1 2	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
_	
3	* * * * * * *
4	House Bills 1484 and 1793
5	* * * * * * *
6	
7	House Judiciary Committee
8	House Judiciary Committee
9	
10	Main Capitol Building Room 140, Majority Caucus Room
11	Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
12	
13	Wednesday, July 15, 1998 - 10:00 a.m.
14	
15	000
16	
17	BEFORE:
18	Honorable Thomas Gannon, Majority Chairperson Honorable Jerry Birmelin
19	Honorable J. Scot Chadwick Honorable Lita Cohen
20	Honorable Brett Feese Honorable Al Masland
21	Honorable Thomas Caltagirone, Minority Chairperson Honorable Peter Daley
22	Honorable Harold James
23	Honorable Kathy Manderino
24	
25	ORIGINAL

1	ALSO PRESENT:
2	
3	Brian Preski, Esquire Majority Chief Counsel
4	
5	Judy Sedesse Majority Administrative Assistant
6	, o 2 2 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
7	David L. Krantz Minority Executive Director
8	MINORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
9	John Ryan, Esquire Minority Chief Counsel
10	
11	Leonard Buchta, Staff Director Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness
12	Committee
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

		3
1	CONTENTS	
2		
3	WITNESSES	PAGE
4		
5		
6 7	Honorable T.J. Rooney, Remarks 133rd Legislative District	4
	Negerable Tite Tedesl Cabas Bearing	13
8 9	Honorable Lita Indzel Cohen, Remarks 148th Legislative District	13
10	Mr. Andrew Barniskis	25
11	Bucks County Sportsmens Coalition Keystone Firearms Coalition	
12	Pastor James Grove, Pastor	47
13	Soul's Haven Baptist Temple and Founder of Free the People Committee	
14	Mr Dean Snuder	57
15	Mr. Dean Snyder Current Senatorial Candidate	•
16	Brother Gary Hahn, Founder	65
17	One Nation Under God in America	
18	Major John R. Capriotti	88
19	Bureau of Forensic Services	
20	PA State Police	91
21	Trooper Kurt J. Tempinski PA State Police, Bureau of Forensic Services	31
22	Sugan DoFrancosco Coordinator	109
23	Susan DeFrancesco, Coordinator Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Pessarch School of Public Health	T O 3
24	Research, School of Public Health	
25		
	1	

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: The House Judiciary Committee will come to order for public hearings concerning the issue of guns and gun violence. We have approximately 50 bills in our Committee dealing with this issue.

So the purpose of today's hearing is just in general overview of the issue is to try to get a sense of which bills or bill we should begin to focus on and work on.

I just want to make these preparatory remarks so everyone understands the general purpose of today's hearing. And with that, I'd like to welcome our first witness, the Honorable T.J. Rooney from the 133rd Legislative District.

REPRESENTATIVE ROONEY: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman, and good morning. First, I'd like
to thank Chairman Gannon for demonstrating the
courage to convene a frank and open discussion on
issues relating to firearms and for allowing the
Committee the opportunity to hear testimony on a
number of bills I had introduced that are
intended to help reduce the number of tragic,
oftentimes accidental and unintentional deaths
and injuries that occur as a result of misuse of
firearms.

I believe as do all of you that now more than ever we must be about the business of considering remedies to the very serious issues surrounding the senseless and needless tragedies, again, resulting from misuse of firearms. Your presence here today indicates the time has come in Pennsylvania to begin the process of change.

It was my intention to talk at length about the content of the two bills that I have advanced, one which requires gun manufacturers to personalize handguns so only the owner or owners can use and one which bans firearms from being brought into municipal buildings.

However, yesterday I was contacted by Mayor Rendell, who as you know is very interested in these issues and other gun-related measures; and he expressed an interest in participating in future hearings.

Chairman Gannon, again, was kind enough to grant the Mayor this opportunity at a future date, so I will postpone my extended remarks to a time in the near future when we reconvene to talk about the specifics of legislation that we otherwise were going to delve into today.

Additionally, I have been working for

the past few years very closely with a group founded by Jim and Sarah Brady. I will provide the Members of the Committee -- and I believe I already have -- with a letter I received yesterday from Mrs. Brady relating to legislation I have sponsored.

It is my understanding that Mr. or Mrs. Brady or a member of their organization would also like the opportunity to appear before the Committee when we reconvene.

Today I would like to point out that I, like everyone else, recognize the escalating problems associated with youth violence and the misuse of firearms. And I fully realize that this isn't a mess we got ourselves into overnight, nor is it mess we will get ourselves out of overnight.

Not any one piece of legislation or even the implementation of a larger package of legislation can completely solve and resolve this dilemma; but we do know that violence is viewed as a learned behavior, and it is assumed to be preventable.

There are social and psychological causes, identifiable risk factors, and patterns

of occurrence that we can narrow it down and begin to attach to our legislative efforts.

So at a time when we are working on enacting laws that are tough on crime and seek to make offenders pay for their actions, I believe we should also be focusing on the ideal goal, which is to prevent people, especially children and teenagers, from committing crimes in the first place.

I recognize that prevention is a difficult task and that there are no easy answers about how to spot those individuals who are likely to commit an act of violence or another crime and how to stop it.

Factors leading to violence as you all know include and are not limited to: Poverty; disfunctional families; prejudice; discrimination; a lack of good jobs; the assault on self-esteem and self-confidence; and the easy access to guns, drugs, and alcohol.

Whenever we can, though, we should be considering and improving legislation in my estimation that addresses these risk factors and makes good common sense.

We should be charging forward with

legislation, for instance, that makes parent and other gun owners more accountable for their weapons by using trigger locks or storing their guns in a place where children and teenagers cannot get their hands on them.

And I have introduced over the course of the past three sessions what in this session is House Bill 523, which deals with the Child Access Prevention Laws often referred to as a CAP Law in other states.

And I just with the indulgence of the Chair would just like to read an excerpt from the letter that I presented to you from Mrs. Brady regarding the Child Access Prevention Law.

Child Access Prevention, or CAP Laws, also referred to as Safe Storage Laws, generally require adults to either store loaded guns in a place that is reasonably inaccessible to children or use a device to lock the gun.

If a child obtains an improperly stored or loaded gun, the adult owner is held criminally liable. This is a reasonable bill that 15 states have already passed into a law and a 16th,

Massachusetts, is considering a CAP bill this

week.

It calls upon gun owners to be responsible and keep guns from where children can get access to them, in addition, preventing unintentional shootings involving children.

These laws prevent unintentional shootings by keeping guns out of the hands of children.

On October 1st, 1997, the Journal of

American -- the <u>Journal of the American Medical</u>

<u>Association</u> released a study that provides

compelling evidence that CAP Laws do work to save lives.

The authors concluded that state CAP laws, again, which make gun owners responsible for storing firearms in a manner that makes them inaccessible to children, reduce unintentional deaths of children by firearms by an average of 23 percent.

The study also demonstrated that these laws are particularly effective in protecting children younger than 10 and those laws that make unsafe storage a felony rather than a misdemeanor are most effective.

And reposited in the Committee,
Mr. Chairman, is my bill, House Bill 523, that

would allow Pennsylvania to become the 17th state to enact a Parental Accountability Measure as it relates to firearms and children.

So of all of the tragedies that gained a high profile early this spring and summer in Edinboro, Pennsylvania; in Jonesboro, Arkansas; in Springfield, Oregon; West Paducah, Kentucky; Pearl, Mississippi, these youngsters' access to firearms was simply too easy.

I believe we also need to move forward on addressing the problems of at-risk children and disruptive students. And I know the Committee has taken a lot of time studying issues surrounding those dilemmas.

I believe we need to improve the services to underserved families and provide better opportunities for their children. But, again, I am not here to suggest that all the blame and responsibility for these problems should rest on the government's shoulders.

As we consider the bills before the Committee today and in the future and look at the myriad of other proposals, I think it's important to remember that many problems can best be solved or addressed by families.

We should, in my estimation as a Legislator, do what we can to provide safer schools, homes, and streets. And I commend the Chairman and the Members of the Committee for taking the time to come up and address and understand and discuss solutions.

But we must also look to our communities, to our parents, our neighbors and friends to be more responsive and to be more responsible to these serious dilemmas.

So I look forward to embarking with you and the Members of the Committee on a discussion that hopefully will lead us in a direction and in considering the merits rather than disadvantages of my legislation and the hundreds of other bills or 50 other bills that the Committee has before it.

I'd like to thank you again sincerely, Mr. Chairman and Members of Committee, for your time and accept any questions that the Committee may like to pose.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you, Representative Rooney. Representative Masland.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I actually really have a request,

not so much a question. The excerpt you read from Sarah Brady's letter, specifically, the sentence in the second paragraph you read about the reduction of intentional deaths by an average of 23 percent in those states that have CAP Laws, I'd be interested in how they determine that.

As you mentioned yourself in your testimony, there are a lot of factors that go into intentional and unintentional misuse of guns. And I would be interested to know how they came up with that percentage. So maybe when a future date they do come before us, they could be prepared to do that.

REPRESENTATIVE ROONEY: I'd be happy to ask them to do so.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Rooney, for coming before the
Committee and sharing your testimony with us; and
you are invited to join the Committee if you
wish.

REPRESENTATIVE ROONEY: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. I'd like to take you up on that

kind offer. I really have some other things I

need to attend to. So I appreciate your time and

the Committee's attention.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you. Our next witness is Representative Lita Cohen, who is also an esteemed member of the House Judiciary Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Welcome,
Representative Cohen, and you can proceed when
you're ready.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you. I do not have prepared remarks. I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak before the Committee today. I commend you,

Mr. Chairman, and certainly all of the Members of the Committee for dealing with this very sensitive, and in this day and age, hot topic.

I have introduced a House bill, House Bill 2484. I don't want to deal specifically or dwell too much on that bill, but again following Representative Rooney, did want to talk to the Committee about my views and the views of some of my constituents as to the entire gun issue. And then I will touch specifically on 2484.

Bill 2484 deals with -- we call it the

Straw Purchasers Restriction Act. It really deals with the frenetic pace of gun running in this Commonwealth.

We're dealing specifically with children, and not only gun-toting children, but children killing other children as we so tragically watched throughout the state and the nation just within the last several months.

And although this is not a panacea and a cure-all, I believe that some of the legislation that has been brought before us will certainly aim in the right direction. Much more needs to be done, as Representative Rooney said.

We have to teach gun safety to our children, respect for guns, involve parents in the lives and activities of children, et cetera, and then get it through our children's heads that guns indeed really do kill.

At least with one of the proposals we'd be taking a strong stand to eliminate one more way illegal guns get into the wrong hands. I have to start by saying that I'll go to the mat for -- to protect the rights of hunters, collectors, sports enthusiasts.

I have many in all three of these

categories in my district. And I find that they are very responsible adults, they are careful with their guns, they're well trained, and they're respectful of guns in general.

Many of the proposed bills that we have before us, and particularly, 2484 is not intended to disturb any of the rights that these responsible, gun-respecting people have.

And I think that that's very important to state at the very beginning of my testimony, that we are not aiming any of these bills to restrict any of the rights that these people who respect guns have.

However, what I'm trying to do and what I think we all should do is stop the illegal sales of handguns on our streets by ending this frenetic gun-running scheme that feeds upon urban violence and indeed leads to violence particularly in our suburban -- in our urban and adjacent suburban areas and that statewide youth access to firearms.

2484 specifically is to stop gun runners from making high-volume gun purchases in Pennsylvania gun shops and in turn selling these firearms to our children. These gun runners make

a 400 to 500 percent profit on such sales. And these unscrupulous acts are indeed a severe threat to our society.

2484 in making many, many exceptions
does indeed preserve the rights and the
protection of our law enforcement officers,
licensed gun dealers, persons whose firearms have
been destroyed or stolen, and for multiple gun
sales as part of collector series, et cetera.

