## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

House Bill 46

Limiting Sale of Firearms to One Gun a Month

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \*

House Judiciary Committee

Main Capitol Building Room 60, East Wing Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Monday, March 1, 1999 - 9:00 a.m.

--000--

## BEFORE:

Honorable Thomas Gannon, Majority Chairperson Honorable Lita Cohen
Honorable Albert Masland
Honorable Jane Orie
Honorable Peter Daley
Honorable Harold James
Honorable Joseph Petrarca
Honorable Donald Walko
Honorable Dwight Evans
Honorable W. Curtis Thomas

KEY REPORTERS

1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404
717.764.7801 Fax 717.764.6367

1	ALSO PRESENT:
2	Brian Preski, Esquire
3	Majority Chief Counsel
4	Judy Sedesse, Majority Administrative Assistant
5	Beryl Kuhr, Esquire Minority Chief Counsel
6	Michael Rish,
7	Executive Director
8	Cathy Hudson, Minority Administrative Assistant
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
~ ~	

## CONTENTS 2 WITNESSES PAGE 3 Honorable Lita Indzel Cohen 4 4 Honorable Dwight Evans 11 5 City of Philadelphia Honorable Ed Rendell, Mayor 20 John Timoney, Commissioner 50 6 Lynne Abraham, District Attorney 89 Honorable Clifford Allen, Mayor 8 41 Edinboro, Pennsylvania 9 115 Joseph Mahoney Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce 10 126 James Reilly, M.D. St. Luke's Hospital 11 Concerned Citizen 12 Leroy Jackson 139 13 Daniel J. Siegle, President 150 Pennsylvanians Against Handgun 14 Violence 15 (Written testimony submitted by the following: John M. Hohenwarter, Jr., 16 State Liaison, N.R.A. Michael Gottlieb 17 Edward Chacker, Chancellor, Philadelphia Bar Association) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

THE CHAIRPERSON: The meeting will come to order. This public hearing is in connection with House Bill 46 introduced by Representative Cohen and House Bill 402 introduced by Representative Dwight Evans.

Opening remarks will be made by the Honorable Lita Cohen from the 148th Legislative District and the Honorable Dwight Evans of the 203rd District.

Representative Cohen and Representative Evans, you may begin when you are ready.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and my fellow members of the House Judiciary Committee.

I want to start out by saying -- and I bring my big foot with me to these hearings because House Bill 46 is not a foot in the door to total gun control as some opponents of the Bill have mentioned.

This is a big foot. It is mine. And it's an entry into complete gun control in the Commonwealth.

As I have stated on many occasions, I will go to the map to protect the rights of

hunters, gun collectors, and sports enthusiastic because they are responsible adults, are careful of their guns, are well trained and are respective of guns in general.

However, it is a fact that a large percent of the violent deaths in the city of Philadelphia and all throughout this Commonwealth are the result of illegal handguns.

The streets of our city of brotherly love and other inner city areas have become dangerous war zones in which innocent children and bystanders end up risking their lives often becoming the tragic victims of senseless shootings.

They get caught in the crossfire while trying to get to and from school, doing their shopping, traveling to and from doctor's offices, or workplace.

The violence in Philadelphia and other major urban areas around the state is being fed by rampant gunrunning schemes. Gunrunners legally are able to make high volume purchases in Pennsylvania gun shops, only to travel to the inner cities and elsewhere in the state and resell these firearms on the streets to young people at a

400 to 500 percent profit.

In addition, some unscrupulous purchasers who purchase a license to carry a concealed firearm have become what is known as strawmen for gangs and criminals.

They avoid criminal history background checks, make high volume purchases, and, if caught, claim that the gun in question must have been stolen or lost and somehow found its way into the hands of the wrong person.

My legislation, an amendment to the Uniform Firearms Act of 1995, would put an end to all of this. Sometimes it's called One Gun A Month Law, but I prefer to call it the Straw Purchaser's Anti-trafficking Prevention Act.

It would accomplish three goals.

Prohibit persons from purchasing more than one traditional handgun in a 30 day period, enhance the penalties for persons who sell more than one traditional handgun in a month in violation of the law and, number three, establish a duty for persons to report lost or stolen firearms.

We are not out to punish those lawful, upstanding citizens who abide by the laws, purchasing and using guns for hunting, collecting,

and other perfectly legal and respectable activities. And I really have to emphasize that.

That's why this legislation includes exceptions to the one per month rule for law enforcement officers, licensed dealers, and for persons whose firearms have been destroyed or stolen.

Also, exceptions are made for multiple sales of firearms as part of a collector series, bulk purchases as part of an estate sale, and purchases of two firearms as part of the dealer's discount for multiple purposes.

Finally, any law abiding citizen can purchase multiple firearms under my legislation by undergoing enhanced background checks through the chief law enforcement officer of the court.

My proposal is not meant to infringe on a person's ability to possess firearms. It was crafted with the rights of upstanding law abiding citizens in mind.

The idea is not new. In fact, South Carolina, a traditional gun right state, became the first state to limit handgun purchases way back in 1975.

Virginia passed a similar law in 1993,

and Maryland adopted the limitation in 1996.

In neighboring states, gunrunning is now virtually non-existent. Although certainly not the full answer to the horrendous problems of gun toting children killing other children, as we so tragically watched events unfold last year in Arkansas and all over even Pennsylvania, my legislation is one step in the right direction.

More still needs to be done. We need to teach gun safety, teach a respect for guns, involve parents in the lives and activities of our children, eliminate the violence on T.V. and in the movies, and get it through our kids' heads that guns really do kill.

We must also make sure that we enforce the laws that are on the books now. But at least with my proposal, we would be taking a strong stand to eliminate one more way legal guns get into the wrong hands.

Opponents of the legislation have raised a number of reasons why they will not support this landmark Bill. They believe there are enough laws on the books related to illegal firearms sales.

They say these laws already prosecute straw purchasers and gunrunning, that we don't

need more laws.

I am very familiar with both federal and state law relating to illegal gun sales. In fact, I was among the 166 members of the House who voted in favor of Act 17 on final passage, a Bill strongly supported by both the N.R.A. and Handgun Control, Inc.

My problem with existing law is that the majority of laws against illegal sales of firearms and strawmen purchases are after-the-fact laws, that is, a person must commit a criminal offense before the illegal activity can stop.

As the laws relate to gun trafficking, the guns are usually on the streets and in the hands of the wrong person by the time the trafficker has finally been apprehended.

To me, that is like diffusing a bomb after it has already gone off. This legislation attacks the problem of illegal gun trafficking at its roots by limiting the number of guns a trafficker can obtain through a strawman by still proving 11 exceptions for multiple purchases of handguns by law abiding citizens.

The penalties prescribed in my legislation for multiple purchases in violation of

the statue would be the same for other violations of Title 18, a felony of the third degree.

Opponents suggest that one gun a month laws simply don't work, that there is no evidence that this type of law has been successful in reducing criminal activity.

That simply is not true. South

Carolina's laws, I referred to before, has been

very successful. For 23 years, South Carolina law

has kept gun traffickers and their strawmen

operations shut down in that state.

Opponents contend that this legislation would cause a person to lose firearm rights forever just because he fails to report a lost or stolen firearm.

Some gun owners have so many guns, they can't possibly keep track of every last one. This Bill, they say, makes criminals out of law abiding collectors. That simply is not true.

And, lastly, opponents say that this is a Philadelphia problem. It isn't. It simply is not a Philadelphia problem. These straw purchasers purchase these guns and they gun run throughout the Commonwealth into our cities, into our towns, into our rural communities.

I have worked closely with Mayor Rendell who will testify today and the U.S. Attorney's Office in this legislation. We have worked for more than two years.

Please understand that this legislation
-- and I must again reiterate -- this legislation
was crafted to avoid unreasonable burdens on law
abiding sportsmen and gun owners.

The Pennsylvania Firearm Traffickers
Prevention Act only effects handguns, provides
numerous exceptions for multiple purchases and
will ultimately save lives.

Thank you again for your courtesy in providing a public hearing and allowing us to present our views. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you,
Representative Cohen. Representative Evans.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: I would like to say good morning to you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee and also my colleague
Representative Cohen as we sit here this morning.

Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to indicate that this is not a Democratic or Republican problem. This is a problem of the people of the Commonwealth of

Pennsylvania.

Representative Cohen and I, with others today, join together to try to address what is probably the number one problem, not just in this state, but in the country.

And in my view, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the reason I stress the importance that this is not an issue of Democratic or Republican is because I think too often too many times in this particular process we have a way of pinning each other to try to come up with a solution that could benefit all of our constituents.

I would like to indicate to you, Mr.

Chairman, that what Representative Cohen has indicated that the only difference in my particular legislation is in the area of attempting to have Philadelphia have its authority to regulate firearms.

For example, in the city of Los Angeles, they just passed a One Gun A Month Bill in the city of Los Angeles. I indicate that to you, Mr. Chairman, because in my view, the city of Philadelphia needs to have a different type of situation available to itself first.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Mayor of the City of Philadelphia has been in the forefront of raising the issue around lawsuits in terms of gun manufacturers.

As a result of that, Mr. Chairman, cities like Chicago, Miami, New Orleans, and other locations have now moved in that particular area. I indicate to you, Mr. Chairman, that I have also called on the Attorney General to join the Mayor, as he did in the tobacco industry, to also explore the idea of the lawsuit.

I do not believe that this is an issue that the Mayor, who happens to be a Democrat from the City of Philadelphia, should be dealing with by himself; obviously, this is an issue that the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania should also be a part of.

Mr. Chairman, just this week there was the report that came out from the federal department that indicated and talked about all of these weapons on the street.

You heard my colleague, Representative Cohen, talk about the statistics and the percentage of crime in guns in Pennsylvania was 51.7 percent. And in Virginia it is 6.6. South

Carolina is 2.8 with the use of guns.

So, as Representative Cohen has indicated in the case of Virginia and South Carolina, you can see there's a direct effect. I passed out to each one of the members on the committee this particular report, and this relates to the issue that she has just expressed.

In addition to that, this is a public health problem. When you begin to look at the costs, Mr. Chairman, it is costing our medical facilities across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania between 25 to \$32,000 per individual who has some type of gunshot wound.

It is clear to me, we all, as taxpayers, are paying for this. We need to understand that somebody has to pay that bill. And we are all paying for that.

In addition to that, of the 300 something homicides in the case of Philadelphia in 1998, 80 percent of them were used with a gun.

It's clear from all public opinion polls that basically people want some type of common sense approach dealing with the question of guns.

No one wants to take away the right of someone who rightfully has the opportunity to use

a gun. But I am finding -- and I can speak to specifically in my district, Mr. Chairman -- is that we have individuals who now come up because the laws in the case of gun permits are too liberal, and individuals -- and I hope when the police commissioner comes up, he will speak to the aspect about the whole aspect of gun permits and individuals who are running around and whips out a gun permit and shows to the police officer that it's all right for me to pack this particular gun.

In addition, there was a survey in the New England Journal of Medicine that the majority of respondents wanted to prevent criminals from obtaining guns.

Seventy percent of those polled and fifty-two percent of gun owners wanted the government to do something about getting the handguns out of the hands of criminal.

When we specifically asked, 81 percent of all respondents and 53 percent of gun owners supported means to reduce illegal sale of guns.

According to the recent A.F.T. report on gun crimes in our cities, as I indicated to you, 51 percent of the crimes in Philadelphia were traced to Pennsylvania gun dealers.

In my view, by limiting handgun purchasers to one gun a month, we will put gun trafficking out of gun business in Pennsylvania.

I have also indicated to you, that if you begin to look at it, that this is a public health problem. We are paying more and more for this particular public health problem.

We need to have a common sense approach to resolving it. This, again, as I indicated to you, is not a Democrat or Republican, Liberal, Moderate or Conservative. This is about how do we address this problem.

So I am going to compliment

Representative Cohen who, in my view, has taken a strong leadership position coming from a suburban district and standing in the forefront, joining with the Mayor of the City of Philadelphia, the District Attorney, as well as the police commission, that this is a collective effort that we all stand here.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee for allowing us to have this opportunity to speak before you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you,

Representative Evans. Are there any questions of the committee? Seeing none. Representative Evans, you can join the committee if you wish.

Representative Cohen, since you are a member of the committee, you have got to get up here.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Before I call our next witness, Representative James has asked to make a brief statement. Representative James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank, Mr.

Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I first want to say that
I support the legislation that we have this
hearing on today.

I wanted to say major U.S. cities, including Philadelphia, are searching for ways to stop gun crimes and curb urban violence.

The proliferation of handguns and assault weapons on our city streets has reached an alarming rate, and the spread of these weapons is usually a direct result of aggressive marketing and manufacturing by those who actually make the guns.

Holding the gun industry financially accountable for the heavy social burden and financial costs of illegal shootings is one way to

begin curbing the violence.

So I encourage Philadelphia Mayor Ed
Rendell and the Philadelphia NAACP that they
should file a lawsuit against gun manufacturers to
recover the costs of gun-related violence.

Filing a lawsuit is not an attack on an individual's right to bear arms. It is a way to encourage the gun industry to be more responsible in its marketing and more accountable for its distribution.

In 1996, the most recent year for which federal government statistics were available, guns were used in 13,263 homicides and 18,232 suicides.

Judges in Philadelphia handle about 7,000 criminal cases involving guns every year, from illegal possession to homicides.

According to the Philadelphia police, of the 340 homicides in the city in 1998, 273 were with shooting deaths. That means 8 of every 10 homicides victims were shot -- the highest rate of any major U.S. city in the country.

Whether Philadelphia joins a multi-city lawsuit or takes on the court challenge alone, the city must work to be reimbursed by the gun industry for law enforcement and medical costs

resulting from illegal shootings.

Officials estimate gun violence costs

Philadelphia nearly 59 million per year. That is
a considerable amount of money taken from the
pockets of taxpayers.

Many big city mayors seem to be backing off with filing a joint lawsuit against gun manufacturers. But I am hopeful that the NAACP and our Mayor will encourage and consider filing that lawsuit and hope that the city of Philadelphia continues to push for justice and set an example for other cities devastated by violent gun crimes.

In urban areas like Philadelphia, poverty and depression grip our communities, most of which are populated by African-Americans and other minorities.

This is not simply a sad case where a single individual somewhere is shot to death.

This is a situation that affects families and entire communities, and when the problem becomes as pervasive as it has in Philadelphia, then the entire city begins to suffer from the violence.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you,

Representative James. Our next witnesses are the Honorable Ed Rendell, Mayor of Philadelphia;
Commissioner John Timoney of the Police Department of the City of Philadelphia; and the Honorable Clifford Allen, Mayor of Edinboro, Pennsylvania.

Welcome, Mayor Rendell, Commissioner
Timoney, and Mayor Allen. You may proceed when
you are ready.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Good morning,
Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. Let me
begin by thanking Representative Cohen and
Representative Evans for their bipartisan approach
to this problem for introducing the two sets of
legislation and for both making very strong and
forceful statements here this morning.

They covered and Representative James in his statement covered a number of statistics that I was going to quote. So I can eliminate some of them. And they are all in my written testimony, which is being passed out.

Let me say in response to what

Representative James has said in his statement,

that we in Philadelphia recognize that the

solution to gun violence is a many faceted answer.

No one piece of legislation, no one law

enforcement effort, no one lawsuit in and of itself will take care of the problem of gun violence.

We have to do many, many different things. And you know the city of Philadelphia, as Representative James and Representative Evans said, has been in the forefront of contemplating legal action or action where the gun manufacturers enter into a voluntary agreement with Mayors across this country to agree to do things to limit the unwarranted distribution of guns that wind up so often on the streets of Philadelphia, in the hands of juveniles and criminals who have no legal right to possess them.

We are also, as you know, strong advocates of the program we are calling in Philadelphia Operation Cease Fire where the N.R.A. and the city of Philadelphia join to persuade the Congress and the President to allow us to try to replicate -- the first big city to try to replicate what went on in Richland, which was called Project Exile.

Someone who uses a gun during a drug transaction, someone who is a prior felon, has a record and has a gun and is caught with that gun

in a car stop or on the streets, those people are prosecutable under state law and federal law.

As you will hear from our great District Attorney a little bit later, in the state courts of Philadelphia, they do not get the type of sentences they deserve.

Many don't get convicted. And when they get sentenced, they get three to four month prison sentences, which usually is time in.

As a result of that frustration, the city, the United States Attorney, the police, the district attorney all have collaborated again with the N.R.A.'s help.

