Virginia Citizens Defense League, Inc. P.O. Box 513 • Newington, VA 22122 • 804-639-0600 • survey.federal@vcdl.org

2022 Federal Candidate Survey

Name:	Position Sought:
Address:	District:
City/State/ZIP:	Party:
	Phone:
Email:	Web Site
the public. Despite a new fe National Park land when the generally ban gun carry on la) forbids gun carry in government buildings, but not on land open to deral law invalidating National Park regulations against gun carry on gun carrier complies with state law, many other federal agencies still and open to the public (e.g., Post Office parking lots). Finding oneself ng gun owner with a permit to carry a concealed handgun into an
	egislation invalidating all agency regulations which ban gun to the public when such gun carry complies with state law?
Yes No	
(or require no permit to carry that states accept all states' has been equally successful National Instant Check Systerelevant state criminal convict accurate processing of Brade NICS Improvement Act standard the funds otherwise authoriz program. By linking such fee subsidies, Congress' action a. Will you SUPPOI	cept" states now accept all other states' concealed handgun permits handguns concealed). Recent efforts in Congress to simply mandate concealed handgun permits have failed even though concealed carry in all 50 states. By contrast, in 2007 the Congress passed the em (NICS) Improvement Act requiring states to share with NICS all ction and mental health adjudication records necessary to ensure y Act gun purchase background checks. States that fail to meet the dards are only subject under the Act to funding penalties of 3-10% of ed to the state under the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) deral mandate to a "non-coercive" percentage of certain federal avoids a constitutional challenge. RT legislation to encourage "shall accept" policies by imposing lities on states which do not accept all other states' concealed
handgun permits?	icles on states which do not accept an other states concealed
Yes No	
b. Will you <u>SUPPO</u>	RT national reciprocity legislation?
Yes No	

3. The federal Gun Free School Zones Act (GFSZA) was enacted in 1996 and makes the possession of a firearm within 1,000 feet of school property a felony. It provides several exceptions to the possession prohibition, including one for individuals possessing a valid license to carry a firearm issued in the state in which the school is located, and BATFE has issued an opinion stating that this text should be strictly construed to mean just that – permits only good in state of issuance				
However, the GFSZA was enacted when there were very few States that had a concealed handgun permitting system, and even fewer had reciprocal agreements for recognition of other state-issued permits. This situation has changed radically in the intervening 15 years. Now, almost all states have agreements or laws in place for reciprocation or recognition of other State handgun carry permits or licenses.				
So, while a Virginia issued concealed handgun permit is recognized as a valid license to carry a concealed handgun in a large number of states, the permit holder could face federal criminal charges if he strays into a federal gun free school zone in all of those states except Virginia.				
Will you <u>SUPPORT</u> legislation to modify the GFSZA to exempt concealed handgun permit holders from the GFSZA firearm possession ban if the state in which the school is located recognizes the permit?				
Yes No				
4. The GFSZA also makes it unlawful to discharge a firearm within a gun free school zone. Unfortunately, there is no exemption to the discharge prohibition for an individual acting in lawful self-defense, lawful defense of others, or lawful defense of property.				
Will you <u>SUPPORT</u> legislation to modify the GFSZA to exempt individuals acting in lawful self-defense, lawful defense of others, or lawful defense of property from the discharge ban?				
Yes No				
5. The GFSZA creates a 1,000-foot gun-ban in all directions from the perimeter of school property. A circle with a radius of 1,000 feet contains over 72 acres of land! Of course, the property of schools can be large with many being built on over forty acres of land (such as two recent high schools in Loudoun County, Virginia), creating an exceptionally large, prohibited zone.				
Congress enacted this ban, even though the Supreme Court had stated the year before in U.S. v. Lopez (1995) that the Commerce Clause could not be used to justify banning firearms on school property (or 1,000 feet beyond it).				
a. Will you SUPPORT legislation to eliminate this 1,000-foot zone?				
Yes No				
b. Will you <u>SUPPORT</u> a repeal of the Gun Free School Zones Act, allowing state and local law to regulate the carry of firearms on or near schools?				
Yes No				

6. Gun control advocates have made a concerted effort to demonize gun shows as a place where criminals have ready access to firearms. However, according to a 2016 U.S. Department of Justice report, only 0.8% of criminals got their guns from gun shows.

The terms "gun show loophole" and "unlicensed gun dealer" have been fabricated to mislead the public into believing that gun shows permit firearm transfers that would be forbidden anywhere else. There is nothing that can be done legally at a gun show that cannot also be done legally outside of a gun show. The so-called "gun show loophole" is no loophole at all. All dealers must perform EXACTLY the same background check at gun shows that is required at their place of business.