So legitimate people who own and use guns are indeed protected by 2484. What we're trying to do is stop straw purchasing of multiple purchases by straw purchases of guns that then find their way into the hands of the wrong people.

The bill also would, as I keep stressing, protect the rights of those who legitimately have guns and use them properly. I will close by reading a letter to the editor from one of the active members of my local community, a leader not in the gun area, which is interesting, but a leader in general in my community.

This is praising Mayor Rendell. And I have to say that -- preface reading this letter

by saying that I've been working with Mayor
Rendell for a year since last July. This 2484,
this Straw Purchasers Restriction Act is the
result of the leadership taken by Mayor Rendell.

He asked me to be the prime sponsor of this bill. We've worked with him for a year. The bill was introduced in April, and I have spoken as Representative Rooney with Mayor Rendell.

He is interested in coming to Harrisburg to tell the Philadelphia story. And being a Representative of the area adjacent to Philadelphia, we obviously have some very common interests.

But this letter to the editor is titled,

Rendell Deserves Praise For Work On Gun Control.

It's a short article: Who were the gun

manufacturers in Washington D.C. who smirked at

Mayor Rendell's appeal for helping controlling

gun violence?

Who are the Legislators in Harrisburg who believe that limiting the purchase of one gun a month threatens Pennsylvania citizens? Aren't they aware that Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina have these laws?

And by the way, these three states have limited handgun purchases to one a month. And they have statistically a remarkable lowering of handgun crime in all three states. It is -- it is noted statistically; it can be proven. And we think that we would like to bring those same kind of valid statistics to Pennsylvania.

Who are the 103 people who bought 13 or more guns at one time in Philadelphia? And who are the people that will bury them -- who will buy them -- excuse me, illegally on the streets of Philadelphia? Who are the citizens who haven't noticed or do not care?

The 337 people in Philadelphia last year died shot by a gun. Who in Philadelphia is not aware that murders of kids by kids with guns have wiped out youth too young to die? Who are the 11,900 successful robbers with guns who are threatening the quality of our lives daily?

Who can speak out on behalf of the countless dead victims of domestic violence who lost their lives to a gun? Who are the dope peddlers and users looking to find easy money to satisfy their habit, daily stalking stores or ATMs with the help of a gun?

Who are the car-jackers, the drunk drivers, the mentally ill who will have access to these guns? Who are the people with previous arrests and prison records who will be easily armed by the flow of guns? Who is the one who called the limit of one gun a month gun rationing?

And that's what we're trying to do, not to ration guns, but to protect our innocent citizens from gun runners, from straw purchases who people -- people who are legally able to buy guns then buy them in multiples -- handguns, buy them in multiples, turn them over to criminals, to people who have records so that they themselves can't buy guns.

They do this at a 400 to 500 percent profit. These people then go out on the streets not only in our cities and suburbs, but in our rural areas as well, they sell these guns. When these guns are used in the commission of a crime and traced to the purchaser, the purchaser merely says, oh, gee. My gun was lost. It was stolen.

There's no obligation now to report the theft or the loss of these guns. 2484 will

indeed make it mandatory to report the loss or theft of guns so that we can keep track of these guns and know -- trace them and know which guns are being used in the commission of a serious crime and who's responsible for that.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I commend you and the Committee, all the Legislators for having the courage to deal with this issue. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Cohen. Representative Feese.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman, just a comment. I have all the
respect in the world for Representative Cohen,
but one-eighth of the population lives in
Philadelphia. Philadelphians commit almost 50
percent of violent crimes in Pennsylvania.
Philadelphians commit almost two-thirds of the
murders in Pennsylvania; one-eighth of the
population is there.

And what these bills attempt to do is solve a Philadelphia problem by imposing restrictions on my constituents. It seems to me that Philadelphia's problem is the inability of the Philadelphia criminal justice system to address problems. We all know that they don't

impose the criminal penalties that are available to them. We see that constantly.

It seems to me that Philadelphia should deal with its own problem rather than restricting the law-abiding citizens in my area as well as other areas. Punish the gun runners; don't punish the law-abiding citizens.

And I see I stirred some of my fellow colleagues from Philadelphia. But it is true. And you watch the sentencings, and it is true that Philadelphia does not deal with its problem. It's time that they do rather than impose solutions on the law-abiding -- other citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including my residents. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Mr. Chairman, may I respond to that?

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I happen to agree
with Representative Feese when he said that he
did not want to impose any restrictions upon the
law-abiding citizens in his district. I don't
think any of us wants to do that.

And indeed that's why I prefaced my

remarks by saying indeed I would go to the mat to protect the rights of gun owners, of hunters, of people who legally and responsibly operate their guns. And I have full -- and indeed I will repeat, I have full respect for these people.

We have statistics. And we do have evidence that the straw purchasers, these gun runners, the results of their actions are indeed leaching out, not just in Philadelphia and its adjacent suburbs, but to the rural areas as well. And that's what we're trying to stop.

We find we have the same problem with drugs that many of our Representatives in rural areas are saying that the drugs that come into their communities are coming from Philadelphia.

We are all in this together. And although Philadelphia's problems are much more massive and probably Pittsburgh and the other urban areas of our Commonwealth, we're in this together and we have to protect each other and help each other.

The way to do this -- and I have to stress this constantly -- these bills are not restricting the legitimate rights of legitimate,

honest, respectable people. And, in fact, they are protecting them.

2484 limits one-handgun-a-month
purchase. I have spoken to gun owners; I have
spoken to people active in the gun community. I
have yet to speak to anyone who purchases more
than 12 handguns a year; husband and wife, 24; if
there's a child, an adult child living in the
house, 36. We can go on ad infinitum. I don't
know anyone who purchases more than 12 or 24
handguns in a year.

And the exceptions in the bill are there for people who are collectors. They can indeed purchase more than one a month. People whose collections have been stolen, dealers, et cetera, law enforcement people, all of those exceptions for legitimate, honest, respectable people who respect guns.

2484 does not limit their purchases; it doesn't. And we were very careful in drafting the bill. And this bill came, as I say, from Mayor Rendell, because he too respects the rights of legitimate people to purchase, to own, use, operate their guns.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Representative

Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. And Representative Feese was
right, it stirs totally from Philadelphia with
just a polite reminder to this Body that
Philadelphia does and has attempted to deal with
their own problems; that it was actually this
body that saw in their wisdom to repeal what I
think was a very beneficial control that
Philadelphia had with regard to handguns and
Philadelphia requirement for right to carry a
concealed weapon, which was working very well.

I don't know the statistics since that's been repealed. I know in terms of what's happened as a result. I do know that the number of people now toting handguns with permits on the streets of Philadelphia has multiplied somewhere like eight- or ten-fold since we repealed that law just a year and a half ago.

And I'm sure when the Mayor is here he will be able to expound on what kind of impact that has had in our city. We can't have our cake and eat it too up here. We either want laws that apply all over the state, or we want Philadelphia to deal with the their own problem. But give us

one or the other; don't take away both. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you,

Representative Cohen, for appearing before the

Representative Cohen, for appearing before the Committee and sharing your testimony with us.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Of course, you can join the Committee. You happen to be a Member.

Just for the information of the Members, we're running a little ahead of schedule; so I'm delighted to see that.

Our next witness -- also we're going to go out of order because of some other scheduling issues. Our next witness is Mr. Andrew Barniskis, Bucks County Sportsmen's Coalition. Mr. Barniskis. Welcome, Mr. Barniskis. You may proceed when you're ready.

MR. BARNISKIS: Thank you. First I want to say I'm glad that Representative Feese didn't go on too long. Because it sounds like he was stealing most of my testimony because I'm going to pursue a very similar theme here.

My name is Andrew Barniskis. I chair the legislative committee of the Bucks County Sportsmen's Coalition. I'm also speaking on

behalf of the Keystone Firearms Coalition of which we are a member.

The Keystone Firearms Coalition is a coalition of county and local sportsmen's and gun rights groups across the state that cooperate primarily in the exchange of and analysis of issues and things of interest to sportsmen and principally gun owners.

Earlier this year I sent a memorandum criticizing an item of proposed firearms legislation to every member of the Bucks County delegation and to the General Assembly. I also sent a copy to the prime sponsor of the legislation.

I was somewhat surprised to receive a personal reply from that Legislator criticizing some of the statements I had made in my memorandum and offering some facts regarding crime in Pennsylvania including the following, which I repeat verbatim: That there were 382,955 reports of violent crime in Pennsylvania in 1996; that 45 percent of reports of violent crime from the southeast region of Pennsylvania, Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and Philadelphia Counties.

There were 455 murders in southeast region of Pennsylvania in 1996. And over two-thirds of the murders committed in Pennsylvania happened right here in our own backyard.

Being among some other not too surprising statistics, for example, that 60 percent of violent crimes and 52 percent of murders are committed by young adults under the age of 25, which is something I think all of us know.

These two cited statistics piqued my interest as I had not observed anything to suggest that my own backyard was quite so active. So I obtained the 1996 crime report by the Pennsylvania State Police to see for myself just how bad things were.

Now, at this point if I were speaking to a less august audience, I would ask you to repeat after me; but I will make a statement of fact and merely ask that you hold the thought, though I will be repeating it later and I also note that several of you have alluded to already this morning.

Philadelphia is governed by the

identical state and federal firearms laws as the rest of Pennsylvania. The reason I state that fact is that there are a number of people in the administration of the City of Philadelphia, in the media, and even in the General Assembly who attempt to lead the public to think otherwise.

But the fact is that gun dealers, gun buyers, or gun owners in Philadelphia, Bucks County, Forest County, Allentown, Harrisburg, all are subject to precisely the same gun laws.

The reason I make that point is that I discovered from the crime statistics of our own State Police that Philadelphia has only 12.7 percent or about one-eighth of Pennsylvania's population, that those one-eighth of the people commit 47.2 percent of violent crimes, and nearly two-thirds of the murders that occur in Pennsylvania all occur in Philadelphia.

With regard to my Legislator

correspondent's fact that over two-thirds of the

murders committed in Pennsylvania happen right

here in our own backyard, I found that statistic

to be somewhat disingenuous since according to

State Police my own backyard -- that is, Bucks

County -- had only four murders or about .6

percent of state's murders compared to

Philadelphia's 414 murders for that reporting

period.

1.8

Chester County had 7 murders or about 1 percent; Delaware and Montgomery Counties each had 15 murders or about 2.2 percent each. In other words, of the 68 percent of murders cited for, quote, southeast Pennsylvania, unquote, about 62 percent occurred in Philadelphia and only 6 percent occurred in the contiguous suburban counties which had a higher total population than the city.

More importantly, the murder rate for Philadelphia was 27.1 murders per 100,000 population compared to 0.7 for Bucks County. In other words, Philadelphians are 38.4 times more likely to kill each other than Bucks Countians.

I'd like to point out something that's not included in those statistics or what proportion of murders were committed with guns, and I don't have that immediately available.

But Philadelphia is governed by the identical state and federal firearms laws as the rest of Pennsylvania. An important statistic, though, is that 25 percent, 1 in 4 of the

counties in our state had murder rates of 0.0; and they are governed by the same laws as Philadelphia.

Regarding the statistics offered by my correspondents regarding violent crimes, I discovered a similar pattern of disingenuity.

Of violent crimes reported by the State Police,

47.2 percent occurred in Philadelphia.

But in my own backyard, Bucks County, they had only 1.8 percent of the state's violent crime. Philadelphia's violent crime rate is 1527 per 100,000 population, almost ten times higher than in, quote, my own backyard and 6.1 times the rate for the rest of state.

If Philadelphia's contribution is not included -- and to remind you again, Philadelphia is governed by the identical state and federal firearms laws as the rest of Pennsylvania.

The reason I keep citing that fact is that faced with shameful and embarrassing crime statistics, many in Philadelphia's administration and some of the Legislature have resorted to their timeless tactic of pleading innocence of responsibility and helplessness in the face of forces imposed upon them by others.

