

military, I believe the need is clear and pressing, the law supports immediate action, and ample funding exists to address this crisis.

□ 1215

BACKGROUND CHECKS WORK

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, today is a momentous day, one that makes me proud of this Chamber. After years of inaction, Congress is moving to address our country's gun violence problem.

We have seen some of the worst mass shootings in our Nation's history in just the past few years. Las Vegas, Thousand Oaks, Sutherland Springs, Parkland, Sandy Hook—these are only a few of the names that recently shocked us to the core. And, sadly, each time, Congress failed to act.

But today—today—we are offering more than thoughts and prayers. We are offering legislation. This bill has bipartisan support—finally, something we can all agree on.

Strengthening our background check system is a small but a very important first step. We simply cannot allow criminals to take advantage of loopholes.

Background checks work. They keep guns out of the hands of criminals, and background checks will save lives.

No more excuses. It is just common sense.

CLOSING BACKGROUND CHECK LOOPHOLE IS LIFE SUPPORT

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, selling a gun to a convicted felon, to a perpetrator of domestic violence, to a fugitive from justice, merits a jail term, but those who oppose this reasonable background check bill are enabling just that.

Someone who couldn't buy a .22 inside a gun shop can, today, go outside that shop and buy a military-style killing machine and get away with it.

Doctors Seth Goldstein and Lisa Epstein, who visited my office this very week on behalf of Moms Demand Action, and 117 San Antonio physicians, they have a view that is different from Members of Congress concerning the result of gun violence. They witness this violence in the emergency room after young bodies are torn apart.

What a different view this debate would have if it were occurring amidst the pain, violence, and blood in a hospital emergency room, because closing this loophole is about life support.

We have got to end the trauma. Let's join the doctors who are out there seeking to save lives and do our part to save lives by passing this bill.

BACKGROUND CHECK BILL

(Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, more than 500 Pennsylvanians are murdered with guns each year, causing untold suffering and tearing our communities apart. Pennsylvanians are crying out for commonsense legislation to stop the bloodshed, legislation like H.R. 8, the bill before us today.

Now, nobody thinks that universal background checks would eliminate gun violence, but the facts suggest that they would reduce it.

In 2017, the Pennsylvania State Police ran over a million background checks on would-be gun purchasers. The vast majority of purchases were approved within a few minutes. But 13,000 were stopped, and the background checks led to the arrest of 150 wanted fugitives and the arrest and conviction of 500 other individuals for illegally attempting to obtain a firearm. Those background checks put some bad guys in jail, and they probably saved some lives as well.

Let's help our police enforce the laws that keep guns out of dangerous hands. Vote for the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019.

BALANCING GUN RIGHTS WITH SAFE COMMUNITIES

(Ms. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take a stand in support of H.R. 8, which takes a critical first step to ensure that every person who purchases a gun undergoes a background check.

People should have the right to feel safe from gun violence in their community, including at home, at work, and at school. Unfortunately, that is not the case today in our country. Time and time again, our communities have experienced gun violence due to the absence of commonsense gun safety measures.

Only 12 days ago, five people, four of whom were my constituents, left their homes for work at the Henry Pratt Company in Aurora, Illinois, and never returned. Their lives were taken by an unspeakably horrific act of gun violence.

It is time to take immediate action to help safeguard our communities from gun violence, and today, for the first time in more than two decades, the House of Representatives will vote on a major gun safety bill, and I will support it.

H.R. 8 is a strong step toward making our communities safer, and I look forward to continuing to work on commonsense legislation that balances gun rights with the safety of our communities.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to stand here today as we work to pass gun violence prevention legislation.

I would like to share a letter from a fifth grader constituent of mine, Alex, from Northfield, Illinois, that perfectly explains why we must pass H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112.

Alex writes: "I don't want to see innocent people dying for no reason. I want all children to feel safe at school. I want all adults to feel safe at work. I want all people to feel safe in their city. I think stronger gun laws will help and also make sure that everyone that buys a gun has to have a thorough background check."

Well, Alex, you are absolutely right, and we are about to finally ensure that everyone who purchases a gun undergoes a comprehensive background check. The next step is banning assault weapons.

This fifth grader and students around the country are telling us to do something real to make them safer, and finally, at long last, the House of Representatives will take action today.

BEER CAN APPRECIATION/ALUMINUM BILL

(Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the critical role that brewers and beer importers play in our Nation's economy.

American beverage companies and brewers employ more than 2.2 million people nationwide, providing more than \$103 billion in wages and benefits. In my home State of Colorado, breweries have become a significant component of my State's culture and economy.

But in order to compete, American beverage companies and brewers need a fair and transparent pricing system for aluminum. That is why I along with my friend, Mr. LAWSON from Florida, are introducing legislation this week giving the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission oversight authority of the aluminum market. These unfair market practices have not only cost the beverage and brewing industries hundreds of millions of dollars, they have also had harmful effects on consumers.

With the help of the CFTC, I hope we can resolve these pricing irregularities that have been plaguing the market so our Nation's beverage companies and brewers can continue to produce some of America's most popular beverages.

BIPARTISAN BACKGROUND CHECKS ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 145 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 8.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1225

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale, with Mr. BLUMENAUER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that today we are considering H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. We have promised the American people that Congress would take steps to reduce gun violence, and this bill is a critical first step toward doing so.

During the past 4 weeks, as the Judiciary Committee, and now the full House, have discussed the issue of gun violence, I have cited grim statistics. Nearly 40,000 Americans lost their lives because of guns in 2017. In fact, every day in America, on average, 34 people are murdered with a firearm, and more than 183 people are injured in an attack.

Gun violence of this magnitude is a distinctly American problem. A country-to-country comparison is shocking. For example, in 2011, the United Kingdom had 146 deaths due to gun violence; Denmark, 71; Portugal, 142; and Japan, just 30. The United States, that year, about 35,000.

A recent study in the American Journal of Medicine found that, compared to 22 other high-income countries, the gun-related murder rate in the United States is 25 times higher. Even when you adjust for population differences, Americans are disproportionately killed by gun violence.

Almost 25 years to the day after the Brady Act was first implemented, expanding our current background check requirement to cover virtually all gun transfers is one of the steps we must take to address this crisis.

Under current law, only licensed firearms dealers are required to conduct a background check before transferring a gun to another person. This means that gun shows, online sales, and other private sales can completely evade this vital tool for ensuring that guns do not get into the wrong hands. It is time to close this dangerous loophole.

This bill 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.

The bill also provides a number of exceptions to this requirement, including gifts to family members and transfers for hunting, target shooting, and instances of imminent death or great bodily harm.

The FBI's internal assessment demonstrated that checks processed through the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, often called NICS, are approximately 99.3 percent to 99.8 percent accurate, and in 90 percent of cases, the background checks are completed within 90 seconds. H.R. 8 will provide an accurate and speedy mechanism to help ensure firearms do not end up in the wrong hands.

There is no reason to continue to make it easy for people who are legally prohibited from possessing firearms to acquire them by circumventing the background check process. H.R. 8 would close this dangerous loophole and save many, many lives. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this vital legislation today.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8, the so-called Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. This is bad legislation that fails to make anyone safer in any regard.

I have been listening here, sitting on the floor for just the last few minutes and listening to those who came up and were happy about this bill coming forward today, and they mentioned many acts of mass violence and situations that have happened. The sad part about it is they claim this is the answer and the first step. In actuality, it is, at best, a side step, and it may actually be a step backwards and will not do what it is being claimed to do.

All this legislation will do is burden law-abiding citizens wishing to exercise their Second Amendment rights, including defending themselves from the gun-toting criminals this bill does nothing to combat.

□ 1230

H.R. 8 foolishly presumes criminals who flout existing laws will suddenly

submit themselves to background checks.

Are Members who support this bill delusional enough to think a criminal trading cocaine to another criminal for a firearm will give consideration to H.R. 8 and go to the nearest gun store to submit to a background check? That is absurd.

Most of us will agree that criminals are not going to do that anyway. My concern is what it actually does in practice to those who are not criminals.

Not only is it foolish to think they will start following the law, it is also foolish to think it is going to in any way make our country safer.

My Democratic friends have exploited every mass shooting, calling for universal background checks, but H.R. 8 would not have stopped a single mass shooting.

These strategies do, however, share one thing in common. Over and over, we see issues of mental health and missed opportunities for authorities to intercede.

Let me just say, Mr. Chair, I share the concern. I am going to share, in just a moment, actual, real things that actually could make a difference in helping to stem the tide of mass violence in our country. But doing this, we have to understand that this bill does not do that, and what may make you feel good may not heal you. That has to be understood.

Look at the recent workplace shooting in Illinois, where the gunman murdered five people. That could have been prevented, but not by H.R. 8. All law enforcement had to do was enforce existing law. The gunman was prohibited from possessing firearms.

In January 2014, he was issued an Illinois firearm owner's identification card. That March, he applied to buy a handgun from a gun dealer. Five days later, he took possession of the gun, having inexplicably passed a background check. That month, he applied for a concealed carry permit. During a background check for the permit, his felony conviction was flagged.

Illinois police revoked his firearm card and sent him a letter telling him to relinquish the firearm. Not surprisingly, the felon did not comply. Had authorities seized the firearm between March 2014 and February 2019, they could have saved five lives.

Aurora, Illinois, is not the only missed opportunity to prevent tragedy. We know about missed opportunities in Parkland; Aurora, Colorado; Sutherland Springs; Virginia Tech; and others.

The common problem here, Mr. Chair, is clear. It is not a lack of background checks.

With H.R. 8, Democrats refuse to acknowledge the human factors leading to these events, but Republicans have a bill to help law enforcement coordinate responses to mental health concerns and other mass violent threat information.

You know what else H.R. 8 doesn't address? The primary ways criminals acquire firearms. Last month, DOJ revealed nearly half of criminals obtained firearms via theft or the black market. The survey also revealed that a mere 0.8 percent of criminals purchased their firearms at gun shows.

If this bill won't prevent mass shootings and address violent crime, what will it do? It will keep law-abiding citizens from protecting themselves. Under this bill, Mr. Chair, a battered woman with a protection order against her abuser who borrows a firearm for self-defense would be a criminal. It would criminalize the selling of a firearm without a background check to someone with a valid permit allowing them to possess, acquire, or carry a firearm. If that person walked into a gun store, they could present that permit and not undergo a NICS check.

On the other hand, there are solutions to prevent mass violence and gun crime. The Mass Violence Prevention Act, which I introduced earlier this week, is one. The MVP Act directly addresses challenges in law enforcement coordination and response. It would reduce the flow of firearms into the black market, and it would bolster law enforcement's ability to prosecute criminals for firearm offenses.

If reducing gun violence, Mr. Chair, is the Democrats' concern, the MVP Act is legislation that we should be considering today, not H.R. 8. Talk to me or my staff about cosponsoring this evidence-based, commonsense legislation. Unlike H.R. 8, the MVP Act could have prevented tragedies such as Parkland.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chair, my Democratic colleagues, by putting this forward and continuing the same narrative, are not actually interested in stopping gun violence. I take the intent to be good; I do not question the motive. All of us in our life do not want to see the tragedies unfold. But this is not the way forward.

This is another thing put out to the very ones who have suffered, telling them we are helping them, while at the same time not telling them the truth about the bill, a bill that guts its own ability to enforce itself, a bill that actually, possibly, would keep people from purchasing firearms because of an unlimited price of a background check.

The question that I have about this bill, Mr. Chair, is not what actually could happen with this. It is what actually will be hurt by this as we move forward.

With that, I believe that we are being misled. The victims of mass violence are being misled by this bill, H.R. 8, because it would not stop what they have been promised that it would stop.

Mr. Chair, for that, I am profoundly sorry. But because of that, I call on my colleagues to reject H.R. 8 and to support real solutions.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. BASS), the chairperson of the Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, which will extend the current Federal background check requirement to unlicensed sellers of guns.

It is about time that Congress takes this issue seriously, and I am pleased that this bipartisan bill has been brought to the House floor with the urgency this issue deserves.

In recent years, our Nation has experienced an increase in mass shootings, and our Nation is appropriately horrified. However, mass shootings are just one symptom of our gun violence epidemic. The daily toll of shootings occurs in communities across our country, on our streets, in our schools, and even in our houses of worship.

As Aalayah Eastmond testified before the Judiciary Committee earlier this month, 1 year after the terrible shooting that took the lives of 17 students and staff and injured 17 others at her high school in Parkland, Florida: "Minority communities bear the heaviest burden of gun violence in this country."

The impact on our young people is simply unacceptable. Every day, 47 children and teens are shot in this country. Eight of these young people die, and 39 are shot and survive.

Citizens across this country such as Diane Latiker, who also testified before the committee, are taking it upon themselves to organize and engage in community-based efforts to reduce gun violence and to assist the young people it affects. We in Congress must match their courage and commitment with action of our own.

I support H.R. 8 because it will reduce gun violence by narrowing the avenues for criminals and other prohibited persons from obtaining guns.

Certainly, there is no single change to our gun laws that will prevent every shooting, but enacting measures that will help prevent some of them is clearly the right thing to do.

Mr. Chair, that is why I support this bill, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, this bill does not narrow—in fact, it continues the process of those who are going to receive guns. Much of the daily toll that we see is actually coming from those who are already violating laws currently on the books. It is time we actually enforce those as well.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8 is brought to us by the same groups and politicians who have made no secret of their desire to ultimately strip law-abiding citizens of their right to defend themselves. Now, they can't do that outright; they know

that. So they do it through cynical measures like this, which weave a web of laws so intricate, that, sooner or later, everyone can be caught up in them.

This law affects not just transfer of ownership, but any transfer of weapon for any period of time. Suppose you exchange shotguns with a friend on a hunt and then separate for a period of time, or you loan a gun to your next-door neighbor of 20 years who is being victimized by a stalker, or you give a gun to your stepson or your great-grandson. Under any of these innocent scenarios and countless more like them, you are guilty of a Federal crime.

These flaws were all pointed out to the bill's sponsors, and none were addressed. Why not? I think the reason should be obvious.

Last October, a 10-year study by Johns Hopkins and UC Davis concluded that California's universal background check law had no effect on gun homicides or suicides—none.

The purpose of this bill is not public safety. That is just a deceptive facade. Its true purpose is to make gun ownership so legally hazardous, so fraught with legal booby traps and draconian penalties, that no honest and law-abiding citizen would want to take the risk of gun ownership.

Most criminals already get their guns illegally and are unconstrained by laws like this. Make no mistake, this is aimed squarely at law-abiding citizens, moving us closer to a society where decent people are defenseless and armed criminals are kings.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, we have a gun violence epidemic in this country. For 8 years, we have marked it with moments of silence and doing nothing, saying nothing and doing nothing. But today, that changes with passage of H.R. 8 for universal background checks.

