

and, if unchecked, would fundamentally alter the balance of powers, violating our Founders' vision for America.

Opposing the President's reckless and anti-American decision transcends partisan politics and partisanship; it is about patriotism, constitutional fidelity, and putting country first.

That is why nearly two dozen distinguished former Republican Members of Congress are urging Republicans in Congress to vote for H.J.R. 46 and uphold "the authority of the first branch of government to resist efforts to surrender" our constitutional powers to an overreaching president.

To quote Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*: "In absolute governments, the King is law; so in free countries, the law ought to be King."

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to uphold the rule of law and the Constitution, and reject the President's power grab; I urge a resounding YES vote on H.J. Res. 46.

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

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 962) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any 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.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 962.

Mrs. TORRES of California. 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. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8, BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1112, ENHANCED BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 145 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 145

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale. 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. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-5. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 1112) to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the background check procedures to be followed before a Federal firearms licensee may transfer a firearm to a person who is not such a licensee. 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 amendments specified in this section 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. 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 116-6 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are

waived. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such further amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. 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 one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), 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.

□ 1330

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 145, providing for consideration of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, and H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019.

The rule provides for consideration of each bill under a structured rule. The rule also provides 1 hour of general debate on each bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019 and the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019 arrived at a time of emergency for America—a real emergency. Every year 120,000 Americans are shot in our country, and 35,000 of them are shot dead. Seventeen thousand of the people wounded or killed each year are children or teenagers, their families devastated, their lives forever changed.

In 2017, gun deaths in America hit the highest level in 40 years, with 40,000 Americans killed.

We have lost more Americans to gun violence in our own communities than to the Vietnam war, the Revolutionary

War, the Civil War, World War I, World War II, the Korean war, the Iraq war, and the Afghan war, combined. This war at home never stops. Each day—yesterday, today, and tomorrow—another 100 people in America are shot and killed by gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a global problem; it is an American problem. While 35,000 Americans are killed by gunfire here each year, it is 146 people in the United Kingdom, 142 in Portugal, and 30 in Japan.

We lose more people to gun violence in a single weekend than England loses all year. We lost more people in the Las Vegas massacre alone, in one bloody night, than the nation of Japan lost to gun violence in 8 years.

No other developed, high-income country's lethal gun violence even comes close to the American carnage allowed by our loophole-ridden gun laws. The gun-related murder rate in the United States is 25 times higher than the average of other high-income countries and hundreds of times higher than some of them.

Now, the good news is that we know what to do to begin to end this crisis. We must close the loopholes.

In 1994, the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act went into effect and required licensed firearm dealers to contact the FBI to run a background check through NICS, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

The Brady Act made it illegal to sell a firearm to felons, to fugitives, to people who had been committed to mental institutions, to drug addicts, to domestic abusers, to undocumented immigrants, and to other disqualified categories.

The Brady Act worked as far as it went. It stopped more than 3 million illegal purchases of firearms by convicted felons, violently abusive partners, fugitives, the mentally ill, and so on. But there are gaping loopholes in the law because unlicensed gun sellers, the people who sell guns online today or at gun shows or in other private transactions, can sell firearms without having to run any background check whatsoever.

More than one-fifth of U.S. gun owners acquired their most recent firearm without any background check at all, which means that millions of people obtained millions of firearms without going through the Brady system, and people who commit gun crimes overwhelmingly obtain their firearms from the unlicensed sources. A 2013 study found that 80 percent of all firearms acquired for criminal purposes were obtained from sources that were not required to go through the background check.

The criminals are not stupid. They follow the loopholes. They go to the internet. They go to the gun shows. They go to the convenience store parking lots to get their weapons of mass destruction without any background check at all.

Our legislation will close these dangerous loopholes by guaranteeing that there is a thorough NICS background check on every gun sale or transfer, with only a few carefully defined exceptions for intrafamily gifts and a few other cases.

Mr. Speaker, there are three primary things you need to know about this legislation:

First, it is backed by more than 90 percent of the American people—fully, 97 percent of Americans, including 97 percent of gun owners, 97 percent of Republicans, and 99 percent of Democrats. It is the very essence of common sense, the sense we all have in common, to make the background check system comprehensive and universal, leakproof, foolproof, and not ridden by the loopholes.

A background check doesn't work if criminals know that there are massive and lawful ways to cheat and get around it. So America, today, stands up to close the loopholes, and that is why this is a day of great triumph for the gun safety movement that has swept America in response to Parkland, Las Vegas, Newtown, and the other massacres that our people have endured.

Second, this legislation is perfectly constitutional. As Justice Scalia found for the Supreme Court in the District of Columbia v. Heller decision, the Second Amendment permits reasonable regulation to exclude from gun ownership violent felons, the mentally unstable, and so on.

Despite all of the solemn invocations of the Second Amendment that we continue to hear bouncing off of the walls of Congress, the opponents of this legislation could not muster a single witness to actually argue that this legislation is unconstitutional, and that includes the George Mason University Antonin Scalia School of Law professor of constitutional law and the Second Amendment who was brought in and just expressed her policy misgivings about the bill without articulating any constitutional analysis at all and rejected the opportunity to say that this legislation is unconstitutional.

The reason 97 percent of Americans favor this legislation is because it is perfectly consistent with the letter and spirit of the Second Amendment, and it sweepingly advances public safety at the same time.

Third, this bill will dramatically lower gun violence in America. More than 90 percent of Brady background checks take less than 90 seconds to complete. But these checks have literally stopped more than 3 million illegal gun purchases by felons, fugitives, domestic offenders, the violently mentally ill, undocumented aliens, and so on. Every day, background checks stop 170 felons and 50 domestic abusers from purchasing a gun. Imagine how much more effective this system will be when we close these gaping loopholes.

Yet, even in the face of the shocking death toll which distinguishes our soci-

ety from the other wealthy societies on Earth, despite the overwhelming public support for this legislation, and despite its clear constitutionality, our friends across the aisle oppose closing the internet, the gun show, and the private sale loopholes.

Instead of getting on our side to close the loopholes, what do they give us? More loopholes. They brought us dozens of amendments to try to suggest more loopholes to the current law.

That is obviously not the direction that America needs to go in, and you will hear some more about that today, Mr. Speaker. They have given us a veritable loophole factory. But now is the time to close loopholes, not reproduce them.

Let's focus on the public safety, which is the cardinal purpose of law in the social contract in a democratic society. Let's pass this excellent bill, and let's pass H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019, which closes the Charleston loophole, the loophole that made it possible for a guy to go out and get a gun because the dealer decided to give him a gun after 3 days because they were still doing a background check.