And as usual, they are seeking a scapegoat issue to use to forestall the day when their own failures become apparent knowing that meanwhile they're whining will keep the state's money trains arriving in Philadelphia on schedule.

And what better scapegoat could they hope for than the media-constructed boogeyman of blaming the existence of guns on our crime problems. What better tactic than to tell people that they have a problem while failing to tell them that their problem exists only in our city.

For example, Ed Rendell would like to sue gun manufacturers for his city's crime problems. He ignores that in other areas of our state governed by identical gun laws, having similar demographics, suffering from similar economic problems, and having identical legal and illegal access to guns, the people fail to respond with a crime or murder rate anything like Philadelphia's.

Any correlation table a statistician would care to generate, be it crime and poverty, crime and race, or certainly crime and gun laws, would be wildly skewed by inclusion of

Philadelphia with the rest of the state.

If the statistics of deaths among smokers were so badly skewed, not one single lawsuit against the tobacco company would have been successful anywhere in this nation.

If access to guns, whether legal or illegal, is a factor in crime, then there should be a cross-border effect discernable in southeastern Pennsylvania, which is what my Legislator correspondent indirectly -- but I believe mishonestly -- attempted to argue.

But no effect exists. The crime and murder rates in the counties outside of Philadelphia are a fraction of what they are inside the city's borders.

If guns, once again, legal or illegal, are more available in the city than the suburbs or vice versa, the bad guys on both sides of the city lines should be able to figure out where and how to get them, and having gotten them, respond with similar behaviors. But that doesn't happen.

Philadelphia's murder and violence rates are many multiples of those of the surrounding counties. Kids, or should I say people under 25 as my correspondent wrote, in Bucks County can

figure out how to get to Kensington in Philadelphia to buy drugs; and they do.

If Philadelphia is a giant street market of guns as has been implied by the Philadelphia Inquirer, for some reason Bucks County's kids under 25 have either not figured out where it is or if they have, they have failed to respond to that availability by killing each other at a 40 times higher rate as Philadelphia residents have.

All this leads us -- and I hope it will lead other Pennsylvanians to arrive at the following conclusions: Pennsylvania has a crime problem. It is called Philadelphia. Subtracting Philadelphia's crime statistics from those of the state show Pennsylvania's crime rates are something substantially less than the crisis that some are attempting to portray by inclusion of Philadelphia's statistics.

The concentration of crime in

Philadelphia has nothing to do with gun laws or

gun availability. If it did, similar

concentrations would be reflected in the

contiguous counties and in demographically

similar populations in other counties, all of

which are subject to the same state and federal

regulations that apply to Philadelphia.

Because there's no demonstrable correlation between the availability of either legal or illegal firearms and crime rates and because criminals can easily cross county borders to obtain contraband, it would be fruitless to apply special firearms regulations to Philadelphia; for example, turning enforcement of firearms crimes over to federal authorities would not solve the fundamental crime problem. And as you know, that has been proposed.

Any Legislator who supports any additional restrictions on firearms ownership, use, or acquisition in Pennsylvania is pandering to a Philadelphia-created charade intended to divert the blame for crime from where it is deserved and is willfully punishing their own constituents for bad behaviors which they have not shared in either individually or collectively.

By doing so they also are punishing

Philadelphia residents by allowing the city to

postpone seeking a solution to the real sources

of their crime problems, whatever they may be. It

is the latter message that we hope and intend to

communicate to gun owners and other Pennsylvanians across the state.

Living next to Philadelphia County, we in Bucks County are all too familiar with the city's perennial cries that nothing is their fault and Pennsylvania would be such a beautiful place if only we sacrificed a bit more to solve our shared problems, which after all are really all our fault in the first place, if only we would give up just a little bit more.

Crime is perhaps one of the clearest examples of the problem within our state that is not shared, and the State Police have compiled the statistics to prove it.

We hope our Legislators have the courage to place the responsibility for it where it logically belongs and where it is deserved rather than punishing their constituents to perpetuate the illusions and delusions of a few self-serving politicians. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you,

Mr. Barniskis. Are there any questions from the

Committee Members? Representative James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. I'm just so shocked at all of

this -- thank you for testifying first of all.

I'm just so shocked at all of the things against

Philadelphia, and you live so close.

You know, I have to just take a moment back to try to understand some of the things that you're saying. I just want to first state that I about 99 percent totally disagree with you and that I think that in Philadelphia we do try to solve our problems and our concerns.

But it's just, you know, and Legislative Body -- we have to convince a number of others that there are certain resources that we need in order to deal with the concerns.

And I think I heard Representative

Manderino said earlier, you know, how, you know,
we got on the floor when they changed the gun

laws. And we said, don't do this to us in

Philadelphia, in terms of changing and where the
statistics in terms of people obtaining guns has
escalated to astronomical numbers, which I'm in
the process of getting -- I'll get it to you

later -- are being -- but in the -- and the
things, you know -- I didn't get the chance to go
over all of your testimony.

What are some of the suggestions that

you have as you live so close in terms of what you think we ought to do in Philadelphia that would help in dealing with the problem?

MR. BARNISKIS: Well, one immediate suggestion I might have is -- I don't have the statistics. But I know your murder rate or violent crime rate I believe has gone down since it became possible for people in the city of Philadelphia to obtain handgun permits.

I just have to comment something that

I've heard that really kind of bothers me is the

statement of the mere fact that people have been

able to obtain the right to legally carry a

handgun as if that is a problem in and of itself.

And I'm aware, and you could debate the problems about people where handgun carry permits -- being able to buy guns without going through the background check and some of those things.

But I keep hearing it cited as a problem. And I have not heard anyone -- and perhaps someone on this Panel could quote such statistics. I have not heard any statistics to demonstrate that it is creating a problem in terms of violence and crime.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Well, I know that the fact that the -- you're correct when you say that the murder rate has went down. And that's a combination of different things. But the availability of guns is more.

And I think that -- and I don't know if we're going to have the statistics; but I would think that the statistics of gun shootings and assaults have risen. But, I mean, that's something that we have to examine and look at.

MR. BARNISKIS: I would agree. And I would say a factor in that has to be what percentage of those were committed by people who are licensed to carry those guns?

Once again, whether the legal right to carry a gun -- which I say it bothers me that I hear the sense from a lot of people that the fact that people can go through a legal process and obtain a gun is not a good thing. That's the sense, the accessibility of guns. They're talking about legal accessability, that that is a problem.

You know, from my side of the fence, you know, viewpoint spectrum, that is a good thing.

And unless it manifests itself as a problem, you

know, a direct and immediate problem, I certainly don't regard it as a problem. The thing in itself is not a problem.

I just want to say that I certainly, while my testimony is very negative to Philadelphia, one of the things that I fail at -- and I think I was too long-winded as it is -- was to communicate the amount of sympathy that I do have for the people of Philadelphia.

You asked for a suggestion. I shouldn't bring it up because I could be easily scapegoated. But, you know, frankly, I really didn't come here with an intent to quote a lot of cliches -- the cliches would be: Enforce the laws you already have, et cetera, et cetera -- because I'm not even sure of those cliches.

I just want to point out that there is a unique problem that exists in one situation.

Now, I cannot analyze it. I'm not as astute as anyone on this Panel. But to me it appears to be a political problem.

The things that I stated about cross-border effects, they indeed are minimum. We in lower Bucks County have a fairly large

public housing area. Things are not as bad there as they are in Philadelphia.

All that points to me is there is something of a political nature. And I'm not going to make any statements about anyone, any administration, any class of people doing their job or not doing their job. I'm just saying when I see that much disparity in statistics from -- between across arbitrary, political borders -- and admittedly they're arbitrary.

You probably know you can drive into Montgomery County, Delaware County, Bucks County, and unless you see a sign, you don't really see in most places a transition of when you're leaving Philadelphia and going into the suburbs.

When statistics obey a political border that closely, what I see is a political problem. But as a layman, I have to admit I cannot define it.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,

Representative James. There is about two minutes

left of your time. Representative Feese has a

question followed by Representative Cohen. You

1 have about one minute, Representative Cohen. REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: 2 Thank you, 3 Mr. Chairman. I'll take 30 seconds. Thank you 4 for being here, sir. I certainly do appreciate 5 your views. I just have a couple questions, and 6 you may or may not agree to answer them. Do you 7 own a handgun? 8 MR. BARNISKIS: I will not agree to 9 answer that. 10 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Fifth Amendment. REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: You don't have to 11 12 answer it. Do you know anyone in your 13 organization or just anyone that other than a collector, et cetera, someone whose collection's 14 15 been stolen, the exceptions that I mentioned, do 16 you know anyone who purchases more than 12 17 handguns a year? 18 MR. BARNISKIS: I have known people who 19 have purchased more than 12 handguns a year. REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: For other than a 20 21 collection? 22 MR. BARNISKIS: For other than a

collection. They were fanatical about the

were horse traders. They would buy something, an

enjoyment of having and using handguns.

23

24

25

exciting new model this week and lose interest

next week and sell it to someone else, legally --

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Are they dealers? They're dealers?

MR. BARNISKIS: No, they were not dealers.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: I see.

MR. BARNISKIS: Because you reminded me -- I hope you don't mind if I respond to something you didn't ask; but you reminded me of the issue. I know and talked to many sportsmen gun owners in northern Virginia and the State of Virginia where they do have the sort of law you're seeking.

As far as, quote, the proliferation of handguns -- which I don't think it is necessarily a bad thing. But if you consider that you want to stop the proliferation of handguns, people there tell me that they now see more people buying the one gun a month they're allowed if they're great hobbyists.

This is probably not thousands of people. But if they're hobbyists, they see people buying a gun as often they're allowed to where before they used to wait till they could

afford it.

And now they have a perception of the law that you better do what the law allows you to do while you can. And I think that's an unintended consequence that perhaps doesn't show up statistically but I'm told exists.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you,
Representative Cohen. Representative Feese,
about one minute.

REPRESENTATIVE FEESE: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman, for the minute. I appreciate the

gentleman's testimony. You were asked a question

of Representative James, what could be done or

what some solutions are.

And I was wondering if you can give me some input on whether you thought the educational system; that is, the public school system or the criminal justice system -- and let me give you anecdotal evidence of why I believe that might be the case.

I was District Attorney of Lycoming

County from 1984 through 1991. And during that

time period, we started to experience an increase
in violent crime.

And eventually our Lycoming County jail was filled with approximately 50 percent of the people from the City of Philadelphia who were referred there by the criminal justice system or were ordered there by the judges to come to Williamsport, Pennsylvania, because it was a nice place to live and recover from your problems but, (1), without transferring their supervisory case files or, (2), without even notifying us that they were coming, as a result of which, we had a significant increase in violent crime.

what we've noticed from these individuals is they had long criminal records for which they were never really sentenced in Philadelphia. It was probation for violent crimes or charges dismissed because they didn't show up. And we also noticed no educational background, really, for the individuals.

So I'd like your comments on that. It seems to me that is where the failing is in the criminal justice system, in the educational system, not in some law regulating handguns.

MR. BARNISKIS: I think if you did a correlation analysis that you're suggesting, I think you would find that that was certainly

true.

I think the quality of education not only in terms of what it qualifies you to do and gain economically, therefore, improve your position, but also -- I really can't think of the right word -- the spirit of education; in other words, the training to become a member of society. That certainly has to have a very high correlation.

I think if you could take the areas that I speak of across the state and do that sort of statistical analysis you could find all the places as I cited, the 20 -- the 17 counties for the sample year that had murder rates of 0.0, you would probably find that they may not have the best -- the highest funded education systems in the state, but they had adequate ones, but both the schools and the cultures train -- I don't really like the word train, but let's say educated people to be members of society.

And somehow I sympathize deeply with the Philadelphia school system. But it seems like the school system operates within a society which it has no effect and no control over.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Representative

Masland, 30 seconds.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: I'm just going to make a comment. I agree with much of what you have to say, Mr. Barniskis. But I think when you say that Philadelphia is the problem that you're doing what we do frequently as politicians, is resorting to overstatement or hyperbole.

