

transgender individuals, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of gender.

On September 23, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: Wouldn't you love to see one of these NFL owners, when somebody disrespects our flag, to say, "Get that son of a B-I-T-C-H off the field right now, out, he's fired? He's fired!", thereby casting contempt on professional football players who engaged in constitutionally protected protests pertaining to allegations of police misconduct with regard to racial minorities, as well as casting contempt on the professional players' mothers by calling the mothers "B-I-T-C-H-E-S", effectively calling these mothers "dogs," thereby inciting hate and hostility and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of race and gender.

On September 30, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: "They want everything to be done for them when it should be a community effort," in the aftermath of Hurricane Maria, thereby casting contempt on Puerto Rican citizens of the United States, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States based on national origin and race.

On October 3, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: I hate to tell you, Puerto Rico, but you've thrown our budget a little out of whack because we spent a lot of money on Puerto Rico, that's fine, we've saved a lot of lives, but Donald John Trump did not make similar comments about Texas or Florida in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey or Hurricane Irma, treating the Puerto Rican citizens of the United States disparately, thereby casting contempt on Puerto Ricans, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States based on national origin and race.

On October 19, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: "The Fake News is going crazy with wacky Congresswoman Wilson (D), who was SECRETLY on a very personal call, and gave a total lie on content!", thereby casting contempt on an African-American Member of Congress, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States based on gender and race.

On October 21, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: "I hope the Fake News Media keeps talking about Wacky Congresswoman Wilson in that she, as a representative, is killing the Democrat Party!", thereby casting contempt on an African-American female Member of Congress, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States based on gender and race.

On October 22, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement sub-

stantially as follows: "Wacky Congresswoman Wilson is the gift that keeps on giving for the Republican Party, a disaster for Dems. You watch her in action & vote R!", thereby casting contempt on an African-American female Member of Congress, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States based on gender and race.

In all of this, the aforementioned Donald John Trump has, by his statements, brought the high office of President of the United States in contempt, ridicule, disgrace, and disrepute; has sown discord among the people of the United States; has demonstrated that he is unfit to be President; and has betrayed his trust as President of the United States to the manifest injury of the people of the United States; and has committed a high misdemeanor in office.

Therefore, Donald John Trump, by causing such harm to the society of the United States, is unfit to be President, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

□ 1230

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 38, CONCEALED CARRY RECIPROCITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 645 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 645

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 38) to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a means by which nonresidents of a State whose residents may carry concealed firearms may also do so in the State. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-45 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered

on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 645, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The rule also provides for a motion to recommit.

Yesterday, the Rules Committee had the opportunity to hear from my fellow Judiciary Committee members, Chairman GOODLATTE, Ranking Member NADLER, as well as Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE and others. Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE happens to be the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.

Last month, the Judiciary Committee rigorously debated H.R. 38 and considered 22 amendments to this legislation. The committee also marked up and discussed H.R. 4477, the Fix NICS Act, which is incorporated into the Rules Committee print.

I thank my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), for introducing this legislation, which takes a commonsense approach and reflects our constitutional right to bear arms.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this body took an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, and, as we all understand, the Constitution enshrines our right to keep and bear arms in the Second Amendment.

Over the years, this right has been challenged in the courts and, in some cases, by public opinion. However, lest there be any question about the constitutionality of our right to keep and

bear arms, let me remind my colleagues that the Supreme Court, the highest court in the land, recognized, in a 2008 opinion, that “the Second Amendment conferred an individual right to keep and bear arms.”

As the son of a Georgia State trooper, I learned to respect firearms at an early age, and I have shared that respect with my boys and daughter. As a Member of Congress, I believe I have a duty to uphold American liberties for current and future generations. I am a cosponsor of the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act because I believe constitutional rights extend past State lines.

Mr. Speaker, the Bill of Rights isn't a philosophical exercise; it is a document that protects the practical expression of liberties that our forefathers recognized as essential elements of our democracy. I, myself, have a concealed carry permit; and, as a husband and father, I have prioritized being able to defend my family and my home should the unthinkable happen.

I am also a sportsman, a hunter, and an ardent defender of the Second Amendment; but, like many others, the primary purpose of owning and keeping a concealed carry permit is self-defense. I don't think that right should be undermined simply because I travel to another State. This bill upholds and recognizes State laws, while ensuring that driving across State lines to run an errand, go to work, or visit a relative doesn't blot out an individual's rights.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you a very recent story about how firearms can play a critical role in self-defense and promote public safety. Just yesterday, in Dawson County, in a part of my district in northeast Georgia, a woman witnessed an individual attacking a sheriff's deputy at a local gas station. The woman was in possession of a firearm and fired at the suspect. While details are still unfolding at this point, it highlights the benefits of a citizenry that is reasonably and responsibly armed.

Contrary to the claims of Second Amendment detractors, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act is not about expanding access to firearms or putting guns in the hands of criminals. On the contrary, the bill includes protections to uphold laws surrounding firearm possession and safeguards individuals' ability to protect themselves and their neighbors.

The Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act supports the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Americans, and, importantly, it offers a solution to the current patchwork of State laws affecting concealed carry permits.

Currently, all 50 States issue concealed carry permits in some capacity, but these laws leave citizens traveling across State lines to decipher a variety of State laws or risk inadvertently breaking the law.

It is also worth noting that, of the States that have adopted right-to-carry legislation, no State has repealed

it. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, we simply have no evidence to indicate that concealed carry permit holders pose a risk to public safety.

The Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act upholds States' rights to establish their own permitting requirements, but it takes the commonsense step of allowing individuals who meet the criteria for concealed carry in their home States to bear arms in other States as long as they follow the local concealed carry laws of the State they are in at any given time.

This bill doesn't allow individuals who currently would be prohibited, under Federal law, from possessing firearms to obtain those weapons, and it doesn't tell States how to regulate the use of firearms. It does, however, ensure that law-abiding citizens can protect themselves and exercise their Second Amendment rights when crossing State lines.

