

But the fact is, the fossil fuel industry has been used to bring more prosperity to third world countries than any other development in industrial history.

This assault on our freedoms, our economic freedoms, our healthcare freedoms, as you mentioned, whether it is the mask, whether it is the vaccines, our individual freedoms with the Second Amendment assault.

This body is going to try to pass two more bills to take away and restrict Second Amendment rights. That is going to happen in this House, we are told. The continued assault on the Second Amendment right.

You know, I have right here—I don't do this very often, but I have some quotes from the Founders as it relates to the Second Amendment right.

As I was looking for quotes, you know, I couldn't find anything that talked about that people could keep and bear arms so they could target practice; that people could keep and bear arms so they could hunt; that people could keep and bear arms for sporting purposes.

These quotes that I have here from the Founders explaining why they wrote into the Constitution the Second Amendment as they did was to ensure we remain free.

Freedom has a cost. Most of the world does not live free to the extent that we still live free, as you often enunciate.

Whether the majority of this Congress likes it or not, we have a Constitution. I happen to like it. I know you do as well. The framers, in their wisdom, made it possible to change the Constitution, but they made it difficult by design.

They said, hey, if you want to change the Constitution, you have got to have super majorities of both Houses. You have got to have super majorities of the State legislatures in order to bring transformational change to the country and amend the Constitution.

But, instead, they want to undermine the Constitution, undermine our freedoms, and attack the rights guaranteed to Americans in our Constitution.

Mr. ROY. I ask of the Chair how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROY. I would just add to my friend from Virginia a great quote from Thomas Jefferson—because he knows I went to the University of Virginia.

The strongest reason for the people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government.

That is the purpose of the Second Amendment, and that is what we know.

I would note that in this context, and I will yield another couple minutes to the gentleman if he wants it, when we are talking about the response from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they break our border purposefully, and then they want us to fix it with amnesty or with some policies to say that Texas has to just accept.

I hear that the mayor of New York is all aghast that people are being dropped off in New York. He said, we need Federal Government help to deal with it. I am, like, welcome to the party, pal. This is what life is like in south Texas every single day.

They break it. They break the border, and then they want you, the American people, to have to carry the water.

They break the Defense Department, drive recruiting down to 40 percent, and then they put in language to draft our daughters, all in the name of so-called equity and equality.

They break our criminal justice system. They break the backs of our law enforcement community. Then they say, we are going to take your guns, your ability to defend yourself.

They break the energy system in our country. Then they say, just go buy a Tesla. What is wrong with you?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. 70,000 bucks. Go ahead.

Mr. ROY. What is wrong with you? Go buy a Tesla. You can plug in. You can drive through west Texas, 300 miles. Don't worry about it. Stop off in Eden, Texas, where, no doubt, they have a charging station and spend \$70,000 for the pleasure.

They break the back of the economy, drive up in inflation, and they say, suck it up, buttercup. Go buy yourself some expensive chicken and rice.

They break the back of this body, this institution, and they ignore their colleagues when their colleagues are saying the chickens are going to come home to roost.

That is the reality of what we are dealing with: A purposeful breaking the back of this country and a tearing apart of the threads that hold us together.

I am going to just say it here on the floor. If we don't start respecting Federalism, the ability to agree to disagree, then this country is doomed. It will break apart under its own weight, and it will be my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that amassed the weight that will break the bow.

That is where we are headed if we don't start respecting the ability of individuals in this country to agree to disagree, allow Texans to be Texans, allow Californians to be Californians.

Unite under the flag of the United States under our core principles but stop shredding our ability to disagree. Stop breaking this country and forcing the American people to buy it.

I yield the balance of the time to my friend Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Well said by the gentleman from Texas.

Their solution, this President's solution, this majority's solution to the economic wreckage they have created is to spend more money.

You just ask yourself. You're baffled. Is it malicious intent, and they recognize the harm that they are doing; and how they are causing the harm; and they are doing it by design; and they are doing it on purpose; or are they

that economically illiterate, and they really are clueless and have no idea what they are doing?