So I won't really chide you too much for that because that's something we'll probably hear a lot of this year. And I say that because some people will point to that and say, it's a Philadelphia problem; why don't you just pack up your bags and go home; we shouldn't even talk about it today.

There are problems in other parts of the state. In Carlisle we recently had a fatal -- policemen had a fatal shooting. The individuals came down from New York City to shoot some people down there. But they're having other problems in town where there were people from within the town.

I don't think you need to have 414 murders in your county before you start trying to discuss it now. Practically, the legislative solution may escape us. But I think it is still

worthwhile for us to engage in this discussion today. That's all I have to say. I appreciate your comments.

MR. BARNISKIS: And the only thing I would respond -- if I could expand on that statement and make it less hyperbole. From my viewpoint, speaking on behalf of gun owners and sportsmen's interests, it is a problem because it does bias statistics that are used in arguments that are going to affect us who do not share the problem, do not, in fact, share the problem, who in no way are responsible for the problem.

And that's a very real way that

Philadelphia is the crime problem for

Pennsylvania is it's negative effects beyond

crime itself in terms of legislation and

regulation extending far beyond its borders.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you very much, Mr. Barniskis, for appearing before the Committee --

MR. BARNISKIS: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: -- and sharing your testimony. Our next witnesses are Brother Gary Hahn and Pastor James Grove and Mr. Dean Snyder.

Thank you, Pastor, you may proceed when you're ready.

PASTOR GROVE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Jim Grove, Pastor of Soul's Haven

Baptist Temple and Founder and Director of the

Free the People Committee of York County.

I'll just preface my remarks by saying I appreciate the comments from the two
Representatives on the back Panel there, back of the Panel relative to what is transpiring here.
I appreciate that.

My approach here is going to be a little bit more philosophical maybe than addled with statistics, although there will be some statistics involved.

The Bill of Rights was drafted in 1789 and ratified by the individual states two years later. Its separate amendments were intended exactly as they were written with no exceptions, stipulations, conditions, or arguments.

The Second Amendment states the right of people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. It came as the result of previous oppressive government behavior and couldn't have been written any plainer.

In his most famous speech, Patrick Henry stated, A well-regulated militia composed of gentlemen and freemen is the natural strength and only security of a free government. This principle of freedom was true then, and it is still true today.

We as Americans owe our liberty and freedom to the brave and determined colonists and minutemen who armed themselves with their own guns and risked their lives to fight the tyranny of King George the Third. The American Republic would not exist today had it not been the conviction among the early patriots that they had a right to keep and bear arms.

In 1982, the United States Senate

Judiciary Committee released a report on the

Second Amendment stating: Together with the

freedom of the press and the right to keep and

bear arms became one of the individual rights

most prized by the colonists.

The United States Constitution and Bill of Rights was established as a result of tyrannical usurpations by Britain. The founding fathers wanted to guarantee that future governmental officials would not repeat the

despotic actions of past.

Founding father Richard Henry Lee said to preserve liberty, it is essential that the whole body of the people always possess arms and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them.

Samuel Adams stated the said constitution shall never be construed to authorize Congress to prevent the people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their arms.

Also let there be absolutely no confusion regarding the reference in the Second Amendment to a well-regulated militia. Militia was defined by the founding fathers as every able-bodied male and had nothing whatsoever to do with an army or a national guard.

The same 1982 United States Senate

Judiciary Committee report referred to

previously concluded the conclusion is thus

inescapable that the history concept and the

wording of the Second Amendment, as well as its

interpretation by every major commentator and

court in the first half century after its

ratification indicates that what is protected is

the individual right of a private citizen to own and carry firearms in a peaceful manner.

In my opinion, House Bill 1484 will further the restraints upon law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms. In fact, according to section 6185 on enforcement, subsection (b), seizure of noncompliant handguns, broad powers are granted to police officers to confiscate firearms beyond constitutional restraints.

In short, I believe that this bill is nothing more than a gun confiscatory act in violation of we the peoples' rights. Instead of trigger lock, perhaps a better title for this bill should be the lock down bill.

Whenever the authorities in prison want to control their population, they institute lock down. This bill is designed to further control the masses by restricting the ready use of their firearms even for the purpose of self-defense, even within their own homes.

Being forced by government mandate to use such devices reduces the right of self-protection in an emergency to the equivalent of having no gun at all.

Our founding fathers knew well a

government that does not trust its honest, law-abiding citizens with the means of self-defense is not itself to be trusted.

Some Legislators in their attempts to convince Americans that they will be safer with more gun control are virtually advocating the disarming of a nation without a thought given to who'll take responsibility for rampant crime and carnage and especially government oppression when private citizens no longer have the ability or means to protect themselves.

And yet, the benefits afforded by guns in saving lives, preventing injuries, and protecting private property exceed the negative statistics on firearms by at least 25 to one. The attached graph illustrates that a gun is the safest and most effective tool which can be used in self-defense.

Here we find that using a gun against a would-be attacker results in a safe resolution 83 percent of the time. Gun controls such as House Bill 1484 helps the state grow stronger at the expense of individual rights as the government itself creeps toward authoritarian rule.

In addition, the knee jerk reaction of

protect the children by the media, anti-gun lobby groups, and government officials bent on promoting a socialistic agenda seriously ignore the facts that children are far more likely to suffer accidental death by traffic accident, drowning, burning, or suffocating than by gun shot.

The attached graph is illustrative of the real facts. If guns are to be outlawed because of 236 accidental deaths a year, so should bicycles, 400 child death a years; automobiles, 3260 children annually; swimming pools and bath tubs, 350 deaths per year; 432 children die each year by accidental fires caused by adults falling asleep while smoking.

Probably no other cause of childhood death has fallen more sharply than death by accidental shooting. See the attached chart from the Second Amendment Project at the Independence Institute in Golden, Colorado.

In light of such statistics, voting for bills such as 1484 on the guise of protecting the children certainly reveals a glaring hypocrisy on the part of Legislators and in addition raises suspicions about a possible sinister agenda of a

continued push for total disarmament and subjection of the people.

Washington D.C. enacted stringent gun control laws in 1976. The homicide rate then was 26.9. It then tripled to 80.6 by 1991 despite or due to the law.

Some 130 million documented cold-blooded murders have been committed by totalitarian governments during the twentieth century. Most of this butcher slaughter was carried out by those nations' police or armies.

These millions of defenseless victims had two things in common: Their governments had unchecked and unrestricted power; and they had no means of defense but garden tools, household utensils, or rocks.

They were subject to indiscriminate robberies and rapes, tortures and killings, and involuntary servitude. Destruction and loss of life due to crime and accidental shooting is minuscule as compared to the enormity of government-sponsored murders and genocide throughout the world.

Millions of lives could have been saved if their right to bear arms had been diligently

protected. Because of a well-armed citizenry, a dictatorship has not happened in America.

Anti-gun fools are more threatening and dangerous to our liberty than criminals and foreign spies. Cowards and gun haters don't deserve to live in America. The Soviet Union would be a better place for them to take up residence.

As the New World Order marches through country after country implementing bureaucratic regulatory controls, rapidly seizing private property rights and granting government-doled privileges and governmental socialists hope for a smooth transition into a perceived Eutopia, there is only one thing that will keep America free: That is gun-toting, red-blooded, American citizens.

Noah Webster wrote, Before a standing army can rule, the people must be disarmed as they are in almost every kingdom in Europe. The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword because the whole body of the people are armed.

This is why federal and state

Legislators are trying incrementally to do away

with gun ownership. I believe that is exactly what House Bill 1484 is actually designed to do.

Why is it that our Legislators are afraid to trust the people with arms? Could it be that Representatives know that they have betrayed their constituents and intend to further do so?

Our founders did not preserve the right to bear arms just for deer hunting, trap shooting, beer drinking, and story telling. Having the fire power capable of resisting government tyranny and oppression was their supreme intention.

If it had not been for the clarion call resounding from colonial pulpits in the 1740s, 1750s, and 1760s to inform the masses, America would never have become one nation under God.

Those preachers sounded the call to resist the coming tyranny of a government gone mad, intoxicated with its own self-imposed power. I sense in my being today the same spirit that resided in my predecessor preacher brethren of days gone by. I too as a community leader and one who has influence upon the people will do my best to walk in the footsteps of those gone on

before me.

If bills such as House Bill 1484, designed to leave only minuscule vestiges of our God-given liberties, continue to flow to and through the Legislature, a day of reckoning is inevitable.

Hopefully, a modern-day Patrick Henry would arise before the armed American people are turned into a mass of helpless, pathetic, disarmed "sheeple" with no means or will to resist.

I am vehemently opposed to House Bill 1484. At the least, bills which are brought into Pennsylvania from an outside source as this one should be suspect. And at the worst, it should reveal an ulterior agenda of total subjection of we the people.

Elected representatives of the people should think twice before placing their names and influence for support on such proposed legislation. Those who have done so are Rooney, Carn, Hennessey, Michlovic, Thomas, Itkin, Curry, Youngblood, James, Josephs, Trello, Corpora, Clymer, Ramos, and C. Williams. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you,
Pastor Grove. Brother Hahn, did you have any

testimony that you'd like to offer?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Mr. Snyder, you may proceed.

MR. SNYDER: Thank you. I'm Dean Snyder, and I'm a candidate to the U.S. Senate, which happens to be occupied currently by Arlen Spector. My testimony today is regarding House Bill 1484, printers No. 1776, dated the 8th of May, 1997, entitled Handgun Safety Standards.

I'm going to go line by line here basically. And on page 2, lines 6 and 7, I would like a clarification on personalized handguns on that phrase. This term is not among the definitions, and I think perhaps there ought to be a definition for personalized handguns or personalized guns.

On page 2 also, lines 25 and 26, personalized guns which can only be fired by the authorized user, now, that's a quote from the bill. How is this possible? Gun locks? Gun locks make handguns useless for emergency, self-defense situations.

Please be fair also in your use of statistics and state in this bill how many times

per year people are saved by handguns from death, rape, and robbery.

There are several references in this bill to reasons why handguns should be controlled, so to speak. But let's be fair and evenhanded here, and let's tell the people in this bill how handguns are used for good purposes as well.

On page 3 -- I have several references there, and you can read them in the copies that I've provided for you -- the term firearm is used. However, guns other than handguns are referred to as firearms, I believe.

This bill is about handguns. It's entitled the Handgun Safety Standard. Therefore, I would request that you delete the word firearm and change it to handgun and make that a global change.

Also on page 3, lines 20 and 21, the bill refers to, and I quote, Any combination of parts from which a firearm -- that should be handgun in my estimation -- can be assembled.

And this is an admission that is forced to people can make their own handguns.

Page -- I'm going to skip to page 3,

lines 28 and 29. The public will probably be amazed to learn that, quote, a person is defined as not only an individual but also as, quote, a corporation, a company, an association, a firm, partnership, society, or joint stock company.

Skipping to pages 4, line 13 through 20, gun owners should have greater representation on the Governor's Commission to establish safety standards for the use of handguns. Emphasis should be placed on safe usage of handguns.

This bill, for those who are watching, may not have this bill in front of them, this bill does outline a governor's commission. And there are very few gun enthusiasts on this commission in my estimation, and that should be made more equitable.

Page 5, lines 16 through 18, quoting, A handgun must be personalized so it can only be fired when operated by that handgun's authorized user or users, end quote. Now, is there any other way to do this than by trigger lock?

Trigger locks, as I said before, render handguns useless in emergency, self-defense situations. I've got a TV show Friday evenings called Other Voices Live on Community Access

Television in York, Pennsylvania.

And callers have called in to tell me that when they're in their trailer and someone breaks through the door they don't have time to go for a key to unlock their handgun. They need immediate access to that handgun. And folks, the Bible tells us if someone breaks in your home in the middle of the night in the dark, you are authorized to use deadly force.

