COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

In the matter of: Public Hearing on House Bills 372, 831, 819, 794, 2415 and 2688

Pages 1 through 82 Assembly Room of the William Pitt Student Union University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Thursday, August 28, 1986

Met, pursuant to notice, at 10:15 a.m.

BEFORE:

H. WILLIAM DeWEESE, Chairman

Commonwealth Reporting Company, Inc.

700 Lisburn Road Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17011

Camp Hill (717) 761-7150

Philadelphia (215) 732-1687

CONTENTS

2	WITNESSES	TESTIMONY
3	Bob Reid	5
4	Michael J. Slavonic, Jr.	22
5	Alan S. Krug	56
6	Joseph Craig	76
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS

 CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Welcome, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is Bill DeWeese. I am from Greene County. The

Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives is meeting

here at the university today to discuss a variety of bills

dealing primarily with weapons.

We have a distinguished group of individuals who are going to share some testimony and observations with the Committee.

Before we get started, I would like to indicate that we will be comparatively informal. I would like the people here at the head table to introduce themselves to the audience.

Starting on our left, Amy Nelson, our research analyst with the Committee. Then we will ask David Mayernik to introduce himself.

REPRESENTATIVE MAYERNIK: Dave Mayernik. I am a Representative from North Hills, North (word inaudible) area.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: My name is Dave

Levdansky. I am a Representative from the 39th District

around Elizabeth (word inaudible) and Clariton area.

REPRESENTATIVE KUKOVICH: Allen Kukovich, Westmoreland County.

MR. EDMUNDSON: Chief Counsel Mike Edmuston, from Harrisburg.

REPRESENTATIVE McVERRY: Terry McVerry,
Representative, 42nd District, which is the South Hills.

MR. 'DUNKLEBERG: I am Paul Dunkleberg. I am a staff member of the Judiciary Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Richard Olasz, State
Representative from the 38th District, West Mifflin, Baldwin,
(word inaudible), 32nd ward of the city of Pittsburgh.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: We are going to stick pretty much to our prepared agenda, but I am going to ask Representative Olasz to offer a few remarks to commence this morning's proceedings, relative to House Bill 372.

He will give a few observations and then I am under the impression that Mike Slavonic will enhance those comments or amplify those comments later on, but after Dick Olasz is finished Bob Reid our first person to offer testimony, the Vice President, North Boro Sportsmen's Association.

Dick, would you please make yourself welcome and thanks for being here this morning.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman for your bringing the Committee to Pittsburgh and giving me an opportunity to speak on House Bill 372.

So that this hearing can move along, I just briefly want to mention one of the reasons why I introduced House Bill 372 back in 1985.

__

Section 6120 of Title 18 of the Pennsylvania

Consolidated Statute (word inaudible) several loopholes

that leave gun owners vulnerable to a number of different

types of gun control laws who do not live in a municipality

which is incorporated under the "Home Rule Charters

and Optional Plans Law of the State of Pennsylvania."

Under Section 6120, any municipality prohibited from enacting legislation which in any manner regulates the lawful ownership, possession or transportation of fire arms.

But a municipality or a city, which is incorporated under the Home Rule Charters and Optional Plans Law is prohibited to enact any ordinance or take any other action dealing with the regulation or the transfer or ownership, transportation or possession of fire arms.

The difference is the transportation or possession-the difference is the word transfer. Thus all other
municipalities could ban the sale of fire arms if they choose
while Home Rule municipalities could not.

This is one of the reasons why I introduce House Bill 372. There are others. But I will defer to Michael Slavonic.

He has some comments on the recent Supreme Court decision which I think the Committee should consider.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Thank you, Dick.

Bob Reid our next person to offer testimony will be introduced by Dave Mayrtnik.

Come on up, Bob.

REPRESENTATIVE MAYERNIK: Mr. Reid is the

Vice President of North Boro Sportsmen's Association. Several

months ago, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Reid called me regarding

a problem that is occurring with their sportsmen's club

about complaints from the neighbors.

This legislation would adequately address this problem and the problem of the club. The reason I had asked Bob to come here today is so that he could explain first-hand to the Committee some of the problems that are being experienced with the club.

Whereupon,

BOB REID

having been called, testified as follows:

DIRECT TESTIMONY

MR. REID: Thank you. First of all, I am a better skeet shooter than public speaker, so bear with me if I stumble a little bit here.

My name is Bob Reid and I live at 119 First Avenue which is in Ross Township, Allegheny County. I represent the North Boro Sportsmen's Association.

I felt compelled to do this, not so much for our club in particular, but just to give you some idea of what a

that we are up against.

3

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

small club or a big club can be subject to and the problems

First of all, a little bit about our club history. The club was organized in the 1930's and it was first established on rented property on Arndt Road, which I believe was in Ohio Township.

In 1963 our club purchased property on Freel (phonetic) Road which is in Economy Borough in Beaver County. We are affiliated with the NRA and the Allegheny County League of Sportsmen.

Our activities are primarily, skeet shooting. We do have trap. We have an archery range. We have some pistol shooting and we have a rifle range.

Primarily, the club participates in skeet shooting. We don't belong to any leagues. It is just amongst ourselves what we do.

The membership consists of approximately 85 people. So you can see we are not real big. We are a small place. The shooting hours are primarily on Saturday from approximately 9:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m.

We have always discouraged any shooting before on Sunday. We weren't really sure if it would noon interfere with any church services in the area, but we always discouraged any shooting at all before noon on Sunday.

We have no lights. We did have lights approximately

North Suburban Trap League.

3

4

5

2

Due to vandalism, we just gave up on the lights. There is no after dark shooting whatsoever. One of the by-laws that I think is pertinent is that there are no alcoholic beverages permitted.

seven or eight years ago when we were participating in the

6

7

8

In other words, if we shoot, we do not drink. There is no exception to that rule. We have picnics. We have lunch and breakfast every Saturday at the club.

9 10

We have picnics, but there is never any alcohol. It is in the by-laws that we are not allowed any alcohol.

11 12

In May of this year, the residents of Freel Road-we are just off of Freel Road. Our driveway is maybe 200 yards long off of Freel Road.

14

15

13

We were advised by one of the residents who frequents our club that the people on the road were getting a petition together to present to borough council to make us

16 17

stop shooting.

19

20

18

At that time we really didn't know what the problem was, if it was the noise--of course, we suspected noise.

21

22

We really didn't know what the petition said or what the problem was, why they, after twenty-three years, all of a sudden, they had a problem with us.

23

We went to the borough council meeting in May. The

25

24

following complaints were made against us. First of all, noise polution.

They wanted us to stop shooting completely.

Secondly, was littering the road. Alcohol abuse, abuse of alcohol.

One gentleman got up in the borough council meeting and said that he looked in our club house one day and saw cases of beer stacked up to the ceiling.

Well, they were in fact cases of clay birds. We used to have to store them inside the building. So, unless he drinks Remington beer, I don't know where he got the idea that that was beer.

It had to be clay birds. Of course, we made that known at the meeting. I don't know how well it came off.

They accused us of shooting on Sunday morning.

They accused us of shooting after dark. They said that we did not agree to our original agreement. Now, when the club was established—and this is before my time with my club.

When it was established they did meet with the residents of the road and they told those people that they would be eligible for full membership of the club at no charge.

They told them that there was some talk of putting in a fishing lake, but at a later date it was decided that

the liabilities and responsibilities of a body of water back in there would be too great and we decided not to do it.

We also may have talked about a picnic pavillian which was never followed up on. Initially they may have had that idea, but it has never been done.

Also, along with the membership, the people were told they would be issued membership cards. Well, specifically membership cards were never issued, but they were all aware that they could use the facility.

They had full privileges. We never issued the membership cards. The solicitors, the borough solicitor, his comments at that first council meeting after all these allegations were made, was that first of all, he would study the borough ordinance.

There was a borough ordinance written after our club was established to prohibit the formation of any further clubs of that type.

There is two clubs in Economy Borough, Ambridge Sportsmen, which has approximately 700 members and ourselves with eighty members.

He said he would study the ordinance and see if we qualified, if he could use that ordinance against us. I might say that he was very-he seemed to be very-to me, he seemed to be very impartial and fair and treated us, I thought, very fairly.

He said it was a possibility that we could be told to fence the property. What prompted that statement, when they accused us of shooting on Sunday morning and after dark, we said it wasn't our members.

It was possibly some people coming in that did not belong to the club, weren't aware of the regulations. Well, you know, that is our responsibility, to keep those people out.

So he said that possibly we may have to fence in the property to stop that, or caretaker or guards, somebody on the property at all times to make sure that outsiders didn't use it and use it improperly.

Another suggestion that he made was to rearrange the shooting fields to reduce the noise. Ir other words, turn the trap fields around so that the muzzle blast would be in a different direction.

Well, that really wasn't practical. He had no way of knowing that without going out and looking at the property.

He was just talking, kind of thinking out loud,

I guess you might say. He also said that he could restrict

our shooting hours.

At that time then he asked the residents if they could wait one month for him to study this situation and make some decision at the next council meeting.

Well, at the June council meeting, the solicitor advises the residents that, first of all, the ordinance--we were there before the ordinance was established and we were perfectly legal.

He said he could impose reasonable restrictions and by that he defined reasonable as to say that he could restrict—he was advising borough council that they could restrict us from shooting, say, before 9:00 in the morning or after 9:00 at night.