Because we have record inflation, 40-year high inflation of 9 percent, which essentially means every American is working for 1 month free this year. One month out of the year they are essentially not getting paid with the loss of purchasing power they have experienced because of the inflation.

So what is their answer to that? Well, if we could just spend more money, if we could just get more of our agenda passed and spend trillions of dollars more, then that will help the problem rather than make it worse.

It is like the person who says, hey, I am trying to lose weight and then they would say, well, the solution is to eat more. That is the solution that they propose, to do more harm, and you just wonder, is it just that illiterate, that ignorant, or is it willful and devious and malicious?

Mr. ROY. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. I think our time has expired. I appreciate the speaker and the staff here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

□ 1645

SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Second Amendment in our Constitution is the amendment that guarantees or ensures all the other freedoms that we hold dear in this country.

The right to defend oneself is a God-given right, but we are unique among the nations of the world in that that right is protected for us and enshrined in our Constitution based on the wisdom of the Founders.

There is a mechanism for changing the Constitution, but it is difficult. Yet, what this body wants to do is to find ways to do what the Constitution clearly says, which is that the Congress has absolutely no constitutional authority to restrict the rights of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms.

I am going to read a few quotes from the Founders from about 250 years ago, and the reason why we go back to the Founders is to understand what they intended with the Constitution. We have the Federalist Papers, of course, and then other writings by the Founders.

Alexander Hamilton said: "The best we can hope for concerning the people at large is that they be properly armed."

Samuel Adams said the Constitution shall "be never construed to authorize Congress to infringe . . . or to prevent

the people of the United States, who are peaceable citizens, from keeping their own arms."

James Madison, the first Congressman from my Fifth District and our fourth President, said: "The Constitution preserves the advantage of being armed which Americans possess over the people of almost every other nation," where "the governments are afraid to trust the people with arms." Still true today.

Noah Webster said: "Before a standing army can rule, the people must be disarmed; as they are in almost every kingdom of Europe. . . . A military force, at the command of Congress, can execute no laws, but such as the people perceive to be just and constitutional; for they will possess the power . . . to resist the execution of a law which appears to them unjust and oppressive."

Thomas Jefferson, from my home district in Virginia, from where the gentleman from Texas went to school, said: "What country can preserve its liberties, if its rulers are not warned from time to time that this people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms."

Thomas Jefferson also said: "No free man shall ever be debarred the use of arms."

Back to James Madison: "The right of the people to keep and bear . . . arms shall not be infringed. A well regulated militia, composed of the body of the people, trained to arms, is the best and most natural defense of a free country."

George Mason said: "To disarm the people—that was the best and most effectual way to enslave them."

Patrick Henry said: "Are we at last brought to such humiliating and debasing degradation, that we cannot be trusted with arms for our defense?" "If our defense be the real object of having those arms, in whose hands can they be trusted with more propriety, or equal safety to us, as in our own hands?"

Samuel Adams said: "The said Constitution be never construed to authorize Congress to . . . prevent the people of the United States, who are peaceable citizens, from keeping their own arms."

Thomas Paine: "Arms discourage and keep the invader and the plunderer in awe, and preserve order in the world. . . . Horrid mischief would ensue were the law-abiding deprived of the use of them."

Patrick Henry also said: "Where and when did freedom exist, when the sword and purse were given up from the people?"

We are doing that right here in this body. We are taking the sword and the purse away from the people.

He said: "Unless a miracle in human affairs shall interpose, no nation ever did or ever can retain its liberty, after the loss of the sword and the purse."

"The great object is that every man be armed."

"Everyone who is able may have a gun."

Final quote from Thomas Jefferson, then I will defer to the gentleman from South Carolina: "Laws that forbid the carrying of arms . . . disarm only those who are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes. Such laws make things worse for the assaulted and better for the assailants; they serve rather to encourage than prevent homicides, for an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed one."