We went down to Washington and got over a million dollars of additional funding for the United States Attorney's Office. We have collaborated to put together a program that transfers hundreds of those cases a year from the state court where they average, if convicted, 3 month sentences to the federal court where under federal sentencing guidelines, they will get a minimum of 59 months in jail, 5 years in prison.

The City of Philadelphia is also raising significant money to have a public relations campaign modeled on the Richland model so that we

can let people know if they carry a gun illegally and they get caught, we are going to make a federal case out of it.

We are going to send you to federal court where you stand an excellent chance of getting a five year prison sentence. So in Philadelphia, we have tried to attack this problem from many different facets.

We are not just coming in and saying gun control, gun control. We understand and appreciate the role of effective law enforcement.

Commissioner Timoney will tell you about some of the terrific efforts that our police department has undertaken with the A.T.F. that have borne tremendous fruit already and that with Operation Cease Fire, hold the hope of really making significant progress.

But understand -- and Representative

Cohen made this point beautifully in her testimony
-- understand, efforts to curb gun violence that
are directed solely after the crime is committed,
are not enough.

They are insufficient, inadequate to save lives, to help us take back the streets, not just

in Philadelphia, everywhere else. Representative Evans and Representative Cohen quoted you some startling statistics.

They are startling statistics. Homicides by firearm in Philadelphia rose in the decade between 1988 to 1997 by 103 percent.

For the years '96 and '97, they were -over 480 percent of homicides were committed by
the use of firearms.

Last year, thanks in great part to our new police commissioner, the homicide rate dropped to 340. But still 81 percent of those were committed at the point of a firearm.

It's not just homicides though. In Philadelphia, we had in 1997, nearly 12,000 aggravated robberies, 53 percent -- more than half -- were committed at the point of a gun.

In Philadelphia, for the same year, we had 6100 aggravated assaults, 37 percent of them were committed at the point of a gun.

What happens in a city where there's this much gun violence is debilitating and often saps the moral of neighborhoods. It creates an atmosphere often dramatized by T.V. that creates a perception that traps people in their houses.

Just consider in one bloody week in 1998 in Philadelphia, 14 people were shot to death.

Eight of these individuals were under the age of 24.

Earlier in 1998, our newspaper headlines reported that shooting deaths of 8 people in Philadelphia, 5 in one weekend alone.

In fact, when there is an absence of homicide, it is noticeable. There was a 12 day period from April 24 to May 5th, last year where no homicides were committed in the city of Philadelphia.

That was reported in the newspapers as the longest stretch, killing-free stretch in the city of Philadelphia in over a decade.

If you want to see something that is sad and tragic and should make every one on this panel pause, we have a calendar for 1997 that we call Days of Death.

This is a calendar that shows

Philadelphians being killed. Over 8 out of 10 of them by firearms. Almost every day of the year.

You can understand and well appreciate, regardless of where you come from, whether it's Philadelphia or Edinboro or Erie or Easton, it

doesn't matter. You can understand how debilitating that is.

Now, I think Representative Cohen and Representative Evans both said that this is not just a Philadelphia problem. And it isn't. It isn't.

I told you that in the years between 1988 and 1997, homicides by firearms were increased by 103 percent in Philadelphia. For the state of Pennsylvania, that increase was 61 percent.

And we are currently handing out to you 3 charts just for the years '96 and '97 to show you the increase in first homicides by firearms in your legislative district. This is broken down by legislative districts.

If it's dark blue or blue, you have had a significant increase in the rate of homicides by firearms. Gray is neutral, stays the same -- no change -- I'm sorry -- is slashed. Gray is a slight decline. This is for homicides.

This is for assaults by firearms in your district, in your legislative district. You see the majority of districts have experienced an increase.

And robbery by firearm is the biggest

increase, not just in Philadelphia. Look at this map. It is occurring all over the state of Pennsylvania.

Firearms violence is going up. Not just in Philadelphia, but all over the state of Pennsylvania.

We believe that there are many ways, as I said, to address this problem. And we have taken those steps. In 1977, I was the newly-elected district attorney of the county of Philadelphia.

I wrote and helped to get pass the death penalty statute that is on the books today and has withstood change. Unfortunately, that statute, in my judgement, is not used nearly as appropriately as it should be.

In 1982, in my second term as district attorney, I wrote and helped get passed the five year mandatory minimum sentence law for people who use guns to commit violent crimes.

And at that time, I said the answer to gun violence is -- as many of you have said -- to get the criminals who are using guns and sentence them to guaranteed prison sentences.

We have the same public information campaign. I don't know if any of remember Jack

Palance who did the ads for us. Use a gun, get five years in prison. Use a gun to commit a crime, you will get five years in prison.

It didn't work to slow the level of gun violence. And let me tell you the most shocking Pennsylvania statistic of all. The most shocking statistic is that all over this state, Philadelphia included, we have gotten tougher on violent crime.

The district attorney will tell you not tough enough, and I agree. But we have gotten tougher on violent crime. Since 1993, from the years '93 to 1996, the state prison population of Pennsylvania increased by 30 percent - from 26,000 inmates to 34,500 inmates.

So we are putting more violent criminals away for longer periods of time, and we are not stopping the gun violence. You have to understand that.

We are doing a better job at law enforcement. We are doing a better job in our courts. We are building more prisons. We are sentencing more people to prison for longer periods of time. And we are not slowing down the rate of gun violence in Philadelphia or in almost

any other jurisdiction in the state.

This legislature -- and Representative

Cohen referred to it in her testimony -- this

legislature tried to help us in 1995 when you

sought to make it a felony to knowing and

intentionally sell or deliver a gun if a person

had the reasonable belief that the gun is intended

to be used in the commission of a crime.

That was an effort to get at straw purchasing. The same thing that One Gun A Month is designed for. Our own State Senator Vincent Fumo always points to this legislation and says, look, we have given you the tools to do it. We have given the police the tools to do it. We have given the D.A., we have give A.T.F. the tools to do it.

It doesn't work. And Commissioner

Timoney can explain to you in more detail why it
doesn't work. But it doesn't work because it is
impossible to catch somebody -- not impossible -A.T.F. does a better job.

But we catch very few people in the actual act of selling guns on the street. We have increased the number of A.T.F. agents. Operation Cease Fire will increase them even more again.

But we don't catch nearly enough. And when a gun is used -- and we trace now all guns in the Philadelphia Police Department, all guns used in crime.

We try to trace them. When a gun is used in a crime, even if we can trace it back to the original purchaser, John Jones citizen who has the right to go into a gun store and purchase it, that gun was used by Billy Smith on the streets of Philadelphia to commit a felony murder.

We trace it back and John Jones says, oh, gee, I lost that gun or it was stolen from me.

Did you make a report? No, I didn't. Reason for Representative Cohen's legislation.

We can't prove that he is not telling the truth. And even if we tried to turn the murderer to testify against the person who sold him the gun -- and the D.A. will tell you, we are not about to make deals with murderers to testify against someone who sold them the gun -- even if we turn them, often they have no recollection. It was dark. The person who sells the gun wears a hat and sunglasses, all sorts of disguises. It was sold at night out of the back of trunks of cars in very dark streets.

It is impossible to get a conviction under that statute. And you gave us a good faith weapon. You intended to give us the weapon you thought was necessary to do the job.

It has not done the job. A.T.F. is doing better. They are doing, I think, to the best of their ability. But it has not done the job. The only way we are going to stop, make a real dent in straw purchasing in Pennsylvania, is for One Gun A Month.

No question about it. Operation Cease Fire will help, but we have to stop the flow of these guns onto the street before the crime is committed.

Now, I would like to just take a moment to give you some outlook at what straw purchasing does in a city like Philadelphia. And Representative Cohen, by the way, made a very good point.

Many of the guns that are sold in straw purchases in Philadelphia are used in other counties, including Montgomery County. Many of the guns that are sold in straw purchases in Pennsylvania are exported.

One of the great ironies of it is

Virginia and Maryland used to be known as states which exported guns to the northeast - Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York.

Now since they have enacted One Gun A Month, Pennsylvania is exporting guns to Virginia and Maryland. An incredible turn of events.

Let's take a look at what One Gun A Month or Straw Purchasers Enforcement Act would do in Philadelphia. Representative Evans has made mention of the new A.T.F. study.

It is an interesting study. I recommend it to all of you. The A.T.F. study makes it clear that juveniles who commit a very high percentage of our violent crimes -- juveniles and youth up to the age of 24 -- that they are getting their guns, not from stolen guns. But they are getting their guns in recently purchased firearms, recently purchased firearms, recently

Somewhere between a quarter and 36 percent of the crime guns used by juveniles in Philadelphia, according to A.T.F., came from straw purchase sales.

You know, when I was a D.A. and I sponsored the legislation in '82 for mandatory sentences for those who use a gun in a robbery or

assault, in a murder, they asked me about sort of things like gun control, and I said, it doesn't matter. Even if we stop manufacturing guns right now, there's so many guns out there that you wouldn't notice a difference for 25 years.

Well, I was wrong. Statistics show that it's recently purchased guns that are used in the majority of crimes in Philadelphia and elsewhere, recently purchased guns that can be tracked.

In Philadelphia in the year '96, there were 38,000 plus guns sold in our region, in the 5 county region; 9 percent of the purchasers bought 30 percent of those guns.

In the 5 county region, we had 25,000 purchasers in 1996. And the One Gun A Month legislation -- and this is an important statistic -- would have effected 103 of them, 103 of them.

But those 103 averaged 22 guns a year.

And let's not kid each other about the right for law abiding citizens to possess guns.

This in no way limits that. If you are single, you can buy 12 guns a year. If you are married, you can buy 24 guns a year. If you have an adult child living in the house with you, you can buy 36 guns a year.

Representative Schumer, who is now
Senator Schumer from New York, entitled his
federal legislation in the House, 12 Guns Is
Enough. 12 guns is enough for any law abiding
citizen. There is no question about that.

Point 4 percent of all the purchasers of guns in Philadelphia, that is all we are effecting, point 4 percent of the purchasers.

The Philadelphia firearms trafficking task force, a police A.T.F. task force, completed 38 criminal investigations in the last 2 years, charged 63 defendants with federal and state firearms violations.

These 63 defendants involved the use of 650 guns -- 650 guns. About 200 of which were recovered. But 450 -- even in cases where the A.T.F. was successful -- 450 of those guns are still at large in the streets of Philadelphia or maybe Montgomery County or Bucks County or Delaware County, Mr. Chairman, committing crimes.

And when we talk about tracing, understand that 14 percent of the guns that the task force recovers, the serial numbers are obliterated, which makes tracing impossible.

Serial numbers are obliterated almost

always by straw purchasers. So truth be known, right now we can trace 20 percent of the crime guns in Philadelphia to multiple purchases.

But if you got those serial numbers back where they are obliterated, probably as much as a third of the crime guns in Philadelphia could be traced to straw purchasers.

And the problem is that this is getting worse rather than getting better. In the 43 month period between January '94 and July 1997, 608 handguns were purchased as part of multi transactions and later traced to crime related straw purchasing schemes.

But in the last 19 months, that number has doubled. In half the time, it has doubled to 1,217 crime guns traced to multiple purchases in the Philadelphia area.

Now, you have heard about Virginia and South Carolina and Maryland. And the results are startling. They haven't eliminated gun trafficking totally.

I think Representative Cohen, in probably an abundance of passion for this issue, said they have eliminated gun trafficking. They haven't. But they have reduced it substantially.

It's made a difference. It is statistically provable that straw purchaser legislation has an effect.

I want to just give you an example of what some of the people are saying. And we have a complete analysis of the One Gun A Month laws in Virginia and Maryland, which we are passing out to you.

But I want to tell you what a few people have said about One Gun A Month legislation. The New York Times asked opponents -- and I quote, They have the burden to explain to crime fearing Americans why a 12 gun per year limit would impose any offensive burden on law abiding users who may want to use a weapon for target shooting, hunting, or personal protection.

The Pittsburg Post Gazette said last week, and I quote, As with most sensible gun limits, there would be next to no impact on law abiding gun owners. Sportsmen and hunters can purchase the same weapons they always have, and in fact, the law would still let them purchase more than they desire. The cap of one gun a month would be felt only by gunrunners who buy much, who buy often. And after their legal transactions,

engage in illegal trade that cost American lives.

And Mary Lee Bleak, a mother of a 21-year-old who was shot to death in Los Angeles said to opponents of One Gun A Month legislation and I quote, I challenge any of them to dare to complain that this might inconvenience any legitimate gun owners. Just ask any parent who has forever lost a child to gun violence how inconvenient it is to bury a dead child.

And those voices speak loudly and clearly to all of us.

Lastly, I want to introduce something today which Representative Evans made reference to. We commissioned, the city of Philadelphia and handgun control, we jointly paid for a poll.

We commissioned a poll, but we wanted to make sure that the source of the poll was not suspect. So we hired American Viewpoint. And I am sending up to the Chairman a description of American Viewpoint's background.

They have done polling for George Bush,
Bob Dole, Senator Phil Graham, House Speaker Newt
Gingrich, Senator Fred Thompson. They have
represented -- they have done polling for
companies like Dow Corning, International Paper,

Mount Santo, the Sun Company, and the Business Round Table.

This is not a left-wing liberal polling organization. This is the heart of the Republican party giving you this poll. What did the poll show in Pennsylvania about how Pennsylvanians feel about One Gun A Month?

The initial question was, Would you favor or oppose legislation to reduce handgun trafficking by limiting handgun purchases to one gun a month?

Again, I hope these are being distributed to you. But it shows that overall, statewide, 71 percent favor, 57 of the 71 strongly favor such legislation, 24 percent oppose.

In suburban and rural counties because we were worried that you would all construe this as an urban issue, we did what is called -- and as elected officials, you all know what I am talking about -- we did over-sampling in suburban and rural areas.

If you look at the green, if you look at the purple, you will see informed rural suburban and initial rural suburban, just look at the blue. Initial rural suburban is the same 71 percent in

favor and actually only 25 percent oppose.

We asked subsequently a series of questions. And when it was explained that the legislation seeks to limit straw purchases regularly used scheme whereby a person buys multiple guns for someone who has not been allowed to purchase a handgun such as a prohibited felon or an underage purchaser, the number in favor jumped to 80 percent - 61 percent strongly in favor, 13 percent against. In rural and suburban areas it was 79 to 15 with 57 percent strongly in favor.

And, lastly, and I know that no one here takes this into consideration. I know people try to vote what they believe is the right thing for people of Pennsylvania.

But opponents have always said that voting for this legislation would be the death now for any legislature. The question was asked, would you be more likely or less likely to vote to re-elect your state legislator if he or she supported this legislation to reduce handgun trafficking by limiting handgun purchases to one a month?

71 to 16 said they would be more likely

to vote for their legislator. And in rural and suburban areas, it was 71 to 17. So, it seemed to me that the people of Pennsylvania have spoken loudly and clearly.

In Virginia, 71 percent of Virginians favored One Gun A Month legislation when it was first proposed. In the end of the debate, when the Virginia legislature stunned many people by voting for One Gun A Month, 88 percent of Virginians favored it on that day.

By the way, of the American Viewpoint poll, 50 percent of those polled either owned a gun or had someone in their family who owned a gun.

So the legislation, I think is reasonable. It does not effect law abiding people. It does not effect gun owners. As the Times, as the Pittsburg Post Gazette, as the Philadelphia Inquirer, as Mrs. Bleak has said, how can you explain to the victims of crime why we are not for this? 12 guns is enough.

A Florida gun manufacturer said, he was quoted as saying in this long running debate in America about this, he said, I know that guns that go out of our shop will be used to kill people and

maim people, but it's not my responsibility.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I couldn't disagree more with that gun manufacturer. It's his responsibility, and it's all of our responsibility.

It's my responsibility as Mayor. It's your responsibility as state legislators. This is a fair, reasonable Bill that has no impact on law abiding citizens that want to use guns for hunting, for target shooting, or for their own protection.

We ought to pass it. We ought to join Virginia, South Carolina, and Maryland. We ought to be proud that we passed it. We are a gun state, but we are an anti-crime state.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mayor Rendell. Mayor Allen, good morning.

HONORABLE MAYOR ALLEN: Good morning and thank you for this opportunity. The route traveled from my home in northwestern Pennsylvania to the State Capital is starting to become a familiar one to me.

The scope of commitment to serve is not limited to the small community in which I reside.

I serve on several boards and meet in Harrisburg regularly.