This loophole says that if it has taken 3 days or more, you have a right to go ahead and get your gun. We are going to close that one, the so-called default proceed provision. We are going to close that one, too, so that we don't see any repeat massacres like the one that took place in June of 2015 at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Mr. RASKIN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, all of us, Republicans and Democrats, want to reduce gun violence. I think there is just a difference of opinion on how we get there.

Unfortunately, H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112, although well-intentioned, will not reduce gun violence as Mr. RASKIN said, and instead it will turn everyday, law-abiding individuals into criminals and could actually do more harm than good.

I grew up in a family that didn't have guns. After my dad returned from World War II, he stopped hunting. So, because I wasn't around them, I have to admit I had an irrational fear of guns for awhile. It wasn't until I became an adult that I got educated.

I remember I first went to a debate where the person who was talking for gun rights said: Do you know who follows the laws? Law-abiding people follow the laws. Who doesn't follow the laws? Criminals do not follow the laws.

So although well-intentioned, often laws are unenforceable, and criminals just do not follow them.

H.R. 8, again, I believe is well-intentioned. But it will not solve the problem. H.R. 8 would not have prevented any of the mass shootings in the last 20 years, not one of them.

I studied them because I am on the Judiciary Committee along with Mr. RASKIN, and we heard this bill in that committee. In most cases, guns were obtained legally. Recent attackers have passed background checks to acquire their firearms, including the attackers at the Thousand Oaks, California, shooting; the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania shooting; the attacker in the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, Parkland, Florida, shooting; the shooting at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida; and the Las Vegas, Nevada, shooting. None of these attacks would have been prevented if H.R. 8 or H.R. 1112 were law.

Then, the attackers in the Columbine High School Colorado shooting used straw purchasers for their weapons, an act that is already illegal and has been illegal since at least the 1960s.

Adam Lanza, the attacker in the Sandy Hook Elementary School, Newtown, Connecticut, shooting used his mother's firearms which were legally purchased by his mother. So as you can see—and I have each one of them listed how the attackers got their guns—H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112 would not have prevented any of these shootings.

Not only would none of the mass shootings be prevented by H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112, but the Department of Justice under President Obama said that in order for universal background checks to actually work and be enforceable, a Federal gun registry is needed. Yet this legislation in H.R. 8 specifically prohibits a registry; thus, again, it is unenforceable.

The fact is criminals don't get their guns legally and will not go through a background check to get their guns even if this bill were signed into law.

□ 1345

A recent Department of Justice report of prison inmates that used guns in their crimes showed that 56 percent obtained their guns illegally and another 25 percent received them from family members—which, by the way, family members are still allowed to get the guns under this law.

It is obvious, then, that they did not get their guns from a gun show or private sales, as Mr. RASKIN is concerned about.

H.R. 8 will also turn everyday, law-abiding citizens into criminals if it becomes law.

Let's look at the amendments that were rejected by the Democrats in the Rules Committee and in the Committee on the Judiciary that offered to protect law-abiding citizens from becoming criminals.

First, there was an amendment—I thought commonsense—that someone thinking of committing suicide would be exempted from temporarily turning over their gun to a friend, and it is not allowed under this bill. They would become a criminal.

So, somebody who wants to commit suicide could not transfer their gun to someone else.

If a law-abiding citizen wanted to let someone temporarily use their gun on their own property, they would become a criminal under this bill.

If a farmer or rancher wanted to temporarily lend a gun to a ranch hand for the purposes of ranch activities, the farmer would become a criminal under this law.

If a domestic violence victim was in fear for her life and wanted to temporarily borrow a gun from a friend to protect herself, she would become a criminal under this law.

Let's also look at some commonsense amendments rejected by the Democrats that would have prevented undue burdens and duplication on law-abiding citizens who have already passed a background check but now have to go through another background check under this law.

People who have security clearances. This is the application to get a government security clearance, page upon page, background check, extensive background check. Yet, someone who has this and has gone through this still has to get another background check.

People who have a concealed carry weapon issued by a State, they have to go through another background check.

People who have already gotten a gun permit from States which require them; they have to go through another background check.

People who have global entry, who have gone through a background check, they have got to do it again under this bill.

Even law enforcement officers. Law enforcement officers have to go through another background check under this bill.

This is placing undue burden on law-abiding citizens.

Now I want to share testimony from a young woman from the Judiciary Committee. This woman was a victim of rape on her college campus. And the reason I am bringing it up is because well-meaning gun control laws actually prevented her from carrying a gun to school because the State she traveled through did not allow her to carry a gun in order to defend herself.

This is a clear example of how law-abiding citizens—not criminals, law-abiding citizens—who follow the law and how this young woman and others like her were actually harmed by well-intentioned gun control laws.

As a survivor of domestic violence, I know all too well how hard it can be to protect oneself or find a lifeline out. My abuser often controlled all my finances. I wouldn't have been able to pay for a background check or a gun.

Sometimes getting a gun from a friend could actually be your only option; yet, unfortunately, under this bill, I tried to offer an amendment, but it was rejected.

Now let's turn to H.R. 1112, which changes the length of time that a background check has to be completed from the current 3 days to 10 business days and then another 10 business days for an appeal. So it could be 20-plus days.

The reason I am bringing this up is I want to tell you a story—a real story—about Carol Bowne. She was a New Jersey woman who was stabbed to death while waiting to be approved for her firearm application.

She already had an order of protection through the courts, but that wasn't enough. She needed more than just that piece of paper.

H.R. 1112 will make the realities of Carol's story happen across the country, putting millions of women and law-abiding citizens in danger. Women who seek avenues of protection will be forced to wait almost a month—20 days to a month—like Carol. How many women will potentially suffer like Carol?

H.R. 8 also has other problems.

Unfortunately, the debate in the Judiciary Committee was cut short. Many commonsense amendments were not even heard. Only 10 amendments out of 100 were heard before the chairman cut off debate.

Because of the rush to get this bill through, there is another problem. There is vague language that is not defined and, thus, is open to interpretation.

I know, in some of the amendments, the majority party has tried to give an alternative to my good, commonsense domestic violence amendments, but it doesn't do any good. And this is the reason; it is because the language is so vague.

It says: Under H.R. 8, a person is allowed to temporarily transfer a firearm if it is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm.

The question is: There is no definition of this, so how long is a temporary transfer? Who determines that? Does the victim determine it?

Who determines if there is imminent death? Does it qualify if a victim of domestic violence thinks they will be killed? Or does the person transferring the gun have to be in the same room and there be some kind of shootout and they throw a gun to them?

What do "imminent danger" and "imminent death" mean?

With something as important as the Second Amendment, I think we owe it to the American people to do our work and take as long as we have to in order to have a fair and open debate on major pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a statement by the National Task Force to End Sexual & Domestic Violence, which is in favor of this legislation and against any weakening amendments.