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Roy).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I have to head down to the House Judiciary Committee to defend the Second Amendment from the attacks being levied by my Democratic colleagues as we speak. We are in there debating.

I would add just one thing to what the gentleman just eloquently put out, the understanding for the American people that when this Nation was founded, we were dealing with debate about what the structure of government should look like. Those who were suspicious of consolidating power, the anti-Federalists, were raising questions.

James Madison, a Virginian, was making points through the Federalist Papers. He said in response to some of the critiques: "All the other checks and balances will always prevent tyranny, but should tyranny ever triumph, the U.S. Constitution provides a mechanism to restore constitutional order," he says. "Besides the advantage of being armed, which the Americans possess over the people of almost every other nation," Madison wrote, "the existence of subordinate governments, the State government to which the people are attached," their State and local governments, "and by which the militia officers are appointed," because that well-regulated militia meant a well-ordered militia, not regulated the way we talk about it, a well-ordered militia. "And it forms a barrier against the enterprises of ambition more insurmountable than any which a simple government of any form can admit of."

The final point is, the Second Amendment does not create a right of revolution against tyranny. That inherent right is universal. The Second Amendment provides the tools and the power for the people to stand and thwart tyranny.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Good for having this Special Order.

Let me give you a live example of what happens with a well-armed militia, the purpose of the Second Amendment is for the citizens of America to bear arms.

This past Sunday, a deranged gunman opened fire in a food court of a shopping mall in Greenwood, Indiana, which is a suburb of Indianapolis. Police say this deranged gunman fired 24 rounds within 2 minutes, killing three and injuring two others.

Nearby was a young man, Elisjsja Dicken, a private citizen who took quick action to stop that gunman. Elisjsja was legally armed and carrying his own weapon under Indiana's constitutional carry laws. Thank God for this young man.

In summarizing Elisjsja's response, the Greenwood chief of police said, "I will say his actions were nothing short of heroic. He engaged the gunman from quite a distance with a handgun." The police chief went on to say Elisjsja was "very tactically sound as he moved in to close on the suspect, and was also monitoring for people to exit behind him. He has had no police experience, no training, no military background."

What a true hero. Elisjsja was simply going about his business at the mall when the unthinkable happened. It is hard to imagine how we might react in that situation, but Elisjsja was equipped; he was prepared; and he had courage to confront that sick individual, who was determined to kill others.

Elisjsja would not have been able to do so if the liberals who want to take away our Second Amendment rights had their way with this so-called gun control.

To my Democratic friends who are determined to restrict our Second Amendment rights, I ask you this: How many more people might have died last Sunday in Greenwood, Indiana, if you had had your way? How many more people would have been slaughtered if Elisjsja didn't have the ability to exercise his constitutional rights? Thankfully, we will never know the answer to that question.

Americans deserve the right to protect themselves and others when their lives are in severe danger. That is why it is so critical to strongly defend our Second Amendment rights against the antigun left that is so intent to demoralize our Second Amendment and our Constitution.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Ronald Reagan, to paraphrase, said: Freedom is only one generation away from extinction, and it must be fought and preserved from one generation to the next, and no nation having lost its freedom in history has ever regained it.

You think about how, in the past year and a half, we have seen our most basic, most essential freedoms trampled upon by those who would also trample upon our Second Amendment rights. They have moved to restrict our own healthcare decisions about whether or not we have to take a vaccine that we may not want or may not need. They have restricted our ability to travel and to move, where we want to go, whether or not we can assemble, whether or not we can worship, whether we can go to work, whether we can operate our business, whether or not we can earn a living. They want to trample upon our rights to defend ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN).

Mr. CAWTHORN. Mr. Speaker, 40 yards, 10 rounds, one man, countless lives saved. I speak today to acknowledge a new American hero.

Just 2 weeks after Indiana passed a constitutional carry provision, one man stood tall in the face of imminent death, protecting his loved ones and his community from evil. Elisjsa Dickenson's incredibly quick and heroic actions are not just to be applauded in the media. They ought to be used as a blueprint for American citizens who legally carry nationwide.

