issued permits or licenses to carry a concealed firearm in any other State that has essentially the same laws. To be clear, this legislation does not create a national licensing scheme or agency. It does not supersede the laws for firearms use in any other State.

The right of self-defense is a fundamental one and has been recognized in law for centuries. The Second Amendment dictates that the appropriate way to fight crime is to target criminals, not law-abiding gun owners. Today we

have an opportunity to clearly recognize the right to bear arms for our citizens and to allow law-abiding citizens to exercise freedom without restrictive barriers. Let's take that opportunity today.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to recognize the former chair of the Constitution Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, JERRY NADLER of New York, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. NADLER. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 822, what the Brady Campaign correctly calls the "Packing Heat on Your Street" bill.

America is in dire economic straits. Millions of people are out of work. Our growth rate is anemic. People are clamoring for Congress to pass legislation to grow the economy and help create jobs. And so what is the House of Representatives doing? This august body is considering gun legislation. The disconnect between the Republican House majority and the American people is beyond belief. It is no wonder that Congress' approval rating is 13 percent, according to the latest Gallup Poll.

Not only are we wasting our time on this issue, what the bill does should scare every American. This bill, as amended by the Judiciary Committee, would let a person with a concealed-carry permit issued by one State take his or her weapon into any other State of which they are not a resident, regardless of the laws of that other State. State laws on both gun possession and concealed carry would be overridden. This bill takes away the right of the citizens of each State to set their own gun control policy. For a Republican House majority that supposedly believes in States' rights, this bill is shocking. So, for example, some States require firearms training or require people to be 21 years old to have a concealed-carry permit. All such rules would be tossed aside by this new Federal mandate.

I tried to protect States by filing an amendment with the Rules Committee which would have created an exception to the bill to let States enforce laws against persons convicted of sex offenses against minors from possessing guns or having concealed weapons. That amendment was not made in order. I guess it was more important to satisfy the gun lobby than it is to make sure our kids are protected from violent predators.

To the extent States want to allow their citizens to enter into other States with concealed weapons, they can do so by entering into reciprocity agreements, and many States have done so. But why would we force those that have not, which have chosen to end reciprocity agreements due to lax standards of another State, why would we force them to accept the concealed-carry permit of every other State?

Because any permit would suffice, this bill will create a race to the bottom, with whatever State has the most

permissive concealed-carry rules setting national policy. In some States you don't even have to be a resident to get a concealed-carry permit. This lowest common denominator approach will only lead to more people carrying more hidden weapons—packing heat on your street. Knowing there are more concealed handguns all around does not make me feel safer.

Lastly, I want to address the constitutional argument. In *Heller*, the Supreme Court held there is a Second Amendment right for persons to bear arm. Nowhere did the Court say, however, that there is an unlimited national right to carry a concealed handgun. In fact, Justice Scalia recognized the legality of reasonable limits on the Second Amendment. I can't imagine a more reasonable restriction for States to impose than those which govern who can carry a concealed firearm in their own States.

I ask that Members reject this deeply flawed and dangerous bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), the chairman of the Constitution Subcommittee.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the chairman.

Madam Chair, H.R. 822, initially introduced by Mr. STEARNS of Florida and Mr. SHULER of North Carolina and supported by more than half of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, would allow people with a valid permit or license to carry a concealed handgun in any other State that permits concealed carry. This is a policy akin to allowing licensed drivers from one State to drive their car in another State so long as they obey the local laws.

Madam Chair, clearly the constitutional right to defend oneself and one's family should not be limited to only when you are at home. Criminals have always preferred unarmed victims. Conversely, law-abiding citizens capable of defending themselves and their fellow citizens demonstrably save innocent lives.

To give one of countless examples, in 2007, a man in Colorado named Matthew Murray wrote online: "All I want to do is kill and injure as many Christians as I can." Murray then went on a shooting rampage, first killing two young students at a missionary training center outside Denver; and then at a gathering of over 7,000 people in and around the New Life Church in Colorado Springs, Colorado, with a rifle and a backpack full of ammunition, Murray entered the church and opened fire, killing two sisters. Murray was ultimately stopped and killed by Jeanne Assam, a church member and volunteer security guard who once worked in law enforcement and who had a concealed-carry permit. Apart from this armed hero's actions, many more innocent citizens would have died that day.

H.R. 822 includes a number of provisions intended to retain the States'

ability to regulate firearm use in their own States and increase public safety. Nothing in the bill affects a State's ability to set the eligibility requirements for its own residents, nor does it affect any State laws or regulations regarding how, when, or where concealed firearms can be carried. It also requires people who want to take advantage of the Federal grant of reciprocity to be properly permitted or licensed by a State to carry a concealed weapon and to be able to produce both the permit or license and a government-issued identification document.

□ 1400

To reiterate Chairman SMITH's comments, studies have shown that concealed-carry laws are very good public policy for our country. Madam Chair, the NRA has estimated, based on FBI crime report data, that right-to-carry States, which widely allow concealed-carry, have 22 percent lower violent crime rates, 30 percent lower murder rates, and 46 percent lower robbery rates than States that prohibit or greatly restrict concealed-carry. H.R. 822 will help further extend this trend.

With that, Madam Chair, I urge my colleague to support this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, for all of the talk of States' rights in this Chamber, H.R. 822 obliterates the rights of State governments to pass their own gun rules and protect their own citizens from illegal gun violence. In my own State of Florida, we have a right-to-carry law, but we require those who seek such concealed permits to prove basic competency.

To protect our families, we deny concealed-carry permits to those convicted of felonies, to those committed to mental institutions, or those with a history of illegal drug use. H.R. 822 denies Floridians the right to protect their own families and set their own standards. If Floridians wanted gun laws as lax as those in Utah, they would adopt their own.

I'm disappointed the Rules Committee blocked my own amendment to amend this bill to ensure that individuals with concealed weapons could only cross lines into States that maintain a national law enforcement database. Without a database system accessible 24 hours a day with criminal background information on individuals holding concealed weapons permits from other States, Florida's law enforcement will be unable to adequately protect the public under this bill. It is the safety of our communities and our families that are at risk as a result.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), the writer, author, and creator of this legislation.

Mr. STEARNS. I would say to my colleague, I'm from Florida, and I'm

supporting this bill. In fact, I'm the proud sponsor of this bill, ladies and gentlemen. I have sponsored this legislation since the 105th Congress—that's almost 14 years ago—because I believe it's long overdue that we take action to enhance the fundamental right of self-defense for all law-abiding citizens of this country.

I want to thank Mr. TRENT FRANKS from Arizona for his assiduous and hard work in pushing this through the full committee and subcommittee, and I also thank Chairman LAMAR SMITH for his efforts, too.

My colleagues, the right—the simple right—to defend yourself and your loved ones from a criminal is fundamental. And it's not extinguished when you simply cross a State border. This bill recognizes this important fact by establishing the interstate recognition of concealed-carry permits in much the same way driver's licenses are recognized.

Now under this legislation, lawfully issued carry permits will be recognized in all States that also issue carry permits. There are now 49 States that issue these permits. Most of these States also recognize permits issued from at least some other States, while some States recognize all valid permits issued by any State. But herein, simply, lies the problem. The nonuniformity of the laws regarding reciprocity makes it difficult for law-abiding permit holders to know for sure if they are obeying the law as they travel from State to State. While preserving the power of the States to set the rules on where concealed firearms can be carried, this legislation will establish interstate carry permit recognition in the 49 permit issuing States. So this legislation will simply make it easier for law-abiding permit holders to know that they are simply in compliance with the law when they carry a firearm as they travel this wonderful country of ours.

Now consider the outcome if States administered driver's licenses as they currently do carry permits. Drivers would have to stop at the State line to determine whether their license was valid before proceeding. Each State would recognize some licenses but, of course, not all of them. Some States would insist that others have precisely the same requirements for issuance of a license before offering reciprocity. And the status of such reciprocity would be constantly changing, literally day to day.

So that is the reality of the current State reciprocity agreements for carry permits today. And only the Congress can remedy this interstate muddle. Our Union is a strong one, and we are proud to be citizens of a Nation who need not present papers to cross internal boundaries. But the holders of carry permits must indeed today worry whether their permits are valid before they can safely venture out of their home State while exercising a fundamental right. Our system of federalism beckons this body

to remedy this disparity in due process and equal treatment under the law.

Mr. Chairman, over the past 20 years, 17 States have passed right-to-carry laws. In each of these States, opponents of firearms ownership have made dire predictions of mayhem in the streets if we simply dared to allow law-abiding citizens to carry a firearm for their own self-defense. But in each case, these predictions were proven to be completely false. In fact, during that period, violent crime has dropped 51 percent to a 46-year low—1991 to 2011—and these are according to the FBI Uniform Crime Reports. Statistics don't lie in this case. They are actually showing violent crime has dropped, and this is one of the reasons.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will not strip States of the ability to prohibit dangerous persons from carrying a firearm. Federal law already prohibits a convicted felon or someone shown to be a danger from the mere possession of a gun, and the carry regulations set up in each State will apply to all permit holders, both residents and nonresidents. This bill does not set up a Federal carry permit system or establish any Federal regulations of concealed-carry permits. That power remains with the States. Additionally, this legislation does not include any new Federal gun laws, nor does it call for additional Federal regulation of gun ownership. In fact, it does not allow for new Federal regulation, for it amends the part of the Gun Control Act that allows only such regulation as is necessary, and in this case none.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. STEARNS. My colleagues, this legislation simply guarantees citizens' constitutional rights as affirmed by two Supreme Court cases, *D.C. v. Heller* and *McDonald v. Chicago*, which simply ruled the Second Amendment is an individual right.

This bill will allow law-abiding citizens who already have valid carry permits to carry firearms when they travel to protect themselves and to protect their families. These are people who have proven themselves to be among the most responsible and safe members of our communities, and we should not deprive them of this fundamental right when they simply cross a State border.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. It's a long time in coming, I'm pleased it's on the floor, and I look forward to its passage.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to just say to my dear friend from Florida, CLIFF STEARNS, you cannot compare licensing concealed-carry permits to driver's licenses, and that's why this idea of yours, with all due respect, has never been passed by the Congress before. The reason is that no States have the same way to automatically check a driver's license for concealed-carry.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1410

Mr. CONYERS. I yield myself 15 additional seconds.

You cannot compare a carrying concealed weapons check with a driver's license because they are checkable. A concealed-carry weapon, there are States that don't even permit the information to be revealed from their database. So you're making a huge error that I hope can be corrected.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlelady from California (Ms. CHU), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. CHU. This bill is a blatant attempt to override and weaken States' laws on an issue that could endanger people's lives. It hurts my home State of California, which developed laws to protect residents by developing criteria on those who could carry concealed-carry weapons. With this bill, that all goes away.

This bill is so bad that it even allows drug dealers convicted of selling drugs to minors to carry a concealed weapon. California would not allow it because such permits can only go to those of good moral character. But under this law, we would have to accept the concealed weapon permit for every other State that allows weapons to these drug dealers. I offered an amendment in the Judiciary Committee to stop this, but those on the other side of the aisle voted it down.

With this bill, a person who endangers the lives of our children will be allowed to carry a concealed loaded gun nationwide, and you would be powerless to stop it. It is the individual States that are in the best position to determine how to best protect its citizens.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this dangerous bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chair, I just would suggest to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that he is correct, one cannot compare this strictly with people and driver's licenses. The fact is, first of all, driving a car is not a fundamental right to defense as enshrined in our Constitution. Secondly, cars kill many more people than guns. And, third, we don't usually defend ourselves with cars.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AUSTRIA).

Mr. AUSTRIA. As a former chairman of the Ohio Senate judiciary committee, I helped lead the fight to pass the first concealed-carry law in the State of Ohio. And I can tell you, even with this law and this right, as one of the thousands of Ohioans with a concealed-carry permit, I understand the need to reinforce our Second Amendment rights by resolving the confusion

and the problems that exist when traveling between States.

The National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act does just that; it allows Ohioans and others with valid CCW permits issued by their home State to concealed-carry while visiting any of the 49 States where it's not expressly prohibited.

H.R. 822 is not a Federal takeover. The bill preserves States' rights by requiring residents to comply with their home State's rules for getting a permit. The bill also maintains reciprocity agreements the States have already entered into with other States.

The bill simply strengthens and protects our constituents' Second Amendment rights, and that's why I've co-sponsored this legislation and look forward to its passage.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just want, when we decide how we're going to cast our vote on this bill, to realize you cannot compare a concealed-carry weapon permit with a driver's license. The States do not have the ability, they do not have the automated machinery to do that. Many will not even release this information; it's considered a private matter. Concealed-carry permit information cannot be revealed in many States.

I now yield 3 minutes to the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 822 will harm public safety. That's why law enforcement organizations such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, and many other law enforcement organizations oppose this bill.

This bill would allow people to use their concealed weapons permit in any State in the Union without regard to the standards and requirements of those other States. This bill even allows people who are ineligible to get a concealed weapons permit in their home State to go out of State and get a permit and use that permit anywhere in the country except their home State.

Some States have minimum standards for those who may be eligible to carry a concealed weapon. For example, some States require firearms training and others deny permits to those who are under 21 or those with certain convictions for assaulting police officers, selling drugs to kids, sex offenses against children, or domestic violence. Standards such as these would be overridden by this bill because permits from States without these standards would have to be recognized.

Now, many States already recognize concealed weapons permits from other States. My home State of Virginia recognizes many States' concealed weapons permits, but it requires a 24-hour

verification. And for this reason, many States do not enjoy reciprocity with Virginia because 24-hour verification is not available. In fact, one State, Colorado, doesn't even maintain a state-wide database, so there can be no out-of-state verification. As has been indicated, a driver's license, any time of day, you can verify the validity of a driver's license. But the concealed weapons permit, many States do not have 24-hour verification.

In overriding the ability of States to control the carrying of concealed weapons by nonresidents, this bill would create a situation where the weakest State laws essentially become the national law. We would be creating a race to the bottom with our public safety laws.

Consideration of this legislation has been a challenge because apparently many people in this body believe that if more people carried guns, the crime rate would go down. Reliable studies, however, point out that the possession of a firearm is much more likely to result in the death of a family member or a neighbor than being used to thwart a crime.

This bill will undermine public safety. We should let the States decide whether or not or under what conditions to allow people who are in their State to carry concealed handguns. I urge my colleagues, therefore, to vote against this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, rights do not come from the government. We are, in the words of the Declaration of Independence, "endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights."

Mr. Chairman, the right to self-defense goes deep and cannot be taken away. The right to self-defense is the cornerstone for the Second Amendment. It is also the foundation for concealed-carry laws across this country.

I am proud that my home State of Indiana has established a responsible process for obtaining a lifetime permit. Today, 49 States have some sort of right-to-carry law.

Mr. Chairman, this bill ensures that permit holders in Indiana like myself can exercise our right to self-defense when our families travel across our great country. If you follow the law, your permit from one State will be honored by another.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Ladies and gentlemen, forgive my passion on the discussion of this subject, but almost 300 young people of African American decent are injured or killed by gunfire from age 15 to 24 every week.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY), a distinguished member of Judiciary.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this measure.

I too offered an amendment which failed in committee. My amendment would have prevented individuals convicted of assaulting a police officer or impersonating a police officer from carrying concealed loaded guns. Several States that allow permits also deny them to those who have assaulted or impersonated cops. The law enforcement officials of these States have decided that that is what's best for their communities. This bill will wipe those protections away and then will go further.

May I remind my friends here who are citing the Constitution as their nexus for this law that the right to keep and bear arms in the interest of self-defense of a person at home is not unlimited.

□ 1420

As the Justices wrote in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, the right is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever for whatever purpose. And, frankly, that's what the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act purports.

So if we're interpreting the 14th Amendment, deeming the Bill of Rights applicable to the States in this manner as to the right to bear arms, then doesn't that argument also dictate that each State interpret other States' decisions on other laws and statutes in the same manner?

Does this mean that States should acknowledge abortion rights from one State to the next?

Does this mean that States should acknowledge alcohol laws from one State to the next?

Does this mean that States should acknowledge marrying licenses from one State to the next, particularly when it comes to same-sex marriage?

I have a feeling that many of my friends here today would answer those questions with a simple "no." You see my trouble with today's premise, then.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS).

Mrs. ELLMERS. I rise today in favor of H.R. 822. The right to bear arms is a staple of our Constitution as a basic American right, and we should continue to protect it while making sure our laws remain efficient.

I am one of 268,000 permit holders in North Carolina. This is not only a rights issue; more importantly, it is a safety issue. As millions of American families know, there is no greater threat to our families than the ability to protect. We must protect our families, and it cannot stop at States' borders.

H.R. 822 also does not impact State laws governing how concealed firearms are possessed or carried. Again, it does not jeopardize the States' rights.

I call on my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

There are, my colleagues, over 65 million handguns in the United States; and nearly 100,000 people in America every year are shot or killed with a firearm.

I now yield 2 minutes to our distinguished Judiciary colleague, a former magistrate from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this dangerous bill, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act. The 10th Amendment of the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution provides as follows: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Mr. Chairman, this bill would override the laws of almost every State by forcing them to accept concealed-carry gun permits from every other State, even if the permit holder would not be allowed to carry a handgun in the State where he or she is traveling. This is ridiculous. Each State should decide who may carry a concealed, loaded gun within their borders; and the Federal Government should respect the States' rights to do so.

The irony here is that my friends on the Tea Party Republican side of the aisle claim to respect States' rights, but then they rush this legislation to the House floor, which tramples over States' rights.

These Tea Party Republicans claim they want to create jobs for the millions of unemployed Americans in our Nation, but they are not focusing on creating jobs. Instead, they're bowing down to the National Rifle Association by moving this piece of special interest legislation forward.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong, strong support of H.R. 822, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act. This bill provides important protections for gun owners, and its time is past due.

As a retired marine and avid outdoorsman, I'm an experienced firearms owner and user. I hold a concealed-carry permit in the State of Minnesota, and I believe individuals have the right to keep and bear arms for the protection of their home, property, family and person. They have that right.

Unfortunately, there have been a lot of mischaracterizations surrounding this legislation. I've heard a lot of it here today. To be clear, this bill does not create a Federal licensing or registration system. It does not create Federal standards, or infringe on the ability of States to make laws for a carry permit, and it does not negatively affect States that have permitless carry systems.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will protect law-abiding gun owners from current confusion caused by the wide array of State laws and preempt the threat of frivolous lawsuits they could face simply by traveling outside of their home State. National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity provides critical recognition that the Second Amendment rights of our constituents do not end when they cross State lines, and this will enhance public safety.

I urge my colleagues to stand for the Second Amendment and to stand for the rights of responsible gun owners who engage in gun safety, and I urge them to support H.R. 822.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to our dear friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, the first reason this bill should be defeated is that it usurps State authority and replaces it with a lowest-common-denominator Federal directive.

This is a radical piece of legislation. In fact, today 43 States are not in compliance with this law; 38 States today prevent people from carrying concealed weapons if they have certain dangerous misdemeanor criminal convictions; 35 States require the completion of a short gun safety program.

The Commonwealth of Virginia has weakened its gun laws over the past 2 years, allowing concealed guns in bars and renewal of permits by mail. I disagree with these actions, but I would never question the general assembly's authority to make these decisions.

But this bill makes our State legislature's judgment irrelevant. This is a Federal power grab coming from a majority that claims to be a defender of States' rights.

The second reason that this bill should be defeated is that our law enforcement professionals oppose it. The International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major Cities Police Chiefs Association, the Virginia Association of Chiefs of Police all oppose this bill. Why? Because they know that it will be nearly impossible for police to verify the validity of 49 different carry permits, placing officers in potentially life-threatening situations.