NATIONAL TASK FORCE TO END SEXUAL & DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, a coalition comprising federal, state, local and tribal organizations and individuals who have fought for

federal protections for survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking, oppose any amendments to H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, that exempts any persons from the firearms background check requirement. This includes amendments exempting victims and survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault, including those with protective orders.

Firearms pose a significant danger to victims of domestic violence, and this is true no matter who owns the firearm. Research shows that a male abuser's access to a firearm increases the risk of intimate partner femicide fivefold and does not support the contention that firearm possession is a protective factor for the victim. The testimony of Christy Salters Martin, a professional boxer and experienced gun user, to the Senate Judiciary Committee illustrates this. Despite her boxing prowess and familiarity with firearms, her abuser was able to take her gun from her and shoot her with it, narrowly missing her heart. Firearms do not make victims of domestic violence safer; firearms put victims at greater risk.

Furthermore, domestic abusers are adept at using the justice system against victims. Abusers often accuse the victim of being the perpetrator of violence, making police reports and seeking protective orders. Abusers are also adept at finding loopholes. If persons with protective orders are exempted from the background check requirement, many abusers who are prohibited from possessing firearms would seek protective orders in order to circumvent the background check requirement to obtain firearms to terrorize their victims.

Moreover, requiring a victim to undergo a firearms background check is not a hurdle to obtaining a firearm. Most firearm background checks are completed in under a minute. A victim seeking to purchase a firearm would still be able to do so quickly, unless the victim was legally prohibited from possessing firearms.

Rather than adding dangerous exemptions to a law that is supposed to protect victims and survivors of domestic violence, Congress should focus on ensuring that adjudicated domestic abusers do not possess firearms. This includes ensuring federal firearms prohibitors protect all victims of intimate partner violence, including dating partners, and ensuring that domestic abusers who are prohibited from possessing firearms relinquish their firearms. The best way to protect victims is to disarm abusers.

Mr. RASKIN. Just to quote a small part of it: "Firearms pose a significant danger to victims of domestic violence, and this is true no matter who owns the firearm. Research shows that a male abuser's access to a firearm increases the risk of intimate partner femicide fivefold and does not support the contention that firearm possession is a protective factor for the victim."

And there is more in here of interest.

I would like to thank my distinguished colleague from Arizona for her thoughts on the question of sexual and domestic violence.

We, indeed, have a provision within the legislation which allows for an exemption from the background check requirement in cases of an imminent threat of great bodily harm.

The question has been raised: Does that include sexual assault, dating partner violence, stalking, and so on? We thought it was self-evident that it did, but, in any event, Representatives

Horn from Oklahoma and Murphy from Florida are introducing a clarifying amendment to be very specific that it is included.

At that point, perhaps we could welcome the support of the distinguished gentlewoman from Arizona, because we are being very clear at that point that our exception for imminent bodily harm and violence includes sexual assault and so on.

I am certain that the gentlewoman's intentions are good, just as are the intentions of the offerers of the amendment in the bill.

Let me just address, in case the gentlewoman hasn't decided to come over to our side now, some of the general points that were made against the legislation.

The gentlewoman articulated an argument we have been hearing a lot of from our counterparts, which is that criminals don't follow the law and, therefore, there is no reason to get rid of the loopholes and strengthen the law, because criminals won't follow the law.

Now, the fallacy of that argument is plain to see. It is an argument against all law.

It is an argument against the law against murder because murderers obviously don't follow the law against murder.

It is an argument against the law opposed to theft because thieves don't follow the law against theft.

But I think anyone who takes time to really study what law is understands that the purpose of the law is to deter people from negative, socially harmful action, the way that the Brady Act has deterred more than 3 million people—felons, fugitives, the mentally unstable, and other unauthorized categories—from accessing a weapon.

Now, that argument sweeps so broadly that it is an argument against having the Brady Act that we have now, and perhaps that is the intention, simply to take down the law that we have got now.

Another purpose of law, of course, is to punish people who violate it and then, again, to send a moral message about what the social norms are.

And we have got social norms about driving, for example. Would we say we are not going to have driver's licenses in America because people who drive without a driver's license ignore the law requiring you to have a driver's license?

It is a completely nonsensical argument.

Let's come back to reality and talk about what the Brady Act actually requires the gun dealers to ask people.

Here are the basic questions that are being asked:

Are you under indictment for or have you ever been convicted of a felony?

Are you a fugitive from justice?

Are you an unlawful user of a controlled substance?

Do you suffer from mental illness?

Have you been dishonorably discharged from the Armed Forces?

Are you subject to a court order restraining you from harassing, stalking, or threatening your child or an intimate partner?

Have you ever been convicted of a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence?

Have you renounced your United States citizenship?

Are you unlawfully present in the United States?

Mr. Speaker, those questions have created a dragnet that has allowed us to stop more than 3 million people from getting weapons who shouldn't have them.

But there are these big, gaping loopholes out there that they can go on the Internet and get one, or they can go to the parking lot of a convenience store in a private sale and get one, or they can go to a gun show and negotiate a private sale and get one without having to answer those questions.

Well, the American people have spoken on this. That is really why this is the first legislation advocating gun safety to hit the floor of the House of Representatives in a quarter of a century.

This is a great day for the gun safety movement that has overtaken America, rejecting the unconscionable toll of 100 people dead every single day in communities across the land.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), the sponsor of the underlying bill, H.R. 8, who has done such a magnificent job advocating this cause through thick and thin.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and for the underlying legislation, a bipartisan measure that will make all of our communities safer and will save lives.

I would like to thank Chairman McGOVERN for his fair consideration of H.R. 8 and the proposed amendments that came before the Rules Committee.

This is an important time in our Nation's history. Over 80 percent of Americans have come together to support universal background checks. This is a new day, and this is the time to act now.

Since the tragedy in Newtown about 6½ years ago, this House has held 54 moments of silence, but we have not held one moment of action.

With Speaker PELOSI's leadership, we now have a chance to vote for two—two—bipartisan bills which will help save lives.

As a gun owner and a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, I was proud to introduce H.R. 8 with my bipartisan colleagues. I look forward to its consideration tomorrow, and I urge my colleagues to support this rule today and the bill tomorrow.

□ 1400

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), my good friend.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112.

We all share the same goal: to end gun violence. But in the course of this debate, House Democrats say they want to do something to end gun violence and anyone who disagrees with their policies doesn't care.

I believe in my heart that the gentleman from Maryland and the folks on the other side of this debate care about the victims of gun violence and the children in this country, and I know in my heart that my colleagues on this side of the aisle and I care, too.

It is a shame that in their rush to do something, anything, Democrats have made this a partisan show. They won't even allow my bipartisan concealed carry reciprocity bill that passed this House last Congress to be debated on the House floor today.