He said the key word here is reasonable. He said he could impose fencing on the property or a security guard. But again, he said it had to be reasonable.

So we agreed to put up a fence or gate across the road, which we had in the past, but the chain had been stolen about three times, so we gave up on the idea.

The bottom line was he advised the residents that he could not shut us down, he could not keep us from shooting, but he could or he--as I said, he was advising the council that they could possibly restrict our activities.

But everything had to be reasonable. Well, at that time the residents turned to us and says, how about talking to us?

You know, let's talk about this and see if we can't come to some kind of an agreement. So we said, okay, so we went in the conference room with the residents that were at the

meeting.

In that meeting they asked us if we would stop shooting on Sunday. Apparently they felt as though maybe their efforts weren't going to be of any good so they decided to at least get us to guit shooting on Sunday.

So we talked about it and I advised them that if we were to make any decision like that, before I could make a commitment I had to get back to our membership, a director's meeting and then I couldn't make a commitment like that at that time.

So we talked to them about giving them the membership cards, which I thought that was kind of funny.

They were interested in their membership cards, but they were trying to shut us down, but that is the way it went.

They were interested in their membership cards.

They were interested if we drank. Of course, we told them about the clay birds that they saw in there and it certainly wasn't liquor.

We talked about the lake. We talked about a lot of things that the way it ended up was that we would consider not shooting on Sunday.

We would put up a gate. We would issue the membership cards. By the way, one thing I forgot to mention, the family that seemed to be spearheading this whole thing, the husband had used our facility to site in his deer rifle and

he had hunted on our property.

His kid used to work for us, like cutting grass and doing some incidental things. So what prompted these people to start this at this time, we still have no idea.

Well, about two weeks after the June council meeting, we get a call from borough council to please send a representative out for a special meeting.

Now, this is two weeks later. We had not had our director's meeting. We had not had our general meeting yet.

So we were not able to make any real commitments to these people. Well, they had called, I guess, some of the council members and complained that there had been no action taken, that we had done nothing and apparently that they felt as though they were being ignored.

So we told council that we would get back to council and the residents as soon as we had our director's meeting, which we did.

After our director's meeting, in writing, we responded to the borough council and to the residents. In fact, the letter went directly to the family that seemed to be--did most of the talking that apparently started the whole thing.

In that letter we agreed to not shoot prior to noon on Sunday. We agreed to put up a fence. We agreed to

1 ssue the membership cards.

Of course, the fence was in an effort to keep people out of there that wasn't supposed to be there. There would be no shooting after dark and things of that nature.

At this time we haven't heard any more from them. That is where we stand right now. Just to sum up, as of this date, there has been no further communication from the council or the residents.

I am here speaking to you in an effort in support of House Bill 794 and 2415. Had the solicitor enforced any of the restrictions such as fencing in the property, that number one, if they had insisted that we fence in the property, the club could not financially withstand such a demand.

I believe there are many small clubs such as ours in the State of Pennsylvania, therefore, House Bill 794 and 2415 must be passed to assure our continuance.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Thanks very much.

Is Henry Burkhart here?

MR. BURKHART: I am here.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Okay. Thank you.

Do we have any questions from members of the Committee for Bob Reid.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Please, go ahead, Dick.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: First, some clarification,

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY (717) 761-7150

Bob. Did they want you to fence all forty acres?

MR. REID: He made that statement. He said, this could be a way of keeping the outsiders out. Yes, he said that.

But he never--at the second meeting he started talking more in reasonable demands. Of course, it was never brought up again.

But had that happened, I don't know if they could do it or not. I mean, we never secured an attorney or got that far with it.

But it was said, yes, fence in the whole place.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: I am certain that all of us know that certain boroughs have limits to height of fences.

But even a minimal four-foot fence around forty acres, I don't think the Commonwealth could afford it.

MR. REID: Well, we certainly couldn't. That would have been the end of us. That is one way they could have shut us down.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: From the time your club was organized in the thirties, did you have shooting, to the best of your knowledge?

Did they shoot at that time from 1930 on up to the present?

MR. REID: Yes. At Arndt Road they shot--they had the old time traps that you had to crank by hand. In 1963 when

we built--when we purchased the property on Arndt it has been shooting every Saturday since then.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Approximately how many homes were there say back in 1963 when the club really became active?

MR. REID: I think it is basically the same then as it is now.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: The same number?
MR. REID: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: When I say buffer zone, is there a tree line or something that separates the club from the homes?

MR. REID: In the summer, I would think that the trees and the leaves would keep the noise to an absolute minimum.

In the winter, the people, the windows are closed. But they stated that it was worse in the winter than it is in the summer.

The one lady, in fact, said that everytime her granddaughter came to the house on the weekends, when we would start shooting, she would run in her room, pull the blinds and hide under the bed, which I thought was a little rediculous.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: The point I am getting at those residents, if there are any new ones, certainly know

of the existence of the club.

•

Perhaps my colleague is more learned maybe in municipal law, Representative McVerry (word inaudible) on your past practices that a lot of communities grant (word inaudible) so to speak as long as you remain active and are not down for a year.

Is that correct, Terry?

REPRESENTATIVE MCVERRY: I really can't speak to that.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: I don't mean to put you on the spot. I know that my experience as a councilman in West Mifflin Borough, that is a situation the way we handled most of those.

Just one last comment. I think it is really unreasonable to shut down a club completely on Sunday. Take members of the House of Representatives, we may be in session or in Harrisburg five days a week.

We come home on the weekends, Saturdays is consistuent business. Sunday is our day to relax. Maybe we want to go out and shoot.

You tell me I can't use my club on a Sunday,

I just think it is unfair. I think it is a reasonable time
to start.

I think it is an unfair restriction.

MR. REID: Well, in our meeting pior to making the

commitment, we came very close to possibly not shooting on 1 Sunday in the summer, like between Memorial Day and Labor Day. 2 I mean, we wanted to make a consession. to get along with the people. We want to be good neighbors. I mean, that was what--we want to keep our club, but at the same time, we would like to get along with the people. 6 But we do have members that Sunday is the only day they can shoot. So we decided that we are just going to go with basically what we have been doing for years. 9 That is all we did. We haven't heard any more. 10 11 12

So all I can say is that I think we are out of the woods. But this is the kind of thing that small clubs like ours are subject to.

But not necessarily small clubs, but we are more vulnerable because we certainly couldn't afford a fence or a quard or you know some of the things that were talked about.

> CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Other questions?

REPRESENTATIVE Yes.

Bob, what is the cost of your dues?

Twenty dollars a year. MR. REID:

REPRESENTATIVE And what would you say

is your annual budget, a ballpark figure? 23

> Somewhere around \$2,500. MR. REID:

I can personally attest REPRESENTATIVE

25

24

3

5

7

8

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY (717) 761-7150

to Mr. Reid's comments. I have been at the club on several occasions.

It is very neat, clean orderly. And I know for a fact that there is no drinking on the grounds.

In these allegations made by the residents at the borough council meeting, has the club ever been cited for any of them by the police?

MR. REID: Oh, no, no.

REPRESENTATIVE : So there has never been citing by the police and no documentation to the fact, but yet you are being harrassed for some reason and you seem to be most vulnerable, as all shooting ranges do, because of noise polution.

In this case, we are fortunate because they are grandfathered in the North Boro Sportsmen's Club that I see a need for this legislation, both House Bills, Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that down the road somewhere there will be clubs that haven't been grandfathered in and will be susceptable to problems by the borough solicitors.

So I would ask for consideration (words inaudible).

Bob, I would like to thank you for coming today
to testify.

MR. REID: Thank you, my pleasure.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Anything else?

REPRESENTATIVE McVERRY: Mr. Chairman.

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY (717) 761-7150

Terry McVerry. CHAIRMAN DeWEESE:

2

REPRESENTATIVE McVERRY: I can't let the last--

I have no reason to doubt that your

3

the comments go by without making an observation of House

reasonable presentation.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bill 794. I think that Mr. Reid, you make a very, very

club acts in a reasonably responsible way. As a matter of fact, I think you should be able to However, as far as House Bill 794 is stay in business. concerned, although I don't oppose the granting of a limited amount of immunity as far as noise polution is concerned, the wording of House Bill 794 is so broad that it would make

owners of rifle, pistol, skeet, trap shooting and black

powder ranges immune from any civil action whatsoever or

criminal prosecution relating to noise or noise polution.

Theoretically, you could come in with a cannon and be blasting it constantly and this legislation would permit you to do that or would not permit a municipality to keep you from doing that.

So just as you and your club are going to be reasonable, so must a grant of immunity of any sort be reasonable.

So I could support this--the theory of this legislation, but I couldn't support this bill in its current form, only for the reason that it is not reasonable.

1 MR. REID: Well, as I said, we want to maintain 2 our ability to shoot and to keep our club and we want to be ` 3 gooe neighbors, too, so whatever it takes, just so we can maintain our ability to shoot and keep our club going. That is what we are interested in. If something 6 like this would help us in any form, that is what we want. 7 CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: You see the point that he was making here. I understand. MR. REID: Yes. 10 CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: You could use a Gatling Gun twenty-four hours a day according to this thing. REPRESENTATIVE MCVERRY: A good point well taken. CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Thank you very much, sir, for joining us this morning. MR. REID: Okay. (Witness excused.) CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Henry Burkhart, Director of the 18 Millville Sportsmen's Club. 19 MR. BURKHART: I don't have any comments to make 20 at this time. 21 CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: That is helpful to a Chairman 22 who is trying to stay on time. I should have had you up 23 here with Bob. 24 Thanks for joining us today, Henry.