There is strong evidence that the best defense an American can possess is a sidearm and the know-how to use it. Mr. Speaker, law-abiding citizens use firearms to defend themselves against criminals as many as 2.5 million times a year, or about 6,850 times a day. This means that, each year, firearms are used more than 80 times more often to protect the lives of honest citizens than to take lives. Moreover, citizens shoot and kill at least twice as many criminals as police do every year, as was the case in Greenwood.

The analysis is clear. Law-abiding, gun-toting Americans are the best line of defense against random acts of mass violence. Make no mistake, Congress' gun control lobby would have rather taken the handgun from Elisjsa's hand and replaced it with blood-soaked corpses of many innocents in Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for many Americans when I say we will carry; we will protect ourselves; we will neutralize threats to our safety and security. We don't need you to defend us. Stop coming for our security. Stop coming for our constitutionally protected rights. Retire to a nice seaside estate protected by armed guards and let red-blooded, freedom-loving Americans conceal carry and, when necessary, kill those who threaten our lives. Remember, you are your own first responder.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, can you confirm how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE), my good friend.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand here with my friends—Chairman PERRY, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. GOOD, Mr. NORMAN—in defense of our Second Amendment rights. I say this not only as a Member of Congress, but I say this as a woman, and I say this as a mother. I say this also as an adult who knows what it is like when my school was held hostage by another student with a gun, a very upset student.

It is not the guns that are the issue. It is the severe mental illness, the breakdown in America with our morals and our values, and this severe divide among all of us as Americans.

I want to add to this, and this is a story that I haven't even been able to share with my good colleagues here, but just this weekend, now that I am a Member of Congress, many of us get a lot of death threats, but one of my family members received a voicemail on their personal cell phone from a man saying very bad things about me, and then saying: "This is what I am going to do to her," and he cocked a gun and shot it several times.

This is the type of threats I get, and it came with the threat of a gun. But I tell you this as a woman and a gun owner: I need to be able to have any kind of gun that I want to own to defend myself, to defend my family, to defend my home. God forbid if someone chose to do something to me.

You see, here is the issue: It doesn't matter how many gun control laws we put in place. It doesn't matter how many types of guns are banned. The criminals and the people who intend to do harm to others, those that would murder someone even if they could murder them with their bare hands, are still going to do it, and they are not going to be the ones that hand over their guns to the government. Oh, no, they are going to be keeping their guns so they can continue breaking the law.

We have guns coming across our border every single day illegally. We have terrorists who have been caught at our border, and then we have a lot of got-aways. We don't know how many of those are terrorists and what kind of criminals, how much human trafficking, how much child trafficking is happening down there. Crime is up in every single city, county, and small town across America.

□ 1700

Americans need their guns, and there should not be a ban on assault weapons because it is not about the gun or the weapon; it is about what is inside someone's human heart.

What we have to do is we have to stand in defense of and protect our Second Amendment because it is the most important freedom that we have. If we are unable to do that, and we lose it in the name of the so-called issues—what they are pointing at really is a tool. A gun is a tool. The gun doesn't get up and kill people on its own. It is the people who do it.

When you take away all the guns from the legal gun owners, the criminals will be the ones that are left with the guns. Then do you want to know what happens? Even if those guns are gone, they are still going to commit murder, and they will just use something else.

It is about elections. That is why they are trying to ban assault weapons, because inflation is out of control, crime is out of control, gas prices are difficult to afford. Now, our President is moving us on to some sort of clean energy that just will fail America even more.

This isn't what we need to do, and I am so happy that there are people here

that want to stand in defense of people's gun rights.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), the chairman of the Freedom Caucus.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from the State of Virginia (Mr. GOOD) for helping host this Special Order and being here in my absence.

Oftentimes, I think that we make this partisan. Republicans are seen or characterized as unempathetic or uncaring in the face of so many tragedies. Of course, it couldn't be further from the truth. We are empathetic. Our hearts break just like everyone else's.