Thirty States, including Georgia, already have “shall issue” permits, which require States to issue permits to individuals who meet the legal requirements for a concealed carry permit; eight States have “may issue” laws, which allow for discretionary permit laws; and 12 States allow for the carrying of a concealed weapon without any permit or license at all.

Many States have some type of reciprocity whereby they mutually recognize permits from other States or may honor permits or licenses issued by other jurisdictions. However, there are some States that neither recognize out-of-State concealed carry permits nor issue permits to nonresidents, resulting in a complete ban on the concealed carry rights of nonresidents who find themselves in those States.

The legal landscape of these State laws and their terms for recognizing concealed carry permits is complex. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we must recognize and remember that, at a practical level, our Union functions by acknowledging the necessary reciprocity of certain State functions, this being one of them and should be. But the current patchwork of State laws means that these law-abiding individuals have to stop and think about their rights, where they are located at the time and whether they recognize their Second Amendment rights, or they risk breaking the law.

Also, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 38 includes the text of the Fix NICS Act. The Fix NICS Act ensures individuals who are prohibited from receiving firearms are properly documented in the NICS system, and it would require Federal agencies to report relevant records in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us upholds a constitutional right to keep and bear arms and recognizes the fact that the Bill of Rights isn't limited to certain jurisdictions. Our Founding Fathers carved certain foundational rights into our democracy, and today's bill simply upholds the spirit and letter of the Second Amendment.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 54th closed rule brought by the Republican majority to the floor. Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, I pointed that out, as well as the fact that there were 25 Members of this body who offered amendments that were not made in order. Significant numbers of them were germane, and they were bipartisan. We cannot continue to ignore the importance of allowing full membership to participate on behalf of their constituents.

Today's bill combines two bills: one, a bipartisan supported approach to strengthening background checks; the other, a disgraceful handout to the powerful gun lobby and gun manufacturers.

I also pointed out last night that the NRA, in many respects, is two bodies: those at the top and the rank-and-file members. Many of the rank-and-file members, for example, support universal background checks that we could be talking about in this measure if an amendment seeking to have that made in order had been made in order.

A month ago yesterday, this country grieved with our brothers and sisters in Sutherland Springs, Texas, as they reeled from one of the worst mass shootings this country has ever suffered. A man walked into a house of worship as churchgoers prayed and sprayed bullets throughout the building. He killed an 18-month-old baby; he killed eight members of one family; he killed the pastor's 14-year-old daughter—a total of 26 people—and he was able to do so in a matter of minutes.

We learned later that this man had served in the Air Force and, while there, had been court-martialed for committing acts of domestic violence against his wife and infant child. As part of his sentence, he was prohibited from purchasing or possessing firearms. Tragically, this information was never put into the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and we call that NICS. He was able to pass a background check and come into possession of several guns he would use to murder 26 innocent people in Sutherland Springs, Texas, on November 5, 2017.

This tragic event is instructive to the bill brought by us today. Clearly, our background check system must be strengthened.

The problems with our background check system are more grave than we previously could even imagine, as recent reports indicate that the FBI has sought to retrieve guns from thousands of people that the background check system should have blocked from buying a weapon but who ultimately were allowed to do so.

I think we can all agree that, if we have a system through which people

like the murderer in Sutherland Springs can buy a gun or one in which thousands of people who should have never been allowed to buy a gun in the first place are able to do so, then we really have no system at all.

Today's bill, in part, would have been a good first step in addressing those weaknesses. But, Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues, in a fashion so common for their majority of this Congress, have decided to sabotage a commonsense, bipartisan bill by combining it with a reckless piece of legislation that will allow guns to be carried all over this country.

Let us remember that the gunman in Texas was a known domestic abuser. He abused his wife and he abused his child. Under today's concealed carry bill, all we would have to do is change "wife" to "girlfriend," and in some States he would be able to obtain a concealed carry permit for a handgun. Should today's bill become law, he would then be allowed to bring that concealed handgun into your State, even if your State does not allow convicted domestic abusers to have concealed weapons.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the State that I am privileged and proud to represent, Florida, stops abusive dating partners from carrying loaded, hidden handguns in public. However, my friend from Georgia's State, right over the border, does not have that same restriction. Under this legislation, Florida would be mandated to allow abusive dating partners with concealed permits from Georgia to carry their weapons in Florida.

□ 1245

Under H.R. 38, violent offenders and people with no firearms safety training would be able to carry hidden loaded guns even if they could not otherwise legally purchase a gun in the State.

Footnote right there: like my friend from Georgia, I, too, have a concealed carry permit in the State of Florida, and I am a firm believer in the Second Amendment and a person's right to own a weapon, but I also think we should be discussing today matters such as the bump stock, and there were amendments that dealt with that that were not made in order. I think we should be discussing assault weapons in the hands of the public. I, for the life of me, do not understand how anybody, other than people in law enforcement and the military, need an AK-47 or a multiple-firing gun.

Mr. Speaker, this idea that we are presented with here is so terrible, so anathema to common sense and decency, that one has to wonder aloud, where did such an idea come from.

Well, we have an answer, and it is probably not too surprising. Today's concealed carry bill is brought to you by the Republican Party via their very influential friends in the powerful gun lobby.

Footnote right there: the gun lobby does the bidding of gun manufacturers,

who benefit immensely. Why don't we just pass a mandate that every woman, man, and child in America must buy a gun, and maybe that would satisfy or satiate gun manufacturers with reference to how they continuously cause us to do things that are not commonsense matters as it pertains to guns.

In fact, this bill, which will allow domestic abusers to carry concealed weapons across State lines, is the top priority for the gun lobby. Well, happy holidays, fellows, but we here on this side of the aisle are going to do everything that we can to make sure you don't get it.