And the 300 mile ride gives me an opportunity to the see a great deal of the countryside of this great Commonwealth.

2 0l

And when traveling the highways in Pennsylvania, I like to think of it sometimes as my backyard. Well, maybe we should all think of it as our backyard.

This past year at home in my real backyard, our community was in the news. We were the focus of a tragedy that was reported around the world when teacher John Gillette was fatally wounded as he chaperoned a school dance.

My name is Clifford Allen, and I am the Mayor of the Borough of Edinboro. We are a small community located in Erie County, all the way on the other end of the state.

I am not here to talk to you about my friend John Gillette, nor the young student accused of the shooting. But the shooting has, however, brought handgun violence a little closer to home.

As I watch the Mayor of Jonesboro,
Arkansas only 30 days earlier address the nation

and the world, I never thought I would have to do the same thing.

It would never happen in my backyard.

But yet on April 24th of this past year, I found the duties of my non-paying office to be expanded. I became the spokesperson for my community and tried to portray an image to the world that we were not the kind of place where this normally happens.

That's the reason it was news. It was news because it was not supposed to happen in a small community like Pennsylvania.

Governor Tom Ridge has given us the slogan, Memories Last a Lifetime. Well, I for one do not want those memories to be that Pennsylvania is the place where handguns can be purchased and then re-sold or traded for illegal purposes. You see, it should not happen here.

Speaking about gun legislation is a little difficult for me because personally I own guns, and I use them. But as a municipal official, I see the merit of this issue.

I understand the defense put forth by the gun lobbyist; and in most cases, I agree with them. If you were trying to take my guns away

from me or the right for me to purchase and use those guns legally, I would be speaking against the issue.

I view myself, friends, and family members as being responsible, law abiding citizens who use our guns for hunting and recreational purposes.

It is the person who uses handguns for illegal purposes that gives the rest of the gun owners a negative image.

As we witness in the news, there is an epidemic of firearm-related violence in America today. This is certainly true in Pennsylvania as evident by the fact that in the 10 year period from 1985 to 1995, deaths by firearms increased by some 66 percent.

In fact, if you were to compare the violent crimes committed nationally with those committed in Pennsylvania, you would see firearms are the cause of higher proportion of violent crimes in Pennsylvania than in the nation.

In 1995, nationally firearms were used in 68 percent of all murders, 42 percent of all robberies, and 23 percent of all aggravated assaults.

The overwhelming firearm of choice today is the handgun. The firearm murders committed nationally in 1995, handguns were used in 80 percent of those murders.

In Pennsylvania, handguns were used in 89 percent of the firearm murders. But a little closer to home in 1997, Erie County had 7 homicides with a firearm.

Much different than the larger metropolitan area, but we had a 75 percent increase from the previous year 1996. We had 103 robberies with a firearm, representing a 21.2 percent increase.

At the same time, there were 80 assaults with a firearm. That was a 23.1 percent increase from the preceding year. Our figures may not be as high as those in larger metropolitan areas. But by percentage, you can see we have a reason to be concerned.

As we know, Pennsylvania law places no restrictions and limitations on the number of handguns an individual may purchase. The absence of any legislation has allowed a black market of illegal handguns to flourish in Pennsylvania.

Across the state -- and we know the terms

straw purchasers, those individuals who go to legally operated stores and purchase handguns for illegal re-sale.

Well, they are making large purchases of handguns for handgun traffickers. The traffickers, in turn, are selling the handguns on the street to criminals and juveniles for huge profits.

One worthy fact is that Pennsylvania has become a large source state for the illegal gun market; therefore, it is happening in our backyard.

We are not providing illegal handguns to our children, but to children of other states across the nation also. Legislation must be taken to stem the flow of illegal handguns.

Four cases I'll cite for you in western Pennsylvania. There's a Kevin Dias who used false identification, bad checks, and alias names to purchase 12 firearms at different locations.

Tiffany Dixon conspired with a known felon, Stefan Cooper, her boyfriend, to obtain 11 firearms at 11 different locations. They wrote bad checks on closed bank accounts.

Floyd A. Robinson admitted in a taped

statement that he purchased approximately 7 firearms for various individuals in exchange for money and/or crack cocaine.

And then we had Leonard Ace who purchased 24 handguns, which he traded for crack cocaine in what is known as the Hill District in the city of Pittsburg.

In 1998, there were 778 crime guns recovered out of state and traced back to a Pennsylvania source. The Federal Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms released a comprehensive analysis of the illegal firearms market just this last week.

The report found that contrary to popular belief as mentioned by Mayor Rendell, that juvenile and youth offenders stole their crime guns. Those individuals were obtaining a large percentage of handguns from the illegal gun market.

House Bill 46 seeks to the availability of illegal handguns on the streets of Pennsylvania by limiting an individual's ability to purchase handguns to one a month.

By reducing the number of handguns available, the profits gained from the illegal

sale of handguns will not be enough to keep the illegal handgun traffickers in business.

At the same time, see, I also find it just as important to share with you what the Bill does not propose, as what it does.

This Bill does not affect the sale of long guns or hunting rifles. I think that's positive. This Bill does not affect any agency performing official law enforcement duties, including correctional facilities.

This Bill does not affect persons who are purchasing for a private collector or from a collector series.

This Bill does not affect persons exchanging a firearm from the original dealer when the gun was purchased within the last 30 days.

This Bill does not affect persons replacing a stolen or irretrievably lost firearm as long as they have a police report to prove it.

This Bill does not affect persons buying in bulk from an estate sale. This Bill does not affect persons taking advantage of a special offer where they can purchase two, then have to wait another 30 days before they can purchase again.

In the ten years I have been involved

with local government, I have found that acting now upon a problem prevents me from looking back and wishing I had done something about it.

Also, I found we should sometimes not be so concerned with what the problem is as much as we should be concerned with the solution needed to solve the problem. That's why we are here today asking for you to solve the problem.

I made two unsuccessful attempts to represent my home area in the House of Representatives. So, I can't say I know how difficult the task is ahead of you. I can only imagine how difficult it is.

Throughout these hearings, you will hear testimony from both sides. Your job will be to solve the problem while keeping everyone happy. When I made my run for office, an old man told me that I would not be able to make everyone happy, so just do the right thing and stand behind it.

I hope you will do the right thing, support House Bill 46 and in the end make sure that the illicit trafficking of handguns does not happen in your backyard.

The handout I gave you here today may have a couple typos on it. You can see in small

municipalities sometimes we also act as our own secretary on the weekend.

So please forgive the two that I found. If you find anymore, just circle them. And I, at this time, would like to thank you for your consideration.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mayor Allen. Commissioner Timoney.

COMMISSIONER TIMONEY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Committee. Thank you for this invitation to come speak before you.

Before I spend four or five minutes with some thoughts, let me just point out I am in receipt of a letter from a friend of mine, Chief Steven White who is head of the Pennsylvania Chief of Police Association who fully supports this Bill, the one legislation.

I have over the last two or three months spoke to numerous chiefs throughout the state, that both verbally and in writing, have made commitments to get this legislation passed.

In 1990, in New York there were 2300 people killed in that city, an all time record of homicides.

In 1991, a year later, we did an analysis of all guns ceased by the New York City Police Department, about 18,000 guns. Of the 2300 homicides, 75 percent in 1990 were committed by guns.

And of the 18,000 guns recovered by the New York Police Department upwards of 85 to 90 came from five southeastern states, source states as they are called.

And so while we had an outrageous record in homicide, we at least have the Yankee smug satisfaction of saying, well, it wasn't homegrown, they came from the south. And if they only got their act together down there, that we would be okay.

Over the last couple of years, New York has done a good job in reducing the homicides.

But received some help from states such as Virginia; whereas, before Virginia had been the main source state for guns coming to New York.

That has now receded, and is quite helpful to the efforts of New York.

About two years ago, the A.T.F. did an analysis of the homicides and guns recovered by the Philadelphia Police Department.

Over the last couple of years, the homicide rate by guns in Philadelphia has maintained its level in the low 80's - 82, 83, 81 percent.

This year, unfortunately, we are running at an 87 percent rate of gun homicides. When A.T.F. did an analysis of the guns recovered by the Philadelphia Police Department two years ago, upwards of 80 - 85 percent of all the guns came from the state of Pennsylvania, and in some cases the city of Philadelphia.

So we don't even have the smug satisfaction of blaming it on the south. This is a homegrown problem that we are hoping, through passing this legislation, you will help give us some relief.

I know there is a lot of rhetoric surrounding this Bill, and that it is people and not guns that cause the mayhem in Philadelphia and in Pennsylvania.

Let me give you two cases in point that I think highlight the importance of this legislation and what, in fact, the whole idea of strawmen purchasers are doing.

About two years ago in February of 1997,

Police Officer Jamal Delaney from the 18th
District in West Philadelphia was shot six times
with a .380 automatic weapon.

Fortunately, he, in turn, returned fire and killed the assailant. But that gun, the .380, was one of at least a dozen purchased by a so-called legitimate citizen that somehow wound up on the streets of Philadelphia and engaged in the drug trade.

Just a few months ago in September of this year a young woman, again in West Philadelphia, a 19-year-old in a fit of depression -- we will never understand the reason why -- but in a fit of depression killed her three 2-year-old son triplets, and then turned the gun on herself. That was in September.

The Philadelphia Police Department and A.T.F. two months prior to that had arrested two so-called legitimate citizens up in the Germantown area of Philadelphia for the straw purchase of 90 guns.

We recovered 23 of those 90 guns. But one of those guns made its way to West Philadelphia and into the hands of that woman where she took her three kids' lives and her own.

There's been a lot of rhetoric and accusations, especially against my boss to my left here, that somehow he is attacking the Constitution and the Second Amendment, the Right to Bear Arms by calling for a piece of reasonable legislation.

And nothing can be further from the truth. The average citizen can still purchase one gun a month, 12 a year, 144 after 12 years. Why in God's name you need more than 144 guns after 12 years is beyond me.

But I think if we are ever to get the violent crime and the homicides under control in this state and in the city of Philadelphia, we need your support on H.R. 46.

So I implore you to think hard and impress upon your colleagues the importance of this piece of legislation. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you Commissioner
TImoney. Are there any questions? Representative
James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you all for testifying. Either the Mayor or the Police Commissioner, I guess, can answer this.

Subsequently and not too long ago -- I forget what year -- we passed legislation. Of course most of the Philadelphia Representatives were kicking and screaming that we didn't want this to happen in Philadelphia.

As a result of that, people were able to go and purchase and get gun permits. Do you have those statistics in terms of what the gun permits were before that legislation was passed and now what it is?

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: I am going to let the Commissioner answer that. But let me just make it clear what Representative James is talking about.

As you may recall, Philadelphia passed a very difficult permit to carry law. We did it under our local ordinance power. Subsequent to that, the legislature preempted that law and removed it from the books.

COMMISSIONER TIMONEY: Since that law was repealed and sent back, the number of permits issued by the Philadelphia Police Department is now five times what it was back then.

But I have put together, under an attorney who works with me, Brad Richmond, a

committee that reviews these permits and tries to, when possible, revoke some of them.

And Brad has been doing a great job. But let me give you one case in point which kind of highlights almost the futility of this.

A man showed up at one of the local hospitals in Philadelphia. He was wrapped in silver foil with an emmet coming out of his head. And he maintained that Indian drug dealers were beaming him with rays.

And when they took the silver foil off of him, he had a gun. And the police were called. And, of course, we took the gun. We confiscated the gun.

He was a bonafide pistol permit carrier. When we revoked his right to carry a permit, that revocation was appealed. It was apparently under the law, if we take you to a hospital to be examined, we have the right to take it.

But if you voluntarily surrender as he did to hospital authorities, it is in dispute. So that case is one example of so-called legitimate citizens of getting permits who may not be in the right state of mind.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: If I can take

you back on that question, Representative Evans' legislation again would ask for Philadelphia to have the right to do some of these things.

And, although, that would be a step in the right direction, it wouldn't cure our problem either. Because that would set up the situation that occurs in Chicago.

Chicago has very difficult laws to purchase handguns in. And Mayor Daley just filed against the gun manufacturers. Separate from any of the other Mayors who filed suit, his complaint was that gun manufactures flooded the suburban gun stores because they full well know that this is a way to circumvent Chicago's tough laws.

So, although One Gun A Month for Philadelphia would be a step in the right direction, it won't cure the problem. Montgomery County will then be exporting guns into Philadelphia.

And I don't think Representative Cohen wants to see that. You don't want to see that. You don't want to see that. You don't want to see Delaware County export guns into Philadelphia either.

I think this should be done on a state-wide basis. Just as you all felt that our

law was not right to set up a different standard,

I think it should be done on a state-wide basis.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Any other questions?

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Mayor, I heard

your testimony that 340 homicide victims in '98

and 272 committed with a firearm. How many of

those firearms have been traced back to straw

purchasers?

You may have stated that.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: It's roughly 20 percent. But understand that we can't trace all guns for a lot of different reasons. And if you factor in the obliteration of guns, I testified that 14 percent of all the guns be examined and try to trace the serial numbers is obliterated.

That is almost always done by straw purchasers because it makes the item more valuable to sell and protects them.

COMMISSIONER TIMONEY: There are two of the populations, there is some kind of noble there. But the homicide victims by gunshot is one sometimes we recover the gun, sometimes you don't.

What the A.T.F. does as far as tracing the guns that are recovered, whether it is at a homicide or during a robbery or just on a gun

arrest itself, so there are two entirely different populations. There is some overlapping.

REPRESENTATIVE DALEY: Is there any statistics or information as to the re-use of guns, handguns committing multiple, separate homicides?

COMMISSIONER TIMONEY: Yes. We have a system where we can check bullet casings. And we have come up with quite a few hits of guns used in multiple homicides. The most recent being last week -- I don't fully understand myself.

I have the documents on my desk. But we have traced a gun amongst a bunch of guns, sometimes two guns are used in a homicide, three used in different homicides.

What we linked up are nine homicides in Philadelphia over the last two years with one or two guns.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: As you may recall, Representative, the University of Pennsylvania had in September of 1997 an extraordinarily high jump in armed robberies in the Penn Campus area.

I know all of the Philadelphia area
Representatives recall that. They normally have

one or two a month. And they went to 27 in that month. In one case a student was shot and almost killed, fortunately survived.

Police finally made an arrest. And the three juveniles that were arrested all had firearms, all used in 22 of the 27 robberies - 22 of the 27 robberies.

All point to the same guns, all of which came from straw purchasers.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Representative Petrarca.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: Mayor, gentlemen, I don't support this legislation with all due respect to Representative Evans and Cohen and quite frankly everyone in the room. I think this is once again another infringement on the Constitutional right of law abiding Pennsylvanians.

You say that one gun a month legislation is reasonable and it's necessary. Again, you mentioned or eluded to the legislation passed a few years ago that was going to solve this problem.

Why not one gun every six months or one gun every nine months? I feel we will be back

here in a couple years, once again, trying to pass legislation to solve the problem in Philadelphia that has not reached those levels around the state as in Philadelphia.

I looked at your statistics. And in my area certainly on two out of the three, there's been a decline. And, in fact, in the Philadelphia area on at least I believe one out of the three there seems to be a decline in robberies or homicides with firearms.

So, my question is, where does this stop?

And, again, why not even go further and try to

infringe upon the Constitutional rights, why not

try to ban all handguns?

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Let me respond. First off all, I think as Mayor Allen said in his testimony, the 66 percent increase in deaths by firearms in the state of Pennsylvania, unless I am wrong, should be a concern to everyone, not just people in Philadelphia.

If you look at those charts carefully, the majority of your legislative districts have seen an increase, as Mayor Allen said for the area, have seen an increase in robberies by firearms, in assaults by firearms, and in homicide

by firearms.

If you look at those polls, and we gave the actual hard copy of the poll to the Chairman, each of you have a summary. It hardly matters where you come from. People in this state want controls over straw purchasing of guns.

And we have picked one gun a month because it is, in our judgement, a reasonable place to draw the line. And let me say to you, Representative, and all people who raise Constitutional argument -- let me say to begin with, all legislation draws the line somewhere.

So to attack legislation for drawing a line, you would have to attack almost everything you do as legislator because you are always drawing a line somewhere.

How much money should be granted to this program? You draw a line. What percentage of tax incentives we should get? You draw a line. How much of a tax cut or how much of a reduction of workers' comp. should we do? We draw a line.

Could we come back and ask for a further reduction of workers' comp. or a further tax cut? Sure, and you often do. But that is not a reason for attacking any one piece of legislation.