Some States don't even keep verifiable databases of those who have been issued concealed-carry permits. Law enforcement is trying to curb illegal gun smuggling, but this bill allows traffickers with concealed-carry permits to transport firearms into destination States and present an unverifiable permit if stopped by police.

This is a blatant legislative overreach, presumably because it was next on the NRA's legislative wish list.

We should defeat this bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS of Arkansas. I rise today in strong support of H.R. 822.

If you get a driver's license in Arkansas, it's recognized in every State in

the country. And if you have a concealed-carry permit, the same rules should apply. Our Second Amendment rights to own and bear arms are universal, and our laws should reflect that as best they can.

The National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act would allow every American citizen with a valid concealed-carry permit to carry a concealed firearm in all States that allow them for lawful purposes.

Let me be clear: If your State bans concealed firearms, then this law will not affect that ban. This bill does not change any State laws about when and where you can carry a concealed firearm. This bill does not create a new Federal licensing system. It simply re-enforces our Second Amendment rights and makes the laws more fair for law-abiding gun owners.

As a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, I believe we must pass the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act now, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL).

□ 1430

Mr. PASCARELL. I had to make a choice on this bill, whether I would support a disputable constitutional issue about whether you can by law carry a concealed weapon or move towards the other side to those who oppose this.

Now, who opposes this legislation besides me? Mayors Against Illegal Guns, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, and the Police Foundation oppose this bill. Doesn't this mean anything to you at all? Doesn't it? Or does it?

I prefer community policing than try to put more guns into the hands of those people who we don't even know are going to be trained to even use them. That's my preference, Mr. Chairman.

This means my home State of New Jersey—this is not Idaho, this is not Montana—in fact, we have the most densely populated State in the Union. There is a different culture. When Clinton argued on behalf of gun possession when he was the President of the United States, he always made this point about the cultural differences in different parts of the country. And we respect that.

I'm not against the Second Amendment. I support the Second Amendment. But I don't want those folks in the street who out-arm and out-gun our police officers.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. PASCARELL. Twelve thousand fewer police officers we have in this country; 12,000 fewer police officers in our streets. We should be worried about

that as a priority rather than this as a priority.

So I made the decision. The evidence is like this against doing this. We haven't had any legislation which took away one gun in the past 20 years from anybody in this country—not one. So we have made the perception being that we want to take guns away from people.

How dare you even say it.

Protect our police. Don't vote for this.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. The right to keep and bear arms is a real simple phrase. Some people have only negative thoughts. When the words "gun" or "firearm" are heard, thoughts immediately turn to criminals; but that's the problem because the debate we're having today isn't about criminals. It's about the rights of law-abiding citizens to bear arms for self-defense.

Look, Illinois is the only State without concealed-carry, but I'd argue we already have concealed-carry. There are people that are killed in Chicago very often by guns that are already concealed but not concealed by law-abiding citizens. Illinois is the only State that doesn't allow any form of it legally.

I want H.R. 822 to be a clear sign to the Governor of Illinois that now is the time to join the rest of the country in allowing citizens the right to conceal a firearm on their person. We hear so much about if we allow people to carry guns, more people are going to be killed. But that flies in the face of statistics.

After 2008, there was a record number of guns purchased, but we saw crime drop almost everywhere, bar none.

My point is that law-abiding citizens in this country are not the problem. Illinois needs to join the rest of the country in supporting conceal-carry for its citizens. And I believe that this is a sign that it's time to do so now.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), a former member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I rise in opposition to H.R. 822, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act.

This ill-conceived bill is yet another distraction from what should be the most pressing concern of this Congress, putting Americans back to work.

What's more disturbing is that this bill jeopardizes public safety by mandating that States honor even the most lax concealed-weapon laws of other States. The gentleman from Illinois is incorrect: this is about criminals.

For my constituents in south Florida, gun control is a serious issue. Miami-Dade County has one of the highest rates of gun violence in the country. In the entire State of Florida, there are almost 800,000 permits for concealed firearms. Florida's process

for issuing concealed-carry licenses is problematic enough, and I would certainly not suggest foisting it on any other State that has stronger safeguards that protect its citizens. But this bill will do exactly that.

For States that require age minimums or safety training before getting a concealed-weapons permit or that prohibits certain violent offenders from getting a permit in the first place, that all goes out the window if this bill is passed into law. What we get in return is the worst of the worst, a lowest-common-denominator of all of the State laws.

For example, in just one 6-month period in 2006, Florida gave concealed-carry licenses to more than 1,400 individuals who had pleaded guilty or no contest to felonies, 216 of them had outstanding warrants, 128 of them had active domestic violence injunctions. And under this bill, other States will be mandated to honor these permits. They will be mandated to allow Florida's self-admitted felons to carry concealed weapons in their States.

This is why the Nation's leading law enforcement organizations strongly oppose this bill. It's also opposed by more than 600 members of the bipartisan Mayors Against Illegal Guns, including many of my local mayors of both parties in south Florida.

Why would this bill be a higher priority than creating jobs? This is the 11th straight month of this Congress, and the House majority still has no jobs agenda.

Regardless of how Americans feel about guns, the overwhelming majority would agree that gun policy is not a higher priority than job creation is right now.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill, and I urge my friends across the aisle to stop putting American lives at risk and start putting them back to work.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the chairman of the Courts Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 822.

Conceal-and-carry permits may be one of the most scrutinized permits for gun owners to receive. Unfortunately, the manner in which these permits are recognized by various States is confusing and inconsistent. H.R. 822 will help resolve this dilemma, Mr. Chairman.

For example, in my home State of North Carolina, conceal-and-carry permits from South Carolina and Georgia are recognized, but not permits from New Mexico.

Meanwhile, New Mexico readily recognizes conceal-and-carry permits from North Carolina. If enacted, there would be no discrepancy over which permits are valid. Another reason for supporting H.R. 822 is that it protects State sovereignty. States are not required to issue conceal-and-carry per-

mits, and State laws regarding the use and ownership of firearms are explicitly preserved.

I firmly believe that the Second Amendment confirms a constitutional right for individuals to own a firearm, Mr. Chairman. I also believe that ownership and use of a firearm carries a special level of personal responsibility.

This bill promotes both of these ideals; and if enacted, it will help make America safer, which probably explains why this bill has 245 cosponsors.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, this is another great example of legislation in search of a problem. Driven by ideological fervor of its sponsors rather than by any practical approach to safety, H.R. 822 would amend existing Federal law to establish a national standard for carrying concealed firearms.

As the sponsors well know, these matters have long been the province of the States. It's fascinating how quickly the majority ignores the 10th Amendment when the gun lobby comes calling. Why needlessly create a conflict, or should I say a shootout, between the Second and the 10th Amendments?

Passage of the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2004, which I voted for, and which permits qualified law enforcement officers to carry concealed firearms across States, makes this essentially redundant and unnecessary.

The bill before us would have the effect of overriding New Jersey's own laws in this area, which police officers and hunters and other citizens tell me work well and keep our citizens safe.

□ 1440

Ask our law enforcement officers. They'll tell you New Jerseyans live well within our gun safety laws. We don't need more lax laws.

Now, others have said today—but maybe it's worth repeating—that this body should be focusing on creating jobs, not passing ideologically driven, special interest legislation that would endanger public safety, subvert the constitutional order, and go against the interests and the declared recommendations of law enforcement officers all across the U.S.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would inform the managers that the gentleman from Texas has 9¼ minutes remaining and that the gentleman from Michigan has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I strongly support the Second Amendment. For that reason, I signed on to the amicus briefs in the Heller case and in the McDonald v. City of Chicago case, upholding the right to bear arms as an individual and constitutional right. I believe that. At the same time, as the former attorney gen-

eral of California, I continue to have a deep and abiding commitment to preserving States' rights in the manner that the Founders envisioned the notion of federalism.

Under the 10th Amendment, it is obvious that the Constitution allocates what are known generally as police powers to the States to protect public safety and health. That's why I object to some of our legislation to expand the Federal role in tort law and in marriage law, because it's not just those things you necessarily agree with, but it's tougher when it's those things you may disagree with that are left to the States. Some people have talked about licenses here. You don't have a right to take your license to practice medicine or law to the next State. We have not required that. We allow States to do that.

Here is the other thing.

My State is one of the most liberal. We have too liberal a law with respect to concealed weapons, but the only way the liberal State legislature in California will respond to this is by following Illinois, because it's the only way they can get a limit, as they see it, on these sorts of things.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. My suggestion is, those who are concerned about it in my State might have to worry about this because our legislature will now be tempted to get rid of all concealed-weapons permits because, unfortunately, under this legislation, that's the only thing they can do to police the eligibility of those who get concealed-weapons permits.

So this does cut both ways, and at least I think we ought to understand that States' rights is a legitimate argument here on this floor.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. I would like to thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for introducing the bill before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bipartisan legislation for two reasons. One, I believe that our gun laws should ensure that a responsible, law-abiding individual is able to exercise his Second Amendment right to carry firearms. Two, this bill simplifies what is now a piecemeal system of existing reciprocal agreements among the States.

There are millions of concealed-carry permit holders in this country, including thousands in my State. They comply with State law to gain a State permit so that they can legally carry weapons for self-defense. By passing this bill, we will ensure that, when they travel to other States, they will be able to exercise their right to self-defense while away from home. This bill does not create a federal licensing or registration system. It does not allow a concealed-weapon permit holder to carry a concealed weapon in

States like Illinois, which do not allow concealed carry.

I think that addresses the criticism of this legislation that it would override a State's ability to determine who can carry concealed weapons within that State's borders. Permit holders who want to take their weapons with them to another State are required to be aware of and abide by that State's rules.

As a strong supporter of Second Amendment rights, I support this legislation, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON).

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 822, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act.

This bill is about freedom. It's about the Constitution and our Bill of Rights. This bill is about the Second Amendment right. As with all of the amendments contained in the Bill of Rights, these were born out of our experiences with King George and out of a desire to prevent such abuses of power in our Republic. Indeed, at the outset of hostilities during the Revolution, the British Army marched to Concord to confiscate our guns and extinguish our freedoms.

The Founders put the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights to assure our right to keep and bear arms and safeguard our liberty. At least in my district, this is a nonpartisan bill. Republicans, Democrats and independents alike support the Second Amendment and hold dear our Bill of Rights.

The premise of H.R. 822 is very simple. If a citizen is permitted to carry a concealed weapon in one State, other States that have a concealed-carry law will honor and recognize it, supporting and strengthening the Second Amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the chairman for yielding and for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 822, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011.

This bipartisan bill has 245 cosponsors, and it enhances Americans' right to self-defense by enabling millions of permit holders to exercise their right to self-defense while traveling outside their home States.

The Second Amendment is in the United States Constitution, and we are all taking an oath in this body to uphold the United States Constitution, including rights under the Second Amendment. The 10th Amendment is certainly an important right as well, but it does not trump the right or the responsibility of this body to protect rights under the Second Amendment.

Forty-nine States have laws that permit their citizens to carry a concealed

firearm in some fashion or another. Unlike driver's licenses, however, concealed-carry permit holders in one State are not always authorized to carry their firearms when traveling outside their home States.

H.R. 822 remedies this problem by granting concealed-carry permit holders reciprocity between States. The firearm owner must abide by all applicable State laws when carrying in a foreign jurisdiction. This bill affirms that the Second Amendment protects the fundamental individual right to keep and bear arms and that the States cannot unreasonably infringe upon that right.

In *McDonald v. Chicago*, the Supreme Court concluded that the due process clause of the 14th Amendment incorporates the Second Amendment right recognized by the Supreme Court in the *District of Columbia v. Heller*.

This bill does not create any kind of Federal bureaucracy that may concern some people. It simply extends to them their Second Amendment rights when they travel in other States. H.R. 822 recognizes that right, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 4¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I love the Second Amendment. I got my first gun from Santa Claus when I was 6 years old. The first handgun I ever fired wasn't my dad's or my uncle's or my grandfather's—it was my mother's. I got my first concealed-carry application filled out as a freshman in law school. I lived in a bad neighborhood and needed it for self protection. I've had it for the last 20 years. I love the Second Amendment.

But if the Second Amendment protects my rights to carry my concealed weapon from State to State to State, I don't need another Federal law that says, yeah, I really mean it. It's already protected. If the Second Amendment doesn't protect my right to carry a concealed weapon from State to State to State, then the Ninth and 10th Amendments leave that responsibility to individuals and the States to regulate on their own.

I came to Congress to protect freedom. I don't believe the Second Amendment was put in the Bill of Rights to allow me to shoot targets. I don't believe the Second Amendment was put in the Bill of Rights to allow me to hunt for deer and turkey. I think the Second Amendment was put in the Bill of Rights so that I could defend my freedom against an overbearing Federal Government.

I don't want the Federal Government in any issue of the law where the Constitution does not require it.

And it does not require it here.

Don't tell me it's an Interstate Commerce Clause issue; we dismiss that on my side of the aisle regularly. Don't tell me it's necessary and proper; we dismiss that on our side of the aisle regularly. And don't tell me it's full faith and credit because we dismiss that on our side of the aisle regularly.

□ 1450

The temptation to legislate is great. The temptation is great. I absolutely believe in the intent of this legislation. I want the right to carry from coast to coast. Georgia has already orchestrated reciprocity agreements with 25 States. We've got 24 more to go. The Second Amendment exists so that we can keep and bear arms to defend ourselves against government, no matter how well-intended. Rather than arms, I ask my colleagues to use their voting cards today to defend us against the overreach of the Federal Government, no matter how well-intended.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have listened to this debate. This is a reciprocity vote that allows me to carry my weapon, as I have carried it for the last 50 years, from one State to another as long as I have a permit and they do also.

But more than that, I am a little bit resentful when I hear on the floor that this is "the will of the NRA." Now, I am proud to have been a lifetime member of the NRA—since I could vote. I am a member today. I participate in their board meetings, and I am proud of that organization. It is probably one of the leading organizations. But to cast that in the form of "they are not the people of America" is wrong. The greatest strength the NRA has is its members. There is talk about how strong they are as a lobbying group. The lobbying group is the citizen, the citizen that wants to carry his arm, as permitted, across State lines, as they do with a driver's license.

This is a good piece of legislation. I'm glad we are having this discussion. There can be differences of opinion. But don't take it away from myself to go from Alaska with my permit and go into the other 48 States, I believe it is, that have permits and I can't use my permit. That's wrong. Let's vote for this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. ADAMS), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mrs. ADAMS. I rise in support of H.R. 822.

As a former law enforcement officer and a State representative, I have dealt with issues relating to our Second Amendment right.

It's interesting when I hear some of the blurring between gun purchasing and a concealed-carry permit. I have done both. And as a law enforcement

officer, I would like to know, if someone would tell me, "Hey, I have a concealed-carry permit and I have a weapon," rather than finding it either by accident or having it pointed at me. So I stand in great support of this piece of legislation. I do believe that it is good legislation. It will not harm the people, as I have heard here on the floor.

And I have heard that we aren't working on jobs. Well, I beg to differ that issue because we have passed over 20 bills sitting in the Senate that have not been heard that would relate to jobs. So, yes, we are working on jobs and the economy, and we also are working on other issues that are brought to us from our constituents.

I stand in great support of H.R. 8122. Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

H.R. 822 is important legislation that recognizes that Americans' ability to exercise their fundamental constitutional rights should not disappear at their State's border. The parade of horrors that have been alleged by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are simply not true. Federal law already prohibits felons, domestic abusers, and illegal drug users from possessing a firearm. This legislation does not change that. If a person is prohibited from possessing a firearm under Federal law, they cannot carry a concealed weapon under this bill.

The arguments we have heard so often today against this legislation are against guns in the hands of violent criminals generally, not against legally permitted concealed weapons. Concealed-carry laws have shown that concealed weapons actually lower violent crime rates in a jurisdiction. H.R. 822 simply permits law-abiding Americans to take their Second Amendment rights with them when they travel.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 822, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011.

By forcing each state to recognize every other state's concealed carry permits, this legislation would create serious safety challenges for communities and law enforcement officials across the country. Further, it seriously infringes upon individual states' rights to set minimum standards based on local needs and concerns.

This legislation has been called the "lowest common denominator approach" to public safety. Currently, states use widely varying criteria to determine who is allowed to carry a concealed firearm. At least 38 states prohibit individuals convicted of certain dangerous misdemeanor crimes from obtaining concealed carry permits; 35 states require completion of a gun safety program or other proof of competency in order to receive a permit; at least 36 states have age restrictions; and 29 states will not award concealed carry permits to alcohol abusers.

Forcing national reciprocity would allow individuals who would be denied a permit in their home state to apply for a permit in a less re-

strictive state. It jeopardizes the safety of police officers making routine stops, who may not have the resources to verify the validity of an unfamiliar, out-of-state concealed carry permit.

Mr. Chair, right now states can determine their own concealed carry regulations. They can choose to enter into reciprocity agreements with other states, and they can choose to end those agreements. They can choose to only allow residents of the state to obtain concealed-carry permits, or they can opt to issue licenses to both residents and non-residents. They can choose, as Illinois has so sensibly done, not to allow concealed carry at all.

Different states have different crime fighting concerns and priorities, and this legislation is a dangerous attempt to override state laws. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 822, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011.

This important, bipartisan, legislation reinforces fundamental rights enshrined in the U.S. Constitution by allowing any person with a valid, state-issued concealed firearm permit to carry a concealed firearm in any state that issues concealed firearm permits.

As an avid hunter and outdoorsman, and as a lifetime member of the National Rifle Association, I can share with personal experience the frustration of my fellow hunters and outdoorsmen the absurdity of having to know which states recognize visiting permit holders from other states and which states that do not.

Our country should not force its law-abiding citizens to check in their fundamental right to self-defense at the state line.

The National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act would clarify this matter by requiring states that allow concealed carry to recognize each other's permits, similar to how states recognize each other's driver's licenses.

Right-to-carry laws also help deter crime. Presently, 40 states have right-to-carry laws. Based on crime data from the FBI, right-to-carry states have 22 percent lower total violent crime rates in comparison to the rest of the country.

In my home state of Texas, violent crime has dropped 20 percent and the murder rate has dropped 31 percent, since the enactment of its right-to-carry law in 1996.

This legislation is also in-line with recent rulings found by the U.S. Supreme Court. In 2008 in *District of Columbia v. Heller* and again in 2010 in *McDonald v. City of Chicago*, the high court found the right to possess a firearm for self-defense cannot be infringed.

I am a proud co-sponsor of the bill and have co-sponsored similar legislation in previous Congresses.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up in support of the U.S. Constitution and the millions of hunters and outdoorsmen in our country and vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 822, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act.

I share the view of many Californians that states have a responsibility to enact common-sense measures to keep deadly weapons out of the hands of children, criminals and individuals with a history of serious mental illness. I am appalled that this bill would supersede reasonable state standards and subject California

to weaker and oftentimes dangerous gun laws of other states.

As the leading Democrats on the Judiciary Committee stated in their dissenting views to this bill:

H.R. 822, the 'National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011,' is a dangerous bill that would override the laws of almost every state by obliging each to accept concealed handgun carry permits from every other state, even if the permit holder would not be allowed to carry or even possess a handgun in the state where he or she is traveling. The law tramples federalism and endangers public safety.

For example, in California, we believe—and it is the law—that if you're a convicted sex offender, you should lose your right to own a gun. But under this bill, an individual in California convicted of misdemeanor sexual battery could carry a firearm.

In California, it is the law that gun owners should have some basic training to ensure guns are stored safely and away from children. But under this bill, individuals with no knowledge of how to handle a firearm could keep and carry a gun in California.

In California, we believe—and it is the law—that gun owners should have a clean criminal record. But under this bill, a man convicted of multiple counts of domestic violence could walk the streets of California with a concealed handgun.