4

5

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

25

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY (717) 761-7150

Mr. Slavonic, Legislative Chairman, Allegheny

County Sportsmen's League, welcome and thanks for joining us. Whereupon,

MICHAEL J. SLAVONIC, JR.

having been called, testified as follows:

DIRECT TESTIMONY

MR. SLAVONIC: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am Michael J. Slavonic, Jr., Legislative Committee Chairman of the Allegheny County Sportsmen's League.

For eight years I was legal affairs director of the Pennsylvania Rifle and Pistol Association and from 1982 to 1985, a member of the board of directors of the National Rifle Association.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to express the position of the Allegheny County Sportsmen's League on House Bill 819, as well as 372, 831 and 2415.

The Allegheny County Sportsmen's League is a nonprofit educational membership organization representing over forty-five clubs and their members in the county.

Our county, as you may know, leads the nation in the sale of hunting and fishing licenses sold. As a result, we hold the honor and distinction of being the voice of over 200,000 sportsmen.

I would like to thank the Chairman for bringing these very important hearings to our county. We view this

legislation as being essential in order to protect the constitutional rights of every citizen of Pennsylvania to own, use and carry firearms.

I would like to begin by first addressing House

Bill 819. We have eagerly awaited for some time now when

the legislature would turn its attention towards a problem that
has been existing for far too long now in the State.

The maladministration and often misuse of the license to carry--firearms statute by some (word inaudible) and police chiefs.

This problem has surfaced in various forms throughout the State and at times—the time has come for the legislature to consider reforming the law.

I believe that it is important to use as a basis for examining this bill, the wording of our right to bear arms constitutional provision, Article 1, Section 21.

This article states, "The right of the citizen to bear arms in defense of themselves and the State shall not be questioned."

These words in my opinion are unmistakable. They guarantee the absolute right of each lawabiding individual adult citizen in this State to carry firearms for lawful purposes.

Some may dispute my claim, but I believe it debates in the 1873 Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention, provides

indisputable support that this article prohibits any attempt to bar a lawabiding citizen his right to carry a license.

During the 1873 convention an attempt was made by one delegate to amend Article--Section 21, in order to prohibit the carrying of a fire arm concealed.

As the delegates discussed this amendment, even the maker of the motion agreed that Article 1, Section 21, "Even if amended as proposed in the nature of a mandate to the legislature and the section itself would not contain a single word that could be construed to prohibit citizens from carrying arms in any manner they may see fit."

Another delegate offered the clarification of the intent of this provision and said, "The spirit and the intention of the section is to allow men to bear arms for their own defense and not arms for aggressive purposes."

These statements make it clear that our right to bear arms is equivalent to our right to free speech and press and religion and any attempt to deny these rights would be illegal.

Some officials have been violating this right and some have been claimed the current statute gives them this privilege.

This misconduct by these individuals--these officials, is what has created the need for House Bill 819.

While a member of the NRA Board of Directors, I had

_-

received numerous complaints from across the State from people who were denied a license to carry.

Some outrightly and others because they could not comply with unnecessary and unauthorized regulations required by these officials that were almost impossible to comply with.

For example, in Venango County, that sheriff simply stopped issuing licenses and refused to renew existing ones.

Under the Constitution and the existing statute, he has no authority to do so.

In Bucks County that sheriff designed an application form for a license which included information not authorized by the law.

In Huntington County, the sheriff's office included a provision in the application that an applicant must obtain the signature of his employer before an application could be processed.

Existing statute does not require such a signature.

Most employers will not sign. This requirement amounts to
a defacto ban on receiving a license.

In Philadelphia, that city's police commissioner is taking it upon himself to greatly restrict the number of licenses issued by his office, something he has no authority to do because that amounts to legislating the law which the city is not allowed to do under the Home Rules Charter and State's Preemption Act.

In Pittsburgh, individuals have been denied a license by the police or were not allowed to renew their existing licenses because it was determined that a reason for requesting a license appeared not to be acceptable.

No reasons in writing were given to these individuals. In the city of New Castle, the police chief had refused to accept an application for a license unless the applicant can show proof of completion of a lethal weapon's training course.

The cost of such training is approximately \$250 and would be prohibitive by certain classes of people in spite of the fact that the law does not require such training.

These are just a few incidents and there may be even more where officials charged with issuing a license to carry a firearm have been misusing their authority and creating unauthorized restrictions not permitted under the law.

Now, the reasons offered by these officials for restricting licenses to law abiding citizens are that they are acting for the sole purpose of serving the best interest of the public.

In some cases that may be true. In other cases they have simply taken it upon themselves to legislate the law because they are personally opposed to the private citizens carrying firearms.

No matter what reason you accept, both are in conflict with the Constitution. When such conflict arises it is the responsibility of the legislature to reexamine the law and make the necessary reforms.

Because in the words of Justice Grandys (phonetic),
"In a government of law, existence of government will be
imperiled if the government fails to observe the law
scrupulously. Our government is the potentent and only
present teacher for good or for ill. It teaches the
whole people by its example.

"If government because a law breaker, it breeds contempt for the law."

Bearing that in mind, I believe that the best solution to the problem that exists is for the legislature to amend the law and set down in clear and unmistakable language what would be required of an individual—if an individual chooses to obtain a license to carry a firearm and the procedure to be followed.

This can be done to protect both the rights of law abiding citizens to obtain a license and insure that people who should not be allowed to carry a firearm are barred from having one.

Allegheny County Sportsmen's League believes that that solution is in House Bill 819. Representative Godshall and I worked hard to bring this legislation together.

It is the results of years of work and really not new law. This bill was modeled after similar laws in Indiana and Georgia.

Both laws have been in existence since the mid to latter seventies and both have proven to be effective in serving both the interest of law enforcement and the citizens of those states.

The bill also is identical to NRA's model legislation on the subject. Under House Bill 819, the county sheriff would be the only police official authorized to issue a carry license.

In talking with some police chiefs, they don't even want the responsibility of issuing a license. I believe that the licensing official should be answerable to the electorate.

This bill will also specify in the law the contents of the application in license form, and that these forms will be provided by the Pennsylvania State Police.

Thus, all application and license forms would be uniform throughout the State and no additional information would be required on the application other than that which is stated in the law.

The sheriff will conduct the investigation into the background of the applicant and approve or disapprove the application within thirty days.

If it appears to the sheriff, based on his

investigation, that the applicant is of good character and reputation, and that the applicant is a person concerning whom no good cause exists to deny the license, then he must issue the license.

This does away with the very vague "suitable person to be so licensed," in the current statute. Also, under 819, disapproval of an application or revocation of a license must be accompanied by a complete and specific reason in writing.

Thus, if an applicant is denied a license, he will know why and be able to decide whether to invoke his right to appeal.

In case of appeal, the commission of the Pennsylvania State Police shall specify the administrative appeals process for suspensions, revocations of a license, and denials of application.

Most importantly, the bill clearly sets in the law, the only reasons why an applicant can be refused a license.

In addition, the definition for a crime of violence has been expanded. Anyone who has been committed to an institution as a naracotic addict or mental patient by a court, will not be permitted to obtain a license.

Last, but not least, in order to protect the sheriff from being liable, just simply administering the law,

819 will provide the sheriff a grant of immunity from liability against the misuse of a firearm by a licensee.

In counties like Allegheny County, 819 will not change the licensing of an individual, but in other counties it will change it radically.

There may be some police officials here today who will speak out against this bill, but I urge them and the Committee, to view this legislation in light of the Constitution, the supreme law of this State.

Unless one is prepared to change the Constitution, all are bound by it and that fact cannot change. We believe that 819 is a fair compromise between the right of an individual to bear arms for self-defense and preventing criminal possession.

Not only is this bill supportive of the Allegheny County Sportsmen's League, but also the ten member counties of the Southwest Division of the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs and the almost 7,000 members of the Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms.

We therefore urge the Committee to report 819 to the floor of the House.

In regards to House Bill 372, the Allegheny County Sportsmen's League strongly supports this legislation, also.

In 1974 when this section prohibiting local regulations of fire arms was added to the Uniform Firearm's Act, the word

transfer was missing from the original bill.

Thus, municipalities could assume that they have the authority to regulate or ban the sale of certain firearms. Nothing can be further from the truth.

When the legislature created the Uniform Firearms Act, they automatically invoked the legal doctrine of preemption.

This doctrine prohibits local governments from enacting ordinances where the State has occupied the (word inaudible) regulation.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court has upheld this doctrine in several cases. For example, Commonwealth versus Ashenfelder (phonetic) the Court stated, "Certainly no intent is manifested or evident to grant power to second class citizens to act in areas where the Commonwealth itself through legislative enactment had provided regulation."

Now in creating the Home Rule Charters Act, the legislature in specific language prohibited municipalities incorporating under this act from restricting the transfer, ownership, transportation or possession of firearms.

So on one hand you have certain municipalities who are specifically prohibited from regulating the transfer of firearms and on the other where no specific language clearly states that.

But in both cases the courts have said that

all municipalities are preempted from regulating the transfer of firearms.