Let me talk about the Constitutional aspect of it. The people who are proponents of the Second Amendment, and they are good people. I was criticized by a number of people in the gun control movement for starting Operation Cease Fire with the N.R.A. for joining with Charleton Heston at a number of different press conferences.

And I believe that is a bunch of bunk. I believe my job is to stop gun violence in Philadelphia. And anybody who wants to help us do that is somebody who I consider to be an ally. And I will take an ally on one cause who is against me on another.

But what makes the proponents of not banning, not putting any limits on guns, what makes them think that the Second Amendment alone in all of our amendments, in all of the Bill of Rights, has no limitation?

We know the First Amendment has limitations. The First Amendment has a limitation. You cannot, with malice, tell an untruth about a public official and claim freedom of the press. You cannot.

You cannot go into a meeting -- if someone were to come into this meeting, a gun

control advocate or a gun control opponent and start screaming and yelling and making a speech that drowned out the witnesses, we can have that person removed because there are limits to the First Amendment.

You can't cry fire in a crowded movie theater. There are limits to the First Amendment. There are limits to the Fifth Amendment. There are limits to the Eighth Amendment.

There are limits to the Fourth Amendment.

And, yes, there are limits to the Second

Amendment. You are allowed to limit the Second

Amendment.

It is not sacrosanct above all amendments. Those limits should be fair and reasonable and responsible. You would not sit here and contend that we should allow people to buy surface-to-air missiles and keep them in their homes. I assume you would not permit that.

So we are limiting the rights under the Second Amendment. You would not sit here and allow people to buy nuclear warheads and hold them in their house, the richest millionaire who wanted to equip himself with nuclear warheads. You would support the state's right to prohibit that type of

conduct.

So it's not that the Second Amendment can't be limited, of course it can. It's where we draw the line. And please and I don't mean to be a smart aleck.

But what would you say to that lady who said, what's wrong with 12 guns a year? What's wrong with one gun a month? How does that limit a hunter? How does that limit a target shooter? How does that limit someone who wants to have a gun for their own protection?

Representative, this is a responsible and reasonable attempt to draw a line that doesn't infringe on people who want to have guns, to our law abiding citizens who want to have guns.

Let's begin this road together. Just like I was willing to go down the road with Charleton Heston and the N.R.A. because I believed it was good for Philadelphia.

And I took some criticism from that from some of my natural allies, some of whom are in the room today. Let's be bold. Take some criticism from some of your natural allies because this is reasonable and responsible.

And as Pennsylvanians, we have to look at

reasonable and responsible solutions to problems.

This doesn't take guns out of law abiding

citizens' hands. It simply doesn't.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Representative Evans.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Mr. Mayor or the Police Commissioner, this is a follow-up to Representative James' question in terms of the number of gun permits that are on the street, which obviously in my district I hear police officers who are concerned when they raid corners and suddenly people pull out their gun permits.

Has anyone looked at Act 17 in terms of the impact this has had since 1995 in terms of putting more guns on the streets, in terms of state law makers and what we exactly have done as a result of change of policy?

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Act 17 is?

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Act 17 was 1995.

It was the Act that basically preempted the City
of Philadelphia's power, basically at the state
level.

COMMISSIONER TIMONEY: Again, I don't have any statistics at hand. Let me just tell you a comparison I can make.

On more than one occasion in the last

year since I have been here, there have come across my desk a legitimate person, the average man or woman in North Philly, West Philly, South Philly where their home has been burglarized and jewelry had been taken or a T.V., what have you, and also two or three guns that were in the hands of legitimate citizens that are now on the street.

I don't have any hard data.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: What I think would be helpful in this process, I am talking to the Chairman, trusted chief counsel, one of the things I think we sometimes miss in this process is a review of legislation.

We need to look at what has happened since 1995 with that act in terms of impact upon the city of Philadelphia and changes made so that we don't add to your problem.

I don't think we in the legislation should add to your problem in terms of dealing with this issue. As you indicated, no, it is not just lawsuits. It's not One Gun A Month. It's just an N.R.A. issue.

It is the number of issues. So I see this hearing, Mr. Chairman, as an opportunity in addition to Representative Cohen's bill and my

Bill, it is for us to have a discussion to try to come up with something, to see exactly what has happened since 1995 when that legislation passed.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: The clearest issue is what the Commissioner said in answer to one of your earlier questions, that we are now approving five times more permits to carry than before.

And that means in terms of citizens who can carry on the street. It's had a tremendous impact. And generally every law enforcement personnel in the country will tell you the more people who carry, the more problems you are going to have.

If it's not traditional criminal problems, you are going to have road rage problems. You are going to have argument problems.

I know it strikes all of you and it strikes me as particular poignant because it happens a lot in Philadelphia and, obviously, happens in Edinboro.

When kids take guns and settle problems for a dispute over a girl. I don't know what the underlying problem was in Edinboro. The problems

that when we were kids we used to settle with our fists or maybe settle with a rock and now we are settling them 9 millimeter automatic weapons that can pump 45 bullets into the chest of another teenager.

And so I think the prevalence of people carrying is very disruptive, number one. But, number two, on this legislation, remember what we are targeting here is not who have the right to carry, not lawful, not people who have the right to purchase.

John Jones goes into a Philadelphia or Montgomery County or Delaware County gun store and buys 15 - 9 millimeter automatic pistols. Folks, you don't have to be a rocket scientist to understand he is not giving them out as presents. He is not buying them because he feels strength in numbers.

He is going to, at the appropriate time, put them in car, take them to some neighborhood in Philadelphia, open that trunk, stop the first guy and say, I have guns for sale.

And within an hour, he will sell those 15
- 9 millimeter automatic pistols for 200 to 300
percent to felons who can't buy them legally and

who may have had a gun and lost it or to juveniles, to young people.

And that's what we are trying to stop here. That's what we are trying to stop here.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: My last question is, the whole cost aspect, the whole health aspect to the Mayor in terms of your budget, what do you see in the terms of public health cost?

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Well,
Representative James in his statement used a
figure that I think he got from Donna Cooper. We
have been looking at what the cost is on a yearly
basis.

We estimate the cost -- and most of our public house costs are social. Welfare structure costs of 58 million dollars a year of gun violence to the city of Philadelphia.

If you added the unreimbursed costs that hospitals in Philadelphia give because of gun violence, it's close to 100 million dollars on an annualized basis.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Does anybody else have response to that?

HONORABLE MAYOR ALLEN: From a small municipality, we are more worried about public

safety. Naturally, our budget is much, much smaller.

It's not really an issue budget-wise for us as much as it is a public safety issue.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Representative Cohen.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner Timoney, something just hit me. Mayor Rendell had mentioned that we draw the line on legislation.

One of the things that we also do is weigh and measure certain factors when we do legislate.

We know that for every victim, at least 10 people are affected. For every victim of a gun shooting, at least 10 people -- family members, community members, friends, teachers, the entire community -- a minimum of 10 people are affected.

Do we know the number of people in the last year or two, three, four years who have made multiple handgun purchases? It seems to me those numbers would be easy to glean. How many people have gone into gun shops, legitimate people, people who can pass the background check and made multiple purchases of handguns in Pennsylvania?

COMMISSIONER TIMONEY: I do not have

those statistics on me right now. I am sure -- I know the one that tracks that is the A.T.F. I am sure that information is readily available.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: My point is to address what Representative Petrarca took issue with, not only to the Second Amendment, but people who are affecting.

And it seems to me -- and I will be willing to bet dollars to donuts that the number of people who make these multiple purchases would be insignificant compared to the number of people that are affected.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: There's no question. Remember my testimony of the 25,000 purchasers in the Philadelphia region for 1996, only 103 would have been effected by this legislation.

But yet, those 103 bought close to 2400 guns. Only 103, point 4 percent, point 4 percent. And if we have to draw the line, that's a pretty reasonable line to draw.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: So we are not affecting that many people by this legislation, not many purchasers, on the other hand, we are effecting hundreds, thousands, maybe millions of

victims that's effected by the results of these purchasers.

HONORABLE MAYOR ALLEN: If I could add one comment for you. Speaking of just one shooting, naturally I don't think it was a straw purchase, it was just maybe an ill-placed handgun in a home.

If you want to know how many people it effected, I can tell you an entire community.

Last April 24th, the people that turned out for a funeral were down the street.

They had to hold the service in the gymnasium at the university. There were probably close to 5,000 people showing up for a funeral service.

That was one shooting. Even if it wasn't a straw purchase, one shooting with a handgun effected an entire community. And it's going to continue to effect them.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: My family and I are victims also. And I know the tremendous bleeding effect, if you will, that it has on family members and the community.

HONORABLE MAYOR ALLEN: My brother committed suicide with a handgun last September.

And it's something our family will never get over.

I don't know where he got the gun.

That is at issue. But that will effect us for the rest of our lives.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: Operation Cease Fire, has that been underway?

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: In the sheet we handed out, we started in late January and early February. And within a week, we had 15 indictments.

It is our hope to indict somewhere between 250 and 300 serious felons, many of whom have multiple convictions. Serious felons who are in possession of a gun.

Remember, these are not people who commit robberies, murders, or assaults. Because those are still tried in the state court. These are people who just -- the crime is that they are a felon and they are in possession of a handgun or they used the handgun.

They didn't even have to fire it, but brandished it during a drug transaction. There's federal jurisdiction as well as state. We are transferring almost all, not entirely all, but

almost all of these cases down to the federal court system.

We hope to have an impact. And these are criminals. These aren't anybody else. These are criminals. They are drug traffickers or they are people who have had violent felonies in their background.

And if we take 250, even the low end, and put them away for 5 years, that has a significant effect in the number of gun crimes that are committed the city of Philadelphia.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: The Instant Check System just went into effect.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: So they don't make this legislation premature?

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: No, I don't think so. Again, remember -- and I think it's important because we have tried to look at all aspects of this.

And I think probably more than any big city in America, we haven't put our eggs in one basket. We have really got a police commissioner who has got his people really cracking down on guns.

The Philadelphia A.T.F. police task force is one of the models for the entire country. They are written up in their nationwide A.T.F. reports who started Operation Cease Fire.

I have very little crawl with you.

Again, I wrote the mandatory sentencing

legislation for people who commit serious crimes
with guns.

District Attorney Abraham will tell you how judges routinely find ways around that in Philadelphia, not just in other parts of the state, but in Philadelphia.

So I agree with you. Gun control measures themselves are not the sole answer. We have to have a multiple-tier front attack. But you cannot do them solely, as Representative Cohen said, by going after things after the crime is committed.

We have got to stop the flow of guns going from legitimate gun shops into the hands of juveniles who have no right to possess gun, no Constitutional right or any other right, or prior felons who have forfeited their Constitutional right to possess guns.

And that's what we are talking about

here.

MR. PRESKI: Mayor, the one question I had for you is this, after the N.R.A. convention in Philadelphia, after you came out with these proposals, one thing that Mr. Behney said during his research on the legislation was there's enough laws on the books already. Why don't you enforce them?

You have eluded to the fact that you have helped write the Mandatory Sentencing Act. One thing that we constantly hear from the opponents is this -- I think this was detailed in the series of Inquire Articles -- you would have 50 stories where there was a gun point robbery and aggravated assault where the victim was shot.

Ultimately, the court convicts of the robbery or aggravated assault, but doesn't convict of the underlying gun effect. Basically, they set up the situation where, okay, you were shot, but the person didn't use a gun to commit it.

Have you had any discussion with the courts in these negotiations or has the district attorney -- maybe she can answer this later -- to kind of get around that problem.

I mean, we have consistently heard that

the laws are there, the law should just be enforced.

One of the things I heard from the committee today is it's better to dump new laws on top of the old laws, when maybe they will find specifics, the judges will find ways around it.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Well, again, we should do both. The judges should enforce the mandatory sentencing law for people who commit violent crimes with guns.

But doesn't it bother you when John
Jones, lawful citizen, no record, goes into a gun
store, buys those 12 automatic 9 millimeter
pistols and sells them knowing they are
instruments of death, knowing that they can maim
people?

He should be punished as well. You tried to address that as a legislature. And I give you credit for it back in 1995 with the statute that I read.

It just doesn't work to stop the flow. We catch them. And we have done a better job catching them. You heard my statistics about the increase in state penitentiary population from --what was it? 25 to 24 to 30,000 or 32,000, a 30

percent increase.

We were doing a better job in law enforcement. What you cite is a problem. But overall, we are doing a better job in law enforcement.

A.T.F. is doing better than it's ever done. And remember, in 43 months there were 600 crime guns that were traced to multiple purchasers. In the last 19 months, as we are doing better job, as A.T.F. is cracking down, that increased to 1200 -- 1200 in 19 months -- when in the previous 43 months it was only 600.

So we are doing a better job in the area that you want us to do a better job in. But we still need this law. We don't need a whole packet of new laws.

We are not here saying outlaw this, out law that. This is a very reasonable law. It does not effect any law abiding citizen.

There doesn't seem to me to be a rational argument for it. The Constitutional argument, as I said, which is always raised. Charleton Heston said and I quote, One gun a month is not an outrageous concept, but it is unconstitutional.

Charleton Heston is a good guy, I like

him. But he is not a constitutional scholar. He is not. I mean, he has those 12 Commandments on a tablet.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Ten.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: There are a couple other that apply to me. He didn't have the U.S. Constitution on that tablet. I am being serious.

This is a law that addresses the problems that you tried to address back in 1995. And the law you passed and you gave us, we can't enforce for the reasons I said.

MR. PRESKI: That's my question. Has the court given you --

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: That is not a court problem. The Mandatory Sentencing Law for crimes like robbery at the point of a gun is a court problem in Philadelphia.

But the law you gave us that makes it a crime for someone to knowingly, intentionally sell a gun to somebody else when they know that they are going to use it for a crime, that is absolutely impossible for us to enforce.

One, for the reason I said because it's

very difficult to prove that the original buyer sold it to someone. He says he lost it. He said it was stolen from his car, who knows.

16l

But secondly, even if he sold it to someone, we have to prove that when he sold it, he knew that that person intended to commit a crime. If the person said to him, man, I need a gun. It's tough out here, I need a gun to protect myself, he's in the clear.

So your attempt to help us in this area didn't work. And the Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina experience absolutely makes it clear, this law will have an effect.

It will have an effect on the gun traffickers. It will have an effect on juveniles and felons who need to buy guns from the gun traffickers.

It will not have an effect on law abiding citizens who want to possess a gun.

MR. PRESKI: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Representative Orie.

REPRESENTATIVE ORIE: I just have one question in regards to this. I am curious to know, you mentioned Maryland and South Carolina to the states that have this --

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: And Virginia.

REPRESENTATIVE ORIE: My question is, you eluded to the straw purchasers, this was a small percentage that you are dealing with that is purchasing mass amount.

3|

My concern would be, my background as a prosecutor, what stops them from going to these other states, outlying states, and bringing it in?

These are individuals that have small percentage and will not, I guess --

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: That's an excellent question. And the honest answer to that is nothing. And that is why contemporaneously being here -- I was in Washington in September testifying for federal One Gun A Month legislation.

You are absolutely right. It does have an impact. The U.S. Attorney for Northern Virginia, Mary Fehey has said that it has had a dramatic impact.

Commissioner Timoney gave me the statistics in New York who stopped Virginia and Maryland from being exporting states, from being producers, from being sources.

We have got to chip away. If we can't

pass federal legislation, we have to chip away at gun legislation one state at one time.

And we have done Virginia and Maryland and South Carolina. Now I think we need to do Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York; although, as the Commissioner is about to tell you, I am sure New York and New Jersey have much stricter gun laws across the board than we do.

COMMISSIONER TIMONEY: The unfortunate part in all of this -- I was speaking to a colleague about two weeks ago up in New York.

And, again, those five southern states were always on the radar screen.

They are starting to disappear. And what has come on the radar screen now as a source state New York is Pennsylvania. And it didn't exist three and four years ago.

Now, it is up at six percent and climbing. And so now you are going to have the dubious distinction of Pennsylvania being the source state for guns going into New Jersey, Connecticut, New York and places like that.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: But that actually buttresses your point. We have to start somewhere. And you are right, if we close off

Pennsylvania, maybe some other state.

But again New Jersey and New York have much tougher overall gun laws. Massachusettes has tough guns laws. Right now the northeastern quadrant of the county, we are the biggest exporting state.

THE CHAIRMAN: What percentage of crimes committed with a gun are committed by a person who has been licensed to carry that handgun?