This is not a trivial issue. In January 2008, a Florida man, Michael Leopold Phillips, killed his wife and then turned the gun on himself, committing suicide. Mr. Phillips had a long history of spousal abuse; he had been arrested on three occasions for domestic violence, and an ex-wife had issued a restraining order against him years earlier. But Florida has some of the most relaxed gun laws in the country, and Mr. Phillips was granted a concealed carry permit by the state even though he had documented history of abusing women.

I believe that California should have every right, with the full force of our laws behind them, to keep guns out of the hands of people like Mr. Phillips.

The Republican leadership likes to preach its fidelity to the overarching principle of states' rights—but this bill shows their fidelity to states' rights is subject to a test of political convenience. When it comes to a state's right to decide how to protect its citizens from gun violence, the Republican leadership has ceded its principles to the gun lobby.

This bill is an affront to federalism and an assault on public safety. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this dangerous legislation.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act, which preempts the laws of almost every state by obliging each to accept concealed handgun carry permits from every other state, even if the permit holder would not otherwise be allowed to carry or even possess a handgun in the state where he or she is traveling. Presently America's economy is struggling. Many of our citizens are devastated by unemployment and crime rates are an issue of national concern. Therefore, extending handgun laws simply does not seem logical.

I am greatly perturbed by the negative ramifications that this bill will have on individual state's abilities to protect their citizens from

gun violence. For example, states such as Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, New Jersey, Nevada, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming require gun safety training as a requirement to obtain a concealed carry permit. North Dakota requires certain permit applicants only to pass an open book exam to satisfy its requirement. My state, New York prohibits carrying by individuals younger than 21 years of age. H.R. 822 eliminates the authority of states to select who may be eligible to carry a concealed loaded gun in public. Who can decide the best protective policies for each state besides the officials elected to represent it?

Additionally, H.R. 822 can potentially endanger the lives of our valued law enforcement officers who strive to protect our citizens. Out of state carrying permits are extremely difficult to verify since a national permit database does not exist and officers tend to have difficulties establishing the validity of these particular permits. Such an impediment can lead to an escalating situation during traffic stops or other high risk situations that could end fatally. Law enforcement officers work diligently to ensure that streets are safe for our citizens but H.R. 822 makes this task more difficult in numerous ways for these esteemed officers. It is our responsibility to protect these law enforcement officials who put their lives at risk on a daily basis to ensure the safety of our citizens.

Supporting this bill will indubitably reverse the efforts by officials in New York to reduce already challenging crime rates. Supporting this bill will jeopardize the safety of my constituents, New York residents and citizens nationwide. Our constituents depend on us to maintain a safe country for them and the generations after them. Voting in support of this bill will put all of our lives at risk. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on this Bill.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chair, my home state of Michigan is one of 49 in the nation that currently has a law that allows individuals to receive a license to carry a concealed weapon.

Some warned that right-to-carry laws would lead to an increase in crime, but the facts bear out that just the opposite is true. Violent crime has gone down substantially across the nation as more and more states instituted right-to-carry laws.

When criminals know that law abiding citizens have the ability to defend themselves they have to think twice before victimizing people. This legislation simply allows those who have gotten the training to receive a permit to carry in their home state to use that permit in other states.

The bill also requires that concealed weapons permit holders abide by the local laws in the state where they choose to exercise this right and thus is not a federalization of gun laws.

Just as another state cannot deny drivers license holders from Michigan the ability to drive in that state, they should not deny concealed carry permit holders from Michigan the right to carry.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation that strengthens the Constitutional rights of all Americans.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chair, I am strongly opposed to the National Right to Carry Reciprocity Act

of 2011. This misguided bill is unworkable in practice and will compromise officer safety and public security. Furthermore, this bill flagrantly treads on the rights of states to legislate and enforce public security within their own states.

It is very troubling that at the very time where we all have the responsibility to be more aware of our public security, my colleagues have introduced a bill that values Wild West "shoot 'em up" swagger over reasonable measures to protect public safety.

This bill will make it easier for criminal gun traffickers to travel to gun markets across the country with loaded weapons, without concern for any police scrutiny. Gun traffickers who have concealed carry permits would be able to bring cars or backpacks full of loaded guns into destination states and simply present their permit if stopped. As a practical matter, to arrest the traffickers, law enforcement would have to observe them in the act of selling guns. Far too many U.S.-purchased weapons make it into the hands of criminals in Latin America, and H.R. 822 would only exacerbate this problem.

Mr. Chair, while I support gun rights for law abiding citizens for sport and collection, I simply cannot support this bill.

I hope my colleagues will join with me and the California Police Chiefs Association, along with other national law enforcement organizations, to defeat this misguided and destructive legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise to oppose the severely flawed H.R. 822, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act.

This bill would make it difficult for states and local governments to enforce their firearms laws and puts the safety of the public and law enforcement at risk. State and local regulations of firearms vary dramatically. Some states have no standards for carrying a firearm beyond the minimum federal requirements. In Maryland, alcoholics and drug addicts, those convicted of certain crimes, or those with a propensity for violence or mental instability, among other things, may not obtain a permit to carry a firearm. This bill would require Maryland to accept concealed carry gun permits from other states even when the permit is not in compliance with Maryland law.

Since there is no national database for concealed carry licenses, it is difficult for states to authenticate conceal carry licenses from out of state. This is one of the reasons Maryland currently does not recognize any out-of-state permits. The inability to quickly and accurately verify the validity of out of state concealed carry permits creates additional risk for law enforcement officers. William McMahan, the President of the Maryland Chiefs of Police Association, recently called this legislation "dangerous and unacceptable."

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this misguided bill.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 822, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011, which was introduced by my good friend, Representative CLIFF STEARNS from Florida. H.R. 822 is a sorely needed, commonsense reform to the enforcement of the concealed firearms permitting process. For too long, law-abiding citizens have been forced to struggle with conflicting and often confusing state laws. When traveling, many gun owners are sometimes forced to choose between safety and obeying

the incompatible laws of another state, even if they have a valid permit in their home state.

In practice, the current system makes the permitted carrying of a concealed weapon legal on one side of an arbitrary line on a map and illegal on the other. Mr. Chairman, it makes no more sense for a state to deny the concealed-carry permit of another state than it would to deny a drivers license in the same scenario. This is simply another example in a long line of bureaucratic infringements on individuals' abilities to exercise their constitutionally protected Second Amendment rights.

Mr. Chair, I commend Mr. STEARNS for his leadership on this issue. The Founding Fathers envisioned a country in which the government existed in order to ensure the rights to "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness," not to create a litany of rules and regulations that ultimately hinders the pursuit of any of them.

Mr. Chair, the American people are demanding a country in which they can freely exercise the rights guaranteed to them in the United States Constitution, and I believe H.R. 822 is a terrific step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support the Second Amendment's rights of law abiding citizens everywhere and vote in favor of H.R. 822.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 822

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 "National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. 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)), a person who is not prohibited by Federal law from possessing, transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm, and who is carrying a valid identification document containing a photograph of the person, and 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, may possess or carry a concealed handgun (other than a machinegun or destructive device) that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce, in any State, other than the State of residence of the person, that—

"(1) has a statute that allows residents of the State to obtain licenses or permits to carry concealed firearms; or

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

"(b) The possession or carrying of a concealed handgun in a State under this section shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations, except as to eligibility to possess or carry, imposed by or under Federal or State law or the law of a political subdivision of a State, that

apply to the possession or carrying of a concealed handgun by residents of the State or political subdivision who are licensed by the State or political subdivision to do so, or not prohibited by the State from doing so.

“(c) In subsection (a), 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.”.

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

“926D. Reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.”.

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

SEC. 3. GAO AUDIT OF THE STATES’ CONCEALED CARRY PERMIT OR LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR NON-RESIDENTS.

(a) The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of—

(1) the laws and regulations of each State that authorize the issuance of a valid permit or license to permit a person, other than a resident of such State, to possess or carry a concealed firearm, including a description of the permitting or licensing requirements of each State that issues concealed carry permits or licenses to persons other than a resident of such State;

(2) the number of such valid permits or licenses issued or denied (and the basis for such denials) by each State to persons other than a resident of such State; and

(3) the effectiveness of such State laws and regulations in protecting the public safety.

(b) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 112-283. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 112-283.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 25, strike “that—” and insert “that does not have in effect an agreement with the State that issued the license or permit providing for reciprocal treatment of such licenses or permits issued by the 2 States, and that—”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

The amendment I have introduced today, because I have such appreciation for the goal of H.R. 822, says: Understanding what we are trying to get is reciprocity across the Nation for all of those States and for all of those citizens that have already labored in the vineyards to achieve reciprocity, let’s leave those State agreements in place. If we must take more Federal responsibility, let’s not take it from those areas where the States are working, where the process is working. If you live in my next-door neighbor State, in Alabama, you already recognize 22 other States’ permits; in Georgia, we recognize 23; in Florida, to our south, 33. The system is working today. Legislatures are working out these agreements today. If we must expand the size and scope of the Federal reach in the gun law legislation, let’s not trample on those agreements that already exist to achieve this goal that so many share.

I absolutely support the goal of H.R. 822, which is to ensure that all Americans have concealed-carry reciprocity across the Nation. That is already happening today, Mr. Chairman, through State legislatures, through State attorneys general, through State Governors negotiating these agreements. My amendment would leave those agreements in place and preserve the rights of States to continue to legislate and regulate in this area.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment undercuts the uniform eligibility standard that forms the foundation of this legislation. The underlying bill allows individuals with valid State-issued permits to carry a concealed firearm in all other States that also authorize concealed carry. This Second Amendment right to bear arms is, therefore, limited by this amendment.

Forty-nine States authorize concealed carry, and 40 of those States have reciprocity agreements with all or some of the other concealed-carry States. But these agreements vary from State to State, creating a patchwork of laws that limits reciprocity, creates confusion for gun owners, and undermines the Second Amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia keeps this patchwork in place by exempting States with reciprocity agreements from the bill. The amendment prevents individuals from taking advantage of nationwide concealed-carry reciprocity unless the State they reside in has a separate agreement with the State they wish to travel to.

While I appreciate my colleague’s dedication to the concept of States’

rights, I think it is misapplied to this legislation. H.R. 822 upholds States’ rights in several important ways:

First, it does not apply to those jurisdictions that prohibit concealed carry, such as Illinois and the District of Columbia;

Second, the bill does not affect a State’s right to set eligibility requirements for its own residents;

Third, H.R. 822 does not impact State laws governing how concealed firearms are possessed or carried within the various States. All State, Federal, and local laws that prohibit, for example, carrying a concealed handgun in a public building or a place of worship apply equally to any nonresident concealed-carry holder; and

Fourth, this legislation does not create any authority for the Federal Government to regulate concealed-carry permits. No Federal agency has any role in the implementation or oversight of this bill which is left, rightfully, up to the States. But, most importantly, this bill respects and protects an individual’s right to bear arms while they are traveling.

In two recent decisions, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed that the Second Amendment endows individuals with the right to keep and bear arms, and this right is based in large part on the right to defend one’s self. Americans don’t need to simply defend themselves in their homes. They must also be able to defend themselves outside their homes and while traveling to other States.

□ 1500

Eighty percent of violent crime occurs outside the home, according to the Justice Department. Americans cannot fully be empowered to defend themselves if they are prevented from exercising all their Second Amendment rights. H.R. 822 advances the Second Amendment right to bear arms, and I regret, I believe this amendment infringes upon that right.

For these reasons, I oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I thank the chairman of the committee for his work on these issues. I agree with so much of what he had to say, that it is absolutely true that the merit of this legislation is that it eliminates the patchwork of reciprocity agreements that go on across this country. And the price we pay for eliminating that patchwork is trampling upon the work of the States.

Now, I’m a freshman in this House, Mr. Chairman, and I think small government conservatives in previous Congresses have lost their way, particularly during the Bush administration. They went along with a huge expansion of government regulation, with the very best of intentions. They went along with the huge expansion of the size of government, with the very best of intentions. They increased the regulatory burden of the Federal Government, with the very best of intentions.

And this bill today is brought with the very best of intentions. But when previous Congresses have gone along with the very best of intentions, personal freedom and liberty have been eroded, even with the very best of intentions.

Mr. Chairman, the only thing that happens if the Woodall amendment passes today is that agreements that already exist for reciprocity, and any future agreements made for reciprocity, will be held supreme over a unified Federal standard. I ask my colleagues, my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues, isn't it worth it? Isn't sacrificing a uniform framework worth it to protect the rights of State legislatures and the work of citizens across this country that they have put in to protect, preserve, and promote Second Amendment rights across this Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Congressman WOODALL's amendment. I would point out that currently States have the ability to enter into reciprocity agreements with other States. This legislation, should it pass, would take that ability away. It would mandate that there be this reciprocity agreement, and that's usurpation of States' rights.

I have no problem with the Second Amendment, by the way, and the NRA is a lobbying organization which is quite powerful here in Washington, DC.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The whole point of this bill is to allow those who have concealed-carry permits to freely carry their weapons into other States that also have and recognize concealed-carry permits.

If we were to accept this amendment, in my judgment, we would be infringing upon the Second Amendment. I feel that the Second Amendment should be enforced. We ought to interpret it broadly. We ought to allow individuals to take advantage of their Second Amendment rights, travel freely from one State to another without restrictions except for the restrictions that are required locally by their State and local governments.

I mentioned awhile ago that one recognition of State prerogatives that we have in the bill is that, for example, if one State does not allow individuals who have concealed-carry permits to go into a public building or a sports event or some other type of location, they are not going to be allowed to do so even if they have a concealed-carry permit from out of State.

So, once again, we need to respect the right that is given to us by the Sec-

ond Amendment in a complete, full way. We need to allow individuals with concealed-carry permits to travel freely from State to State. This underlying bill does that, with one exception: the State of Illinois does not recognize concealed-carry permits. You would not be able to carry a weapon into that State. But except for that one State, we need to embrace the Second Amendment in every way that we can practically, recognize the Supreme Court has done the same thing, and allow individuals to travel with those concealed-carry permits.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. MCCARTHY OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 112-283.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 25, strike "that—" and insert "that has in effect a law providing that the provisions of this section shall apply with respect to the State, and—"

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my colleague from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for working with me on this issue. I rise totally in opposition to H.R. 822.

It saddens me, but it does not surprise me, that we're here having this debate today. H.R. 822 is an unnecessary and seriously flawed piece of legislation. This bill overrides the decisions of States and forces them to recognize concealed-carry gun permits from every other State.

Almost every State currently allows carry permits, but States differ substantially in regards to their permitting requirements. They have different minimum age requirements. Some States require safety training before receiving a permit, and some States bar people convicted of certain crimes. These different requirements have been put in place by the elected legislatures of the States who did so with an under-

standing of the specific needs of their communities. H.R. 822 erases all of that and creates an unworkable system.

Under this bill, States with strong gun safety laws, such as New York, California, and Massachusetts, would allow out-of-State visitors, potentially as young as 18, to walk down our streets armed and dangerous. There are States in our Nation that don't require a background check before issuing a concealed-carry permit. There are States in our Nation that don't require any firearm training before letting people walk around with a concealed weapon. These are decisions that those States made for themselves. I don't want those decisions imposed upon the communities I represent, and neither should anybody else.

Also, police officers would be faced with the task of attempting to determine the authority of permits from 48 other States on the fly and in potentially tense situations. Simply put, this bill is anticomunity, antisafety, and antipolice.

And, finally, the bill attempts to solve a problem that simply does not exist. Many States have chosen to enter into these agreements with other States to honor each other's concealed-carry permits. Nothing is stopping a State from recognizing a permit from any other State. The fact that States have not done so represents a deliberate choice to only enter into agreements with States that they feel have the proper approach to issuing concealed-carry permits.

The Federal Government should not be second-guessing the decision of the States in this matter. It saddens me but does not surprise me. We are here today discussing not how to make Americans safer and reduce gun violence, but, instead, we're talking about how to weaken our gun laws and considering a bill that takes local decisions out of the hands of local officials.

The gun manufacturing lobby will try to say otherwise, but I fully support the Constitution, as my colleague mentioned before. I believe in the rights afforded in the Second Amendment, and I support law-abiding gun owners. In the absence of a perfect, nonviolent society, however, we must make laws to protect the public. I know this firsthand. After all, it was a man with a concealed handgun that took the life of my husband and gravely wounded my son on the Long Island Railroad back in 1993.

Now, you may hear arguments today about interstate commerce as a justification for this bill, but this bill has nothing to do with interstate commerce. This bill is simply about the Federal Government overriding the States' laws about who can carry a concealed weapon.

You may also hear comparisons to State-issued driver's licenses, which are recognized nationwide. But if we want to compare guns to cars, as the gun lobby often likes to do, let's have

this conversation. Cars and their use are among the most heavily regulated consumer products and activities in the United States due to the safety risk they pose.

One thing that does surprise me, though, is why so many supporters of this bill who have been so vocal about defending States' rights in the past are now choosing, in this instance, to trample on States' rights.

□ 1510

Federalism dictates that some things should remain with the States and some things should be addressed at the national level.

Going back to the matter of interstate commerce, I'm sure all Americans would love to see the House address interstate commerce in a more direct way, which is getting Americans back to work and growing the economy. We should be talking about how to create jobs and prepare the next generation to succeed in the global economy. Instead, we're talking about how to trample on States' rights, weaken gun laws, and make America less safe, all to please our country's powerful gun lobby. So, as I said, it saddens me, but it does not surprise me that we're having this debate today.

I have an amendment under which States would be required to proactively opt-in to the agreements called for by H.R. 822. The intent of this amendment is to require that States affirmatively pass legislation enacting the provisions of H.R. 822 before the bill can go into effect in that State. This would restore States' rights, something I believe in.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and oppose H.R. 822.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment frustrates the basic purpose of H.R. 822. It requires that States pass legislation to implement the bill's provisions.

The Supreme Court, in two recent cases, has recognized a fundamental individual right to bear arms that is largely based on the right to defend oneself and one's family. Over 80 percent of violent crime occurs outside of one's home, according to the Department of Justice. This means that for the right to bear arms in self-defense to have any meaning, law-abiding citizens with permits should be able to carry firearms outside of their homes and sometimes across State boundaries.

Under current law 40 States have established a patchwork of reciprocal agreements that can be confusing for concealed-carry permit holders to navigate. H.R. 822 provides uniformity to our concealed-carry laws by creating nationwide reciprocity for concealed-

carry permit holders. By contrast, this amendment allows States to opt out of H.R. 822's Federal grant of reciprocity. And it provides that only States that choose to pass laws implementing the legislation must recognize out-of-state concealed-carry permits. This amendment would, in effect, just continue the status quo and so would be of no help to individuals with concealed-carry permits.

Since 2004 police officers have enjoyed the right to use a concealed-carry permit to take a firearm across State lines. And, in 2010, President Obama signed legislation to include other law enforcement personnel who could take advantage of this ability. It is ironic that some of these groups now want to deny this same right to law-abiding citizens with concealed-carry permits.

According to a 2009 Zogby poll, 83 percent of those polled said they supported concealed-carry laws—83 percent. Over 4 million Americans across the country have qualified for a concealed-carry permit. They, most likely, endorse this legislation.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York's mentioning States' prerogatives, and I hope she will express the same sentiments about other pieces of legislation. H.R. 822 retains the States' ability to regulate firearms in their own States by making clear that all State regulations regarding how a firearm is carried continue to apply to both residents and nonresidents, and by keeping in place the State's own permitting process.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 112-283.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 1, insert "(A)" after "(1)".

Page 6, line 4, strike "(2)" and insert "(B)".

Page 6, line 5, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 6, after line 5, insert the following:

"(2) provides for the issuance of such a license or permit, and requires the applicant for such a license or permit to complete and submit the application to the State in person."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment would exempt States from right-to-carry reciprocity when the State does not require individuals to apply for and complete a carry permit application at their local law enforcement station.