We know universal background checks work, because since the passage of the Brady bill, 3.5 million illegal gun sales were prevented. But, of course, there is a huge loophole. Millions and millions of gun sales happen without a background check at all. In fact, one in five, 22 percent, of guns are sold with no background check. That means criminals, domestic abusers, and people prohibited due to mental illness can get a gun. This bill changes that.

We also know that States that have enhanced background checks have lower rates of gun homicides, gun suicide rates, and gun trafficking.

This is a commonsense bill to protect the American people from the scourge of gun violence.

Finally, after 8 years of pleading with our Republican colleagues to do something about gun violence in this country, to take up a bill—we had a sit-in to try to force a vote—finally,

today, we are taking our first step to reduce gun violence in this country by passing H.R. 8.

Finally, we will see Members of Congress standing up to the power of the gun lobby and doing what is right for the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I remind the Chair that we did pass Fix NICS last year. We did take into account—those things have been done. We just simply are not moving a bill that we don't feel works, and we actually have offered an alternative.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I tell you that H.R. 8 will do little more than further burden law-abiding gun owners. Without an unconstitutional Federal gun registry, this bill is impossible to enforce.

There is no gun show loophole. Federal law is the same regardless of where a firearm sale takes place. Federal law requires all firearms dealers to be licensed and to initiate a background check before transferring a firearm to a nondealer, regardless of where that transfer takes place.

As for nondealers, Federal law prohibits transferring a firearm to anyone known or believed to be prohibited from possessing firearms. That is already the law.

According to DOJ, less than 1 percent of criminals in State prison for firearm crimes get their firearms from dealers or nondealers at gun shows. According to ATF, 6 percent of Federal armed career criminals got their firearms from dealers or nondealers at gun shows.

Online sales loophole: There is no online sales loophole. The Federal law is the same regardless of how people communicate about selling or buying a firearm.

Federal law prohibits anyone, licensed firearm dealer or not, from shipping a firearm to a person who lives in another State unless the receiver is also a dealer. Dealers must document all firearms they receive.

H.R. 8 also fails to include many of the realistic exceptions to the new background check requirements for private transfers, such as transfers between law enforcement officers outside of their duties, transfers to concealed carry permit holders, transfers to museums or licensed collectors, transfers to Active Duty military, and many more.

H.R. 8 includes an exception to the background check transfer if the transfer is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm. But that transfer is only allowed for the length of time that it is necessary to prevent imminent death or great bodily harm. It doesn't even define those terms.

What about a false alarm? Does it extend to domestic violence fears if the person is not getting attacked immediately? Gun rights groups have argued

that without a definition, this provision would only provide protection in instances where it is likely too late for the victim to make it out safely.

Finally, H.R. 8 would not have prevented any of the recent high-profile shootings. In those cases, the shooter either passed a Federal background check or stole the firearms they used.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), the chief author of this legislation and the chairman of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of my bill, H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019.

Mr. Chair, first, I thank Speaker PELOSI and Chairman NADLER for their support. Gun violence is a true national emergency, and I am glad that we are moving so early in this Congress to address this crisis.

Mr. Chair, I also thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who recognize the importance of passing this legislation, Representatives KING, FITZPATRICK, MAST, UPTON, and SMITH, who stand with more than 90 percent of Americans who support universal background checks.

□ 1245

This bill will require a background check on all firearm sales and most transfers. Mr. Chairman, I am a life-long gun owner. I am a hunter and I support the Second Amendment. If this bill did anything to erode the rights of lawful gun owners, I wouldn't support it and it wouldn't have my name on it.

Background checks work. Every day, they stop 170 felons and 50 domestic abusers from getting a gun from a licensed dealer. But, in some States, those same people can go into a gun show or go online and buy a gun without a background check. This bill will help stop them from doing so.

Some will argue that criminals won't follow the law. If that is the case, then why do we have laws against murder? People still commit murder. Why do we have laws against stealing? People still steal. This is flawed logic, and don't fall for it.

This bill is supported by law enforcement, medical professionals, veterans, gun owners, religious leaders, and the millions of Americans who took to the streets in support of H.R. 8.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues support this bill and honor the lives lost with action. No more moments of silence with no action to follow. Today, your thoughts and your prayers aren't enough. Today, you can vote, "yes".

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose H.R. 8, a bill that criminalizes gun transfers between law-abiding citizens who have no criminal record and no criminal intent.

The bill includes several flawed and unworkable exceptions. Take the law enforcement exception. It allows the police to transfer a firearm, but criminalizes transfers to law enforcement.

Under this bill, a parent whose child finds a gun in a park commits a Federal crime if the parent surrenders the gun to police.

Under this bill, a citizen commits a Federal crime if they participate in a local gun buy-back program.

Under this bill, an attorney commits a Federal crime when they turn a client's gun over to the police to clear the client through ballistics testing.

Will criminalizing cooperation with law enforcement make us safer? The majority apparently thinks so, and I think it is crazy.

The Democrats' bill gives special privileges to the bodyguards of the wealthy elite, like former Mayor Bloomberg, who is funding the special interest advocacy for this bill. He can afford to hire bodyguards. But average Americans, who rely on the Second Amendment as their source of personal protection, are not given similar protections.

Nothing should be more offensive to this body than a bill that denies citizens their endowed rights while giving wealthy elites special protections, privileges, and dispensations. But that is H.R. 8.

Take the family exception; the rule allows a vote on an amendment to ensure that transfers between parent and child include stepparents and stepchildren. What about transfers between a foster parent and foster child? This bill says foster relationships are not worthy of the same respect and equal treatment. Every Member of this body should be ashamed to vote for this bill that reflects such terrible policy and discrimination.

Take the Good Samaritan exception, allowing transfers where a threat of death or harm is imminent. Imminent means death is menacingly near, a standard so strict that it is, frankly, too late to transfer a gun once it is obvious a gun is needed for protection.

Under this standard, it is illegal to loan a gun to a victim of domestic violence for her protection until the transferor is practically witnessing a murder in progress.

This standard would also prevent a gun owner who has intermittent suicidal thoughts, a known side-effect of certain prescription medications, from legally transferring a gun—his own gun—to a friend for safekeeping.

Because this bill criminalizes transfers between law-abiding Americans, while doing nothing to curb criminals' access to guns, this bill provides the American public with a false sense of security.

Because this bill includes unworkable exceptions that will mislead people

into thinking a gun transfer is legal when it is not, this bill provides law-abiding gun owners with a false sense of immunity.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on this totally and completely unconstitutional legislation that would deprive people of their constitutional rights to keep and bear arms.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a member of the committee.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, today marks a very pivotal moment in our fight to prevent gun violence and to ensure the safety of every community across our Nation.

I thank the more than 230 of my colleagues who have cosponsored H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. I thank Chairman NADLER, Speaker PELOSI, Congressman THOMPSON, and Congressman KING for making gun violence prevention a priority in this Congress. I am so proud to be an original cosponsor of this historic legislation.

As many of you may know, gun violence is an issue that is deeply personal for me. Gun violence prevention and a desire to make meaningful change is the very reason I am here today, in this legislative body, speaking to every one of you.

In 2012, my son, Jordan Davis, was shot and killed by a man who opened fire on a car of unarmed teenagers at a gas station in Jacksonville, Florida. My son was only 17 years of age. Jordan would have turned 24 this month.

After my son's death, I dedicated my entire life to advocating for commonsense gun safety solutions, but it was the shooting at Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, last year, that finally motivated me to join this legislative body.

The overwhelming bipartisan support for universal background checks symbolizes the power of advocacy and the incredible power of the survivors, family members, and students who have shared their stories as they advocate for commonsense gun safety solutions and demand that we act to address gun violence.

Today, we are truly taking this action. H.R. 8 will ensure that mothers and fathers have one less reason to worry. It will give students one less thing to fear when they walk into a school. Most importantly, it will make our communities and our Nation a safer place to live, and every human being in America deserves such.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. It is time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 8.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation claims to be a solution to gun violence, yet

does nothing to actually solve the real problems that contribute to this crisis. As it stands now, this legislation does nothing to make our schools, churches, or communities safer. In fact, it only infringes on the constitutionally guaranteed Second Amendment rights of law-abiding American citizens, something I cannot support.

This bill will criminalize the private transfer of firearms and will make exercising basic constitutional rights impossibly expensive for millions of law-abiding Americans. Not to mention, it is essentially unenforceable without a national gun registry. But, let's be honest, that is where my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to end up: registering firearms so they can systematically take them away. We must stop our Nation from falling down this slippery slope.

I think we can all agree that something needs to be done to stop the illegal ownership and misuse of firearms, but H.R. 8 is not the answer. This legislation would have done nothing to prevent many of the prominent tragedies that occurred in my home State of Florida.

The shooter at Marjorie Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland passed a background check. The shooter at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando passed a background check. And, just weeks ago, a man who murdered five women in my district passed a background check.

H.R. 8 would have done nothing to stop these violent acts, just like the previous attempts to require universal background checks have done nothing to prevent actual crimes.

If Democrats are serious about gun violence, they would have voted for my amendment. I filed an amendment in committee that would have required law enforcement to be notified upon the attempt of someone to purchase a firearm and failed a background check. Law enforcement would have been notified. But instead of supporting policies that curtail legal possession of firearms, the Democrats on both the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee rejected my proposal. How is that unreasonable?

Mr. Chairman, I stand for the Constitution. I stand for freedom. And I stand for the Second Amendment. That is why I am not voting for this proposal.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I will point out that the bill says:

Nothing in this act . . . shall be construed to authorize the establishment, directly or indirectly, of a national firearms registry.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank him for his leadership as chair of the Judiciary Committee, for bringing us to this place promptly. It is an historic day in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I thank our distinguished colleague from California, Mr. MIKE THOMPSON, for his relentless, persistent leadership to make America safer by bringing forth commonsense background check legislation. He is a gun owner and a veteran. He has been on both sides of the gun. He is a hunter. He is an advocate for the Second Amendment. And, as he said, if this had anything to diminish that, he would not have his name on it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this strong, bipartisan bill and join Mr. THOMPSON in commending Mr. KING of New York for making this initiative bipartisan from the start, in the previous Congress and now. It is a long, overdue commonsense action to end the epidemic of gun violence in America.

Let us salute, again, the persistent leadership of so many in this body. And, again, Mr. THOMPSON, as chair of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force; he has worked in a bipartisan way to protect our communities, and we are grateful to him for that.

We can do all the inside maneuvering that we want, and that is really important and essential, but, without the outside mobilization, we cannot enjoy the success of saving lives and making progress. So I want to thank the courageous advocates who are here today, in the gallery, including March for Our Lives and Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, and so many more. They have made a complete difference.

As President Lincoln said: “Public sentiment is everything. With it you can accomplish almost anything, without it almost nothing.”

I thank them for building public sentiment to a point where now about 90 percent of the American people support commonsense background check legislation, including many members, courageously, of the National Rifle Association.

This bill is proudly bipartisan because gun violence prevention should not be a Democratic or Republican issue. Gun violence does not discriminate by party or politics. It reaches into all of our communities, our schools, our places of worship, our workplaces, and our streets, and it will require all of our courage to defeat it.

Last night, we were at an occasion to mark the 25th anniversary of the Brady Bill. Some of us were in Congress at that time. Many of us here, then or not, admire the courageous work of Sarah and Jim Brady to make the country a safer place by reducing gun violence.

Twenty-five years ago, we enacted the Brady background check system, which has denied more than 3 million sales to potentially dangerous individuals. Yet, the Brady Bill does not stop people from purchasing guns from unlicensed sellers without a background check at gun shows and online.

We must pass H.R. 8 to close this dangerous loophole and keep our communities safe from gun violence. That is what we are intending to do today.

George Bernard Shaw said that: "It is the mark of a truly intelligent person to be moved by statistics," and here are the facts:

Nearly 40,000 lives are cut short every year from gun violence.

An average of 47 children and teenagers are killed by guns every single day. As I said, it is all about the children, the children, the children.

We read about the tragic mass murders that have happened in our country, and they stir us to action, hopefully. Here it has been they stir us to a moment of silence, and now, finally, to action.

□ 1300

But it is every day. Every day 47 children and teenagers killed by guns.

And, again, another figure, hearkening back to 90 percent of the American people want commonsense universal background checks.

The statistics spell out the stories, but it is the human personal stories that change minds.

How moving it was to hear our colleague, Congresswoman McBATH, with her generosity of spirit tell her personal story of losing her son, Jordan—I can't even imagine carrying that burden—but turning her grief and her tragedy into action and courage to run for Congress, to stand on this floor and share her personal story with us. That takes real courage.

Let's hope that we all have the courage to save children's lives, everyone's lives in our country whose deaths can be avoided.

There is no person in this body whose political survival is more important than the survival of our children.

We are grateful, again, to the young people, parents, survivors across America who have told their stories, marched for their lives, and demanded change. This bill delivers that change, ensuring that people who are a danger to themselves and others cannot purchase a gun and perpetuate violence in our communities.

This week, the House will build on this progress by passing another bipartisan background check bill. We must close the Charleston loophole that enabled the horrific hate crime at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church.

We salute the majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN, for his leadership on H.R. 1112.

Tomorrow, we will vote on that. That is another part of strengthening the background check provisions.

As Members of Congress, again, we take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution, the American people. To honor that oath, to honor the victims of gun violence and their families, Congress must take real action on this floor. Today, we must pass this bill and take the first steps toward ending the senseless crisis of gun violence in our Nation.

Again, I hope that all of us will have the courage to save lives, remembering

that no one's political survival here is more important than the survival of the American people—especially our children.

I urge a strong bipartisan "yes" vote and pray that we can do the right thing and send a clear message to the families of those who have lost their loved ones to gun violence, that we have crossed a threshold here today to reduce gun violence in our country and take more steps to improve the safety of the American people, honoring the Constitution of the United States, respectful of our hunters and the need for people to defend themselves, but doing so in a way that does not endanger others.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I agree. I believe facts are important, and I believe the strength to tell that. I believe the chairman just redid that. He exactly explained why this bill will not operate because of the very fact that, inside the bill itself, it does not have a registry, which I will remind the Chair that the Department of Justice under President Obama said a universal background check bill will not work without a registry and is on the websites of many advocates for this bill. That is just one of the areas that we look at as we go forward in realizing that this has already gutted itself when we look at the bill.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE).

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the previous speaker, the Speaker of the House, reminding us all that it is California where Michael Bloomberg and the gun control advocates have established their utopia of a land without guns. And what has it led us to? With some of the strictest gun control laws in the land, we have some of the worst incidents of gun violence in the country.

Gun control measures do not address the problems of gun violence, and this bill will not address gun violence.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 8. The legislation is an attempt to take away our Second Amendment rights, hidden under the guise that we will see a reduction in violent crime.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim the bill would save lives, but nothing in this bill would have stopped any of the recent mass casualty shootings that have occurred in our country. The only thing this bill does is limit the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

They will tell you this bill closes loopholes; however, the loophole that they believe exists is private gun ownership, and what they really want is to regulate the private transfer of firearms. If my neighbor is in trouble and needs to borrow a firearm to protect his family, I should be allowed to loan that firearm to my neighbor so that he can protect himself and his family.