The only way to correct the latter when municipalities attempt to regulate the transfer of firearms, like a Pittsburgh city councilman attempted to do in 1983, is to go to court.

It is a very costly and unnecessary action. All that House Bill 372 does is place the word transfer in the preemption act and add ammunition and ammunition components and bring this act up to date to current laws as defined by the Supreme Court.

This is common sense legislation and we urge the Committee to report 372 to the floor of the House.

Another bill that represents common sense legislation is House Bill 831. Under State law before anyone can carry a firearm outside the home or place of business, they must first obtain a license to carry.

If anyone wishes to carry a firearm while hunting or fishing they must first register the firearm with the county treasurer.

Under Pennsylvania's definition of a firearm, a shotgun with a barrel less than twenty-four inches is considered a handgun.

As a result a license is required to carry. The definition of a firearm in Pennsylvania is different than under Federal law.

Federal law defines a handgun as a shotgun with a barrel less than eighteen inches, a rifle with a barrel less than sixteen inches.

Under our definition it would be illegal to hunt with some of the newer shotguns with some of barrels of twenty-two inches that are legal in other states.

We don't believe that the licensing statute was intended to prevent hunters from carrying shotguns without a license.

Certainly, Federal law doesn't consider a shotgun with a twenty-two inch barrel a handgun and neither should Pennsylvania.

The definition of a firearm is simply out of date and should change. House Bill 831 does the job. We urge the Committee to report it to the floor of the House in order to bring our laws into compliance with Federal law.

Of all the bills being considered here today,
House Bill 2415 means the difference between the growth or
death of the shooting sport.

Most of the shooting ranges today have been in existence for maybe forty to fifty years. Sportsmen built these ranges on tracts of land far out of the way from most homes and large communities.

Over the years developers have knowingly slowly built homes in new communities around these shooting ranges.

These shooting ranges are now faced with a problem they never believed would occur, being shut down under very restrictive noise ordinances.

Now, guns make noise and very little can be done about that. Most people belong to the sportsmens clubs do so so they can shoot, use the shooting ranges and participate in shooting competition.

Trap and skeet shooting and other firing competitions mean income for the club and most clubs make these shoots available on a weekly basis.

Hunter safety courses and other firarm training programs are an important function of most clubs. All these functions require good, safe ranges.

Most of the ranges I have shot at are very good and safe ranges and post no safety problems to the surrounding areas.

In fact, the National Rifle Association offers their member clubs free range inspections in order to keep these ranges safe, but not much can be done with the noise.

Most of the clubs in Allegheny County that I know of attempt to cooperate with their neighbors, but are growing more concerned that these efforts may not always be enough.

Shooting ranges throughout the country are being threatened with being shut down under very stiff and impossible to comply with noise polution ordinances.

Several ranges in Pennsylvania have already come under severe community pressure to shut down. One such club, Factoryville Sportsmen's Club has already been shut down and there may be others.

Most clubs have invested considerable sums of money in their shooting ranges. If they lose them, the clubs will go out of business.

Most legal experts that I have talked to agree that because the ranges existed first, any attempt to close them under noise polution ordinance will not hold up in court.

That may be true, but a long court fight could be enough to bankrupt a club. Withthe ever increasing costs of liability insurance most clubs are barely staying in the black.

Now, some clubs have considered moving to more open spaces. But what is to say that they will remain open. The other problem with moving is that they may lose their implied legal protection of prior existence.

The only solution to this very serious problem is to provide our shooting ranges with protection against noise ordinances designed to close the ranges.

We believe that House Bill 2415 provides the best possible solution. House Bill 2415 protects the right of existing ranges in this State to be immune from civil action of criminal prosecution under a strict impossible to comply with noise ordinance.

It also protects future range development by granting the same protection to new ranges, provided, of course, that such ranges are in compliance with any applicable noise control law (word inaudible) at the time of construction the range was initiated.

Allegheny County Sportsmen's League is solidly behind this legislation because it protects the future of our shooting sports.

We therefore urge the Committee to report 2415 to the floor of the House.

In conclusion, I want to again thank the Committee for the opportunity to share with you the positions of the Allegheny County Sportsmen's League on these very important gun owner legislation.

I want to extend to the Committee my willingness to work with you throughout the time necessary to successfully report these bills to the floor of the House and their eventual passage into law.

In the meantime, should you have any questions, I would be very pleased to answer them.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Thanks very much.

Questions for Mike Slavonic?

Dick Olasz.

REPRESENTATIVE OLASZ: Just in the way of advice for the shooting clubs in Allegheny County, once again West

Mifflin Borough was involved in a noise polution case.

I think that Allegheny County has noise levels that (words inaudible) the various decibals. But the case of fact, Richard Alesnik (phonetic) who is now a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas was the borough solicitor in that case, so if you have any problem with that, you can give me a call and I can get the specifics on it for you.

MR. SLAVONIC: I did. I did talk to Judge Alesnik on this. In fact, he is one of the individuals--one of the legal experts that I refer to in my testimony,

He is of the opinion that most clubs currently are grandfathered in, because of their prior existence. But that doesn't stop--we are very much concerned with these legal challenges.

Allegheny County Sportsmen's League just challenged an anti-hunting ordinance in court. It cost us nearly \$4,000.

I don't think any club, one club could possibly come up with that type of money to defend themselves.

I think that is where the importance of 2415 comes in, is that it specifically states in the law what authority a municipality has in regards to noise ordinances.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Terry?

REPRESENTATIVE McVERRY: I would just say to Mr. Slavonic, I appreciate his presentation. It was very well

put together and very well presented.

MR. SLAVONIC: Thank you, Mr. McVerry.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Paul?

MR. DUNKLEBERG: No, nothing.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Mike, comments, questions?

MR. EDMISTON: No.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Before you start, I would like to welcome Representative Jerry Kosinski from Philadelphia.

Dave Mayernik?

REPRESENTATIVE MAYERNIK: No:hing.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: David Levdansky?

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Yes, I have a few Mr. Slavonic.

You mentioned under House Bill 831, which deals with the barrel lengths for different kinds of firearms.

You mentioned that there are, in fact, some of the new shotguns have barrel lengths shorter than twenty-two inches that are possibly used for hunting purposes.

Could you cate a few specific examples of models, perhaps?

MR. SLAVONIC: The models, I don't have. But I think Remington, Winchester do have some shorter barrels. I know one particular instance, a fellow called me, he had one of these shotguns and he was coming back from a range and the--his truck broke down.

While he was trying to repair it along the side of the road, a police officer came by to offer assistance. He noticed the firearms in the back of the vehicle.

He inspected the firearms and noticed the barrel on one of the shotguns appeared kind of short. He measured it and found out it was twenty-two inches long and arrested the individual for carrying--possession of a firearm without a license.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: I just asked that because I am a little unaware myself of--

MR. SLAVONIC: There are some shorter. There are some shorter shotguns, shorter-definitely shorter than the twenty-four inches that we prohibit possessing.

REPRESENTATIVE : I have one myself, a Remington H72 with a folding stock. Chairman DeWeese has been to my house and viewed that weapon.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Among the rest of the arsenal.

REPRESENTATIVE : That would be an example.

It has an eighteen inch barrel length overall.

MR. SLAVONIC: Okay. I was pretty sure Remington had that. I wasn't positive of the model or make of it because I didn't have one.

REPRESENTATIVE : The overall length is twenty-six and a half inches.

MR. SLAVONIC: Yes.

 REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: On your comments on House Bill 372, you note that possibly some municipalities could assume that they have the authority to regulate or ban the selling of certain firearms.

Could you point to some examples. Has that in fact occurred or is this a theoretical possibility?

MR. SLAVONIC: Well, Pittsburgh attempted to do it, for one thing. Councilman Robertson, city of Pittsburgh, attempted to ban possession of (word inaudible) hand guns.

There is--haven't been too many attempts throughout Pittsburgh. But there are even some ordinances that are on the books right now that I would have to state are possibly not in compliance with the law.

I think what we are trying to do here is to protect ourselves. We know very well that the anti-gun community in this country have attempted various states ordinances which would ban the transfer of firearms.

They have said that their goals were to go into the states because they were having such a difficult time at the Federal level on banning handguns, to go into the various states and attempt to do this at the local level.

Basically, what we are doing is, number one, bringing our law up to date in compliance with what the Supreme Court has said, and simply protecting ourselves from any future attempt by the anti-gun groups in the country.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Just perhaps another additional question or two this time regarding, I believe, House Bill 819.

Would you have any objection--I note that under this bill the application is to include much information about age, race, sex, date of birth, et cetera.

Would you be opposed to including a person's social security number on the application?

MR. SLAVONIC: No. When we wrote this bill, we tried to do the best job we possibly could. The Pennsylvania State Police has reviewed the bill when it was first introduced under Senate Bill 1417 by Senator Mike Fisher.

They made that suggestion. We had written back to Senator Fisher and said we would not object to that type of information.

In writing something like this, something as important and—it is not always to get all the information that would be necessary—but there are other points in the bill that the State Police commented on that we wouldn't have any problem with.

We have attempted to add these revisions to the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: You also note that this--I see here in a summary of the bill that this license would be valid indefinitely as opposed to the present five-year

limitation.

MR. SLAVONIC: (Words inaudible) when the bill was written and of course, it was 1984. Mr. Godshall had just reintroduced the bill in its original form.