The United States Congress should never be in the business of stripping States of the right to make their own decisions about whether to recognize other States' permits. States have put forward a considerable amount of time trying to determine just what is best for their citizenry in reference to safety. By overriding State-based concealed-carry laws and forcing States to recognize concealed-carry permits from every other State, we're putting our State and local law enforcement in grave danger.

Two nights ago the sheriff in my county and I discussed this matter. I might add he is a Republican sheriff who is a friend of mine. We discussed this matter, and we concluded that it's going to be very difficult to get people to want to become police officers. Not only are they being attacked in reference to their organizing efforts, but now we are going to make it difficult for them to do their jobs.

This amendment closes a loophole that would otherwise be created by H.R. 822.

Almost every State allows concealed-carry in some form, but States differ in how they implement their concealed-carry policies, including having, as has been mentioned, different age requirements, training requirements, and excluding individuals guilty of certain crimes. One of these major discrepancies is addressed in this amendment and would force a State wishing to enforce H.R. 822's State reciprocity requirement to make certain carry permit applications are completed at an individual's local law enforcement station.

In my home State of Florida, concealed-carry permits may be granted to nonresidents, and all applicants are allowed to apply by mail. It is so easy that a staffer in one of our offices was able to complete the form in less than 30 minutes. If H.R. 822 passes, residents and nonresidents of Florida would be able to apply by mail from almost anywhere in the country and use their concealed-carry permits throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, gun violence continues to grow at astounding levels in the United States. When the Surgeon General was Mr. Satcher, he called it an epidemic and even said that it was a health crisis so many people were killing each other with weapons.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for his amendment. I rise in support of it and observe that last year, over 70 percent of Utah's concealed-carry permits were issued to nonresidents. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, the last thing we need is to tell sovereign States that they are no longer free to make the decision to require an in-person interview when making a gun permit determination. At least 10 States grant law enforcement broad discretion to deny permits to carry concealed, loaded guns based on an applicant's record or other factors. Fourteen other States grant law enforcement more limited discretion. In addition, at least 14 States require applicants to show good moral character. Many of these States require applicants to present themselves in person for interviews. For example, applicants in New York must complete an in-person interview to receive their carry permit.

By contrast, Utah applicants, as has been pointed out by the ranking member, can submit their application by mail and can complete the fingerprinting and firearm safety training requirements outside of the State. In comparison, Utah's driver's license application specifically requires, and rightly so, that applicants submit the application in person, that it be notarized, and that the employee initial the application upon submission. Utah also grants permits to nonresidents, potentially allowing individuals nationwide to apply for a permit by mail.

□ 1520

Supporters of H.R. 822 claim that concealed-carry permits should be treated like driver's licenses. My amendment, however, points out that this is yet another instance of my friends' hypocrisy. First-time drivers applying for licenses in Utah and Florida must appear in person and pass a written and road test.

While Utah and Florida are free to make the decision that they will not require in-person appearances for concealed carry permit applicants, it should not be the job of Congress to impose this decision on other states.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 822 is a dangerous bill, and quite frankly will do nothing to create a single job across the nation.

Americans are hurting, they want jobs, and to be able to provide for their families.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which will help to close a dangerous loophole created by H.R. 822.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

This amendment would effectively gut the bill, though the intent is actually somewhat unclear.

As written, the amendment allows a visitor to carry a handgun under the provisions of the bill only in States that require applications to be completed and submitted in person; however, few States have such a requirement for nonresidents.

This amendment would create unnecessary confusion. For example, Florida accepts applications by mail, but the State of Washington does not. If this amendment were adopted, a Virginia resident who held a valid permit could carry a handgun in Washington, which requires everyone to apply in person, but not in Florida, which has no concerns about issuing permits by mail.

It is possible that the amendment was intended to allow interstate carry under the bill's provisions only for holders of permits that were issued in person. The problem is that isn't how the amendment is drafted. If it were, it would still effectively gut the bill because so few States require in-person application.

The fact is that any application or fingerprinting requirements for a resident or a nonresident to obtain a concealed-carry permit are in addition to all the other requirements, including a national instant-background check that the applicant must go through first to legally purchase the gun.

Despite what some opponents of H.R. 822 would have you believe, not everyone who owns a gun is a criminal. And, in fact, there is overwhelming evidence to show that concealed-carry laws have resulted in lower crime rates in most States. Typically, most criminals don't bother with legally purchasing a gun and then making sure they have a valid permit before they carry it concealed; they just do it. That's why we call them criminals.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 112-283.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 1, insert "(A)" after "(1)".

Page 6, line 4, strike "(2)" and insert "(B)".

Page 6, line 5, strike the period and insert "; and".

"(2) maintains a complete database of all permits and licenses issued by the State for the carrying of a concealed handgun, and

makes that database available to law enforcement officers from all States 24 hours a day."

Page 6, after line 5, insert the following:

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am hoping that there will be no Member that will oppose a common-sense amendment that allows our law enforcement officers to be more protected.

One might think, as I point to this picture of a nurse giving a young man an immunization shot and the young man squinting, that I would be more in tune with this legislation to have a law enforcement officer or a policeman dressed in their uniform.

I put a child here because I wanted to emphasize the fact that, can we have any disagreement that if we put our law enforcement officers in jeopardy, many of them leave behind families. Or I might use as an example this young child is squinting in pain from immunization. That won't harm them, but a person recklessly having stolen maybe someone's gun that comes with the national concealed law, the right-to-carry law, may not have a squinting child but, rather, a dead child.

Let me give you an example of the legislation or the amendment that I have in real time. A North Harris police officer in 2008 had a traffic stop. Before he went to this individual that he was stopping, he dutifully went to a dispatcher, a database to find out who this might be. Tragically, it was not soon enough because a gun was taken and he was shot dead. He leaves behind a wife and two children, albeit the fact that I have a child here, because I'm simply trying to create a simple amendment to this bill that will protect our law enforcement.

What does my amendment do? It ensures that a comprehensive database is created to provide a listing of individuals from each State who possess permits and licenses to carry concealed weapons. This amendment would also require that the concealed-weapons database be available to law enforcement officers in all States 24 hours a day. Thank goodness, because of Federal funding, many of our law enforcement officers have their laptops, many of them even their iPads, and so this database is a simple process.

It is interesting or it should be known that 36 States are especially adversely impacted by this bill because 36 States do not grant any reciprocity. Twenty-seven States recognize concealed-carry permits from only select States. So a 24-hour database, I believe,

would do what Republicans and Democrats say they want to do: protect law enforcement officers.

Failing to implement a national system that would allow law enforcement officials to check the status of individuals who are legally allowed to carry a concealed gun will result in a routine situation, such as a traffic stop, becoming a life-threatening situation. If an officer discovered a gun during a routine traffic stop, the officer might quickly and accurately determine this guy is legal as to whether the driver or lady possesses a valid out-of-state permit.

Oh, yes, we can offer reciprocity, but does the officer on the street walk around and look at the car that's coming across the border of their State and a sign says, We have reciprocity, I am from such and such, I'm okay. It is nearly an impossible task for the officer to verify the validity of 48 different carry permits—are we going to have a national carry permit—in the middle of what could be a tense situation.

Even if that person is legally carrying it based upon the permit from another State, according to the majority's report on this bill, only 18 States maintain an electronic database of concealed-carry permits that are immediately accessible to other law enforcement agencies. Seven States cannot provide any real-time access to this basic information to out-of-state agencies, and two States do not even maintain a database for their own purposes. This amendment gives our local law enforcement a plausible chance to verify whether out-of-state concealed-carry permits are legitimate.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I yield to my ranking member on this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. And I am in full support of the logical and rational approach that she is taking in supporting a database.

I plead with my colleagues to join us in a bipartisan sense to support an amendment that would create a comprehensive mechanism so that all permits and licenses for carrying concealed weapons would be available on a 24-hour-a-day basis. I congratulate the gentlelady on her amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

Who can oppose such a simple amendment, particularly when it is noted that some States do not have this electronic database?

The officer who went to his dispatcher, who was doing the right thing, he lost his life. He left behind children. Do we want squinting children getting an immunization shot or getting shot?

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment #4 to H.R. 822, the "National

Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011." My amendment ensures that a comprehensive database is created to provide a listing of individuals from each State who possess permits and licenses to carry concealed weapons. This amendment would also require that the concealed weapons database be available to law enforcement officers in all States 24-hours a day.

Failing to implement a national system that would allow law enforcement officials to check the status of individuals who are legally allowed to carry a concealed gun could result in a routine situation, such as a like traffic stops, becoming life-threatening situation.

If an officer discovered a gun during a routine traffic stop, the officer must quickly and accurately determine whether the driver possesses a valid out-of-state permit. It is a nearly impossible task for the officer to verify the validity of 48 different carry permits, in the middle what could be a tense or dangerous situation.

According to the Majority's report on this bill, only 12 states maintain an electronic database of concealed carry permits that are immediately accessible to other law enforcement agencies. 7 states cannot provide any real time access to this basic information to out-of-state agencies, and 2 states do not even maintain a database for their own purposes.

This amendment gives state and local law enforcement a plausible chance to verify whether out-of-state concealed carry permits are legitimate

Consider for a moment, a police officer in Houston, Texas has just pulled someone over for speeding. The driver, who is a resident of Missouri, gives the officer a concealed carry permit from Utah, which is a state that grants concealed carry permits to nonresidents. Under our current system it is impossible for the officer in Houston to instantly confirm whether or not the driver from Missouri has a valid right to carry a concealed weapon.

State and local law enforcement should always be aware of who is carrying loaded, hidden guns in their communities. A local sheriff or police chief would benefit from knowing how many people carrying a concealed weapon have entered their jurisdiction from out-of-state, and who those people are.

My amendment would give the officer the ability to garner this information from a comprehensive database; this would allow the officer to have an advantage when approaching a vehicle with a potentially armed driver.

As it stands officers would have to distinguish between real and fake carry permits issued not only by their own state, but by every state. And in many cases, officers would have to determine whether a person is entitled to carry a gun, which would depend on their state of residence and is nearly impossible to verify quickly.

The comprehensive database provides the officer with an information safety net, although my amendment will not address the significant flaws in this legislation; this is an attempt to ensure that law enforcement officers have an additional tool at their disposal.

In addition, state authorities would also have information on whether or not the individuals applying for licenses in their state have ever had a license revoke in a different state.

Under this bill, local law enforcement will have a difficult time verifying out-of-state permits in real time. Pass this amendment to give

our local law enforcement officials a fighting chance.

A comprehensive database would save lives, as state officials could use this database to determine whether they would be issuing a permit to an individual, who may have had their permit revoked in another state.

THE STORY OF MARQUS

In 2005, a man named Marqus had his concealed carry permit revoked by Philadelphia Police after he had been charged with attempted murder. During the revocation hearing, he attacked an officer.

After this incident Marqus was able to attain a new permit from Florida despite his record of violence. He then used his Florida permit to carry a loaded gun in Philadelphia.

Marqus who under Philadelphia law regained his right to carry a concealed weapon in Philadelphia only because of a reciprocity agreement with the state of Florida, would eventually, use this right to carrying a concealed weapon to shoot a teenager in the chest thirteen times killing him in the streets of Philadelphia. Philadelphia did its job, they revoked a license of a violent individual.

Florida if they had access to the type of database I am proposing today may have reconsidered issuing a license to Marqus. However, if Florida continued to issue licenses to individuals that a state, such as Texas, did not agree believe have licenses. Under the current law the State of Texas would be able to revoke their reciprocity agreement. H.R. 822 takes away the States ability to determine how to best protect their citizens from those who they have determined should not be allowed to carry concealed weapons.

Currently, each state has its own eligibility standards. Those criteria include determining the following: At least 38 states, including Texas, prevent people from carrying concealed weapons if they have certain dangerous misdemeanor criminal convictions beyond domestic violence misdemeanors, which prohibit gun possession under federal law.

Over 50 percent of states, including Texas, require those seeking permits to complete a safety training program, many of these programs include live fire training, or other proof of competency prior to the issuance of a carry permit. As well as, and age restriction such as prohibiting anyone

Although it is often argued that guns do not kill people, people kill people. Well, it can also be said we should not make it any easier to put a powerful and lethal weapon in the hands of those who have histories of violence and abuse.

Every sheriff and police officer in the country would have to honor concealed carry permits from all 50 states but first they would need to be able to verify the validity of each state's different type of permit. Knowing local laws and recognizing when someone is breaking them already keeps our law enforcement busy. But H.R. 822, as written, would not give police a way to ensure out-of-state permits were valid or up to date.

Some state permits look as simple as a library card, and would be just as easy to forge. A national database would result in a uniform approach on who has a valid permit to carry a concealed weapon. The fact that each state has its own requirements is indicative of how complex this issue really is and with one measure Congress would eliminate the right of States to set their own public safety laws. If

this measure passes every state will be compelled to honor every other State's permit to carry concealed and loaded guns, regardless of how different each state's standards or criteria to secure a permit may be.

States should have the right to know whether the individuals carrying concealed weapons have valid permits or licenses to carry or possess concealed weapons. This measure would require that one central database be created, which encompasses the information of each person from each state who has a current, valid permit or license to carry or possess a concealed handgun—and requires that this comprehensive database be accessible to law enforcement in any state 24 hours a day.

I believe that an amendment creating a comprehensive listing of licensed individuals from each State, in one main location that is accessible at any time of day is a necessary tool that will protect the public and the safety of law enforcement officers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

This amendment seeks to require States to maintain a database of all concealed-carry permits that would be accessible to law enforcement officers 24 hours a day. This amendment, aside from being a version of NCIC for law-abiding citizens, is unnecessary for a number of reasons.

The State-issuing authority already maintains a database of concealed-carry permits, and a number of States make these databases accessible to law enforcement through the Nlets System, which law enforcement in all 50 States can use to determine whether someone visiting from another State is carrying a valid concealed permit. This system is available to law enforcement officers 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Law enforcement officers can also contact other States to determine whether a person has a criminal background, a warrant out for their arrest, or other information that will help determine whether someone poses a safety threat to themselves or the general public.

□ 1530

But the fundamental flaw of this amendment is that it continues to place conditions and restraints on law-abiding citizens all the while ignoring the obvious, which is that people intent on doing harm do not register their firearms nor call ahead to report their travel schedule.

No database has yet been created which can determine whether a person with a firearm intends to use it in a criminal matter, whether the firearm is carried illegally or not, so officers are trained to be careful in every situation and have the authority to take necessary precautions to ensure the safety of those on the scene of an investigative stop.

This amendment, as is true with many other amendments that we have

and will consider today, is premised on the flawed view that concealed-carry permit holders pose a threat to public safety. People intent on committing illegal acts will not go to the trouble of obtaining a concealed-carry permit, and statistics back that up.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 5 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 112-283.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 14, after the period insert the following: "Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the possession or carrying of a concealed handgun in a State shall be subject to any law of the State that limits the eligibility to possess or carry a concealed handgun to persons who have received firearm safety training that includes a live-fire exercise."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

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

I rise in support of my amendment to this dangerous bill, the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act.

My amendment is about protecting a State's right to decide who may carry a concealed, loaded handgun within its borders. It would require the possession of or carrying of a concealed handgun in a State be subject to that State's law regarding firearm safety training, including live-fire exercise.

Currently, at least 34 States require applicants to complete a firearm safety training course or present proof of equivalent experience in order to obtain a concealed-carry permit; 19 States require live-fire instruction to obtain a carry permit. However, some States only require minimal training such as an Internet-only instruction. Even worse, however, are the States that do not require any firearm training to obtain a concealed-carry permit.

This bill would override State laws and require States to allow out-of-State residents to carry loaded, concealed weapons in public, even if they have not met basic licensing or training requirements mandated for carrying in that State. This does not make any sense.

By federally mandating recognition of all out-of-State concealed handgun permits, H.R. 822 would allow individuals who do not meet a State's live-fire firearm training standards to carry concealed weapons within their borders and prohibit States from ever restricting carrying by those individuals.

According to the Violence Policy Center, since May 2007, at least 385 people, including law enforcement officers, have been killed by individuals with concealed-carry permits. None of these incidents involved self-defense. Some of these incidents included mass shootings—the most recent occurring in July at a child's birthday party at a Texas roller rink—claiming the lives of 89 innocent victims. This illustrates why States should have the right to determine who is eligible to carry firearms within their borders. They know what is best for their communities.

This bill is all about the National Rifle Association and its needs, not about the American people and putting them back to work. Congress should not put its stamp of approval on this dangerous and misguided legislation.

States that require a person to demonstrate that they know how to use a firearm or meet minimum training standards before obtaining a concealed-carry permit should not be forced to allow out-of-State visitors to carry concealed weapons if they do not meet that State's concealed licensing requirements, especially if a State requires that individuals undergo live-fire training to ensure they know how to properly operate a firearm. This is common sense.

This is a commonsense amendment, and it will keep Americans safe. It simply would require the possession or carrying of a concealed handgun in a State be subject to that State's law regarding firearm safety training, including live-fire exercises.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment allows States to prohibit nonresidents from carrying a concealed firearm if they did not take part in a firearm safety class that included a live-fire exercise as part of the permitting process. This amendment would, for the first time ever, insert the Federal Government into the State's concealed-carry permitting process. H.R. 822, by contrast, protects

each State's ability to set its own eligibility requirements for concealed-carry permits.

Thirty-seven States require some degree of firearms training. The gentleman from Georgia's home State, interestingly, does not require any training and, thus, under this amendment, its citizens would not be able to enjoy the Federal grant of reciprocity provided by H.R. 822.

The States carry out their training requirements in a number of ways. Some States allow applicants to certify their proficiency through classroom training, while other States recognize prior military or police service to meet these requirements. Virginia, for example, provides eight different ways to meet the training requirements.

This amendment is silent on a number of important issues. Is prior military or law enforcement service sufficient to meet the live-fire requirement? Does an applicant need to go through this training each time they renew their permit or is it sufficient to have completed a course the first time they applied? These ambiguities give us more reason to oppose this amendment.

We know that concealed-carry laws do reduce crime. A study by John Lott and David Mustard found that when concealed-carry laws went into effect, murders fell by over 7 percent and rapes and aggravated assaults fell by 5 and 7 percent, respectively. These findings have been confirmed by 18 other studies, but none have found that concealed carry increases crime.

The benefit of concealed-carry laws should not be measured only by the instances of self-defense, but also by the number of crimes that are prevented from occurring in the first place.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I agree wholeheartedly with my colleague from Texas, Chairman SMITH. This legislation does, in fact, insert the Federal Government into State licensing of firearms, and it does it in a big way. It actually eviscerates the States' ability to regulate how or the qualifications for applicants to be able to receive a concealed-carry permit.

As I stated earlier, 34 States require applicants to complete a firearms safety training course; unfortunately, Georgia does not. But that does not mean that that is right or proper. I believe that other States can certainly have a more conscientious approach to gun licensing, and certainly States have had a right to do that, and I want to preserve that right.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from Georgia agrees with me that this amendment does insert the Federal Government into the States' concealed-carry permitting process. I would simply say that that admission and the fact that that is the case is enough reason to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1540

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 112-283.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 14, after the period insert the following: "Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the possession or carrying of a concealed handgun in a State under this section shall be subject to any State law limiting the eligibility to possess or carry a concealed handgun to individuals who have attained 21 years of age."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

Before I came to Congress, I was a member of the Tennessee Senate for probably an inordinate amount of years before I graduated to this august body. It took me 24 years to matriculate. But during those 24 years, I worked on much important legislation to help the people of Tennessee.