When this matter gets to the other body, I can assure my friend from Georgia, and all of the speakers on either side today, that it is going nowhere.

So what are we doing by bringing this measure in the first place? Is it a distraction? Is it an absolute necessity that we do this?

Mr. Speaker, just so we are crystal clear, what is happening right now in the people's House, let me reiterate, just over 2 months after a gunman killed 58 people and wounded nearly 550 people in Las Vegas, and just over a month after another gunman killed 26 people in their church as they prayed, this Republican majority, in response to those atrocities, saw fit to bring to the floor a bill that would allow violent offenders to carry concealed weapons all across the country. Let that sink in.

This isn't the only time that we have done something along these lines. After Sandy Hook, after children were killed and their teachers were killed, we did nothing. After Virginia Tech; where people were killed in significant numbers at a military base; in Colorado in a theater; in Orlando, Florida, in a nightclub, repeatedly we have seen these multiple shootings, or mass shootings as they are referred to, where three or more people are killed, 330 times this year alone we have had mass shootings, yet we come here with a bill talking about carrying concealed weapons.

Every day in America, 93 people on average are killed with a gun, seven of them children, but in the midst of this gun violence epidemic, and that is what it is, what do my Republican colleagues do? Did they bring to the floor legislation to close the gun show loophole, or did they close loopholes to prevent domestic abusers from purchasing guns, or are they considering a ban on so-called bump stocks that do turn semiautomatic weapons into illegal automatic guns, most recently used to rain carnage down on innocent concertgoers in Las Vegas?

One country music singer pointed out that his band had legal guns, but they were afraid to bring them out in Las Vegas because the authorities couldn't ferret out who was doing the shooting. We had that in a Wal-Mart that all of us saw posted, the shooting where people with guns caused confusion among the police.

A footnote there: this bill proposes to study the issue of bump stocks. Mr. Speaker, we don't need a study. As my colleague, Congresswoman DINA TITUS, who represents the city of Las Vegas, said last night at the Rules Committee, the only study we need is to go look at the 58 crosses in her district. That is what bump stocks do. That is your study.

Did my Republican colleagues bring to the floor a bill that would have addressed any of these commonsense proposals? Of course not, because even though those proposals have the support of an overwhelming majority of American people when it comes to guns, that is not what motivates my Republican friends. What they care about is the gun lobby and gun manufacturers and their wish list. That is why we are here today.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle like to compare a concealed carry permit to a driver's license, but let me set the record straight, because that comparison is nothing but a gross exercise in false equivalency. A driver's license must meet stringent, uniform Federal criteria established under the REAL ID Act. This includes a photo of the license holder and data including their date of birth and their State of residence.

There are absolutely no such uniform standards when it comes to concealed carry permits. In some States, they could look like a paper library card. In others, they may have photo identification.

There is no national database, no hotline that contains permit information from all 50 States, so law enforcement would be in a position of having to find each individual issuing agency to verify that a concealed carry permit is valid, and that is impossible.

My Republican colleagues often tout their support for our first responders. Well, I urge them to heed the warnings of those brave men and women. Major law enforcement groups understand how dangerous this bill would be, and that is why so many of them oppose what the majority is trying to do here today. Organizations like the Major Cities Chiefs Association, Police Foundation, and Police Executive Research Forum all stand in strong opposition to today's bill.

To make matters worse, this piece of legislation even exposes members of the law enforcement community to personal litigation if they mistakenly question someone's ability to carry a concealed weapon.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just some small issue limiting a law enforcement officer's ability to carry out their job; this limit on challenging concealed carry permits will cost lives. In fact, a recent study conducted by Stanford University found that when States weaken law enforcement's authority to deny a permit to those who pose a danger to the community, violent crime goes up by 13 to 15 percent. This research is clear, convincing, and not at

all difficult to fathom. When you lift limits on who can carry a concealed weapon, gun-related crime goes up. It is that simple.

Mr. Speaker, among the many important issues this body must address, the following stand out: as of this moment, we are roughly 72 hours away from a government shutdown; we have 800,000 persons whom we refer to as DREAMers who continue to wait for us to do the right thing and bring them fully into the only country that they know as home; and we have 9 million children and their parents facing an unconscionable lapse in lifesaving funding for the incredibly important Children's Health Insurance Program.

Given all that, what does the Republican-controlled Congress do? They bring a bill to the floor that will make it easier for domestic abusers to cross State lines with concealed weapons. This is shameful and no way to run a government.

Last night, I thought actively too long trying to go to sleep about the acronym GOP, Grand Old Party, the conservatives, the States' rights conservatives, the fiscal conservatives who are about to dump serious debt on our children should be called now by their acronym, rather than GOP, in light of the choice that they make with reference to guns, perhaps GOP should stand for "Guns Over People."

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER). She has some language in this bill. I also would like to thank her for her support for this legislation.

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

This bill, which reaffirms the Second Amendment rights of all law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms in every State, includes a provision I introduced earlier this year as the Police Officers Protecting Children Act.

My provision would help protect our children from school shootings and empower local law enforcement to respond rapidly in the case of an emergency. As many of you who represent rural areas know, in these sparsely populated regions, our local law enforcement is stretched thin.

My bill would amend the Gun-Free School Zones Act to allow school boards to permit off-duty and retired police officers to carry their firearms on school campuses so they can respond quickly in the event of a crisis. The legislation would expand the reach of local police officers, decrease emergency response time, and put more choice back in the hands of our local school districts. It is a win-win-win.

As we have learned over and over, localities are much better equipped to know what works for their district rather than the Federal Government. In fact, the idea of my bill came from a constituent who is a retired police of-

ficer and served his community for 30 years. This gentleman came to me because he wasn't allowed to use his weapon to protect his grandchildren at school even though he had decades of experience and continued to pass an annual recertification test.