What about the single mother victim of assault, like Sheneen Allen? Does she not have the right to defend herself?

Instead of working on commonsense solutions that can actually help prevent tragedies—like supporting local law enforcement, ensuring laws and protocols are followed, improving mental health, and implementing my concealed carry reciprocity—they are targeting law-abiding citizens, and they are disregarding existing Federal law.

There is no gun show loophole. Federal law already requires a background check on every commercial gun purchase in America no matter where it takes place. Federal law already prohibits so-called straw purchases.

Let's make one thing clear: H.R. 8 would not have stopped Newtown. H.R. 8 would not have stopped Parkland. It would not have stopped Las Vegas or Sutherland Springs or San Bernardino or the tragic attack on our former colleague, Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords.

But the proponents of gun control don't want you to judge them based on outcomes; they want you to judge them based on intentions. And they say anyone who points out the facts, anyone who dares observe the obvious flaws in their legislation, does so because they don't care.

In their rush to do something, House Democrats ignore that House Republicans have done many things, like strengthening the background check system, which would have prevented Sutherland Springs; improving mental healthcare, which would have prevented many of these shootings such as Newtown and Charleston and Parkland; and giving schools the tools they need to protect students. All these bills received bipartisan support in the last Congress, but we don't get credit for real action because they say our intentions weren't good enough.

We owe it to the American people to look past the intention and the emotion and focus like a laser on outcomes. What can we do to actually end gun violence once and for all?

So what is this bill actually going to do?

It is going to turn a law-abiding American into a criminal when you

loan your shotgun to your buddy to go dove hunting.

It is going to make it illegal for a victim of stalking to borrow a gun from a neighbor for protection.

It is going to make the cost of background checks so expensive that the average American can't afford to buy a gun. Meanwhile, criminals are going to continue to get their firearms, whether it is through theft or the black market or on the street.

I applaud President Donald Trump for standing with us against this ineffective legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

The American people want us to work together to solve this problem and stop gun violence. Can't we come together in a bipartisan way and not just do something, but do something that will actually make a difference?

I am calling on my colleagues to put partisanship aside. Work together on ideas that will actually make a difference. I stand ready to continue this work. I will work with anyone to end gun violence while also protecting the rights of law-abiding citizens, and I reject the false dilemma that we can't do both.

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

I suppose that we are in a rush to do anything, something, anything that works in order to curb the terrible toll of gun violence on our society.

In the last Congress it is true there was other legislation that was brought to us. One was a proposal to legalize silencers in America, which sounds to me more like an agenda of organized crime than it is of the U.S. Congress trying to seek public safety.

But there was this bipartisan Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act, which was a massive assault on federalism and States' rights. It would have destroyed every State's concealed carry law in the country to a level at the lowest common denominator. So if you could get a license to carry a concealed loaded weapon in one State—and in some States there are more than a million people who have been able to get them through completely permissive and lax laws—then you could go anywhere in the country. That is their proposal. That is what is coming out of the loophole factory.

I just would like to assure my friend that we have a provision in our legislation, if you read it carefully, which says that you can temporarily transfer a gun at a shooting range, at a shooting gallery, or for purposes of hunting, so he doesn't have to worry about this.

Our friends are either not reading carefully enough or they are overlooking very clear passages in our legislation which deal with commonsense concerns.

This is bipartisan legislation. It is backed by more than 90 percent of the American people, and it is going to advance common safety. So rather than searching for mysterious reasons to oppose it, why shouldn't everybody get

together to say this is something that will promote the public safety?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. RASKIN of the Rules Committee for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. I am proud to be a cosponsor, and I thank Congressman THOMPSON for his leadership.

Our bill is intended to ensure that individuals who are prohibited from owning a firearm are not able to possess one.

Representative RASKIN is right. America is in the midst of a gun violence emergency. Each year, 120,000 Americans are injured by a firearm; 35,000 Americans die; and of those, 17,000 who are injured and killed are children.

No other country in the world suffers the ravages of gun violence, and I am afraid we have become numb to it. But we don't have to accept it, and we are not, because we are going to finally pass legislation here today.

Mass shootings are on the rise. Military-style assault weapons are deadlier than ever. People are being gunned down in churches, schools, movie theaters, nightclubs, and synagogues.

For so many years, the Republican-led Congress blocked action on commonsense gun safety laws. But, finally, to the American people: We heard you; to the students who marched for their lives: We are finally going to act.

It is time now. I urge adoption of this bipartisan bill, the rule. It is a vote for the safety of our communities and our families.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a couple of things that were said previously.

I had sponsored an amendment, as a survivor of domestic violence, to allow victims of domestic violence and sexual abuse who have orders of protection to be able to get transferred a gun if they might be in fear for their life.

As I have said, often victims of domestic violence don't have the financial means or they are so restricted by their perpetrator that it is difficult for them to go out and purchase a gun, let alone get a background check, and so they might have a friend whom they can borrow it from.

Now, in response, I think, Mr. RASKIN, if I am not mistaken, said that the Democrats did help domestic violence victims. I just don't think that their amendment cuts it, and I am going to read the amendment if this is the one that the gentleman is talking about.

It says: A temporary transfer that is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm, if the possession by the transferee lasts only as long as immediately necessary to prevent the

imminent death or great bodily harm—and then here is the amendment—including the harm of domestic violence, dating partner violence, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic abuse.

I would say just because you add the words “domestic violence,” “victims of domestic abuse” doesn’t mean this is going to help; and the reason is simply because of what I said before, that these terms in here are really unclear. I really would like somebody to explain, and they are not defined anywhere, who determines prevent imminent death or great bodily harm?

So, let’s say I am a victim of domestic violence and I think my perpetrator is going to kill me. Does imminent death and, in this word, say, last only as long as immediately necessary to prevent the imminent death? So does that mean the person who—my friend who can lend me a gun has to be right there in the same room and see that there is imminent death coming?

I mean, there is no definition here. So it is unclear to me that this would help at all.

Also, what is the definition of “temporary transfer”? How long is that? How long is temporary transfer? Does that mean, you know, just enough time you can throw somebody a gun while they are imminently in death? I mean, do you have to be right there? What does this mean? There is no definition.

So, if we are going to proceed with this, I think that we should at least define what these terms mean. Therefore, I really wish that my amendment that said that victims of domestic violence or sexual abuse that have an order of protection through the court—through the court—would be allowed to at least borrow a gun to defend themselves from, maybe, a friend.

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

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

I want to thank my colleague for advancing our discussion here because I think now we are really starting to get somewhere.

The gentlewoman suggested an amendment which allows for the transfer of a firearm to a victim of domestic violence or sexual assault who has an order of protection issued by a court. That is an extremely narrow exception.