One of the things I helped the people in Tennessee with is I wrote the Right to Carry bill in Tennessee. The fact is this was a difficult bill to pass; it was a difficult bill to craft. There were people with different opinions of what should be in the bill, and we debated it. We went back and forth on what should be in it. We took votes and certain things passed and certain failed, and we came up with a bill we thought was a good bill.

I always felt that people who could take a gun and have enough vision and calmness of hand and hit a target at some pace, not have a criminal record, and pass a written test of limited challenge, should have a right to carry a

gun. In fact in Tennessee, very few people with the right to carry a gun have committed crimes and used their guns improperly.

But the fact is we worked on this law and we had certain restrictions, and one of the restrictions is you had to be 21 years of age, the same age that you have to be to buy a beer or to drink. And 36 other States came to that same decision that you should be 21 before you can get a permit to carry a gun.

Eight States have differed: Alabama, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, and South Dakota. So you've got a southern State in there, you've got an eastern State, a couple of Big Tens, a couple out in the Big Sky world, and some in the east. And they decided you only had to be 18, those eight States.

This bill, if passed, would tell the citizens in those 37 States and the legislators in those 37 States that argued and determined that 21 was the right age that it would be the right age in your State for the people who are residents of your State, but if somebody from one of those other eight States came into your State and was less than 21, they could carry a gun when your citizens couldn't. Because their State decided 18 was sufficient, your laws made no difference; and you'd have teenagers carrying guns in States that had determined that it was not the appropriate age.

Twenty-one is the right age to drink, and I'm not submitting that it should be less at this time, but the fact is the brain doesn't really develop to a certain extent until you're out of your teens; and that is why much of the crime and the violent crime is committed by people 18 to 20. They are only 5 percent of the population, but 20 percent of the homicides in violent crime are committed by people from 18 to 20. And if you pass this bill, you'll have people 18 to 20 going into States and having a right to carry a gun when the citizens of that State won't have it. That makes no sense.

In 2007, the most recent year in which we have data, there were 13,000 people who lost their lives in this country to accidents involving alcohol; but there were 31,000 people, over twice as many, who lost their lives because of gunfire.

It doesn't make sense that we would not only trample on the laws of the different States but also the work of the legislators such as me who worked hard within the legislative bodies, within the give-and-take of Senate and House and conference committees to come up with what we thought was the policy of our State to have that overridden by the folks here in this United States House of Representatives, the Senate would be concurring, to pass a bill to say your laws make no difference, and 18- and 19- and 20-year-olds from Alabama and South Dakota and Maine and New Hampshire are going to be able to come in your State and carry a gun when your citizens won't be able.

It should be up to each of the States to decide that, and what we're getting to is the lowest common denominator, which isn't right.

So the fact is these laws should be left up to the States. The States right now can have reciprocity agreements. Tennessee didn't have one when we passed our bill in 1996, but in 2003 they got one. But the State of Tennessee decided on its reciprocity, not the United States Congress. And States have reciprocity agreements, and they're all going to be overridden. Some are more liberal than others—Tennessee is the most liberal—but other States have got restrictions. They're all going to be set aside because of this.

I would hope that the Members who come from the 37 States that require your citizens to be 21 would not allow people under 21 to come into your State and have teenagers who are most likely to commit crimes with guns to come into your State with a concealed-carry permit.

Mr. CONYERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Your experience in your State legislature and your legal experience really have impressed me that your amendment, and we haven't talked about this today on H.R. 822, is extremely important. I hope my colleagues will join with you.

Mr. COHEN. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

This amendment prohibits persons who are legally permitted to carry a concealed weapon between the age of 18 and 21 from taking advantage of H.R. 822's grant of reciprocity. We continue to believe, Mr. Chairman, that adults who reach the age of 18—which is the age of majority for well nigh everything in this country, save alcohol—are capable of being responsible just as 19-year-olds and 20-year-olds are. They can vote. More importantly, they can serve in the military where they are highly trained to handle firearms in very critical situations.

Fewer than 10 States allow people under 21 to receive a concealed-carry permit. One State allows this if a weapon is necessary for the person's job, such as law enforcement, and another if a person gets permission from law enforcement.

This amendment eliminates the current practice of many States, including the amendment sponsor's home State of Tennessee, recognizing concealed-carry permits of nonresidents between the ages of 18 and 21, even though their own residents must be 21 to conceal carry.

In fact, 14 States recognize all valid permits issued by any States, including those States that permit persons between the ages of 18 and 21. As many as 10 additional States recognize 18-year-old permit holders from other States with which they have reciprocity.

Mr. Chairman, America trusts our brave men and women under the age of 21 to volunteer for duty and to defend our country. What this amendment says, however, is you can carry a gun and defend this country overseas, but you can't carry a gun and defend yourself once you get back. This is not consistent with the Second Amendment, nor is it reflective of our views with respect to what 18-year-olds can and should be permitted to do. What is good enough to defend the foundations of this Republic and us, I hasten to add, should be sufficient to defend oneself.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Based on your argument, you would think that the state that the laws of the 37 States have that limit gun permits to people that are 21 should be abolished. Why does your legislation not go further and trample on the States' rights and say that you can only have a limitation of age 18 and say that you cannot have a limitation of age 21?

Mr. GOWDY. The only thing that this debate today has given me cause for celebration for is I now know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are familiar with the concept of States' rights because I have not heard them talk about it for the first 11 months.

Do you suppose Tennessee should have a different version of the First Amendment or the Fourth Amendment or the Fifth Amendment or the Eighth Amendment? So why are we treating the Second Amendment like it is in the constitutional trash heap?

Mr. COHEN. No. What I'm saying to you, sir, is your belief is obviously that the Second Amendment is an individual right so that the States that have laws that say you have to be 21, those laws should be abolished and we should limit it to 18.

For the record, I have talked about States' rights on medical tort liability, and I've talked about States' rights on medical marijuana.

Mr. GOWDY. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Tennessee is right. He has from time to time mentioned States' rights, which puts him in a very lonely position on his side of the aisle.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1550

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 112-283.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 21, strike the close quotation marks and the following period.

Page 6, after line 21, insert the following:

“(d) A person may not, under this section, carry or possess a concealed handgun in a State, unless the person provided at least 24 hours notice to the designated law enforcement agency of the State of the intention of the person to carry or possess a concealed handgun in the State.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank you for your courtesies, and I am delighted to have seen my good friend engage in a dialogue and a colloquy with my friend from Tennessee. Maybe I might even get the same courtesies because this is a very important issue that also deals with constitutional questions.

I am back with my young man who is getting his immunization shot, with a nurse looking over him, because I want people to know that this is about family, that it's about the fact as to whether or not we make a statement on behalf of protecting law enforcement, of protecting our families, and not fall upon the spear of the Second Amendment and the National Rifle Association.

To my ranking member and dear friend, even the supercommittee is not without ghosts riding through. I understand they had a deal, and then Mr. Norquist comes riding through. Whenever we want to talk about getting together on guns and the Second Amendment, the NRA comes riding through. So we've got the NRA, and we've got Mr. Norquist, and we can't ever get any bipartisanship because the ghosts keep riding through.

My amendment is a very simple one, and it speaks, again, to protecting the lives of our officers, and what it says is having the State have a designated entity, a designated agency, that requires an individual coming into another State with a concealed-carry permit to provide at least 24 hours advance notice to law enforcement agencies of

their intention to carry or possess a concealed handgun in another State. States must retain their ability to know which individuals are allowed under this newly proposed bill to possess and carry a concealed weapon.

Now, my friend did not engage with me in a dialogue, the gentleman, I believe, from South Carolina.

But just imagine a trooper with a traffic stop on, say, for example, I-45 in the State of Texas—it could be I-95 in Maryland—at 3 a.m. The car has a Colorado license plate, and the driver supplies a Colorado driver's license. The State trooper goes back to his car, and he can instantly validate this person is from Colorado with respect to the license plate and the license. Upon returning to the car, the trooper notices that the driver has a concealed weapon on his hip. The driver hands over his Colorado concealed-carry permit. The trooper has no ability to determine the validity of that permit. Therefore, if that person had been required to notify a State agency in Texas or in Maryland, that information might be readily accessible.

I heard a comment about the NLET process. You can go to the NLET. Only 12 States have allowed electronic access to their concealed-carry databases known as NLET. It does not respond, in essence, to the other 38 States.

My friends, we are recklessly passing a bill that we think is sorely needed. It does not in any way have anything to do with jobs. It doesn't have anything to do with protecting innocent children. It has nothing to do with making sure our law enforcement is safe. I am simply adding an amendment that would make it better. When you're coming into our State, let's let our law enforcement know, and let's provide safety to the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

This amendment is based on the premise that any person who possesses a gun, including an American who legally purchases a gun and obtains a concealed-carry permit, is a criminal and must seek permission to exercise his or her constitutional rights. It would be nice, indeed, if we could get those who harbor criminal intentions to call ahead of time and inform local law enforcement of their plans. It would, in fact, be ideal if they would let us know which store they were going to rob, which home they were going to invade, which car they intended to steal.

That typically doesn't happen, Mr. Chairman, and to require law-abiding citizens to call ahead is mind-boggling.

Do we have to call ahead when we plan to assert our First Amendment rights? Do we have to call ahead and inform States we're traveling through

of our intention to rely upon our Fourth Amendment rights? What about Miranda? Do we call ahead and reserve our Miranda reservations? Do we need to tell them which road we'll be traveling on, Mr. Chairman—and who do they call and what do they tell them when they call? Do they describe the gun? Do they tell them what caliber?

What is law enforcement supposed to do with this information? Does anyone really think criminals ever call ahead and announce their intentions? What happens if a person fails to provide notice, Mr. Chairman? What is the designated law enforcement agency expected to do with this information—maintain a database of all entering nonresidents and track the person's movements inside the State?

Should a nonresident with a concealed-carry permit engage in criminal activity within the State, is the State then liable for not preventing it?

Would a person who lives in Maryland but works in Virginia be required to call every day, Mr. Chairman?

What if it's an emergency trip—the birth of a grandchild? A sickness in the family? Do we just postpone our trip so we can meet the requirements of this amendment or do we sacrifice our right to travel in self-defense because we didn't call quickly enough?

This is a practical nightmare. It's a constitutional abomination. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I'm so glad my dear friend rose to speak to the new phenomenon of apples and oranges.

My friends, I am not coddling criminals. We know this is a distinctive bill that is not addressing the question of criminals who come to do us harm. What we are suggesting is that guns kill, and we are suggesting that people use guns to kill.

On that lonely, dark road at 3 a.m., when that trooper identifies your driver's license but can't identify whether or not you have a legitimate concealed-weapon permit to carry, then we are asking for you to have help. We're asking for there to be 24-hour notification. I am sure there will be the possibility of waivers, but don't tell me that a law enforcement entity, once known that they can go to the documentation that has the notification that someone is coming in from another State with a concealed weapon, will not find it useful. In fact, it will help this law enforcement officer tell this individual carrying legally, On your way, sir; On your way, ma'am. Thank you. Or, in essence, we might catch someone who has a concealed weapon and a permit from another State, but that person is rushing across the State to get away from a wife or a husband and has been in a violent domestic abuse or a domestic violence altercation.

So let me just say, for all of the laughers, guns kill, and it is a shame

that we allow the ghost of the NRA to ride into this place and just smack down common sense. Save the lives of children because guns kill. Save the lives of law enforcement officers who leave behind children, because guns kill. Don't fool around with the NLET process, which doesn't even work. Let's notify. I ask for the support of my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment No. 8 to H.R. 822, the "National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act of 2011." My amendment ensures that any person seeking to possess a concealed weapon in a state other than the state that issued the concealed carry permit must provide at least 24 hours advance notice to law enforcement agencies of their intention to carry or possess a concealed handgun in another State.

States must retain their ability to know which individuals are allowed, under this newly proposed bill, to possess and carry concealed weapons within their borders. This measure would require an individual to notify out of state law enforcement, 24 hours in advance, of their intention to possess or carry a concealed weapon into the borders of a State in which those individuals are not licensed.

In its current form, the bill will have a difficult time verifying out of state permits in real time, endangering their lives, and the lives of the public. State and local law enforcement must always be aware of who is carrying loaded, hidden guns. This information will give law enforcement a fighting chance as they protect their communities.

I believe that an amendment requiring prompt and adequate notification to law enforcement officials regarding an out of state individual's intention to carry a concealed weapon is necessary to protect the safety of the public and to protect the safety of the men and women who protect the public.

According to the Majority's report on this bill, only 12 states maintain electronic databases of concealed carry permits that are immediately accessible to other law enforcement agencies. 7 states cannot provide any real time access to this basic information, and 2 states do not even maintain databases.

Currently, there are several states that have implemented time requirements to ensure the safety of their citizens when dealing with a variety of weapons. This amendment will create a standard that is sure to provide law enforcement with the information desperately needed to keep the public safe from unknown harms.

This is a fundamental states rights issue. The measure before us today takes away a state's right to set their own criteria for determining who should be allowed to carry a fire arm within their borders.

Texas has robust handgun concealed carry laws and these laws would only undermine the criteria established by my home state. This measure would bolster the protections that Texas and many other states seek to implement to protect their citizens from gun violence. Texas standard to attain a permit is currently higher than current federal law and the requirements of a number of other states.

As it stands Texas already honors the permits of 39 other states; which only emphasizes that this can be address at the state level. One of my main concerns is that the lives and safety of men and women working in the line of duty will be compromised if we fail

to effectuate this amendment requiring a 24-hour advance notice of out of state individuals carrying concealed weapons.

Law enforcement officers put their lives on the line for us every day. Since 2009 least 122 law enforcement officers have been shot and killed, with an average of one officer killed by gunfire each week. Since the beginning of 2011, guns have killed at least 30 law enforcement officers. It is important that the very men and women who put their lives on the line are the very men and women who have instant access to information on whether on not the individual they are approaching during a routine traffic stop is armed.

In 2009, Houston Police Officer Timothy Abernathy was shot and killed during a routine traffic stop. An 11 year Veteran of the Houston Police Department, Officer Abernathy stopped a vehicle for a minor traffic violation. This should have been routine, but the suspect shot Officer Abernathy in the head, killing him. Officer Abernathy was 43 years old.

Gun violence is dangerous to all Americans. In 2010, approximately 8,775 people were killed by firearms. 6,000 of those deaths were caused by handguns. In 2010, 152 of those killed by guns were law enforcement officers. Each year, there are approximately 16,000 assaults on police officers, and many of those attacks utilize firearms.

The facts are quite simple. If we are going to ask state and local law enforcement officials to put their lives on the line every day for the safety of our communities, we owe it to them to know who is carrying a loaded and concealed weapon. Establishing a database of individuals with concealed carry permits could save a life.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to H.R. 822 in order to ensure that we act fervently to protect the lives of those who risk their lives for the general public on a daily basis. Again, this amendment will strengthen a State's ability to continue its efforts to protect the safety of its citizens and law enforcement officials.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 112-283.

Mr. CICILLINE. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 21, strike the close quotation marks and the following period.

Page 6, after line 21, insert the following:

“(d) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the possession or carrying of a concealed handgun in a State on the basis of a license or permit issued in another State,

unless the Attorney General of the State, the head of the State police, and the Secretary of State of the State have jointly issued a certification that the laws of both States which provide for the issuance of such a license or permit are substantially similar.”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

As a founding member of the bipartisan Mayors Against Illegal Guns, co-chaired by Mayor Menino of Boston and Mayor Bloomberg of New York, I rise today in strong opposition to the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act.

This dangerous legislation threatens public safety by undermining the ability of States and localities to reduce gun violence by limiting the carrying of loaded concealed weapons within their borders.

This bill has nothing to do with honoring the Second Amendment. It, instead, completely dishonors the rights of local communities and State governments to make decisions to protect the well-being and safety of their citizens. This bill prevents States from responding to the unique needs of their communities as they determine the eligibility criteria for carrying a loaded concealed weapon. It instead forces them to accept standards set in other States.

□ 1600

As a result, this bill strips away reasonable limitations properly enacted by States and imposes upon every State, except Illinois, the least restrictive standard in the country for carrying a concealed loaded gun. The implications of this bill are drastic and a radical departure from well-settled practice and law that assigns primary responsibility for public safety to States and localities.

In Rhode Island and in many States like it, this bill would decimate the strong concealed-carry framework developed by duly elected officials within the State. These officials enacted requirements that they believe most effectively prevent dangerous individuals from carrying a concealed firearm within their borders.

Rhode Island does not have any reciprocity agreements recognizing any other State permits; and our heightened standards require applicants to be at least 21 years old, of good character, not an abuser of alcohol, to complete a firearm safety training course that includes a live-fire examination, and to show good cause for needing a concealed-carry permit. To further provide for our unique public safety needs, Rhode Island also grants broad discretion to local law enforcement officials in the process of approving or denying

a concealed-carry permit. As a result, Rhode Island ranks among the States with the lowest gun death rates, less than half the national average.

Under this bill, Rhode Island would be forced to recognize concealed-carry permits from all States, regardless of how lax the other States' standards. This would leave my fellow Rhode Islanders subject to the whims of the other States' concealed-carry permits and actually prioritize the rights of out-of-State concealed-carry permit holders over the rights of Rhode Islanders within our own borders. For example, while Rhode Island requires safety training that includes a live-fire exam in order to acquire a concealed-carry permit, there are 10 States that have no training requirements whatsoever. While Rhode Island prevents alcohol abusers from obtaining these permits, only 28 States have such a standard in place.

The commonsense provisions of Rhode Island State law and the laws of similarly situated States prevent dangerous individuals from carrying loaded concealed weapons. Such protections would be completely undermined by this law. This bill is a clear and undeniable threat to public safety and will facilitate a new path that allows more and potentially dangerous individuals to carry concealed loaded guns within our borders and against our will. This must not be allowed.

Because this bill presents such an indisputable threat to public safety in many States, I have introduced this amendment which would require that, at the very least, prior to granting reciprocity in a State, the attorney general, the head of a State police, and the secretary of State jointly certify that the laws of a nonresident permit holder State are substantially similar to its own. This would provide States an opportunity to preserve adherence to their core requirements that restrict concealed-carry weapons but not allow them to deny permits from States that match their standards. It would, at a minimum, ensure that we respect the decisions and judgments made by local and State governments on this key public safety issue.

The certification process will not be burdensome to States. In fact, some States, including South Dakota and Nebraska, already incorporate this type of process in determining eligibility for engaging in reciprocity agreements with other States.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and protect the citizens of this country from the imposition of dangerously lax standards for the carrying of concealed weapons in direct contradiction to the decision of local and State governments charged with protecting the lives and safety of their citizens.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is one of three amendments under consideration today that would allow the States to opt out of the nationwide concealed-carry system that H.R. 822 seeks to establish. This undermines the bill's goal of creating national uniformity in our concealed-carry laws.

This amendment provides that every State attorney general, head of police, and secretary of State must certify that the concealed-carry eligibility laws of every other State are substantially similar to their own before the State can participate in this legislation's grant of reciprocity. This is obviously intended to be overly burdensome both to those with concealed-carry permits and to the States themselves. It is also simply a way for State officials who do not support the Second Amendment right to bear arms to decide that their State will not recognize out-of-State concealed-carry permits.

The amendment also incorrectly assumes that there are critical differences between the States' eligibility requirements, which is simply not the case. Each State has a vested interest in making sure that those with a propensity towards violence are not granted a concealed-carry permit. Every State conducts a thorough background check so that unqualified individuals will not be able to carry a concealed firearm. The eligibility standards used by the States are more similar than not. The fact that there may be small differences among the States' eligibility laws should not allow a State to prohibit the exercise of Second Amendment rights within its boundaries.

Also, Federal and State laws governing the purchase of a firearm must be complied with before a person can even apply for a concealed-carry permit. In order to purchase a firearm or take advantage of the reciprocity extended by H.R. 822, a person convicted of a felony or a domestic violence misdemeanor cannot legally purchase a firearm under Federal law. A person must also be cleared through the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Instant Criminal Background Check System, or NICS, before they can purchase a firearm.