Of course, House Bill 583, I believe it was, recently passed the legislature. We would be in agreement to accept the five-year term, although we believe that the indefinite period is reasonable.

New York State has an indefinite license.

Everybody is aware of the fact that New York as being fairly anti-gun.

They seem to have no problem with an indefinite license. But to make it short, we feel that since 583 is already law, we would accept that as far as validation.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Okay. Another question that I have, you note that under the proposal in House Bill 819, essentially the county sheriff would make a decision whether or not to grant approval or disapproval for the application.

I see perhaps a benefit to be gained by including local police chiefs in the decisionmaking process. Often they are more aware of the individual and perhaps even know them personally in a small community and could offer some significant input to the county sheriff in making his decision.

Would you be opposed to including the approval of

the local municipal law enforcement department?

MR. SLAVONIC: I don't believe that the bill excludes them personally. I believe that the sheriff can use whatever means that is at its disposal to investigate the background.

If that means contacting and working with the local police chief to in effect accomplish that investigation, the bill doesn't exclude that.

In fact that is what Sheriff Koon does in this county. He works with the police chiefs in order to--before the license is issued.

What we are saying is that we feel that the issuing and the administration of the licensing process should be done from the sheriff.

Some sheriffs delegate this authority to their police chiefs. For example, in New Castle; in New Castle, the police chief does the investigation and does the processing of the license, not the sheriff.

We ran into the problem with that police chief up there expanding his authority where he didn't have to. City council overruled him and in fact placed part of House Bill 819 in the law up there in the sense that they want to just comply with what they were saying, forcing the chief to comply with State law.

We are not attempting to remove the chiefs from the

investigative process. We feel that the actual issuing and the administration of it should be done through the county sheriff.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Would you then be opposed to actually including the local police chief in on the decision to approve or disapprove of the application?

MR. SLAVONIC: Yes. I think that the local chief does not have the resources at its disposal in order to make the decision.

The decision is based on whether or not the individual's background check reveals that he is the type of person that is not prohibited from acquiring a license.

Personally I feel that the chief of polices

do not have at their disposal this type of information. The

individual securing the license may be a member of the

community, but he may have been just a member of that

community for maybe six months or so.

There is no way the police chief can know his background or have any records on the individual. The sheriff does have access to this.

He can work closely with the Pennsylvania State
Police in doing a very good investigation, which I think
Sheriff Koon does.

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: David Mayernik?

1 ||

REPRESENTATIVE MAYERNIK: Yes.

Mike, when I recently got in the General Assmebly in the beginning of 1983 I contacted you regarding an article that I read regarding the banning of firearms.

I know that you were involved in the fight and it was just north of us. I believe it was Grove City.

MR. SLAVONIC: Yes. Grove City was attempting to ban the possession of firearms. It was basically a hunting type ordinance.

They were attempting to ban the possession of firearms in their public grounds. What happened was that they were not aware of the fact that they were in violation of State law.

That is basically a carrying and possessing situation.

REPRESENTATIVE MAYERNIK: That has been addressed then?

MR. SLAVONIC: We went up and we resolved that situation which everybody up in Grove City is in complete accord with.

REPRESENTATIVE MAYERNIK: I just wanted have to hear that, some of the problems that do occur throughout the Commonwealth that have to be addressed by the sportsmen's club and the enforcement procedures.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Anything else from members?

I have just a couple of general questions. This is my first opportunity as Chairman in this area to speak with people from the sportsmen's area.

Just a curiosity question. Allegheny County you said leads the nation in the sale of hunting and fishing licenses, the voice of 200,000 persons.

I am just curious as to why, from the Puget Sound to Miami Beach, Allegheny County leads the nation and why is that?

MR. SLAVONIC: Well, Pennsylvania leads the nation in the sale of hunting and fishing licenses. From Allegheny County there is approximately—we lead the State.

So as a result, we--

the coal miners, the steel workers.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Does it just happen that way?

MR. SLAVONIC: It happens that way because we-
CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: The blue color, ethnic background,

MR. SLAVONIC: I think you will find out Chairman DeWeese that there are probably more white collar workers who hunt and fish in Allegheny County than maybe even blue collar workers.

But Pennsylvania has always led the country in the sale of these licenses and possibly has been the number one hunting state in the nation.

For years--and even the recent statistics that have

come out, show Pennsylvania gain in the lead in these areas, especially in hunting. 2 3 Allegheny County has always led the State. CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Well, I quess this is more of a conversation for a dinner sometime. 5 I have never been able 6 to figure out some of the dynamics, demographics and why. 7 MR. SLAVONIC: Well, I think the concentration 8 of people in this area, for one thing. The fact that Allegheny County is a leading area in the State. 9 Philadelphia, for some reason, while it may be 10 greater in population, just simply has not had that many 11 12 hunters coming out of there. 13 Why, I don't know. 14 I will tell you why. REPRESENTATIVE 15 We don't buy the licenses. 16 REPRESENTATIVE I think another reason 17 for the high issuance here is probably attributable to 18 Chairman Letterman. 19 CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Second question, 819, have you 20 had some conversations with Gene Koon? 21 MR. SLAVONIC: Yes, I did. We sat down in his 22 office and talked for about an hour on the bill. Sheriff 23 Koon is a very fair sheriff and very fair in issuing the 24 licenses in Allegheny County.

1

25

Basically he had no real difficulty with the bill.

In fact I remember one of his comments was, he said, it really isn't going to change anything in Allegheny County.

He did have some problem with the indefinite license period at that time, before 583 passed. But I even think now probably--583 resolving one of his problems probably would put him almost completely in accord with this course.

We would have to talk with him to get his.

CHAIRMAN DeWEEST: Okay, Mike. The final question I have, just for sixty seconds, can you tell me just a little bit about, from an NRA or sportsman's perspective, liability insurance.

You mention on page seven of your testimony as being a potential problem. Could you talk to me for a minute or two about that?

MR. SLAVONIC: Well, a recent meeting of the Allegheny County Sportsmen's League the issue of liability insurance again came up.

I think the whole issue of liability insurance on any matter has been an issue no matter what is concerned. Sportsmen are really feeling the pinch.

I know when I first joined my club, I think my membership dues was ten dollars. That wasn't too long ago.

Right now my latest membership dues I paid was thirty dollars.

So it has increased considerably since I first

even joined my club. All that is due to the cost of liability
insurance.

These clubs have been trying their best to keep

These clubs have been trying their best to keep membership dues down and provide the services that their members want in regards to shooting ranges.

Everytime they turn around to renew their policy, some clubs are actually even losing liability insurance and having a hard time obtaining it because of the cost.

I think that what I was trying to refer to was clubs moneys are just not there in trying to defend themselves if a case would be brought against them under noise polution.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Thank you very much for your testimony this morning.

MR. SLAVONIC: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: One second. Chief counsel had two points he wanted to bring out. I am very sorry.

MR. EDMISTON: Mr. Slavonic, a point of clarification for me. The investigation, 819 proposes that that be performed by the sheriff and there have been some discussions as to how that is done in Allegheny County.

Do you know how it is done elsewhere throughout the State?

MR. SLAVONIC: No, no.

MR. EDMISTON: Okay. Additionally, on 372--I'm

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY (717) 761-7150

sorry--on 831, the barrel length. When we were doing some preparation for the hearing we took a look at the Federal statute.

It is somewhat different from Pennsylvania in terms of the weapons defined. There is a definition of a short barrel shotgun.

There is a definition of a short barrel rifle.

Our definition of firearms do not include those terms or those sub definitions.

Have you looked at that disparity and made recommendations on that point over time? It is very clear that you have been involved on these issues for a good while, and rather extensively.

MR. SLAVONIC: There is a difference. Federal law doesn't really define a hand gun. I think it is important to point out that Federal law wasn't to be used—was to be used basically as a guideline to the states, allow the states to even develop their laws.

But it does clearly show that a--the difference between a rifle and a shotgun. I think what we are doing here with 831 is basically the barrel lengths.

I think if you go into Title 2 firearms on the Federal law, there is even a better definition. It does define hand guns.

It gets into hand guns, short guns, short barrel

L

shotguns. So we in a sense will be bringing it up to compliance with Federal laws involved with Title 2.

Title 2, I think goes into a better definition.

MR. EDMISTON: The last question I have is whether you have an understanding of the utilization by some of the ranges around Allegheny County and the availability of the free range inspections that are referenced in your testimony.

MR. SLAVONIC: South Park Township--I'm scrry.

(Word inaudible) Sportsmen's Club in South Park Township had a problem about a year or so ago in regards to community residents around there, wanting to shut the club down.

They were looking at the range as being unsafe and attempted to point out to the borough council that these ranges down there at (word inaudible) Sportsmen's Club were unsafe because there was apparently a stray bullet that had entered a house.

There was a very careful investigation by a very competent firm in Maryland who came up and conducted surveys and that.

They found out that the trajectory and the angle of penetration was impossible for the bullet to have been fired from the ranges.

If you have ever seen (word inaudible) Sportsmen's Club, it is probably one of the finest ranges that I have ever seen as far as safety is concerned.

They have erected baffles down the range, both their rifle and pistol ranges. The baffles have an opening in it and from the house from where you are sitting and shooting, you can only shoot through about a twelve inch by about twenty-four inch wide opening.