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: I don't have that statistic. But I can tell you just from my experience of being a D.A. for eight years and an Assistant D.A. for seven years and Mayor for eight years, a tiny percentage of what are called the non-crimes of passion.

If you eliminate the husband and wife shootings, boyfriend/girlfriend shootings, arguments in bars and tap rooms, arguments in homes, if you take the guns that are where shootings occur in the commission of crimes, almost none. Almost none.

Now, husband and wife, those are all licensed guns. And that opens up another issue that we don't want to talk about today. Tap rooms, often -- not always -- but often are

legitimate guns.

Arguments at home, legitimate guns.

Children taking a gun and playing with it and shooting another child, almost always legitimate guns.

But guns committed in crime almost never by licensed gun owner, almost never.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Your focus here is with respect to guns that are committed in the commission of a crime?

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Sure.

THE CHAIRPERSON: So we are excluding those weapons. For example, I don't think I need to have a license to have a gun in my house.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Correct. But you can lawfully purchase it. I expanded beyond license to include people who lawfully possess guns.

THE CHAIRPERSON: That was getting into another question.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: But remember, and I'm sorry to interrupt. But remember, juveniles cannot purchase guns. People with prior records, people with prior felonies cannot purchase guns.

And that's all we are trying to do is to stop the flow of guns in their hand.

THE CHAIRPERSON: The other question, I am assuming you don't have the answer, that would be the number of crimes with handguns where the firearms were illegally attained under current law because you had indicated that current law lifted some of the restrictions that Philadelphia had.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: No. I'm sorry if I didn't state that clearly. The dialogue that Representative Evans and Representative James and I have been having is about a permit to carry.

That wasn't about the lawfulness of the purchase. There are two things, you have to be a lawful purchaser and then secondarily you have to get a license to carry the gun.

So, you can carry it on the street, carry it concealed. If you don't have a permit, carrying a gun concealed is a crime. It is a crime under the Firearm's Act.

THE CHAIRPERSON: You brought up something else. How about where the weapon was purchased lawfully, do you have a percentage of those where they were involved by the purchaser in the commission of a crime?

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Again, other than the crimes of passion and in the heat of argument --

THE CHAIRPERSON: I am excluding those.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Almost none.

COMMISSIONER TIMONEY: Again, it is a hard argument to prove. For example, I'll give you two cases. Two police officers were arrested for purchasing upwards of 300 guns for sale on the street.

The two gentlemen, Germantown area of Philadelphia, 90 guns. Those were legitimate purchases of guns, legitimate purchases of guns that wound up, if you will, the drug trade, the hands of criminals, the hands of teenagers.

So the legitimately purchased guns, if you think about it logically, every gun manufactured is purchased somewhere along the line legally except for burglary or robbery --

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: From a gun -COMMISSIONER TIMONEY: Everything else is
legally purchased. How do they get from the legal
purchase out to the streets? And the answer is,
in some of the cases, straw purchasers.

What we are talking about is removing the

profit from the sale of guns from a legitimate purchaser, the average Joe that goes in, buys 90 or a hundred guns and then goes and can turn it around in the course of a month and make \$10,000 with no problem.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: No taxes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: That's why, when I phrased my question, I said where the crime was committed by the purchaser. I am trying to narrow this issue.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Is violent crimes, again, leaving out the crimes of passion, mostly -- you heard the statistic in the A.T.F. study, upwards of 36 percent of juveniles who commit crimes of violence, their guns have been able to trace those to straw purchases.

If you increase the number by the obliterated figure, it's almost 50 percent. For adults, it is 20 percent. And with the obliterated purchase, it is almost a third.

So, a very large percentage are coming from straw purchasers. And then you have the percentage that come from guns that are stolen, which is not quite as large, probably around 8 or 9 percent.

Very few of the guns, again, come from legitimate purchase, legitimate lawful purchases.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I want to thank Mayor Rendell and Mayor Allen and Commission Timoney for appearing before the committee this morning and providing us with their thoughts on these two pieces of legislation.

HONORABLE MAYOR RENDELL: Thank you for the time and the opportunity.

THE CHAIRPERSON: We are running behind schedule. I wanted to give the prior panel as much latitude as possible. I would like to try to get us back on track.

So each witness in our schedule has been allocated 20 minute. I don't want to seem unfair. But I would like the witnesses to try to stay within the allocated time.

And we will also limit questions from the committee to approximately five minutes.

So, our next witness is Honorable Lynne Abraham, District Attorney for the City of Philadelphia.

MS. ABRAHAM: Thank you, Representative Gannon. Good morning to the Chairman and members of the panel. I think what I would prefer to do,

rather than to read my prepared remarks, I think what I'll do is I'll ask the court reporter and the committee if my prepared remarks may be marked as an exhibit and entered into the record in their entirety.

I think that will save some time also.

It will eliminate some repetition. And instead, I want to concentrate, if that is acceptable to the committee, on some of the issues that have been raised.

THE CHAIRPERSON: The committee will accept District Attorney Abraham's prepared remarks as an exhibit as part of this hearing.

MS. ABRAHAM: Thank you very much.

Instead, I would like to concentrate on some of
the issues that have been raised previously and
may yet be raised in the future.

I think that it's fair to say that there isn't probably anybody on this committee who someplace within their personal lives or their extended lives, as elected officials or otherwise, hasn't been touched in some way by violence committed by handguns, either personally or by extensions to the family or extended family.

And I believe that the legislation that

we are addressing today, the Bills submitted by
Representatives Cohen and Evans speak to the issue
of violence all over the Commonwealth.

Indeed, some of my remarks in my prepared statement indicate that just last month or so a gentleman from Nanticoke, Pennsylvania in Luzerne County was arrested for federal firearms violations for a straw purchase of firearms which later found their way into crime, as well as Lycoming County where three 3 bought 50 firearms as straw purchasers, which found their way into allegations of crime including from juveniles.

I think that this legislation will require some amount of courage and bravery on the part of legislators. Because I believe that some of the issues that were raised by the prior speakers in some of the questions indicate that there is going to be some stiff opposition to this proposed package of legislative acts.

I am going to leave to you the job as I think it's best done to work out the differences between the competing Bills because you do that best.

And I am not going to get between two friends of mine, Dwight Evans and Lita Cohen as to

which Bill is better. I'll let you do that.

But each Bill has specific things that ought to be commended to the body as a whole. Parenthetically, I might add that the eleventh Commandment is thou shalt not regulate gun ownership in Pennsylvania and the twelfth is thou shalt not pass One Gun A Month.

Those are the two Commandments that I think Mayor must have been thinking of on that extended tablet and a half of the formerly Twelve Commandments.

I think that one of the things that we don't necessarily talk about when we talk about crimes of violence is the residual effect on people who don't die. We always cite homicide figures because they are the easiest perhaps to count.

Obviously, you can't argue with a dead body. But what is more compelling to me even than the extraordinary blood bath that is daily committed on streets all over Pennsylvania is the residual effect of gunshot injuries.

I don't prefer to call them accidental because you can't accidentally shoot somebody. Somebody has to put his or her finger on the

trigger and squeeze a certain amount of pressure to make the firearm work.

And as a gun owner myself, I can tell you that accidental -- really accidental gunshot injuries are very few and far between. So, I prefer to call them intended consequences of deliberate use of a firearm.

We call them accidents, but they are not really accidents at all. The other part is suicides. And I believe that we have to very, very carefully look at the consequence of suicide by firearm, which is dramatically escalating in communities all over the Commonwealth as well as elsewhere.

Plus, the accidental shootings of people by other people that I previously spoken of, plus on top of that all of the firearm injuries, the quadriplegia, the hemiplegia, the paraplegia that results from these gunshot injuries, plus the people who have perhaps no outward physical manifestation of their gun injury, but carry the inward manifestation of the gun where maybe the bullet is still lodged in a tissue or close to a nerve.

Maybe the person has the searing memory

of having been confronted with the butt end of a firearm.

I think it's not too far of a stretch of the imagination to understand that while a great many of the crimes committed with firearms are by illegally possessed and obtained firearms, I don't want to gloss over in response to Representative Gannon's question the fact that lawful, quote, lawfully obtained guns are used in the commission of crimes.

For example, I don't want to -- and I know the Mayor didn't mean to do this. But when a person obtains a firearm to keep in their home or their fixed place of business and that gun is used in the commission of a suicide, homicide, or any other kind of act that is criminal in nature, we should very carefully count those acts too because they exact a tremendous calculus.

And I can see many, many cases in Philadelphia and elsewhere where spouses, lovers, significant others use firearms to settle differences.

And I don't know where Mayor Rendell grew up in New York, but in Philadelphia, I ran. And all the kids ran. We didn't use a rock. We ran.

But, unfortunately there isn't any human being who can out run a bullet. And that is the sad fact.

I think also, Representative Gannon, the fact that your question indicates an issue shouldn't be gain safe in that the fact that lawful gun owners are not involved with crime proves that the laws regulating guns -- to me -- targets the illegal users, so that gun users who use guns for hunting, target shooting, recreation, personal protection are not the ones who our gun laws concentrate on.

And also I believe that Operation Cease
Fire will help only in a certain amount of cases.
We have been involved in the district attorney's
office in Philadelphia with a program called FAST,
Federal Alternative to State Trials, since 1991
when I became the district attorney.

In that, what we would do is we would transfer a certain number of cases to the federal government on a small grant that lasted only a few years to prosecute cases. Local prosecutors from my office would be detailed to the U.S. Attorney's Office.

Even when the small grant ran out, we continued that program because we believed that

some of our Philadelphia judges were not -- and I believe this is mirrored elsewhere in Pennsylvania -- some of our judges were not abiding by the five year mandatory minimum.

And Operation Cease Fire now provides funding for district attorney assistants. We have two full-time assistant D.A.s along with three U.S. attorney assistants who are prosecuting nothing but Philadelphia handgun cases.

And I will say here before this committee what I said in Philadelphia. We would not need federal intervention or the federalization of state crime if local judges would do what they were supposed to do.

While undoubtedly, many of our good judges are complying with the law, there are a number of our judges who do not. And the demanderization of gun crimes is a plague on the community.

And it has created the need for Operation Cease Fire, Trigger Lock, FAST or whatever else you want to call these federal firearms programs. If we would take care of business, we wouldn't have to do this.

Similarly, the firearms laws in

Pennsylvania could do a better job had the 1995 amendment not been passed.

I participated on the committee in 1995 to re-visit the gun laws of Pennsylvania. And I regret to say that I voted against that package. It passed the legislature anyway, which doesn't mean anything. I just registered my decent from your committee.

You are the elected body of representatives. This is no criticism of you. But I want to make sure that you understand that my position was and remains that the 1995 laws that Representative Evans referred to weakened the previous gun laws of Pennsylvania, not strengthened them.

It was packaged -- and I emphasize the word package -- of gun strengthening law, it wasn't.

We believe that you will hear during the course of this day from people who advocate either one of these Bill's passage, words like reasonable and measure.

And I think I want to make sure that you understand from me that that is my position entirely. These Bills are reasonable and they are

measured.

Remember our statutes and our

Constitution both of Pennsylvania and of the

United States -- in response to Representative

Petrarca's inquiry -- there have been very few

cases in Pennsylvania, the 1970's, and in the

United States Supreme Court.

I believe the last time the United States Supreme Court addressed the issue of the second amendment -- don't hold me to this -- but I seem to think somewhere in the '40s, somewhere in the 1940's.

So the answer to your question,
Representative Petrarca, is that nobody really
knows what the Second Amendment really means. In
the United States Constitution it says roughly a
well-regulated malitia being necessary for the
protection of the states, the right to keep and
bear arms shall not be infringed.

It is different in the Pennsylvania

Constitution. But I don't think anybody would

argue, not even the most avid gun enthusiastic,

that the state has absolutely no power under its

police powers or otherwise to regulate firearms.

So, I don't believe that we, as

Pennsylvanians, or you, as representatives, have to fear that if you take a measured and responsible step towards the regulation of firearms, you are going to hear much of an outcry.

17l

Yes, you will hear some. And, yes, you will take some heat for it. But this is a case which is measured, not enthusiasts, but in real flesh and blood.

And I think I was terribly impressed by Mayor Allen's poignant statement about the case in his jurisdiction. And I know on a daily basis in Philadelphia -- we just had one of those rare weekends last weekend.

We had eight or nine murders the past few days. And over this past weekend, my chief of homicide came in and said, Guess what, Lynne? Guess what happened this weekend?

I said, What happened this weekend? How many people were murdered? He said, No, you don't understand. It was just the opposite. No people were murdered in Philadelphia over the weekend.

Isn't that great?

Now, for the chief of homicide, who has been in that office 25 years to come to the district attorney and say, guess what, we have

reason to be pleased, nobody was murdered this weekend -- not again saying the previous six, seven or eight days -- that is a sad commentary on what is happening with gun violence.

So I think for all the reasons, including by the way, in part of your package you will see -- I don't know, by they way, the A.T.F. considers a 24-year-old a youth.

But if Henry Hyde said at 24 he was a youth, that was good enough for me. A little humor makes the medicine go down.

The youth crime initiative on 27 communities, so this is all over the nation.

These guns in the back of your abbreviated packet are the ones that are the 10 firearms listed most frequently.

The Larsen 9 millimeter semi-automatic pistol, the Smith & Wesson 40 caliber 40 automatic pistol, the Brico 9 millimeter, and .380 semi-automatic pistol, the high point 9 millimeter, the glack 9 millimeter, the star 9 millimeter, a Larse .380. These are all semi-automatic pistols.

This is the weapon of choice. This is why our police officers all over Pennsylvania had

to now be issued glacks, a little six shot four inch Smith & Wesson was fine from the history of the police officers in Philadelphia until recently.

Now our officers have to be armed with glacks in order to meet the fire power on the street. I dare say when Representative James was shot, as I remember, he was shot because I was the judge who presided over his case.

When he was shot trying to prevent a robbery of a beer distributor at 19th and Moore in South Philadelphia. Then Officer James had a six shot revolver, probably a four inch on his hip and the bad guy had a bigger gun and outgunned him.

And that guy did not get his gun through lawful means. So I think that all of these things commend our attention and lead to the question at hand.

What can this legislation do? In response to Brian Preski's question about judges, the answer is this legislative body cannot do anything about judges, each of whom is independently elected.

However, I have met and will continue to meet with judges to try to impress upon them that,

as a former judge, which I am of almost 16 years duration, I believe it's their obligation in appropriate cases not to give a waiver discount or to lesson the impact of a case because a gun was used or because of some other reason.

Many of our judges are good judges who sentence honestly, but there are some who lower or denigrate the seriousness of a crime. And they are all too frequently on the front pages of our headlines.

But the legislative body can't do anything about judges except dialogue with them. And I would suggest, and it wouldn't be a bad thing for legislators as well as district attorneys, as I have done, to sit down with judges and say ,what is the problem here? Why is this happening?

But from a legislative point of view, these two bills are very strong indicia of the fact that the legislature as a body recognizes the horrendous calculus that suicides, accidents, homicides, and other crimes committed with firearms have upon our populous and are willing and welcoming the idea to step up to the plate.

And I think those things cover my remarks

except for one last things about Insta-Check. One of the representatives -- I forgotten which one asked about Insta-Check.

I believe that Insta-Check is not all that it's cracked up to be. First of all, it doesn't cover the mentally ill. It does not eliminate people with phoney or forged identities, cloned identifications, false identifications, aliases to be trapped by Insta-Check.

Not only that ,but Insta-Check goes through our computer and the gun is already sold long before A.T.F. has the power under Insta-Check to fully check out the person who presents himself or herself to a gun dealer.

So Insta-Check guns, Insta-Check system is okay as far as it goes, but by compressing the amount of time it allows too many people to have guns on the street before A.T.F. checks them out.

I think the other complaint would be that police chiefs will have an additional burden placed on them. I accept that. I think that's part of the process that we have to deal with.

And I am very sensitive to unfunded mandates being placed upon me. So I absolutely understand our chiefs having more resources to do

what we ask of them to do by this legislation.

I believe there is a realistic way that we can do it and accomplish the ends without taking away legitimate gun owners' rights to keep arms and use them for recreational sport or other legitimate purpose.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, District
Attorney Abraham. Any questions from members of
the committee? Representative Evans.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Real quick,
Madam District Attorney, the same question I asked
the Mayor back to Act 17 when you indicated that
you voted against that piece of legislation.

How much of a problem has that legislation been for the city of Philadelphia? And have you been able to do some type of analysis between 1985 and 1999 in terms of that state policy?