Data from the FBI's annual Uniform Crime Report show that right-to-carry States, those that widely allow concealed-carry permits, have 22 percent lower total violent crime rates, 30 percent lower murder rates, 46 percent lower robbery rates, and 12 percent lower aggravated assault rates as compared to the rest of the country. This amendment allows the current patchwork of concealed-carry laws to continue and ignores the right to bear arms guaranteed by the Second Amendment.

For those reasons, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Rhode Island has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. CICILLINE. Just very quickly, the purpose is not, of course, to overly burden State governments but, instead, to respect the judgments and decisions they've made in weighing the equities and making determinations as to what is the right criteria, to give respect to the duly elected officials in States who have made those judgments. It happens in South Dakota. It happens in Nebraska. It's not unduly burdensome. It's really about respecting the people in State government and in local governments who have the responsibility to protect the public health, safety, and well-being of residents of States.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if you respect and support the full right of individuals to enjoy the rights under the Second Amendment to the Constitution to bear arms, you will oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 112-283.

Mr. REICHERT. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:
SEC. ____ GAO STUDY OF THE ABILITY OF STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TO VERIFY THE VALIDITY OF OUT-OF-STATE CONCEALED FIREARMS PERMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the ability of State and local law enforcement authorities to verify the validity of licenses or permits, issued by other States, to carry a concealed firearm.

(b) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a written report which contains the results of the study required by subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Today we are considering a national reciprocity law for firearms licenses and permits. I have always supported Second Amendment rights for people to carry and keep firearms.

I come at this from a little bit of a different perspective. I was a police officer for 33 years. I worked the streets for 6 years in a patrol car, SWAT commander, hostage negotiator. I have had guns pointed at me. I have looked down the barrel of a shotgun. I have looked down the barrel of a rifle. I have heard the shots fly by. I have been at the other end of the gun, too. Fortunately, I have not had to fire at anyone, but in protection of the people in my community, I have experienced being at both ends of a firearm.

So I understand and I get the concerns of cops, my brothers and sisters in law enforcement. What we want to make sure today is that those law enforcement officers across this country that protect us—and they're protecting us while we're in the Capitol today—are equipped and prepared to enforce this law.

I have a concern, so my amendment would require that the GAO look into whether or not law enforcement officers are able and have the ability to verify the validity of out-of-State concealed firearms permits and licenses. Within 1 year of enactment, the results of this study will be reported to the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Our State and local law enforcement across this country every day put their lives on the line. They put the badge on. They put their uniforms on. They walk out into the street. They go out in their patrol cars and are putting their lives on the line. It's a risk and responsibility that they will gladly accept. They want to come home safely, of course, to their families, but they know the risks when they leave their home. They know the risks when they put on the badge. We owe it to them to ensure the underlying bill does not create any unintended consequences or additional safety concerns.

□ 1610

Right now it is unclear whether every cop in every jurisdiction across this Nation can efficiently determine the validity of concealed-firearms permits. Each State decides how best to store that information and have access to its own concealed-carry permit information, but maybe not that of other States.

Only 12 States right now are participating in a program that allows electronic access to a joint concealed-carry database. In the remaining 38 States, law enforcement officers are required to contact appropriate local officials over the phone or by email. This method is not timely enough and not effective. We must understand how long it takes for law enforcement officers to determine whether or not a State concealed-carry permit is legitimate or fraudulent. This is critical to both the

safety of the cops patrolling our neighborhoods and protecting the rights of law-abiding citizens.

This GAO study will help us better understand the impact of national reciprocity for concealed firearms on our Nation's law enforcement and their ability to effectively enforce the law. We must pass this amendment to ensure that our cops have the adequate tools to enforce this law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I merely wanted to ask our distinguished colleague from Washington if I understood correctly that the GAO would conduct a study about the ability of the State and local law enforcement to verify the validity of out-of-state concealment after this bill is passed?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The question is whether or not this study is tied to the passage of the bill. No, the study is not tied to the passage of the bill. The study will begin upon passage of the bill, and the report must be filed before 1 year is up.

Mr. CONYERS. I see. Could I ask the gentleman why we wouldn't conduct the study in front of the bill rather than after the bill?

Mr. REICHERT. The way that this amendment is presented, it's presented allowing the study to go on as law enforcement encounters this new law and will then know what challenges they face as they look to enforce the law. We won't know all of those things until the law is in place.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, may I suggest that perhaps our responsibility as Federal legislators might be to determine the impact of this proposal on public safety before we pass it, not years later after we pass it.

Would the gentleman concede that that might be the more appropriate path that we normally take?

Mr. REICHERT. Yes, sir. That is what my amendment is intended to do, to gather that information so we can appropriately revise the current policies that may exist in police departments across the country and sheriff's offices across the country.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington, a former sheriff himself, for yielding me time; and I appreciate his offering this amendment, which requests a study by the Government Ac-

countability Office on the ability of State and local law enforcement agencies to verify the validity of non-resident concealed-carry permits.

The study requested by the gentleman's amendment will provide additional assurance that nonresident permit information can be verified by law enforcement officers across the country.

I urge my colleagues to support his amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 112-283 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. WOODALL of Georgia.

Amendment No. 2 by Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment No. 4 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 8 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 140, noes 283, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 843]

AYES—140

Ackerman	Carnahan	Cummings
Akin	Carney	Davis (CA)
Amash	Carson (IN)	Deutch
Andrews	Castor (FL)	Dicks
Baca	Chu	Doggett
Baldwin	Cicilline	Dold
Becerra	Clarke (MI)	Doyle
Berman	Clarke (NY)	Edwards
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Ellison
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Engel
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bralley (IA)	Cohen	Farr
Broun (GA)	Connelly (VA)	Fattah
Butterfield	Conyers	Filner
Capuano	Crowley	Frank (MA)

Fudge	Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman (NJ)
Garamendi	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Gerlach	Lungren, Daniel E.	Sánchez, Linda T.
Gohmert	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Gonzalez	Maloney	Schakowsky
Green, Al	Markey	Schiff
Grijalva	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)
Hahn	McCollum	Scott, David
Hanabusa	McDermott	Serrano
Harris	McGovern	Sewell
Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Sherman
Hinchee	Meehan	Sires
Hinojosa	Miller (NC)	Smith (WA)
Hirono	Miller, George	Stutzman
Holt	Moore	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Moran	Thompson (MS)
Insee	Nadler	Tierney
Israel	Neal	Tonko
Jackson (IL)	Oliver	Towns
Jackson Lee	Pallone	Tsongas
(TX)	Pascrell	Van Hollen
Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Velázquez
Johnson, E. B.	Payne	Vislosky
Keating	Pelosi	Walsh (IL)
Kildee	Perlmutter	Wasserman
King (IA)	Pingree (ME)	Schultz
King (NY)	Polis	Watt
Kucinich	Price (NC)	Waxman
Langevin	Quigley	Welch
Levin	Rangel	Wilson (FL)
Lewis (GA)	Reyes	Woodall
Lipinski	Richardson	Yarmuth
Loeb sack		

NOES—283

Adams	DeGette	Hurt
Aderholt	DeLauro	Issa
Alexander	Denham	Jenkins
Altmire	Dent	Johnson (IL)
Amodel	DesJarlais	Johnson (OH)
Austria	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Bachus	Dingell	Jones
Barletta	Donnelly (IN)	Jordan
Barrow	Dreier	Kelly
Bartlett	Duffy	Kind
Barton (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Kingston
Bass (CA)	Duncan (TN)	Kinzinger (IL)
Bass (NH)	Ellmers	Kissell
Benishek	Emerson	Kline
Berg	Farenthold	Labrador
Berkley	Fincher	Lamborn
Biggart	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Bilbray	Flake	Landry
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Lankford
Bishop (GA)	Fleming	Larsen (WA)
Black	Flores	Larson (CT)
Blackburn	Forbes	Latham
Bonner	Fortenberry	LaTourette
Bono Mack	Fox	Latta
Boren	Franks (AZ)	Lee (CA)
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Boustany	Galleghy	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Garrett	Long
Brooks	Gibbs	Lucas
Brown (FL)	Gibson	Luetkemeyer
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Luján
Bucshon	Goodlatte	Lummis
Buerkle	Gosar	Mack
Burton (IN)	Gowdy	Manzullo
Calvert	Granger	Marchant
Camp	Graves (GA)	Marino
Campbell	Graves (MO)	Matheson
Canseco	Green, Gene	Matsui
Cantor	Griffin (AR)	McCarthy (CA)
Capito	Griffith (VA)	McCaul
Capps	Grimm	McClintock
Cardoza	Guinta	McCotter
Carter	Guthrie	McHenry
Cassidy	Gutierrez	McIntyre
Chabot	Hall	McKeon
Chaffetz	Hanna	McKinley
Chandler	Harper	McMorris
Coble	Hartzler	Rodgers
Coffman (CO)	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Cole	Hayworth	Michaud
Conaway	Heck	Miller (FL)
Cooper	Heinrich	Miller (MI)
Costa	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Costello	Herger	Mulvaney
Courtney	Herrera Beutler	Murphy (CT)
Cravaack	Higgins	Murphy (PA)
Crawford	Himes	Myrick
Crenshaw	Hochul	Napolitano
Critz	Holden	Neugebauer
Cuellar	Honda	Noem
Culberson	Huelskamp	Nugent
Davis (IL)	Huizenga (MI)	Nunes
Davis (KY)	Hultgren	Nunnelee
DeFazio	Hunter	Olson

Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Bishop (UT)
Burgess
Gardner

Giffords
Kaptur
Meeks
Paul

Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walz (MN)
Waters
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woolsey
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

□ 1644

Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Messrs. CANTOR, HONDA, and WESTMORELAND changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. JACKSON of Illinois, CLYBURN, BRADY of Pennsylvania, CARNEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. TIERNEY, VAN HOLLEN, OLVER, KING of New York, SHERMAN, BLUMENAUER, FARR, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, GEORGE MILLER of California, WAXMAN, PERLMUTTER, KEATING, ISRAEL, Ms. LORRETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. TSONGAS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. MCCARTHY OF NEW YORK

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. CAPITO). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 147, noes 274, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 844]

AYES—147

Ackerman
Amash
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Ciilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez

NOES—274

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter

Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Brady (PA)
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
King (NY)
Kucinich
Lungwin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Loeb
Loeb
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Pallone
Pascrell

Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Rush

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann
Bishop (UT)
Ellison
Gardner

Giffords
Kaptur
Kind
Lynch

Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sevell
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1648

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 148, noes 277, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 845]

AYES—148

Ackerman
Andrews

Baldwin
Bass (CA)

Becerra
Berman

Bishop (NY)	Hanabusa	Pelosi	Labrador	Nugent	Schock	Clarke (MI)	Israel	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Perlmutter	Lamborn	Nunes	Schrader	Clarke (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Brady (PA)	Himes	Peters	Lance	Nunnelee	Schweikert	Clay	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Braley (IA)	Hinojosa	Pingree (ME)	Landry	Olson	Scott (SC)	Cleaver	(TX)	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Hirono	Polis	Lankford	Owens	Scott, Austin	Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Butterfield	Holt	Price (NC)	Larsen (WA)	Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Cohen	Keating	Rothman (NJ)
Capps	Honda	Quigley	Latham	Paulsen	Sessions	Cannolly (VA)	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Hoyer	Rangel	LaTourette	Pearce	Sewell	Conyers	Kucinich	Rush
Carnahan	Inslee	Reyes	Latta	Pence	Shuler	Crowley	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Carney	Israel	Richmond	Lewis (CA)	Peterson	Shuster	Cummings	Larson (CT)	T.
Carson (IN)	Jackson (IL)	Rothman (NJ)	Lipinski	Petri	Simpson	Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard	LoBiondo	Pitts	Smith (NE)	Davis (IL)	Levin	Levin
Chu	(TX)	Roybal-Allard	Long	Platts	Smith (NJ)	DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger	Lucas	Pompeo	Smith (TX)	DeLauro	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Clarke (MI)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda	Luetkemeyer	Posey	Southerland	Deutch	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Keating	T.	Luján	Price (GA)	Stearns	Dicks	Lowey	Schwartz
Clay	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta	Lummis	Quayle	Stivers	Doggett	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Kucinich	Sarbanes	Lungren, Daniel	Rahall	Sutzman	Dold	Maloney	Scott, David
Clyburn	Langevin	Schakowsky	E.	Reed	Sullivan	Doyle	Markey	Serrano
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Schiff	Mack	Rehberg	Terry	Edwards	Matsui	Sewell
Connolly (VA)	Lee (CA)	Schwartz	Manzullo	Reichert	Thompson (PA)	Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Conyers	Levin	Scott (VA)	Marchant	Renacci	Thornberry	Engel	McCollum	Sires
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Scott, David	Marino	Ribble	Tiberi	Eshoo	McDermott	Slaughter
Cummings	Loebback	Serrano	Matheson	Richardson	Tipton	Farr	McGovern	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Sherman	McCarthy (CA)	Rigell	Turner (NY)	Fattah	Meeks	Stark
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Sires	McCaul	Rivera	Turner (OH)	Filner	Miller (NC)	Sutton
DeFazio	Lynch	Slaughter	McClintock	Roby	Upton	Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Maloney	Smith (VA)	McCotter	Roe (TN)	Walberg	Fudge	Moore	Tierney
DeLauro	Markey	Speier	McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Walden	Garamendi	Moran	Tonko
Deutch	Matsui	Stark	McIntyre	Rogers (KY)	Walsh (IL)	Green, Al	Murphy (CT)	Towns
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton	McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Walz (MN)	Grijalva	Nadler	Towns
Doggett	McCollum	Thompson (CA)	McKinley	Rohrabacher	Webster	Gutierrez	Napolitano	Tsongas
Dold	McDermott	Thompson (MS)	McMorris	Rokita	Welch	Hahn	Neal	Van Hollen
Doyle	McGovern	Tierney	Rodgers	Rooney	West	Hanabusa	Oliver	Velázquez
Edwards	McNerney	Tonko	Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland	Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Vislосky
Ellison	Meeks	Towns	Mica	Roskam	Whitfield	Himes	Pascrell	Wasserman
Engel	Miller (NC)	Tsongas	Michaud	Ross (AR)	Wilson (SC)	Hinojosa	Pastor (AZ)	Schultz
Eshoo	Miller, George	Van Hollen	Miller (FL)	Ross (FL)	Wittman	Hirono	Payne	Watt
Farr	Moore	Velázquez	Miller (MI)	Royce	Wolf	Holt	Pelosi	Waxman
Fattah	Moran	Vislосky	Miller, Gary	Runyan	Womack	Honda	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)
Filner	Murphy (CT)	Wasserman	Mulvaney	Rush	Woodall	Hoyer	Peters	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Schultz	Murphy (PA)	Ryan (OH)	Yoder	Inslee	Pingree (ME)	Yarmuth
Fudge	Napolitano	Neal	Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)			
Garamendi	Neal	Oliver	Waters	Scalise	Young (FL)			
Gonzalez	Oliver	Pallone	Watt	Schilling	Young (IN)			
Green, Al	Pallone	Pascrell	Waxman					
Grijalva	Pascrell	Pastor (AZ)	Wilson (FL)					
Gutierrez	Pastor (AZ)	Payne	Woolsey					
Hahn	Payne		Yarmuth					

NOES—277

Adams	Chaffetz	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Chandler	Gosar
Akin	Coble	Gowdy
Alexander	Coffman (CO)	Granger
Altmire	Cole	Graves (GA)
Amash	Conaway	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Cooper	Green, Gene
Austria	Costa	Griffin (AR)
Baca	Costello	Griffith (VA)
Bachus	Courtney	Grimm
Barletta	Cravaack	Guinta
Barrow	Crawford	Guthrie
Bartlett	Crenshaw	Hall
Barton (TX)	Critz	Hanna
Bass (NH)	Cuellar	Harper
Benishek	Culberson	Harris
Berg	Davis (KY)	Hartzler
Berkley	Denham	Hastings (WA)
Biggart	Dent	Hayworth
Billbray	DesJarlais	Heck
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Heinrich
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Hensarling
Bishop (UT)	Donnelly (IN)	Herrger
Black	Dreier	Herrera Beutler
Blackburn	Duffy	Higgins
Bonner	Duncan (SC)	Hinchev
Bono Mack	Duncan (TN)	Hochul
Boren	Ellmers	Holden
Boswell	Emerson	Huelskamp
Boustany	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Hultgren
Brooks	Fitzpatrick	Hunter
Broun (GA)	Flake	Hurt
Buchanan	Fleischmann	Issa
Bucshon	Fleming	Jenkins
Buerkle	Flores	Johnson (IL)
Burgess	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
Burton (IN)	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Fox	Jones
Camp	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Campbell	Frelinghuysen	Kelly
Canseco	Gallely	Kind
Cantor	Garrett	King (IA)
Capito	Gerlach	King (NY)
Cardoza	Gibbs	Kingston
Carter	Gibson	Kinzinger (IL)
Cassidy	Gingrey (GA)	Kissell
Chabot	Gohmert	Kline

Labrador	Nugent	Schock	Clarke (MI)	Israel	Price (NC)
Lamborn	Nunes	Schrader	Clarke (NY)	Jackson (IL)	Quigley
Lance	Nunnelee	Schweikert	Clay	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Landry	Olson	Scott (SC)	Cleaver	(TX)	Richardson
Lankford	Owens	Scott, Austin	Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Larsen (WA)	Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Cohen	Keating	Rothman (NJ)
Latham	Paulsen	Sessions	Cannolly (VA)	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
LaTourette	Pearce	Sewell	Conyers	Kucinich	Rush
Latta	Pence	Shuler	Crowley	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Lewis (CA)	Peterson	Shuster	Cummings	Larson (CT)	T.
Lipinski	Petri	Simpson	Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Sanchez, Loretta
LoBiondo	Pitts	Smith (NE)	Davis (IL)	Levin	Levin
Long	Platts	Smith (NJ)	DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes
Lucas	Pompeo	Smith (TX)	DeLauro	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Luetkemeyer	Posey	Southerland	Deutch	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff
Luján	Price (GA)	Stearns	Dicks	Lowey	Schwartz
Lummis	Quayle	Stivers	Doggett	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Lungren, Daniel	Rahall	Sutzman	Dold	Maloney	Scott, David
E.	Reed	Sullivan	Doyle	Markey	Serrano
Mack	Rehberg	Terry	Edwards	Matsui	Sewell
Manzullo	Reichert	Thompson (PA)	Ellison	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman
Marchant	Renacci	Thornberry	Engel	McCollum	Sires
Marino	Ribble	Tiberi	Eshoo	McDermott	Slaughter
Matheson	Richardson	Tipton	Farr	McGovern	Speier
McCarthy (CA)	Rigell	Turner (NY)	Fattah	Meeks	Stark
McCaul	Rivera	Turner (OH)	Filner	Miller (NC)	Sutton
McClintock	Roby	Upton	Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
McCotter	Roe (TN)	Walberg	Fudge	Moore	Tierney
McHenry	Rogers (AL)	Walden	Garamendi	Moran	Tonko
McIntyre	Rogers (KY)	Walsh (IL)	Green, Al	Murphy (CT)	Towns
McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Walz (MN)	Grijalva	Nadler	Towns
McKinley	Rohrabacher	Webster	Gutierrez	Napolitano	Tsongas
McMorris	Rokita	Welch	Hahn	Neal	Van Hollen
Rodgers	Rooney	West	Hanabusa	Oliver	Velázquez
Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland	Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Vislосky
Mica	Roskam	Whitfield	Himes	Pascrell	Wasserman
Michaud	Ross (AR)	Wilson (SC)	Hinojosa	Pastor (AZ)	Schultz
Miller (FL)	Ross (FL)	Wittman	Hirono	Payne	Watt
Miller (MI)	Royce	Wolf	Holt	Pelosi	Waxman
Miller, Gary	Runyan	Womack	Honda	Perlmutter	Wilson (FL)
Mulvaney	Rush	Woodall	Hoyer	Peters	Woolsey
Murphy (PA)	Ryan (OH)	Yoder	Inslee	Pingree (ME)	Yarmuth
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)			
Neugebauer	Scalise	Young (FL)			
Noem	Schilling	Young (IN)			