Page 5, lines 22 through 24, quoting:
Personalized handguns shall not be manufactured
to permit the personalized characteristics to be
readily deactivated, end quote. Again, a clear
statement that such handguns would be useless in
an emergency situation where the owner's life or
someone else's life is in immediate peril.

Page 5, line 29 and 30, quoting from the bill: Independent laboratories for determining whether handguns comply. Who's going to pick up the tab for this? I think this is probably more tax dollars being spent. I question, you know, the usage of these tax dollars on a questionable outcome.

Page 6, lines 6 and 7, quoting from the bill: Submit a prototype of a handgun model for

testing. This is for manufacturers and at the manufacturer's cost. Now -- end quote. These costs are going to be passed along to the buyer, no question about it.

Page 6, lines 23 through 26, quoted from the bill: Certified, personalized handgun shall be imprinted on the approved handgun at the manufacturer's expense. Again, costs are going to be passed on to the buyer.

But my point here is you're going to put a phrase on a gun, certified, personal handgun as if it makes that handgun better than some other handgun.

That's like Protection From Abuse

Orders. You're giving someone a piece of paper

and you're giving them false hope that there's a

protection in a PFA. There's a woman in our

county that had a PFA, and she's dead now.

Page 7, lines 9 through 15, quoting from the bill: On or after four years from the date of the adoption of the commission's original standard, handguns that do not meet the standard described by the commission pursuant to this subchapter shall not be manufactured, possessed, sold, offered for sale, traded, transferred,

shipped, leased, distributed, or acquired in this Commonwealth, end quote.

Page 8, lines 4 through 9 also allows owners to keep their handguns which do not comply with the commission's standards -- that's a right they already have -- but does not allow owners to pass their handguns down to their heirs. An entire industry based on resale and trading will be upended and tax revenues will be lost.

Page 7, line 18, constitutional restraints -- those are words that are in the bill. Now, the United States Bill of Rights, the Second Amendment states: A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania states in the Declaration of Rights, Article 1, Section 21, The rights of the citizens to bear arms in defense of themselves and state shall not be questioned.

In reference to the bill language, constitutional constraints is acknowledged to refer to constraints on police searches and seizures but begs the question, Should there be

any constraint on the right to bear arms?

Page 8, line 10 through 18, handguns purchased by police is a phrase that's in this bill, et cetera, are exempted from the commission's standards. This implies that handguns in responsible hands are okay. And that means the emphasis should be on responsible handling of handguns instead of costly, restrictive personalization of handguns.

Page 8, line 21, quoting from the bill:

Possessing -- anyone who's possessing commits a

felony of the third degree if they are possessing
a handgun that is not under the standards. Now,

possession of a nonstandard handgun is made a

third-degree felony in this paragraph. This

contradicts section 6185(a)(2) above.

Page 8, lines 27 and 28, altering, possessed, felony of the third-degree -- again, it's mentioned here -- the word altering implies acknowledgment that standard handguns can be altered. Again, I must emphasize responsible handling rather than personalization. And, again, the word possess contradicts section 6185(a)(2).

Page 9, line 4 and 5, possesses,

trades, transfers -- again, it's a reference to those kind of things. This states an owner cannot pass his handgun to an heir. That concludes my testimony. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you,

Mr. Snyder. Representative James. I'm sorry.

Brother Hahn, were you going to offer some
testimony?

MR. HAHN: Yes, I was.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: I'm sorry. You may proceed.

MR. HAHN: Thank you. For those who don't know me on your Panel, my name is Gary Hahn. I'm the founder of One Nation Under God in America, an organization that is dedicated to bringing this country back to God and back to its patriotic base of constitution, unlike you've been told by other organizations who have testified against us here, people who put together these potty bills like we have here today.

When I looked at 1484, the bill, I had to wonder what the foundation was for this bill in the first place. It's been pointed out here today this foundation cannot be found in the

United States nor the Pennsylvania Constitution.

So, obviously, it's not an attempt on or an effort to use constitutional standards to live by in this country by law.

I've heard this Committee refer to our

system of government as a democracy.

That -- there's nothing can be further from the truth. And I have literature that I can give to you from the federal government that'll tell you clearly the federal government considers a democracy a form of tyranny.

We are not a democracy. We are a republic based on law. And it's time that the Representatives that we hire understand that we expect them to follow those laws and principles.

We have to look at bills like 1484 though, and understand where they come from and why they exist. What is really being attempted here? What type of situation are we setting up for the future if we pass these type of bills?

If we asked someone in Washington, D.C. and that system of government, which, of course, we know to be the murder capital of the world, a capitol that has the most restrictive laws concerning guns of any place that I know in the

country, they might tell you that this is crime prevention or accident-safety oriented.

But what do they know about crime prevention? They've already outlawed guns in D.C., and it's the murder capital statistically of the world. These are the same people that told us we have to develop safer bullets. I never heard any anything more ludicrous in my life than to come up with the thought of developing a safer bullet.

And I wonder what type of dollars are spent for some speechwriter to sit down and come up with a catch phrase like that so that it could be spoken by Jocelyn Elders to tell us how to run our lives by developing safer bullets.

1484 is telling us how to develop safer guns. Guns are not safe if put in the hands of unsafe people any more than bully clubs, knives, a water tank, or anything else that can be used to injure or kill people.

But it's not the gun that is the problem. And it's high time that our Legislators understand that we have not a gun problem, we have criminal problems. And the criminal problems are not addressed by talking about the

tools of their trade.

You don't -- you don't address an alcoholic's problem by trying to outlaw booze. Prohibition proved that. And you don't outlaw criminal problems by trying to hide all the tools they have to work with.

Well, if actually trying to make this a safer place free of crime isn't the answer, then what is the answer? What are you trying to accomplish in even considering 1484?

Well, if you went to Vermont where they have very, very few gun restrictions, where actually gun control means taking better aim, they would probably tell you they believe this is one more step to confiscate the weapons that we have in the hands of people.

You've carefully worded it into your bill -- whoever put this bill together -- the forfeiture procedure so that over a generation you can legally, not lawfully, but legally steal the private property, the personal property that is currently in the hands of the people. That's theft.

What you're attempting to do is legislate lawful theft, and it won't work.

Someone asked another person who testified here today if they had a firearm, or I think they said handgun.

I have a handgun. I also have semiautomatic rifles. Many of the people in our group have weapons. There's no Legislative Body that's going to lawfully walk into the homes of America and begin to take their firearms under the name of trying to stop crime.

You can't stop crime by committing crime. It's been stated here that one of the reasons for people to have handguns is for their own protection. I'd like to ask this Body to consider if the people are not going to be allowed to protect themselves, who's going to protect them?

I'd like to share with you what the Supreme Court has said about your police forces protecting the people. Now this goes back a piece, it goes back to 1856; but it's never been overruled. The Supreme Court declared that local law enforcement officers have no duty to protect a particular person from crime.

The local police are private police forces; they have been since 1856. They are a

private army of incorporated seats of governments. They are there to keep order and to protect the government seat that hires them.

They are not elected like a sheriff. They do not work for the people. And the Supreme Court says they're not obligated to protect the people.

In 1979, the court again ruled that a government and its agents are under no general duty to provide police protection of the people.

Now, if the government is not going to protect us from crime -- and obviously the government has not done a very good job of doing that -- then who's going to protect us when you take the guns out of the hands of the people?

It gets worse. In 1982, it was ruled that there is no constitutional right, no constitutional right to be protected against being murdered by criminals and madmen. The police are private armies of corporated (sic) government seats. They are not obligated to protect the people.

In fact, policemen have gotten in trouble in your major cities, for those of you in the Philadelphia area, for taking extraordinary steps to protect citizens. They are not

obligated to; they are not lawfully allowed to.

You want to take guns away from the people to protect the criminals, then let's say that and do it. If you want to take guns away from the people to stop the criminals, let's not even talk such foolishness.

The people have a right under federal constitution, state constitution, and moral obligation to have a right to be protected against the criminal element. You don't want to provide that protection; your courts don't want to provide that protection. So why are you stopping the people?

I'd just like to close by giving what I consider the most humble warning that I can give this august body: The people in this country, in this Commonwealth have been very patient. You have changed our courts from being courts based on laws of moral right and wrong to simply regulation and revenue enhancement.

You have told our parents that they no longer have rights to raise their children in a Biblical way, to correct them and to make sure that they stay within the bounds of right and wrong.

You have tried to change our system of life in such a way that now you no longer know inside of you inherently whether you're breaking the law because you're doing right or wrong.

You've got to go to a million books and read a million laws to find out.

If you continue on the pathway you're going and if you begin now to take guns away from the people, I fear that you are opening a door that within the next 18 months you will see a bloody revolution on the streets of this Commonwealth.

That is not a threat. I don't want to see that any more than you do. But history shows us that's the direction we're headed. If you do not turn around, become a repentant leadership, come under the authority of God, the Constitution, and the people, you are leading the way to the destruction of this great Commonwealth.

And you won't sit back and ho-hum it when it happens. We'll all be hiding because none of us are going to be winners. We'll see the destruction of this state. We may see the destruction of this nation.

People tried to warn the king many, many

years ago; but the king laughed. The king didn't think it was ever going to happen. Listen to the people. Please, listen to the people. You are leading us down the path -- you know, look at our own history.

1.0

How many of the leaders of the black community spoke out in peace during the 60s trying to tell government, We don't want to overthrow you. We want our piece of the pie. We want what's right, what's ours.

And eventually the peaceful voices weren't listened to because the government didn't listen to them. So leaders came forth that said the only way we're going to get it is burn, baby, burn.

You are not bringing the patriot community, the Christian community to a point where leadership that speaks in peace -- Mr. Grove, Mr. Snyder and others are getting a very difficult time being heard because voices are rising to the top that's telling the people it's too late, government doesn't care, it's time to burn, baby, burn.

Please, for God's sake, for the sake of the people of this Commonwealth, for the sake of

your own children and grandchildren, don't do this. Don't bring us to that point with restrictive, unconstitutional, immoral laws like 1484. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you,
Brother Hahn. Any questions? Representative
Daley. We're falling a little behind time, so
you have about one minute.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Mr. Chairman, I was kind of hesitant to raising questions to the august Panel here, and I know with one minute to do that it's rather limiting my ability to identify some of the key issues in your commentary, gentlemen, that I find rather offensive.

I've been in this Legislature now 16
years, and I represent Washington and Fayette
Counties. And I voted pretty much about 99
percent in NRA issues. I oppose this legislation
as well as many of the Members of this Panel.

But I find some of the commentary made today very offensive towards the process. And I wish I had more than one minute to go item by item that offends me.

But I'm also a student of American

history. I taught American history. And one quote that you missed, Reverend, was Voltair says, I may disagree with what you say, but I fight for your right to say it.

And that's truly what has made America free. That is truly what has made America the way it is, a collective group of a number of people, be it of color, be it of race, be it of national origin working together for a common purpose, collectively together in a free society.

I would like to make some comments, Mr. Speaker; but unfortunately, I know you're limiting me. And I am offended by some of the comments here because I believe some of these people who have signed on this bill are not anti-gun fools.

And I'm offended by that comment. And I'm also offended by the comment that the only thing that keeps America free is gun-toting, red-blooded Americans, because I don't know what the hell a gun-toting, red-blooded American is.

My dad was in 17,000 in World War II and got the Silver Star. And I don't think he was a gun-toting, red-blooded American. I think he was an American. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

1 CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you,
2 Representative Daley.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: If any Members have any comments concerning any of the testimony presented today, they can send me written comments; and they'll be incorporated into the record.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: I would rather we would limit ourselves to questions as opposed to debate on the issues that are raised by the speakers. That will help speed the process along. Representative James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. And since you put it that way, I

will reduce some things to writing. And I think

that is true in terms of keeping the process.

