

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise in opposition to this measure.

I, too, offered an amendment which failed in committee. My amendment would have prevented individuals convicted of assaulting a police officer or impersonating a police officer from carrying concealed loaded guns.

Several states that allow permits also deny them to those who have assaulted or impersonated cops. The law enforcement officials of these states have decided that that is what's best for their communities. This bill will wipe those protections away and then will go further. May I remind my friends here who are citing the Constitution as their nexus for this law, that the right to keep and bear arms in the interest of self-defense of a person at home is not unlimited.

As the justices wrote in the District of Columbia vs. Heller, quote, "the right is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever for whatever purpose," end quote. But frankly that's what the National Right-to-Carry Reciprocity Act purports.

Interpreting the 14th Amendment, deeming the Bill of Rights applicable to the states in this manner as to the right to bear arms, then doesn't that argument also dictate that each state interpret other states' decisions on other laws and statutes in the same manner? Does this mean that states should acknowledge abortion rights from one state to the next? Does this mean that states should acknowledge alcohol laws from one state to the next? Does this mean that states should acknowledge marriage licenses from one state to the next? Particularly when it comes to same-sex marriage?

I have a feeling that many of my friends here today would answer those questions with a simple no. You see my trouble with today's premise then. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back."