That opening goes through these baffles all the way down. So anybody pulling the rifle or even hand gun in any direction up or down, there is going to be shooting into these baffles that are about twelve inches thick full of pea gravel and are high enough that there is no way that you can get up or shoot up.

Well, during this whole discussion on the safety of the ranges, the NRA did come in and inspect the ranges. This is something that NRA does offer to the member clubs and provide assurances to people around that (word inaudible) was in fact a very safe range.

MR. EDMISTON: You don't have any information though generally as to the use of that service by other ranges?

MR. SLAVONIC: Some clubs that I am aware that have contacted NRA people and asked them to come up and inspect their ranges.

Most--NRA does put out very good information on developing and building ranges. A lot of the clubs have built these ranges in compliance with NRA standards, which

basically you would have to say are the industry standards on the ranges.

NRA, while I was on the board, monitored the construction of the olympic shooting ranges in the recent olympic shooting that occurred out in California.

So, yes, there have been clubs that have asked for NRA's help on them. I don't know how many of them.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Terry McVerry?

REPRESENTATIVE McVERRY: Mr. Slavonic, I am very supportive of House Bill 819, as a matter of fact, I am a co-sponsor of the legislation.

MR. SLAVONIC: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE McVERRY: I do note, however, and I am not opposed to this idea that there is a grant of immunity to the sheriff for any conduct that the licensee may engage in with a weapon.

I think that is totally appropriate. However,

I think that we may have to address that issue from the

perspective that provided the requirements of Section 8109,

Sub (d), are complied with.

That is the section that requires the investigation and the follow through. Provided the sheriff has complied with all of the previously set forth requirements that that grant of immunity be appropriate.

Because theoretically the way this is worded right

now, I think, I could go into the sheriff with my wrist band saying I just walked out of Mayview State Hospital where I have been for the last twenty-nine years and ask for a permit and the sheriff who knew my grandfather said, okay, Terry, here it is and then I would go to McDonalds and open up fire.

The sheriff in that instance should not be immuned.

MR. SLAVONIC: Well, Mr. McVerry, that was the intent of the provision that we had. That is why we placed language in the law that the sheriff conduct the investigation.

Right now, that really doesn't say that in the law. The sheriff doesn't even have to conduct an investigation under law right now.

If I walk in and ask for a license, he can hand it to me and I am gone. But I--in order to prevent politics from getting involved in the issuing of licenses, which it does in counties, we wanted to place that in the law to make sure that the sheriff is also bound by the law in that instance.

The granting of immunity came from the fact that

Sheriff Koon had told me that there are cases where he just

gets to an individual where he doesn't really have a grasp

on whether or not the--he knows the individual is a law abiding

individual and has every right under the law to possess that

firearm.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

But there is just that question in his mind. He says what he has to do and what he does in order to protect him, is deny the license, force the individual to go to court.

As a result, the court issues the license and then automatically immunes him from any liability. He does that to protect himself.

I think by placing that in the law, what we are going to do is prevent that burden being placed on the court and also the burden being placed on the applicant to have to pay lawyers fees and court fees and whatever to have to go to court to acquire -- so the sheriff can acquire that immunity.

> Thanks very much. MR. EDMISTON:

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Very good. Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Dr. Alan Krug, Field Representative for the National Rifle Association.

As Dr. Krug is making his way to the table, I would like to make an announcement for the general public and for the members.

Representative Michael Bortner has introduced House Bill 2688. We have some extra copies after the meeting. After Dr. Krug we have one more witness.

> The meeting should be another half hour, forty-five COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY (717) 761-7150

22

24

minutes. We have some extra copies for people. It deals with retail theft and specifically, retail theft involving firearm and making it a felony of the third degree.

It is a one-page bill. We would like for everyone here to at least be aware of the introduction of this measure, and to supply our Committee with some written testimony or any observations you may have in the next several weeks, next month.

Mr. Bortner could not be here today. But he did want us to make this announcement on 2688. We would welcome your views and observations on this bill.

Dr. Krug, welcome to the Judiciary Committee hearing. Whereupon,

ALAN S. KRUG

having been called, testified as follows:

DIRECT TESTIMONY

DR. KRUG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I represent the organizations listed on the mast head of the front page of my statement there, the Pennsylvania Sportsmen's Coalition, the NRA and six Statewide Pennsylvania sportsmen's groups, and also today I have been asked to represent the Unified Sportsmen of Pennsylvania.

The total membership of all those groups is somewhat over 400,000 individuals. I am a consultant and field representative for the National Rifle Association.

I would like to talk about House Bill 372, first of here, for a minute. We strongly support House Bill 372. It has two purposes.

The first is to add ammunition and ammunition components to the State Firearm Preemption Statute. The reason that we would like to have ammunition added to that statute is simply to avoid costly litigation in the future.

This happened in Maryland recently when an anti-gun group in a Washington, D. C. suburb succeeded in having the local government there pass a law which said that no one could purchase hand gun ammunition unless they had a license to carry.

In other words, what they were doing was trying to around the Maryland State Firearm Preemption Law by restricting the availability of ammunition.

It is very simple. If you don't have any ammunition you can't do any shooting. That is what they were after.

The sportsmen had to go to court.

That law was overturned by the Maryland courts.

The courts ruled that in effect in occupying the field of firearm regulation the State had likewise occuppied the field with respect to ammunition.

So the ordinance was thrown out. But it cost the sportsmen probably \$20,000 to accomplish that. We don't want to have to go through the same thing here in Pennsylvania.

So to be prudent, we would like to add ammunition and ammunition components to the statute so that it is in there and we avoid that kind of situation.

The other part of the bill adds the word transfer to the State Firearm Preemption Statute. As Mr. Slavonic noted, it was just an oversight that that word was left out of the original legislation.

It was in the bill when it was introduced, but due to, believe it or not, a typographical error, in the Senate Judiciary Committe when the bill came out of that Committee the word transfer was somehow dropped and no one caught it.

So the statute became effective without the word transfer. The result of that was that the city of Philadelphia claimed that the Philadelphia Gun Law was not unconstitutional because it dealt with the transfer of firearms.

Again, the sportsmen had to go to court and after very costly litigation, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court did determine that in effect our State Firearm Preemption Law does include transfer and the Philadelphia law was ruled unconstitutional.

But we want to put that word transfer in there just to make the law clear for any one who might read it.

Again, it is a prudent thing to do.

So it is really a perfecting amendment. We would

T

Ħ

just be notifying what Pennsylvania courts have already said is the case at the present time.

House Bill 831. You have heard some testimony this morning about that, why the sportsmen want that bill. It is a fact that many firearms, many shotguns carried by sportsmen every fall are—do have barrel length—shotguns with barrel lengths of less than twenty—four inches, some twenty—two inches, some twenty inches.

For many years we have had a National Firearms

Act, since 1934, which designates legal barrel lengths for

rifle and shotguns of sixteen and eighteen inches respectively.

What we want to do is simply to make the parrel lengths under our law the same as they are under Federal law. The reason we want to do this is because we have had the National Firearms Act since 1934, sportsmen are generally familiar with the National Firearms Act.

That is the Federal law that covers automatic firearms, machine guns and also sawed off rifles and sawed off shotguns, the so-called gangster weapons.

It has been around since 1934. Everyone knows about it. But nobody knows really, nobody knows that in Pennsylvania a shotgun with a barrel length of less than twenty-four inches is the same as a hand gun.

So, again, every fall we have hundreds, probably thousands of law abiding sportsmen running around during the

hunting season transporting these shotguns in their automobile in violation of the Uniform Firearms Act.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: How did that ever happen, just to ask a question?

DR. KRUG: Well, in my statement you will see a sentence in there that in my twenty-six years of doirg research in the firearm legislation issue. I have never been able to ascertain how Pennsylvania got that twenty-four inch barrel length.

We are the only state that has it. No other state in the Union has anything like that. I don't, for the world, know how they came up with that in the first place.

But it is also potentially harmful in the case of the law abiding firearm dealer. Many dealers are not aware that, under Pennsylvania law, a shotgun with a barrel length of less than twenty-four inches is the same as a hand qun and consequently subject to the application to purchase procedure and the waiting period.

So many of these shotguns are sold by dealers without going through that. That is a violation of the Uniform Firearms Act.

They could be subject to really what would be unwarranted arrest and prosecution, now, law abiding dealers. So that is a second reason that we need to get rid of this.

It does nothing for law enforcement. It ought to

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

changed, made consistent with the Federal law.

House Bill 819 is an excellent bill and we support the concepts embodied in that bill. You have heard something this morning about the various abuses that have occurred around the State in recent years with respect to the issuances of license to carry.

There has been an increase in incidents in these abuses. They become greater in number, more widespread and more varied in their content.

Something does need to be done about it. The
Pennsylvania Sportsmen's Coalition has been developing
legislation very similar to House Bill 819 over the past several
years with the Pennsylvania State Police.

We haven't introduced that legislation as yet. Hopefully we will soon be able to do so with bipartisan support.

The reason that that bill has not been introduced is that we have been struggling to settle on wording which would allow some limited discretion on the part of the license issuing agent so that in an obvious case where it would not be in the public interest for a given individual to be granted a license, the license could be denied.

But at the same time, that discretion would be strictly limited so that law abiding citizens constitutional rights to bear arms in defense of themselves would not be

compromised.