And what Representative Daley said, yes, I think that's what makes democracy work is that we have a right to say what needs to be said whether other people believe it or not. And I totally disagree and are offended by some of your remarks.

And I'm not sure in one of the statements that someone may have said something in reference to black leadership, talked about

burn, baby, burn. I don't think -- that was not the case.

I think what happened is that you had some people in the black community that was -- whatever the reason was, might have made the statement. But that was not the recognized black leadership as it relates to King and those that talked about civil disobedience to try to get some of the laws that they foreclosed on.

But in terms of questions, I just -- and I know that we're limited. But somebody made a statement about the Bible said to use deadly force -- I would just like it if somebody could either just give us that section or part of the Bible that says that.

And the other thing I want to ask anybody on the Panel that can answer is if the Constitution says that we have a right to bear arms, which you know I don't disagree with -- but my problem is I'm concerned about handguns. Why don't we deal with handguns and let everybody, you know, just continue to have rifles or whatever other kind of guns?

Because handguns seems to be what's causing most of the problems and that

handguns -- what's wrong with having handguns personalized where they can only be used by the person who, you know, who bought it or has it and then if they sell it, whatever, then they make that change?

1.5

I think that's a good thing if the government can get behind it and make that work, you know, going on modern technology.

PASTOR GROVE: First of all, the exact quotation of the reference I cannot give you without my Bible here. But Mr. Snyder, I believe, was referring to the book of Exodus where Moses certainly in the law gives the right of self-defense when someone is attacked or someone enters a home at night, cannot be identified. It is in the book of Exodus.

And as to the reference to handguns,
Representative James, and why you want to apply
it to handguns, Mr. Hahn mentioned the statistics
there related to the State of Vermont and the
lack of firearms laws in the State of Vermont.

And it just so happens that Vermont has the lowest crime rate in the nation. And that doesn't differentiate between rifles, shotguns, handguns. And handguns happens to be the choice

of those who would want to personally protect themselves as a gun for that reason.

It is not a shotgun necessarily or not a rifle, which is cumbersome in a home or in a private residence. It certainly is a handgun.

And certainly with the trigger lock device on 1484 it renders that type of a weapon practically useless.

MR. SNYDER: I would like to add I didn't give a reference, a Biblical reference, hoping that folks would go to the Bible and look it up themselves.

Also the question posed what's wrong with personalizing, I thought I made it very clear that personalizing probably means trigger locks, which means not being able to use the handgun in an emergency situation. If there's some other way to do that --

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: I'm not just talking about using trigger locks. I'm saying personalizing that the gun can be only be used by a person that --

MR. SNYDER: Yes, sir. That's what I'm asking. Can you tell me what are the ways specifically that that can be done? I cannot

think of ways that that can be done other than currently with trigger lock. If you can give me other examples, I'm open to listening to your suggestions.

But I would like to emphasize once again that I think it's a personal responsibility. I think that's the key, that's what should be stressed in any kind of handgun control legislation, making sure that these guns are used responsibly.

MR. HAHN: Mr. Chairman, can I answer two points for Mr. James which he addressed?

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Sure.

MR. HAHN: I believe he questioned why handguns as opposed to other types of guns, why we should be concerned about handguns. According to the FBI -- which I don't think is a group that's in the practice of trying to support patriot positions -- according to the FBI, there were approximately last year 2,000 felons who were killed by handguns by citizens.

There were an additional 8,000 felons, criminals who were nonfatally wounded while trying to attempt crimes that were going to be harmful crimes physically to their victims.

Why handguns? Well, honestly, I can't imagine myself walking down the streets of Harrisburg with an SKS with a 20-round clip in it. I don't think they'd appreciate that. However, I can imagine having a concealed handgun which would allow me to protect myself.

The other point which you raised and I had addressed and you brought back to me was that you don't feel that burn, baby, burn was representative of the black leadership in the 60s.

That's my point exactly that there was a peaceful leadership like Dr. King who spoke about the need to use nonviolence; that, yes, there was a time to go militant. But it was a nonviolent form of militant.

But that because the government leaders ignored those peaceful voices that the people who were trying to use nonviolence, many of them became frustrated not because they were bad people, but because they saw no other avenue but to get more militant.

That's where the burn, baby, burns came from because somebody tapped into that anger, that frustration. Right now we're not the ones

tapping into this in the community, but there are people who are doing it.

Listen to some of the radio programs.

There are people who are building careers,
lucrative careers tapping into the frustration.

Now, the frustration comes from the lack of
leadership on the behalf of government bodies.

Again, this isn't meant as a put-down. I'm trying to share with you what we see on our side of the table. You know, nobody in this House wrote this bill. The people whose names are on it did not write the bill. It came as a model bill from the John Hopkins study on gun crimes.

Most of the bills that come into this

House, they could come in that way from

model -- as model bills from groups that are

trying to push a private agenda. It's no secret

that the Legislative Reference Bureau hands you

bills.

You know, it's no secret that you may have an idea but they put the legalese into it.

It's no secret that the ADL and different groups, even the NRA, I'm sure, brings model bills across the country.

1 What we're saying is, for once step 2 back, be objective and say, okay, let's give them 3 the benefit of the doubt. Let's believe that 4 their motives are pure. But does this bill 5 constitutionally meet the need? 6 Be objective, and if it doesn't; cast it 7 aside. Don't destroy the state trying to correct 8 a problem with something that has no way of 9 working and only frustrates and angers people 10 more. Thank you. 11 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, 12 Mr. Chairman, just thank you. And you thank you 13 for responding to the question. I know we're low I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, in 14 on time. 15 terms of what you said as us responding, would 16 that be just our comments on their testimony to 17 you or to questions or both? 18 CHAIRPERSON GANNON: You mean comments 19 or questions? 20 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Yeah. CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Since the Panel 21 22 wouldn't be able to field any questions, just

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: One other statement they made, Mr. Chairman; and I'm glad

comments that you may have on the testimony.

23

24

25

that you're having these hearings. I think we need more like this because one of them indicated that we're leading down the road of bloody revolution. And I see that coming also.

I don't know whether legislation will help it or what. But I see that's what we're coming to. And I think as leaders that we need these kinds of hearings to try to address these kinds of concerns before it gets to that.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you, Representative James.

MR. HAHN: Mr. Chairman, may I make one small comment?

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: We're behind schedule, and I see that Representative Masland has some questions.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I know that we're low on time, so
I'm just going to throw out some things real
quickly and maybe you can get back to our staff
later on.

Mr. Hahn, if you could get us the citations to those cases that you mentioned, specifically, the 1856 and 1979, I suppose U.S. Supreme Court -- could possibly be

Pennsylvania -- but if you have the names and citations of those two and the others, I'd appreciate that.

Mr. Snyder, you note that on the second page of your testimony that a couple sections contradict section 6185(a) (2). There is no 6185(a) (2). Maybe you can check -- I think you might mean 6186 -- and let our staff know about that also.

And, finally, Pastor Grove, as I did with the earlier witness, asked for some type or -- actually, it was a Representative in the room -- he asked for some backup on the statistics that were given to us through him on handgun control.

If you could give us some of the background for the statistics, for the graphs that you have, if you could get that, I'd appreciate that. And specifically, I'm interested in how you came up with the 25-to-1 figure on page 2 of your testimony.

I don't need that right now. But if you have some statistical backup for that -- I think it's important because I want those statistics.

Of course, as we all know there's lies, damn

lies, and statistics. I don't know what's worse.

So if you could get us the material on that, I'd appreciate it.

PASTOR GROVE: Okay. On the graphs if you notice the reference where they're taken from and the organizations that have done the research are listed with each graph.

REPRESENTATIVE MASLAND: Okay. You don't have that, but they would have that; is that what you're saying?

PASTOR GROVE: Yes. That's where the graphs came from. That's where the information came from. They're all listed on all the graphs of the sources.

MR. SNYDER: Just briefly, the reference that was referred to 6185 had to do with persons being able to maintain their handguns even after the standards. So it's that section I'm referring to. And, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request that any written comments that come to you be forwarded to me as well.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: We can do that, sure.

MR. HAHN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to answer Mr. Masland's question.

1 CHAIRPERSON GANNON: If you would give 2 it to us through staff, we'd appreciate it. 3 MR. HAHN: Okav. 4 CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you very 5 much. Just a word. Brother Hahn, you have been 6 before the Committee before; but the protocol is 7 to provide the Members of the Committee with your written testimony so we have a chance to read 8 through it as you're presenting your remarks. 9 10 We realize sometimes people want to 11 deviate from the written comments; that's 12 permissible. But we would prefer if you are going to appear before the Committee, 13 14 particularly the Judiciary Committee, you provide the Members with copies of your written comments 15 16 beforehand. Thank you for attending the hearing and 17 18 presenting us with your testimony, 19 Pastor Grove -- I'm sorry -- Pastor Grove, 20 Brother Hahn, and Mr. Snyder. Thank you. 21 going to take a 5-minute break for our 22 stenographer. 23 (At which time, a brief break was taken.) 24 CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Okay. We'll start

the hearing again. And we have the Major John

25

Capriotti, Director of the Office of Forensic Services; Pennsylvania State Police's Trooper Kurt Tempinski, Pennsylvania Bureau State Police. And if you would like to start your testimony now.

MAJOR CAPRIOTTI: Good morning. I'm
Major John Capriotti of the Pennsylvania State
Police. I'm the Director of the Office of
Forensic Services. I'd like to thank the
Chairman and Members of this Committee for the
opportunity to testify this morning.

I represent Colonel Paul J. Manko, the Commissioner of the Pennsylvania State Police.

Accompanying me this morning is Trooper Kurt

Tempinski who is a ballistics examiner assigned to our Bethlehem Regional Laboratory.

As a public safety agency, the

Pennsylvania State Police generally support any
and all efforts which have as their objective the

protection of the Commonwealth's citizens.

The three House bills under consideration by this Committee concern firearms, which our troopers during the course of investigations encounter on a regular basis.

In 1997, the Pennsylvania State Police

Laboratory Ballistics Unit, which provides
ballistics services to all police agencies in the
Commonwealth with the exception of those in
Allegheny and Philadelphia Counties, received
1475 firearm case submissions.

Of that number, 603 cases or 41 percent were related to homicides, suicides, or aggravated assaults. In a majority of these cases, 63 percent, handguns were used. While we do not compile statistics relating exclusively to accidental shootings, we know that they represent a relatively small number of all submissions to our laboratories.

We are concerned about the improper, illegal use of firearms and their accessability to those persons intent on such activity. With regard to the House bills under consideration by this Committee, Trooper Tempinski is prepared to present specific information he has obtained.

Generally, though, I would like to offer an overview. There are many types of security devices available for the safe storage of firearms. They range in price from the inexpensive to the very expensive. They all have one common fault; and that is much like other

safety devices, they are of no value if not used.

Any law which is passed necessitates a vigorous education program designed to inform the public of the law's requirements and to encourage enthusiastic, voluntary compliance.

The proposal to establish a state handgun standard commission may be one way to encourage this compliance. We are, however, concerned about the safety standard which requires that a handgun must be personalized in order to be sold, possessed, transferred and so forth within the Commonwealth.

To our knowledge, this technology is not yet fully developed; and it certainly is not yet commercially available. Trooper Tempinski will provide with you specific details concerning this issue.

The proposal to prohibit a firearm or other dangerous weapon in a municipal building is largely covered by an existing Section 908, Prohibited Offensive Weapons, Title 18, Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes. This crime prohibits possession of firearms or dangerous weapons at any time, in any place, by any person other than those specifically exempt.

The difference between Section 908 and the proposed new law is that persons now lawfully licensed to carry concealed firearms under the laws of the Commonwealth would no longer be permitted to carry a firearm in a municipal building.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this brief statement. Before Trooper Tempinski begins -- presents his information, I will be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON:. Thank you. Did you want to have the Trooper present his demonstration and other testimony and we'll open it up for questions?