This is not something we should need to go to the Federal Government to get

permission to do. The Second Amendment does not say that, after you get permission from the government, your right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

Our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution to protect us from the government and gave individuals the Second Amendment to protect themselves.

I carry this Constitution every day on the campaign trail asphalt. I carry it with me every day now to remind myself of those protections that were given to us—not by government, but by God.

This bill is nothing more than an attempt to advance the agenda of radical gun-grabbers and lay the foundation for a national gun registration scheme. Mr. Chair, I urge the House to reject this misguided legislation so we can begin having real discussions about ways to reduce crime across this great Nation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), a member of the committee.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I rise today to express my strong support for this bill, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act.

Since the Brady law was enacted in 1994, many American lives have been saved, murders have fallen by at least 32 percent, and our community streets are safer and stronger as a result. But our work is not done. In Houston alone, we see an average of 550 acts of gun violence per year.

Too many of our loved ones are lost to senseless gun violence that could be prevented by keeping firearms out of dangerous hands. We know expanded background checks work.

States requiring background checks on all handgun sales see half as many mass shootings as States without the expanded requirements. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 8. This commonsense bill will prevent private firearm sales to prohibit purchasers and close online and gun show loopholes.

While this bill does not cover everything, it is a step in the right direction that will make my district—Houston, Texas—and this country safer.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, may I request the time for both sides, please.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 16¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, my name is PETE STAUBER, and I was a law enforcement officer for 23 years in the great State of Minnesota, the city of Duluth.

In December of 1995, at 10:32 p.m., at the intersection of 6th Avenue East and 4th Street in Duluth, Minnesota, a criminal who should not have had a

firearm tried to take my life. I was shot in the head, and by the grace of God, I survived.

A few years after that, while on duty in a hostage situation, another criminal pulled a gun on me. Face-to-face, I was staring down the barrel of a handgun. The suspect pulled the trigger. The gun malfunctioned, and I was in a fight for my life. When it was all over, by the grace of God, I was alive. The individual was handcuffed.

Both those individuals were career criminals.

Back to when I was shot in the head, Mr. Chair: I begged the U.S. attorney, along with our police department, to charge the individual with possession of a handgun by a felon. They didn't do it. That individual was allowed to circumvent our community for another 8 years before he was finally put in prison, where he belonged. No more harming other people.

Representative COLLINS' Mass Violence Prevention Act gets the county attorneys and our Federal attorneys present to prosecute these individuals who have no respect for life.

I carried a handgun for 23 years, Mr. Chair, as a tool to defend my life or somebody else's life from great bodily harm. I support the individual right of law-abiding citizens, the right to keep and bear arms.

Both my wife and I live in rural Minnesota. When we need to protect ourselves, when it takes awhile for law enforcement to get there, we have the ability.

There is nobody I know who wants somebody who is going through a mental health issue or a career criminal or a drug dealer to have these.

We need to start respecting life. Life is precious, from conception to natural death. I am a very proud husband of an Iraq war veteran who understands the value of life.

Mr. Chair, I rise against this. There are better ways to get mothers and fathers, county attorneys, Federal prosecutors, local police departments, and sheriff departments to work together to have a fusion center so, when a young individual types into a computer "I want to be a mass school shooter," there is an instant response to identify the individual and work through it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a member of the committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chair, we introduced H.R. 8 8 years ago after our friend and former colleague, Gabby Giffords, was shot and nearly killed.

When she was by our side to introduce the bill, she said: "Speaking is still difficult for me, but I don't think I can make myself more clear: Congress must act to make our country safer from gun violence."

Now is that time. We have waited too long to close loopholes that let people easily avoid background checks through private sales. I have cried with too many survivors and attended too

many funerals. I have marched with too many student activists, and I have bowed my head through too many moments of silence.

We know strong gun laws work. In the 25 years since the Brady law took effect, background checks have stopped more than \$3 million in gun sales and have saved countless lives.

It is time to expand the Brady law. It is time to close the dangerous loopholes. It is past time for Congress to take action to save lives from gun violence.

Mr. Chair, this is not a moment of silence. This is not a sit-in. This is action by the United States House of Representatives on behalf of everyone who has pled for that action after San Bernardino and after Sutherland Springs and after Fort Hood and after Virginia Tech and after Columbine and Sandy Hook and Las Vegas and Pulse and everyday gun violence in our communities and, yes, after Parkland.

Let's represent the 95 percent of the American people who want us to take this action to help save lives. Let's pass H.R. 8.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, before I yield to the gentlelady, it has been quoted here, especially, 90 to 95 percent of the people want universal background checks. And everything has statistics, a poll, but when actually put to the voters of Maine, the voters of Maine actually rejected it, and I understand where they are coming from on that.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair, I rise today to defend the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Nebraskans.

In Nebraska, the need for firearms is the same today as it was even when the Second Amendment was enacted before we were even a territory of the United States.

Rural Nebraskans depend on their firearms for self-defense and for protecting their livestock. They also know how to handle firearms, to store them securely, to handle them appropriately, and perhaps to even let neighbors who are able to use them safely borrow them to meet their needs.

I have serious concerns. The bills we are considering today and tomorrow are going to criminalize this behavior for Nebraskans who have done this for generations and won't even know that they are breaking the law.

Should a rancher who lends a rifle to a neighbor to address threats from predatory animals face a year in prison and a \$100,000 fine? No.

Should a legally carrying farmer who is injured at work be subject to arrest for handing his firearm off before being taken to the hospital? No.

These are exactly the situations this bill would create, while doing little to address the real problems underlying crime in our society.

Mr. Chair, this is a bad bill, and I urge its swift rejection.

□ 1315

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman, and I certainly thank the ranking member for being present here today. I hold up in my hand pages and pages of mass shootings, which I will include in the RECORD.

LIST OF MASS SHOOTINGS SINCE COLUMBINE MASSACRE

(By Zayed Abdalla, Feb 20, 2018)

Below is a list of all mass shootings in the United States which occurred after the Columbine High School Massacre. Dates and death tolls (excluding the shooter) are included. Although many other mass shootings have occurred, for the sake of time and physical space, only shootings involving the death of five or more people have been included in this article.

1. Columbine High School Shooting, Littleton, Colorado—April 1999: 13 Dead
2. Atlanta Shootings, Atlanta, Georgia—July 1999: 12 Dead
3. Wedgwood Baptist Church shooting, Fort Worth, Texas—September 1999: 7 Dead
4. Xerox Killings, Honolulu, Hawaii—November 1999: 7 Dead
5. Tampa Hotel Shootings, Tampa, Florida—December 1999: 5 Dead
6. Wakefield Massacre, Wakefield, Massachusetts—December 2000: 7 Dead
7. Lockheed Martin Shooting, Median, Mississippi—July 2003: 6 Dead
8. Living Church of God Shooting, Brookfield, Wisconsin—March 2005: 7 Dead
9. Red Lake High School, Red Lake Indian Reservation, Minnesota—March 2005: 9 Dead
10. Goleta Postal Shootings, Goleta, California—January 2006: 7 Dead
11. Capitol Hill Massacre, Seattle Washington—March 2006: 6 Dead
12. West Nickel Mines Amish School, Nickel Mines, Pennsylvania—October 2006: 5 Dead
13. Tolley Square Shooting, Salt Lake City, Utah—February 2007: 5 Dead
14. Virginia Tech University, Blacksburg, Virginia—April 2007: 32 Dead
15. Crandon Shooting, Crandon Wisconsin—October 2007: 6 Dead
16. Westroads Mall Shooting, Omaha Nebraska—December 2007: 8 Dead
17. Kirkwood City Council Shooting, Kirkwood, Missouri—February 2008: 6 Dead
18. Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois—February 2008: 5 Dead
19. Atlantis Plastics Shooting, Henderson Kentucky—June 2008: 5 Dead
20. Carthage Nursing Home Shooting—Carthage, North Carolina—March 2009: 8 Dead
21. Geneva County Massacre, Geneva and Samson, Alabama—March 2009: 10 Dead
22. Binghampton Shootings, Binghampton—April 2009: 13 Dead
23. Fort Hood Shooting, Fort Hood, Texas—November 2009: 13 Dead
24. Hartford Beer Distributor Shooting, Manchester, Connecticut—August 2010: 8 Dead
25. Tucson Shooting, Tucson, Arizona—January 2011: 6 Dead
26. Seal Beach Shooting, Seal Beach, California—October 2011: 8 Dead
27. Oikos University, Oakland, California—April 2012: 7 Dead
28. Seattle Café Shooting, Seattle, Washington—May 2012: 5 Dead
29. Aurora Shooting, Aurora, Colorado—July 2012: 12 Dead
30. Sikh Temple Shooting, Oak Creek, Wisconsin—August 2012: 6 Dead

31. Accent Signage Systems Shooting, Minneapolis, Minnesota—September 2012: 6 Dead
32. Sandy Hook Elementary School, Newtown, Connecticut—December 2012: 27 Dead
33. Santa Monica College, Santa Monica, California—June 2013: 5 Dead
34. Hialeah Shooting, Hialeah, Florida—July 2013: 6 Dead
35. Washington Navy Yard Shooting, Washington D.C.—September 2013: 12 Dead
36. University of California Santa Barbara, Isla Vista, California—May 2014: 6 Dead
37. Marysville Pilchuck High School, Marysville, Washington—October 2014: 4 Dead
38. Charleston Church Shooting, Charleston, South Carolina—June 2015: 9 Dead
39. Chattanooga Military Recruitment Center, Chattanooga Tennessee—July 2015: 5 Dead
40. Umpqua Community College, Roseburg, Oregon—October 2015: 9 Dead
41. San Bernardino Attack, San Bernardino, California—December 2015: 14 Dead
42. Kalamazoo Shooting Spree, Kalamazoo County, Michigan—February 2016: 6 Dead
43. Orlando Night-club Shooting, Orlando, Florida—June 2016: 49 Dead
44. Dallas Police Shooting, Dallas Texas—July 2016: 5 Dead
45. Cascade Mall Shooting, Burlington, Washington—September 2016: 5 Dead
46. Fort Lauderdale Airport Shooting, Fort Lauderdale, Florida—January 2017: 5 Dead
47. Las Vegas Shooting, Las Vegas, Nevada—October 2017: 58 Dead
48. Sutherland Springs Church, Sutherland Springs, Texas—November 2017: 26 Dead
49. Rancho Tehama Shooting, Rancho Tehama, California—November 2017: 5 Dead
50. Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School, Parkland, Florida—February 2018: 17 Dead

According to The Washington Post, since 1966, 1077 individuals have been fatally shot and wounded as a result of mass shootings in which more than four people perished; Children and teenagers compose about a tenth of these fatalities. Almost 300 guns have been obtained by authorities in these shootings, and over half of them were obtained legally. The AR-15 rifle has been increasingly used in such shootings, with the latest being in this month's most recent high school shooting in Florida. It is estimated that more than 8 million of these weapons are owned in American households. The trend in mass shootings has been rising notably since 2006-07.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank Moms Demand Action, and I thank all those who have offered themselves in this fight. I thank our chair, Mr. THOMPSON, for his constant and persistent work.

Through my tenure as ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, and now third in seniority on the Judiciary Committee, it has given me a picture that many have not seen, and that is that we have been fighting for gun safety legislation for almost three decades.

It seems that even though Mr. Cohen is in a hearing right now where facts are being disputed, there are no facts to dispute the fact that people die from guns. And those who get guns are never regulated.

By no means do I want you not to have a handgun to protect yourself, or to enforce gun trafficking laws, or to make sure that prosecutors prosecute

those for gun possession, but it begs the question. What is the question? The interpretation of the Second Amendment is no one should prohibit the right to bear arms. As I stand here today, there is nothing in the underlying bill that is prohibiting that.

It is simply common sense and giving dignity to those who died at the Columbine High School shooting, the Atlanta shooting, the Wedgwood Baptist Church shooting, the Lockheed Martin shooting, the Living Church of God shooting, the Red Lake High School shooting, the Northern Illinois University shooting, the Santa Fe shooting in Texas, the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School shooting, and the Sutherland Springs church shooting in Texas.

It says that you have to have a check, a background check. It closes the gun show loophole. It gives exemptions for the issues of domestic violence and sexual assault. It allows families to transfer, and ranchers, farmers, and fishers to transfer.

My God, what more do we want? People have died. Are we not going to show that we are committed to saving lives, not to abuse the Second Amendment, to misuse it? We can bear arms. But the question is whether or not we will recognize that there are 350-plus million Americans, and there are more guns in this country than there are citizens.

I beg of my colleagues: Stop the violence. Vote for this bill.

Mr. Chair, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and an original co-sponsor, I rise in strong of H.R. 8, the "Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019," legislation that strengthens 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 means of ensuring firearms do not end up in the wrong hands.

An internal assessment by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) demonstrated that the National Instant Criminal Background Checks System ("NICS") yields results that are approximately 99.3 percent to 99.8 percent accurate, and in 90 percent of cases, are processed within 90 seconds.

We must be constructive and proactive in our response to 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 and Prevention ("CDC") 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 2015.

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.

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 CDC 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.

This is why legislation put forward to arm teachers is not the solution.

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

We must look at gun violence in its totality to determine what are the root causes of these alarming rates of lives cut short.

We are elected by our constituents to lead in resolving the issues that plague our country, and the issue of gun violence is a definite plague across the nation.

My good friend, Houston Police Chief Art Acevedo, gave a statement after four of his officers were shot while on duty.

He rightfully admonished us elected officials who, so far, have accomplished absolutely nothing about the public-health epidemic of gun violence.

Thanks to the new Democratic majority in Congress, we had a long overdue Gun Safety Hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

That hearing is the first step in the legislative process of addressing the epidemic.

Chief Acevedo was a witness at that hearing, testifying that if the proposed legislation on background checks is enacted and saves at least one life, then it is worth it.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, for his leadership of the Gun Violence Prevention Task Force and for introducing this timely and important legislation.

Congressman THOMPSON sat in the audience during the entirety of the Gun Safety Hearing on February 13, 2019, demonstrating his longstanding commitment to the issue.

Also helping to bring us to this point today is Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY of Illinois, who represents one of the most affected districts when it comes to gun violence.

She is a valiant leader who will not rest until the Congress finds solutions for communities like hers and others all over this country.

I want to thank Aalayah Eastmond, a survivor from the Parkland School Shooting, for testifying as a witness at the House Judiciary Gun Safety Hearing.

Her heartfelt and vivid testimony was met with a standing ovation by the crowded audience in the hearing.