Additionally, the sheriff of Laclede County in my district said: Not allowing current law enforcement officers, or qualified retired law enforcement officers, to carry weapons at schools simply puts children's lives at risk.

I agree.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Judiciary Committee for including my legislation in this important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), a very good friend of mine.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act.

This dangerous bill is an attack on commonsense gun laws across the country. It will force States like mine in New York, with carefully crafted gun laws, to recognize the concealed carry permits from all other States.

This bill doesn't create a national standard. Instead, it lets the States with the weakest laws dictate the safety of everyone else. Thirty-one States require safety training, 35 States prohibit domestic abusers from carrying concealed weapons, 27 States prohibit people convicted of violent misdemeanors from carrying concealed weapons. All of these States' laws will be overridden if H.R. 38 passes.

It is unconscionable, in the wake of two of the worse mass shootings in modern American history, Republicans are still trying to dismantle gun laws. It is like "Alice in Wonderland." We must fight on behalf of the safety of all Americans and pass comprehensive gun safety laws, not this dangerous bill.

□ 1300

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a fellow member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the underlying bill, H.R. 38; or maybe that is the lead bill and there is an underlying bill that has been attached to it. I want to speak a little bit here about this process.

First of all, though, we have a concealed carry bill before us that is a good and an excellent bill, that has been hard-worked and well-vetted, and I want to thank Mr. HUDSON for his diligent work on this for a number of years.

A year and a half or more ago we had this bill about ready to go before the Judiciary Committee. I raised an issue. My concern was that it didn't allow for the proper respect for the States—7 then, 12 now—who have legitimate constitutional carry, which is: Since you

have a Second Amendment right, you have a right to carry a weapon.

Under this bill now, having incorporated an amendment that I had prepared a year and a half or so ago that allows then for the residents of the States who have constitutional carry to then travel into other States; if they are legal in their home State, they are legal in another State, under this bill, without having to require the States that respect full constitutional carry to produce permits for their citizens and their residents to travel into neighboring States or anywhere in the country. I think that is a significant improvement, and I thank Mr. HUDSON for his cooperation and work on that. Like I say, this is a good and solid bill.

I am, however, concerned about this process. When I hear the gentleman, Mr. HASTINGS, speak about this is the 54th closed rule that we have seen, I am for a lot of open rules. I am for open debate. I want to fight it out in committee and I want to fight it out here on the floor.

Our Founding Fathers understood that. They set this system up this way. They said to all of us: Go to your district, pull the best ideas you have there, generate your own good ideas, bring them here, and let them compete in this marketplace of ideas.

But if we don't have the window to compete with ideas, if we don't have that opportunity to have the debates, if we don't have the opportunity to force votes on amendments, then the best that America has to offer eventually doesn't show up in the law or to the President's desk.

This is one of those circumstances where we learned a bill that didn't have a number the morning that we marked this up in committee is now the Fix NICS bill. It got a number sometime that same day. There was not a full opportunity to vet the Fix NICS bill. I am very apprehensive about what it might do to this country.

I would like to have had hearings and learn what kind of American citizens, law-abiding citizens, will be disadvantaged by the Fix NICS bill. Whose names get on that and why? How do you get those names off when you need to be cleaning up the list?

I want to have everybody on the list who belongs on the list, but I don't want anybody on the list who doesn't belong on the list. I want to protect American people and I want to protect constitutional rights.

We didn't get an opportunity to look into this, and anybody who brought an amendment to the Rules Committee, it came to the floor under a closed rule. So I am concerned and I am apprehensive about this.

In fact, as I look through these provisions, I strongly support section 103, VICKY HARTZLER's section in the bill. Section 104—

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I support also the section of the judges, but offered an amendment in committee—too many Members weren't there; at least 10 Republicans were gone—to protect congressional Members of Congress in the same way as the judges. We didn't have that opportunity to actually have a hearing on it in the committee—a legitimate one—and we didn't have an opportunity to bring that amendment to the floor, so I have this apprehension.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we get back to regular order.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Iowa, Mr. KING, had two amendments that were rejected last night in the Rules Committee. I join him in saying that we need to get back to regular order.

Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to inform me and my friend from Georgia how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 11¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act.

Our country is still reeling, Mr. Speaker, from two of the worst mass shootings in modern American history.

From the 58 people murdered in Las Vegas to the 25 killed in a Texas church, how can we face the families of these people and say that this bill is the best we could do?

Studies show that States with laws permitting concealed carry experience an estimated 13 to 15 percent increase in violent crime than there would have been without the right to carry laws.

But we don't need academic studies, Mr. Speaker, to know that this bill is wrong. We just need to look at real people.

One of my constituent's sisters was shot in Las Vegas and survived. She is one of the lucky ones. They won't have any empty spots at the holiday table this year because they lost someone to gun violence. Over 14,000 Americans, including parents of nearly 700 children, are not as fortunate, and my heart goes out to them, especially as we enter the holiday season.

Today, we have a critical opportunity to say enough is enough, and I strongly urge my colleagues to stop this heinous bill from moving forward.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), a fine member whose strong support of this bill is appreciated.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, and the underlying rule. The Second Amendment right to bear arms must stand resolute, as should all our constitu-

tional rights. This legislation simply affirms the right of law-abiding citizens to effectively exercise their right in other States as they do at home.

Forty-two States broadly recognize the right of law-abiding citizens to carry concealed handguns, and most States allow some form of concealed carry. State recognition of concealed carry licenses from other States is not uniform or consistent. Those who wish to carry a concealed weapon across State lines are subject to a confusing patchwork of State laws that make it difficult for law-abiding citizens to travel with a firearm without fear of prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what critics would have you believe, this legislation does not upend State laws or expand access to firearms. States will still have the right and the ability to set specific conditions for residents to conceal carry, and individuals from other States must abide by those laws and rules when they carry in other States.

This legislation does not lessen limitations on gun purchases. If you are prohibited from purchasing a firearm now, they will continue to be prohibited from purchasing a firearm if this bill is passed.