perform EXACTLY the same background check at gun shows that is required at their place of business.				
Closing the imaginary "gun show loophole" is just the first step in a campaign to criminalize all private gun transfers and create a de facto gun registry.				
Will you <u>OPPOSE</u> any legislation designed to restrict non-dealer private gun transfers (whether at gun shows or outside of gun shows)?				
Yes No				
7. In addition to efforts to close the non-existent "gun show loophole", gun-control advocates have recently started pushing "universal background checks" to criminalize <u>all</u> non-dealer private gun transfers. The only way to enforce private-seller background checks is to implement universal gun registration so the government knows who has what guns and when any transfers take place. The only way to enforce universal gun registration is to implement universal compliance inspections.				
In addition, under the "universal background check" scheme, the Right to Keep and Bear Arms would be the only right enumerated in the US Constitution that would require permission from the government to exercise that right.				
Will you OPPOSE any "universal background check" legislation?				
Yes No				
8. In 1994, Congress banned 180 types of semi-automatic firearms based on appearance or accessories. These so-called "assault weapons" are mechanically and functionally identical to other semi-automatic one-shot-per-trigger-pull firearms, all of which are useful for hunting, target shooting, collecting, and self-defense. In order to keep these banned firearms on the market, manufacturers made simple cosmetic changes to them. The law was allowed to sunset in 2004 because it had no effect on crime rates.				
Will you <u>OPPOSE</u> any law banning any type of semi-automatic firearm or limiting magazine capacity?				
Yes No				

9. In 1968, Congress established categories of persons prohibited from possessing firearms including those convicted of crimes punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than one year (the common law definition of a felony offense).
Twenty-eight years later, in 1996, Congress passed the Lautenberg Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Gun Ban. This amendment to an appropriations bill added to the categories of prohibited persons those who had been convicted of misdemeanor offenses as minor as disciplining a child or having a heated argument with a spouse or other family member. This ban applies even when the defendant is not entitled to a jury trial nor given notice that a conviction would result in loss of firearm rights for life. This law effectively disarms individuals for life as states do not have a mechanism to restore firearms rights removed by federal law. Finally, this law is ex post facto for individuals who were convicted decades before the law went into effect.
a. Will you <u>SUPPORT</u> modifying the Lautenberg Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Gun Ban to prohibit possession of a firearm <u>only</u> if the person is both (1) afforded a right to a jury trial for the offense, and (2) warned by the judge, prior to entering a guilty plea, that a guilty plea will result in loss of gun rights for life.
Yes No
b. Will you <u>SUPPORT</u> modifying the Lautenberg Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Gun Ban to affect only those convicted after the act took place.
Yes No
c. Will you <u>SUPPORT</u> the repeal of the Lautenberg Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Gun Ban?
Yes No
10. The BATFE has been cited in recent years (1) for putting gun dealers out of business through trumped up paperwork "offenses," (2) for arbitrarily banning firearms and components from importation by bureaucratically reclassifying them, and (3) for converting semi-automatic firearms into machine guns in order to set up innocent Americans for prosecution. In addition, BATFE has implemented outrageous programs, such as "Fast and Furious", in an effort to encourage support for more gun control.
Will you <u>SUPPORT</u> prosecuting those who abuse their power or misuse their position within the BATFE?
Yes No

In 1993, Congress passed the Brady Act. The National Instant Check System (NICS) portion of the Brady Act makes the "in state only" provision of GCA of 1968 for buying handguns obsolete. In 1968 there was no way for a national background check to be performed in a reasonable time, so forcing people to buy handguns near their home may have had some merit. Today, national background checks can be performed in seconds. Will you SUPPORT removing the "in state only" provision of the Gun Control Act of 1968? Yes No 12. Under the GCA of 1968, convicted felons and certain other people were prohibited from purchasing or possessing firearms. The individual could petition the BAFTE to have their rights restored if they were not likely to be a danger to the public. However, since 1992, Congress has explicitly prohibited the BAFT from expending funds to investigate or act on applications by individuals – effectively blocking the restoration of rights on a federal level. This means the only path to restoration of rights is a Presidential Pardon. Will you SUPPORT funding the restoration of rights process for people convicted of crimes punishable by a year or more in prison? Yes No
Yes No 12. Under the GCA of 1968, convicted felons and certain other people were prohibited from purchasing or possessing firearms. The individual could petition the BAFTE to have their rights restored if they were not likely to be a danger to the public. However, since 1992, Congress has explicitly prohibited the BATF from expending funds to investigate or act on applications by individuals – effectively blocking the restoration of rights on a federal level. This means the only path to restoration of rights is a Presidential Pardon. Will you SUPPORT funding the restoration of rights process for people convicted of crimes punishable by a year or more in prison?
12. Under the GCA of 1968, convicted felons and certain other people were prohibited from purchasing or possessing firearms. The individual could petition the BAFTE to have their rights restored if they were not likely to be a danger to the public. However, since 1992, Congress has explicitly prohibited the BATF from expending funds to investigate or act on applications by individuals – effectively blocking the restoration of rights on a federal level. This means the only path to restoration of rights is a Presidential Pardon. Will you <u>SUPPORT</u> funding the restoration of rights process for people convicted of crimes punishable by a year or more in prison?
purchasing or possessing firearms. The individual could petition the BAFTE to have their rights restored if they were not likely to be a danger to the public. However, since 1992, Congress has explicitly prohibited the BATF from expending funds to investigate or act on applications by individuals – effectively blocking the restoration of rights on a federal level. This means the only path to restoration of rights is a Presidential Pardon. Will you SUPPORT funding the restoration of rights process for people convicted of crimes punishable by a year or more in prison?
Yes No
13. The GCA of 1968 requires gun dealers to keep records on gun purchases (ATF Form 4473) for 20 years even though the statute of limitations for a criminal prosecution is only five (5) years. This is an invasion of gun owner privacy and results in a federal system of decentralized registration. Further, the requirement burdens gun dealers with maintaining files on gun owners for decades.
Will you <u>SUPPORT</u> legislation to reduce the time that gun dealers must keep firearms transfer records from 20 years to 5 years?
Yes No