MS. ABRAHAM: The answer to your question is, I have not been able to do an analysis because as you might know, Representative Evans, my office's computer is not hooked up.

And the new millennium, the year 2000, we will be dealing with tools that are almost 17th century by comparison. I would like to be able to

do that.

My sense is that there is a body, perhaps A.T.F. or others who may have been able to gather those figures. We have not. But I believe the committee was not -- the people on the committee were not A bad committee. They are not bad people or motivated by improper motivation.

But I think that the law has been severely weakened and that really goes back to the question about separating Philadelphia by the our jurisdictions.

There was very strong opposition to creating an exception to the place in Pennsylvania which contributes 40 percent of the prison population in the state.

And I regret that we were exempted or excepted from that one exception. I believe that if Philadelphia had maintained its separateness, we would be able to track and trace firearms and keep a better cheek on firearm violence than we have.

It doesn't mean it is the only answer.

It means it is a better answer. I know when you go to get a firearms license right now the lines at least for the first year were down the street

and around the corner. Thousand of people were trying to get gun licenses.

15l

1.8

So I believe that thorough analysis is necessary. I just don't have the capacity to do it. I know that that one exemption alone in Philadelphia is enough to cause me concern about creating an island of Philadelphia within Pennsylvania.

That is my only thought. I leave it up to you to do whatever you wish, but I hope it doesn't meet the same fate as our previous gun legislation.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Representative Thomas.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam District Attorney, the thing that led to the 1995 law was this underlying notion that individual counties were constitutionally precluded from creating ordinances to regulate gun activity within the jurisdiction.

And because we could not resolve that question of whether or not the Commonwealth counties should be allowed to do that, we came up with the '95 law.

My first question is, have we resolved that issue? Is there a dominant opinion out there

as to whether local municipalities or local counties are preempted from implementing local gun ordinances?

MS. ABRAHAM: My sense is, Representative Thomas, that under the present statutory scheme, counties are preempted by any state statute that covers the same or similar issue.

It is not just related to guns. It is any act which the legislature deems in its wisdom to pass can preempt a municipality from acting.

And I think there also may be issues of double jeopardy.

Remember, there are questions of whether you have a local ordinance in a state law, you prosecute two different crimes at two times, and the answer is you can't because you would have a double jeopardy issue or what we call in the law companic issue. You have to join all the crimes together.

So I believe that in the current statutory scheme vis-a-vis guns, state law preempts counties. And I think it is desirable for the state, if possible, to speak with a single voice on an important issue as guns.

Because in a diverse state of

Pennsylvania where, for example, Philadelphia is presently the first class city, but I understand Pittsburg is trying to get to be with city counsel and different forms of government, another first class city.

And you have small and mostly rural counties and this vast agricultural state, I think it is beneficial to try to do that, if possible.

But I don't speak for the legislature, so I am not prepared to say under any circumstances and all the time no municipality has the right to have a voice in their own governments.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Just one comment to a follow-up question. One of the things that was troubling to many of us in a state like Pennsylvania, you have municipalities like Philadelphia, Chester, and other municipalities that have a unique set of circumstances when it comes to gun control.

And to that extent, any uniform legislative prescriptions should allow for counties like Philadelphia County to be able to address something that is endemic to that particular county.

MS. ABRAHAM: I think the statute that

was changed by the '95 statute was a state statute. It was not a municipal ordinance that provided for the gun licensure in Philadelphia.

But I think we have to be mindful of one thing -- and you are the legislature, you, ladies and gentlemen can do anything you want under the Constitution -- and that is that Pennsylvania is not a static state.

People are moving back and forth and all over the place. The exitus from Philadelphia to surrounding counties means that you have to be prepared to quickly change laws to meet the changing circumstances.

So there are additional problems of deciding when a formerly rural county becomes all of the sudden a part of the metropolitan area and has its similar metropolitan issues.

I don't know that that is a subject for today's discussion, but certainly it is something that is within the legislative purview to discuss, how you wish, if at all, to exempt certain municipalities or jurisdictions from legislative enactments.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: And you leave it to our discretion to determine when that should

happen?

MS. ABRAHAM: Sure.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: And I am reminded of Act 35, which deals with the public school code in there and guns on school property. We provided a particular prescription for Philadelphia Counties.

MS. ABRAHAM: Yes, indeed.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: And then exempted other counties from that same prescription.

MS. ABRAHAM: Yes, indeed. And, as a matter of fact, my office and John Delaney who is the head of our juvenile -- deputy of our juvenile division, is in charge of all of those cases.

And while we are always stunned by any child or children bringing guns to stool, we are mindful of the unique issues that are in Philadelphia; however, if you have a case like you have in Erie, then people start to worry about, wait a minute, did we neglect to do something?

But, obviously, Representative Thomas, we submit ourselves to the jurisdiction of the legislature to do what is legislatively appropriate under our Constitution.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: And I am thankful

that we have district attorneys like yourself and mayors like Mayor Rendell, because there is also this underlying presumption that because we are lawmakers, we have the answers.

And I submit to you that we don't have the answers all the time. And we need to hear from people like yourself to provide some quidance.

And this is a very difficult issue. I read Article 2. It has never been fully interpreted until today. And so to that end, we are really in somewhat of a right mind.

So, whatever guidance we can get is definitely appreciated it.

MS. ABRAHAM: My desire is really in saving lives. And I belong to, as you well know, Representative Thomas, I go to a lot of -- first of all, I go to the morgue an awful lot and see in stark reality what is happening to our citizenry including very young children and all the way up to senior citizens in their 70's and 80's and sometimes 90's.

And also I go to a lot of the survivors functions, Lost Streams, Living Hopes. And you see the portraits of these kids. And there are a

lot of children who are victims of gun violence.

And also in court, I think what happens is the focus is on the Defendant and the deceased is only a brief memory. And I think about Police Officers Laretha Vaird who was ambushed in a bank while on duty and in full uniform, first female officer to be murdered in cold blood while on duty.

She was ambushed in a bank when she answered a call of a silent alarm. And the three men who perpetrated that crime, two are doing life and the other has been sentenced to the death penalty.

And the gun that was used to murder

Officer Laretha Vaird -- although I believe the

gun was attempted to be made not traceable because

of an obliteration of some the numbers -- that gun

was purchased by a straw purchaser and obtained

illegally by the shooter.

So when you think of the survivors, the moms, the dads, the sisters, the brothers, the sons, and the daughters, when you go to rallies by Suton Shehad, the scholarship fund, and the James Mills of buying guns.

We buy guns every year and folks like

that you really -- Shon So Donlee and all of those other great people who are here and people who are in this room but who are not introduced perhaps, but maybe known to you, Belok Wyum, who is here today, fabulous advocate for anti-gun violence.

We stand shoulder to shoulder because we are interested in one thing. We don't want to limit the guns of decent, honest, honorable citizens to have self-protection, myself included as a gun owner.

But what we do want to do is we want to make sure that the guns don't come into the wrong hands and reap vengeance upon us that we know all too well, stunning in its proportion.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: I thank you for testifying. You basically answered what I was going to ask you. In regard to Officer Vaird, it is a fact that that was a straw purchase gun?

MS. ABRAHAMS: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Were you able to get to the purchaser or are there any laws that can get to a straw purchaser and charge them when that happens?

MS. ABRAHAMS: Right now, as I understand it, Representative James, there are no laws on the

books that address straw purchasers.

And that's why I believe this whole issue has to be explored. Representative Thomas said we are not really in a quagmire, but we are in the dark. We have a blindfold over our eyes.

And we are trying to sort of stumble around and figure out what the law will be when and if our Supreme Court or the United States Supreme Court will address this issue.

But specifically on the issue of that purchaser, I believe the A.T.F. has been looking into that. I am not aware that that purchaser was prosecuted by A.T.F, first, because of the reason that there is no gun law talking about the straw purchasers per se except as to the instances that the Mayor has eluded to, but also because it's very difficult to prove that the gun was bought as opposed to it was stolen out of my car, it was burglarized from my home.

One of the most recent straw purchases was a -- and I mean this with no offense -- the Christian Book Store. That's what it was called. My store was broken into, and these guns were stolen.

So it's difficult to prove that (A) sold

(B) a gun in violation of our federal firearms laws.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Madam

District Attorney, for attending the hearing today and taking time from your schedule to present us with your views on these two important House Bills.

MS. ABRAHAMS: Thank you, Chairman Gannon.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Our next witness is Joseph Mahoney with the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce. Welcome. You may begin when you are ready.

MR. MAHONEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Joe Mahoney. I am senior

vice-president of the Greater Philadelphia

Chambers Commerce.

I am here testifying on behalf of our president Charlie Pizzi, who is down with that flu that has been going around and regrets that he couldn't be here this morning.

First, I would like to commend Mayor
Rendell and Commissioner Timoney and Assistant
District Attorney Lynne Abrahams for their

leadership and their efforts to make Greater

Philadelphia region a safer and more attractive

place to live, work, and to visit.

We share their vision and determination that Philadelphia and Pennsylvania can and will be a top-rate, first-class destination for business, pleasure, and quality of life.

A few months ago, Mayor Rendell addressed the Chamber's Board of Directors. Always candid and never at a loss, he reflected upon a decision he was privately weighing -- a potential lawsuit against gun manufacturers to recover the costs of gun violence in the city.

The business leaders around the room took notice of his concern and agreed that the time has come to address the serious issue of gun violence and acknowledge that our society and our economy suffer as a result of lenient access to guns and poor enforcement of existing laws and penalties.

Since that time, the Chamber has joined with Mayor Rendell and others to promote ideas and programs that can be helpful in reducing crime and violence in Philadelphia, our region and in Pennsylvania.

On January 25, the Chambers facilitated a

program with the Mayor and Charlton Heston,

President of the National Rifle Association, to

implement Virginia's "Project Exile" in

Philadelphia.

The program involves transferring gun offenders from State to Federal Court, where the sentencing guidelines are tougher.

For example, a twice-convicted armed robber is stopped for a traffic violation and the police find him armed with an automatic pistol. Currently, he is tried in State Court where the conviction rate is approximately 60% and where the average sentence is 4 months in prison.

If the same offender were tried in Federal Court, which also has jurisdiction, the average sentence, according to federal guidelines, would be 5 years in prison with no parole.

In Richmond, Virginia, "Project Exile" has had dramatic results in significantly lowering the level of gunpoint homicides, robberies, and assaults. We are hopeful that similar results will be achieved in Philadelphia.

"Project Exile" works to discourage criminals from using guns because of the severe penalties and consequences. We also believe that

lenient access to guns is a serious handicap when a city or state is working to reduce violent crime.

Today, I would like to express our appreciation to Representative Lita Cohen and Representative Dwight Evans for their work in preparing legislation to address this growing problem in Pennsylvania.

I would like to thank the committee too for recognizing that we must move forward in the consideration of new, reasonable, and fair laws to aid in local efforts to limit gun trafficking and to remove guns from the hands of criminals.

One Gun A Month legislation, as detailed in the proposals offered by Representatives Cohen and Evans, would limit a person to not more than one firearm with the 30-day period and would require a background check for the purchasing of more than one firearm a month.

Exceptions to this law would include agencies performing official law enforcement duties, firearms dealers, collectors, and other specific purchases.

The measure also details penalties for failure to report a lost or stolen firearm, and

fines and imprisonment for dealers who violate any of the new gun control provisions.

In another lesson we can learn from Virginia, an organization named "Virginians Against Gun Trafficking" waged a campaign in 1993 to impose new, stricter gun control laws and improved enforcement in their state.

A legislative proposal grew out of substantial evidence that Virginia's weak gun purchase laws were the source of substantial gun running to other states.

Proof of residency requirements to obtain a Virginia driver's license were lenient as well, enabling "anyone" to travel to Virginia to buy a gun.

Further evidence of a rise in crimes committed with handguns and its impact on local economic development provided the impetus there for major support from the business community.

One Gun A Month and parallel legislation to tighten driver's license residency requirements are now in effect in Virginia. Proponents believe their success in passing the legislation was a direct result of the business community's recognition of the impact of violent crime on

economic development.

2 O

The new laws have resulted in some amazing statistics. Since implementation, Virginia's share of guns recovered in the northeastern United States fell by 54% to just 16%.

The percentage of guns traced back to Virginia gun dealers fell by a similar amount. According to law enforcement officials, illegal or straw purchases of handguns, which had made that state the "firearms supermarket" also dropped sharply.

The Virginia State Crime Commission concluded that the state's One Gun A Month statute has had its intended effect of reducing Virginia's status as a source state for gun trafficking and that the law does not appear to create an onerous burden for law abiding gun purchasers.

The Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce is not here today to advocate a ban on the sale of handguns. There are legitimate reasons to possess weapons.

We do not support the violation of anyone's constitutional rights or ability to defend themselves.

We believe that asking individuals to limit their purchases of handguns to one gun per month is not an unreasonable request for law abiding and forthright citizens.

We believe this legislation promotes the responsible use of firearms and will make it more difficult for criminals to obtain handguns and other weapons in Pennsylvania.

I have included in my testimony a copy of an editorial from last week's <a href="Philadelphia">Philadelphia</a>
<a href="Inquire">Inquire</a>. In their commentary, they cite a new study by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, which reveals that one-third to one-half of the nation's young criminals are armed with guns illegally acquired on the street through the straw purchase of firearms from legitimate gun dealers.

The A.T.F. study found that more than half of the guns used in crimes by juveniles and young adults are acquired by others - proof that current gun permitting, buyer checks, and record-keeping efforts are not enough to protect the public.

Locally, in 1997, a total of 2,904 crimes were committed with handguns in and around

businesses and commercial enterprises in the City of Philadelphia.

Even though that number is down from the 3,288 similar homicides, robberies, and assaults committed in 1996, we, as leaders in the community, are obligated to do more than protect employers and their employees, customers, neighborhood residents, and visitors.

We must take another step toward controlling the illegal proliferation of guns in our society. We urge your favorable consideration of the Bills proposed by Representatives Cohen and Evans.

These measures reflect the mood across the country - that more must be done to remove quns from the hands of criminals.

Our society and our economy suffer the costs and consequences of gun violence every day. Crime rates scare away existing and potential employers costing us jobs and new businesses.

Health care costs rise because local hospitals must bear the burden of stitching up uninsured gun victims. Municipal budgets bulge to pay extra police officers to guard dangerous streets.

School district expenditures balloon because funds must be diverted from classrooms to install weapons scanners. Growing businesses find that their investment plans must include enhanced alarm and security systems, rather than expansion possibilities and new jobs.

Company benefits now include armed escorts and cab service for overtime workers, rather than holiday bonuses or child care.

The estimated cost of firearm injuries in pain, suffering and lost quality of life was 75 billion dollars in 1992.

The estimated cost of direct health care expenditures for firearm-related injuries in the United States in 1995 was 4 billion dollars.

The average per person cost of firearm fatalities is the highest of any injury-related death at \$373,000 per death.

In a recent federal court decision in New York, a jury found the gun industry negligent in the way it sells and distributes guns. Attorneys for the families of seven shooting victims argued that gun manufacturers knowingly allow their products to flow into an underground market where they are purchased by criminals.

As reported by a writer for the Ayn Rand Institute, this lawsuit may have set a new precedent giving our courts almost limitless power to shut down the manufacturers of legal and legitimate products.

This is not the direction of sound public policy. For the court to act in this manner is proof positive that legislation is necessary to help control the proliferation of guns in the underground market.

Again, we urge your favorable consideration of laws to promote the responsible use of firearms and make it more difficult for criminals to obtain handguns and other weapons in Pennsylvania.

And I thank you for your consideration.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you for your testimony. Any questions?

MR. PRESKI: I have one, sir.

Representative Cohen eluded to the cost in health care. Have you seen any other costs -- health care is a big one we can all identify. Somebody gets shot, they need to be fixed.

Are there other arrears where you see those kind of same numbers or what is number two?

Is it businesses, where businesses start to put on the boards and windows and everything else?

What comes next?

MR. MAHONEY: I can't tell you from a 1, 2, 3 standpoint and answer your question that specifically. What I can tell you is when this issue was discussed before our board of directors a many or two ago -- and our board is comprised of chief executive officers of a host of different kind of companies from service firms to manufacturers to suburban businesses, city businesses, a whole host and covers the gamut of firms in Philadelphia and the Philadelphia region -- they voted unanimously to support this legislation citing it as a real business issues.