If you can't legally own or carry a firearm today, this legislation will not allow you to do so after it is passed.

This legislation is about respecting our Constitution. Our other constitutional rights, like free speech, do not expire when you cross State lines. They are not restricted by State lines. So why should we also allow the Second Amendment to be limited by State lines?

Indeed, the core of the Second Amendment is self-defense, and the ability to carry a firearm outside your home is a critical component of that constitutional right. That is why 24 State attorney generals, including Michigan's attorney general, Bill Schuette, submitted letters supporting this legislation. They know, like I do, that this legislation is common sense. It prioritizes the rights of law-abiding citizens to conceal carry and the ability to travel freely from State to State without worrying about conflicting State laws and prosecution.

Mr. Speaker, each of us are required to take an oath of office here. In that oath, we swear to uphold and defend our Constitution—the Constitution of the United States. That is what this legislation exactly does. It makes sure our exercise of constitutional rights applies throughout the United States.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle questions proceeding with this legislation while funding for the Federal Government hangs in the balance in the next 72 hours. I agree. We must keep the lights on. We are all responsible for keeping the lights on. It isn't as if it is one side of the aisle or the other, and in the past, it has been a bipartisan agreement to do so.

Suddenly, the other side of the aisle says: If we don't get exactly what we

want on terms we have, including on DACA, we will take it to the precipice.

A solution on DACA is there if my colleagues wish to take it. At this point, so far, they haven't.

But there are some things that aren't malleable. There is right and there is wrong in this. I suggest we solve it in the next 72 hours and we keep the lights on because we are all equally responsible for that.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my good friend, who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, why should the United States of America be the only rich country in the world that cannot protect our families from gun violence?

It doesn't have to be this way. In fact, there are a number of States that have enacted gun safety protections. And in those States that have done so, there are fewer gun deaths and there are fewer gun injuries.

My State of Oregon is one of those that has enacted them, in part, because of votes of the people, not politicians. This proposal would strip away protections of Oregonians because there are 12 States that, basically, if you are 21 and have a pulse, you can carry a firearm. Others have much less-restrictive proposals.

This eliminates the ability of States to protect its own citizens. It is shameful. It is wrong.

Someday, Congress will come to its senses and enact reasonable gun safety legislation for the country. But until we do, for heaven's sake, don't punish States that have accepted their responsibility to protect their families.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON).

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

As a lifelong gun owner and staunch advocate for protecting our Second Amendment rights, I am proud to co-sponsor this legislation.

H.R. 38 would protect law-abiding gun owners with concealed carry permits, like the single mother, Shaneen Allen, from Pennsylvania. Many of you have heard this story. I know the author of this bill, Mr. HUDSON, has told this story many times, where Miss Allen was arrested in New Jersey during a routine traffic stop because her valid Pennsylvania concealed carry license had no legal standing in New Jersey.

Our constitutionally protected Second Amendment rights should not stop at a State line. This commonsense bill would ensure that concealed carry permit holders' rights to carry firearms across all State lines will exist.

The legislation would allow Georgia's 600,000-plus concealed carry permit holders to remain protected while traveling. The bill would also incentivize

States to report individuals prohibited from owning guns to the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System, better known as NICS, and it gives States the resources they need to follow this law.

This would not put an additional burden on law-abiding gun owners or make it more difficult for them to purchase or carry a firearm. It simply ensures that agencies and bureaucrats are following the existing laws.

I appreciate Mr. HUDSON's hard work to advance this commonsense legislation to protect Americans' constitutional rights, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule and the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), my good friend.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us creates a dangerous race to the bottom, forcing States to accept concealed carry permits from all other States, regardless of their training standards, their background check system, or their safety requirements.

Make no mistake, this bill would make it easier to cross State lines with hidden, loaded weapons, threatening local communities by making it harder for law enforcement to determine who is lawfully carrying a firearm. No wonder sheriffs, police chiefs, and other law enforcement agencies oppose this bill.

What a shame it is that, after the terrible mass shootings in Las Vegas and Texas, the first gun-related bill this House considers would actually make it easier for dangerous people to carry concealed weapons in more places.

Mr. Speaker, these tragedies aren't inevitable. They are the result of policy choices. We could be working together to enact commonsense measures to respond to the gun violence epidemic facing our country. But as long as Republicans are beholden to NRA extremism, these proposals, I am afraid, will fall on deaf ears.

I urge my colleagues to reject this shameful proposal and to work, instead, to address the root causes of gun violence in this country.

□ 1315

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 38, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act.

Since I was elected to Congress in 2014, I have been devoted to preserving the constitutional rights of Americans, including the inalienable right to bear arms.

Despite our Second Amendment protections, many States have laws restricting the ability of citizens to carry concealed weapons, principally out-of-State residents. This is particularly

confusing and burdensome for law-abiding citizens who choose to conceal carry and live near a State line.

For example, the district I represent borders South Carolina along the Savannah River. For many of my constituents, the closest grocery store, bank, and even their work may be in South Carolina. Thankfully for my constituents, Georgia and South Carolina already have firearm permit reciprocity.

But this is not the case everywhere. As the law currently stands, Americans in other States are losing their right to bear arms on a daily basis simply because they live near a State line. Just as your First Amendment right to free speech does not change from one State to another, neither should your right to protect yourself and your family.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will see this and will join me in voting for this commonsense legislation to solve this problem.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the co-chair of the Law Enforcement Caucus in the Congress of the United States. This bill is terrible. The Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act should not be voted on.

As a may-issue State, New Jersey allows local law enforcement the discretion on issuing concealed carry permits. In order to receive a permit, applicants must demonstrate an urgent need to carry a concealed weapon and pass a safety course on par with firearms training required of police officers.

H.R. 38 would undermine the good regulations New Jersey has in place by forcing New Jersey and other States to recognize the concealed carry standards from every other State, even if their regulations are weak or non-existent.

