

# Virginia Citizens Defense League, Inc.

P.O. Box 513 • Newington, VA 22122 • 804-639-0600 • survey.federal@vcdl.org

## 2025 Federal Candidate Survey

Name:	Position Sought:
Address:	District:
City/State/ZIP:	Party:
	Phone:
Email:	Web Site:

1. Federal law (18 USC 930) forbids gun carry in government buildings, but not on land open to the public. Despite a new federal law invalidating National Park regulations against gun carry on National Park land when the gun carrier complies with state law, many other federal agencies still generally ban gun carry on land open to the public (e.g., Post Office parking lots). Finding oneself on this land turns a law-abiding gun owner with a permit to carry a concealed handgun into an unwitting criminal.

**Will you SUPPORT legislation invalidating all agency regulations which ban gun carry on land open to the public when such gun carry complies with state law?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

2. Thirty one (31) "shall accept" states now either recognize all other states' concealed handgun permits, or they require no permit to carry handguns concealed. Recent efforts in Congress to simply mandate that states accept all concealed handgun permits from other states have failed even though concealed carry has been equally successful in all 50 states. By contrast, in 2007 the Congress passed the National Instant Check System (NICS) Improvement Act requiring states to share with NICS all relevant state criminal conviction and mental health adjudication records necessary to ensure accurate processing of the Brady Act gun purchase background checks. States that fail to meet the NICS Improvement Act standards are subject under the Act only to funding penalties of 3-10% of the funds otherwise authorized to the state under the Byrne Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) program. By linking such a federal mandate to a "non-coercive" percentage of certain federal subsidies, Congress' action avoids a constitutional challenge.

**a. Will you SUPPORT legislation to encourage "shall accept" policies by imposing minor funding penalties on states which do not accept all other states' concealed handgun permits?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**b. Will you SUPPORT 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. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (BATFE) has issued an opinion stating that this provision should be strictly construed to mean just that – permits only exempt the holder from the GFSZA in the state where the permit was issued.

However, the GFSZA was enacted when there were very few states that had a concealed handgun permitting system. Even fewer had concealed handgun permit reciprocal agreements with other states. This situation has changed radically in the intervening 28 years. Now, almost all states have agreements or laws in place for reciprocity or recognition of other State handgun carry permits or licenses.

So, while a Virginia 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 any state except Virginia.

**Will you SUPPORT legislation to modify the GFSZA to exempt concealed handgun permit holders from the GFSZA if the state in which the school is located recognizes the gun-owner's permit?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

4. 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).

Evidence shows that so-called gun-free zones are targeted by evil people intent on mass murder, as they can inflict massive carnage before someone with a gun shows up to stop their killing spree. Further evidence indicates that knowing there could be armed civilians in the area is often enough to deter such attacks.

**a. Will you SUPPORT legislation to eliminate this 1,000-foot zone?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**b. Will you SUPPORT 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 \_\_\_\_\_

5. 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 SUPPORT 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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 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 OPPOSE 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 all non-dealer private gun transfers. The only way to enforce private-seller background checks is to implement a centralized gun-registration database, allowing the government to know what guns a person has 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. 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 OPPOSE any law limiting magazine capacities or any law banning any type of firearm in common use for lawful purposes?**

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 SUPPORT modifying the Lautenberg Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Gun Ban to prohibit possession of a firearm only 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 SUPPORT modifying the Lautenberg Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Gun Ban to affect only those convicted after the act took place.**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**c. Will you SUPPORT the repeal of the Lautenberg Misdemeanor Domestic Violence Gun Ban? Misdemeanors should never take away any basic civil rights.**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

10. The BATFE has been cited in recent years (1) for putting gun dealers (FFLs) out of business through insignificant clerical “offenses,” (2) for arbitrarily banning firearms and components from importation by bureaucratically reclassifying them, and (3) for redefining semi-automatic firearms into machine guns to set up innocent Americans for prosecution. In addition, BATFE has implemented outrageous programs, such as “Fast and Furious”, to encourage support for more gun control.