So we hope that eventually something can be done about this. Again, it is a problem. There are all kinds of obstacles that are being thrown up in the paths of citizens who need a license.

We feel that carrying in defense of self is a proper reason to be granted a license. Any citizen, generally speaking, any citizen who does not suffer diminished citizenship rights is entitled to that license.

By diminished citizenship rights, I mean someone who is a convicted felon and an adjudicated mental defective and adjudicated habitual drunkard, someone who has been committed to a mental institution, someone who is absent without leave from the U.S. Armed Forces, someone who is in the country as an illegal alien and so forth.

Those people would certainly have diminished citizenship rights and would not necessarily be entitled to a license to carry.

We don't think that they should have it. But the citizen with full citizenship rights, we believe is entitled to have a license and again in carrying in defense of self is a proper reason.

That is what the Uniform Firearms Act is all about.

It does not entitle a license issuing agent, for example, to

deny a person a license because they don't meet a certain

level of marksmanship.

That is not what is meant by a suitable person in the Uniform Firearms Act. I would just like to touch upon the constitutional convention of 1873 which Mr. Slavonic mentioned this morning.

That is a very interesting exercise to look into what happened there. There is some mention of it in my statement, which you might want to read.

But what happened there was that an amendment was offered by a delegate to insert the word openly after the word arms in the constitutional provision on the right to bear arms in Pennsylvania, so that henceforth the constitutional right would be restricted to carrying openly.

However, that delegate when he introduced that amendment, he said that it was not his purpose to prohibit carrying concealed.

The purpose of restricting the right was only to allow governmental regulation of carrying concealed. But even that was beat down and defeated in the constitutional convention.

They wouldn't even have that. So again you might want to read the proceedings of that.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: That was even before Krug came on the scene.

DR. KRUG: That is right. It is very interesting

in that the delegates at that convention in 1873 would not even have anything to do with permitting State government to even regulate carrying concealed firearms.

Now, when the Uniform Firearms Act was enacted in 1934, it was then known as the Whitcomb Act. We got this wording in there that the issuing agent may issue a license.

Well, I think that if we would have had a representative of the organized sportsmen on the Hill in Harrisburg at that time, that we never would have gotten that wording, because, again, if you look at the history of the right to bear arms in Pennsylvania in the Nineteenth Century, you will see that that discretion is just not allowed under the constitution.

You might ask, why don't we go to court and get a decision on that. We are going to court. We have two cases pending now in Montgomery County, which we are going to go all the way to the Supreme Court with if necessary to try to get a ruling on that particular question.

But, nevertheless, in the meantime, we need some legislative relief and all of you gentlemen being intellectually honest, I am sure that if you look at the history of that constitutional provision, you will see that in effect that word may in there does mean shall.

If it doesn't mean shall, then law abiding citizens constitutional rights are being compromised when they are not

issued a license.

So we hope that you will, at some point, look favorably on this kind of legislation and do something about it.

We would be glad to work with you on it. Hopefully we will come up with something that is agreeable to everyone. One way that the problem of the discretionary power might be addressed, at least in some part, is to establish a firearm license appeals board, like the State of Connecticut has had since 1967.

They have an appeals board there where an aggrieved applicant for a license to carry an appeal to the board without charge and without the necessity of hiring an attorney.

That appeals board can make a decision with respect to the issuance of a license which is binding on the issuing authority.

It is just the same thing as if the court ordered it. That appeals board has received (word inaudible) from sportsmen and law enforcement alike in Connecticut.

As I say, it has been in effect since 1967. It worked beautifully. The coalition also has legislation which would establish such a board in Pennsylvania and hopefully you will soon be getting that for consideration.

Finally, I would like to go to the range noise exemption bills, which we are badly in need of. The story on

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY (717) 761-7150

that is the same all around the State.

That is that a group of sportsmen who like to shoot get together, they form a club, they buy a piece of land out in the boondocks, they construct a range and they start shooting and having a lot of fun, but over the years urbanization brings houses out near the range.

People who move out there, they know the range is there, certainly they know that gun fire makes noise, but they build their houses there anyway and then after they have been there awhile, all at once, the residents of one or more houses decides they don't like the range there any more, so they institute some kind of legal action against the club.

Mostly these are nuisance suits that are instituted. The reason for that is very simply. As a shooting range consultant, I can tell you that noise levels at shooting range property lines are way lower than you would ever believe.

They are usually no more than the sound level of a passing automobile. So that even where noise ordinances are (word inaudible), it is always impossible if the noise levels—or virtually always impossible if the noise levels are mentioned scientifically, to close the range down on the basis of a noise ordinance.

It is usually done on the basis of some kind of nursance complaint. But at any rate, the clubs do need

protection.

It is just not fair for a club to go out in the boondocks, as I said, and buy a piece of land, put a lot of money into a range and then have people come on after the fact and build houses next to it and then try to close the range.

Something needs to be done to protect those ranges and also to protect ranges that might be built in the future.

House Bill 2415 is one that I drafted earlier to meet some of the objections that were raised to the original bill, Senate Bill 1032, which is identical to 794, the other bill that is with us today.

What 2415 simply says is that you must--if you build a new range, you must comply with any noise ordinances or zoning ordinances that are in effect in that area at the time you start construction.

But once you get your money into that range, that is it. Then nobody can come along after that and pass some other ordinance just to put you out of business, because again, that simply is not a fair situation.

As far as the question that was raised this morning about the problem of maybe wanting to limit the activites that would be exempt, we would have no problem with that.

1 2 out 3 wou! 4 as 5 the 6 show 7 8 I w

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

If Committee counsel could work with us and work out some wording which would in effect say that these ranges would be immune from prosecution and/or nuisance complaints, as long as they were operating within reasonable limits the normal kind of activities that you would expect at a shooting range, that would be fine with us.

We would have no problem with that. With that, I will answer any questions that anyone might have.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Thank you, Dr. Krug.

Questions from members of the Committee?

Jerry Kosinski.

REPRESENTATIVE KOSINSKI: Yes.

Dr.Krug, are there any particular laws to

Philadelphia concerning gun control or any variances in

Philadelphia statutes, any local ordinances, simply with

hand guns?

DR. KRUG: No. Their laws are the same as the Statewide law. They come under the Uniform Firearms Act.

REPRESENTATIVE KOSINSKI: But don't they have any sort of restrictions, let's say, on Saturday night specials or certain types of hand guns?

DR. KRUG: No. Under the State Firearm Preemption Statute they would not be able to enact that kind of legislation.

REPRESENTATIVE KOSINSKI: But sometimes the

1 authorities in Philadelphia may lead you to believe that they 2 do have certain restrictions other than the State. 3 I know about the State Preemption Statutes. 4 am an attorney. But I am thinking in some particular qun 5 shops in Philadelphia. 6 Do you hear any reports of police harrassment 7 of gun dealers? 8 No. I can't say that I have, no. DR. KRUG: far as I know there hasn't been any of that, at least it 9 10 doesn't come to my attention. 11 The sportsmen have had a very good working 12 relationship with the Philadelphia Police Department over the 13 years, and particularly when Gregg Sandborne (phonetic) was 14 commissioner. 15 He was on the NRA board of directors for a number 16 of years. 17 Right. REPRESENTATIVE KOSINSKI: I am familiar 18 with Commissioner Sandborne. I am speaking of Commissioner 19 Tucker now. 20 Well, I will show you a copy DR. KRUG: Right. 21 of a letter that I wrote to him that you might be interested 22 in. 23 Any other questions? CHAIRMAN DeWEESE:

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY (717) 761-7150

Point of clarification.

Mr. Krug,

24

25

Staff?

MR. EDMISTON:

Representative McVerry made some references earlier to various immunity provisions in a couple of the legislative proposals.

If I am understanding your observation correctly, earlier, I have the understanding that the people that you are working with and that you represent are prepared to consider some suggestions that acknowledge a need for immunity, but will consider some restraints as to its breath, the breath of that immunity.

Is that a correct understanding?

DR. KRUG: Sure. That is correct. I mean, we don't believe that anyone just ought to be able to go into any area they want and put in a shooting range.

That just would not be reasonable. We firmly believe that anyone who wants to build a shooting range should conform with existing zoning law, existing noise control ordinances and be reasonable in the operation of their range.

We see no problem with that. Again, I think you heard in the--from the first gentleman who testified this morning before you what is really a good example of the attitudes sportsmen have.

They are reasonable people. They want to be good citizens. They want to be good neighbors. They don't want to do anything that causes their neighbors discomfort or displeasure.

 They want to be friends with their neighbors and do what is reasonable. If I could, I would just like to mention one other item.

We have another piece of legislation that is going to be coming in, a bill that we developed, the Coalition, with the Pennsylvania State Police and the Pennsylvania Association of County Treasurers.

It is a bill that would provide for a sportsmen's firearm permit which would take the place of the provisional firearm registrations which county treasurers now issue.

As you know, county treasurers have to issue these, what in effect are permits for hunting and for fishing. They have to issue a different one for every firearm that a sportsman wants to carry.

It is a tremendous amount of paperwork for them. It is a tremendous amount of paperwork for the State Police.

Both the State Police and the county treasurers want to simplify this paperwork and certainly the sportsmen would like to, so we do have what I think is an excellent piece of legislation that we all developed which would establish this sportsmen's firearms permit.