Back in my state, despite incident after incident of rampant gun violence, Texas Governor Greg Abbott and Attorney General Ken Paxton, both prominent Republican opponents of gun control, issued the usual statements of offering the usual thoughts and prayers.

Chief Acevedo said, "I appreciate your prayers . . . but the question is, what are policymakers willing to do, besides prayers, to address a public-health epidemic?"

I want to answer his question—"what ARE we going to do?"

We are going to overcome the fierce opposition from House minority members.

We are going to overcome a recalcitrant and reluctant Senate.

And finally, we are going to overcome the opposition of the President and the gun lobby.

I am a defender and supporter of the Constitution.

I appreciate the Second Amendment and the right that it provides our citizens.

However, I am also a defender of the right to live, the greatest divine right of all.

I want all Americans to enjoy their Second Amendment right, but not at the expense of the lives of our children, students, communities, and law enforcement officials.

Imagine going to grade school in this day and age and having to undergo "active shooter" drills.

Imagine having children in grade school today.

Imagine the anxiety parents feel knowing that any day the precious lives of their children may be interrupted by someone with an AK-47 or AR-15.

Imagine a brighter future for America's children, one that does not include active shooter drills and funerals for adolescents.

We can help make that future a reality and we can start by voting to pass H.R. 8, the "Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019."

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. Let's be very clear on this: H.R. 8 will not prevent criminals from getting their hands on firearms. What H.R. 8 will do

is violate the constitutional rights of millions of Americans.

Under this bill, almost every time a lawful gun owner wants to transfer or sell a gun, he or she will have to go through a government-sanctioned intermediary. Under this bill, no longer could I let my cousin or my neighbor borrow my gun. If this bill becomes law, overnight, millions of law-abiding gun owners could suddenly be subject to Federal prosecution. Of course, we all know that criminals are going to do what they already do: make illegal transfers of firearms.

We have heard a lot about how this is going to be the most open Congress in history. Well, Mr. Chair, I filed an amendment that would strip out the text of H.R. 8 and replace it with a nationwide concealed carry reciprocity. Mr. Chair, the Democratic leadership blocked a vote on my amendment. What are they so afraid of? I guess they think they can shield their Members from votes to protect the Second Amendment and benefit our Nation's law-abiding gun owners.

Mr. Chair, I have news for the majority. Gun owners of America are watching this debate. They know what H.R. 8 is all about, and they know that this is just a sham to chip away at the Second Amendment and our Constitution.

I will oppose this bill and any bill that goes against the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Americans. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" and fighting against this assault on the Second Amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend, the chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan bill. Atlanta, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Parkland, Charleston, Oak Creek, Newtown, Orlando, Las Vegas, and many other places: How many more must suffer? How many more must die?

For years, the people spoke up. Mothers called. Fathers cried. Students marched. But Congress offered a blind eye or a deaf ear to their cries.

Today, we say to those who begged and pleaded for us to act that we see you. We feel your pain. We heard your cries, and we are going to answer today, now.

We sat in on this floor. I want to thank the chair of our task force, MIKE THOMPSON, for never giving up, for never giving in, for keeping the faith, for keeping your eyes on the prize. We are doing the right thing today.

We have a mission. We have an obligation and a mandate to pass this bipartisan bill that must become public law.

Today, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "yes." It is good. It is the right thing to do to save lives and to stop this madness.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8. I commend the efforts of Congressman MIKE THOMPSON from California for introducing this commonsense legislation.

What it simply does is require that all sales of firearms go through a licensed firearms dealer who has to run a background check. Current law mandates that all licensed gun dealers, before transferring a weapon, have to perform a background check.

The problem we have in this country is the law allows unlicensed firearms dealers competing with licensed firearms dealers to sell just as many firearms as a licensed gun dealer, but without doing the background check. That enables criminals and people who should not have weapons to have firearms, and that contributes to the proliferation of weaponry on our streets in the hands of those who should not have them.

It produces violence, and we are looking to stop the violence with this legislation, and so I ask my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL).

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Chair, today, we tell our fellow Americans that their children's right to learn without fear; that their own right to dance at a concert, worship at a synagogue, shop at the mall; that all those rights to come home, to live, and to love are greater than any other right in the Constitution.

This bill puts in place an expansion of violent history checks on firearm purchases where there were too many gaps before.

It will not end every gun violence death in America, but we should try. It also will get rid of this argument about States like California and Illinois, where you have gun violence. You can no longer say, well, they have tough background checks there, so it is not working. Well, no, we are only as safe as the lowest common denominator. If our States like Nevada and Arizona have low restrictions when it comes to purchasing a firearm, we are only as safe as they are.

We will have a nationwide background check that will make sure that all of us are safe. We are here, Mr. Chair, because of Mr. THOMPSON, because of Moms Demand Action, because of Everytown for Gun Safety, and because of March For Our Lives.

Keep marching. You got us to this point.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 9¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 5¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 8. This bill is long overdue. For too long, Congress has failed to end the cycle of gun violence and death that too many families are now familiar with.

In 2017 alone, 40,000 people died from gun violence. Congress did nothing. Last year, five reporters at the Capital Gazette in my district were murdered in cold blood in a mass shooting that took place in their newsroom. Congress did nothing.

Gun violence is a crisis in our communities and a real national emergency that will no longer be met with inaction.

For the first time since Congress passed the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1994, we will pass a bill in pursuit of our effort to protect our communities and end this scourge of gun violence.

The American people overwhelmingly want us to act. For the people, we will pass universal background checks out of the House as our first piece of comprehensive gun safety reform.

Mr. Chair, today is only the beginning.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN), a member of the committee.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I am delighted that we are finally at this day, because you know the tide, you know the toll that takes place every day. On average, every day in America, 342 people are shot: murders, assaults, suicides, or suicide attempts. That means every single day—yesterday, tomorrow, and the next day, and the next day—100 people, on average, will die of gun violence and another 200 or more will literally be wounded or shot in the crossfire.

We know that, in 2017, more than 39,000, nearly 40,000 people died of gun violence, all kinds of gun violence. That was an extraordinary uptick in gun violence.

I carry with me today the picture of Ben Wheeler, whose courageous mother testified before the Pennsylvania House of Representatives in 2014.

I carry with me today a picture of Ron, the son of my dear friend, Marge, who died of gun violence by suicide.

I carry with me, not by picture, but in my heart, the 16-year-old son of my former student at La Salle University who was shot in random gun violence in the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 8. In conclusion, Mr. Chair, I long for the day when orange ribbons are obsolete and when orange scarves are a fashion statement, not a cry for help.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentle-

woman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a member of the committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Chair, just 2 weeks ago in my district, six lives and six families were forever changed by gun violence in a 6-day period. Four people were killed and two were injured in six different shootings. One person was 28. The other five were 16, 17, and 18. They were teenagers. My heart goes out to all of those victims' families.

Thoughts and prayers are no longer enough. It is long past time that our actions speak louder than our words. No matter which State we are from, with over 40,000 gun violence deaths last year, every State has been severely impacted by gun violence.

The public health crisis has been politicized and weaponized as a means to divide us, despite the fact that it is a crisis that should bind us together, and we must come together.

□ 1330

Background checks are the foundation of commonsense gun policy, and they are supported by the overwhelming majority of Americans. Our current system fails us in two ways, but the bills we are looking at this week are designed to address that.

Under current law, firearm sales can proceed regardless if a good background check comes back within a 3-day period, and it doesn't capture all the sales. So this puts an incredible burden on law enforcement and an incredible burden on ATF agents who have to go and reclaim guns that are sold, despite the owner of the gun not being able to pass the background check. So for too long those in a position to act have failed to do so. But that ends now.

I strongly support the commonsense gun legislation in H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, again, I agree with the sentiment that we need to actually fashion something that will work. Unfortunately, this, for many reasons we have already stated, will not.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My friend, the gentleman from Georgia, just rose and said that this won't work. We have risen on this floor time after time after time after time and had a moment of silence followed by no action.

As I said time after time, we have had a moment of silence. I will tell my friend from Georgia that it hasn't worked. It has been appropriate, but it has not worked.

Can we guarantee that this will work to make every person safe?

It cannot. It will not. But I rise in strong support of doing something, and in this case doing something that 90 percent of America supports.

Mr. Chairman, this House is finally going to do its job and take action—not just a moment of silence, but action—to address the epidemic of gun violence in our country.

After the tragedies at Sandy Hook, Orlando, Las Vegas, Charleston, the Tree of Life synagogue, and Great Mills High School in my district, the House, under the previous leadership, did nothing. It didn't work.

After the shooting just down the street at the Washington Navy Yard, the Republican-controlled House did nothing. Three of the victims of that attack were constituents of mine living in southern Maryland. Dr. Wendy Edmonds and Wanda Wallace are in the gallery, Mr. Chairman. They are the sisters of Sylvia Fraser, a Navy Yard shooting victim.

Montana Geimer, daughter of Wendi Winters, a writer for the Capital Gazette of which my colleague, Mr. BROWN, just spoke; and Mackenzie Boughey, a high school student who organized a March for Our Lives rally in Anne Arundel County, are here with us today not to have a moment of silence, but to have a moment of action.

Many of our districts have been painfully affected by gun violence. In St. Mary's County in Maryland, as I told you, Mr. Chairman, a student was killed by a shooter at Great Mills High School, and a courageous school resources officer there saved countless other lives. In Annapolis, five staff members of the Capital Gazette were gunned down in their newsroom.

For years, the American people have demanded action to address gun violence. After the Parkland shooting, just over a year ago, students marched in cities from coast to coast to demand that Congress protect them in the classroom, in the streets, in houses of worship, and in all public gathering places.

I, as I am sure many of you have, had the opportunity to meet with many of the students who participated in the March for Our Lives and heard the determination in their voices as they spoke about working to achieve a future where students would no longer have to practice active-shooter drills in their schools. I found their courage and persistence deeply inspiring.

Now, with a change in the majority control, we are bringing to the floor legislation supported by, as I said, nine out of ten Americans, including a majority of responsible gun owners to expand criminal background checks to make sure that those who have a criminal past, a past of violence—domestic or otherwise—a mental health problem, or are on the no-fly list because they are perceived as possibly terrorists, won't be able to buy a gun.

Does that mean they won't get a gun?

It does not. I understand that. But as I told my friend from Georgia, the moments of silence have not worked. They were appropriate, I understand, but they didn't work.

We will also be voting this week on legislation offered by our whip, Mr. CLYBURN, to close the loophole that contributed to the horrific mass shooting at Mother Emanuel AME Church in Charleston in 2015.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Senate to follow the House and pass the legislation we advance, and I call on the President to sign it without delay.

Mr. Chairman, let us not have a moment of silence for this legislation. Do not let it die. Do not let the hope that it provides die. Do not let us stand by one more time to lament the death of a constituent, a friend, a neighbor, a fellow citizen, who dies at the hand of a gun purchased illegally or by someone who should not have a gun.

This is not about taking away guns. It is about preventing guns getting in the hands of people who do bad things, and we can predict that they are a danger to others. Let us not have a moment of silence for this bill. Let us pass it. Let the Senate pass it. Let the President sign it. Let's make an effort at least to stop the carnage.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the words of the majority leader. However, I will say that in the previous Congress, this Congress did pass Fix NICS. It also passed the STOP School Violence Act. I am sure, among other reasons, it is probably why the majority leader voted against those bills in which they were included.

I do agree with him. The moments of silence may not have stopped, but it did call upon a higher power to realize that we are fragile human beings involved in tragedies. I will also remind the folks, and Mr. Chairman, yourself, that this bill will also not do what it has many times been promoted for it to do, because any of these mass violence episodes would not have been affected by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to these gun control bills that are being brought forward. They are brought forward under the guise of background checks.

Let's look at what these bills would actually do. We had identified any number of problems with this bill that we were trying to improve, and every one of those was shut out, shut out by the Democratic majority who wanted to try to stifle the opposing side's debate because they think just saying background checks makes this a good bill.

Let's talk about what this bill will do to make criminals—felons—out of law-abiding citizens. If you loan your gun to a friend under this bill, maybe they are thinking of buying a similar gun to protect themselves and they want to go to a shooting range to see if this gun is the right kind of gun to protect themselves with, which they have a right to

do under the Second Amendment of this Constitution, loaning your gun to that friend in that act would make you a felon subject to a year in jail and subject to a \$100,000 fine, Mr. Chairman.

We tried to fix that. They shut that amendment out.

In this bill, if you loan your gun to a friend who maybe has been a victim of domestic violence—and one of my colleagues who is here in opposition to this bill is one of those victims of domestic violence. She had an amendment to fix this bill to say, if she has got a temporary restraining order against her boyfriend who has been beating her and she is afraid he is going to come back tonight, under one of the bills, if she goes to buy a gun tonight and the Fix NICS system isn't working, she may have 20 business days to get that gun.

Now, good luck if the boyfriend shows up to beat her up that night and she says: Don't worry, I am on day 8. I only have another 12 days before I can buy the gun. Will you come back so I can defend myself then?

Do you really think that is going to happen?

You know what that means to her.

So in the bill we said: What if you can loan your gun to her?

She goes to a friend and says: I know you have a gun. I don't have a gun. I am trying to protect myself because I have got a TRO, but I know he is probably going to come back.

Under this bill, you will be a felon, a year in jail, \$100,000 fine. We tried to fix that, too, Mr. Chairman, and they shut that amendment out. That is what this bill does.

Oh, by the way, we are talking about law-abiding citizens here. If you go hunting with a buddy and you try to loan your gun to a buddy, Mr. Chairman, they say there is an exemption in the bill. But it is written so vaguely that you not only need to bring your hunting partner, you might need to bring your attorney to find out if loaning your shotgun to your friend makes you a felon under this bill.

These are law-abiding citizens. These are people who use guns to defend themselves, which is the basis of the Second Amendment. Our Founding Fathers believed every American has the right to defend themselves, because every day, on average, in this country guns are used by good people to defend themselves against bad people, and it is going to make it harder for them to get access to these guns to defend themselves. So, again, we tried to fix some of these problems.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you about another problem we tried to identify and fix. If you loan your gun, you will be a felon.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Louisiana an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SCALISE. So now we have identified areas where law-abiding citizens

can become felons. We tried to fix it; they wanted that to stay in place.

So what is that motivation?

But then we identified another problem. If someone who is in this country illegally goes to buy a gun and the system flags them, and it says: Wait a minute, this person is not even here legally. They are breaking Federal law trying to buy a gun. We said that we should notify ICE so at least our Border Patrol agents in the interior can deport them. They blocked that amendment.

So now a law-abiding citizen can become a felon under their bill, but someone who is here illegally trying to buy a gun in violation of the law can't be turned over to authorities. This is a bad gun control bill, and we ought to reject it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out the penalty in this bill that is being cited as \$100,000 is in fact \$1,000.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I request of the chairman: Does he have any more speakers at this time?