Most women who are enduring domestic violence don’t have a civil protection order. Part of that is because of the incompetence of the laws in a lot of States, and part of it is because they haven’t had the wherewithal to go and get one.

But our legislation and our amendment sweeps much more broadly. It allows any woman who is a victim of domestic violence, who faces a threat from their attacker, to be loaned a gun by a family member or be loaned a gun by a friend until the threat is resolved.

My friend suggests that there is something ambiguous about the words. I just don’t see the ambiguity. Their original argument attacked the utility

of all criminal law, saying we shouldn’t have criminal laws, essentially, because criminals won’t follow them.

This seems like an attack on law itself. Law depends upon language. But the language is clear here that if there is a threat and if you are suffering from the threat of domestic violence, sexual assault and so on, then you can get the gun.

Who interprets it? Well, you have got the right to go out and get it. If someone were to prosecute you for doing that, the prosecution would clearly lose.

So I am afraid that our friends are looking for problems in this bipartisan legislation which simply don’t exist.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member on the Judiciary Committee and senior member on the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee, I, too, am glad of the underlying discussion regarding the protecting of women.

I rise today to support H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, to close the gun show loophole, supported by 80 percent of the American people, so unlicensed dealers cannot, undercover, out of the back of their trunk, sell to people who would create and perpetrate either mass murders or individual abuse and gun violence.

I also support H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019, that would, in fact, have stopped the deaths at the Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, South Carolina, where worshippers were shot down, nine of them.

To listen to the debate in the Judiciary Committee, 10 hours of rebuffing these simple legislative initiatives, I beg of my colleagues to stand with us. It is clear that we have an amendment, Horn and Murphy, that clarifies great bodily harm, includes domestic violence, dating partner violence, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic abuse. We want women to be protected and others involved in domestic abuse circumstances.

My amendment that will be brought up as well will provide the information as to how many times the FBI has had to deal with petitions that have been denied.

Let us not have another 20 years before we have bills that deal with gun safety legislation. Let’s do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule governing debate on H.R. 8, the “Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019” and H.R. 1112, the “Enhanced Background Check Act of 2019,” as well as the underlying legislation.

These legislative proposals address and strengthen the background check system that is already in place to purchase a firearm.

A 2013 study found that approximately 80 percent of all firearms acquired for criminal purposes were obtained from sources who were not required to run a background check,

and that 96 percent of inmates who were not prohibited from possessing a firearm at the time they committed their crime obtained their gun this way.

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

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

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

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

An internal assessment by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) demonstrated that NICS background checks are approximately 99.3 percent to 99.8 percent accurate, and in 90 percent of cases, are processed within 90 seconds.

H.R. 1112, the “Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019,” would strengthen the background check procedures federal firearms licensees or dealers follow before selling or transferring a firearm.

As under current law, firearms dealers would be required to run a background check on prospective buyers using the NICS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In December 2012, a gunman walked into Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown,

Connecticut, and killed 20 children, 6 adults, and himself.

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

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

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

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

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

A recent study by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention looking at 30 years of homicide data found that for every 1 percent increase in a State's gun ownership rate, there is a nearly 1 percent increase in its firearm homicide rate.

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

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

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

And that begins with passing H.R. 8, the "Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019," and H.R. 1112, the "Enhanced Background Check Act of 2019."

I urge all Members to support the rule and the underlying legislation when it comes to the floor.

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

I would like to refute some of the things, or talk about some of the things said by my friends on the other side.

One of the things that I do want to talk about is that Mr. RASKIN said that my amendment is such a narrow exception for domestic violence victims. I had a broader one in Judiciary Committee, if the gentleman remembers, and Chairman NADLER told me that it was too broad, that it was too vague, so that is why I made it very specific.

If the gentleman would like, I will make it broad again.

□ 1415

Also in the Rules Committee, there was another amendment as well, and we are both on Rules, too, of course.

There was a broader one from Mr. SCALISE, who is a victim of gun violence. He had an amendment that was ruled out of order. That basically said any victim of domestic violence, which was broad, but then he had another subsection that said victim of domestic violence or sexual abuse that has an order of protection. So we covered both, yet it was ruled out of order. So we really tried.

Now, the other thing that you brought up, that it is very clear what

imminent danger means, and that would cover somebody, and surely a domestic violence victim would not become a criminal under this law. Well, I don't think it is very sure.

So I ask Mr. RASKIN, my colleague, if he would be open to removing the word "imminent" and just say "danger," instead of "imminent danger," because to me, "imminent danger" means you have to be right in the same room, you know, and throw somebody a gun or something. I mean, to me, the word "imminent" needs to be removed from the language.

The other thing I would like to talk about is the number of times now my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said: Oh, so many people support this universal background check.

Well, I disagree. I disagree, because there is proof right in Maine. They had a ballot measure, and it was rejected by the majority of the people.

I suppose it depends on how you ask the question, but I just don't think that when you get into the details of how it takes away our fundamental Second Amendment rights and actually burdens law-abiding citizens and actually may harm people, some of these laws—like was the case with the young woman who testified in Judiciary who said that good-intentioned gun laws actually prevented her from defending herself, and she was raped.

So I would say I have some disagreements with some of your statements.

I also want to point out that there are many things that we can do on a bipartisan basis, and this obviously is not bipartisan. I am a co-chairwoman of the Women's Caucus in Congress, and I have talked to my counterpart, a very nice woman and Congresswoman. We really do want to work on bipartisan solutions to gun violence. I would say one of those is let's really concentrate on mental health issues.

Now, we have done some things in the past. We did the Fix NICS Act, which we passed last year on a bipartisan basis, which really is an attempt to fix the national background system so that local jurisdictions actually report when there are problems, which I think is very valuable.

We also did legislation in a bipartisan manner that would protect our schools more.

Here is another thing we could do in a bipartisan manner. As you have noted, 3.5 million people have been stopped by NICS since 1994 from getting guns, and 112,000 were stopped just last year. But you know what? Only 12 of those 112,000 were actually prosecuted. Why? I mean, we have laws on the books now, and we are not even enforcing them. So I think that is another thing we can do on a bipartisan basis.

Again, this bill, I believe, does more harm than good. I do think my colleagues are well intentioned. I do believe that all of us, whether we are Republican or Democrat, want to reduce gun violence.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, first, to clarify one thing, this is bipartisan legislation. We have at least five Republicans who are cosponsoring and supporting this legislation. I assume my friend doesn't mean to read those five Republican Members of the House of Representatives out of her caucus.

I am not quite sure what happened in Maine, but I know that there are around a dozen States and the District of Columbia that have already gotten rid of the loopholes that we are going to get rid of today in this Federal legislation.