It would be good for hunting, fishing and trapping.

It would be good for any gun. It would in effect be a permit

for the individual and not for the gun and is with the case

of the license to carry, it would be good for a term of five

years.

So that bill will soon be coming in and will have the strong support of the State Police and the treasurers association and, of course, of the sportsmen.

So you can be looking for that.

MR. EDMISTON: Dr. Krug, before I turn the chair back over to the Chairman of the Committee. I am in general agreement with your testimony on the bills.

I would like to take advantage of your being here and ask you two questions that are rather topical in the General Assembly.

I don't want to take too much time and you don't even need to respond now, but you might want to correspond with the Committee in the near future.

One is that several legislators in the Southeastern part of the State in particular, have been concerned over one or two isolated occurrances where mental health patients ran rampant and some people were shot.

I just would like to apprised of the NRA's response to how that should be dealt with. Secondly, there has been an investigative committee in the State dealing with teen suicide in the State which has risen rapidly.

There seems to be a correlation between alcohol and weapons and teen suicide. At some point I would like to know your response to how, if any way, the General Assembly

should deal with that.

R

DR. KRUG: All right. Well, I think first of all that what you are talking about is the Springfield Shopping Mall incident in Southeast Pennsylvania.

I would say that it is dangerous to legislate on the basis of one isolated incident. I think that usually you get bad legislation if it is the result of an isolated incident.

But I think--I agree that it was a serious incident and it did point out the question of mentally persons obtaining firearms.

Certainly, we do not think that people who are mentally ill should have firearms. The question then becomes how do you prevent people who have mental problems from obtaining firearms.

We would have no objection to having something in the law that any person with a history of involuntary commitment to a mental institution would be prohibited from purchasing.

We would, of course, I think like some exemption in there that after so many years that with a doctor's certificate that person could get relief if they were again well.

We would have no objection to having some kind of procedure like that. The problem that you run into and the

problem that was (word inaudible) with the Springfield Mall incident, is that first of all, we have people being released today that probably shouldn't be released and I think that is a separate issue that the legislature has to deal with.

In fact, it is my understanding that the courts have ruled that these people have to be let out even though they could be a danger, they still have to be let out.

So that needs to be dealt with. The other thing is that under existing law, a law enforcement agency could not even run a general check on an applicant to purchase for mental illness because of the privacy statutes regarding that kind of information.

Is is privileged information. I think that perhaps some list under present law could be maintained with respect to involuntary commitment by the courts, but I am not even sure about that.

But I am pretty sure that that is as far as you could go under present law. So if anything more than that were to be done it would require another area of the law to be looked at, again, the privacy statutes regarding that kind of information.

The second item is?

MR. EDMISTON: Recently some psychiatrists of (words inaudible).

DR. KRUG: Oh, the suicide thing. Okay.

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY (717) 761-7150

MR. EDMISTON: They talked about the teen suicide problem.

DR. KRUG: Well, I, in my years of research in the firearm legislation issue, that has come to the surface many times. I have not seen any studies which were scientifically valid that indicated that the presence or absence of a firearm had any bearing on whether or not someone committed suicide.

There are many ways a person could commit suicide as you well know. I think that that would be as far as our position would go at the present time.

We have not seen any kind of scientific evidence that there is any cause and effect relationship there. So we wouldn't feel that there would be any need for any kind of specific legislation, firearm legislation, to deal with that problem.

I am familiar with one so-called study that was published in a public health journal which claimed that there was a connection.

But if you would like to discuss that so-called study some time, I would be glad to talk with you about it. It really was not a study at all.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Dr. Krug, thank you very much for joining us today and allowing us to be the beneficiary of your perspective.

At the conclusion of the meeting, I would like to

have about three or four minutes with you. Are you going to be around? 3 DR. KRUG: Yes. CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Okav. Fine. 5 (Witness excused.) 6 CHAIRMAN DEWEESE: The last individual that will testify before our committee this morning, Joe Craig, 7 Honorary President of the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs. 9 10 Joe, you have been rather tolerant. 11 unusual for this committee, but we are running twelve minutes 12 behind. 13 Thank you for lingering and welcome to our 14 proceeding. 15 Whereupon, 16 JOSEPH CRAIG 17 having been called, testified as follows: 18 DIRECT TESTIMONY 19 MR. CRAIG: As the saying goes, you have heard from 20 the two experts, now you hear from the amateur. 21 I would like to thank the Committee Chairman and 22 members of the Committee for having given our Federation the 23 opportunity to appear at this hearing today. 24 Because of the limited time we had to prepare

for this hearing plus some other mitigating circumstances, we

were unable to provide the Committee with the required number of copies of our testimony, which they had requested.

However, we will see that such is prepared and sent to the Office of the Chairman of the Committee as early as possible.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Thank you. We have it on tape, but thank you very much.

MR. CRAIG: As a way of introduction, I am Joseph H. Craig from neighboring Beaver County and have been the president of the Beaver County Conservation League for over thirty years.

You may wonder why. They tell me I am the only one who knows how to write a letter and use a typewriter.

I am also the honorary president of our State Federation and as such President (word inaudible) has requested I represent the Federation at this hearing.

A piece of information that might be of interest to the members of the Committee is that we represent 67,952 individual organized sportsmen conservationists in 544 individual clubs in fifty-three counties within our Commonwealth.

If the members of the Pennsylvania Wildlife Federation, which is our educational arm, are taken into account the figure would be conceivably much greater.

Although we are interested in all legislation affecting our members, in the interest of brevity, we will

confine our remarks solely to House Bill 794, Printer's Number 894.

We are extremely concerned about the ever increasing problems that our clubs who have shooting facilities are experiencing, which have caused them to greatly curtail their shooting activities and in some cases, have had to refrain from shooting all together.

There have been times when these clubs were taken into court and have emerged with an unfavorable decision rendered by the presiding judge.

In a recently conducted survey by our Federation, the results indicated that approximately eighty percent of our clubs have shooting facilities and that ten to fifteen percent have problems of varying degrees.

You might ask the question, why did these clubs build their facilities so close to civilization? The truth of the matter is the greater majority of these facilities were constructed years ago in relatively isolated rural areas.

The fact of the matter is they did not encroach on the urban population, but rather the urban population encroached on the clubs.

More times than not, with the full knowledge that the shooting facilities existed nearby. Although the shooting facilities of these clubs are used primarily by the club members, they are also utilized by local and State police for

practice and qualification, conducting of hunter education courses, for siting in days prior to hunting seasons, for competitive shoots in leagues comprised of members of various clubs, and are used by the general public for various social functions.

It is my understanding that an amendment will be introduced to House Bill 794 and as we read it, it appears that it gives the same protection to sportsmen, conservation clubs as House Bill 1625, Act No. 57 of this year did for volunteer coaches in little league and instructors in hunter education.

We subscribe to such legislation and support same.

Our Federation supports House Bill 794, Printer's No. 894,

as well as the subsequent bill 2415, Printer's No. 3370,

and are now supportive of the proposed amendment to House

Bill 794.

We ask that the Committee look favorable on this amendment. That ends my testimony, gentlemen. Once again I would like to thank you for extending us the opportunity to be here today.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Thank you very much, Joe.

Dave Mayernik, any comments, questions or observations?

REPRESENTATIVE MAYERNIK: No questions.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Dave Levdansky?

REPRESENTATIVE LEVDANSKY: No.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Jerry? Paul? Mike?

MR. EDMISTON: I have a brief comment if I might.

MR. CRAIG: Yes, sir.

MR. EDMISTON: I had the good fortune to meet with your president, Mr. (word inaudible), when Representative Hasay was discussing with the Chairman moving this bill.

I am delighted that he was able to enlist your presence today on his behalf, because as I understand it, it is primarily the result of the aggressive interest from your organization that the matter of the difficulties that ranges are having have been brought to the attention of this Committee.

I would like to thank you.

MR. CRAIG: They always manage to get into trouble some how or other.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: I am somewhat unorthodox.

Thanks to your brevity, sir, we are one minute ahead of time.

The hearing was supposed to conclude at 12:00.

Does anyone in the audience have any questions or observations they want to share with any members of the General Assembly?

We are well paid and have good expense accounts and we have a few more minutes if you want to--

MR. CRAIG: I can make a request of you, Mr.

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY (717) 761-7150

DeWeese.

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Yes, sir.

MR. CRAIG: Greene County is not in our State Federation.

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Okay. We will have to discuss that. You will have to tell me who some of the potentates down there are.

MR. CRAIG: Well, Melvin Lemley (phonetic) used to be the head man. I can't tell you who it is now.

REPRESENTATIVE I thought they were affiliated with West Virginia.

(Witness excused.)

CHAIRMAN DeWEESE: Chief counsel studiously remands me that we will anticipate some written comments from several sheriffs around the Commonwealth, the Sheriff's Association, State Police Commissioner and through Dr. Krug and other men and women who are in Harrisburg on a regular basis.

Obviously those papers and opinions will be made available to the sportsmen's community and the men and women here who are vitally concerned with the firearms legislation.

On time and after a very beneficial effort, at least from our perspective, I will conclude this hearing. Thank you ladies and gentlemen very much.

Meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that after House of Representatives personnel tape recorded these hearings, they were transcribed by me, to the best of my ability.

COMMONWEALTH REPORTING COMPANY, INC.

Kay Succa