**a. Will you SUPPORT prosecuting those who abuse their power or misuse their position within the BATFE?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**b. Will you SUPPORT holding the BATFE to the same standard of accuracy that they require from FFLs?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

**c. Will you SUPPORT reparations to the dealers who lost their livelihood because they were harmed by the “Zero Tolerance Policy” of the ATF?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

11. The Gun Control Act (GCA) of 1968 first established the federal prohibition against purchasing a firearm outside a person’s state of residence. In 1986, Congress permitted the purchase of shotguns and rifles from dealers outside of a person’s state of residence, but handguns still may not be purchased outside of a person’s state of residence.

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 BATFE 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 BATFE 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 restoring funding to the federal program which allows those whose prohibition results from federal law to petition for restoration of the right to purchase, possess, and transport firearms?**

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. Last year the BATFE changed the rules, requiring all dealers to keep their records forever instead of being able to destroy them after 20 years. This creates a gun registry by default as the FFL will eventually be required to turn these records over to the BATFE. 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 forever.

**Will you SUPPORT legislation to require mandatory destruction of records after 5 years, whether held by the FFL or the BATFE?**

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 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, which goes against our long-held standard of innocent until proven guilty in a court of law.

**Will you OPPOSE ALL attempts to pass Red Flag laws or laws that encourage states to pass their own Red Flag laws?**

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 several federal "lists," drawn up by federal bureaucrats without judicial oversight, such as the no-fly list, or the so-called "terrorism watch list," be denied firearm purchases by NICS without due process.

**Will you OPPOSE 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 simply 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.

There have been few crimes committed with suppressors, and their use does not mask the fact that a gun has been fired. Given these facts, the health benefits far outweigh any risk to public safety.

**Will you SUPPORT legislation to remove suppressors (silencers) from the NFA regulations and allow their sale without the lengthy waiting period caused by the backlog of applications?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

17. The Hughes Amendment to the Firearm Owners Protection Act of 1986 prohibits civilian ownership of any fully-automatic firearm that was not registered prior to May 19, 1986 – even though no crimes have ever been documented involving legally owned fully-automatic firearms in over 60 years.

**Will you SUPPORT legislation that would repeal the Hughes Amendment and allow law abiding gun owners to register new machine-guns with BATFE?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

18. In 2025, the SHORT Act (Stop Harassing Owners of Rifles Today) was introduced in both the House and Senate to delete the taxation, registration, and regulation in the National Firearms Act (NFA) of firearms currently classified as Short-Barreled Rifles, Short-Barreled Shotguns, and Any Other Weapons. This bill undoes the egregiously unconstitutional registration, taxation, and regulation of many firearms by removing them from the NFA and would force the BATFE to destroy all related records.

When purchasing a rifle for self-defense, a gun owner's primary focus should be functionality, usability, and individual preference — not mind-numbing regulations. Americans should not have to measure barrels, look for unpublished BATFE rule-making letters, and obsess over whether a "pistol brace" touches their shoulder when they shoot the firearm.

**Will you SUPPORT legislation to remove short-barreled rifles, short barreled shotguns, and any other weapons from the NFA regulations and allow their sale without the lengthy waiting period caused by the backlog of applications?**

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

19. Congress is continually besieged with a variety of new legislative proposals to supposedly combat crime or make our children safer, but which does neither. Instead, the legislation effectively restricts our right to keep and bear arms. Would you:

a. **OPPOSE** legislation raising the federal legal age for possession of a handgun, rifle, or shotgun from 18 to 21 years of age?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

b. **OPPOSE** legislation that would limit the number of firearms a buyer can purchase in any given period of time?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

c. **OPPOSE** legislation that would require or allow any agency of the Federal Government to establish and/or maintain a firearms ownership registry?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

d. **OPPOSE** legislation that bans “bump stocks” or any similar devices that may increase the rate of fire, but do not actually convert a semi-auto firearm into a fully automatic firearm?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

e. **OPPOSE** any bill that bans firearms chambered in .50 caliber or less?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

f. **OPPOSE** any bill that imposes punitive taxation on ammunition or firearms?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

g. **OPPOSE** any bill that increases the amount of time that the FBI can retain the names of gun owners who have been run through the National Instant Check System?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Feel free to attach additional comments to this survey.

### Candidate Authorization

My signature affirms that the answers given above accurately represent my beliefs as a candidate for elective office.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Candidate's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date