NOT VOTING—8

Bachmann
Gardner
Giffords

Kaptur
Paul
Poe (TX)

Schmidt
Shimkus

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway

Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallely
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herrger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinchev
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline

Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallely
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta

Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herrger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hinchev
Hochul
Dingell
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallely
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta

□ 1654

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON
LEE) on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 139, noes 284,
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 846]

AYES—139

Ackerman	Bishop (NY)	Capps
Andrews	Blumenauer	Capuano
Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Carnahan
Bass (CA)	Braley (IA)	Castor (FL)
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Chu
Berman	Butterfield	Cicilline

NOES—284

Adams	Cooper	Guthrie
Aderholt	Costa	Hall
Akin	Costello	Hanna
Alexander	Courtney	Harper
Altmire	Cravaack	Harris
Amash	Crawford	Hartzler
Amodei	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Austria	Critz	Hayworth
Baca	Cuellar	Heck
Bachus	Culberson	Heinrich
Barletta	Davis (KY)	Hensarling
Barrow	DeFazio	Herrger
Bartlett	Denham	Herrera Beutler
Barton (TX)	Dent	Higgins
Bass (NH)	DesJarlais	Hinchev
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Hochul
Berg	Dingell	Holden
Berkley	Donnelly (IN)	Huelskamp
Biggart	Dreier	Huizenga (MI)
Bilirakis	Duffy	Hultgren
Bishop (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Hurt
Black	Ellmers	Issa
Blackburn	Emerson	Jenkins
Bonner	Farenthold	Johnson (IL)
Bono Mack	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Boren	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, E. B.
Boswell	Flake	Johnson, Sam
Boustany	Fleischmann	Jones
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Jordan
Brooks	Flores	Kelly
Broun (GA)	Forbes	Kind
Buchanan	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Bucshon	Foxy	King (NY)
Buerkle	Franks (AZ)	Kingston
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Kinzinger (IL)
Burton (IN)	Gallely	Kissell
Calvert	Garrett	Kline
Camp	Gerlach	Labrador
Campbell	Gibbs	Lamborn
Canseco	Gibson	Lance
Cantor	Gingrey (GA)	Landry
Capito	Gohmert	Lankford
Cardoza	Gonzalez	Larsen (WA)
Carney	Goodlatte	Latham
Carson (IN)	Gosar	LaTourette
Carter	Gowdy	Latta
Cassidy	Granger	Lewis (CA)
Chabot	Graves (GA)	LoBiondo
Chaffetz	Graves (MO)	Loebback
Chandler	Green, Gene	Long
Coble	Griffin (AR)	Lucas
Coffman (CO)	Griffith (VA)	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Grimm	Luján
Conaway	Guinta	Lummis

Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts

Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Whitfield
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—10

Bachmann
Bilbray
Gardner
Giffords

Kaptur
Paul
Schmidt
Shimkus

Waters
Woodall

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1657

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF
GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 144, noes 281,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 847]

AYES—144

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)

Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)

Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)

Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Finer
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Insee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)

NOES—281

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello

Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreyer
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeke
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel

Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

Hastings (WA)

Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb
Loeback
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul

McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pitts

Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shuler

NOT VOTING—8

Bachmann
Gardner
Giffords

Gohmert
Kaptur
Paul

Schmidt
Shimkus

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1701

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the noes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 150, noes 276,
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 848]

AYES—150

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano

Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Crowley

Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Dold
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo

Farr	Loeb sack	Roybal-Allard	Myrick	Roe (TN)	Southerland	Keating	Napolitano	Schiff
Fattah	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger	Neugebauer	Rogers (AL)	Stearns	Kildee	Neal	Scott (VA)
Filner	Lowey	Rush	Noem	Rogers (KY)	Stivers	Kucinich	Olver	Serrano
Frank (MA)	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda	Nugent	Rogers (MI)	Stutzman	Langevin	Pallone	Sherman
Fudge	Maloney	T.	Nunes	Rohrabacher	Sullivan	Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Sires
Garamendi	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta	Nunnelee	Rokita	Terry	Lee (CA)	Pastor (AZ)	Slaughter
Gonzalez	Matsui	Sarbanes	Olson	Rooney	Thompson (PA)	Levin	Payne	Speier
Green, Al	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky	Owens	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry	Lewis (GA)	Pelosi	Stark
Grijalva	McCollum	Schiff	Palazzo	Roskam	Tiberi	Lofgren, Zoe	Peters	Sutton
Gutierrez	McDermott	Schwartz	Paulsen	Ross (AR)	Tipton	Lowey	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (MS)
Hahn	McGovern	Scott (VA)	Pearce	Ross (FL)	Turner (NY)	Lynch	Price (NC)	Tierney
Hanabusa	McNerney	Scott, David	Pence	Royce	Turner (OH)	Maloney	Quigley	Tonko
Hastings (FL)	Meeks	Serrano	Peterson	Runyan	Upton	Markey	Rangel	Towns
Himes	Miller (NC)	Sherman	Petri	Ryan (OH)	Walberg	Matsui	Richardson	Tsongas
Hinche y	Miller, George	Sires	Pitts	Ryan (WI)	Walden	McCarthy (NY)	Richmond	Van Hollen
Hinojosa	Moore	Slaughter	Platts	Scalise	Walsh (IL)	McCollum	Rothman (NJ)	Velázquez
Hirono	Moran	Speier	Poe (TX)	Schilling	Walz (MN)	McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Holt	Murphy (CT)	Stark	Polis	Schock	Webster	McGovern	Rush	Schultz
Honda	Nadler	Sutton	Pompeo	Schrader	Welch	Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Waters
Hoyer	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)	Posey	Schweikert	West	Miller (NC)	T.	Waxman
Inslee	Neal	Thompson (MS)	Price (GA)	Scott (SC)	Westmoreland	Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (FL)
Israel	Olver	Tierney	Quayle	Scott, Austin	Whitfield	Moran	Sarbanes	Woolsey
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Tonko	Rahall	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)	Nadler	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Jackson Lee	Pascarell	Towns	Reed	Sessions	Wittman			
(TX)	Pastor (AZ)	Tsongas	Rehberg	Sewell	Wolf			
Johnson (GA)	Payne	Van Hollen	Reichert	Shuler	Womack	Adams	NOES—299	King (IA)
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Velázquez	Renacci	Shuster	Woodall	Aderholt	Dingell	King (NY)
Keating	Perlmutter	Visclosky	Reyes	Simpson	Yoder	Akin	Dold	Kingston
Kildee	Peters	Wasserman	Ribble	Smith (NE)	Young (AK)	Alexander	Donnelly (IN)	Kinzing er (IL)
Kucinich	Pingree (ME)	Schultz	Rigell	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)	Duffy	Dreier	Kissell
Langevin	Price (NC)	Waters	Riverra	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)	Amash	Duncan (SC)	Kline
Larson (CT)	Quigley	Watt	Roby	Smith (WA)		Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Labrador
Lee (CA)	Rangel	Waxman				Austria	Ellmers	Lamborn
Levin	Richardson	Wilson (FL)				Baca	Emerson	Lance
Lewis (GA)	Richmond	Woolsey	Bachmann	Kaptur	Shimkus	Bachus	Farenthold	Landry
Lipinski	Rothman (NJ)	Yarmuth	Gardner	Paul		Baldwin	Fincher	Lankford
			Giffords	Schmidt		Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)

NOES—276

Adams	Cuellar	Huelskamp
Aderholt	Culberson	Huizenga (MI)
Akin	Davis (KY)	Hultgren
Alexander	Denham	Hunter
Altmire	Dent	Hurt
Amash	DesJarlais	Issa
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins
Austria	Dingell	Johnson (IL)
Baca	Donnelly (IN)	Johnson (OH)
Bachus	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Barletta	Duffy	Jones
Barrow	Duncan (SC)	Jordan
Bartlett	Duncan (TN)	Kelly
Barton (TX)	Ellmers	Kind
Bass (NH)	Emerson	King (IA)
Benishkek	Farenthold	King (NY)
Berg	Fincher	Kingston
Biggert	Fitzpatrick	Kinzing er (IL)
Bilbray	Flake	Kissell
Billirakis	Fleischmann	Kline
Bishop (GA)	Fleming	Labrador
Bishop (UT)	Flores	Lamborn
Black	Forbes	Lance
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Landry
Bonner	Fox	Lankford
Bono Mack	Franks (AZ)	Larsen (WA)
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Boswell	Gallely	LaTourette
Boustany	Garrett	Latta
Brady (TX)	Gerlach	Lewis (CA)
Brooks	Gibbs	LoBiondo
Broun (GA)	Gibson	Long
Buchanan	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas
Buchson	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Buerkle	Goodlatte	Luján
Burgess	Gosar	Lummis
Burton (IN)	Gowdy	Lungren, Daniel
Calvert	Granger	E.
Camp	Graves (GA)	Mack
Campbell	Graves (MO)	Manzullo
Canseco	Green, Gene	Marchant
Cantor	Griffin (AR)	Marino
Capito	Griffith (VA)	Matheson
Cardoza	Grimm	McCarthy (CA)
Carter	Guinta	McCaul
Cassidy	Guthrie	McClintock
Chabot	Hall	McCotter
Chaffetz	Hanna	McHenry
Chandler	Harper	McIntyre
Coble	Harris	McKeon
Coffman (CO)	Hartzler	McKinley
Cole	Hastings (WA)	McMorris
Conaway	Hayworth	Rodgers
Cooper	Heck	Meehan
Costa	Heinrich	Mica
Costello	Hensarling	Michaud
Courtney	Herger	Miller (FL)
Cravaack	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)
Crawford	Higgins	Miller, Gary
Crenshaw	Hochul	Mulvaney
Critz	Holden	Murphy (PA)

NOT VOTING—7

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 30 seconds remaining.

□ 1705

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON
LEE OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 123, noes 299, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 849]

AYES—123

Ackerman	Cohen	Filner
Bass (CA)	Connolly (VA)	Frank (MA)
Becerra	Conyers	Fudge
Berman	Crowley	Garamendi
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Green, Al
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Bradley (PA)	Davis (IL)	Hahn
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Hanabusa
Capps	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Capuano	Deutch	Hinojosa
Carnahan	Dicks	Hirono
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Holt
Chu	Doyle	Honda
Cicilline	Edwards	Hoyer
Clarke (MI)	Ellison	Israel
Clarke (NY)	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Clay	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Cleaver	Farr	(TX)
Clyburn	Fattah	Johnson (GA)

Adams	Dingell	King (IA)
Aderholt	Dold	King (NY)
Akin	Donnelly (IN)	Kingston
Alexander	Dreier	Kinzing er (IL)
Altmire	Duffy	Kissell
Amash	Duncan (SC)	Kline
Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Labrador
Austria	Ellmers	Lamborn
Baca	Emerson	Lance
Bachus	Farenthold	Landry
Baldwin	Fincher	Lankford
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Larsen (WA)
Barrow	Flake	Latham
Bartlett	Fleischmann	LaTourette
Bass (NH)	Fleming	Latta
Benishkek	Flores	Lewis (CA)
Berg	Forbes	Lipinski
Berkley	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Biggert	Fox	Loeb sack
Bilbray	Franks (AZ)	Long
Billirakis	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bishop (GA)	Gallely	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Luján
Black	Gerlach	Lummis
Blackburn	Gibbs	Lungren, Daniel
Bonner	Gibson	E.
Bono Mack	Gingrey (GA)	Mack
Boren	Gohmert	Manzullo
Boswell	Gonzalez	Marchant
Boustany	Goodlatte	Marino
Brady (TX)	Gosar	Matheson
Braley (IA)	Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)
Brooks	Granger	McCaul
Broun (GA)	Graves (GA)	McClintock
Buchanan	Graves (MO)	McCotter
Buchson	Green, Gene	McHenry
Buerkle	Griffin (AR)	McIntyre
Burgess	Griffith (VA)	McKeon
Burton (IN)	Grimm	McKinley
Calvert	Guinta	McNerney
Camp	Guthrie	Meehan
Campbell	Hall	Mica
Canseco	Hanna	Michaud
Cantor	Harper	Miller (FL)
Capito	Harris	Miller (MI)
Cardoza	Hartzler	Miller, Gary
Cardoza	Hastings (WA)	Moore
Carney	Hayworth	Mulvaney
Carson (IN)	Heck	Murphy (CT)
Carter	Heinrich	Murphy (PA)
Cassidy	Hensarling	Myrick
Chabot	Herger	Neugebauer
Chaffetz	Herrera Beutler	Noem
Chandler	Higgins	Nugent
Coble	Hirono	Nunes
Coffman (CO)	Hinche y	Nunnelee
Cole	Hochul	Olson
Conaway	Holden	Owens
Cooper	Huelskamp	Palazzo
Costa	Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen
Costello	Hultgren	Pearce
Courtney	Hunter	Pence
Cravaack	Hurt	Perlmutter
Crawford	Inslee	Peterson
Crenshaw	Issa	Petri
Critz	Jenkins	Pitts
	Cuellar	Johnson (IL)
	Culberson	Johnson (OH)
	Davis (KY)	Johnson, E. B.
	DeFazio	Johnson, Sam
	Denham	Jones
	Dent	Jordan
	DesJarlais	Kelly
	Diaz-Balart	Kind

Reed	Schilling	Thornberry	Lewis (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Sherman	Rigell	Schrader	Tiberi
Rehberg	Schock	Tiberi	Lipinski	Payne	Sires	Rivera	Schweikert	Tipton
Reichert	Schrader	Tipton	Loeb	Pelosi	Slaughter	Roby	Scott (SC)	Turner (NY)
Renaacci	Schwartz	Turner (NY)	Lofgren, Zoe	Peters	Speier	Roe (TN)	Scott, Austin	Turner (OH)
Reyes	Schweikert	Turner (OH)	Lowe	Pingree (ME)	Stark	Rogers (AL)	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Ribble	Scott (SC)	Upton	Lynch	Price (NC)	Sutton	Rogers (KY)	Sessions	Walberg
Rigell	Scott, Austin	Vislosky	Maloney	Quigley	Thompson (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Sewell	Walden
Rivera	Scott, David	Walberg	Markey	Rangel	Thompson (MS)	Rohrabacher	Shuler	Walsh (IL)
Roby	Sensenbrenner	Walden	Matsui	Reyes	Tierney	Rokita	Shuster	Walz (MN)
Roe (TN)	Sessions	Walsh (IL)	McCarthy (NY)	Richardson	Tonko	Rooney	Simpson	Webster
Rogers (AL)	Sewell	Walz (MN)	McCollum	Richmond	Towns	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NE)	West
Rogers (KY)	Shuler	Watt	McDermott	Rothman (NJ)	Tsongas	Roskam	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland
Rogers (MI)	Shuster	Webster	McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen	Ross (AR)	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Simpson	Welch	McNerney	Ruppersberger	Velázquez	Ross (FL)	Southerland	Wittman
Rokita	Smith (NE)	West	Meeks	Rush	Visclosky	Royce	Stearns	Wolf
Rooney	Smith (NJ)	Westmoreland	Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Linda	Wasserman	Runyan	Stivers	Womack
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Whitfield	Miller, George	T.	Schultz	Ryan (OH)	Stutzman	Woodall
Roskam	Smith (WA)	Wilson (SC)	Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Walters	Ryan (WI)	Sullivan	Yoder
Ross (AR)	Southerland	Wittman	Moran	Sarbanes	Schakowsky	Scalise	Terry	Young (AK)
Ross (FL)	Stearns	Wolf	Nadler	Schakowsky	Schiff	Schilling	Thompson (PA)	Young (FL)
Royce	Stivers	Womack	Napolitano	Schwartz	Schwartz	Schock	Thornberry	Young (IN)
Runyan	Stutzman	Woodall	Neal	Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)	NOT VOTING—10		
Ruppersberger	Sullivan	Yoder	Olver	Scott, David	Woolsey	Bachmann	Kaptur	Smith (WA)
Ryan (OH)	Terry	Young (AK)	Pallone	Serrano	Yarmuth	Gardner	Paul	Wilson (SC)
Ryan (WI)	Thompson (CA)	Young (FL)	Pascrell				Giffords	Schmidt
Scalise	Thompson (PA)	Young (IN)	NOES—277			Hinojosa	Shimkus	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Gutierrez	Schmidt
Bachmann	Kaptur	Shimkus
Barton (TX)	McMorris	
Gardner	Rodgers	
Giffords	Paul	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1708

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 277, not voting 10, as follows:

Roll No. 850

AYES—146

Ackerman	Cohen	Green, Al
Andrews	Connolly (VA)	Grijalva
Baldwin	Conyers	Gutierrez
Bass (CA)	Crowley	Hahn
Becerra	Cummings	Hanabusa
Berman	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (NY)	Davis (IL)	Himes
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hirono
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Holt
Bralley (IA)	Deutch	Honda
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Hoyer
Butterfield	Doggett	Inslee
Capps	Dold	Israel
Capuano	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Carnahan	Edwards	Jackson Lee
Carney	Ellison	(TX)
Carson (IN)	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Chu	Farr	Keating
Ciulline	Fattah	Kildee
Clarke (MI)	Filner	Kucinich
Clarke (NY)	Frank (MA)	Langevin
Clay	Fudge	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Garamendi	Lee (CA)
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Levin
		Adams
		Aderholt
		Akin
		Alexander
		Altmire
		Amash
		Amodei
		Austria
		Baca
		Bachus
		Barletta
		Barrow
		Bartlett
		Barton (TX)
		Bass (NH)
		Benishek
		Berg
		Berkley
		Biggart
		Bilbray
		Bilirakis
		Bishop (GA)
		Bishop (UT)
		Black
		Blackburn
		Bonner
		Bono Mack
		Boren
		Boswell
		Boustany
		Brady (TX)
		Brooks
		Broun (GA)
		Buchanan
		Bucshon
		Buerkle
		Burgess
		Burton (IN)
		Calvert
		Camp
		Campbell
		Canseco
		Cantor
		Capito
		Cardoza
		Carter
		Cassidy
		Chabot
		Chaffetz
		Chandler
		Coble
		Coffman (CO)
		Cole
		Conaway
		Cooper
		Costa
		Costello
		Courtney
		Cravack
		Crawford
		Crenshaw
		Critz
		Cuellar
		Culberson
		Davis (KY)
		DeFazio
		Denham
		Dent
		DesJarlais
		Diaz-Balart
		Dingell
		Donnelly (IN)
		Dreier
		Duffy
		Duncan (SC)
		Duncan (TN)
		Elmiers
		Emerson
		Farenthold
		Fincher
		Fitzpatrick
		Flake
		Fleischmann
		Fleming
		Flores
		Forbes
		Fortenberry
		Fox
		Franks (AZ)
		Frelinghuysen
		Gallely
		Garrett
		Gerlach
		Gibbs
		Gibson
		Gingrey (GA)
		Gohmert
		Goodlatte
		Gosar
		Gowdy
		Granger
		Graves (GA)
		Graves (MO)
		Green, Gene
		Griffin (AR)
		Griffith (VA)
		Grimm
		Guinta
		Guthrie
		Hall
		Hanna
		Harper
		Harris
		Hartzler
		Hastings (WA)
		Hayworth
		Heck
		Heinrich
		Hensarling
		Herger
		Herrera Beutler
		Higgins
		Hinche
		Hochul
		Holden
		Huelskamp
		Huizenga (MI)
		Hultgren
		Hunter
		Hurt
		Issa
		Jenkins
		Johnson (IL)
		Johnson (OH)
		Johnson, Sam
		Jones
		Jordan
		Kelly
		Kind
		King (IA)
		King (NY)
		Kingston
		Kinzinger (IL)
		Kissell
		Kline
		Labrador
		Lamborn
		Lance
		Landry
		Lankford
		Larsen (WA)
		Latham
		LaTourette
		Latta
		Lewis (CA)
		LoBiondo
		Long
		Lucas
		Luetkemeyer
		Luján
		Lummis
		Lungren, Daniel
		E.
		Mack
		Manzullo
		Marchant
		Marino
		Matheson
		McCarthy (CA)
		McCaul
		McClintock
		McCotter
		McHenry
		McIntyre
		McKeon
		McKinley
		McMorris
		Rodgers
		Meehan
		Mica
		Michaud
		Miller (FL)
		Miller (MI)
		Miller, Gary
		Mulvaney
		Murphy (CT)
		Murphy (PA)
		Myrick
		Neugebauer
		Noem
		Nugent
		Nunes
		Nunnelee
		Olson
		Owens
		Palazzo
		Paulsen
		Pearce
		Pence
		Perlmutter
		Peterson
		Petri
		Pitts
		Platts
		Poe (TX)
		Polis
		Pompeo
		Posey
		Price (GA)
		Quayle
		Rahall
		Reed
		Rehberg
		Reichert
		Renacci
		Ribble

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WESTMORELAND) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1712

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to. The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) having assumed the chair, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 822) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State, and, pursuant to House Resolution 463, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the 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. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CICILLINE. I am opposed. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cicilline moves to recommit the bill H.R. 822 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 5, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . LIMITATIONS ON RECIPROcity FOR CHILD SEX OFFENDERS, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OFFENDERS, AND KNOWN OR SUSPECTED TERRORISTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2 of this Act shall not apply to a person—

(1) who has been convicted in any court of a sex offense against a minor;

(2) who has been subject within the past 10 years to a court order which restrained the person from harassing, stalking, or threatening a spouse, family member, an intimate partner, or a child of an intimate partner; or

(3) whom the Attorney General determines is known or reasonably suspected to be or have been engaged in conduct constituting, in preparation for, in aid of, or related to terrorism.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In subsection (a):

(1) INTIMATE PARTNER.—The term “intimate partner” has the meaning given that term in section 921(a)(32) of title 18, United States Code.