But we recognize that in this imperfect Union that seeks to be more perfect every single day, with every single action, that the right to defend oneself, the right to bear arms, is enshrined in the founding documents, the founding documents that we all take an oath to uphold and defend.

We don't just dismiss that like it doesn't exist. We understand that, unfortunately, there are evil people in the world and that this right exists, given to us by God, outlined in our Constitution, so that we can then defend ourselves from any assailant, from any attacker, because we have the God-given rights of liberty and of life. We have that.

We seek some kind of protection for ourselves that also protects our God-given rights but doesn't allow the criminals to prevail upon us in our homes, in our businesses, and on the streets.

Yet, right now, while Americans are suffering the worst cost of living in 40 years—I know the administration doesn't want to talk about it. Right now, violent crime is up 30 percent, an unprecedented rate, not told to us by SCOTT PERRY or BOB GOOD or RALPH NORMAN, but by our FBI, an unprecedented rise in violent crime.

Right now, right down the hall, instead of dealing with the rise in crime; instead of dealing with the fact that DAs, supported by the extreme radical left, are letting criminals out on the street; not dealing with the issue that millions of people are flowing across our border, certainly laced with a certain criminal element with no regard to American laws coming across our border; notwithstanding the fact that some of the people that lead our country at the highest levels bailed out violent criminals and paid for their bail to be on the street to then assault and assault their neighbors, that is all happening right now.

Down the hall, as we speak, our colleagues on the left are trying to reinstitute the assault weapon ban, the assault weapon ban that they know, since 1994, when it was instated then, did absolutely nothing to solve this problem.

Because they don't really care about crime—they don't care at all. We are

seen as unempathetic. Meanwhile, every city, every weekend across the country, is like a war zone. You would actually be safer in a war zone. I know. I have actually been to a couple of them. You would actually be safer in a war zone than downtown Chicago, St. Louis, Detroit, or New Orleans.

But they are down the hall working on a solution that doesn't fix anything. It doesn't fix a thing. It takes our rights away and doesn't solve anything.

We are here because we believe that Americans have the right to defend themselves, to be free, and to be safe in their homes. We are here as Freedom Caucus members to say that we do stand with the Constitution. We actually believe in our oath. We think that we can do both. We think that we can defend ourselves and stop most criminals' violent activities.

But there have to be consequences. What you are seeing right now across the country are the consequences of not holding people accountable. That is what you are seeing right now, violent criminals being let out on the street over and over again. The message being sent by this administration and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle is it is okay. It is okay to just do that. It is okay to commit any crime you want.

Heck, there was a gentleman in New York minding his store. He was attacked. He defended himself. Unfortunately, the attacker's life was taken. What did the district attorney do? He charged the man who defended himself with murder. That sends a signal to every criminal that it is okay to commit your crimes.

Mr. Speaker, it is not okay. This solution is not going to solve anything except disarming law-abiding citizens, meanwhile knowing that the criminals that are willing to disregard the law and use the weapon to kill somebody are certainly going to disregard the law and maintain that weapon when you tell all law-abiding citizens that they must turn theirs in.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot stand. We are here today to say that no matter what happens down the hall, no matter what vote they bring out of that partisan-led committee to disarm America, we will oppose it with every fiber of our being. We will oppose it.

Even if we lose on this round, in 6 months, when we are in the majority around here, if they were to be successful in imposing this confiscation on American citizens, the confiscation of not only the rights to life but the rights to self-defense, we will reinstate them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD) for carrying the load for us here.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman PERRY.

Chairman PERRY, have you ever been asked by the media about a police officer killed in the line of duty? Have they ever asked you about that shooting?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Faulkner was killed in Philadelphia by Mumia Abu-Jamal, and all they usually ask me about that is: What are we going to do to get that killer out of prison?

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. I am never asked about the 100 police officers killed last year in the line of duty.