TROOPER TEMPINSKI: Good afternoon. My name is Trooper Kurt Tempinski. I'm with the Bureau of Forensic Services. I function as a firearms toolmark examiner. My purpose here today is to demonstrate some safety devices to you that are currently available on the open market.

The first device I'd like to demonstrate is the Gun Vault, Incorporated. It's a Mini Vault, Model GV 1000. The operation is that the firearm is placed within the vault, the door is

closed and secured, and then one needs to know the correct keypad sequence to gain access to the firearm. One has access. It has a manual override in that if the electronics fail -- it is electrical -- that one can still open it by means of a barrel key.

I've rated all the safety devices as either being medium, minimum, or maximum security. And I've also given some positive and negative aspects to each.

The construction of this device is 16 gauge steel with a foam lining. The locking mechanism is an electronic keypad, and also it has the manual key lock override.

The security level I designated this as was maximum. The positive aspects are that it's designed to be mounted on an immovable object.

There are screw holes to mount this to whatever object one would desire to mount it to.

It's not easily compromised in that it's fairly secure; it's well constructed; it's easy to operate and gain access to a firearm if one would need to gain access to the firearm.

And the firearm is hidden from view, so someone wouldn't have an idea of what was in

here. The negative aspect of it is that it is quite expensive, retailing for somewhere in the neighborhood of \$190.

The second device that I'd like to bring to your attention is a Remington Safety Gun Lock. Essentially, it's a bicycle-type lock with a vinyl covered metal cable that one would just simply insert into either the barrel or the cylinder of a semi-automatic firearm. One would run it through the magazine area and in through the chamber or the barrel also. One simply then secures the lock, rendering the firearm inoperative.

I designated this as a medium security level device. It has a key-type lock. It can be secured to an object. One could use the device also to secure this to some immovable object. It's not easily compromised. It's inexpensive, retailing for only about \$8.

The negative aspect is the firearm isn't hidden from view -- someone seeing the firearm with this device. Apparently, it wouldn't protect from you theft or anything of that nature unless you did secure this to an immovable object.

The next device I'd like to demonstrate is the Master Lock Gun Company, what they call their Gun Lock. It's a trigger lock. To utilize this particular device, one would simply take the device -- it's two halves -- place it over the trigger of the firearm that one desires to lock, and push the two halves together.

2.3

One does not have access to the trigger at that point rendering the firearm inoperative. The construction is cast aluminum alloy with plastic and rubber inserts on the inside so you don't scratch your firearm. The security level I assigned this is medium.

The positive aspects are it's not easily compromised, it's inexpensive, it's easy to operate, and it is well constructed. The negative aspects are the firearm isn't hidden from view and it doesn't deter a theft.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: How do you take it off? Do you need a key?

TROOPER TEMPINSKI: Yes, ma'am. Key's inserted, turned, and the two halves separate.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: If I may ask a follow-up?

TROOPER TEMPINSKI: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Kathy's question, there's been some concern raised about access and quickness to access a firearm if need be with a break and enter, let's say, in a private residence. How much time, how many seconds to take that off if need be and -- it's either loaded -- if it is already loaded?

TROOPER TEMPINSKI: Yes, if the firearm would be loaded -- however, the manufacturer doesn't recommend one keep a firearm loaded with a trigger lock on it. Again, that's what the manufacturer recommends. It doesn't preclude you from loading it and keeping it in that manner, but they don't recommend it as a safety.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Right, as a safety feature. How many seconds do you think it would take to actually take it --

TROOPER TEMPINSKI: Not too long, a few seconds. However, one has to obtain a key from wherever one has the key, obviously close at hand, not very much time. If one is waking up from a dead sleep, fumbling around trying to find a key, it could take quite a while. And the price of this particular item is around \$12.

The next device I'd like to bring to

your attention is also a trigger lock device very similar to the Master Lock; however, it's a little less expensive. It essentially is two pieces of plastic with a screw-type device for security.

One would insert that into the trigger area of a firearm, screw the screw in. One can manually do that to a certain point. Then there's a key that one inserts that is a little different than a regular head screwdriver in that it has two prongs and two corresponding holes on the screw-type device.

It renders the gun inoperative,
again in the same manner. One can't get to the
trigger; one can't fire the firearm. The
security level I designated this is minimum. The
positive aspects of this particular device is
that it is inexpensive, retailing for only about
\$6.

The negative aspects are one key fits all. Every one of these devices is the same. It's poorly constructed, the plastic construction -- if one had a screwdriver, one could break this right off. It's -- the firearm's not hidden from view; it doesn't deter

theft; and it's very easily compromised.

It would probably keep a child, a small child from getting at the firearm safely; however, an older child would probably be able to defeat this device.

And one removes it in a much similar fashion that one put it on. You unscrew the screw device, which in the dark might take a little bit of time and coordination.

The next device I'd like to present is the Saf T Lok. And their device, which they call it the Saf T Lok, it essentially replaces the grips on a firearm. A mounting place and a locking mechanism is placed within that area that was occupied by the original grips.

The lock interrupts the actuation of trigger mechanism on this particular firearm so that one can't pull the trigger and one cannot cock the hammer. If one wants to deactivate this device, one has to know the combination, which deactivates the device and now allows the firearm to function.

The construction of this device is a metal lock with rubber grips. The locking mechanism is a manual, push-button combination

system that I just showed you.

The security level, however, is minimum; that being due to the fact that the durability and reliability of this product is questionable. One installs it with a screwdriver. One can remove it with a screwdriver, and it's easily compromised.

The positive aspects of it are that it attaches directly to the firearm, it's not easily lost or misplaced, and one doesn't have to fumble with a key to get it to open.

Also they make a similar device for a semiautomatic pistol in this case, a Model 1911 Colt. And it works in a similar fashion. One needs to know the combination, then it deactivates, allows you to manually depress the safety now allowing the firearm to operate.

I have some comments on personalized firearms also and we can get more in depth with that if you like. The existing technology is not in place presently to manufacturer personalized firearms that can only be discharged by the authorized user.

Colt's Manufacturing, Incorporated, in cooperation with Sandia National Laboratories and

funding from the National Institute of Justice is the current leader in development of personalized firearms technology.

According to Ms. Beth Lavach, a Colt's representative, a second generation personalized firearms or what they consider -- they call a smart gun, does exist. Ms. Lavach further stated that it will be more than a year before a personalized firearm or smart gun will be available to the law enforcement community.

And you can refer to the enclosures from Colt's Manufacturing for the technical information, which again, if we'd like to go more in depth we can. If you have any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer them.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you.

Questions from the Members? Representative James
and then Representative Masland and
Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you. I know that time is short, and I just want to thank you for testifying and providing the information. I like that first one that you showed. I think that's truly maximum and be readily available if needed.

But I just want to ask you, I noticed that you said something about personalized handguns. And I'm talking about where the gun is only used by a person who would -- and I know that technology is being developed.

But how do you feel about it if the technology is developed, as the professional enforcement in terms, would you support that?

TROOPER TEMPINSKI: Well, I just have to say from the firearms view and that I'm very familiar with the mechanical operation of firearms. Their intention, Colt's Manufacturing intention with the National Institute of Justice is to produce a firearm for law enforcement officers.

I believe it's somewhere between 14 and 16 percent of officers that are killed in the line of duty are killed with their own sidearms. However, I have misgivings about electronic and mechanical components being assembled into a firearm for law enforcement.

Mechanical devices fail on their own.

When you add electronic components to them, you can see there's more prone-ness to failure in that aspect. If something could be made

completely reliable, that's one issue. If it can't, that is another issue, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: We won't know that until it is developed so that we can test it. But I'm saying that if, in fact, that showed in everything we do there's some unreliable -- some aspect, some small percentage -- nothing works 100 percent.

But I'm saying -- so I understand you say from a law enforcement perspective they support it if, in fact, that can be developed that that can only be used by the person that bought the gun, that is afforded the support by law enforcement; is that correct?

TROOPER TEMPINSKI: I'm sorry, I missed the last statements. You're talking about either civilian or law enforcement?

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Law enforcement.

If, in fact, that can be developed where the handgun can only be used by the person that bought the gun?

TROOPER TEMPINSKI: I would have to say that we as the State Police don't have a policy position at this point in time, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Okay. All right.

Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you.

Actually, my question I think was very similar to what Representative James just asked. And maybe if I can just ask it again to make sure I understood what he said.

My feeling is that these kinds of personalized guns for law enforcement will be as -- there's obviously enough of a demand or at least an interest from law enforcement now to try such a thing or the manufacturer wouldn't be moving in that direction to try to manufacture one.

And I assume that until it gets kind of tested out there in the field to see whether or not law enforcement would be comfortable with it and whether it would work to suit their needs that what happens in those field tests will determine how interested law enforcement in general is in this kind of product.

I guess my question to you is based on where we are now with prototypes and things like that. What from your perspective are the potential pluses or benefits of this kind of handgun to law enforcement? And what are the

potential concerns or pitfalls that you see or at least have at this stage of the game, if you can respond to that?

TROOPER TEMPINSKI: I believe that anything that promotes officer safety is a good thing. However, the detractors as I said is reliability and functioning. Officers need their firearms to function flawlessly in the line of duty. We're not even able to achieve that with mechanical firearms let alone firearms with electronics and mechanics in it.

MAJOR CAPRIOTTI: Also, I think it's very important that the -- that it's realized that the police officers do not routinely draw their weapons and engage in gun battles. It's something that occurs fairly infrequently. We rely very heavily on training and very heavily on reaction to train our people.

I'd be somewhat concerned about an officer getting in a situation and having to use another officer's weapon and being unable to use it. That's just one example of some of the concerns that I have personally.

I think it's just all of the scenarios, the possible scenarios are so many out

there we haven't had a chance to think about them. We have not seen one of these weapons. We have not seen any of the research. We have no data at all to base any conclusions on.

So I think we have to wait and see what it is and what it looks like. Maybe there are ways that things can be developed that will at least allay our fears to the point we would endorse it. But at this point, we simply can't do that.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you. Chief Counsel Preski.

MR. PRESKI: Major, this is one general question. The Chairman opened up these hearings. And he recognized the fact that in this Committee we have 50 to 60 different bills that would deal with firearms, their regulation, who can get them, how they can get them.

We've heard about the
bills -- Representative Rooney, Representative
Cohen came and talked about one handgun a month.
I guess the purpose for this hearing was to

identify issues and to see where we take this debate or where we take this further.

Given your experiences, what -- and not on behalf of the State Police, but just personally, where do you think we should go with this issue? Where do you think we should go with this debate? What kind of stuff do you think we should look at?

MAJOR CAPRIOTTI: I'm not sure I understand the question.

MR. PRESKI: We have a variety of bills. We've heard tons of things. We had the presentation from the Trooper about the trigger locks and the various things. Representative Cohen said maybe instead of putting locks on guns, we limit the ability of people to purchase them, one handgun a month.

There are bills before the Committee that deal with liabilities for parents should the kids take the guns and use them. I guess what my question is, based on upon your law enforcement experience, you've raised concerns about the number of guns that are used in the homicides and the assaults and the things that you see on patrol and what your troopers encounter on a

daily basis.

Are there any thoughts that you have, again, I say this -- I assume it would have to be personally rather than on behalf of the State Police, what do you think we should look at as a Committee?

MAJOR CAPRIOTTI: Obviously, I'm not here representing myself today. If I were, I would have testimony that might or might not differ from that that I'm offering on behalf of Pennsylvania State Police. I represent the Pennsylvania State Police.

And, historically, we have not taken positions on these issues, issues of this type. But we vigorously enforce any laws that the Legislature deems appropriate to enact. And that's our position on these also.

MR. PRESKI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: I have just a couple of quick questions. Your policy, your training that you utilize at the Academy for all the officers, are the cars with the guns, shotguns and anything else left in the cars when shifts are changed? They do not take the shotguns home with them; is that correct? It's

not assigned to a particular trooper?