My friend also invokes Second Amendment rights. I thought that we had put that red herring to rest in 2008 in Heller v. District of Columbia. Justice Scalia said that reasonable regulation to screen out felons and fugitives and the mentally unstable is perfectly consistent with the Second Amendment.

Everybody on both sides of the aisle favors the Second Amendment, along with the rest of the Bill of Rights. If you are going to oppose this legislation, you have to base it on some public safety rationale and not pretend like anybody has made a constitutional argument, because nobody has made a constitutional argument.

Finally, on the question of the domestic violence amendment, I would invite my friend to come on over, and we would gladly have unanimous consent to have her added to the amendment, which is the broader amendment she is talking about. Of course, her amendment was the narrow one, which required you to have a civil protection order before there would be an exception from the provisions of the legislation.

She said she was misdirected by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. All I can say is the legislative process is a treacherous place and a rocky road for people in the minority. I have been dealing with that for several years. In any event, we would love to have you join the amendment now. Mr. Speaker, I make that offer to my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), who is the great and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for yielding me the time, and I thank him for his leadership on this important issue.

Let me remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are opposing this legislation that people are watching this debate, and I know many are scratching their heads wondering what is going on, because what we are trying to do here is close loopholes that allow violent criminals to get access to guns, not create more loopholes.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I spoke at a town hall sponsored by students at Bancroft High School in Worcester, Massachusetts. Those young people demanded action on gun violence, not unlike other young people all across my district and all across this country. They are terrified, and they are tired of seeing one massacre after another after another after another. They are sickened by the unacceptable high rate of gun violence in this country.

We have an obligation to be on their side, not on the side of the gun lobby.

In fact, most gun owners agree with what we are doing here today. Ninety-seven percent of gun-owning households support universal background checks. You don't see support like that on very many things, but on this issue, the public is speaking loud and clear. The question is whether Congress is going to listen.

My office has been flooded with calls on this year after year after year, and I have heard from loved ones of victims killed and from those injured. I know many of my colleagues can say the same thing. It is heartbreaking.

Each of us is in a unique position. We can do more than just listen. We can act. We can actually vote to help save lives.

Sadly, past majorities have turned a deaf ear. In fact, it has been nearly a decade since the Judiciary Committee held a hearing on a major bill to combat gun violence. When they were in charge, my Republican friends on the other side instead held a hearing on a bill that would have actually brought more guns from out of State into local communities.

Their indifference on this issue of gun violence, their silence, has been stunning. But this majority is not satisfied with inaction. We will not be cowed by the gun lobby.

We are moving legislation, in the case of H.R. 8, that has been in the works for more than 20 years. The time for inaction is over.

Listen to the young people in your districts. They are not content with a future where gun violence is the norm. They want and they deserve better.

Last night in the Rules Committee, my Republican friends tried to pass exception after exception after exception.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN).

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, they tried to pass exception after exception to this universal background check bill, essentially trying to gut the bill.

Well, this is a modest reform in the right direction. We are trying to save lives. We are tired of massacres. We are tired of comforting parents whose loved ones were killed in gun violence. We are tired of inaction. We are tired of the gun lobby dictating what Congress does and doesn't pass.

This majority is going to be run by the people of this country, and the ma-

jority of the people of this country overwhelmingly support these bills.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this rule and vote for the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman RASKIN for yielding and for his tireless leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and H.R. 8, Congressman THOMPSON's bipartisan bill that makes gun sale background checks universal.

This bill is an important step to ensure that individuals who should not be allowed to purchase a gun are no longer able to purchase a gun.

Since 2014, nearly 400 of my constituents have died by gun violence. Our community feels their loss every single day. Here are just a few of their names and tragic stories.

Davon Ellis: Davon was a star football player and an excellent student at Oakland Tech High School. He was shot and killed while walking home from school. My nephew was walking with him when he was gunned down.

Travon Godfrey: Travon was killed in 2016 while sitting in a car with his friends in front of his home. Every time I think about Travon, my heart breaks. Travon came to a town meeting that I held on gun violence in January of 2016.

Sadly, these heartbreaking stories are all too familiar in communities across the country. More than 30,000 Americans lose their lives to gun violence each year. Shootings now kill as many Americans as car accidents, and that is why this bill is so important.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me additional time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good first step to ensure that our background checks are strengthened, that we keep guns out of the wrong hands, and that we close these loopholes.

Mr. Speaker, we must end this epidemic of gun violence in our country. This is a national emergency. This bill will save lives, so I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make my amendment in order, which would allow domestic violence and sexual assault victims with orders of protection to be exempt from the gun transfer prohibitions. This amendment is crucial to saving lives.

As a survivor of domestic violence, I know what it is like to be in fear for our lives.

This commonsense amendment is clearcut. If you are a victim with an order of protection, you can borrow a firearm or transfer a firearm to you. It is important, because victims don't often have the means to purchase or go pay for a background check.

The Democrats have presented a letter from the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence as a reason for not needing my amendment. However, with all due respect, the National Task Force does not speak for every victim, and they certainly do not speak for me. In fact, they never even contacted me, and I have been an outspoken person saying I am a survivor of domestic violence since I ran for Congress. I am also the person who sponsored the amendment to extend the Violence Against Women Act, yet they have never talked to me or reached out to my office.

The majority offered a political amendment on domestic violence, which I have already talked about, which really does not do any good, because the definitions of imminent danger are not defined, and it will not be carried out and will not be effective.

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 (Mr. PRICE of North Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, in closing, we all want to solve gun violence in the United States, but H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112 will not solve the problem.

□ 1430

As co-chairwoman of the bipartisan Women's Caucus, I am committed to working across the aisle on solutions we can all agree on. However, this is not one of them. We can talk about mental health. We can talk about strengthening the NICS background check system even more. We can talk about enforcing the laws that are already on the books.

H.R. 8 will turn law-abiding citizens into criminals by making everyday gun transfers a crime and putting those who seek to protect themselves in jail for wanting to do so.

H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112 will place an undue burden on citizens who already have a background check. For instance: security clearance, global entry, State-issued permits, et cetera.

These pieces of legislation put law-abiding citizens in danger by disarming them and emboldening criminals. The bad guys never follow the law. In fact, I believe that this legislation violates the Second Amendment of the Constitution because it does not prohibit undue fees for background checks and, thus, some people cannot afford them

and, thus, not be able to get a gun to defend themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I urge “no” on the previous question, “no” on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, far from trying to turn law-abiding citizens into criminals, our legislation will save law-abiding citizens from criminals, simply by expanding the successful Brady law, which has been in effect for decades now.

The gentlewoman introduces a constitutional argument at the last minute here, saying that our legislation is unconstitutional because there may be undue fees imposed. Of course, those are the fees that are currently imposed under the Brady law, so I am afraid that my friend has just made an argument for the unconstitutionality of the current law, which has saved us from more than 3 million felons, fugitives, mentally unstable people, drug abusers, and undocumented aliens from acquiring firearms in the country.