Mr. NADLER. Yes, I have one more.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Members are reminded to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

□ 1345

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is the distinguished author of the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was asked to talk about some of the outrageous allegations that were made about this bill, and the chairman already cleared one up, and that is the \$100,000 fine that we are hearing from the other side. It is \$1,000, as was pointed out.

We also heard that this isn't constitutional. Well, the Constitution is pretty clear: Individuals have a right to bear arms. Nobody is disputing that. As a matter of fact, it was settled in *District of Columbia v. Heller*.

But also in that opinion were Justice Scalia's remarks that stated that government also has a responsibility and a right to regulate firearms. That is all we are doing.

We are saying that people who are felons, domestic abusers, dangerously mentally ill, a danger to themselves or others shouldn't be able to have guns. I don't think anybody can dispute that. And how do you find out if you don't do a background check?

My friends on the other side of the aisle said this won't work. We have

heard it a hundred times: This won't work. Well, we have been working on this for 6½ years, ever since Sandy Hook. We have pleaded with the other side to work with us, have a hearing.

What are your ideas?

Absolute silence from them. Absolute silence.

This does work. We know that licensed dealers stop the sale of firearms to 170 felons every day and 50 domestic abusers every day because they are required to do background checks.

But in some States, that same individual can be found to be prohibited, walk outside and go to a gun show or go online and buy a gun without the benefit of a background check—and that is wrong.

Countless speakers from the other side of the aisle said this wouldn't have stopped this crime, this wouldn't have stopped this mass shooting, this wouldn't have stopped that mass shooting. Well, my friends, if that is your standard, if you will only support a bill that will stop every mass shooting, that will stop every death by a firearm, that means you want to get rid of all guns, and no one on this side of the aisle is saying that.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. The only way you can ensure that there will never be another person murdered by someone with a gun is to do away with all guns. We recognized that from day one.

Numerous speakers have said, just today on this floor, this will not stop every death. But it will stop some, and it is certainly worth pursuing.

I urge your "aye" vote.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, is this now the final speaker?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close as well.

Mr. Chair, before I close, I would like to say that I agree with the statement from the gentleman just now that there are maybe the ones turned away every day. The problem is there are only 60 a year prosecuted for what is a crime. This doesn't address that.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), a licensed firearms dealer.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Chair, I thank my friend from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for allowing me the time.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 8 and want to lay out a couple of reasons for my opposition.

Before I do, I think it is important to acknowledge how polarizing this debate has become over the last several years. More specifically, I want this body to know that, as a human being, as an American, as a father, when I see the heartbreaking news of a mass shooting like the one we saw just 54 weeks ago in Parkland, it just breaks my heart.

With that being said, this bill that we are voting on today would not have done anything to stop that tragedy from happening, nor would it have prevented any of those recent mass shootings.

The 19-year-old murderer in Parkland passed a background check.

The man who murdered 26 innocent people at First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs also passed a background check, although he wouldn't have if the Air Force had passed along his criminal information like they were supposed to have done.

And the evil that took place in Sandy Hook wouldn't have been stopped by this bill either. The killer used his mother's guns to kill her and 26 others. They were bought legally.

Mr. Chairman, the simple fact is that criminals don't abide by the law, and this would only create traps for law-abiding gun owners.

However, there are actions that we can take, actions that we can do, that would make meaningful strides in combating the violence that we see today.

One example of something we could do, improve information sharing between law enforcement officials across this country.

Mr. Chair, to close, I disagree with the policy of this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, we have heard the other side here say that some people lie on the forms; they are not prosecuted. Well, that may be, and maybe law enforcement ought to prosecute more people.

That doesn't negate the necessity for the bill. It doesn't negate the fact that too many people who shouldn't have guns, who are mentally unstable, who have committed crimes, and who are abusers get guns because they buy a gun at a gun show or not from a registered gun dealer and, therefore, do not have to undergo a background check.

Everyone who gets a gun should have to undergo a background check, with the few exceptions we put in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8 is legislation that is long overdue for passage by this body and for enactment so that we can take a critical step overwhelmingly supported by the American people to protect us from gun violence.

We have had too many moments of silence, too many expressions of sympathy, too many deaths—39,000 deaths from guns last year—but little action here in Congress on this issue.

Today we act. I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this vital bill to start taking back our streets from the killers, to start blocking people who shouldn't have them from having guns.

Save our lives.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chair, when I voted for the Brady Law in 1993—which took

effect on February 28, 1994—it was to keep firearms out of the hands of dangerous persons including felons and abusers.

Twenty-five years later—and 300 million background checks that have blocked 3 million purchases to dangerous individuals—few if any today seriously suggest that the Brady law should be repealed.

I support the Second Amendment. Universal background checks prescribed in H.R. 8 are an attempt to ensure that firearms are procured, owned and used by responsible, law abiding citizens.

According to the Brady Campaign, about 1 in 5 guns now sold in America are done so without a background check. That's a significant loophole.

According to the CDC, there was a record 39,773 deaths from firearms in 2017—higher than in any other year—23,854 were self-inflicted and 14,542 were homicides.

To mitigate gun violence in America, H.R. 8 expands Brady background checks to transactions by private sellers not currently covered by the law.

Multiple school shootings have led to robust, comprehensive action at every level to make classrooms safer. I have visited many schools in my district—and I have found that while the threat is being taken seriously, no one policy, program or initiative can ensure the level of protection our students need and deserve.

Mr. Chair, no constitutional right is absolute including the Second Amendment. The First Amendment's freedom of speech, for example, has reasonable limits including the promulgation of slander and libel law.

To preserve public order, we accept reasonable restrictions on the freedom to assemble. Even freedom of religion isn't without some modest boundaries.

In like manner, universal background checks don't erode Second Amendment rights but do help ensure much needed protection from gun violence for everyone.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act.

This year, my State of the Union guest was Alexandria Goddard, a young activist who helped organize Portland's March for Our Lives.

Alexandria led thousands of Oregonians in a march to demand that Congress take action to prevent gun violence.

By passing this bill we are heeding the call of the hundreds of thousands of students who marched for their lives.

They know—and we know—that this bill will save lives because it requires a background check for nearly all firearm sales and transfers.

The evidence shows that Oregon and the other states that have already passed comprehensive background checks have 35 percent fewer gun deaths, and 47 percent fewer women shot by their intimate partners.

Congress is finally doing more than offering thoughts and prayers.

We are acting. We are acting for Parkland, for Sandy Hook, for Umpqua Community College, and for the hundreds of thousands of victims and survivors around the country.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 8.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today to voice my support for H.R. 8, The Bipartisan Background Check Act of 2019. This

common sense bipartisan legislation would expand the current firearm background check system to cover all commercial firearm sales nationwide.

Our nation is currently enduring a crisis that is putting families and communities at risk. Gun violence has become so commonplace in our society that we no longer seem to flinch whenever these events occur. Gun violence threatens national security and inflicts a toll. 125,000 people are shot every year and more than 36,000 people die as a result of these shootings. A 2018 report conducted by the Centers for Disease Control & Prevention revealed that there were 3,353 firearm-related deaths in my home state of Texas. 352 of these were children and teenagers under 19 years old. Texas unfortunately has played host to some of the most viscous recent mass shootings, such as the 2009 Fort Hood shooting, the Dallas police officer shooting in 2016, the Plano and Sutherland Springs Church shootings in 2017, and last year's Santa Fe High School shooting.

We have high levels of gun violence in this country because we have weak laws that are riddled with loopholes. This bill will not only eliminate those loopholes, but it will do so without infringing upon second amendment rights. Implementing universal background checks is supported by 97 percent of Americans, including 97 percent of gun owners.

The reality is that gun safety laws will reduce violence and we must do everything in our power to prevent the reoccurrence of unnecessary tragedy and loss of life in this country. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-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.

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

H.R. 8

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to utilize the current background checks process in the United States to ensure individuals prohibited from gun possession are not able to obtain firearms.

SEC. 3. FIREARMS TRANSFERS.

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

(1) by striking subsection (s);
(2) by redesignating subsection (t) as subsection (s); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (s), as redesignated, the following:

“(t)(1)(A) It shall be unlawful for any person who is not a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to transfer a firearm to any other person who is not so licensed, un-

less a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer has first taken possession of the firearm for the purpose of complying with subsection (s).

“(B) Upon taking possession of a firearm under subparagraph (A), a licensee shall comply with all requirements of this chapter as if the licensee were transferring the firearm from the inventory of the licensee to the unlicensed transferee.

“(C) If a transfer of a firearm described in subparagraph (A) will not be completed for any reason after a licensee takes possession of the firearm (including because the transfer of the firearm to, or receipt of the firearm by, the transferee would violate this chapter), the return of the firearm to the transferor by the licensee shall not constitute the transfer of a firearm for purposes of this chapter.

“(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

“(A) a law enforcement agency or any law enforcement officer, armed private security professional, or member of the armed forces, to the extent the officer, professional, or member is acting within the course and scope of employment and official duties;

“(B) a transfer that is a loan or bona fide gift between spouses, between domestic partners, between parents and their children, between siblings, between aunts or uncles and their nieces or nephews, or between grandparents and their grandchildren;

“(C) a transfer to an executor, administrator, trustee, or personal representative of an estate or a trust that occurs by operation of law upon the death of another person;

“(D) 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;

“(E) a transfer that is approved by the Attorney General under section 5812 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

“(F) a temporary transfer if the transferor has no reason to believe that the transferee will use or intends to use the firearm in a crime or is prohibited from possessing firearms under State or Federal law, and the transfer takes place and the transferee's possession of the firearm is exclusively—

“(i) at a shooting range or in a shooting gallery or other area designated for the purpose of target shooting;

“(ii) while reasonably necessary for the purposes of hunting, trapping, or fishing, if the transferor—

“(I) has no reason to believe that the transferee intends to use the firearm in a place where it is illegal; and

“(II) has reason to believe that the transferee will comply with all licensing and permit requirements for such hunting, trapping, or fishing; or

“(iii) while in the presence of the transferor.

“(3)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the Attorney General may implement this subsection with regulations.

“(B) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph may not include any provision requiring licensees to facilitate transfers in accordance with paragraph (1).

“(C) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph may not include any provision requiring persons not licensed under this chapter to keep records of background checks or firearms transfers.

“(D) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph may not include any provision placing a cap on the fee licensees may charge to facilitate transfers in accordance with paragraph (1).

“(4) It shall be unlawful for a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer to transfer possession of, or title to, a firearm to another person who is not so licensed unless the importer, manufacturer, or dealer has provided such other person with a notice of the prohibi-

tion under paragraph (1), and such other person has certified that such other person has been provided with this notice on a form prescribed by the Attorney General.”.

SEC. 4. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) SECTION 922.—Section 922(y)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “, (g)(5)(B), and (s)(3)(B)(v)(II)” and inserting “and (g)(5)(B)”.

(b) CONSOLIDATED AND FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2012.—Section 511 of title V of division B of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by striking “subsection 922(t)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (s) or (t) of section 922”.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to—

(1) authorize the establishment, directly or indirectly, of a national firearms registry; or

(2) interfere with the authority of a State, under section 927 of title 18, United States Code, to enact a law on the same subject matter as this Act.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

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

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 116-14. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 116-14.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment 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 participant in the PreCheck or successor trusted traveler program of the Department of Homeland Security.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would allow gun owners to legally transfer their firearms to individuals who have been approved and are participants in TSA's PreCheck program.

TSA PreCheck identifies trusted travelers and, thus, allows expedited movement through airport security. In order to receive TSA PreCheck, one must submit an application, have an in-person interview, and go through a background check and fingerprinting.

Fingerprinting is not required, currently, to purchase a gun; thus, a TSA PreCheck background check is more stringent. If an individual can pass this background check and be admitted to this Federal Government program, there is no reason why they shouldn't be able to borrow a firearm from a friend. They have already gone through a more extensive background check system than to acquire a weapon. The current background check does not require fingerprints; a TSA PreCheck does.

Membership to TSA PreCheck must be renewed every 5 years. Again, the TSA PreCheck process requires fingerprints and an in-person interview. The process, currently, for purchasing a gun requires neither of those under Federal law. It appears, then, that the TSA PreCheck process is a more extensive process.

H.R. 8 restricts not only the purchase, but also the everyday gun transfer for law-abiding citizens. This amendment and many other Republican amendments—I think I had five others that were not made in order—seek to give some relief to law-abiding citizens from this overarching and burdensome legislation.

In H.R. 8, we are not only talking about the purchase of firearms, we are talking about the transfer of firearms, which includes lending your firearm. The Democrats have proposed a bill that would criminalize millions of law-abiding Americans. Because this bill uses ambiguous, overarching, and vague language, it encompasses so many potential situations. This amendment seeks to give some relief.

If we are going to allow Americans to be given expedited and reduced screening in our most sensitive and secure environments in the U.S. airport getting on a plane, why wouldn't we allow them to lend a gun to their friend?

H.R. 8 criminalizes me and others just for handing someone a firearm who isn't a direct family member or in other very narrow situations. In fact, as I said yesterday, the language in this bill is so ambiguous. What is "imminent danger"? There is no definition in the bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it is fatally flawed and would undermine the public safety impact of the bill.

The amendment would add an exception to the background check requirement for anyone who is a participant in the TSA PreCheck program by the Department of Homeland Security.

By exempting those who have obtained a TSA PreCheck from the background check requirement, the amendment would allow many dangerous people, including people with disqualifying mental health conditions and some

criminal convictions, to obtain firearms without a background check.

The current background system, the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, was designed specifically for background checks pursuant to the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

The system, often called the NICS, contains the information that no other Federal database contains, and the TSA does not check NICS when determining a person's eligibility for the TSA PreCheck program.

Although participants in the TSA PreCheck program have had their criminal backgrounds vetted, the standards for approval and participation in the TSA PreCheck program are not the same and, in many cases, are more lenient than those which prohibit firearm possession and purchase.

For example, the NICS searches the records of people prohibited for mental health reasons during a firearms background check. These mental health reasons, though, are not part of the TSA PreCheck search.

As of January 31, there are more than 5.7 million of these mental health records in the NICS indexes, making it the second most populous category of prohibited records for firearm purchase.

Because the Department of Homeland Security does not have access to these mental health records for TSA PreCheck program purposes, individuals who have been adjudicated to be disqualified to own firearms for reasons of mental condition or have been committed to any mental institution may be accepted under the TSA PreCheck program but are not legally able to possess a gun. Under this amendment, they would be legally exempted from the background check requirement and would be able to get a gun, despite being legally prohibited from doing so.

The TSA bars people convicted of certain criminal offenses, such as rape or aggravated sexual abuse, from participating in the TSA PreCheck program only temporarily. It doesn't restrict people convicted of these serious crimes for more than 7 years, and it wouldn't bar people released from prison for these crimes within the last 5 years.