And the fear of crime in our community, they cited as being detrimental to them attracting good employees, to insurance costs, to added costs of business, alarm systems, the bars on windows, everything that you mentioned.

And this is a change for us. I don't think that we would have testified on an issue like this a few years ago. But the issue has become more and more a concern to businesses as an added cost factors.

MR. PRESKI: Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Any other questions to my left? Thank you for your testimony. We appreciate it. And the next person we want to hear from is Dr. James Reilly.

DR. REILLY: Thank you very much. I want to thank the members of the House Judiciary Committee for inviting me or allowing me to come today to speak on behalf of this very important piece of legislation.

My name is James Reilly, and I am a trauma surgeon. What I want to do this morning is briefly give you my perspective on what handguns are doing or how they are effecting our society.

What I would like to do first is give you a couple of things to think about as I go through my remarks because I think they are important to highlight up front.

First of all, firearm injury and firearm death is now at an epidemic level, not only in the United States but unfortunately the state of Pennsylvania as well.

The second thing I want you to consider is that the handgun is the overwhelming weapon that is used in the majority of firearm injuries

and firearm deaths not only within the United States, but within our own state as well.

I would like you to think about, thirdly, the fact that firearm injury and firearm death is a preventable disease. And I say that because we should be very optimistic in terms of our ability to decrease the number of firearm injuries and deaths that we see in our communities.

And the final thing that I would like you to think about is that firearm injury, firearm death and the handgun is no longer an endemic to our major cities.

It is now spreading like a virus into our small towns, our medium size cities, and into our rural areas of the state.

Now, if you look at some of the literature that is published about handguns in the United States, this is a typical statement that you will come across here on this screen.

This one in particular says that of all the children that were shot in this study, about 50 percent of those children were shot within their own homes and 38 percent occurred in the homes of friends and relatives.

What I want to call to your attention is

the word "accident". Because if you look up the word "accident" in the dictionary, it is very clearly defined as occurring by chance, either unexpectedly or unintentionally.

I would like you to think about the fact that there is no such thing as an accidental firearm injury or death. Every single time that somebody is shot with a firearm, it is either due to the specific intent of one person to injure or kill another or it is due to somebody's lack of attention to firearm safety.

There is no such thing as a firearm injury or death that occurs by chance.

When we talk about firearm injuries, we talk about death because death is something that is eminently measured among our society.

Death, though, is really not the endpoint that we are talking about here. As it was eluded to earlier, the person who is shot or killed is not necessarily the only person that is involved with these firearm injuries. There's family, there's friends, there's community, and there is society.

There is physical, emotional, psychological, and financial costs that are simply

incalculable due to firearm injuries. In the United States alone, every year 36,000 human beings are killed because of a firearm.

The majority of these are handguns that commit these crimes, that are used in these crimes. If you look at the data from 1994 and 1995 alone, staggering statistics.

Twenty-nine percent more Americans were killed within our borders in those two years from firearms than in the entire eleven years of the Vietnam War. Again, the handgun was the weapon used in the majority of these crimes.

In 1995 alone, firearms were responsible for seven percent more American deaths than the entire three years of the Korean War. Again, it was a handgun that was used in the majority of these murders.

In 1997, if you look at the statistics on homicides alone in this country, seventy percent of them were committed with a firearm. The handgun was the predominant weapon used in these homicides.

Here is some data that I took from the University of Pennsylvania's trauma center, where I work. And if you look at the years 1997-1998,

we were able to get pretty good statistics on what type of weapon was used in the firearm injuries.

And you will see that we saw about 350 to 360 firearm injuries each of those 2 years and 90 to 95 percent of the time it was the handgun that committed the injury, that was used to inflict the injury.

Now, the spread of firearm use and firearm injury and death is no longer contained within our major cities. Right now I am working at Saint Luke's Hospital Regional Trauma Center in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

University of Pennsylvania helps to manage this trauma center. We have only been operating for a couple months since April '98. We have already seen 12 total firearm injuries.

There are 2 trauma centers in this small community. This number may not seem like it's a lot, but for that community, that is a significantly increased amount of firearm injury based on what they were used to seeing.

Handguns clearly dominate our society in terms of their use in violent crime. Just about 80 percent of all homicides are committed with a handgun and 70 percent of all suicides are

committed with a handgun.

Since 1985, we have seen a dramatic increase in the number of homicides that are committed with the use of a handgun.

And coincidentally, we have also seen a dramatic increase in the number of handguns in our society. Over forty percent of American households have at least one handgun.

Now, when you talk about the handgun, I think it is very important to distinguish it from sporting weapons, things like rifles and shotguns which are clearly made for somebody to enjoy in any of fashion.

The handgun, however, is specifically designed to kill another human being. Whether you purchase one of these for self-defense or to commit a crime, the gun, when it is discharged, is intended to kill another human being.

And it should be distinguished from other types of weapons because of that. The handgun, because of its small size, its light-weight and its ability to be concealed has become the weapon of choice for our criminals.

It's also the weapon of choice in people who unfortunately commit suicide. And you will

see that 70 percent of all firearm suicides are committed with a handgun.

If you commit suicide or attempt it with drugs, on average, 23 percent of those people will succeed. If they use a firearm, it is 90 percent lethal.

If you make it to our trauma center with a gunshot wound, you have about a 90 percent chance across the board of leaving alive. If you are injured in one of your major blood vessels, such as the aorta or the vena cava, you have a 50 percent chance of leaving alive.

Survival is not the endpoint for these people. They almost always carry significant emotional and psychological scars with them the rest of their lives.

Violent crime trends in the United States are significantly changing. They are moving from the big cities through the small cities and again this is no longer something that is endemic to big cities.

This is some data that comes from some of the larger and smaller cities in the United States. We all are aware of New York City's ability and dramatic decrease in the number of

homicides.

But towns like Nashville and Youngstown,
Ohio are now experiencing dramatic rises in their
homicide rates. I think this is very alarming.
Firearm violence is a preventable disease.

It is now epidemic in our communities.

It is no longer endemic to our large cities. The handgun is the specific weapon of choice used in these violent acts and it needs to be thought of differently from other types of weapons.

What I want to do now is show a couple of slides that gives you an idea of what we are faced with in our trauma centers every single day, every single night.

And I don't think that you can really talk about handguns and violent crime without having a firsthand look at some of these types of injuries that we see.

If you can take a minute to set up the projector.

That is a gunshot wound to the abdomen caused by a handgun. There's no blood. It's not very impressive to look at.

That's a picture of two gunshot wounds to the abdomen. Again, not much blood, not much to

look at. If you come into the trauma center with a blood pressure that is reasonable, we will shoot some x-rays to figure out which way the bullet went because we like to know whether you are hit in the chest, the abdomen, or both.

If you are hypotensive, you go straight to the operating room. This is the type of wound we need to make in order to fix the wound that the bullet made.

You can see it is a fairly significant wound. And that is a major operation. This is a picture of the small intestine, which has been shot with a handgun.

This is the type of injury that we often need to repair. This is a picture of a liver that's been hit by a handgun. There is a large amount of blood over the liver.

This patient has a significant injury and has a very high chance of dying. This is a picture of a liver being repaired, again, shot by handgun.

This is picture of an arm that's been shot. This patient will probably go on to have long term morbidity from this injury and probably will not use that arm normal again.

This is a picture of a wound in the chest that needed to be made to repair a handgun injury. And in this picture, the surgeon is actually manually compressing the heart trying to pump blood to the rest of the body.

In this situation, the patient's outcome is almost uniformly fatal. And this is what happens every single night in trauma centers throughout Philadelphia.

This is a picture of somebody who came in with a gunshot wound to the chest, again a handgun, had open cardiac massage performed. And this patient died.

Currently, I would tell you that there is no national registry. We have no idea how many people are injured each year from handguns. We know that it's a staggering amount.

But we can only estimate the cost in terms of human suffering and death and injury in our nation annually.

I am very proud of the fact that I have lived in Pennsylvania my entire life. And I know that Pennsylvania is called the Keystone State for a very good reason.

In 1803, in the Philadelphia Newspaper

Arora, it published that Pennsylvania was the key stone in our democratic arch. And it was said that way because Pennsylvania had provided leadership for the nation in terms of social, political, and economic change.

And I would ask you to consider what you are doing today as a leadership role for the entire nation.

If you take a look at this brief exert from the Declaration of Independence, I think that is something that maybe later today you can look at and go over the words very carefully.

I would ask you to ask yourself how much suffering are we willing to endure as a society and how much evil are we willing to tolerate as a society before we decide that we are going to establish new laws that protect for the future and security of not only ourselves, but our children.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Dr. Reilly. Any questions? Representative James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you for testifying. I think the last slide, I think I would like to have a copy of that for all the people that say that we bridge the Second

Amendment or --

lives.

DR. REILLY: You have a copy, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: I think that's what we need to give the people saying we are bridging the Second Amendment.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Representative Cohen.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you.

Doctor, would you have any idea of the cost? We have heard today of the cost in terms of human

Would you have any idea -- just your hospital perhaps would be a barometer -- of the dollar cost to the citizens of the Commonwealth for you, E.M.T. personnel, etc. to deal with these gunshot wounds?

DR. REILLY: I have in front of me a copy of an article. The source of this is Pennsylvania HealthCare Cost Containment Council. There is a fair amount of variability between hospitals in terms of their efficiency and their ability to take care of patients with devastating injuries like this.

The University of Pennsylvania on average, it costs them about \$45,000 a piece to take care of one of these patients. And about 78

percent of that cost, if you take all corners, has to either be absorbed by the hospital or absorbed by the public funds that are available.

17l

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: I recently spent a couple hours at the University of Pennsylvania emergency ward, and I saw some cases come in. \$45,000 per case?

DR. REILLY: That's on average, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: About how many a
year?

DR. REILLY: Well, we get on average, 350 to 370 firearm injuries a year. Now, we also get stabbings and other violent injuries.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: I understand.

DR. REILLY: But just gunshots alone, about 350 to 370 a year. And it is very consistent over the last decade.

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you, Dr. Reilly.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Dr. Reilly, for appearing before the committee today and sharing your thoughts and inputs.

Mr. John Hohenwarter, State Liaison with the National Rifle Association could not be here today.

And in lieu of personal appearance, we are going to accept his written testimony as part of the record.

Our next witness is Mr. Leroy Jackson. You may proceed when you are ready, Mr. Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: I am going to address my written testimony. If you don't mind, I have heard a few things here I would like to discuss. One thing was, why do we have to take crimes from state to federal government because Trans Dresher gets four months in jail?

Why? We have to go to the feds for that? Justice Renquist just cascaded federal Congress about that very thing. Don't federalize state crimes. Homicides, robberies these are state issues, not federal issues. Not federal issues at all.

Mayor Rendell of Philadelphia said there is limitations on the Second Amendment. Well, there are. We see them every day. They are called laws against crimes of violence. That is all the limitations we need. That is all. Now, I am going to go into my speech.

My name is Roy Jackson. I live in Felton, Pennsylvania. That is southern York

County. I am employed as a consultant of a major manufacturer.

I am a private citizen. I am not a politician. I am a 9-year veteran of the U.S. Navy. I am also a Vietnam veteran.

I am here to testify against the Bill H.R. 46 and the successor number, which is now H.R. 46.

When I enlisted in the Navy, I swore an oath to defend this country and the Constitution of the United States. I believe in that Constitution and all rights guaranteed by the BIll of Rights.

I know that all actions of all the citizens aren't to my liking or to your liking. That's the way it is. That is the price of freedom.

The price that I am willing to pay as a private American citizen and a taxpayer. When you, the legislators of this House were elected, you also swore an oath to the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of Pennsylvania.

Both of those Constitutions guarantee our right to bear arms. I understand the limitation

specified by the Constitution. You swore on that oath. You swore it.

If you don't like it, you can change it.

It's called amendments. Do that. Not by a Bill,
but an amendment.

Mayor Rendell or this gentleman -- this black gentleman over here who I forgot --

REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Representative Evans.

MR. JACKSON: Evans. Anyway, thank you.

Bringing up about the handgun permits in

Philadelphia. Well, the question maybe Mayor

Rendell should ask himself is, why was there a

five fold increase in gun permits in Philadelphia?

And the real question is of that five fold increase, how many of those of which I am one in York County, not in Philadelphia, use their guns to commit crimes?

I feel you will find the percentage is very, very, very low be it a crime of passion or domestic crime or a crime outside the house of -- a regular crime, I guess.

I am a little rough around the edges. I am not used to public speaking. That's the question maybe Rendell should ask.

Anyway, this Bill attempts to limit and infringe upon the very rights you swore to uphold. I am sure one of you will say the rights are not unlimited. Well, Rendell did.

But it is not for the government to determine that. There are mechanisms in place to amend the Constitutions of both the United States and Pennsylvania.

If you want to limit a right, you can amend it. Not that this Bill exempts certain government agencies from the limitations placed upon the citizens. I see nothing in the Second Amendment that gives government the right to bear arms at all.

I believe Thomas Jefferson, the founder of this country, was quite heinous. They did not want a standing in Army. Now, remember, I was a military lifer. So, I have been there.

But to limit a private citizen's right yet grant the same right to a law enforcement agency, no, that's not your business.

Again, amend the Constitution. In the private sector there is a concept known as value added. This means the concept, change of process being discussed lends value to the customer.

This value may be tangible or intangible. The inverse is non-value added. Remember that term. Non-value added. Something like the music out here.

And this citizen declares this Bill, this One Gun A Month concept totally without value, totally non-value.

There is exceptions to the One Gun A

Month Bill. I refer to the exemptions given law
enforcement and sellers of firearms. I also note
that my copy of H.B. 46 allows multiple purchases
-- it's on page 8 of HR 2484, section 2 -- if the
purchaser submits to an "Enhanced Background
Check".

What is that? I mean, if I get one gun, blow somebody away because of limited enhancement, there's no background check. Do the background check. Don't make it because the guy wants to buy two.

By the way, to correct Representative Cohen there, as I mentioned, I carry a permit. And when I bought my first gun, after the Insta-Check came on board, I still had to go through Insta-Check. So, we are not exempt.

This Bill requires multiple purchasers

fingerprinting and photographic records of buyers.

I was fingerprinted when I enlisted in the Navy.

This was for the purpose of identifying those killed in action.

But this Bill expects citizens to submit to fingerprinting in the exercise of their rights?

Come on. Do you really expect us to do that, for a right that we already have? I don't think so.

For the information of these here today,
I used to vote Democrat. I voted for Bill Clinton
in 1993. Then the insanity of blaming firearms
for the crime began. The "demonizing" of the
Second Amendment began.

Clinton and his foolish interpretation that the Amendment was solely for "sporting arms", which it's not.

I mean, we all exercised the First

Amendment today, correct? Of course, we are. The

question is, how do we get that First Amendment?

It's by the government.

Otherwise, there wouldn't be a United States flag on that pole. It would be a union jacket. Is this correct? We would be singing to King George. Hail to the King rather than the Star Spangled Banner.

I would be hard pressed to vote for a Democrat again. The Democrats are the party of socialism, elitism, the party that destroyed the value added concept of personal responsibility.

Personal responsibility, that's what it's all about. We have personal rights. And it's got to be personal responsibility.

So, Ms. Cohen, others, introduced a Bill that results in limiting the rights of the Pennsylvania citizens in some misguided sense that it will reduce crime.

The F.B.I. statistics that we saw earlier say violent crime rates are dropping. A.T.F. said crimes went up. So, I am not really sure who is right.

Perhaps the intent is to stop the terrible tragedies such as those occurring in several schools around the country. We have all heard comments such as "We're doing it for the children."

The school shootings are crimes of aberration. They are not the norm. They are aberrations from the norm.

I realize that that is a cold statement.

It really is. I mean, to someone who lost a loved

one or to a crime of any kind, it's tragic.

But for the school shootings, the offenders were apprehended. They system worked.

So, do this for the children, protect that Constitution because once it's gone, it's gone.

Do not blame firearms for those who misuse them. Do not destroy rights because it is politically correct. I urge each and every one of you to heed my words here today.

I urge each and every one of you to vote against this and any other Bill of this nature. I urge you to vote them down. I urge each and every one of you to resist the temptation to use "feel good" legislation to impress the voters back home.

I urge you to address this, and any, issues in a way that is, in fact, value added for the democracy and value added to this country.

That's all I got. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Jackson. Representative James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: How many guns do you own?

MR. JACKSON: Currently, a .38 and a .22. No, I don't have a .22. A .38 and a 9 millimeter.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: So, do you see a need to buy more than one handgun?