(2) TERRORISM.—The term “terrorism” means international terrorism (as defined in section 2331(1) of title 18, United States Code) and domestic terrorism (as defined in section 2331(5) of such title).

Mr. GOWDY (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, with nearly 14 million unemployed Americans and our Nation's economy continuing to struggle, it is disheartening that we stand here today divided, engaging in heated debate about expanding the ability of people to carry concealed weapons and ignoring the most important issue confronting our country, the jobs crisis. We're debating an effort to undermine the ability of States to protect residents from the scourge of gun violence, and we have before us a bill that will effectively preclude States from limiting who can carry a concealed weapon within its borders and for what purpose.

While many of my colleagues and I are seriously opposed to the passage of the underlying bill, there still remains an opportunity for us to find common ground. There's a chance for us to unite around a reasonable and commonsense amendment which would prevent the privileges in this bill from being extended to some of the most dangerous individuals into in our society, individuals who have or intend to inflict great harm upon our communities and our Nation.

Let me be clear, this is the final amendment, and passage of this amendment will not kill the bill. It will be incorporated into the final language and be immediately voted upon.

While many of us may disagree with the underlying intent of this bill, it's

hard to imagine anyone would disagree that there are certain individuals that should not be afforded the right to carry concealed, loaded weapons across State lines. It's hard to imagine that anyone would advocate for preserving a path for terrorists, child sex offenders, stalkers, and domestic abusers to transport a loaded gun into another State. Yet these glaring loopholes are present in the underlying bill. And if my amendment is not passed by this body, this dangerous and appalling pathway for violence will remain.

For far too long, terrorism has inspired fear in our country and threatened the happiness and safety of our citizens. While we continue to live in a world that requires constant vigilance and full awareness of the danger of future terrorist attacks, there is not a single provision in H.R. 822 that would prevent suspected or known terrorists who acquire concealed-carry permits in one State with lax regulations from carrying that same concealed loaded weapon into another State with more stringent regulations.

In addition, many current States' concealed-carry laws do not sufficiently protect victims of domestic violence. A 2007 investigation found that Florida's licensing system had granted concealed-carry permits to more than 1,400 people who had pleaded guilty or no contest to a felony, 128 people with active domestic violence injunctions, and six registered sex offenders.

In fact, in 2010 Gerardo Regalado, a man who had a record of violent behavior against women, was able to obtain a concealed-handgun permit in Florida. He then went on to commit the worst mass killing in Hialeah, Florida's history when he killed his estranged wife and three other women at a local restaurant. H.R. 822 will force other States to recognize Florida's concealed-carry permits, the same permit held by Gerardo Regalado.

Finally, there are no protections in H.R. 822 to prevent individuals convicted of a sex offense against a minor from carrying a concealed loaded gun into a State whose requirements might have otherwise prevented that individual from acquiring a concealed-carry permit. Child sex offenders, individuals who create unimaginable lasting harm in our communities, should not be allowed to continue to perpetuate fear in the hearts of our children and families. H.R. 822 will force other States to recognize permits issued to these individuals who pose danger to our children. All too often, guns legally end up back in the hands of criminals, and nothing in this underlying bill would impede child sex offenders or domestic violence offenders from carrying their loaded concealed guns across State lines.

In the simplest of terms, my amendment would preclude child sex offenders, domestic violence offenders, and known or suspected terrorists from enjoying the privilege of concealed-carry reciprocity authorized in the under-

lying bill. We owe this commonsense amendment to our brave law enforcement officials and first responders, who bear the greatest responsibility in protecting us from terrorist attacks.

□ 1720

We owe this to our Nation's children, whose innocence is threatened by dangerous individuals who prey on them. We owe this to the victims of abuse, who deserve some consolation that the law will not send their abusers legally armed into another State to continue stalking, threatening, and perpetuating abuse.

Now is the time for our Chamber to unite. Let's demonstrate to the American people that we can use common sense and come together to do what is right. While there is no question that the Second Amendment embodies the right to bear arms, our citizens also enjoy the right to be free from the terror of gun violence.

I urge all Members to support this motion.

Mr. GOWDY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GOWDY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Members are reminded to not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. GOWDY. Madam Speaker, the Second Amendment to our Constitution was drafted, debated, and ratified in precisely the same manner as the First Amendment, the Fourth Amendment, the Fifth, the Sixth, and other amendments our colleagues on the other side of the aisle hold sacrosanct.

And consistent with this belief that liberty and the right to arm one's self are inextricably linked, it is settled law that our Constitution protects the right to travel. It protects the right to self-defense. It protects the right to defend the lives of others. Not once, Madam Speaker, but twice the Supreme Court has held the right to keep and bear arms is a fundamental individual right. And those rights do not know any geographic boundary. Our right to defend ourselves does not ebb and flow with the vicissitudes of our travel or because we transverse a State line.

Despite the fact that these rights are protected in the Constitution, there are still those who seek to treat the Second Amendment as a constitutional second-class citizen. Sometimes those efforts to denigrate the constitutional status of the Second Amendment are overt and sometimes they are obscure. And as much as we appreciate the renewed—and I'm sure short-lived—in-fatuation with States' rights embraced

by some of our colleagues on the other side, let me ask you simply this:

What limits are you willing to accept with regard to the First Amendment? Does your State want reporters to have to pass a test so they can exercise their First Amendment? Do you want 50 different versions of freedom of religion?

What about the Fourth Amendment? Is one State free to dispose of the exclusionary rule because it doesn't agree with it? Do we have 50 different versions of what is a reasonable search and seizure?

What about the Fifth Amendment? Do we have 50 different versions of Miranda?

What about the Eighth Amendment? Are there 50 different versions of cruel and unusual punishment?

We are delighted, Madam Speaker, to have our colleagues rediscover the beauty of the 10th Amendment and the concept of State rights. Eventually, we hope the same for the Second Amendment.

This motion to recommit is offered to jettison the underlying bill and further relegate the Second Amendment to a constitutional scrap heap. All of these amendments were dealt with in committee, and the matters of State law classifications are just that, State law. The fact that certain State legislatures refuse to protect their citizens does not mean this body will refuse or abdicate its responsibility to defend the Second Amendment.

This bill, H.R. 822, has 245 cosponsors, more than half the Members of this body, and it enjoys that wide and diverse support because it is emblematic of our forefathers' genius. They gave us the fundamental right to travel. They gave us the fundamental right to protect ourselves. They gave us the fundamental right to protect others. And they gave us the fundamental obligation to defend liberty.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 674.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 263, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 851]

AYES—161

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Fudge
Garamendi
Gonzalez

Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Himes
Hinochey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kildee
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Olver
Pallone

NOES—263

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp

Campbell
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming

Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Townsend
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Diaz-Balart
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden

Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley

NOT VOTING—9

Bachmann
Dreier
Gardner

Giffords
Kaptur
Paul

Schmidt
Shimkus
Shuster

□ 1743

Ms. HOCHUL changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 272, noes 154, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 852]

AYES—272

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amodei
Austria
Baca

Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishek
Berg

Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn

Bonner	Gutierrez	Palazzo	Engel	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger	Austria	Dold	Kind
Bono Mack	Hall	Paulsen	Eshoo	Lowey	Rush	Baca	Donnelly (IN)	King (IA)
Boren	Hanna	Pearce	Farr	Lungren, Daniel	Sánchez, Linda	Bachus	Doyle	King (NY)
Boswell	Harper	Pence	Fattah	E.	T.	Baldwin	Dreier	Kingston
Boustany	Harris	Peterson	Filner	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta	Barletta	Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Petri	Frank (MA)	Maloney	Sarbanes	Barrow	Duncan (SC)	Kissell
Brooks	Hastings (WA)	Pitts	Fudge	Markey	Schakowsky	Bartlett	Edwards	Kline
Broun (GA)	Hayworth	Platts	Garamendi	Matsui	Schiff	Barton (TX)	Ellison	Kucinich
Buchanan	Heck	Poe (TX)	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz	Bass (CA)	Ellmers	Labrador
Bucshon	Heinrich	Pompeo	Green, Al	McCollum	Scott (VA)	Bass (NH)	Emerson	Lamborn
Buerkle	Hensarling	Posey	Grijalva	McDermott	Scott, David	Becerra	Engel	Lance
Burgess	Herger	Price (GA)	Grimm	McGovern	Serrano	Benishek	Eshoo	Landry
Burton (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Quayle	Hahn	McNerney	Sherman	Berg	Farenthold	Langevin
Calvert	Higgins	Rahall	Hanabusa	Meeks	Sires	Berkley	Farr	Lankford
Camp	Hinchee	Reed	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)	Slaughter	Berman	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Campbell	Hochul	Rehberg	Himes	Miller, George	Speier	Biggert	Filner	Larson (CT)
Canseco	Holden	Reichert	Hinojosa	Moore	Stark	Bilbray	Fincher	Latham
Cantor	Huelskamp	Renacci	Hirono	Moran	Sutton	Bilirakis	Fitzpatrick	LaTourette
Capito	Huizenga (MI)	Reyes	Holt	Murphy (CT)	Thompson (CA)	Bishop (GA)	Flake	Latta
Cardoza	Hultgren	Ribble	Honda	Nadler	Thompson (MS)	Bishop (NY)	Fleischmann	Lee (CA)
Carson (IN)	Hunter	Rigell	Hoyer	Napolitano	Tierney	Bishop (UT)	Fleming	Levin
Carter	Hurt	Rivera	Insee	Neal	Tonko	Black	Flores	Lewis (CA)
Cassidy	Issa	Roby	Israel	Olver	Towns	Blackburn	Forbes	Lewis (GA)
Chabot	Jenkins	Roe (TN)	Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Tsongas	Blumenauer	Fortenberry	Lipinski
Chaffetz	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)	Jackson Lee	Pascrell	Turner (NY)	Bonner	Fox	LoBiondo
Chandler	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)	Jackson Lee	Pastor (AZ)	Van Hollen	Bono Mack	Frank (MA)	Loeb
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)	Johnson (GA)	Payne	Velázquez	Boren	Franks (AZ)	Lofgren, Zoe
Coffman (CO)	Jones	Rohrabacher	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Visclosky	Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Long
Cole	Jordan	Rokita	Keating	Perlmutter	Wasserman	Boustany	Fudge	Lowe
Conaway	Kelly	Rooney	Kildee	Peters	Schultz	Brady (PA)	Gallegly	Lucas
Cooper	Kind	Ros-Lehtinen	King (NY)	Pingree (ME)	Waters	Brady (TX)	Garamendi	Luetkemeyer
Costello	King (IA)	Roskam	Kucinich	Polis	Watt	Braley (IA)	Garrett	Luján
Courtney	Kingston	Ross (AR)	Langevin	Price (NC)	Waxman	Brooks	Gerlach	Lummis
Cravaack	Kinzinger (IL)	Ross (FL)	Larson (CT)	Quigley	Welch	Broun (GA)	Gibbs	Lungren, Daniel
Crawford	Kissell	Royce	Lee (CA)	Rangel	Wilson (FL)	Brown (FL)	Gibson	E.
Crenshaw	Kline	Runyan	Levin	Richardson	Woodall	Buchanan	Guinta	Lynch
Critz	Labrador	Ryan (OH)	Lewis (GA)	Richmond	Woolsey	Bucshon	Guthrie	Mack
Cuellar	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)	Lipinski	Rothman (NJ)	Yarmuth	Buerkle	Gonzalez	Maloney
Culberson	Lance	Scalise	Loeb	Roybal-Allard		Burgess	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Davis (KY)	Landry	Schilling	Bachmann	Kaptur	Shimkus	Burton (IN)	Gosar	Marchant
DeFazio	Lankford	Schock	Gardner	Paul		Butterfield	Gowdy	Marino
Denham	Larsen (WA)	Schrader	Giffords	Schweikert	Schmidt	Calvert	Granger	Markey
Dent	Latham	Schwartz		Scott (SC)		Camp	Graves (GA)	Matheson
DesJarlais	LaTourette	Scott, Austin		Scott, Austin		Campbell	Graves (MO)	Matsui
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Sensenbrenner		Sessions		Canseco	Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)
Dingell	Lewis (CA)	Sewell		Sewell		Cantor	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)
Donnelly (IN)	LoBiondo	Shuler		Shuler		Capito	Griffin (AR)	McCaul
Dreier	Long	Shuster		Simpson		Capps	Griffith (VA)	McClintock
Duffy	Lucas	Simpson		Smith (NE)		Capuano	Grijalva	McCollum
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)		Smith (TX)		Cardoza	Grimm	McCotter
Duncan (TN)	Luján	Smith (WA)		Southerland		Carnahan	Guinta	McDermott
Ellmers	Lummis	Stearns		Stearns		Carney	Guthrie	McGovern
Emerson	Mack	Stivers		Stivers		Carson (IN)	Gutierrez	McHenry
Farenthold	Manzullo	Stutzman		Sullivan		Carter	Hahn	McIntyre
Fincher	Marchant	Terry		Thompson (PA)		Cassidy	Hanabusa	McKeon
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Thornberry		Tiberi		Castor (FL)	Hanna	McKinley
Flake	Matheson	Tipton		Tipton		Chabot	Harper	McMorris
Fleischmann	McCarthy (CA)	Turner (OH)		Upton		Chaffetz	Harris	Rodgers
Fleming	McCaul	Walberg		Walberg		Chandler	Hartzler	McNerney
Flores	McClintock	Walsh (IL)		Walsh (IL)		Chu	Hastings (FL)	Meehan
Forbes	McCotter	Walsh (MN)		Webster		Ciicilline	Hastings (WA)	Meeks
Fortenberry	McHenry	West		West		Clarke (MI)	Hayworth	Mica
Fox	McIntyre	Westmoreland		Whitfield		Clarke (NY)	Heck	Michaud
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Whitfield		Wolfe		Clay	Heinrich	Miller (FL)
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Walden		Wolfe		Cleaver	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Gallegly	McMorris	Walsh (MN)		Webster		Clyburn	Herger	Miller (NC)
Garrett	Rodgers	Walsh (MI)		West		Coble	Herrera Beutler	Miller, Gary
Gerlach	Meehan	Walsh (IL)		Westmoreland		Coffman (CO)	Higgins	Miller, George
Gibbs	Mica	Walsh (MN)		Whitfield		Cohen	Himes	Moore
Gibson	Michaud	Webster		Wittman		Cole	Hinchee	Moran
Gingrey (GA)	Miller (FL)	West		Wolf		Conaway	Hinojosa	Mulvaney
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland		Wolfe		Connolly (VA)	Hirono	Murphy (CT)
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Whitfield		Wolfe		Conyers	Hochul	Murphy (PA)
Gosar	Mulvaney	Wittman		Wolfe		Cooper	Holden	Myrick
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Wolf		Wolfe		Costa	Holt	Nadler
Granger	Myrick	Wolfe		Wolfe		Costello	Honda	Napolitano
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Wolfe		Wolfe		Courtney	Hoyer	Neal
Graves (MO)	Noem	Wolfe		Wolfe		Cravaack	Huelskamp	Neugebauer
Green, Gene	Nugent	Wolfe		Wolfe		Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Noem
Griffin (AR)	Nunes	Wolfe		Wolfe		Crenshaw	Hultgren	Nugent
Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee	Wolfe		Wolfe		Critz	Hunter	Nunes
Guinta	Olson	Wolfe		Wolfe		Crowley	Hurt	Nunnelee
Guthrie	Owens	Wolfe		Wolfe		Cuellar	Insee	Olson
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Culberson	Israel	Olver
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Cummings	Issa	Owens
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Palazzo
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Davis (IL)	Jackson Lee	Pallone
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Davis (KY)	(TX)	Pascrell
		Wolfe		Wolfe		DeFazio	Jenkins	Pastor (AZ)
		Wolfe		Wolfe		DeGette	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen
		Wolfe		Wolfe		DeLauro	Johnson (IL)	Payne
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Denham	Johnson (OH)	Pearce
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Dent	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
		Wolfe		Wolfe		DesJarlais	Johnson, Sam	Pence
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Deutch	Jones	Perlmutter
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Diaz-Balart	Jordan	Peters
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Dicks	Keating	Peterson
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Dingell	Kelly	Petri
		Wolfe		Wolfe		Doggett	Kildee	Pingree (ME)

NOES—154

Ackerman	Capuano	Costa
Amash	Carnahan	Crowley
Andrews	Carney	Cummings
Baldwin	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Bass (CA)	Chu	Davis (IL)
Becerra	Ciicilline	DeGette
Berman	Clarke (MI)	DeLauro
Bishop (NY)	Clarke (NY)	Deutch
Blumenauer	Clay	Dicks
Brady (PA)	Cleaver	Doggett
Braley (IA)	Clyburn	Dold
Brown (FL)	Cohen	Doyle
Butterfield	Connolly (VA)	Edwards
Capps	Conyers	Ellison

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York and Mr. CUMMINGS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1751

3% WITHHOLDING REPEAL AND JOB CREATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 674) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the imposition of 3 percent withholding on certain payments made to vendors by government entities, to modify the calculation of modified adjusted gross income for purposes of determining eligibility for certain healthcare-related programs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 853]

YEAS—422

Ackerman	Akin	Amash
Adams	Alexander	Amodei
Aderholt	Altmire	Andrews