Under current law, these felony convictions prohibit possession or purchase of a weapon, but, under this amendment, people released from prison within the last 5 years for these crimes could get the weapons—could get the weapons.

The TSA PreCheck program does not have a minimum age requirement, and this amendment would allow people under the ages of 18 and 21 to purchase firearms illegally and without a NICS background check.

Furthermore, the TSA PreCheck program only requires a background check every 5 years, and the PreCheck system may not be advised that a firearms disqualifying offense has taken place after the initial PreCheck background check has occurred.

In other words, you get the TSA PreCheck, and if you are convicted afterwards, within 5 years, for a very serious crime, under this amendment, you could get the gun, although, legally, you shouldn't without a background check, and the TSA PreCheck program would not have picked it up.

□ 1400

These shortcomings of the TSA PreCheck system make it an inadequate and dangerous substitute for a NICS background check. To prevent potentially prohibited purchasers from obtaining firearms, licensed dealers should conduct background checks on participants in the PreCheck program as they would with any other member of the public.

The blanket exception of this amendment for anyone who participates in the TSA PreCheck program would undermine the bill's ability to enhance public safety because it would enable people convicted of serious crimes, people adjudicated to have serious mental illnesses, to purchase guns without a background check, even though the TSA system would not pick them up.

The TSA system is not a substitute for the background check system. It doesn't pick up many of the crimes. It doesn't carry it forward. And it is not a substitute for this system.

To pass this amendment, which would allow people who have qualified under the TSA PreCheck program not to have background checks, would allow a lot of people who shouldn't have guns to have them. Therefore, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I ask that my colleagues vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I won't take even the 30 seconds. I just support the amendment. I think it is good. Many of the flaws that we have seen in this bill so far, this is an amendment that actually works.

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

Mr. NADLER, in his statement, said that my amendment would allow dangerous people to get guns. I have to say I disagree.

I am the ranking member on the Committee on Homeland Security subcommittee that deals with TSA, and the TSA PreCheck system is more stringent than the background check currently required to obtain a gun, when you purchase it. Again, it requires a fingerprint background check and an individual interview. Neither of those are required right now.

We had offered a number of amendments to help this bill become less burdensome on law-abiding citizens, and so I am happy that one was at least ruled in order, this TSA one, and I would ask my colleagues to please vote "yes" on it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PRICE of North Carolina). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DEAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 116-14.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 11, after "harm," insert "including harm to self, family, household members, or others,".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019. My amendment clarifies that those at risk of committing suicide would be exempt from the background check requirement in instances of imminent threats of death or great bodily harm.

Specifically, this legislation amends the bill to insert the line "including harm to self, family, household members, or others" to the list of instances when a person is exempt from the background check requirement and may temporarily transfer away a firearm for safekeeping.

The spirit of this long overdue legislation is to save lives, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which will further achieve this goal by addressing the leading instance of gun death in this country, suicide.

Last year, nearly 40,000 people were killed by gun violence, with another 80,000 literally caught in the crossfire. Of those killed, over half, more than 20,000, people tragically died by gun suicide.

And the problem has grown. Nationally, over the past years, the past decade, the rate of suicide by gun death has increased 19 percent. This is a problem that grips our entire Nation.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, there has been a 24 percent increase in gun suicides over the past 10 years, claiming the lives of over 14,000 people. These are our friends, our loved ones, young and old, people for whom our

hearts ache, people we wish we could hold just one more time.

I offer up a picture of a dear friend of my family, Ron.

Unfortunately, very few of us are left unscathed by this problem. While there are many factors that contribute to self-harm, the presence of a firearm in the home increases the risk of suicide. Not surprisingly, using a gun is the method that most often ends in death.

Guns are dangerously effective at what they are designed to do. That is why this amendment is so important. It ensures that those in crisis can temporarily transfer a firearm safely until the crisis has passed. It clearly defines that a person can temporarily hand over firearms to someone they trust while they work through this difficult time.

This clarity is needed because, in times of crisis, moments matter. It may literally be the difference between life and death.

We are here today at a historic moment to take action against the violence that plagues this country, our communities, and our loved ones. The Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, with this amendment, will keep guns out of the hands of those who legally should not have them and also gives those who need a safe way to separate themselves from their guns a way to do so.

If we have the courage to pass this legislation, the courage here in the House and in the Senate and in the White House, it will do just that. It will save lives.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the willingness of the amendment, I think, but I rise in that, again, this is something discussed at committee. It was an attempt to—it is basically a failed attempt to fix one of the shortcomings of this legislation.

I understand why they would bring it. I understand why they would want to fix it, because its existence indicates what we have been saying about the flaws in the bill, which we discussed at committee.

Like other floor amendments that are going to be offered, this is nothing more than trying to basically change the appearance of what is a flawed perception. The problem here is it addresses the undefined term of "imminent" used in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known, and I have spoken about it many times, that I am still currently serving as a United States Air Force chaplain. I have pastored for many years, and I have been on the other end of phone calls from those who were struggling and thinking of taking their life.

Suicide is not something that we can define very easily. It is not something

that we can simply limit to: Yes, guns are effective. But any method that someone uses to choose to end their life is sad and a struggle for those of us who have dealt with this.

The term "imminent" here is problematic for those of us who have dealt with those who are struggling with suicide because imminent to them and imminent to a judge and imminent to someone who wants to take his life, and to law enforcement, indicates something precipitous that will happen in a very short amount of time, a very imminent act, something that is maybe going to happen, Mr. Chairman, even before I finish my speech. That is an imminent kind of act.

Imminent does not extend to 12 hours or 24 hours or even 46 hours. That would not fall under the definition of "imminent." And I am not willing to let a prosecutor or a judge who may not like guns, who would actually say that was an imminent threat, and by transferring it for more than a short amount of time, you have then fallen under and fall under this.

Now, I would hope that would never happen, Mr. Chairman. But we have to be serious about this issue of imminence. For those of us who have dealt with this, there may be, and I have had times when people would come to me and they were thinking about harming themselves, but the imminence factor was not there. They were just trying to see if they could clear their head. It may be a week that would pass, and they came back and would say it was fine.

But in this issue, I understand the intent and the heart here, but it is a very weak attempt to fix problems that we had already pointed out in this bill. And it will still not fix the problem, because the problem is the imminent standard. That is the part that we are struggling with.

We can disagree about this, and I will respect the gentlewoman if she disagrees, and would expect her to. But let's remember, this is carried out, if, say—which I would hope would not happen—this bill actually becomes law. It then will present a problem for those who have to enforce it and those judges who would have to interpret it.

We have to remember that our actions here, we vote on words on paper, not aspirational ideas. Those are happy thoughts, not words on paper. The only thing that the courts can do is vote on words on paper.

I appreciate the gentlewoman bringing this. I support the intent, especially dealing with suicide, which many of us have worked on, and the tragedy that it leaves in the wake of so many. But please understand my opposition to this is it is still a flawed product because we have not dealt with the very issue of imminence in this legislation and this amendment.

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, which clarifies the bill's exemption for the background check requirement in instances of imminent threats or great bodily harm would apply to someone who is at risk of committing suicide.

The amendment makes clear that the limited number of exemptions to the background check requirement include circumstances in which someone feels that they are a danger to themselves. They may temporarily transfer a firearm until the danger has passed. This is a limited and reasonable exemption that only applies to those who fear they will harm themselves, so that they may temporarily surrender their weapon.

I listened to the gentleman from Georgia, and I appreciate he doesn't think that the amendment goes far enough or solves the underlying problems of the bill, as he sees it. But even from his point of view, it should go in the right direction. So I urge everyone to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the author of this bill, Representative THOMPSON, and I thank all the tireless advocates who have worked to bring us to this day.

I thank the good gentleman from Georgia for his comments. Clearly, he understands the gravity and the grave nature of gun death by suicide in this country. As you can see, that number has been escalating over the past 10 years. That includes more than 20,000 people in a single year.

Gun violence by suicide is quite deadly. We know it, and so I thank my colleague from the other side of the aisle for at least supporting the spirit of what we are trying to do here.

For the greater safety of our citizens, our neighbors, our friends, and our family members, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and please support this bill, H.R. 8.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 116-14.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 14, insert “, including the harm of domestic violence, dating partner violence, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic abuse” before the semicolon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN)

and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oklahoma.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 8 is a critical piece of legislation that I am proud to support. Congress needs to act to cut down on our Nation's widespread gun violence. We must close loopholes that give buyers and sellers a way around background checks. There is no reason vendors at gun shows or online should be exempt from the safety measures other merchants must obey. We should also vet sales between two people.

That is not to say that there should be no exceptions. My amendment carves out protections for people who face risk of domestic violence, dating partner violence, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic abuse.

The underlying bill, H.R. 8, already creates an exception to the background check requirement when there is a temporary weapon transfer, if the transferee is at imminent risk of death or great bodily harm. Our amendment is meant to make it crystal clear and explicit that this exception applies when the transferees are protecting themselves from an abuser. It does not expand the underlying exception; it offers one critical example of where it might apply.

□ 1415

When I talked to Oklahomans across my district last year, they confided in me their concerns about gun violence. I promised to work towards policies that would protect them.

We need to protect our Second Amendment right, but there is no credible reason why we as a state and nation can't acknowledge there are steps we can take to save lives and find a path forward to do so.

H.R. 8 does just that. It increases safety without limiting our Second Amendment rights by implementing commonsense policy.

But when we take these commonsense steps, we need to acknowledge our power to create unintended consequences, and to prevent them.

That is why I am offering this amendment. In addition to my commitment to gun safety, I have talked about my devotion to helping protect women and families.

Between 1998 and 2017, the Oklahoma Domestic Violence Fatality Review Board found nearly 1,700 people were killed in our State because of domestic violence. In 2017 alone, 91 Oklahomans were murdered.

The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey found that nearly two in five Oklahoma women will face some form of domestic abuse or sexual violence during their lifetimes.

Oklahoma is consistently ranked in the top five States for women killed by men in one-on-one homicides.

Oklahoma domestic violence programs serve an average of 18,000 people annually, according to the YWCA.

Oklahoma is not an exception. These problems persist. One in four women and one in nine men experience intimate partner physical violence; these people deserve to be protected.

For us, that means many things, including strengthening and reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act and investing in support services and family justice centers. But it also means we need to empower people to protect themselves.

That is why Congress should pass laws to strengthen background checks and create exceptions for those who truly need them.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, again, I understand the need or want to do this is to make many things that actually came in discussions in our committee about some of the problems that we found here, and the mere submission is another tacit admission that the Democrats understand the flaws in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is not something that I am going to relitigate here, but also, when debate is cut short, this is what happens when you get to the floor. When debate is cut short in committee, this is what happens.

They realize that good products were brought up, but yet they chose to push through a bill because they had a timeline.

We went through this in the Rules Committee. I get it. This is what is coming up. But, again, to put this in, “great bodily harm,” it is minimally helpful at this point. It goes back to the problem we had with “imminent” in the last one.

These are all things, frankly, that could have been—even in a bill that I would disagree with at the end of the day on this—this is, again, not something that is going to fix it. A victim of domestic abuse can live in constant fear of her abuser and feel threatened at all times.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I understand at least the attempt to fix something, because they understand that there were problems and they don't want to make it worse, but I have advocated all along that what this does help, it also hurts. And this is, again, just another attempt to do that.

I appreciate that they are figuring out the problems now; I just would oppose this amendment, because, again, it does not completely fix the problems that we have seen, and would not in the bigger picture.

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

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she

may consume to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for this amendment to H.R. 8 introduced by Representatives HORN and MURPHY.

This amendment protects people facing the threat of domestic violence, dating partner violence, sexual assault, stalking, and domestic abuse.

I am the daughter of a military veteran, and like most Kansans, I respect the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. But also, like most Kansans, I am tired of politicians doing nothing to stop senseless killings.

That is why I support commonsense solutions to keep our communities safe, like expanding background checks and closing dangerous loopholes in our laws.

In our effort to ensure the safety of our communities, however, we can't forget the needs of those at risk of domestic violence to protect themselves from abuse.

According to the Kansas Bureau of Investigation, in 2017 a domestic violence incident was reported every 23 minutes and a domestic violence murder occurred every 9 days in the State of Kansas.

In the United States, more than 12 million people experience some form of domestic violence by a current or former domestic partner every year.

These women and men deserve our support, which means we also need to reauthorize and strengthen the Violence Against Women Act.

These men and women deserve to be protected. I cannot emphasize that enough.

Mr. Chair, I am proud to support H.R. 8. It is a critical piece of legislation that will save lives, and I urge my fellow colleagues to stand up for survivors and those at risk and support this amendment.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I simply want to say I support this amendment, which clarifies that great bodily harm is included in the exception to the bill's background check requirement, includes domestic violence, sexual assaults, stalking, et cetera. It is a good amendment. I urge people to support it.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would like to simply close by reiterating the importance of H.R. 8 and my support for it in this amendment, and clarifying and protecting individuals who are at risk from domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Congresswoman STEPHANIE MURPHY, who cosponsored this amendment, as well as Congresswoman DAVIDS and Congressman NADLER for their remarks.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. VAN DREW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 116-14.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 3, after "children," insert "including step-parents and their stepchildren".

Page 3, line 5, insert "if the transferor has no reason to believe that the transferee will use or intends to use the firearm in a crime or is prohibited from possessing firearms under State or Federal law" before the semicolon.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 145, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, my amendment clarifies that the exceptions for gifts and loans of firearms between parents and their children applies to stepparents and stepchildren.

The reason I offer this amendment is to recognize that the relationship between stepparents and stepchildren is sometimes stronger than or as strong as that of the biological parent-child relationship.

The parents of one of my closest friends are technically stepparents, but you would never know it, because they are all so close and love each other so much.

The amendment also clarifies that gifts and loans of firearms among family members are still subject to the existing legal standard for all transfers.

Existing law states that no person may deliver a firearm to someone if he or she has a reason to believe that the person is prohibited from possessing a firearm.

Consequently, even gifts and loans among family members are not permissible if the transferor has a reason to believe that the transferee may use the firearm in a crime or is prohibited from possessing firearms.

Again, the amendment clarifies that while a background check is not required for these transfers, the existing legal standard continues to apply.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, again, I am not opposing this amendment, but like the previous amendment, again, it is proof that this bill is still not ready for prime time and should have spent more time instead of moving a very ill-timed previous question because of a timing deadline that they had to get to the floor. It fixes one of the many flaws in the bill.

Again, Republicans had solutions to these loose ends all over the bill, but our debate time was stopped. But I do have just a question here. Although I am not opposing this amendment, it merely adds the exchange between stepparent and their stepchildren.

What about stepsiblings who also love each other dearly? But this doesn't include that. Stepgrandparents and stepgrandchildren? What about foster families or adoptive families?

It is a simple fix that, again, goes forward and, again, struggles.