TROOPER TEMPINSKI: No, the shotguns are not assigned to particular troopers. They're maintained within the building until which time they're signed out and taken and placed in the patrol vehicles. They are not left in the patrol vehicles in that manner.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Your personal guns, though, you do take them home with you? Is there training, is there policy as to how those guns are to be handled and stored and kept in safekeeping? Everybody has families they go home to; everybody takes a gun home with them. What's your official policy and training concerning that situation?

MAJOR CAPRIOTTI: Well, obviously we have regulations governing not only the safe handling of firearms, but the care and storage of those weapons. There are several.

Our Field Regulations Manual, which each trooper has personally, contains a section in there which prescribes what an officer is to do. We have administrative regulations which also cover that.

If you are asking me, do we require that

a trooper put a gun lock on his --

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: No no.

MR. CAPRIOTTI: -- issued revolver. No, we do not do that. But we do have guidelines that that trooper must adhere to as far as the handling and storage of those weapons. And they receive that training at the Academy.

And they're very tough on them at the Academy because that's where they learn -- that is the first exposure many people have to firearms and the habits they learn that they're going to carry throughout their career.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: And there are other law enforcement agencies that you deal with and are put through training at the Academy given the same exposure to the regulations?

MAJOR CAPRIOTTI: Yes. All the police officers as you well know receive the training at one of the training sources in gun handling. And marksmanship also is taught at all of those facilities.

They all use the same curriculum, so there's a certain standard that all police officers who have received 120 Training will at least achieve.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: I was just for the record wanting to put that on there about the policy and regulations that are followed by the Pennsylvania State Police in their handling and storage of their weapons. Are there any other questions?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you. Thank you both for testifying. We'll next hear from Susan DeFrancesco, Coordinator, Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Research, School of Public Health.

MS. DeFRANCESCO: Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Center for Gun Policy and Research of the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health in support of House Bill 1484 that creates handgun safety standards.

Firearms killed close to 36,000 individuals in 1995 in the United States through homicide, suicide, and unintentional shootings. We're losing about 100 people a day to gunfire, and many of those are young people. In Pennsylvania in 1995, we lost 1400 people to gunfire.

Young children find guns in their home and are able to fire them, shooting themselves and others. Children and teenagers also use guns found in the home to commit suicide.

For certain segments of population, gun death is the leading cause of death. Gun deaths are just the tip of the iceberg. For every fatality, almost 3 nonfatal injuries require hospitalization.

We have a public health problem on our hands. And our Center supports House Bill 1484 as a public health response to that problem. House Bill 1484 will save lives.

House Bill 1484 requires personalized guns; it requires that guns be designed in such a way that they can only be fired by the authorized user. This is very much a public health approach, an approach aimed at the prevention of gun death and injury by changing the design of a product.

Modification of products to make them safer have been mandated successfully before by other public health legislation. Safer motor vehicle design has been legislated. Now we have laminated windshields, collapsable steering

wheels, improved blocks. We have air bags.

And the last several decades there has been the steady decline in motor vehicle injury and death. For decades we focused just on the driver of the car, passing laws that required people to drive safely to the exclusion of other strategies.

But once we also turned our attention to the product itself, the car, death and injuries started to decline. We need to take the same approach with guns.

We have traditionally focused on the user of the gun and inadequately examined the manufacturer of the gun. Regulating who makes the trigger is just as important as trying to regulate who pulls the trigger.

Requiring a personalization techniques technologies be designed into the gun will not prevent all gun death and injury, but it will reduce the likelihood of certain gun-related deaths and injuries.

Personalized guns would be inoperable by the young child that finds the gun in the home, the despondent teenager that reaches for the family gun to commit suicide, and the criminal

who steals the gun.

For at least some of the recent school shootings, most notably the ambush in Jonesboro, Arkansas, if the guns used had been made inoperable by personalization, lives would have been saved.

The technology exists to personalize guns. Many patents to personalize guns have been awarded in the last few decades. As the Trooper said, Colt's Manufacturing Company has developed prototypes of personalized guns that employ radio frequency technology.

The user wears a tiny transponder embedded in a ring, a watch or a lapel pin. The firearm transmits low power radio signals to the transponder, which in turn notifies the firearm of its presence.

If the transponder code is one that's been entered into the firearm, the firearm recognizes it; and you can fire the gun. Colt's manufacturing plans are to offer the firearm for use by police officers in the next couple of years.

We're also aware that companies have made strides in the development of fingerprint

knowledge. A fingerprint sensor can be placed in the handle of the gun to identify the user's fingerprint. Fingerprint data about authorized users are stored in memory within the gun.

Before the gun will fire, the user's fingerprint must be matched with stored, authorized fingerprints. It's also important to make the point that House Bill 1484 is not about taking people's guns away. It's about regulating guns as consumer products to protect people at risk.

Public health has a tradition of helping those at risk, especially children. We have done it before with medicine bottles, for example. Federal regulations require that medicine caps be child resistant, and we have prevented many childhood poisonings.

We did not try to educate every child to stay away from medicine bottles, nor did we try to educate every care giver to keep medicines away from children to the exclusion of changing the design of the product. Another example of mandating the safe design of a product to save lives.

We also have evidence that the public

overwhelmingly supports the regulation of guns as consumer products. In the 1996 nationwide poll conducted by our Center in collaboration with the National Research Center of the University of Chicago, the respondents, 55 percent of those respondents said they support government safety regulation for guns, 86 percent supported legislation that would childproof guns, and 68 percent favored legislation requiring that all new handguns be personalized.

It's also important to note that the technology has been developed to the point where it is no longer a question of whether we will have personalized guns. We will have personalized guns.

It's just a question of whether we will still have guns that are not personalized, whether we will still allow guns to be manufactured that are operable by children and to a offer a despondent teenager an extremely effective means of suicide. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Questions from the Committee? Counsel Preski.

MR. PRESKI: One question. In your one fact sheet that you handed out, it states in some

Is

1 localities laws requiring that in several years 2 the only handguns that can be legally manufactured or sold in those jurisdictions would 3 4 be personalized handguns. 5 The Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Policy 6 and Research has prepared a monologue -- that 7 would be this? Is that House Bill 1448? MS. DeFRANCESCO: House Bill 1448 is 8 9 patterned after that model, yes. Okay. Thank you. 10 MR. PRESKI: 11 CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Representative 12 James. 13 REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Yeah. Thank you, 14 Mr. Chairman. In reference to the Colt Smart, is 15 that information as given by them? Or is that 16 just --17 MR. PRESKI: State Police. REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Oh, State Police. 18 19 I'm sorry. I just want to thank you for Okay. 20 testifying and for providing the information 21 because I was going to ask in reference to 22 whether the Chief Counsel just asked -- I wanted 23 to know if that was part of it. 24 I was going to ask for a copy of model

legislation, but that's House Bill 1484.

25

there any other states that it has been moved forward?

MS. DeFRANCESCO: Yes. It's been introduced in New York. I believe it died in the Committee at the end of last session. It's very much alive though in New Jersey and has bipartisan support. It's been introduced in both Houses, and they should be holding hearings this fall.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I'm not sure if this is within your knowledge; so if it's not, just let me know. You did testify that personalizing guns is a available technology, and you talked about the Colt Smart Gun that uses the transmitter versus other manufacturers that are looking at a fingerprinting mechanism.

But how -- how -- how far into actual testing and use in the field have any of these gone? For example, the folks who testified before you from our State Police said, well, you know, I don't know whether we would want to use

it because we have real concerns -- I'm paraphrasing. This wasn't exactly their words.

But we have real concerns about how functional they would be, about percentages of mishap, about whether or not they would be less reliable than the regular mechanical -- I mean, those at least in their minds are still unanswered questions.

My question to you is, Are they still unanswered questions? Do these things -- are they too new to have been field-tested or actually tested by any law enforcement group out there in any police force in the country on a municipal or state level using this technology today? Where are we along that line?

MS. DeFRANCESCO: That is beyond my knowledge. I think you'd have to ask Colt. We know from Colt's own statements that they do expect to market this to police officers within a year or so. So I imagine some testing still has to be done. You'd have to ask them.

I would like to make a point, though, that safety standards that protect the public's health are often technology-forcing. And the

courts have said that that's legitimate, and to protect the public's health that is required. So (pause.)

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: You're talking about just in general with regards to product liability laws and the introduction of new technology in --

MS. DeFRANCESCO: I'm talking about the different federal laws we have like the pollution standards, the standards that were developed to change the design of motor vehicles, some of the product safety standards that the Consumer Product Safety Commission has promulgated.

They have often been technology-forcing and tested in the courts. And the courts have said when it protects the public health, it's legitimate to do that, especially when a law would give time for manufacturers to develop the technology to a point where it can be used, especially when it's a performance standard which the House Bill is, performance standards rather than a design standard.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Representative

James and Counsel Preski.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you again, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this is to the Committee. Maybe we the Committee or Subcommittee of the Committee can maybe because of the gun violence problem that we have in Philadelphia, maybe in terms of trying to address the needs that we can go to Colt as a Subcommittee to see how this process is working and maybe examine it to see what we do to either help or to implement other policies it addresses.

CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Excellent suggestion.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you.

MR. PRESKI: Just in response to the Representative's question, I know that Chairman Gannon is planning additional hearings on this issue. We're kind of taking a very broad approach to see where we are. I certainly will raise that with him.

Ma'am, I have one question. Given that you take a products liability approach, it seems, to this whole gun violence question. Out of Philadelphia I know Mayor Rendell has discussed a lawsuit much like the tobacco litigation against

1 the qun manufacturers. Are you aware of that? 2 MS. DeFRANCESCO: Yes. 3 MR. PRESKI: Do you have any 4 brief thoughts concerning that litigation? 5 MS. DeFRANCESCO: We see -- our 6 Center actually is often consulted. Several 7 of us are lawyers, and we're consulted on some of 8 the kinds of liabilities suits that would hold 9 manufacturers responsible for not manufacturing 10 quns that are personalized and not manufacturing 11 guns that have other different kinds of safety 12 devices that could be put into guns and are not. 13 So we see that also a public health 14 strategy to try to create the incentive to have 15 guns designed in such a way that they can be 16 protected. 17 MR. PRESKI: But you see that on a local level or a state level, not a federal level? 18 19 MS. DeFRANCESCO: Um, yeah. A lot of 20 the court cases that we're aware of are local and 21 state. 22 Isn't there a federal MR. PRESKI: 23 prohibition against product liability for gun 24 manufacturers? 25 MS. DeFRANCESCO: I don't think so.

1 MR. PRESKI: Okay. Thank you. 2 MR. BUCHTA: To the best of my 3 knowledge -- I'm Democratic staff. To the best 4 of my knowledge, there is a federal prohibition 5 against product liability laws against firearms. And I believe the case law on it was 6 7 established by Remington. There was a lawsuit 8 against Remington relative to a product they 9 make, the Remington Rifle 700 BDL. And I believe 10 the courts held that the firearms essentially are 11 exempt from the product liability laws. You'd have to go back and look at the federal case law. 12 13 Sheriff Green will CHAIRPERSON GANNON: 14 be submitting testimony for the record. 15 like to thank you for testifying and your 16 knowledge in this hearing. 17 MR. JAMES: Mr. Chairman I just spoke so 18 the Sheriff and he just said that he wanted to 19 thank the Committee for inviting him and that he 20 will be submitting testimony for the record. 21 Thank you. 22 CHAIRPERSON GANNON: Thank you. 23 (At or about 12:59 p.m., the hearing was concluded.) 24

25

## CERTIFICATE

I, Deirdre J. Meyer, Reporter, Notary Public, duly commissioned and qualified in and for the County of Lancaster, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my stenotype notes taken by me and subsequently reduced to computer printout under my supervision, and that this copy is a correct record of the same.

This certification does not apply to any reproduction of the same by any means unless under my direct control and/or supervision.

Deirdre J. Meyer, Reporter, Notary Public My commission expires August 10, 1998.