Mr. PERRY. Right.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. I am never asked about the police officers who are shot in America's largest cities, as you have mentioned. I am never asked by the media about that.

I am never asked about the hundreds of shootings that take place every weekend in America's largest cities, these war zones, these crime zones that are under Democrat control.

There is always a connection here. These are cities that have been controlled by Democrats. These are Democrat policies carried to their conclusion.

What they are trying to do to the entire country, which has been in place much longer in these major cities—you mentioned Baltimore, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, on and on, New Orleans, and so forth. That is where most of the crime is in this country. That is where most of the shootings take place in this country, and they don't care about that.

Do they want to harden our schools? Do they want to do what is necessary to keep our kids safe?

I have long been an advocate in my home State of Virginia, the community where I served as a county supervisor, in allowing armed personnel within the school system who are trained and want to carry concealed and be part of a rapid response team, teachers and staff, to be armed in the schools to keep the children and the staff safe. The Democrats are against that.

We all know the truth. Mr. NORMAN from South Carolina mentioned this a moment ago. The best response to a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun. The best response is more good people with guns, more law-abiding citizens with guns, as the Founders wrote and intended and as the Founders recognized 250 years ago when we didn't have this violent crime in America's largest cities.

If the Second Amendment is not safe, then no other right is safe. There is a reason why the Second Amendment comes right after that First Amendment guarantee to speech, free speech, to free assembly, to free worship, to petition our government for our grievances. It is that Second Amendment right to keep us safe, to ensure we remain a free people.

If you look around the world, if you look at the nation of Ukraine, Ukraine would be a different place today if the citizens were armed and permitted to be armed the way we are here in this country. Taiwan would be a much safer country today from the threat of its

large enemy on its border if their citizens were armed the way our citizens are armed today.

The Founders recognized in their wisdom that not only did we possess a God-given right to defend ourselves, to keep ourselves and our families safe, but also that we would be unique among the nations of the world in enshrining that in our Constitution and protecting that right and saying that Congress has no authority to infringe on that right for law-abiding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Virginia is absolutely right. That is our duty here.

People think that the Federal Government maybe is supposed to provide so many things. I am sure that every one of us has different visitors that come in and ask us what the Federal Government can provide for them.

What this government was set up for by our Founders—and, unfortunately, many of our citizens don't know it—is to provide us with the rights that have been given to us by God and to defend them. That is what we are supposed to be doing here.

Right down the hall, it is not about making sure that we maintain our rights to defend ourselves, to maintain the rights that everybody in that room swore an oath in the Constitution to uphold and defend. They are actually looking to strip the very people that are law-abiding, the very people that would follow the law, would purchase the weapon legally, would file the paperwork and do everything that is required in their States. Those are the people that they wish to disarm.

They are not in there talking about stopping criminals. They are not talking about stopping criminals. They are talking about stopping law-abiding citizens who are trying to defend themselves when somebody breaks into their home at night or their store or prevails upon them on the street when they are out with their children or, heaven forbid, our citizens dare to travel to one of these cities anymore.

I represent a company in my district called Starbucks. Their CEO is closing stores all across the northwest of our country because of safety. People want to go to Starbucks. They can't because it is not going to be there anymore, not because of sales, but because of safety.

If that is not a sign of a sickness—and the CEO of Starbucks, I don't know that he thinks that the answer is an assault weapons ban. Maybe he does. But I haven't heard of the Starbucks being held up by an assault weapon.

Every single week, every single weekend, people are killed in major cities, horrific violence, perpetrated whether it is with a knife or whether it is with a handgun. But it is the people that do it. These are inanimate objects. Great Britain banned handguns a long time ago and is now considering banning knives because knife attacks are on the increase.

Our country has a sickness, and we are sympathetic to it. But taking the tool away doesn't address the sickness. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so focused on the firearm that they can't even see past the fact that they are disavowing their oath to the Constitution.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his comments.

The first 10 amendments to the Constitution were intended to protect the individual, the people, from the government. The Constitution protects the individual, the minority, from the tyranny of the majority.