But I do want to go back and address something, Mr. Chairman, that came up earlier, and it seemed to get an interesting response from my friends across the aisle, my colleague stated that the appropriate fine is \$1,000, not \$100,000. They cite the U.S. sentencing guidelines for this number, but I do have to remind the chairman that since the Booker decision, of course, the guidelines are only advisory. And we need not look to the advisory guidelines, but look at the statute the bill amends.

Remember, we do not vote on aspirations in this Chamber; we vote on words on paper.

18 USC 924(a)(5) contains the penalty for violating part "(s) or (t) of section 922 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

18 USC 3571(b)(5) "for a Class A misdemeanor", which this is, "that does not result in death, not more than \$100,000."

So it could be \$1,000 or it could be up to \$100,000.

I appreciate our confusion over this issue, but unfortunately, as I stated before, this is what happens when a bill is rushed to the floor, and it is why we oppose this legislation.

When we understand this, Mr. Chairman, again, you can offer amendments that make Members feel good, but feeling good doesn't heal you and feeling good will not make this better.

I will not oppose this amendment, but, again, I think in just the moments that I have had here, I raised enough questions about this amendment to

take up those very issues that were spoken of about the love between step-parents and stepchildren. What about the stepsiblings? What about the stepgrandparents? That is still part of that device and not addressed in this.

And, again, going back to the issue of the fine: again, the statute and the bill itself are pretty clear; it is fined under this process and not the guidelines that are sentencing.

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank the body for its support of my amendment, and I urge a “yes” vote on the Van Drew amendment.

This is a good amendment, and I believe it will be helpful, and I believe it creates an atmosphere which is a fair atmosphere for everyone to increase safety and yet at the same time to understand the relationships that do exist in stepfamilies.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, again, I appreciate the gentleman bringing it, but as was said, this is an attempt to make a bill that should have been vetted more in committee not be vetted more. And I appreciate that.

I am not going to oppose the amendment, but when I take it a step further, what about the stepparents and the stepsiblings between each other, and the stepgrandparents and stepgrandchildren? I have had a wonderful look at those families. Those are precious families. Why are we just stopping at one?

Again, it goes back to the heart. And I understand the rush to get here, but, again, what makes you feel better and makes you feel good does not always heal you. This is something that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Chair, with this, I am not going to oppose this amendment. It is unfortunately very lacking in a bill that is lacking on many points, but with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. VAN DREW).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 116-14 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mrs. LESKO of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. LESKO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 250, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

AYES—182

Abraham	González-Colón	Nunes
Aderholt	(PR)	Olson
Allen	Gooden	Palazzo
Amodei	Granger	Palmer
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Pence
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Posey
Babin	Graves (MO)	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Green (TN)	Reed
Baird	Griffith	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Grothman	Rice (SC)
Banks	Guest	Riggleman
Barr	Guthrie	Roby
Bergman	Hagedorn	Rodgers (WA)
Biggs	Harris	Roe, David P.
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Hice (GA)	Rooney (FL)
Brady	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (AL)	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Scalise
Buck	Hudson	Schweikert
Budshon	Huizenga	Scott, Austin
Budd	Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Shimkus
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Simpson
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Smith (MO)
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Smith (NE)
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Smucker
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Spano
Chaibot	Joyce (PA)	Staubert
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Steil
Cole	King (IA)	Steube
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger	Stewart
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Taylor
Comer	LaHood	Thompson (PA)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Thornberry
Cook	Lamborn	Timmons
Crawford	Latta	Tipton
Crenshaw	Lesko	Turner
Cuellar	Long	Upton
Curtis	Loudermilk	Wagner
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Walberg
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Walden
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Walker
Duffy	Marshall	Walorski
Duncan	Mast	Waltz
Dunn	McCarthy	Watkins
Emmer	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Estes	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	McHenry	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	McKinley	Westerman
Flores	Meadows	Williams
Fortenberry	Meuser	Wilson (SC)
Foxx (NC)	Miller	Wittman
Fulcher	Mitchell	Womack
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Wright
Gibbs	Mullin	Yoho
Gohmert	Newhouse	Young
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	Zeldin

NOES—250

Adams	Blunt Rochester	Carson (IN)
Aguilar	Bonamici	Cartwright
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Case
Amash	F.	Casten (IL)
Axne	Brindisi	Castor (FL)
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Castro (TX)
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Beatty	Buchanan	Cicilline
Bera	Bustos	Cisneros
Beyer	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Clay

Cleaver	Johnson (TX)	Plaskett
Cline	Kaptur	Pocan
Clyburn	Keating	Porter
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Pressley
Connolly	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Cooper	Khanna	Quigley
Correa	Kildee	Raskin
Costa	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Courtney	Kim	Richmond
Cox (CA)	Kind	Rose (NY)
Craig	King (NY)	Rouda
Crist	Kirkpatrick	Roy
Crow	Krishnamoorthi	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kuster (NH)	Ruiz
Cunningham	Lamb	Ruppersberger
Davids (KS)	Langevin	Rush
Davidson (OH)	Larsen (WA)	Rutherford
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Ryan
Davis, Danny K.	Lawrence	Sablan
Dean	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
DeFazio	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lee (NV)	Scanlon
DeLauro	Levin (CA)	Schakowsky
DelBene	Levin (MI)	Schiff
Delgado	Lewis	Schneider
Demings	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Schrier
Deutch	Loebach	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lofgren	Scott, David
Doggett	Lowenthal	Serrano
Doyle, Michael	Lujan	Sewell (AL)
F.	Luria	Shalala
Engel	Lynch	Sherman
Escobar	Malinowski	Sherrill
Eshoo	Maloney,	Sires
Espallat	Carolyn B.	Slotkin
Evans	Maloney, Sean	Smith (NJ)
Finkenauer	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Fitzpatrick	McAdams	Soto
Fletcher	McBath	Spanberger
Foster	McCollum	Speier
Fudge	McEachin	Stanton
Gabbard	McGovern	Stevens
Gallagher	McNerney	Stivers
Gallego	Meeks	Suozi
Garamendi	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Garcia (IL)	Moore	Takano
Garcia (TX)	Morelle	Thompson (CA)
Golden	Moulton	Thompson (MS)
Gomez	Mucarsel-Powell	Titus
Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy	Tlaib
Gottheimer	Nadler	Tonko
Green (TX)	Napolitano	Torres (CA)
Grijalva	Neal	Torres Small
Haaland	Neguse	(NM)
Harder (CA)	Norcross	Trahan
Hastings	Norton	Trone
Hayes	O'Halleran	Underwood
Heck	Ocasio-Cortez	Van Drew
Herrera Beutler	Omar	Vargas
Higgins (NY)	Pallone	Veasey
Hill (CA)	Panetta	Vela
Himes	Pappas	Velázquez
Hollingsworth	Pascarell	Visclosky
Horn, Kendra S.	Payne	Wasserman
Horsford	Perlmutter	Schultz
Houlahan	Perry	Waters
Hoyer	Peters	Watson Coleman
Huffman	Peterson	Welch
Jackson Lee	Phillips	Wexton
Jayapal	Pingree	Wild
Jeffries		Wilson (FL)
Johnson (GA)		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—5

Frankel	Katko	San Nicolas
Gosar	Radewagen	

□ 1458

Mr. RUSH, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. PETERS, Meses. PRESSLEY, SCANLON, Messrs. KENNEDY, HECK, O'HALLERAN, Miss RICE of New York, Messrs. PETERSON, GALLAGHER, CLINE, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. SUOZZI, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Messrs. PERRY and LEWIS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. SPANO, GOHMERT, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Messrs. KINZINGER and BUCK changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. KENDRA S. HORN OF OKLAHOMA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 310, noes 119, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

AYES—310

Adams	Davis, Danny K.	Jeffries
Aguilar	Davis, Rodney	Johnson (GA)
Allred	Dean	Johnson (LA)
Arrington	DeFazio	Johnson (TX)
Axne	DeGette	Joyce (OH)
Bacon	DeLauro	Kaptur
Balderson	DelBene	Keating
Barragán	Delgado	Kelly (IL)
Bass	Demings	Kennedy
Beatty	DeSaulnier	Khanna
Bera	Deutch	Kildee
Beyer	Diaz-Balart	Kilmer
Bilirakis	Dingell	Kim
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Kind
Blumenauer	Doyle, Michael	King (IA)
Blunt Rochester	F.	King (NY)
Bonamici	Duncan	Kirkpatrick
Bost	Engel	Krishnamoorthi
Boyle, Brendan	Escobar	Kuster (NH)
F.	Eshoo	Lamb
Brindisi	Españillat	Langevin
Brooks (IN)	Evans	Larsen (WA)
Brown (MD)	Finkenauer	Larson (CT)
Brownley (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lawrence
Buchanan	Fletcher	Lawson (FL)
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Lee (CA)
Burchett	Foster	Lee (NV)
Burgess	Fudge	Lesko
Bustos	Gabbard	Levin (CA)
Butterfield	Gaetz	Levin (MI)
Carbajal	Gallego	Lewis
Cardenas	Garamendi	Lieu, Ted
Carson (IN)	Garcia (TX)	Lipinski
Cartwright	Gianforte	Loeb sack
Case	Gohmert	Lofgren
Casten (IL)	Golden	Lowenthal
Castor (FL)	Gomez	Lowe y
Chabot	Gonzalez (OH)	Lucas
Chu, Judy	Gonzalez (TX)	Luján
Cicilline	González-Colón	Luria
Cisneros	(PR)	Lynch
Clark (MA)	Gottheimer	Malinowski
Clarke (NY)	Graves (GA)	Maloney,
Clay	Graves (LA)	Carolyn B.
Cleaver	Green (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Cloud	Griffith	Mast
Clyburn	Haaland	Matsui
Cohen	Harder (CA)	McAdams
Cole	Hartzler	McBath
Collins (NY)	Hastings	McClintock
Conaway	Hayes	McCollum
Connolly	Heck	McEachin
Cook	Herrera Beutler	McGovern
Cooper	Hice (GA)	McHenry
Correa	Higgins (NY)	McKinley
Costa	Hill (AR)	McNerney
Courtney	Hill (CA)	Meadows
Cox (CA)	Himes	Meeks
Craig	Horn, Kendra S.	Meng
Crenshaw	Horsford	Miller
Crist	Houlahan	Moore
Crow	Hoyer	Morelle
Cuellar	Hudson	Moulton
Cummings	Huffman	Mucarsel-Powell
Cunningham	Huizenga	Murphy
Davidson (KS)	Hurd (TX)	Nadler
Davidson (OH)	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Davis (CA)	Jayapal	Neal

Neguse	Rush	Thompson (PA)
Newhouse	Ryan	Tipton
Norcross	Sablan	Titus
Norman	Sánchez	Tlaib
Norton	Sarbanes	Tonko
O'Halleran	Scanlon	Torres (CA)
Ocasio-Cortez	Schakowsky	Torres Small
Omar	Schiff	(NM)
Pallone	Schneider	Trahan
Panetta	Schrader	Trone
Pappas	Schrier	Turner
Pascarell	Schweikert	Upton
Payne	Scott (VA)	Van Drew
Perlmutter	Scott, David	Vargas
Perry	Serrano	Veasey
Peters	Sewell (AL)	Vela
Peterson	Shalala	Velázquez
Phillips	Sherman	Visclosky
Pingree	Sherrill	Wagner
Plaskett	Shimkus	Walden
Pocan	Sires	Wasserman
Porter	Slotkin	Schultz
Posey	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Pressley	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Price (NC)	Smucker	Webster (FL)
Quigley	Soto	Welch
Raskin	Spanberger	Wexton
Reed	Stanton	Wild
Rice (NY)	Stauber	Wilson (FL)
Richmond	Stefanik	Wittman
Riggleman	Steil	Womack
Roe, David P.	Stevens	Woodall
Rooney (FL)	Stivers	Wright
Rose (NY)	Suzoi	Yarmuth
Rouda	Swalwell (CA)	Young
Roybal-Allard	Takano	Zeldin
Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	
Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	

NOES—119

Abraham	Granger	Palazzo
Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Allen	Green (TN)	Pence
Amash	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Amodei	Guest	Reschenthaler
Armstrong	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Babin	Hagedorn	Roby
Baird	Harris	Rodgers (WA)
Banks	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Barr	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Bergman	Holding	Rose, John W.
Biggs	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Bishop (UT)	Hunter	Roy
Brady	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Brooks (AL)	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Buck	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Budd	Joyce (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Byrne	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Calvert	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Kinzinger	Smith (NE)
Carter (TX)	Kustoff (TN)	Spano
Cheney	LaHood	Speier
Cline	LaMalfa	Steube
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Stewart
Comer	Latta	Taylor
Crawford	Long	Thornberry
Curtis	Loudermilk	Timmons
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Underwood
Duffy	Marchant	Walberg
Dunn	Marshall	Walker
Emmer	Massie	Walorski
Estes	McCarthy	Waltz
Ferguson	McCaul	Watkins
Fleischmann	Meuser	Weber (TX)
Flores	Mitchell	Wenstrup
Fox (NC)	Moolenaar	Westerman
Fulcher	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Gallagher	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Nunes	Yoho
Gooden	Olson	

NOT VOTING—8

Castro (TX)	Gosar	Radewagen
Frankel	Grijalva	San Nicolas
Garcia (IL)	Katko	

□ 1509

Mr. CHABOT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. KELLY of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8) to require a background check for every firearm sale, and, pursuant to House Resolution 145, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I am.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Collins of Georgia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 8 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 5, after line 4, insert the following:

“(E) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph shall include, in the case of a background check conducted by the national instant criminal background check system in response to a contact from a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, which background check indicates that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g)(5), a requirement that the system notify U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

As was just read, the motion to recommit will notify U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, commonly known as ICE, when an illegal alien who is prohibited from possessing a firearm attempts to purchase a firearm by going through the process of application.

Madam Speaker, I have been here all afternoon, and we have heard time and time again how we have had the problem of mass violence. We have talked about how to solve it, and, unfortunately, this underlying bill, as I have brought out many times already, will not do this. We have heard that we have to do something basically even if it won't work.

Madam Speaker, I will remind this House one more time that what makes you feel good does not always heal you. When we understand that, then we can begin to move forward.

What we have found this day is that this bill has many problems because we chose to rush it to the floor because we had a deadline, and we cut off debate in committee.

We found amendments offered to fix parts of this bill that do not fix them but actually make them worse.

We have found out that the authors of the bill did not even know how much was going to be fined in the bill until we actually pointed it out.

Now we come to the biggest part: I have been here all day listening to: We have to keep criminals from having firearms. We have to keep criminals from having firearms.

I will say it once more, Madam Speaker: We must keep criminals from having firearms.

I am glad to let you know, Madam Speaker, we are now giving everyone in this body a chance to do just that.

A similar measure was promoted. What we are simply saying is that, if you have someone who is a criminal who came into our country illegally—criminal time number one—if they then try to buy or purchase a firearm which they are unable to do, that is the second strike as a criminal, and what we are simply saying is, if they do that, they will be reported to ICE.

