

As a signatory of the amicus brief urging the Supreme Court to overturn the unconstitutional gun ban, I was outraged at the D.C. Council's new gun restrictions. So I joined with Mr. CHILDERS of Mississippi to help craft the Second Amendment Enforcement Act, which is the text of the amendment we are debating here tonight.

This bill repeals D.C.'s gun ban and permits law-abiding gun owners the right to keep their firearms in ways that will ensure their availability and use for self-defense. This amendment ensures that the intent of the Supreme Court and of the second amendment are upheld for all citizens, including those who live in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

I wanted to clarify for those watching the debate and for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the one hearing we did have, there were four witnesses. Three of them were Federal witnesses, and Mr. ISSA asked each one of them whether the bill that this amendment is amending had any impact on them. All of them said no. They were never asked another question during the hearing, because they weren't relevant to the hearing.

The fourth witness was the police chief of Washington, D.C., and she did have an opinion and doesn't agree, obviously, with this amendment. But she is a political appointee of the mayor, and while it may be her personal view, if she held a view different from the mayor or city council, she would have been removed.

So it was somewhat inaccurate to present that at our hearing, that somehow the witnesses all felt that there was this imminent danger in the Federal sector, because all three of them said the bill had nothing to do whatsoever with their positions.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve. I understand that Mr. CHILDERS is ready to close.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOUDER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CHILDERS. I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SOUDER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi have the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. No, the gentleman from Illinois, as a manager controlling time in opposition to the amendment, is entitled to close debate thereon.

Mr. CHILDERS. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me just simply say to my distinguished colleagues Mr. DAVIS from Illinois and all those who have spoken not only for my amendment, but to those also who have spoken against my amendment, I have nothing but the greatest of respect for all of you. I have nothing but the greatest re-

spect for this wonderful institution which I am so proud to be a part of.

Mr. Chairman, there is no hidden agenda here. The intent of my amendment offered in the form of a substitute is simply to give the law-abiding citizens of the District of Columbia the same rights and freedoms that all Americans share, from coast to coast and all over this great land.

I appreciate the spirited debate. I certainly hope that I have been respectful of all of my colleagues. It certainly was my intent. In closing, I would like to ask for a recorded vote, and I understand that will be in the morning, and I would urge passage of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to certainly acknowledge the not only newness of the gentleman from Mississippi, but also his demeanor, his debate and his introduction of legislation. It occurred to me though if we were in West Point, Mississippi, or if we were in Fort Wayne, Indiana, or if we were in Western Pennsylvania telling the people in those communities what we thought they ought to be doing or the way in which we felt they had to be in compliance with the Supreme Court as they were wrestling with those decisions themselves, they probably would say that we were unwelcome.

I think that the people of the District of Columbia would say that this amendment is unwelcome, that it further takes away their right to self-governance. Here they are, they don't have a representative in Congress with a vote. Now we are saying that your City Council and your representatives on the City Council can't decide the way in which you would be in compliance with the highest court in our land.

Let me just mention that a previous speaker said that the District passed a law prohibiting District residents from bringing in weapons from across State lines. That was incorrect. In fact, Congress passed this law, not the District of Columbia. But this amendment would remove this restriction.

So I think Members should understand that this is the first step in the NRA's plan to repeal Federal gun control laws, not just in the District of Columbia. But I think it is a matter of using the District of Columbia to work one's will for other parts of the country and to work a national will using the people of the District of Columbia.

I think the protections that are needed and the compliance that is needed can be found in the Waxman-Norton bill, and that this amendment, the Childers amendment, unfortunately strips that bill of its impact. For that reason, I would urge that we reject the Childers amendment vote for the Norton-Waxman bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Mississippi (Mr. CHILDERS).

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

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) having assumed the chair, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Chairman 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. 6842) to require the District of Columbia to revise its laws regarding the use and possession of firearms as necessary to comply with the requirements of the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of District of Columbia v. Heller, in a manner that protects the security interests of the Federal government and the people who work in, reside in, or visit the District of Columbia and does not undermine the efforts of law enforcement, homeland security, and military officials to protect the Nation's capital from crime and terrorism, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute Special Orders are entered in favor of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), each with customary leave to insert.

There was no objection.

A REVISION TO THE BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES FOR CERTAIN HOUSE COMMITTEES FOR FISCAL YEARS 2008 AND 2009 AND THE PERIOD OF FISCAL YEARS 2009 THROUGH 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, under section 205 of S. Con. Res. 70, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 2009, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a revision to the budget allocations and aggregates for certain House committees for fiscal years 2008 and 2009 and the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013. This revision represents an adjustment to certain House committee budget allocations and aggregates for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, and in response to consideration of the bill H.R. 6899, Comprehensive American Energy Security and Consumer