Mr. Speaker, our country is a social contract. I know we have got a lot of young people here today. We are a social contract. If you go back and read any of the social contracts—there is Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, or Thomas Jefferson—any of them say, we leave a state of nature, which is a state of war and a state of violence, in order to live in a civilized way.

But how civilized is it when tens of thousands of Americans, every year, are being killed in firearm violence? Every day, another hundred Americans are killed with guns.

In 2017, the highest level in 40 years, nearly 40,000 Americans died from gun violence. That is not a civilized state. That is a state of war. That is a state of violence.

We know what the loopholes are, and we are going to close the loopholes with our bipartisan legislation, which has support from Republicans and it has support from Democrats. The public opinion polls show that more than 95 percent of the American people support what we are trying to do here—close the gun show loophole, close the private sale loophole, close the internet loophole—make sure that everybody who purchases a gun in America is purchasing it only with the universal comprehensive mental and criminal background check.

We have amendments for the discrete exceptions that are necessary, including in cases of imminent violence, including rape and sexual assault via domestic violence. We think that this legislation is excellent legislation that every Member of Congress should feel proud voting for.

Mr. Speaker, I submit both H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Check Act, as well as the bill to close the Charleston loophole, so that criminals are not given guns after 3 days. We are able to delay that process in the event that more investigation is needed.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 145, the rule providing for consideration of the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019 (H.R. 8) and the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019 (H.R. 1112).

These critical bills would ensure that there is a comprehensive background check on every firearm purchase, something that 97 percent of American voters, including 97 percent of gun-owning households, support.

H.R. 8 requires background checks on all firearm sales, including those conducted by unlicensed gun sellers, closing what has become known as the “gun show loophole.”

H.R. 1112 closes another loophole in current statute that allows gun dealers to transfer a firearm after three business days if they have not received a definitive response from the background check system.

Tragically, this gap became known as the “Charleston loophole” when it contributed to the brutal murder of nine people at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston in 2015.

Congress must act immediately on the ABCs of gun violence prevention.

A is for Assault Weapons Ban.

B is for Background Checks Reform.

C is for Closing the Gun Show Loophole.

These measures make progress on B and C, and I urge my colleagues to support them.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

Sec. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 5 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution if offered by Representative Lesko of Arizona or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

Sec. 5. The amendment referred to in section 4 is as follows:

Page 3, line 17, strike “or”.

Page 4, line 15, strike the period and insert “; or”.

Page 4, after line 15, insert the following:

“(G) a transfer to a victim of domestic violence or sexual assault who is to be protected under an order of protection issued by a court of law.”

Mr. RASKIN. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of House Resolution 145, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 144; and

Adoption of House Resolution 144, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 191, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—229