Now, which Members in this body are opposed to notifying law enforcement when a person prohibited from purchasing a firearm attempts to do so? Are we against that? No.

I believe my friends across the aisle are not. I have heard it all day: We don't want criminals to have firearms.

But my question to you now, Madam Speaker, is—be very careful. If you vote “no” on this motion to recommit, you cannot go back to your constituency, no matter what is said, and say: I voted to keep illegal aliens, those who should not have a firearm, from having a firearm.

We have heard it all day. And you can moan, you can talk, you can think about it, but, again, Madam Speaker, I understand the sympathy and the concern and the pain upon this bill, but let's not kid ourselves. The bill itself guts itself when it will not even allow a registry which the Obama administration said it had.

Let's actually get back to a point in saying, if there is something about this bill, give everybody an opportunity to actually keep a gun out of a criminal's hands and actually have that criminal punished for that by turning them in.

But, Madam Speaker and my colleagues, please listen to me right now. Hear me clearly. Hear me clearly. No matter what will be said in just a moment, no matter what the chairman or anyone else will say about this bill, if you vote “no,” you are voting to allow someone who should not have a firearm to get away with it and not be prosecuted for it.

Be very clear, Madam Speaker. You can try and make it look better. You can try and say: “Well, it was not part of the bill. I have got to have the bill”; but never get away from the fact, Madam Speaker, if you vote “no” on this motion to recommit, you are making a choice to say: “I guess some criminals can get away with trying to get a firearm.”

That is why this motion to recommit needs a “yes” vote. This is why we on this side stand for making sure that proper firearm safety is upheld while our rights are being upheld and, at the same time, looking to find real solutions, not perpetrating a fraud on those who are scared simply to pass a piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, vote “yes” on the motion to recommit and actually keep guns out of criminals' hands.

Madam Speaker, I yield back balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, let's remember what we are dealing with. We are dealing with the fact that current Federal law with respect to firearms background checks is dangerously limited and flawed because background checks are only required for sales by licensed gun dealers and that many, many people get a gun at a gun show or from someone else. Something like 20 percent, I think the figure is, or 25 percent of gun sales escape background checks.

So all kinds of people who may be criminals, who may be mentally ill, and who may be domestic abusers who shouldn't have guns get guns, and that results in lives forfeited. It results in people killed.

This bill goes a long way toward solving that by saying we are going to require background checks of everyone who gets a gun, with some exceptions, with some reasonable exceptions which are in the bill.

Now, along comes this motion to recommit, which is a total red herring having nothing to do with the purpose of the bill, and says that, if someone fails a background check because he is illegally in this country, you should report that to ICE.

First of all, if he fails a background check because he is illegally in the

country, that means the system knows he is illegally in the country. It means they already know that.

So what is the point of reporting him? He has to be in the system as illegally in the country in order to fail the background check because of section (g)(5). So we already know that, and this is totally circular, number one.

Number two, this is just a red herring to try to mix up the immigration issue with the gun violence issue, and they really have nothing to do with each other.

Number three, for 8 years, we couldn't get a hearing—not a hearing in a committee—on this bill or on any real bill to stop the plague of handgun violence in this country.

Madam Speaker, 150 people killed in Great Britain, 95 in Austria or wherever, 39,000 in the United States—no one will tell me that Americans are 10,000 times as mentally ill as Europeans or Japanese. The problem is we don't have adequate protections on guns. This bill goes in the direction of doing it, and they want to sabotage the bill with a phony issue raised by this MTR.

Now, there is an issue. If people fail the background check for various reasons, then you can make a case it should be reported to local law enforcement agencies. Mr. CICILLINE has a bill to do just that. I am going to yield to him in a second. But the fact is it has nothing to do with this bill. It is just an attempt to sabotage this bill.

If you believe that we ought to cut down on the plague of gun violence in this country, that we ought to save lives, that we ought to get rid of all these people who shouldn't have guns having guns, and that we ought to have background checks in sensible situations, then vote against the motion to recommit and for the bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are on the precipice of passing the first commonsense gun safety bill in this Congress in 25 years. I have been here for 8 years. We begged and pleaded and had a sit-in to try to force Republicans to take up some measure to reduce gun violence in this country.

There are women, men, and families all across America who are demanding that Congress do something. We are about to do this, and you raise a motion to recommit on a phony issue to try to muck this up with this gimmick. If you were concerned about reducing gun violence in this country and passing commonsense gun safety legislation, you had 8 years to bring a bill to the floor.

But if you are really concerned about this, I have good news for you. I have legislation, because, in fact, if someone buys a gun who is a prohibited purchaser, whatever their immigration status is, if they have committed a crime, then they should be arrested

and prosecuted. Every single Democrat believes that.

So I have a piece of legislation that says, if that happens, notify the field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the local law enforcement agency, and the State law enforcement agency, the agencies responsible for enforcing the criminal law, so they can arrest and prosecute that person.

I am looking for a Republican coled. I look forward to hearing from you.

Madam Speaker, defeat this phony amendment and pass universal background checks.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, let us not accept this red herring. Let us not divert. Vote “no” on the motion to recommit and “yes” on the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam 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, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 209, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—220

Abraham	Cook	Grothman
Aderholt	Costa	Guest
Allen	Craig	Guthrie
Amodei	Crawford	Hagedorn
Armstrong	Crenshaw	Harris
Arrington	Crist	Hartzler
Axne	Cunningham	Hern, Kevin
Babin	Curtis	Herrera Beutler
Bacon	Davidson (OH)	Hice (GA)
Baird	Davis, Rodney	Higgins (LA)
Balderson	Delgado	Hill (AR)
Banks	DesJarlais	Holding
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hollingsworth
Bergman	Duffy	Horn, Kendra S.
Biggs	Duncan	Hudson
Bilirakis	Dunn	Huizenga
Bishop (UT)	Emmer	Hunter
Bost	Estes	Hurd (TX)
Brady	Ferguson	Johnson (LA)
Brindisi	Finkenauer	Johnson (OH)
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (SD)
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Jordan
Buchanan	Flores	Joyce (OH)
Buck	Fortenberry	Joyce (PA)
Bucshon	Fox (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Budd	Fulcher	Kelly (PA)
Burchett	Gaetz	Kim
Burgess	Gallagher	King (IA)
Byrne	Gianforte	King (NY)
Calvert	Gibbs	Kinzinger
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	Kustoff (TN)
Carter (TX)	Golden	LaHood
Chabot	Gonzalez (OH)	LaMalfa
Cheney	Gooden	Lamb
Cline	Gottheimer	Lamborn
Cloud	Granger	Latta
Cole	Graves (GA)	Lee (NV)
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Lesko
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Long
Comer	Green (TN)	Loudermilk
Conaway	Griffith	Lucas

Luetkemeyer	Reschenthaler
Luria	Rice (SC)
Marchant	Riggleman
Marshall	Roby
Massie	Rodgers (WA)
Mast	Roe, David P.
McAdams	Rogers (AL)
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)
McCaul	Rooney (FL)
McClintock	Rose (NY)
McHenry	Rose, John W.
McKinley	Rouzer
Meadows	Roy
Meuser	Rutherford
Miller	Scalise
Mitchell	Schrader
Moolenaar	Schweikert
Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin
Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Murphy	Sherrill
Newhouse	Shimkus
Norman	Simpson
Nunes	Slotkin
O'Halleran	Smith (MO)
Olson	Smith (NE)
Palazzo	Smith (NJ)
Palmer	Smucker
Pence	Spanberger
Perry	Spano
Peterson	Stauber
Posey	Stefanik
Ratcliffe	Steil
Reed	Steube

NAYS—209

Adams	Fletcher	McEachin
Aguilar	Foster	McGovern
Allred	Fudge	McNerney
Amash	Gabbard	Meeks
Barragán	Gallego	Meng
Bass	Garamendi	Moore
Beatty	Garcia (IL)	Morelle
Bera	Garcia (TX)	Moulton
Beyer	Gomez	Mucarsel-Powell
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Nadler
Blumenauer	Green (TX)	Napolitano
Blunt Rochester	Grijalva	Neal
Bonamici	Haaland	Neguse
Boyle, Brendan F.	Harder (CA)	Norcross
Brown (MD)	Hastings	Ocasio-Cortez
Brownley (CA)	Hayes	Omar
Bustos	Heck	Pallone
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Panetta
Carbajal	Hill (CA)	Pappas
Cárdenas	Himes	Pascrell
Carson (IN)	Horsford	Payne
Cartwright	Houlahan	Pelosi
Case	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Casten (IL)	Huffman	Peters
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Phillips
Castro (TX)	Jayapal	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Pocan
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Porter
Cisneros	Johnson (TX)	Pressley
Curtis	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Clark (MA)	Keating	Quigley
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Clay	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Cleaver	Khanna	Richmond
Clyburn	Kildee	Rouda
Cohen	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Connolly	Kind	Ruiz
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Rush
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Ryan
Cox (CA)	Langevin	Sanchez
Crow	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Scanlon
Cummings	Lawrence	Schakowsky
Davids (KS)	Lawson (FL)	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Schneider
Davis, Danny K.	Levin (CA)	Schrier
Dean	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Lewis	Scott, David
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Serrano
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)
DeBene	Loeb sack	Shalala
Demings	Loftgren	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Sires
Deutch	Lowe y	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Luján	Soto
Doggett	Lynch	Speier
Doyle, Michael F.	Malinowski	Stanton
Engel	Maloney	Stevens
Escobar	Carolyn B.	Suozzi
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Swalwell (CA)
Españolat	Matsui	Takano
Evans	McBath	Thompson (CA)
	McCollum	Thompson (MS)

Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood

Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—3

Frankel

Gosar

Katko

□ 1533

Mr. NEAL changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. DAVIDSON of Ohio and MASSIE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House on the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 8, back to the House with an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER:

Page 5, after line 4, insert the following:

“(E) Regulations promulgated under this paragraph shall include, in the case of a background check conducted by the national instant criminal background check system in response to a contact from a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer, which background check indicates that the receipt of a firearm by a person would violate subsection (g)(5), a requirement that the system notify U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.”

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, in order for the amendment that was just passed to be passed, am I correct that you would have to vote for this bill with that amendment now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the question on the amendment and then the question on passage.

Mr. HOYER. The vote now is to pass the bill as amended. Am I correct?

My parliamentary inquiry is, if that does not pass, am I correct that the amendment that was just voted for by so many in this House, it would be defeated if the bill is defeated?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Following the disposition of the amendment, the Chair will put the question on passage of the bill.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam 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 240, nays 190, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—240

Adams	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Omar
Allred	Gottheimer	Pallone
Axne	Green (TX)	Panetta
Barragán	Grijalva	Pappas
Bass	Haaland	Pascarell
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bera	Hastings	Pelosi
Beyer	Hayes	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Heck	Peters
Blumenauer	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Hill (CA)	Pingree
Bonamici	Himes	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Brindisi	Horsford	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Houlahan	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Buchanan	Huffman	Raskin
Bustos	Hurd (TX)	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carbajal	Jayapal	Rose (NY)
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rouda
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson (TX)	Ruiz
Case	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Keating	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kildee	Scanlon
Cisneros	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kim	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schneider
Clay	King (NY)	Schrader
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schrier
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Scott, David
Connolly	Lamb	Serrano
Cooper	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Shalala
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Courtney	Lawrence	Sherrill
Cox (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Sires
Craig	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Crist	Lee (NV)	Smith (NJ)
Crow	Levin (CA)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Levin (MI)	Soto
Cummings	Lewis	Spanberger
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Stanton
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Stevens
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Suoizzi
Dean	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowe y	Takano
DeGette	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Luria	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	Lynch	Titus
Delgado	Malinowski	Tlaib
Demings	Maloney,	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Torres (CA)
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Torres Small
Diaz-Balart	Mast	(NM)
Dingell	Matsui	Trahan
Doggett	McAdams	Trone
Doyle, Michael F.	McBath	Underwood
Engel	McCollum	Upton
Escobar	McEachin	Van Drew
Eshoo	McGovern	Vargas
Espallat	McNerney	Veasey
Evans	Meeks	Vela
Finkenauer	Meng	Velázquez
Fitzpatrick	Moore	Visclosky
Fletcher	Morelle	Wasserman
Foster	Moulton	Schultz
Fudge	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Gabbard	Murphy	Watson Coleman
Galleo	Nadler	Welch
Garamendi	Napolitano	Wexton
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Wild
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
	Norcross	Yarmuth
	O'Halleran	

NAYS—190

Gooden	Palmer
Gosar	Pence
Granger	Perry
Graves (GA)	Peterson
Graves (LA)	Posey
Graves (MO)	Ratcliffe
Green (TN)	Reed
Griffith	Reschenthaler
Grothman	Rice (SC)
Guest	Riggleman
Guthrie	Roby
Hagedorn	Rodgers (WA)
Harris	Roe, David P.
Hartzler	Rogers (AL)
Hern, Kevin	Rogers (KY)
Herrera Beutler	Rooney (FL)
Hice (GA)	Rose, John W.
Higgins (LA)	Rouzer
Hill (AR)	Roy
Holding	Rutherford
Hollingsworth	Scalise
Hudson	Schweikert
Huizenga	Scott, Austin
Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (LA)	Shimkus
Johnson (OH)	Simpson
Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Jordan	Smith (NE)
Joyce (OH)	Smucker
Joyce (PA)	Spano
Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
King (IA)	Steil
Kinzinger	Steube
Kustoff (TN)	Stewart
LaHood	Stivers
LaMalfa	Taylor
Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Latta	Thornberry
Lesko	Timmons
Long	Tipton
Loudermilk	Turner
Lucas	Wagner
Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Marchant	Walden
Marshall	Walker
Massie	Walorski
McCarthy	Waltz
McCaul	Watkins
McClintock	Weber (TX)
McHenry	Webster (FL)
McKinley	Wenstrup
Meadows	Westerman
Meuser	Williams
Miller	Wilson (SC)
Mitchell	Wittman
Moolenaar	Womack
Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Mullin	Wright
Newhouse	Yoho
Norman	Young
Nunes	Zeldin
Olson	
Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—2

Frankel Katko

□ 1544

Mrs. BEATTY changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 787

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 787.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of a bill I sponsored, H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, to make sure that the most vulnerable children in the United States have access to lifesaving medical care, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Madam Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the Majority Leader to immediately schedule a vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act so that we can protect the sanctity of human life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

OUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING HEALTH AND WELLNESS COACHES

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor America's health and wellness coaches.

Approximately 70 percent of healthcare dollars in the United States are spent on lifestyle-related diseases; but health and wellness coaches can decrease those costs by helping people achieve their personal health and wellness goals.

Far too many people suffer and struggle with poor health because they don't have the motivation and resources or sustained support needed in