14. A few states, such as California and Virginia, have implemented Red Flag laws, also called Gun Violence Restraining Orders (GRVO), Extreme Risk Protection Orders (ERPO), or Emergency Substantial Risk Orders (ESRO). The fact that the accused is left free and unsupervised instead of the Court mandating psychiatric observation, detention, supervision, and/or treatment proves that these are really gun-confiscation laws disguised as "gun-violence prevention" or "suicide prevention" laws and are being pushed hard at both the state and federal levels.		
Red Flag laws allow a judge to direct the police to confiscate a person's firearms merely on the word of another that the gun owner is a danger to himself or others. The accused does not get any due process, or even any notice, before the police show up at his door to remove all his firearms at gunpoint. Only after a period of time can the gun owner petition the court to return his firearms. The court can deny the petition for as long as they choose.		
Red Flag laws strip a citizen of not only his right to keep and bear arms, but also his right to due process and presume guilt in advance of a crime being committed.		
Will you OPPOSE ALL attempts to pass Emergency Substantial Risk Orders laws or laws that encourage states to pass Emergency Substantial Risk Orders?		
Yes No		
15. Shortly after the US Supreme Court held in District of Columbia v. Heller that the right to bear arms was an individual right protected by the Second Amendment, federal district courts struck down the federal law mandating that persons arrested for certain crimes forgo all firearms rights if released on bail. This requirement to relinquish firearms rights without any conviction or individualized determination of dangerousness was held to violate the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment.		
Nonetheless, some members of Congress continue to propose that persons on any of a number of alleged federal "lists," drawn up by federal bureaucrats without judicial oversight, such as the no-fly list, or the so-called the "terrorism watch list," be denied firearm purchases by NICS without due process.		
Will you <u>OPPOSE</u> any effort to deny Americans their firearm rights based upon government watch lists drawn up by bureaucrats without judicial oversight and due process?		
Yes No		

16. In 2017, bills were introduced in both the House and Senate to remove suppressors, also known as silencers, from the National Firearms Act (NFA).

Contrary to the depictions in the movies, suppressors do not make a gun silent, they simple reduce the sound to a level less likely to cause hearing damage. There is also medical evidence that the sound concussion or shock wave can cause brain damage and hearing loss. Suppressors effectively reduce this shock wave to safe levels.

fa olic S

		nmitted with suppressors and their use does not mask the ese facts, the health benefits far outweigh any risk to publ
regulations a		to remove suppressors (silencers) from the NFA e without the onerous \$200 tax and lengthy waiting of applications?
Yes	No	
ownership of any fully	/-automatic firearm	earm Owners Protection Act of 1986 prohibits civilian that was not registered prior to May 19, 1986 – even mented involving legally owned fully-automatic firearms in
		that would repeal the Hughes Amendment and allow ister new machine-guns with BATFE?
Yes	No	
(SBRs) from the Nation registration, taxation,	onal Firearms Act (and regulation of s	House of Representatives to remove short-barreled rifles (NFA). This bill undoes the egregiously unconstitutional short-barreled rifles by removing them from the National ATF to destroy all related records.
usability, and individu to measure barrels, lo	ial preference — no ook for unpublished	e, a gun owner's primary focus should be functionality, ot mind-numbing regulations. Americans should not have d ATF rule-making letters, and obsess over whether a en they shoot the firearm.
regulations a		to remove short-barreled rifles from the NFA e without the onerous \$200 tax and lengthy waiting of applications?
Yes	No	

•	sieged with a variety of new legislation, supposedly to combat crime in reality, does neither. Instead, the legislation is designed to
	n raising the federal legal age for possession of a handgun,
Yes	No
b. <u>OPPOSE</u> legislation purchase a month?	n that would limit the number of handguns a buyer can
Yes	No
	n that would require or allow any agency of the Federal sh and/or maintain a firearms ownership registry?
Yes	No
	n that bans "bump stocks" or any similar devices that do not rearm to a fully automatic firearm?
Yes	No
e. OPPOSE any bill th	at bans firearms chambered in .50 caliber or less?
Yes	No
f. OPPOSE any bill that	at imposes punitive taxation on ammunition or firearms?
Yes	No
	at increases the amount of time that the FBI can retain the who have been run through the National Instant Check
Yes	No
Feel free to attach additional co	omments to this survey.
	Candidate Authorization
My signature affirms that the answers	given above accurately represent my beliefs as a candidate for elective office.
Our distanta Cinn at	
Candidate's Signature	Date