Allowing States with the weakest concealed carry requirements to set the national standard creates a race to the bottom. Aside from the outrageous fact that House Republicans are pushing a bill to weaken States' rights, this bill makes it harder for local law enforcement to do their jobs.

This bill does not establish a process for officers to easily verify that someone is carrying lawfully, because officers would be essentially required to know the permitting standards of every State, a heavy and unnecessary burden, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for consideration of H.R. 38 and the underlying bill, the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act.

The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution, Mr. Speaker, protects the individual rights of American citizens to keep and bear arms. This is a fundamental right to our great Republic.

In Wyoming, Mr. Speaker, we know that this is a God-given right enshrined in our Constitution, which is why Wyoming is a constitutional carry State. Wyoming is not alone in this Constitution-based conviction.

Across the country, Mr. Speaker, 42 States broadly recognize the right of law-abiding citizens to carry concealed handguns. Further, all 50 States allow some form of concealed carry. Many States, but not all, Mr. Speaker, already recognize the gun laws of other States.

However, Mr. Speaker, those traveling through or living on the border of a State that does not recognize their home State's laws could have their gun rights stripped when they cross State lines. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

This puts otherwise law-abiding citizens in a situation where they may be criminally liable for simply carrying out their constitutional right to keep and bear arms.

The constitutional rights of United States citizens should not change or end at State lines, Mr. Speaker. The Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act ensures the rights of law-abiding citizens to travel across State lines without worrying about the conflicting patchwork of State concealed carry laws or regulations.

This bill is crucial to protecting our constitutional rights. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, 26: that is how many people were gunned down in a Texas church. Fifty-nine: that is how many were murdered at a concert in Las Vegas. And 489: that is how many law-abiding Americans were injured in that same attack.

Mr. Speaker, it has been weeks after those shootings, and we haven't taken a single action in the United States Congress to stop the gun violence epidemic plaguing America.

Instead, Republican leadership is pushing a bill with blood money from the NRA that will create a race to the bottom where States with the weakest concealed carry requirements will rewrite the laws for everyone else.

Meanwhile, we all know there are bipartisan bills that will reduce gun deaths, including my bill to ban bump stocks. Those bills have been denied a vote.

Mr. Speaker, we have lived through too many massacres. At this rate, I guarantee we will live through more. Let's stop this nonsense and work together on commonsense solutions the majority of Americans want.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), my good friend

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 38, which unconscionably combines a needed reform to improve background checks



with a wholesale abandonment of sanity with respect to gun permitting.

The Fix NICS Act would improve notifications about criminal activity for background checks, which I strongly support. A system, by the way, that tragically failed prior to the Sutherland Springs shooting.

Unfortunately, this reform is tied to the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, which would endanger millions of Americans and undermine well-established State laws with respect to concealed carry.

My home State of Rhode Island has strong, sensible procedures for getting a concealed carry permit. In Rhode Island, you must be at least 21 years old, trained in gun safety, and must have just cause to carry a concealed weapon. Domestic abusers are not eligible.

H.R. 38 would override these commonsense laws, putting our residents at risk. It would allow anyone denied a permit in Rhode Island to permit shop in States with weaker laws, and it would allow residents of States with weaker requirements to carry freely in our neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, gun violence is an epidemic in this country. We should not be taking steps to put more guns on our streets. I urge my colleagues to heed the warnings of law enforcement officers and reject this dangerous bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I can't think of a more breathtaking display of nerve or brass than what the Republican majority is doing with this bill.

After the tragedies we have suffered in Las Vegas and in Orlando, in Aurora, Colorado, that I represent, to race to the bottom to have the easiest laws—and no offense to Georgia, but Georgia has no business and no right to tell Colorado what its laws concerning the health, safety, and welfare of Coloradans should be under the 10th Amendment.

Instead of taking up real legislation on assault weapons or bump stocks that make those assault weapons machine guns that mowed down all those people in Las Vegas, we are saying: No. Whatever State has the weakest, most lax gun laws, then that State is going to control all the other States. That is wrong, that is unconstitutional, and this bill should be rejected right here and right now.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act.

Mr. Speaker, a group of 34 of my Republican colleagues sent a letter this week to Speaker RYAN urging a vote before the year's end on legislation that would protect DACA recipients. I include in the RECORD that letter.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, December 5, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: We write in support of passing of a permanent legislative solution for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) recipients before the end of the year. DACA recipients—young people brought to America through no fault of their own—are contributing members of our communities and our economy. For many, this is the only country they have ever known. They are American in every way except their immigration status.

Since DACA's inception, the federal government has approved approximately 795,000 initial DACA applications and 924,000 renewals. Since being approved for DACA status, an overwhelming majority of these individuals have enrolled in school, found employment, or have served in the military. Studies have shown that passing legislation to permanently protect these individuals would add hundreds of billions to our country's gross domestic product (GDP). That is why the business community, universities, and civic leaders alike support a permanent legislative solution.

We agree with President Trump that executive action was not the appropriate process for solving this issue, as was done under the previous administration, and we believe Congress should act. We are compelled to act immediately because many DACA recipients are about to lose or have already lost their permits in the wake of the program's rescission. Not acting is creating understandable uncertainty and anxiety amongst immigrant communities.

While we firmly believe Congress must work to address other issues within our broken immigration system, it is imperative that Republicans and Democrats come together to solve this problem now and not wait until next year. We all agree that our border must be enforced, our national security defended, and our broken immigration system reformed, but in this moment, we must address the urgent matter before us in a balanced approach that does not harm valuable sectors of our economy nor the lives of these hard-working young people. We must pass legislation that protects DACA recipients from deportation and gives them the opportunity to apply for a more secured status in our country as soon as possible. Reaching across the aisle to protect DACA recipients before the holidays is the right thing to do.