Adams	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Omar
Allred	Gottheimer	Pallone
Axne	Green (TX)	Panetta
Barragán	Grijalva	Pappas
Bass	Haaland	Pascarella
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bera	Hastings	Perlmutter
Beyer	Hayes	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Heck	Peterson
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Hill (CA)	Pingree
Bonamici	Himes	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Brindisi	Horsford	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Houlihan	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Bustos	Huffman	Raskin
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Jayapal	Richmond
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	Royal-Allard
Case	Kaptur	Ruiz
Casten (IL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Ryan
Chu, Judy	Khanh	Sánchez
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Cisneros	Kilmer	Scanlon
Clark (MA)	Kim	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Schrer
Connolly	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Langevin	Scott, David
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawrence	Shalala
Cox (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Craig	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Crist	Lee (NV)	Sires
Crow	Levin (CA)	Slotkin
Cuellar	Levin (MI)	Soto
Cummings	Lewis	Spanberger
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Stanton
Davis (CA)	Loebback	Stevens
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Suozzi
Dean	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lujan	Takano
DeLauro	Luria	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Delgado	Malinowski	Titus
Demings	Maloney	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean	Tonko
Deutch	Matsui	Torres (CA)
Dingell	McAdams	Torres Small
Doggett	McBath	Trahan
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Underwood
Engel	McBachin	Van Drew
Escobar	McGovern	Vargas
Eshoo	McNerney	Veasey
Espaiatl	Meeks	Vela
Evans	Meng	Velazquez
Finkenauer	Moore	Visclosky
Fletcher	Morelle	Wasserman
Foster	Moulton	Schultz
Fudge	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Gabbard	Murphy	Watson Coleman
Gallego	Nader	Welch
Garamendi	Napolitano	Wexton
García (IL)	Neal	Wild
García (TX)	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
Golden	Norcross	Yarmuth
	O’Halleran	
		NAYS—191
Abraham	Barr	Burchett
Aderholt	Bergman	Burgess
Allen	Biggs	Byrne
Amash	Bilirakis	Calvert
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)
Armstrong	Bost	Carter (TX)
Arrington	Brady	Chabot
Babin	Brooks (AL)	Cheney
Bacon	Brooks (IN)	Cline
Baird	Buchanan	Cloud
Balderson	Buck	Cole
Banks	Budd	Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)	Hurd (TX)	Rodgers (WA)	Costa	Khanna	Price (NC)	Kelly (MS)	Olson	Stauber
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Roe, David P.	Courtney	Kildee	Quigley	Kelly (PA)	Palazzo	Stefanik
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Cox (CA)	Kilmer	Raskin	King (NY)	Palmer	Steil
Cook	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)	Craig	Kim	Rice (NY)	Kinzinger	Pence	Steube
Crawford	Jordan	Rooney (FL)	Crist	Kind	Richmond	Kustoff (TN)	Perry	Stewart
Crenshaw	Joyce (OH)	Rose, John W.	Crow	Kirkpatrick	Rose (NY)	LaHood	Peterson	Stivers
Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Rouzer	Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Rouda	LaMalfa	Posey	Taylor
Davidson (OH)	Kelly (MS)	Roy	Cummings	Kuster (NH)	Royal-Allard	Lamborn	Ratcliffe	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford	Cunningham	Lamb	Ruiz	Latta	Reed	Thornberry
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Scalise	Davids (KS)	Langevin	Ruppersberger	Lesko	Reschenthaler	Timmons
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger	Schweikert	Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Rush	Long	Rice (SC)	Tipton
Duffy	Kustoff (TN)	Scott, Austin	Davis, Danny K.	Larson (CT)	Ryan	Loudermilk	Riggleman	Turner
Duncan	LaHood	Sensenbrenner	Dean	Lawrence	Sánchez	Lucas	Roby	Upton
Dunn	LaMalfa	Shimkus	DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Luettkemeyer	Rodgers (WA)	Rodgers (WA)	Walberg
Emmer	Lamborn	Simpson	DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Scanlon	Marchant	Roe, David P.	Walden
Estes	Latta	Smith (MO)	DeBene	Lee (NV)	Schakowsky	Marshall	Rogers (AL)	Walker
Ferguson	Lesko	Smith (NE)	Delgado	Levin (CA)	Shiff	Massie	Rogers (KY)	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Long	Smith (NJ)	Demings	Levin (MI)	Schneider	Mast	Rooney (FL)	Waltz
Fleischmann	Loudermilk	Smucker	DeSaulnier	Lewis	Schrader	McCarthy	Rose, John W.	Watkins
Flores	Lucas	Spano	Deutch	Lieu, Ted	McCaul	Rouzer	Rouzer	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Stauber	Dingell	Lipinski	Schrier	McClintock	Roy	Webster (FL)
Fox (NC)	Marchant	Stefanik	Doggett	Loebback	Scott (VA)	McHenry	Rutherford	Wenstrup
Fulcher	Marshall	Steil	Doyle, Michael F.	Lofgren	Scott, David	McKinley	Scalise	Westerman
Gaetz	Massie	Steube	Engel	Luján	Serrano	Meadows	Schweikert	Williams
Gallagher	Mast	Stewart	Escobar	Luria	Sewell (AL)	Meuser	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
Gianforte	McCarthy	Stivers	Eshoo	Lynch	Shalala	Miller	Sensenbrenner	Wittman
Gibbs	McCaull	Taylor	Espaillat	Malinowski	Sherman	Mitchell	Shimkus	Womack
Gohmert	McClintock	Thompson (PA)	Thompson (PA)	Evans	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Moolenaar	Simpson	Woodall
Gonzalez (OH)	McHenry	Thornberry	Finkenauer	Finkenauer, Sean	Slotkin	Mooney (WV)	Smith (MO)	Wright
Gooden	McKinley	Timmons	Garcia (TX)	Garcia (IL)	Soto	Mullin	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Gosar	Meadows	Tipton	Gomez	Garcia (TX)	Spanberger	Newhouse	Smucker	Young
Granger	Meuser	Turner	McBath	Maloney, Sean	Stanton	Norman	Nunes	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Miller	Upton	McCollum	Meeks	Stevens	Cohen	Hagedorn	Smith (WA)
Graves (LA)	Mitchell	Walberg	McGovern	Meng	Thompson (CA)	DeFazio	Katko	Wagner
Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Walden	McNerney	Thompson (MS)	Thompson (CA)	Frankel	King (IA)	Fulcher
Green (TN)	Mooney (WV)	Walorski	McNerney	Titus	Swalwell (CA)	Lowey		
Griffith	Mullin	Watkins	McNerney	Torres (CA)	Takano			
Grothman	Newhouse	Watkins	McNerney	Titus	Titus			
Guest	Norman	Weber (TX)	McNerney	Torres (CA)	Titus			
Guthrie	Nunes	Webster (FL)	McNerney	Torres (CA)	Titus			
Hagedorn	Olson	Wenstrup	McNerney	Torres (CA)	Titus			
Harris	Palazzo	Westerman	McNerney	Torres (CA)	Titus			
Hartzler	Palmer	Westerman	McNerney	Torres (CA)	Titus			
Hern, Kevin	Pence	Williams	Haaland	Murphy	Torres (CA)			
Herrera Beutler	Perry	Wilson (SC)	Harder (CA)	Nadler	Torres (CA)			
Hice (GA)	Posey	Wittman	Hastings	Napolitano	Torres (CA)			
Higgins (LA)	Ratcliffe	Womack	Hayes	Heck	Torres (CA)			
Holding	Reed	Woodall	Higgins (NY)	Higgins (NY)	Torres (CA)			
Hollingsworth	Reschenthaler	Wright	Hill (CA)	Hill (CA)	Torres (CA)			
Hudson	Rice (SC)	Yoho	Himes	Hill (CA)	Torres (CA)			
Huizenga	Riggleman	Young	Horn, Kendra S.	Horn, Kendra S.	Torres (CA)			
Hunter	Roby	Zeldin	Horsford	Houlihan	Torres (CA)			
NOT VOTING—11								
Bucshon	Hill (AR)	Smith (WA)	Hoyer	Pallone	Torres (CA)			
Cohen	Katko	Wagner	Huffman	Panetta	Torres (CA)			
DeFazio	King (IA)	Walker	Jackson Lee	Pappas	Torres (CA)			
Frankel	Lowey		Jayapal	Pascarel	Torres (CA)			

□ 1458

Messrs. HURD of Texas and WALDEN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—227

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)	Brooks (AL)	Cheney	Golden	Adams	Brown (MD)	Clarke (NY)
Aguilar	F.	Castro (TX)	Brooks (IN)	Cline	Gonzalez (OH)	Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Clay
Allred	Brindisi	Chu, Judy	Buchanan	Cloud	Gooden	Allred	Bustos	Cleaver
Axne	Brown (MD)	Cicilline	Buck	Cole	Gosar	Axne	Butterfield	Clyburn
Barragán	Brownley (CA)	Cisneros	Buschon	Collins (GA)	Granger	Barragán	Carbajal	Connolly
Bass	Bustos	Clark (MA)	Budd	Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	Bass	Cárdenas	Cooper
Beatty	Butterfield	Clarke (NY)	Burchett	Comer	Graves (LA)	Beatty	Carson (IN)	Correa
Bera	Carbajal	Clay	Burgess	Ferguson	Graves (MO)	Bera	Cartwright	Costa
Beyer	Cárdenas	Cleaver	Byrne	Gaetz	Hudson	Beyer	Case	Courtney
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Clyburn	Calvert	Gallagher	Hern, Kevin	Bishop (GA)	Casten (IL)	Cox (CA)
Blumenauer	Cartwright	Connolly	Carter (GA)	Gianforte	Herrera Beutler	Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Craig
Blumenthal	Case	Cooper	Carter (TX)	Gibbs	Hice (GA)	Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Crist
Blunt Rochester	Casten (IL)	Correa	Chabot	Gohmert	Hill (AR)	Boyle, Brendan	Chu, Judy	Crow
Bonamici					Holding	Jordan	F.	Cicilline
					Hurd (TX)	Jordan	Cisneros	Cummings
					Johnson (LA)	Joyce (OH)	Brindisi	Clark (MA)
					Johnson (PA)	Joyce (PA)		Cunningham

NOT VOTING—10

Cohen	Hagedorn
DeFazio	Katko
Frankel	King (IA)
Fulcher	Lowey

□ 1510

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 46, TERMINATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED BY THE PRESIDENT ON FEBRUARY 15, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 144) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 46) relating to a national emergency declared by the President on February 15, 2019, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 193, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—228