MR. JACKSON: No. Actually, this Bill means very little to most people. We all know that. Most people can't afford to buy five or six hundred dollar guns more than once a month.

So, it is really a non-value added Bill because it is not going to effect anybody really. But, see, I do believe that, like this gentleman who was sitting next to me earlier said, why not every six months? Why not one every one year? Why not just ban them all? Why not?

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: I would like to.

MR. JACKSON: Schumer would love to, we know that. But this is Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Are you a member of any malitia?

MR. JACKSON: No. Don't believe in them. But I am a member of N.R.A. but I am not here in an official capacity.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Jackson, knowing your opposition to this Bill. And I don't want to speak for you, but I am going to assume that you would not want to see -- looking at what this

legislation addressed, the issue of an individual going out and purchasing several weapons with the sole purchase of then re-selling them at probably a very inflated price and not really caring or maybe even knowing that those weapons were subsequently used in the commission of a crime.

And my thought was, you talk about value added. Just briefly, how would you make this legislation value added or what would you propose that would attack that particular problem that we have heard discussed by previous testifiers?

MR. JACKSON: When I received this Bill from Brian Preski it was still H.R. 2484. I picked up one this morning. There maybe changes that I am not familiar with.

THE CHAIRPERSON: They are substantially the same.

MR. JACKSON: To limit anyone, to eliminate the amount of handguns or any other weapons or anything at all, for that matter, you would put up a Bill that if I sold a handgun to a person who was a juvenile, felon, something like that, solely for those individuals, okay, go ahead and do that.

But don't limit my right. Don't limit my

right if I want to buy five a month, that is my business and my money. I can't afford it. But if I could, I still wouldn't.

But either way, don't screw me to get them. Sorry about the terminology.

THE CHAIRPERSON: And I am not trying to --

MR. JACKSON: How would I correct it?

I'll tell you what, I would get rid of One Gun A

Month. We heard this morning that some

individuals have mentioned -- the district

attorney who was here earlier who was incorrect.

The F.B.I. does the Insta-Check, not the A.T.F.

They were discussing that they can turn around situations for criminals in Pennsylvania, which I don't know if that is actually the case. But if it is, tighten them up.

We don't have to give it to the federal government for that. You really don't want that anyway, do you?

They go to jail, keep them there. Don't let them out. Don't let them out in four months. Earlier Representative James said that the NAACP

-- I am going to say something I am sure you are not going to like -- but okay.

The NAACP said about suing the gun manufacturers. The most heinous crimes I have ever heard of took place in Texas last year. You know exactly what I am talking about. You know, Jasper, Texas?

Terrible. They drug that guy behind a truck for a couple miles. Man, how sick can you be? But are you going to sue Ford Manufacturing for the pick-up truck? Nope.

Texas did the right thing. They caught the felon, and they are going to hang him. Yipper.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Jackson, for taking the time to come before the Committee to express your views on the two pieces of legislation. Thank you, sir.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Our next witness is

Andrew Siegel, President of Pennsylvanians Against

Handgun Violence. Welcome, Mr. Siegle.

MR. SIEGEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the committee for allowing me and Pennsylvanians Against Handgun Violence to participate.

I would not at this time repeat all of

the items in my written remarks because many of those have been covered.

But what I want to do is address a couple of issues and fill in some blanks in terms of historical perspective in Pennsylvania's firearms law, particularly some misconceptions that have been stated here today concerning Act 17 and what happened, when it passed and since passed.

I'll try to keep my voice up. I married into a family of musicians ,so walking into my in-laws' house is sort of what I feel like now where there are drums everywhere.

Our organization is a grass roots organization, which lobbies for reasonable firearms law. We don't enforce candidates. We are bipartisan. We do voter education. We vote. We work on helping youth and those types of issues.

In 1994, when the legislature formed a committee, which was commonly called the Fumo Committee, to investigate and to deal with issues of assault weapons, I was appointed to that committee to represent Handgun Control, Incorporated.

PAHV did not have a representative on the

committee at all. The committee went around the state, held public hearings in Pittsburg, Philadelphia, State College and received volumes of testimony and other materials.

When we convened, we discovered that there was a significant middle ground among the committee members. The committee was comprised of people including the sportsmen, the N.R.A., District Attorney Abraham, a representative from the Pennsylvania State Police, Representative James was on the committee, and others.

When we reviewed all of the information we found, we realized that the biggest problem in Pennsylvania was dealing with illegal sales and transfers of weapons and how we had to keep those weapons out of the wrong hands.

The committee then proposed legislation, as a whole. Of the members of the committee, only one opposed the legislation. And the N.R.A. took a neutral stance. They neither opposed or supported the final version of the legislation.

And we, as a group, what I'll call the Fumo Committee, supported that Bill in its entirety. When the Bill came to the Senate floor on a procedural issue, a number of amendments were

made.

And these were amendments, which we knew were coming and which we were very concerned with. One eliminated Philadelphia's heightened requirement for people to obtain a carry permit. Previously, persons in Philadelphia who wanted a carry permit, needed to who a need for the permit.

That, coupled with the Bills -- the decision that persons who had a carry permit elsewhere did not have to wait the waiting period to purchase a weapon, caused us significant concern.

In fact, the provision that's been quoted and that the Mayor of Philadelphia was asked about where a seller sells a firearm and may either be civilly or criminally liable if they do it negligently or knowing, that was a provision -- I am sure Representative James will remember -- that I kept harping for, that we needed this.

That provision has never been enforced.

But what happened was the legislature, the Senate by one vote by a Philadelphia Senator, in fact, who changed his vote, decided to eliminate Philadelphia's heightened requirements for a carry permit.

That, coupled with the Bill's elimination of a waiting period, led to the problem that we are now facing in Philadelphia and throughout the state.

And you can look. The times correlate almost exactly. When the legislature eliminated the waiting period, that took away the time for the federal law enforcement authorities to be able to get the information on multiple sales.

The waiting period was gone. And in Philadelphia it became essentially opening the flood gates. And it was from that point on that we had the problem.

You never heard of Philadelphia as a source of guns elsewhere for multiple purchases until after the act in 1995. There were other amendments that we also opposed on that legislation.

So it's a misnomer for people to say that all the members of the committee supported the legislation in its entirety as it was signed by the Governor. We didn't.

We supported what came out of committee, and we opposed certain amendments. But we felt on the whole on balance, the legislation should pass

because it had some significant changes, including the fact that private sales of weapons, which include the secondary sales, now, finally in 1998, are now regulated Pennsylvania law for handguns.

The other misnomer in that legislation and what we have heard here today is we have the law, just enforce it. I wish we could have enforced the original law.

The Bill was signed by Governor Ridge, one of the first Bills he signed in 1995. That legislation has never been fully enforced in this state.

In fact, it's been amended three times and some of the provisions of that legislation don't go into effect until the end of this year. So it is a misnomer when people say, just enforce the Bill.

We would have loved to have seen the Bill enforced. But this legislation, for whatever reason, has made multiple amendments, including one set of amendments that were passed at 11 at night with no notice to anyone.

I found out about them watching P.C.N. on T.V. because no one knew about them. And the next day I called certain legislators who said, we

found out about it at the last minute.

So the problem that we had historically is that Act 17, with all its good intentions, changed the way people can purchases weapons in this state.

If you had a valid carry permit, you no longer had to wait the waiting period. In Philadelphia, that meant that people were going into licensed federal firearms dealers and making multiple purchasers.

And representatives from the U.S.

Attorney's Office have spoken throughout the city and elsewhere as recently as last week before the Philadelphia Bar Association, whose board of governors unanimously endorses this legislation.

And you have written testimony here concerning that.

And they describe the fact that

Philadelphia, because of these, changes became a
source state.

So what you are dealing with here essentially are the unintended consequences of the 1995 legislative amendments put through by the Senate.

The House could only confer up or down on

these amendments. And it's those changes which are particularly troublesome in terms of what is happening here in Pennsylvania now.

And that's why we were concerned enough to address this in the committee. But gunrunning was never a problem in Pennsylvania.

We had a waiting period. We had heightened requirements for carry permits. This legislature eliminated Philadelphia's right to legislate its weapons.

That was the first problem. The second problem was that the legislature was addressing assault weapons. Push that aside and I believe that the Fumo Committee would do nothing.

Turned out, the committee was very diligent and we worked very hard. And we accomplished something.

Then came the amendments that I have talked about. And then came where we are today. Mayor Rendell, who has always been a supporter of gun control, never was addressing these issues in 1994 and 1995 and before that. And there's a reason.

There was no reason for any of us to feel that that was a problem. That was happening in

South Carolina. It was happening in Virginia.

And we all knew it. Because their laws were more lax.

Pennsylvania has now, through these efforts or accidents -- because I don't believe anyone here intended these consequences to occur -- changed the landscape dramatically.

So what these bills are doing is trying to, one, fill in the loopholes that were created back in 1995 so that a problem that didn't exist previously can be corrected.

The prior speaker told you that most people don't need more than one gun a month.

And he gave a whole litany about the Second Amendment.

But if you listened, everyone agrees that the Second Amendment, like every other amendment, has limitations. I don't believe that anyone who believes that the Second Amendment should allow persons convicted of a murder, who are paroled, to have weapons.

But yet that is not in the Second

Amendment. The Second Amendment, which deals with
malitia, doesn't address that issue. Every
amendment is subject to reasonable limitations.

And that's what's here before this committee. You have heard, well, what if, what if? We could all play that game. That is not what is in the legislature.

And I think it is important to look at the fact that you have two pieces of legislation, one coming from a Philadelphia legislator and one from a suburban legislator from different parties.

And I can tell you, having gone around this state and seeing people, that it is not a Partisan, Republican or Democrat or Liberal or Conservative issues. It's is an issue more of common sense and public safety.

This Bill is going to address the four percent of the purchasers who are abusing Pennsylvania law. That does not mean that people who are law abiding and have a need or desire for a weapon are going to be impacted by this.

And I have heard people ask me, well, why do you want one a month? One a month, from the history now in three other states that we can look at, has worked.

It's reasonable. To go, What if? What about? We can all play that game. And we all know what happens when you play that gun any which

way.

You could take any piece of legislation and take it to its logical or illogical conclusion and we would have that.

This legislation has to look at what happened in 1995 and why the Fumo Committee Was so intent on keeping guns out of the wrong hands. It was the right approach.

And it was the approach that was supported by gun owners. You heard today from Mayor Rendell about the poll that was commissioned through his office.

There was a poll taken in 1994 and 1995 by the committee because we were told by the N.R.A. at that time that Pennsylvanians do not support that type of legislation.

The results of that poll showed that overwhelmingly gun owners and non-gun owners supported that Bill. And, in fact, there's been no repercussions to the legislature about that Bill because people felt it was reasonable.

The repercussions are what we are here for today. We were told, when we got the results of the poll that we took back in '94 and '95, that you asked the wrong question.

We went back and had the poll re-done asking what we were told was the right question. and I don't have the poll results with me, but we can get them for the committee. And the results were the same.

People understand the difference between a sportsman or a citizen who wants a gun for self-protection and someone who wants to go into a gun store and turn around and sell multiple weapons.

Down the block from my office in Philadelphia there was a barber shop where U.P.S. was delivering weapons through the front door to a federal firearms licensee, and he was selling them out the back door so fast that they couldn't do anything for years.

They finally caught the man and sentenced him. And that was fine that they sentenced the man. But it didn't help with all of the multiple homicides that were traced to weapons that came from his establishment.

And that's what we are trying to do.

It's easy to say, punish the criminal. And no one disputes that. You haven't heard anyone who disputes that.

But it is better if we can cut the supply. So that it's harder for criminals to get weapons.

We know from experience that the Brady Law background checks have eliminated a large number of people who shouldn't get weapons from buying them.

There's no solution that will eliminate all illegal sales. And anyone who tells you that there is, is telling you a story. What we are look for are solutions directed towards the problem.

The problem here is multiple purchasers.

This Bill is the perfect solution to that. And

it's not something that's not tried, not tested.

Our organization, PAHV, supports both Bills or some compromise between the Bills. They are both excellent pieces of legislation. We are also proud of the fact that we have worked with members of the aisle here on all sides on this and other issues.

Last year, late last year there were amendments proposed to Act 17. They passed the House -- or they passed the Senate and they came to the House.

It was there that our group discovered that there were unintended consequences to that legislation that were not only bad gun control, but were bad for the sportsmen.

And we were the ones who told State House members about that, and the House did pass corrective legislation. The Senate, despite what we saw being represented to the House, renegaded on the deal and those amendments never got to the Governor.

But the House did the right thing because it was advised by our organization and the N.R.A.

-- Allen Crew commented to the Press that we were right -- that the Bill had unintended consequences.

We are not, as portrayed by some, a zeolat gun-banning organization. We believe that reasonable legislation can and will work when given the opportunity.

In 1995, we thought we had that opportunity and then the Senate made changes and we are now here today. I don't think any of us believes we would be here today if we had the waiting period, if Philadelphia had its heightened requirements, and if, in fact, there was the time

for the information about multiple sales to get to the feds.

We no longer have that. The instant background check has eliminated that issue in Pennsylvania because anyone can go in, buy the weapon. And by the time the information is transferred, it's too late.

It's time to look at a solution that we know has worked elsewhere. And for this legislature to approve one or both of the Bills out of committee, we know that citizens support Bills like this because they are aimed not at the average law abiding citizen, but at the people who abuse the process.

And I would ask this committee to endorse this legislation as quickly as possible so that we can eliminate a problem that plagues not only Pennsylvania, but for now a good portion of the East Coast.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Any questions from the committee? Representative James.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you for testifying. And that was a good committee we worked on. Unfortunately, we lost a little bit in

the end.

But is there something that you think that maybe we, as policymakers, could do as it relates to straw purchases, if there are so many guns purchased that there could be recorded information as given to the state police that someone bought five guns?

MR. SIEGEL: Well, the problem is two fold. One, all multiple purchases are reported to the feds.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: They are?

MR. SIEGEL: They are. There's a form, there is a federal form. But by the time the dealer takes the form, fills it out and mails it to the U.S. Attorney or the feds -- I don't know exactly how the process is done -- it's too late.

We also have right now, because of the way Act 17 is written, all that does is determine whether, based on Social Security numbers and other criteria, whether a person is approved for a weapon.

The legislature could certainly change that. In other states, I believe, it's South Carolina, for example, as soon as someone requests to purchase a weapon and then the next day could

go to dealer number two to request it, they know and they can track it.

And I am sure since we know the state police computer is up and running, probably their data base is very similar to what South Carolina uses or certainly similar to what the F.B.I. uses for background checks that go to them.

So I don't think it is a problem. I mean, I think it is a very easy thing to do in terms of tracking names, Social Security numbers, etc.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: That would be something we would have to --

MR. SIEGEL: I think it's implicit in this because anyone who is going to have to buy multiple weapons, if you pass this legislation, the state police are, obviously, going to have to determine multiple sales.

And as soon as it hits their computer, they should be able to know that.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: If they don't pass this legislation, they would have to do something else?

MR. SIEGEL: Well, I think waiting periods deter people, in terms of that. I mean,

waiting periods are often talked about for heat of passion.

16l

But I think they go beyond that. And I think this legislation shows that because one of the advantages of instant purchases is that you can go out on the street.

You know, the guy wants to make his purchases and turn around and from what all law enforcement say, make a hundred or two hundred percent markup very quickly.

Waiting periods coupled with the requirement that the feds are informed of the purchases are a big discouraging factor. So they serve the other consequence, but I don't sense any desire from the overwhelming part of the legislature here to reinstate waiting periods.

So I think we have to address the multiple sales this way.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much for attending the hearing today and presenting the position of Pennsylvanians Against Handguns Violence in these two important pieces of legislation.

Mr. Michael Gottlieb was scheduled to appear before the committee. He will be

submitting written testimony, which will be made part of the record.

And Mr. Edward Chacker, Chancellor of the Philadelphia Bar Association, who was also scheduled to appear before the committee, will be submitting written testimony and that will be made part of the record.

Because of scheduling, both could not be here today.

With that, unless there is any other business to be brought before the committee as part of this public hearing, this public hearing is closed.

(At or about 12:30 p.m., the hearing adjourned.)

\* \* \* \*

CERTIFICATE

I, Michelle S. Parke, Reporter, Notary 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 and means unless under my direct control and/or supervision.

Dated this 6th day of April, 1999.

15 Michelle & Parke

Michelle S. Parke - Reporter

Notary Public