Sincerely,

Scott Taylor; Dan Newhouse; Mia Love; Mark Amodei; David G. Valadao; Dave Reichert; Brian Fitzpatrick; Mike Coffman; Charlie Dent; Frank A. LoBiondo; Peter T. King; Carlos Curbelo; Ileana Ros-Lehtinen; Ryan A. Costello; Fred Upton; Jeff Denham; Rodney Davis; John J. Faso; John Katko; Chris Stewart; Susan W. Brooks; Adam Kinzinger; GT Thompson; Mike Simpson; Mimi Walters; Leonard Lance; Pat Meehan; Elise Stefanik; Tom MacArthur; Chris Smith; Jenniffer González-Colón; Joe Barton; Will Hurd; Bruce Poliquin.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ari-

zona (Mr. GRIJALVA) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, each day that Congress delays action on the Dream Act, 122 people lose their temporary protected status granted by DACA.

Since the Trump September 5 announcement, 11,182 young people have lost their DACA status and face the daily threat of being detained and deported.

Time and time again, House Democrats have pleaded to Republicans and their leadership the urgency of finding a legislative solution that would permanently protect DREAMers. We have pleaded and explained the economic benefit, \$23 billion yearly contributed by DREAMers to the GDP of this Nation.

We have pleaded with the Republican leadership to bring a Dream Act to the House floor that is just and fair without the trappings of xenophobia, division, or hate.

We have pleaded that the DREAMers have not committed a crime. It was not an act of volition on their part as children.

We must move beyond the political calculations about race, us-versus-them divisions in this country, and scapegoating.

The House has an opportunity and the authority to vote on a clean Dream Act and embrace the shared values and humanity of this Nation, while rejecting the politically manufactured hysteria.

Mr. Speaker, I ask a "no" vote on the previous question so that H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, can come to the House floor.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have watched this year as members of the Republican majority have worked diligently to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which would have been a failure for the American people but great for special interests.

I have watched members of the Republican majority work relentlessly to push a tax scam bill through this body that will certainly be a failure for the American people but great for corporate America and the ultrawealthy.

I have watched members of the Republican majority here today and yesterday in the Rules Committee champion a bill that will be a failure for the American people, especially survivors of domestic violence, but great for the powerful corporate gun lobby and gun manufacturers. I sense a theme for my friends across the aisle, and it is a shameful one.

Mr. Speaker, our country faces a gun violence epidemic, and we here in Congress should be doing all that we can to put it to an end.

The opportunity to pass a bipartisan measure to strengthen our background

check system has presented itself, but apparently the majority, without hearings, would rather drown bipartisanship in the dirty waters of the corporate gun lobby and gun manufacturers.

I have said it before, and I will say it again here today: Those who stand in the way of legislation that will address our country's gun violence epidemic are increasingly culpable for its need-less continuation. That is why I dubbed and gave the acronym GOP, "Guns Over People," but I guess I should have used the acronym "Good Old Puppets" of the gun lobby and gun manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule and underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I do appreciate my friend from Florida. We have many lively debates on the floor and many lively debates in the Rules Committee. But if you really want to see things going in really a tone and tenor misspeak on this floor, let's at least get back to saying there are ideas that we agree with and disagree with.

There are ideas of actually just taking a constitutional right and being able to apply that in the Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, which is what we are talking about here, regardless of who might find that appealing, what groups or nongroups. That is a constitutional right that we are fighting for.

But in this regard of saying that puppets—the moment that the group who enjoys killing babies says, "You need to make sure that right is available," then my friends across the aisle are quick to jump to their strings to say, "Yes, I want to do that."

When they wanted to have more government-controlled healthcare, they also said: Oh, but our insurance companies, we need to have a position for them in which they are taken care of.

I guess that was another puppet string, Mr. Speaker.

I think the bottom line is, let's quit, knowing that many of us on both sides have our positions, and we have people who like our positions on both sides, whether they be Democrat or Republican.

But one of the reasons that the American people are very frustrated with this body is because the tone and tenor is not on policy, which we can disagree on. It is who controls the other.

If we wanted to lay out a laundry list of supporters of the Democratic Party and maybe supporters of the Republican Party and say, that is all that matters, then fine, Mr. Speaker. If we have degenerated to that, then so be it. But shame on us.

Whether you want reciprocity or not, good. Argue it. Whether you want to have another thing in our tax reform

and you believe tax reform can be done in a different way, argue it. But when we separate out who is a puppet and who is not, then we are also racing to the bottom. We are racing to the bottom of the civil discourse that the American people are tired of. Look at the last election.

So when I look at this today, Mr. Speaker, I look at a bill—and we have also heard interesting things that have been said, like: Officers will be in trouble and possibly can be sued. Look at the language that is put into the bill, a Terry stop, that they could ask, and that they are protected from suit.

What they are not protected from is unlawful arrest. Then they will be held liable. Or maybe, it has also been said that we are going to turn all of these concealed carry permit owners, like myself and my friend from Florida, loose on the country and terrible things are going to happen.

May I remind us here on the floor that Florida, which has issued nearly 2 million permits, has only revoked 168 due to gun crimes committed by permit holders. That is 0.008 percent. The fight that concealed carry permit holders are generally more law-abiding citizens than the general public, we can disagree, Mr. Speaker, and that is part of this body.

We can come to different conclusions. That is the reason we have a debate floor. But when we start to try and bring in other things, and who is controlled by whom, then I just simply, Mr. Speaker, ask that the other side cut their strings first.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 645 OFFERED BY  
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of

the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.



Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. 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.

### RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House and offer the resolution that was previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### RESOLUTION

*Impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the United States, of high misdemeanors.*

*Resolved*, That Donald John Trump, President of the United States is unfit to be President and is impeached for high misdemeanors, and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the Senate:

Articles of Impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States, in the name of itself and of the people of the United States, against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high misdemeanors committed as President constituting harm to American society to the manifest injury of the people of the United States:

#### ARTICLE I

In his capacity as President of the United States, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony and courtesies necessary for stability within the society of the United States, Donald John Trump has with his statements done more than insult individuals and groups of Americans, he has harmed the society of the United States, brought shame and dishonor to the office of President of the United States, sowing discord among the people of the United States by associating the majesty and dignity of the presidency with causes rooted in white supremacy, bigotry, racism, anti-Semitism, white nationalism, or neo-Nazism on one or more of the following occasions:

On August 15, 2017, Donald John Trump made a widely published statement characterizing a group of anti-Semites, bigots, racists, white nationalists, and Ku Klux Klansmen who rallied in Charlottesville, Virginia, as “very fine people”.

On August 7, 2017, hate groups returned to Charlottesville, Virginia, at the statue of Robert E. Lee, the Confederate general, chanting “You will not replace us!” Since this event on October 7, the President has made many widely published statements about many things including, the National Football League, but has not made one widely published statement condemning the hate groups for returning to the place where an innocent person lost her life at the hands of hate.

On November 29, 2017, Donald John Trump shared 3 videos posted by a leader of a Brit-

ish political party considered by many to be an extremist group. The videos purported to show various violent acts committed by Muslims, and were entitled: “Muslim migrant beats up Dutch boy on crutches!”, “Muslim Destroys a Statue of Virgin Mary!”, and “Islamist mob pushes teenage boy off roof and beats him to death!”. The clearly inferable intent of the post was to demonstrate the alleged propensity of Muslim immigrants to engage in violent acts. Even if the videos showed what they purport to show, in sharing these videos with his 43,800,000 followers on Twitter, Donald John Trump’s dissemination of such material evinces an invidious intent to create division within American society.

In all of this, the aforementioned Donald John Trump, by his statements, unmindful of the high duties of his high office and the dignities and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony, respect, and courtesies necessary for stability within the society of the United States, has undermined the integrity of his office, has sown discord among the people of the United States, has brought disrepute, contempt, ridicule and disgrace on the Presidency, has acted in a manner antithetical to the cause of a just society, has betrayed his trust as President to the manifest injury of the people of the United States, and committed a high misdemeanor in office.

Therefore, Donald John Trump by causing such harm to the society of the United States is unfit to be President and warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office.

#### ARTICLE II

In his capacity as President of the United States, unmindful of the high duties of his high office, of the dignity and proprieties thereof, and of the harmony, and respect necessary for stability within the society of the United States, Donald John Trump has with his statements done more than simply insult individuals and groups of Americans, he has harmed the American society by publicly casting contempt on individuals and groups, inciting hate and hostility, sowing discord among the people of the United States, on the basis of race, national origin, religion, gender and sexual orientation, on one or more of the following occasions:

On January 27, 2017, Donald John Trump issued Executive Order 13769 providing for a partial shutdown of immigration from mainly Muslim countries, to fulfill a campaign promise that read as follows: “DONALD J. TRUMP STATEMENT ON PREVENTING MUSLIM IMMIGRATION (New York, NY) December 7th, 2015—Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country’s representatives can figure out what’s going on”, thereby casting contempt upon Muslims, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of religion.

On July 26, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: “After consultation with my Generals and military experts, please be advised that the United States Government will not accept or allow Transgender individuals to serve in any capacity in the U.S. Military. Our military must be focused on decisive and overwhelming victory and cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail”, and thereby casting contempt on transgender individuals, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of gender.

On September 23, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: “Wouldn’t you love to see one of these NFL owners, when somebody dis-

respects our flag, to say, ‘Get that son of a B-I-T-C-H off the field right now, out, he’s fired? He’s fired!’” thereby casting contempt on professional football players who engaged in constitutionally protected protests pertaining to allegations of police misconduct with regard to racial minorities, as well as casting contempt on the professional players’ mothers by calling the mothers “B-I-T-C-H-E-S”, effectively calling these mothers dogs, thereby inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States on the basis of race and gender.

On September 30, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: “They want everything to be done for them when it should be a community effort”, in the aftermath of Hurricane Maria thereby casting contempt on Puerto Rican citizens of the United States, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States based on national origin and race.

On October 3, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: “I hate to tell you, Puerto Rico, but you’ve thrown our budget a little out of whack because we spent a lot of money on Puerto Rico, that’s fine, we’ve saved a lot of lives”, but Donald John Trump did not make similar comments about Texas or Florida in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey or Hurricane Irma, treating the Puerto Rican citizens of the United States disparately, thereby casting contempt on Puerto Ricans, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States based on national origin and race.

On October 19, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: “The Fake News is going crazy with wacky Congresswoman Wilson (D), who was SECRETLY on a very personal call, and gave a total lie on content!”, thereby casting contempt on an African-American Member of Congress, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States based on gender and race.

On October 21, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: “I hope the Fake News Media keeps talking about Wacky Congresswoman Wilson in that she, as a representative, is killing the Democrat Party!” thereby casting contempt on an African-American female Member of Congress, inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States based on gender and race.

On October 22, 2017, Donald John Trump made a public statement substantially as follows: “Wacky Congresswoman Wilson is the gift that keeps on giving for the Republican Party, a disaster for Dems. You watch her in action & vote R!” thereby casting contempt on an African-American female Member of Congress inciting hate and hostility, and sowing discord among the people of the United States based on gender and race.

In all of this, the aforementioned Donald John Trump has, by his statements, brought the high office of President of the United States in contempt, ridicule, disgrace and disrepute, has sown discord among the people of the United States, has demonstrated that he is unfit to be President and has betrayed his trust as President of the United States to the manifest injury of the people of the United States, and has committed a high misdemeanor in office.

Therefore, Donald John Trump, by causing such harm to the society of the United States, is unfit to be President, warrants impeachment, trial, and removal from office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

#### MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.