There is a reason why we are not a democracy. We are a representative republic based on the rule of law, based on a Constitution that would ensure that we remain free, that would ensure that we protect the rights of the individual.

The number one job of the Federal Government, that we have gotten so far away from here in this body, is to keep us safe and secure. Part of that is to ensure that our rights are safe and secure, and that includes the right to defend ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, the right to defend ourselves. Mr. GOOD and I, our colleagues on this side of the aisle, we haven't voted to defund the police. We support law enforcement.

Even though we support fully law enforcement, here is what we know: When someone breaks into your home and you pick up your phone, it is going to take a certain amount of time, unless law enforcement is sitting out in your driveway. You are going to have to do something about it at that moment.

What our colleagues on the other side of the aisle right now are telling us is: No, you are not going to have any opportunity. You are not going to have any ability to do anything about it.

You can use harsh language. I suppose you can throw the lamp that is on your bed stand in self-defense, but that doesn't stop the assailant's bullets that are coming into your home for who knows what reason.

Mr. Speaker, we deserve—because we have earned the right to defend ourselves. We live in America. We have a Constitution that we live under. It outlines our rights as ordained by the Good Lord above. We cannot have this Congress and man take them away from us.

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1 of House Resolution 1230, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 21, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-4775. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting Lieutenant General Michael E. Kurilla, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of general for a period not to exceed 14 days before assuming the duties of the position for which the higher grade is authorized, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4776. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing 3 officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4777. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting Major General Dimitri Henry, United States Marine Corps, to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4778. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's additional legislative proposals and section-by-section analysis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4779. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress on Distribution of Department of Defense Depot Maintenance Workloads for Fiscal Years 2020 through 2022; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4780. A letter from the Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's 2021 Fair Lending Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5493(c)(2)(D); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 1013(c)(2)(D); (124 Stat. 1970); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4781. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report to Congress, "Prioritization Framework for Technical Cybersecurity Support to Public Water Systems"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4782. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Report to Congress on Direct Commercial Sales Authorizations to Foreign Countries and International Organizations for Fiscal Year 2021, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2415(a); Public Law 87-195, Sec. 655 (as amended by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 148); (110 Stat. 1435); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4783. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a letter pursuant to the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (Convention); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4784. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a letter pursuant to the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (Convention); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4785. A letter from the Assistant Inspector General for Audits and Evaluations, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting an action on nomination and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-4786. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's Office of the Inspector General's (OIG) Semiannual Report to Congress for the period October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022, pursuant to section 5(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-4787. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the Office's government-wide legislative proposals; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-4788. A letter from the Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Justification, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f(f); Aug. 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 7(f) (as amended by Public Law 93-445, Sec. 416); (97 Stat. 436); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-4789. A letter from the Director, Congressional, Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting explanation and justification for revisions to FEC Form 1 and the instructions for FEC Form 1, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 30111(d)(1); Public Law 92-225, Sec. 311 (as amended by Public Law 96-187, Sec. 109); (93 Stat. 1364); to the Committee on House Administration.

EC-4790. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Senate, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal "To clarify the application of the additional fees relating to certain H-1B and L petitions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4791. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report to Congress on a visa inadmissibility determination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4792. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Medicare Beneficiary Ombudsman Annual Report for Calendar Years 2017- 2019, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395b-9(c)(2)(C); Public Law 108-173, Sec. 923(a); (117 Stat. 2394); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

EC-4793. A letter from the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Annual Report Required by Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 and Railroad Retirement Solvency Act of 1983, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231u(a)(1); Aug. 29, 1935, ch. 812, Sec. 22(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-90, Sec. 108(a)); (115 Stat. 890) and 45 U.S.C. 231f-1; Public Law 98-76, Sec. 502 (as amended by Public Law 104-66, Sec. 2221(a)); (109 Stat. 733); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4794. A letter from the Secretary to the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 2022 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; Public Law 100-647, Sec. 7105; (102 Stat. 3772); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.